

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, May 7, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Freeport-McMoran Sierrita, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for an Agreement to Amend Permanent Easement and Second Amendment to Deed and Easement Agreement, extend contract term to 5/7/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$270.00 revenue (CTN-RPS-24-164)

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

Supervisor Heinz asked why this contract required Board approval and could not be approved by the County Administrator given the contract revenue amount.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, clarified that it was due to the contract amount and not the dollar amount.

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

2. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Airport Authority, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Regional Drainage Facility - Tucson International Airport, extend contract term to 6/6/24 and amend contractual language, Flood Control Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$536,421.00 (CT-FC-22-370)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 7, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Larry Klingler, d.b.a. First Plaza, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide a lease agreement for the Dewhirst-Catalina Library located at 15631 N. Oracle Road, Suite 199, extend contract term to 4/30/27 and amend contractual language, Library District Operating Fund, contract amount \$183,614.87 (CT-LIB-15-469)

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 7, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

1. FEASIBILITY REPORT RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - RK¹, of the District Board of Rocking K South Community Facilities District, authorizing and ratifying the Giving of Notice of Hearing with Respect to a Feasibility Report for Public Infrastructure to be financed by the district; approving such report; authorizing the sale and issuance of not to exceed \$1,950,000.00 aggregate principal amount of general obligation bonds, Series 2024A, of the district; prescribing certain terms, conditions and provisions for such bonds; approving the execution and delivery of a bond registrar and paying agent agreement; approving the execution and delivery of other documents relating to such bonds; awarding such bonds to the purchaser thereof; appointing a bond registrar and paying agent for the bonds; authorizing the levy of an ad valorem property tax with respect to such bonds; and authorizing the taking of other actions securing the payment of and relating to the bonds.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that Pima County had an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Rocking K, under which the organization established the tax rates for the jurisdiction. She indicated that while the rates had been approved by the Board, the IGA allowed for the organization to pass \$40 plus million in bonds. She stated that \$1.8 million had been issued and this request was to issue another \$1.95 million in general obligation bonds. She reiterated that this was at the request of the organization of the taxing district and authority.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

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, May 7, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Dr. Jacqueline Jean Barrios, Assistant Professor, Public & Applied Humanities, The University of Arizona and Director, LitLabs.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passing of Lou-Ann Preble, a community member and elected official who served in the Arizona House of Representatives, District 9 from January 1993 through January 2001. He offered his condolences to her family.

PRESENTATION

5. Recognition of the “We A.R.E. Gems” Quarterly Recipients

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 23-5, Employee Recognition Program, the following employees have been selected for the quarterly "We A.R.E. Gems" recognition:

- Diana Trejo – Finance & Risk Management
- Luis Burruel - Facilities Management
- Harrison Alvarez – Public Defense Services
- Hassael Cazesuz - Library District
- Holly Schaffer - Library District
- Jennifer Torrez – Pima Animal Care Center
- Laith Alshami – Development Services
- Francisco Ramirez – Regional Flood Control
- Jennifer Cabrera (Gauglitz) – Board of Supervisors, District 3
- Sonya Tran – Assessor’s Office

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, presented the awards to the recipients. No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director and Patrick Cavanaugh, Deputy Director, Pima County Economic Development, proclaiming the week of May 6 through May 10, 2024 to be: "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WEEK"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Ivy Baumann, Human Resources Division Manager, and Stephanie Hubert, Employee Recognition Program Coordinator, Pima County Human Resources, and the Employee Recognition Committee, proclaiming the week of May 5 through May 11, 2024 to be: "PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. Tonya R. Strozier, Director, African American Student Services Department, Tucson Unified School District and Professor Desirée Cueto, Associate Professor, Department of Teaching, Learning & Sociocultural Studies, The University of Arizona, proclaiming the day of Friday, May 17, 2024 to be: "BLACK AND BROWN GIRLS WELLNESS DAY"

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

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Dan Turrentine, Food Drive Coordinator, National Association of Letter Carriers, Carl J. Kennedy Branch No. 704, proclaiming the day of Saturday, May 11, 2024 to be: "NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS FOOD DRIVE DAY"

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

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Gustavo Chairez, Stacey Carter, Noelani Roman, Daphne Lara-Cordova, River Rosales, Corrections Officers, and Antonio Rivas-Pardo, Corrections Sergeant, Pima County Sheriff's Department; Audrey Robles, RN, Health Services Administrator and Margaret Estrada, RN, Director of Nursing, NaphCare, proclaiming the week of May 5 through May 11, 2024 to be: "CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK"

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

11. Presentation of a proclamation to Luke Cole, Santa Cruz River Program Director, Sonoran Institute; Mike Quigley, Arizona Director, and Rebecca Perez, Urban to Wild Manager, The Wilderness Society, proclaiming the day of Friday, May 10, 2024 to be: "SANTA CRUZ RIVER DAY"

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

12. Presentation of a proclamation to Audrey Robles, RN, Health Services Administrator, Margaret Estrada, RN, Director of Nursing, NaphCare; Monique Garcia, RN and Michael Mendoza, RN, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the week of May 6 through May 12, 2024 to be: "NURSES WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

13. Presentation of a proclamation to Christine Russell and Karen Valdez, Pima County Public Library; Magdalena Verdugo, CEO, YWCA of Southern Arizona; Yvette Sykes, CEO, Arizona Diaper Bank; and Krista Hinman, Marketing and Business Outreach for the Arizona Diaper Bank, proclaiming the week of May 20 through May 28, 2024 to be: "PERIOD POVERTY AWARENESS WEEK"

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

14. Presentation of a proclamation to Pima County Sheriff Chris Nanos and Tucson Police Chief Chad Kasmar, proclaiming the week of May 10 through May 16, 2024 to be: "NATIONAL POLICE WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

15. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Jennifer Carrasco addressed the Board regarding her support for JobPath and how they helped her alleviate stresses by providing her with a success coach that offered one-on-one support and had also helped with living expenses.

Sharon Fickes spoke about Minute Item No. 72. She encouraged voters not to overlook judicial votes in the upcoming election and that they to listen to Supervisor Heinz's remarks made during the April 16, 2024 Board Meeting.

Cory Stephens spoke about a proposed excessive wealth tax and standardized cost of health care initiative and criticized the affordable housing trust fund that would be paid for by taxpayers.

Ujane Morales spoke in support for JobPath. She expressed her gratitude for their financial help and explained how she gave back to them.

Raf Polo expressed his opposition on the amount of time he was allowed to speak at Call to the Public and read from the Prophecies of Jeremiah, Chapter 1.

Laurie Moore voiced her concerns regarding the enforcement of immigration laws.

Don Hayles expressed his opposition to the Santa Cruz Riber Bridge Project due to public safety, traffic overload, small neighborhoods, vandalism, property taxes, and increases during stagflation and past poor planning.

Ana Greif, CEO, JobPath, stated that the organization had implemented changes to better serve the residents of Pima County. She indicated that the students they helped would not feel comfortable speaking to a government employee due to fear of getting in trouble and emphasized the importance of their collaboration.

T.T. Martinez spoke in support of JobPath and shared her experience and the financial relief they provided to her. She indicated that she would graduate later in the month and this accomplishment was due to JobPath.

Michelle Herman, Success Manager, JobPath, outlined the philosophical differences between case managers and success coaches.

Crystal Martinez voiced her support for JobPath and shared the ways they had financially supported her.

David Smith expressed his concern over the lack of common good done for the community.

Keith Van Heyningen stated that there was a \$3 Billion deficit that resulted from the neglect in road maintenance, that the government controlled the food bank, and suggested the border be sealed to help inflation and the housing crisis.

Jessica Normoyle spoke in support of nonprofits, and that there would be a labor shortage by 2030 and the way to mitigate that would be to engage with the underserved and disengaged population.

Sharon Greene expressed concern over the destiny of America and that the border crisis and foreigners that bought U.S. land would lead America to starvation.

Rick Yngve, Board Member, JobPath, emphasized the importance of cross sector collaboration in economic development.

Claudio Rodriguez, Senior Director, Policy & Advocacy, Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, addressed the Board regarding the continued partnership between the County and the Marana and Sahuarita Food Banks.

Nina Dallman spoke in support of JobPath and identified the two core differences between JobPath and One-Stop. She stated JobPath was family oriented while One-Stop was education based.

Javier Flores spoke in support of JobPath and shared his personal experiences and how the organization had financially helped him.

Celina Duran expressed her support for JobPath and how they financially helped her when she struggled and it felt like a family to her.

* * *

Supervisor Scott asked the County Administrator to follow-up with JobPath's leadership regarding the Home Repair and Weatherization funds received by Pima County.

Supervisor Heinz commented that in the State of Arizona voters were able to vote to retain or not retain judges and he indicated there were two Arizona Supreme Court judges involved in the 1864 abortion decision. He asked voters not to skip over the judges when they voted in November.

Supervisor Lee indicated that the Board had recently received a memorandum from JobPath and asked that staff from the Community and Workforce Development Department review it and provide a response. She questioned if JobPath was going beyond the funding mechanisms it was under and stated that Grants Management and Innovation found significant findings in the monitoring report. She commented that the issue was not the value of JobPath and how it helped students, but it came down to County funds. She also advised the County Administrator to review the Federal Financial Aid Pell Grant and examine why some students were not receiving it, especially being under the umbrella of JobPath and One-Stop.

Chair Grijalva clarified that JobPath was not being defunded and at the last meeting the Board approved \$1 million to JobPath and had done that for the previous two cycles, so additional funding had been provided to JobPath for three years.

* * *

16. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 1:05 p.m.

17. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:38 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

18. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement with KE&G Construction.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the proposed settlement, as discussed in Executive Session.

19. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), for discussion or consultation for legal advice regarding release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum dated March 13, 2024, Subject: Ability of Pima County Sheriff Nanos to Adopt a Deflection Program.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

20. The Board of Supervisors on April 2, 2024 continued the following:

Recognition of Armando Membrila

Discussion: Recognizing Armando Membrila for his 25 years of service on the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee and 33 years of service on the Planning and Zoning Commission. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz acknowledged Mr. Membrila's years of service on both committees and for the tremendous amount of time he dedicated to help shape a better community.

No Board action was taken.

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

Chair Grijalva stated on April 18, 2024, she attended the Visit Tucson and Board of Health Visit Tucson Board of Directors meeting and she completed the Certified Tourism Ambassador Training Program. She explained that at the Board of Health's April 24, 2024 meeting, the main discussion was heat and Dr. Cullen emphasized that heat-related issues were the leading cause of weather-related fatalities, surpassing all other extreme weather events. She explained that in Pima County, hospital emergency rooms and urgent care visits due to heat-related illnesses tended to peak during the months of June through August and the most vulnerable groups to heat-related illnesses included seniors, infants, low-income residents, individuals with disabilities and pregnant individuals.

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

22. **Update on Sahuarita and Town of Marana Food Bank and Community Resource Center**

Discussion/Direction/Action: An introduction of the partnership by the Town of Marana, Mayor Ed Honea and the Town of Sahuarita, Mayor Tom Murphy. Carlos Valles, Executive Director of the Sahuarita and Marana Food Bank and Community Resource Center, and Roberta Lopez-Suter, Board President, Sahuarita and Marana Food Bank and Community Resource Center, will provide an update on the Marana operations and services since it began its partnership with Sahuarita in December 2023. (District 3)

Supervisor Lee thanked Mayor Ed Honea and Mayor Tom Murphy for their efforts in helping the program flourish and requested they provide an update on their partnership.

Tom Murphy, Mayor, Town of Sahuarita, stated that last September the Town of Marana learned that the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona was withdrawing from Marana and due to the close relationship they had with the Sahuarita Food Bank (SFB), he was able to convince the Town of Marana to collaborate in the operation. He stated the SFB started in 2009 out of a closet with the Good Sheperd Church, which had been successful over the years and had a capital campaign in 2018. He stated that when the Board reviewed the slideshow, he was the proudest of slide 4 and quoted a proverb, "If you give a person a fish you can feed them for a day. If we teach them to fish, we could provide for life," which addressed food insufficiency as well as the Community Resource Center, the Family Resource Center and Project Azul. He emphasized the importance of breaking generational poverty and providing employment opportunities.

Ed Honea, Mayor, Town of Marana, stated that when he was notified that the Regional Food Bank would be pulling out of Marana, he took immediate action and called Mayor Murphy and former Supervisor Bronson, and they began working with the Town of Sahuarita after their meeting at their State of the Town meeting and they toured the SFB, met with staff and were welcomed with open arms. He stated that they wanted to accomplish taking care of their community, which was doing well, but many people in their area were not. He stated that the SFB and Marana Food Bank (MFB) served about 80% of individuals that did not live in their municipality. He acknowledged Supervisor Lee's swift action to help and that they would work on forming a partnership with Pima County to provide services for the community.

Roberta Lopez-Suter, President, Marana Food Bank and Sahuarita Food Bank, explained that she served for both food banks because she worked for Trico Elective Cooperative which provided electricity to both areas, and she was also a member of the SFB Board for four years and was named President the prior year. She added when the MFB was acquired, she had been asked to assume the President role. She stated the partnership worked seamlessly and that Trico was pleased to be involved. She added that they provided food and monetary donations and believed in both of the food banks so much that they provided volunteers twice a month to help on food distribution days and with their leadership they had made miraculous efforts in a short period of time.

Carlos Valles, Executive Director, Marana Food Bank and Sahuarita Food Bank, provided a slideshow presentation with an overview of the MFB and Community Resource Center. He stated they had three pillars, with the first being the Food Bank. He explained the food bank was run with two full-time and three part-time staff members and volunteers with a strong belief that their organizations should be run by members of the community. He added that in the prior year the SFB had 33,000 volunteer hours and the MFB had 45 actively engaged volunteers. He stated they did not want to disrupt their current drive-thru model which allowed clients to choose their own food items to help with food waste and provided them with dignity. He stated the food bank was open four days per week with the possibility of opening a fifth day in the future. He stated that the second pillar was Families and

Individuals Served and for the current calendar year, January was the slowest month and in the last quarter of the year 109 new families registered for emergency food. He added that numbers were consistently high throughout Pima County and globally due to high food prices and inflation. He stated that the third pillar was for Resources, which was in the Community Resource Center. He stated that while food was important, it was also important to get people out of poverty and break generational cycles. He stated that some of the programs offered were for tax preparation in partnership with Pio Decimo for income eligible individuals, the Pima County One-Stop Navigator Pilot Program which helped 250 individuals, ServSafe certification for individuals employed in the food industry and the Paint Program that taught individuals how to paint and start their own business. He explained that the SFB had been open since 2009, they distributed emergency food four days per week, and one day per week with their Home Delivery Program. He stated they also had a Backpack Program, which was partially funded through the Town of Sahuarita and the Pima County Community Services Block Grant. He stated they had 781 children enrolled in 12 schools located south of Valencia Road to the Arizona border. He added their nutrition program consisted of Diabetes Management Education and they worked with their partners. He explained that the Community Resource Center included wrap-around services and if they lacked a service, they could connect an individual with a provider. He stated that last November they became a licensed vocational school through the Arizona State Board for Private Postsecondary Education and had partnered with the National Coalition of Certification Centers to offer a Welding Program. He added that there was 29 students enrolled in the program and once completed, they would have no debt and their partners committed to \$60,000.00 jobs upon graduation. He stated that they wanted to put people into jobs they wanted and be able to earn a livable wage. He stated they also had a Google IT Certificate Program and had 7 graduates their last cohort and provided an example of two success stories with one individual who went from \$0.00 to \$50,000.00 and another who went from \$50,000.00 to \$70,000.00 after they received this certificate. He explained that their Family Resource Center was funded through First Things First and United Way of Southern Arizona was the administrator of the grant and had served 147 families in six months, which was a program that served families with 0 to 5 children. He explained that Project AZUL, Arizona Uniting Lives, was an extension of their organization that brought their resources on a 46-foot mobile unit equipped with Starlink highspeed satellite internet access, 22-foot classroom space, generators and a bathroom, to communities in need. He added they had done well and that GED and learning English had flourished in some areas over the last six months. He referred to the slide that showed Families and Individuals Served was high overall and showed photos of their programs which included culinary skills, the full client choice model, line and prep program, tech hub with 3D printers, Lego robotics, a class for Seniors that taught about scamming, a welding program, the Drive-thru model and educational programs.

Supervisor Lee indicated that it took a village for their operation to be successful and asked for an introduction of the team in attendance.

Mr. Valles introduced Sofia Castro, Program Manager, SFB and MFB; Curtis Keim, Vice President, SFB; Penny Pestle, Past Board Chair, Board of Directors; Denise Burns, Advisory Board, MFB; Richard, Marana Volunteer; John Officer, Advisory Board, Town Council of Marana; and Clint Peek, Advisory Board, MFB.

Supervisor Scott thanked the MFB and SFB for their partnership to ensure that there was proximity to food bank services for all the residents that benefited from the operation of the food bank. He requested more information from the County Administrator on other areas within the County regarding their proximity to food bank services and where they lacked proximity to services as a result of this partnership and how the County might follow up with the Community Food Bank and other entities to fill the gaps.

No Board action was taken.

23. **Dedicated Affordable Housing Funding Options**

Discussion/Direction/Action: In furtherance of Policies 1, 2, and 3, of the recently adopted Prosperity Initiative (Pima County Board of Supervisors Policy E 36.2, Reducing Generational Poverty and Improving Individual and Community Wealth), directing the County Administrator to come back to the Board at our August 19, 2024, Board Meeting with initial options vetted by staff for the establishment of a dedicated Pima County Housing Trust Fund, for the development and preservation of affordable housing in Pima County. Such Fund, which could have a single or multiple funding sources, should be able to achieve annual combined revenues for affordable housing of at least \$10 million per year to start (FY2026), with the ability to grow to meet increased demand in future years.

Potential funding mechanisms to evaluate and present to the Board for discussion and further direction on August 19th may include any one, or combination of, the following: (A) a portion of the primary property tax dedicated to affordable housing (similar structure to PAYGO policy), (B) a new secondary property tax for affordable housing backed by bonding, (C) Document Recording Fees, (D) voluntary Developer Impact Fees (similar to the Tempe model), (E) a Pima County sales tax dedicated to affordable housing, and/or (F) other options that could be achieved through a vote of the Board of Supervisors and/or the electorate. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz expressed his concern over the lack of affordable housing units and the number of individuals living on the street after being discharged from the hospital. He noted how there used to be a dedicated funding source that was thrown out by the Supreme Court due to its classification as an impact fee. He stated that many other communities had dedicated funding streams that removed it from the General Fund to support housing and requested the County closely examine options for this. He highlighted how this would be in furtherance of policies 1 through 3, outlined in the recently passed Prosperity Initiative. He stated that something could be brought forward after staff review to consider all options and establish a dedicated mechanism to ensure his goal of at least \$10 million or more,

compared to the current allocation of \$5 million and that the County needed to do more than that. He stated that the housing crisis was worsening, with rents skyrocketing in Pima County and across the state and nation, placing many constituents at risk of homelessness and distress with the housing situation. He felt this could be a role that the County could embrace, but the Board needed to review the information. He stated staff needed to review months of data and present it to the Board with an analysis of the possibilities, what made sense, if it needed to be referred to the ballot or legislature.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz to task the County Administrator and her team with completing an analysis with options to be brought back to the Board for discussion or consideration of the options. The motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Grijalva explained her decision not to vote for Supervisor Heinz's proposal and mentioned that upon entering office, they reviewed various suggestions with staff. She noted that while some ideas were deemed impractical others were deemed possible. She expressed her concern over the lack of affordable housing emphasizing the impact on both Districts 2 and 5 the most. She stated that she was willing to explore funding options as a target of the Prosperity Initiative aimed at addressing the need for more funding. She stated that Pima County had a Housing Trust Fund which was created in 2004/2005 to address the affordable housing issue and it was funded with a rooftop fee on newly constructed housing, however it lost revenue during the recession and became dormant in 2011/2012, after it was deemed legally questionable by the former County Attorney's Office. She stated that perhaps that was something that could be revisited by asking the current County Attorney to review the information. She stated that she had no issue with dedicating a portion of the primary property tax to affordable housing, similar to other issues, for example, like the PAYGO Program. She added that the possibility of utilizing secondary property tax bonding required a public vote with significant community interest before it would be in the County's best interest because it would be a costly campaign and would require interest payments on bonds. She expressed her concern with document recording fees and questioned where they currently went and whether departments would lose funding, her concern with voluntary developer impact fees because the County would have to cut corners by removing established development requirements to incentivize voluntary contributions and that the use of existing mandatory development impact fees for affordable housing was not permitted by statute, that a Pima County sales tax dedicated to affordable housing was the most regressive form of taxation that would hit the poorest the hardest, like requiring low-income individuals to pay for their own affordable housing because there was already a very high local tax burden. She stated that she was okay with the other options. She was unsure that this required a vote and that the Board had previously considered various funding sources that were deemed problematic or undoable. She stated that perhaps the exercise to the PAYGO inquiry could be limited and the reassessment of the rooftop fee approach or by reviewing other suggested possibilities like placing a portion of County property sales into the Housing Trust Fund. She questioned where those funds currently went and whether a portion of those sales could go into affordable housing, or by earmarking a portion

of building permit fees for the fund. She stated that she could support reviewing all the options, but was unsure if a vote was required for some of the other issues and she wanted to avoid redundant efforts by staff.

Supervisor Scott expressed gratitude towards Supervisor Heinz for his well-thought-out proposal and explained the reason he did not second the motion. He stated that in October 2022, the Board appointed an 18-member Regional Affordable Housing Commission (RAHC) which included representatives from each district office and various jurisdictions, however it lacked representation from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and the Tohono O'odham Nation. He stated that he had repeatedly expressed that the RAHC had not done enough to act on its mission. He read aloud the Commission's mission statement as outlined on the County's website. He stated that while the Commission had done a terrific job dealing with the GAP funding proposals vetted by staff and sent recommendations to the Board, he raised concerns with the lack of long-term strategic thinking and discussion. He stated that they were supposed to come up with a strategy to increase the supply of housing and felt that they had not engaged in the long-term strategic visioning the Board thought they would do based on their task force recommendations which led to the creation of the Commission. He stated that he would be very supportive of some of Supervisor Heinz's ideas being reviewed by the Commission. He added that Board members would be invited to a meeting, and last summer when he addressed the Commission he requested they consider a Housing Trust Fund or a Land Trust which was similar to the Community Land Trust. He expressed his interest in Supervisor Heinz's ideas being considered by the Commission or other ideas that dealt with long-term thinking on how to fulfill their mission.

Chair Grijalva indicated that for the last two years, \$5 million was allocated from the County's budget for housing that would be used for leveraging to attract other funding. She questioned the status of submitted proposals, the opportunities that were considered and the feedback for any that did not qualify. She stated that the federal government would be soliciting for grants, and the reason why this and the investment in preschools and open space were done was for the leverage to be able to draw other funding because the County would not be able to fund it alone.

Supervisor Heinz questioned why a vote would not be made if Board members were generally supportive of the ideas or whether it needed to be directed to the RAHC.

Chair Grijalva stated that her arguments were different from that of Supervisor Scott and some of those things could not be moved forward and sought clarification on whether a vote was needed. She requested that the County Administrator explore options and provide a recommendation. She stated that there were knowledgeable staff in the County that could provide more information on the matter and reiterated she was unsure whether a vote was needed.

Supervisor Heinz stated that this was not an exhaustive list and if it was something that could not happen without other requirements those did not need to be explored, and there might be other ideas on the list not considered that might be feasible. He

stated that he would like them to be explored and that perhaps the RAHC commissioners needed clearer direction which this may provide that.

Chair Grijalva questioned if the proposal should be given to the Commission versus the staff.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that both the Commission and staff should be working together.

Supervisor Lee stated that she believed the City of Tucson had leveraged their Industrial Development Authority (IDA), regarding affordable housing that might pertain to this, and she questioned if the County had the authority in its IDA to follow similar efforts.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that her understanding of the Board's requests for this item was for information on a variety of feedback and a full report on what efforts had been made to leverage resources and everything being addressed by the Commission and all their funding opportunities that had been gleaned, including the IDA.

Supervisor Christy stated that the idea to remand Supervisor Heinz's comments and ideas and Supervisor Scott's comments regarding the Commission be sent to the Commission while staff worked on provided answers to Supervisor Heinz's questions and felt that the Commission should be engaged in this process. He stated that this could be staff direction to the County Administrator and was unsure if it required a vote.

Ms. Leshar confirmed that the Board's direction was clear in terms of reviewing the mission and inquire for progress on the individual ideas presented and add to their portfolio to look at what those different funding opportunities might be and request them to report back on their findings, as well as staff, that included ways to leverage other programs.

No Board action was taken.

24. **Release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum Regarding Deflection Protocol, Law Enforcement**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Waiving privilege and releasing to the public the Pima County Attorney's Office memorandum written by Sean Holguin, Deputy County Attorney, dated March 13, 2024, Subject: Ability of Pima County Sheriff Nanos to Adopt a Deflection Program. (District 2)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to waive the attorney-client privilege and release the memorandum.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

25. **Non-Competitive Outside Agency Funding for 2024-2025**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Non-Competitive Outside Agency Funding for the 2024-2025 recommended budget specific to JobPath, Sun Corridor Inc., and the Metropolitan Education Commission.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the Board had previously discussed the non-competitive outside agencies and them not being subject to the annual appropriation process. She stated that at the request of the Board, they reviewed various programs that were being conducted by Attractions and Tourism and through Community and Workforce Development (CWD), with the focus to examine programs, such as JobPath, Sun Corridor, Inc., Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC), and funding provided through health-related programs by the Arizona Board of Regents. She stated that while the Board considered her recommendations, to keep in mind that JobPath had the remainder of their last \$1 million allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) dollars at the rate of \$750,000.00 annually and her recommendation was for them to be funded at \$600,000.00 for the following year and to reduce Sun Corridor from \$650,000.00 to \$550,000.00 and to reduce \$50,000.00 from the Board of Regents related health programs. She stated that as the Tentative Budget was being discussed they indicated the need to cut \$300,000.00 from Outside Agency funding. She stated that another recommendation was to maintain the current funding level of \$122,000.00 for MEC and transition it back into the competitive Outside Agency process in future budget years, starting with the 25/26 budget cycle.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if during the current budget cycle there would be an additional \$1 million going to JobPath on top of the recommendation provided or any amount determined by the Board.

Ms. Leshar clarified that there had been a 3-year allocation for \$1 million per year which was in its last year, and they had until the end of the calendar year to spend down the remainder which was about \$350,000.00. She explained that JobPath had been steadily increasing their general fund allocation starting at \$250,000.00 per year until it reached an allocation of \$750,000.00 per year. She stated that three years prior the County began the \$3 million ARPA allocations, so that equaled \$1,750,000.00 and as the ARPA dollars were wound down and other cuts were impacting the County budget, they recommended cutting the amount by \$150,000.00 while they continued to spend down the ARPA dollars through the end of the calendar year.

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification whether this was a recommendation for Fiscal Year 2024/2025, if it would be re-evaluated for 2026 or if it was a permanent change.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was a change for the following fiscal year.

It was moved by Supervisor Lee to approve recommendation Nos. 2, 3 and 4, as listed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated May 6, 2024, and to remove recommendation No. 1 for further discussion.

Chair Grijalva requested clarification of the recommendations.

Supervisor Lee read the recommendations as follows:

1. Reduce JobPath Inc., General Fund annual budgetary contribution from \$750,000.00 to \$600,000.00.
2. Reduce Sun Corridor Inc., General Fund annual budgetary contribution from \$650,000.00 to \$550,000.00.
3. Reduce funding to the Arizona Board of Regents for health related programs by \$50,000.00.
4. Maintain MEC at its current funding level of \$122,000.00 and move MEC back to the competitive outside agency funding process for the 2025/2026 budget.

Chair Grijalva seconded the motion. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva commented that she had dedicated one of her staff during the prior year to work exclusively on a company that Sun Corridor had brought into Pima County that were environmental polluters and she wanted to ensure that the contract with Sun Corridor mirrored one they had with the City of Tucson that required them to check-in with the County on a regular basis. She stated that the argument posed to her was that the company in question was brought with funding from other locations and the County was one of their largest funders. She stated that it made her feel uncomfortable and she would like to be consulted to ensure they understood what the Board had voted for and passed resolutions for, and that they worked diligently to not bring companies that went against those resolutions.

Supervisor Scott offered a friendly amendment to the motion to remove recommendation No. 4 for separate discussion.

Supervisor Lee and Chair Grijalva accepted the friendly amendment.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy to roll back all the funding levels to 2019 levels.

Chair Grijalva inquired about those funding levels.

Supervisor Christy stated that his recollection was that Sun Corridor and JobPath stayed at the same level as it currently was. He explained that way it was pre-COVID levels and without the infusion of COVID monies and felt that this would be a theme to review as the budget process moved along. He added that COVID was gone and funding for those programs was discontinuing or already terminated and

the need to review where the County was at the 2019 levels and to adjust for inflation.

Chair Grijalva stated she could not support the substitute motion.

Supervisor Lee replied in the negative and stated it was due to the additional General Fund cuts as recommended by the County Administrator and the need was to focus their attention on that area.

The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board was back to the original amended motion, to approve recommendations No. 2 and 3.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Scott to keep MEC at its current funding level and not move it back to the competitive Outside Agency funding process for the next budget cycle. The motion died for lack of a second.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Lee to approve recommendation No. 4, as listed in the May 6, 2024 County Administrator Memorandum. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that he previously served on the MEC Executive Board and for years the joint City/County Commission had been funded by both jurisdictions through their competitive Outside Agency process. He stated that at that time, they received commitments from former Supervisor Elías and Council Member Romero to remove the MEC from the Outside Agency process, which had not been fulfilled. He stated that when he was elected to the Board of Supervisors, he approached the County Administrator on the issue to follow up on the commitment, and in turn, the Board removed the MEC from the Outside Agency process. He added that the City of Tucson had not followed up on their similar commitment, which he felt was disturbing since it was a joint City/County Commission and it was not an outside agency. He stated that he had asked the County Administrator to follow up with the City Manager and requested that Chair Grijalva follow up with the Mayor regarding not removing them from their Outside Agency process and to at least match what the County had historically provided to the MEC. He reiterated that for years, the County had provided the major share of support and did not feel it was appropriate, it was not an outside agency and in 2021, the Board removed it from the process and he was unclear why the Board was considering going backwards to reverse that decision. He stated that he could not support the motion.

Supervisor Christy questioned MEC's prior funding levels.

Ms. Leshar responded that for the prior two years it was \$120,000.00 and \$122,000.00, but she did not have historical data. She indicated that she could provide it to the Board.

Chair Grijalva recalled it was \$125,000.00 with some kind of percentage cut.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification of what the Board would vote on for the MEC.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the MEC recommendation was for \$122,000.00 for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. She explained her perspective on why she thought it was acceptable for MEC to be in the competitive process. She noted that in her experience of writing grants and requesting funding from the County for more than 25 years and part of the process was to justify other funding with a diversified fund base of support, had to show who the Board of Directors were and had to prove why it was a unique program to serve the needs of Pima County residents. She felt that it was a good exercise for the MEC to go through and they historically received funding. She expressed her concern that they continued to mostly rely on County funding to sustain their program and there needed to be investment by other organizations to show that there was value to them, and they could also continue with fundraising. She added that she served on the MEC as the County's representative prior to Supervisor Lee and COVID was a difficult time for them, which was why she felt comfortable providing them additional time to adjust and they also had a new Chief Executive Officer. She stated that she would reconsider if the City of Tucson was willing to match Pima County, something that the City had not done for a significant amount of time.

Supervisor Christy asked what Chair Grijalva was suggesting.

Chair Grijalva clarified that it was to approve the recommendation made by the County Administrator, \$122,000.00 for Fiscal Year 2024/2025 and that they would be part of the Outside Agency competitive funding process for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

Supervisor Christy requested confirmation if MEC had received \$122,000.00 to \$125,000.00 over the last couple of years.

Chair Grijalva responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott reiterated his opposition to the motion, but formally requested that Chair Grijalva and the County Administrator, along with MEC leadership, follow up with City of Tucson leadership regarding that they at least match the funding provided by the County for this joint City/County Commission, noting that the historic underfunding predated the Board's tenure dating back to the formation in the 1990's. He hoped that Mayor Romero recalled conversations she had with the MEC Executive Board when she was the Ward 1 Council Member and was the

City's liaison, and that the current Ward 1 Council Member liaison would also follow up on the matter.

Supervisor Heinz commented that he and his staff had a brief meeting with the new Executive Director, Rocque Perez, who embraced being part of the competitive funding process and reaffirmed that the City of Tucson did not contribute what the County had. He stated that the MEC was not an outside agency, but MEC leadership appeared okay with the situation.

Chair Grijalva stated that another reason she was comfortable with it was because historically, there were other outside agencies that did not go through the same competitive process, but they were monitored and evaluated by staff on a regular basis, and she felt that for all the organizations being discussed it would have been helpful. She provided an example of how things could be discovered with organizations because of the correlation to the requirements of federal funding which to her was important that a process and evaluation be in place, and it merited review to ensure the County received what was requested for its investment.

Supervisor Scott commented that he had a similar conversation with Mr. Hanna, the current Chair of the MEC Executive Board, who was not in favor of the MEC going back to the competitive Outside Agency funding process.

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

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board was back to the JobPath recommendation.

Supervisor Lee expressed gratitude to the students that shared their experiences with JobPath during Call to the Public. She emphasized that she was not advocating for JobPath to be eliminated, but rather suggested the General Fund monies be reduced and have JobPath address underserved populations. She thanked the JobPath Board Chair for being in attendance and asked whether the Grants Management and Innovation (GMI) Department's monitoring report had been shared with the JobPath Board. She stated the reason she brought it up was because it was very concerning as a taxpayer the things that were found in the report, which were egregious. She stated that she was compelled to discuss the findings so that everyone understood how egregious they were. She explained that GMI conducted a monitoring because \$3 million in ARPA funds was provided, but the invoices submitted could not be paid based on the federal regulations. She stated that one finding was for compensation noncompliance and showed that they were unable to produce documentation of secondary signatures on timesheets, unable to provide timesheet records for two months, as well as payroll documents for a sample employee. She stated that a second finding was for procurement noncompliance and showed they were unable to produce procurement-related documentation for a sample vendor, unable to produce JobPath procedures for small purchases to be covered with federal awards or subawards. She stated that a third finding was for cost allowability noncompliance and showed that they provided financial support to student participants without sufficient written rationale and

backup documentation. She stated that a fourth finding was for eligibility noncompliance and showed 17 individuals were found not to reside in Pima County. She stated that the fifth and last finding was for performance noncompliance and showed inadequate documentation and data collection systems to validate program results. She added that the Economic Development department had also corroborated that most of the results requested or what GMI had requested were not present and the information given was verbal. She stated that as student files were reviewed, adequate documentation was not in their files regarding the data collection. She stated that the most egregious things found was the purchase of a vehicle for a student in which they failed to provide documentation for financial assistance provided to a participant that received \$8,000.00 to purchase an \$11,000.00 vehicle and the student then received \$3,000.00 from their partner and JobPath reimbursed the partner with an additional \$3,000.00, therefore, JobPath provided \$11,000.00 for this individual to wholly purchase a vehicle. She expressed concern that this was something that should not be done. She added that the monitoring report indicated that JobPath needed to establish consistent policies and procedures to provide written support for allowability and reasonableness of participant payments, that they had no policies and procedures rationalizing the reasonableness of participant payments in this case, nor could it produce adequate transaction documentation, it was problematic on a variety of fronts and violated compliance with federal and County regulations. She was also concerned with the 17 non-Pima County residents, their pattern of insufficient documentation and GMI staff could not validate participant outcomes for tested files and the monitoring results dovetailed with repeated problems GMI had with JobPath related to monthly and quarterly data collection reporting required by ARPA CSLFRF rules established and enforced by the U.S. Department of Treasury. She added that there were tremendous issues with back up documentation insufficiencies, as well as missing or altered data over time. She stated that this was a small review of the last 25 years, but was unsure if there were other audits, JobPath conducted their own audits which resulted in no findings. She stated that part of her recommendation would be for JobPath to be placed under the supervision of CWD so that they could ensure the documentation was completed as well as ensure the rules and regulations were being followed.

Chair Grijalva expressed concern that JobPath was its own organization, however financial checks and balances were important and she believed that GMI was trying to help JobPath rectify their systematic issues. She noted there was a leadership change and because they had been around so long, there were assumptions made regarding their operation. She added that by looking at what was federally allowable was beneficial for the County and JobPath, but when an organization ran a program that relied on results, the data was required to back it up. She expressed this had been her concern, because the data showed impressive results, but they had no proof, and it was important for the data to be collected instead of anecdotal information. She was also concerned with their coaches that worked closely with students; however, she questioned how the expenditures would be justified because it was known that by students completing classes was not only about money, but there was also other factors and support systems in place. She questioned the

justification for varying levels of support given to different students which for her had been the missing part of it. She stated that JobPath had recently had an additional monitoring on May 3rd, but the Board did not have that information and perhaps the things listed for the current monitoring may have been resolved. She stated that at this point, she would not be able to support the amount recommended by the County Administrator. She stated that her thought was to wait until May 21st for this item and requested that JobPath not ask people to come to Call to the Public because it made her think that they were using their resources to lobby the Board. She added that she had talked with students and people were welcome to contact her directly, but it would be beneficial to receive the results of the additional monitoring to make a more informed decision. She stated that she would also like to be able to give JobPath credit if they were able to resolve the findings in the report.

Supervisor Scott stated that he would be comfortable waiting until May 21st. He stated that any amount approved by the Board for 2024/2025 in General Fund support would require a contract. He questioned if the contract could address the accounting and reporting standards, as well as an agreed upon plan for JobPath to diversify its funding base and whether the contract would be considered by the Board in June.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and stated that the provisions suggested could be reviewed to be included in the contract as long as it was acceptable to both parties.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that everything could be bargained for, but cautioned the Board to ensure it was within the federal and state guidelines.

Supervisor Heinz asked if JobPath was subject to federal rules and oversight before they received the \$1 million in funding.

Ms. Leshar responded that the \$1 million in ARPA monies were different federal standards.

Supervisor Heinz stated that Pell Grants were federal dollars that could be used for many things. He stated that cars should not be bought for everyone and that it was his understanding that was a one-time mistake that would not happen again, but it helped two JobPath students in Pima County. He added Pell Grants could be used for tuition, fees, textbooks, school supplies, transportation, and childcare for student dependents which was heard during Call to the Public and it seemed like the scrutiny and concern about insufficient metrics was resolved or currently being resolved. He felt that it was not a great idea to be dumping something like this that helped many people and that the 17 nonresident individuals helped, out of 600 was worth the County to continue to support them. He stated that there should be other ways to ask for help and that Pima County One-Stop had done a great job and worked hand-in-hand with JobPath, they still had a role to play, they should still be

funded by the County and he would support continuing the level of funding at \$750,000.00 and discussing it further at the next meeting.

Supervisor Lee stated the initial importance of this was for duplication of services and the monitoring report was very important, so she brought it forward. She stated that the realization was that the programs of CWD and the JobPath report showed they were very similar. She was not sure if that meant there was not a place for JobPath, but she had thought about the possibility based on one of their reports was to look at the high school population. She added that she could support that JobPath look at different populations that did not create overlaps with One-Stop. She stated that One-Stop could very well offer the same things as JobPath if they had the funding that the County provided. She stated that if JobPath could review what was really needed and worked with One-Stop, they would be able to indicate the niches they would not be able to work with but felt there was a need and collaboration with One-Stop to figure out those specifics. She stated that she did not believe One-Stop went to the high schools for recruitment, but there was a high level of high school dropouts and she felt that JobPath could assist those students as well as the School Superintendent getting in touch with charter schools or home schooled students. She expressed her excitement if JobPath partnered with Youth on Their Own, Primavera that dealt with homelessness and Literacy Connects that did English as a Second Language and Adult Basic Education for individuals that needed assistance. She stated that she saw the value that JobPath could bring and hoped that if she could support funding to see new proposals on how they would diversify funding sources and looked at other needed high-risk areas.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the County Administrator's recommendation regarding JobPath, to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 21, 2024.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

26. Annual Action Plan

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 16, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve submission of the Pima County 2024-2025 Annual Action Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

FY 2024/2025 Pima County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

Location-Applicant/Program/Activity/District/Request/Recommendation

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Builds/ps/3/\$50,000/\$50,000

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Works/ps/3/\$20,000/\$20,000

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Teen Project/ps/3/\$35,000/\$30,000

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Youth Center/pf/3/\$40,000/\$25,000

Arivaca Community Center/Facility Improvements/pf/3/\$40,000/\$30,000

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resources/Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resources Facility Improvements/pf/3/\$35,000/\$30,000

Arivaca - Friends of Arivaca Schoolhouse/Schoolhouse Facility Improvements/pf/3/\$35,000/\$35,000

Avra Water Co-op, Inc./Aging Meter Replacement Program/MXU Install Program/pf/3/\$60,000/\$25,000

Drexel Heights Fire District/Family Safety Program/ps/3,5/\$15,000/\$15,000
 Flowing Wells School District/Flowing Wells Family Resource Center/ps/1,3/\$46,000/\$40,000
 Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/SHIM Safety and Health in
 Motion Fall Prevention/ps/2,3,4/\$35,000/\$15,000
 Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Facility
 Improvements/pf/2,3,4/\$39,500/\$40,000
 Sahuarita Food Bank/Warehouse Logistics Improvements/pf/2,3,4/\$413,021/\$60,000
 City of South Tucson/Administration/admin/2/\$35,000/\$30,000
 City of South Tucson/Code Enforcement Program/ps/2/\$25,000/\$10,000
 City of South Tucson/Community Cleanup & Green Program/ps/2/\$10,000/\$5,000
 City of South Tucson/Crime Prevention and Education Program/ps/2/\$25,000/\$20,000
 City of South Tucson/Fire and Rescue Safety Equipment/pf/2/\$15,000/\$10,000
 City of South Tucson/Youth Programs/ps/2/\$120,000/\$100,000
 Living Streets Alliance/South Tucson Bicycle Pedestrian Program/ps/2/\$30,000/\$25,000
 Pima County CWD/Administration/admin/All/\$500,000/\$430,089
 Pima County CWD/CDBG/OA Contingency Allocation and Waiver of Indirect
 Cost/-/All/\$250,000/\$181,509
 Pima County CWD/Emergency Septic/hsg/All/\$100,000/\$50,000
 Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$1,000,000/\$550,000
 Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc./Nahui Ollin Wellness Program (NOWP)/ps/All/\$50,000/\$20,000
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair
 Program/hsg/All/\$275,000/\$240,000
 DIRECT Center for Independence/Home Access Program/hsg/All/\$75,000/\$50,000
 Habitat for Humanity Tucson/Habitat Home Repair Owner-Occupied Housing
 Rehabilitation/hsg/All/\$170,000/\$70,000
 IMPACT of Southern Arizona/Facility Improvement/pf/All/\$85,250/\$55,000
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona/ps/All/\$48,000/\$25,000
 Our Family Services, Inc./Reunion House Facility Improvements/pf/All/\$25,000/\$25,000
 SER Jobs for Progress/SER Facility Improvements/pf/2/All/\$70,000/\$55,000
 Southwest Fair Housing Council/Fair Housing Enforcement, Education, and
 Outreach/admin/5/All/\$35,000/\$25,000
 St. Luke's In The Desert, Inc., d.b.a. St. Luke's Home/Facility Improvement,
 Roof/pf/All/\$350,000/\$77,000
 The Diaper Bank of Southern Arizona/Warehouse Upgrades/pf/2/All/\$35,000/\$30,000
 Three Points Fire District/Community Be Safe Program/ps/3/\$26,500/\$20,000
 Watershed Management Group/Green Stormwater Infrastructure for Neighborhood
 Cleanup/pf/All/\$100,000/\$45,000
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/ps/All/\$40,000/\$27,000
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/HNS Campus Facility Improvements/pf/2/All/\$75,000/\$75,000
TOTAL REQUESTED \$6,611,632/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$2,665,598

HUD Eligible Activity Abbreviations: admin = Administration; ps = Public Service; pf = Public Facility
 Improvement; ngu = Neighborhood Green-Up; infra = Infrastructure Improvement; hsg = Housing
 Rehabilitation; ed = Economic Development; land = Land Acquisition; demo = Demolition; bf =
 Brownfields and Clearance.

FY 2024/2025 Pima County Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

ESG Component/Agency/Program/Activity Focus/District/Request /Recommendation

Emergency Shelter/Emerge!/Emergency Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence/DV
 Families/All/\$50,000/\$30,264
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Casa Paloma/Single Women/All/\$55,000/\$30,000
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Family Pathways/Families,
 Individuals/All/\$55,000/\$30,000
 Emergency Shelter/Sister Jose/Women's Center/Single Women/All/\$50,000/\$13,500
 Emergency Shelter/Sister Jose/Shelter/Families/All/\$65,590/\$20,000
 Homeless Prevention/Green Valley Assistance Services/Valley Assistance Family MAP (Map a
 Plan)/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$52,500/\$30,000

Homeless Prevention/Pima County/Homeless Prevention/Families, Individuals/All/\$52,000/\$50,667
Administration/Pima County/-/Administration/All/\$16,887/\$16,887
Administration/Pima County/ESG/OA Contingency Allocation and Waiver of Indirect
Cost/Administration/All/\$20,105/\$20,105
TOTAL REQUESTED \$502,082/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$241,423

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

Supervisor Scott thanked staff from Community and Workforce Development (CWD) for meeting with the Board offices regarding the plan and for all the community outreach that went into putting it together. He stated that during a discussion with the director and staff of CWD he let them know that he wanted to see administrative costs reduced in future years. He highlighted that CDBG had an administrative cost of \$430,089.00 and ESG was \$16,887.00. He stated that the director informed him that it was a topic of discussion within the department.

Chair Grijalva indicated that she had the same conversation with them regarding the percentages. She indicated that in the past, it was listed as an additional indirect and was now classified as contingency allocation and appreciated staff's willingness to do that. She emphasized the amount of funding available for nonprofits and that any reduction to Pima County would make a huge difference for the programs.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

27. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00011, Rocking K South Neighborhood 5 Parcel J-1: Lots 1-75, Common Area 'A' & 'B'. (District 4)

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

28. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00013, Rocking K South Neighborhood 5 Parcel J-2: Lots 76-191, Common Area 'A' & 'B'. (District 4)

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

29. Final Plat With Assurances

P24FP00002, Rocking K South Neighborhood 5 Parcel G: Lots 1-135, Common Area 'A1-A4' & 'B1-B2'. (District 4)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

30. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.11, Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan Pension Funding.

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

HEALTH

31. Heat Awareness Week

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 17, of the Board of Supervisors, for the adoption of 'Heat Awareness Week'.

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

Supervisor Christy criticized the purpose of the Resolution due to its projection that Pima County would experience 160 days of temperature at or above 90 degrees by 2035. He stated that this seemed like summer to him and that his office reviewed information from the National Weather Service, The National Oceanic and the Atmospheric Administration and stated that the resolution was worried about 160 days of temperatures at 90 degrees or above, but in 2017, there were 190 days of 90 degrees and above temperatures and that the rankings showed it was a normal pattern, but yet the County caused it to be an emergency development when there had been previous many more days at 90 degrees or above. He added that the record in 1910, was 178 days of 90 degrees or above. He felt the resolution went overboard. He referred to a section of the resolution that mentioned the Pima County Office of Climate and Environmental Justice (CEJ), but stated that he could not find this office in Pima County's organizational chart. He referred to the resolution regarding this department and other County departments incorporating heat resilience and response into its comprehensive climate action plans. He questioned who the Climate Action Executive team was, what they did and whether it was a new department.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the office of CEJ was in the Health Department and created by a specific grant they received for their department. She stated that she did not have the names of the members of the Climate Action Executive team, but provided previous updates to the Board. She stated that she would provide an additional update to the Board. She added there were two

elements of the action team and a variety of Directors that came together across departmental efforts to review a variety of issues related to heat response and had folks that served as advisors. She stated at this point the primary concern was to address the heat of the summer with County employees to ensure they were taking the precautions necessary for folks working in the field and in the community. She stated that this was simply for the adoption of heat awareness.

Supervisor Christy asked if the program was federally funded.

Ms. Leshar responded that the CEJ was funded by grants but would get back to the Board on the source of the grants and reiterated that this was in effect a resolution adopting Heat Awareness Week to remind people of the concerns related to Pima County employees.

Supervisor Christy stated that another concern with the Resolution was that it indicated Pima County would develop and enact other policy recommendations to include the potential development and consideration of ordinances or procedural modifications. He questioned if the Resolution would bring similar policies and mandates as the ones from COVID.

Ms. Leshar responded that because this had been a primary concern that was the reason they indicated that if any kind of conversations or policies were needed, those would come to the Board for policy direction.

Supervisor Christy asked where that information was listed.

Ms. Leshar stated that Supervisor Christy had read the information and asked for clarification of what he read.

Supervisor Christy responded that it stated, "Pima County will develop..." however it did not mention anything about the Board or the climate emergency action committee.

Ms. Leshar reiterated that they would bring policies back to the Board for approval and that there had been discussions from other communities regarding cities that had enacted ordinances and the conversations they had was that they did not want to revisit some of the concerns that occurred during the pandemic when rules were created very quickly which provided them additional time to not revisit but could learn from those lessons.

Chair Grijalva requested that the slide show be presented to the Board.

Francisco Garcia, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, provided a slideshow presentation and stated that in 2018 the Health Department had initially produced an analysis of heat-related deaths from data at emergency room visits, hospitalizations and deaths. He stated the County had been engaged in many ways to better understand how the

issue impacted the County's jurisdiction. He referenced a slide and stated that in 2023 there were 176 heat related deaths that occurred in Pima County and 46% of those individuals died in their own homes, most of them were elderly or clinically vulnerable, and 26% of those individuals were unhoused. He added they were also required to report on undocumented border crossers that died of exposure, which represented 28%. He stated that heat-related issues predominantly affected males due to occupational exposures associated with outdoor work. He stated that by 2035, it should be planned to experience 160 days of temperatures over 90 degrees, therefore the County needed to start thinking about smart strategies it could implement to help the community in confronting the environmental challenge. He explained that to date, the heat response planning had been led by the Health Department since it had been framed as a public health issue. He stated that the Climate Action Executive team was established in early Fall by the County Administrator which consisted of department directors, that began strategizing on climate-related matters pertaining to the County's enterprise and region. He stated this was the larger group that would provide guidance for the efforts and initiatives and would review a draft plan that contained three key elements, which would be brought back to the Board. He stated that the first element was for collaborative planning, which involved engaging various stakeholders from the community, partner jurisdictions, governmental and non-governmental entities in terms of planning for a warmer climate and preparing for accelerated services and logistical support as it got hotter and thinking about cooling centers and other response opportunities. He stated that the second element was for targeted intervention and since it had been worked on since 2018, they noticed patterns of where physically in the community and other social locations some of those deaths occurred. He stated that it was appropriate for the County to think about how to reduce deaths and morbidity that was hospitalizations and emergency room visits associated with heat and by being more conscientious and targeting interventions in the right settings.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the kinds of interventions.

Dr. Garcia clarified that the interventions referred to the types of strategies that might be deployed, such as a cooling center or a policy on the availability of water for individuals working outdoors. He stated that the third element was for resiliency and that as a community, there was a need to develop a plan to be able to overcome and endure the anticipated hotter climates and start to think about what those approaches might be. He added that the Resolution spoke to an action taken by the Governor declaring the current week as Heat Awareness Week in the State of Arizona and was also being done by other jurisdictions and was a general awareness going into the warmer months.

Supervisor Heinz stated that this was a significant situation and Maricopa had 645 heat-related deaths in 2023. He stated that as a hospital physician, during his residency he had learned much about his most memorable patient because it taught him about the border region and why it prompted someone to go through with it. He added that during the months of July through September he saw people nearly dying from kidney failure, heat exhaustion, and rhabdomyolysis and learning this

was important and there was a need to call attention to it. He recalled a time when he helped a distressed elderly women get home safely due to the extreme heat. He stressed the importance of the situation and stated both Districts 2 and 5 had inequities in access to shade, noting that tree canopies, shade and covers seemed to shy away from the most impoverished. He stated that another long-term strategy would be to work on everything possible to build on and other strategies that made sense and reminding individuals to have water available, take breaks and be in the shade, which could save lives.

Chair Grijalva stated that this was a good step towards awareness and could support continuing to work with the Health Department and other organizations to help address heat awareness which was a crisis. She suggested starting first with Pima County employees and ensuring they were protected by the heat by providing adequate shade and sun protective clothing, which was really important. She stated that she toured the wastewater facility and found very little shade and not enough places for employees to get out of the heat. She stated that the resolution that acknowledged extreme heat posed significant threats in Southern Arizona and disproportionately affected vulnerable populations, such as seniors, children, people of color and those with health conditions. She added that the County was projected to experience increasing days of high temperatures, which led to a rise in heat-related injuries and deaths. She stated that the heat killed more in the U.S. each year than any other extreme weather event and it was unacceptable.

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

32. **Resolution and Contract**

A. **Public Health Crisis Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 18, of the Board of Supervisors, declaring Fentanyl to be a Public Health Crisis.

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

B. **Contract**

City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Disbursement of Opioid Settlement Funds, no cost/5 year term (CTN-HD-24-178)

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

Chair Grijalva emphasized this had been something they had been working towards for a long time. She stated that the NAACP sent in a letter to the Board to be considered as part of the IGA, and even though it did not need to be part of this

specific one, she believed it was important to look at some of the concerns and to try to incorporate the work that the group had done.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the opt-in jurisdictions.

Francisco García, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that the opt-in jurisdictions included Marana, the City of Tucson and South Tucson. He stated that the opt-out jurisdictions included Oro Valley and Sahuarita. He explained that those jurisdictions would be the ones that received checks about 10 days after the County received the wire transfer for the full amount. He stated that the other jurisdictions had allowed the pooling of those resources for better planning and implementation.

Supervisor Scott questioned if the Nation or the Tribe were a part of the One Arizona settlement.

Dr. Garcia responded they were not and that there was an ongoing separate legal action that was brought forth by the tribal communities in the State of Arizona. He stated that they were tightly working with the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and the Tohono O'odham Nation, as well as the Tucson Urban Indian Center and other urban serving American Indian institutions.

Chair Grijalva indicated that the contract would be voted on by the City of Tucson Mayor and Council at their meeting on this same day.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

33. Classification/Compensation

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

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

2019/ Division Manager Regional Wastewater Reclamation/ 18 (\$88,881 - \$133,321)/ 1/ E*

6018/ Public Health Program Specialist II/ 7 (\$43,902 - \$59,267)/ 5/ NE**

6023/ Resource Navigator/ 4 (\$37,924 - \$51,197)/ 5/ NE**

2025/ Human Resources Medical Risk Manager/ 17 (\$80,508 - \$112,711)/ 1/ E*

2024/ Compensation Analyst/ 15 (\$66,536 - \$93,150)/ 2/ E*

*E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

**NE = Non-Exempt (paid overtime)

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

Supervisor Christy questioned if the new positions were in response to the Classification and Compensation Study.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

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

REAL PROPERTY

34. Surplus Property

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 19,200 square feet of an undeveloped vacant residential lot located at 5081 N. Kolb Road, Lot 49 Quail Canyon, Tax Parcel No. 114-13-0700, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the property map showed five parcels and four of the parcels were included and asked why the fifth parcel was not considered for purchase. He indicated on the west side of the parcels there was a large, pie-shaped parcel section and inquired if there were plans for dispensation of that in the process.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that the parcels were acquired as part of the Cove Road Improvement Project, funded by the 1997 HURF bond funds. He stated that at the time of property acquisition, those properties were identified as being necessary for the roadway improvements. He explained that while he did not know the specific reason why certain parcels were acquired, it would have pertained to the design of the cross section for the roadway, which was necessary to be acquired by the Department of Transportation.

Supervisor Christy inquired if there were plans for the unimproved parcel located on the west side of the parcels.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that staff would research that inquiry and information would be provided to the Board.

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

35. Surplus Property

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of a 26,400 square foot parcel with a 1,503 square foot single family residence, located at 5041 N. Kolb Road, Lot 51 Quail Canyon, Tax Parcel No. 114-13-0720, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 34, for discussion related to this item.)

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

36. Surplus Property

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of a 24,000 square foot parcel with a 1,463 square foot single family residence, located at 5021 N. Kolb Road, Lot 52 Quail Canyon, Tax Parcel No. 114-13-0730, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 34, for discussion related to this item.)

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

37. Surplus Property

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of a 23,976 square foot parcel with a 1,588 square foot single family residence, located at 5001 N. Kolb Road, Lot 53 Quail Canyon, Tax Parcel No. 114-13-0740, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 34, for discussion related to this item.)

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

38. Cellular License Agreements and Communications Easement

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - ~~1820~~, of the Board of Supervisors, for the conveyance of twenty-three (23) Cellular License Agreements along with a 50 Year Communications Easement, Pima County, Arizona, to TPA VI, L.L.C., (Tower Point). (All Districts)

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

39. Request for Drainage Easement

Staff recommends approval of a drainage easement to Rincon Valley Super Storage, L.L.C., across Tax Parcel No. 225-74-4420, as part of an approved Site Construction Permit for the development of Tax Parcel No. 205-74-047A, \$500.00 revenue. (District 4)

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

40. **Sale of Real Property - Tax Parcel No. 304-41-003G**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 19, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0019. (District 4)

Chair Grijalva requested clarification regarding the number of acres.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that it was for 4.133 acres.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Behavioral Health

41. The Arizona Board of Regents and Banner Health, d.b.a. The University of Arizona, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the operation of the South Campus Hospital, General Fund, contract amount \$75,000,000.00/5 year term (CT-BH-24-441)

Chair Grijalva indicated that this item was related to Minute Item No. 43 and that the items would be heard together.

Supervisor Lee stated that she would recuse herself due to a potential conflict of interest.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, reminded the Board that Pima County had been in the business of running a hospital since 1864 in a variety of ways. She stated that the business in 1977 was a response to bonds and the ability to build and operate Kino Hospital with varying degrees of success. She explained that in 2004, Pima County came into an agreement with University Physicians, Inc., to provide a lease and operating agreement due to the increasing volume of patients. She stated it was important to recognize that the two documents were interrelated. She stated that the previous lease indicated that if the funding was discontinued the lease was discontinued. She clarified that both the lease and funding agreement went together for the operations of the facility. She added that since the inception this facility had continued health care south of Broadway to many in the community and recent growth of Tubac and Green Valley showed significant use of the facility, growth and enhancement. She stated this was a five-year agreement to continue the operations and funding while they continued to evaluate what long-term agreements might be.

Dr. Bob Evani, Chief Executive Officer, Banner-University Medical Group, and President, Banner Academics, strongly urged the Board to support the continued proposal and collaboration with Pima County to continue to provide services

through the lease and operating agreement. He stated that it was a very necessary resource in that part of the community and the County had future growth plans in the area. He stated they were excited to continue the partnership and serve the Tucson community at-large. He reassured the Board regarding Banner's commitment to staying in the marketplace despite the negative press over the last two years and that they wanted to continue to serve the community and partner with the County to provide necessary services. He stated that some might view the agreement as "kicking the can down the road" but it allowed them the opportunity to take a step back together to decide how they could revitalize the area and provide the necessary services moving forward and to serve the needs of the Tucson community.

Supervisor Christy questioned why Banner would not buy the hospital from the County.

Dr. Evani responded that the area was highly government subsidized at about 80% of governor payors and at the current time it was financially difficult to provide for it, but they hoped that with this agreement moving forward it would allow them the adequate time to plan for that eventuality, so rather than kicking it down four and a half years and having a similar discussion, to have those discussions within the next year and a half to be able to plan together on what services were necessary to serve the community and potentially purchase the hospital.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether there was a timeframe of when Banner would initiate discussions on potentially purchasing the hospital from the County.

Dr. Evani replied that he would not commit to a timeframe, but that discussions were open and that with the current proposal there was continued investment on behalf of Banner which increased compared to the prior agreement that showed their willingness to continue discussions and have a favorable resolution on all sides.

Supervisor Christy stated that one of the issues the community had was that if something happened to Banner with its finances, cashflow or other business-related issues, Banner could end the contract and he questioned where the County would be at that point.

Dr. Evani reiterated the negative press spread over the last two years with Banner leaving the community, but assured the Board that would not happen, and reaffirmed their commitment. He reminded everyone that their affiliation with the University of Arizona required 23 more years and they were committed to stay in the community and did not envision the scenario.

Supervisor Christy stated that his District included Green Valley, which had yet to have a successful hospital facility for the past 7 to 8 years and there had been a failure of rural hospitals throughout the community due to financial situations, particularly in Green Valley that had a beautiful facility and location that went belly up with a prior history of it happening to prior owners. He questioned what

assurances Banner could provide, other than a signature on a lease agreement that they would be here to honor those five years including discussions of purchasing Banner from the County.

Dr. Evani clarified that Banner was not part of the Green Valley Hospital mentioned by Supervisor Christy and there were a variety of reasons that it failed. He stated that they had ambulatory space in Green Valley that served the community which also made this partnership that much more important and in lieu of another hospital in that area, this hospital would serve that community. He stated there would be some continued reinvestment to increase the level of services provided in a larger scope outside of the South Campus. He added that their history of being at Banner for almost 10 years should be proof that they were not planning on leaving the community.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he preferred the County not own a hospital as he previously expressed and questioned if the commitment had to be five years or if it could be done in two years. He stated that it sounded like there was some uncertainty and he would rather utilize \$15 million for something else. He added this was a good deal, there was draw down and the graduate medical education from the State no longer existed and was aware that these funds went towards that and that was incredibly important to train new Doctors and Nurses. He stated that it would be great to find another mechanism for funding like Maricopa's hospital healthcare taxing districts. He stated that he was unsure if the legislature had made a population-based determination that only Maricopa could participate, but Pima County had grown, and he wondered if more collaboration could be done to remove this from the County's books. He expressed his interest in the \$15 million being used for affordable housing that was desperately needed in the community. He reiterated the possibility of referring something to the legislature and involving the County's lobbyists to help expand the provision that allowed Maricopa to bring it to the voters for a dedicated funding stream.

Ms. Leshar stated that these discussions had been ongoing for about 15 years and the current agreement had been in negotiations for the last two years. She explained that a memorandum had been provided in January 2024, which included the history that the County had spent in excess of \$25 to \$30 million and they were trying to decrease the amount they were spending to provide healthcare in the area. She stated that as they began negotiations it was found they also recently provided \$1.5 million for the maintenance of the facility which had been removed from the current agreements and that there were conversations regarding the future of the facility. She stated those conversations included questions, such as whether the County was the rightful owner, what was the relationship with the University of Arizona, and was not easy to suggest that the County no longer partner with Banner or another hospital. She stated that another part of the agreement included the way Banner was integrated into the University of Arizona medical center and school to provide continuing education. She added that the five years and offloading of the maintenance were part of the negotiations being considered so that it was not a 15-year agreement to continue evaluations and discussions regarding the County's

desire to no longer provide funding and for Banner to own the facility. She stated that in the negotiations they were trying to find a middle ground for the maintenance and operations to continue on a limited funding basis and the 5 years was a decrease from a 15-year agreement and hoped this would allow them to explore future funding opportunities like a taxing district such as Maricopa County and the possibility of the sale of the facility.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the reason he suggested reducing the 5-year agreement was in case a change of statute happened, and that what they did in Maricopa applied in Pima County and it could be referred within the next year and passed, the County would still be on the hook to pay the \$15 million for the remainder of the term. He stated that he was okay with the term being reduced from 15 years to 5 years.

Supervisor Christy sought clarification on whether the County spent additional funding for other services in the same facility, which Banner did not provide, such as services provided from the criminal justice system and the jail.

Ms. Leshar responded that when the County utilized hospital beds for inmates from the jail, there was a fee for those beds just like the fees paid for beds at TMC, St. Joseph's or Banner.

Francisco Garcia, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, concurred and stated that on occasion the County purchased services such as stays in the hospital for those that the County had fiduciary responsibility for, including radiology, laboratory testing, etcetera but predominately being hospitalizations for detainees from the juvenile or adult detention center and it was treated as any other hospital in the community.

Supervisor Christy questioned if it also included psychiatric services at Banner.

Dr. Garcia responded affirmatively and stated that Banner was one of the three hospitals the County had arranged contracts for restoration to competence.

Chair Grijalva stated the location of the facility was critical to the people in the community and access was important. She shared a positive experience she had with a doctor for a minor foot surgery that worked out of Banner and commended them for the attention, care and ease of scheduling an appointment, which at the moment was rare and added that she had also brought someone to the emergency room. She stated that she realized at a late hour of the night in a southside community, that there would be a wide array of people there, which was also seen in other emergency rooms and was glad more discussions would continue and if there was a way down the line to figure out a district to tax then it was something the County could renegotiate because it was a critical need in the community and she agreed with Ms. Leshar ideally not to partner how they currently were, but she supported the item.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Lee recused herself due to a potential conflict of interest, to approve the item.

Community and Workforce Development

42. International Sonoran Desert Alliance, Amendment No. 2, to provide for Ajo Plaza Life Safety improvements, extend contract term to 3/31/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-22-258)

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

Chair Grijalva asked if the improvements were not completed by December 2024, would the County be able to find a contractor to complete the work or work with the vendor to acquire a contractor because this contract continued to be extended due to the difficulty in finding someone to complete the repairs.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that information would be reported back to the Board.

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

Facilities Management

43. Banner - University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C., to provide for a Second Amended and Restated Lease Agreement at Banner - University Medical Center South Campus, contract amount \$10,050.00 revenue/5 year term (CT-FM-24-442)

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

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Lee recused herself due to a potential conflict of interest, to approve the item.

Grants Management and Innovation

44. Pima Community College District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for job training programs infrastructure enhancement and amend contractual language, U.S. Department of Treasury, American Rescue Plan Act - Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, contract amount \$4,714,187.72 decrease (CT-GMI-22-277)

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

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, clarified that this contract was for a decrease in funding.

Supervisor Christy asked where the funds had originated from and what would happen to the decreased amount.

Ms. Leshar responded that the unspent American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds would be returned into the pool and brought back to the Board for reallocation. She stated the funds were from ARPA.

Supervisor Christy questioned if there had been consideration to return it to the federal government.

Ms. Leshar responded that heretofore all of those dollars had been brought back to the Board for reallocation.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was reduced due to no demand for the program.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, responded this item had been previously approved by the Board at the last ARPA reallocation and Pima Community College District struggled to meet the spend down requirements from the date that the funds would be unable to be encumbered. He mentioned that after discussions with Pima Community College, an agreement was made and the funds had already been reallocated based off the approval that was made beforehand.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification if the funds had already been reallocated.

Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative and stated that this particular reduction had been approved by the Board as part of the ARPA reallocations that had been done last month and was brought back to the Board due to the contractual obligation. He stated that due to the reduction in the contract it needed to be approved by the Board.

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

Health

45. Tucson Unified School District, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the provision and administration of childhood immunizations and other health services and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-HD-22-69)

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

Human Resources

46. United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide for the Employees Care about Pima County (ECAP) 2024 Campaign, General Fund, contract amount \$38,337.60 (CT-CA-24-435)

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

Information Technology

47. Arizona Public Service Company, Amendment No. 1, to provide a Tower License Agreement for wireless communications facilities, extend contract term to 5/20/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-IT-19-198)

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

Procurement

48. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-203, Amendment No. 3, Airwave Communication Enterprises, Inc., Arizona Emergency Products, Inc., d.b.a. American Emergency Products, Lamoine Waterhouse, d.b.a. Complete Auto Restore, L.L.C. and The Specialists on Oracle, to provide for emergency code equipment parts and services. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$600,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$3,820,000.00. Funding Source: Fleet Services (95%) and General (5%) Funds. Administering Department: Fleet Services and Sheriff's Department.

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

49. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-19-172, Amendment No. 6, Morpho USA, Inc., d.b.a Idemia Identity & Security USA, L.L.C., to provide for biometric products and services. This amendment extends the termination date to 10/31/25. No cost. Administering Department: Sheriff's Department.

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

50. **Award**

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-24-161, Bestway Electric Motor Service Co., Inc. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide for pump repair service. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$482,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: WW Ops, KSC Ops and General (20.72%) Funds. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

51. Kaizen Laboratories, Inc., to provide for a point-of-sale and reservation management system, General Fund, contract amount \$90,000.00/\$750,000.00 revenue/2 year term (MA-PO-24-162) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the \$750,000.00 revenue amount.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that this was a point-of-sale system utilized by the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation (NRPR) Department for paying fees for programming and rental facilities. He stated that it was generated revenue through the Parks fee ordinance that could be paid online by consumers.

Supervisor Christy asked who would get the accrued revenue.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded the accrued revenue went into the special revenue funds in NRPR and would get invested into the facilities and amenities within the park system.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on whether the amount would go into the Director's discretionary fund, which was mentioned to him by the NRPR Director.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that he was unfamiliar with the term of discretionary fund, but believed Mr. Pereira was referring to the special revenue fund. He clarified that the special revenue fund went into investments in parks. He stated that the NRPR director, along with his staff, had the ability to annually identify the priority needs and invest those dollars in upgrades, which included playground system infrastructure, lighting system improvements, routine maintenance, service expansion, or new programs and classes.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the upgrades would go before the Parks Commission for any kind of disconcertment.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the Parks Commission met on a regular basis and their meetings included a director's update and the Commission received notification of any capital improvement plans. He explained that program expansions and related items were brought to the Advisory Commission and they would provide input to the Director.

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

52. Motorola Solutions, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for Motorola Flex software and support, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (MA-PO-23-180) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Sheriff's Department

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

Real Property

53. TPA VI, L.L.C., to provide for a Purchase and Sale Agreement, contract amount \$9,080,000.00 revenue/50 year term (CTN-RPS-24-170)

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

54. Freeport-McMoran Sierrita, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for an Agreement to Amend Permanent Easement and Second Amendment to Deed and Easement Agreement, extend contract term to 5/7/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$270.00 revenue (CTN-RPS-24-164)

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

Supervisor Heinz asked why this contract required Board approval and could not be approved by the County Administrator given the contract revenue amount.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, clarified that it was due to the contract amount and not the dollar amount.

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

Sheriff

55. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 21, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2024 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-997 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for

assistance in law enforcement operations during fiscal year 2023-2024, \$25,000.00 revenue, (CTN-SD-24-160)

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

56. Larry E. and Claire B. Klingler, d.b.a First Plaza, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for a lease agreement for the Pima County Sheriff's Catalina Substation located at 15631 N. Oracle Road, Suite No. 175, extend contract term to 4/30/27 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$55,430.80 (CT-SD-15-472)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

57. **Acceptance - Behavioral Health**

Attorney General State of Arizona, to provide for the Opioid Abatement Funding - Coordinated Reentry Planning Services Programs, \$2,689,409.00 (GTAW 24-122)

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

Supervisor Scott indicated that he had requested additional information from the County Administrator regarding the Opioid Settlement Fund, which was previously discussed and he neglected to bring it up during that discussion of the IGA. He stated that the additional information he requested should be provided to the entire Board.

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

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

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 9, to provide for the Community Action Services Program and amend grant language, \$2,708,459.73 (GTAM 24-67)

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

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency, to provide for the Emergency Food & Shelter Program Phase 41, \$406,537.00/2 year term (GTAW 24-139)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the County had roughly three years of funding from the Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), which was designated for migrants and migrant shelters and it appeared that the same funding was now being repurposed for residents facing homelessness. He questioned what was going to happen and whether there was any competition involved with the Emergency Eviction Legal Services (EELS) that was already in place. He also asked whether migrants would be involved in this particular funding.

Francisco García, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that the EFSP had been ongoing for more than a decade, long before the migrant crisis. He explained that it was the mechanism that FEMA used in order to resource emergency food and shelter. He stated that same mechanism had been used by the same agency to fund some work relating to asylum seekers, but they were unrelated matters. He reiterated that while they ran out of the same agency and program, they were unrelated and segregated funds. He indicated that none of these funds under this item were for asylum seekers. He explained that the funds were part of the allocation received by the County to provide food, shelter, utility and rental assistance. He indicated it was not a substitute for the EELS program, although related, it was a completely different component that was essentially a formula allocation from FEMA for homelessness.

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

60. **Acceptance – Constables**

Arizona Constable Ethics Standards and Training Board (CESTB), to provide for CESTB Equipment - Ammunition, \$3,681.63 (GTAW 24-140)

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

61. **Acceptance – Constables**

Arizona Constable Ethics Standards and Training Board (CESTB), to provide for CESTB Equipment - Printer, \$1,645.55 (GTAW 24-141)

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

62. **Acceptance – Constables**

Arizona Constable Ethics Standards and Training Board (CESTB), to provide for CESTB Equipment - Uniforms, \$6,126.01 (GTAW 24-142)

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

63. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the BJA FY2022 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, no cost (GTAM 24-62)

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

64. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Family Health Partnership, d.b.a. Affirm Sexual and Reproductive Health, to provide for reproductive health services, \$55,000.00 (GTAW 24-144)

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

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

Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management, to provide for the Healthy Forest Initiative, Tucson Mountain Park Invasive Grass Control, \$150,000.00/\$11,900.00 General Fund match/\$4,770.00 In-Kind volunteer time match/3 year term (GTAW 24-133)

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

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

Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to provide for the Pima County Native Plant Nursery: Greenhouse and Associated Infrastructure, \$329,260.00/2 year term (GTAW 24-137)

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

67. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**

Petco Love, to provide for the Petco Love Lifesaving Impact Award, \$300,000.00 (GTAW 24-143)

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

68. **Acceptance – Sheriff**

Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, to provide for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$771,737.00 (GTAW 24-138)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

69. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 278730, Lori Danielle Maestas, Brindis Bistro & Bar, 180 W. Continental Road, No. 178, Green Valley, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

70. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 285294, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Three Canyon Beer and Wine Garden, 4999 N. Sabino Canyon Road, Tucson, Series 7, Beer and Wine Bar, Person Transfer.

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

71. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 285296, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Three Canyon Beer and Wine Garden, 4999 N. Sabino Canyon Road, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

ELECTIONS

72. Hearing - Fee Schedule

ORDINANCE NO. 2024 - 6, of the Board of Supervisors, amending fees for election-related services provided by the Pima County Elections Department.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

73. Affordable Dwelling Insurance in Wildfire Prone Areas

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the proactive steps the Board of Supervisors can take to address the lack of access to affordable dwelling insurance in wildfire prone areas in Pima County. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that there was a situation in dire need of attention and intervention regarding homeowner's insurance. He stated that he heard a talk show of realtors and mortgage experts explaining that the biggest impediment to qualifying for a mortgage or mortgage revisions were due to a dramatic rise in homeowner's insurance, and in some instances over 40% in a year. He explained this made it difficult to qualify for a home when suddenly the insurance rates rapidly increased by 40% and disqualified individuals. He stated that another issue was that insurance was not there for coverage and individuals were exposed to insufficient coverage which would not allow them to repair or rebuild their home depending on the extent of the damage. He hoped his Board colleagues read the letter from the Mount Lemmon Homeowners Association and the Mount Lemmon Business Community and hoped they also understood that this issue was not only specific to District 4, but rather it affected every district and that wildfires were causing insurance to become unavailable or increase to epic proportions. He believed this needed to be addressed Countywide and that the country was also experiencing the same thing and it was a delicate balance that insurance companies were underwriting risk, including the at-risk communities that were fire prone versus those that were not and the determination of those that would pay the balance so that the insurance could underwrite it. He felt it needed the County's attention particularly through its lobbying efforts at the State legislature and requested that Jenny Zimmerman, President of the Mount Lemmon Business Community, address the Board about the matter.

Jenny Zimmerman, President, Mount Lemmon Business Community, addressed the Board and stated that Mount Lemmon had 350 acres of private deeded land and their insurance was doubled. She stated for example, the Sawmill Run Restaurant paid \$28,000.00 in insurance and their taxes were \$19,000.00, which were the highest taxes in the State of Arizona. She stated that the entire State was red and the Bighorn Fire had destroyed 121,000 acres and there was not much more that could be burned in the area. She stated they had 44 hydrants and 2 full-time career Firefighters, and they needed more help. She added that when people tried to rebuild but did not have insurance, they could get by until the structure was ready, but then they did not have insurance. She stated she recently opened a 700 square foot gift shop in the heart of Summerhaven and the insurance increased over \$450.00 and she was currently paying \$2,000.00. She added that no one wanted to go to Mount Lemmon and she would not be able to sell real estate and the entire State was dealing with these issues and requested any additional help.

Supervisor Christy questioned what could be done to engage the County's lobbyist in the State legislature to work collaboratively with the Department of Insurance to ensure this was a top priority and action was needed because the County was exposed to significant losses.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the first thing would be to start with the Department of Insurance and recalled her time working for the State during the Aspen Fire and the immediate action they took and that she would engage the County's lobbyists immediately and examine it from a variety of fronts. She stated that Pima County's legislative plan for the year included funding related to the wildfire fund and were advocating for additional funds through the Department of Emergency and Military Affairs and the Department of Insurance. She stated the next steps would be to provide an update on all efforts that would be made, including regular updates.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that what was being discussed was people to remain in their homes and this could be an impediment to keep their homes. He stated that when the County was considering potentially raising primary property taxes and also increasing homeowner's insurance, the County was involved in both matters and there was a need to review it holistically and any collaboration to provide relief through lobbying the legislature was a step in the right direction.

Ms. Zimmerman reiterated that they had the highest taxes in the State and the situation was not helping anyone and if individuals could not afford to live in Mount Lemmon no one would stay there.

Supervisor Scott thanked Supervisor Christy for bringing the matter forth and spoke about the similar challenges that District 1 residents from the Village of Catalina were facing in terms of what their insurance company saw as a Wildland Urban Interface area and appreciated Administrator Leshar's intent to follow-up with the

Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions and share information with the Board that could be provided to their constituents.

No Board action was taken.

74. **Southwest Border Executive Situational Report**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Pima County Office of Emergency Management and Grants Management & Innovation's Southwest Border Executive Situational Report, for the period of April 18 to April 24, 2024. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that it was interesting to him that up until a couple of months ago, the County was ensconced with the issue of street releases and an influx of migrants at the border and not being able to handle them. He stated the situation prompted the need to go to the federal government, the need for comprehensive immigration policy and then running out of funds by March 31st. He stated that the County received another large gift of \$21 million. He referred to the most recent Southwest Border Executive Situational Report dated April 18th through April 24th and during that period only about 200 individuals came across the border with a total of 1,377 individuals that arrived in one day, which was only a couple hundred shy of the record, yet the Board heard nothing of it from the County Administration or it being brought to the Board as an agenda item. He stated that the federal funding continued to be managed by the Grants Management and Innovation Department (GMI), Communications, Health Department, Emergency Management, and County Administration working with Casa Alitas Welcoming Center and the City of Tucson (COT), which seemed to move along as it had been. He added that the COT had contracts with four hotels with one hotel providing medical isolation. He questioned which hotel was being used for medical isolation.

Francisco Garcia, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that the County used the hotels that were contracted by the COT and had historically tried to keep individuals in a single area. He stated that the Quality Inn was the hotel being used as a medical isolation in a single location due to the ease of service and support.

Supervisor Christy stated roughly \$21 million from the federal government was received or was set to be received and the funds were supposed to run out by March 31st, yet no funding had been placed on a Board agenda for continued funding approval and questioned how the County would pay for these services between March 31st to date. He stated that it had been approximately 5 weeks since the funding ended and historically the County spent \$1 million per week, but there had been no approval to accept the money. He again asked how this would be paid and who approved it.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the County continued to utilize the funds that were made available from the funds that would run out by the end of March. She stated that as Supervisor Christy pointed out, the expenditure rate was

at \$1 million per week with the majority of that amount being due to the number of individuals that came from Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to the facility, which had dropped. She stated that the amount provided was bridge funding until the funding came from the federal government. She stated that if the existing funds started to run out and the federal funds were delayed then they would not be able to operate until they were received. She stated that the additional \$21 million would come as a contract to the Board for approval.

Supervisor Christy questioned when the contract would come before the Board, whether the bridge funding was adequate, and why the Board was told funding would run out on March 31st.

Ms. Leshar stated that it was appropriate to continue to project expenditures at the rate that it was being spent. She explained that based on the weekly reports the number of individuals that were being brought to the facility was consistently high or increasing. She stated that as they looked at those dollars the concern was that it not in any way be an expenditure undertaken by the County's budget and they wanted to take a conservative approach on when the dollars would run out and the need to end the program on March 31st. She stated that there may be additional funding of about one to two weeks of a trial, and they would not kick individuals out of the facility and therefore needed some dollars available for that. She added they continued to work with the federal government on the contracts that would be brought before the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the Board had been slightly misinformed regarding when the federal funding would end.

Ms. Leshar stated that the Board was not misinformed and explained it was based on the numbers and projections available at the time, including the historical data on the weekly reports. She stated that Mr. Clark and others remained in contact with CBP and they discussed this with their regional partners to know that those numbers would remain at that level. She added that in order to provide the dollars at the current spend rate at \$1 million per week that was what was needed. She stated that was projected to the Board in the budget and to suggest that if it came in underbudget and in some way not being fully transparent was not the intent. She stated they indicated what they believed the cost was and what they believed the dollars were needed with the number of people coming and the cost to provide services.

Supervisor Christy recalled the tenure of previous conversations emphasizing the need for funding from the federal government to avoid street releases. He stated that five weeks had gone by, and the money was supposed to run out at \$1 million per week. He questioned how many more weeks the County would be able to sustain at the current burn rate before additional funding would be received and how much remained.

Ms. Leshar stated she would get back to the Board with more information and as Supervisor Christy pointed out the numbers had been much lower than what was seen prior to March 31st which was the reason the Board was reminded of the concern of running out of funds and wanted to avoid individuals being kicked out or street released which was the reason they had the dollars appropriated for it.

Supervisor Christy stated that during the same discussion of the program ending due to the funding ending, it was mentioned to find another entity to run the program. He questioned if anyone had been found to run the program.

Ms. Leshar responded there was ongoing communication with a variety of individuals primarily with Catholic Community Services and other vendors. She stated the goal remained to not be the fiscal agent for the program and she believed the current funding remaining would get them through the calendar year and was hopeful to provide them adequate time to get out of the business.

Supervisor Christy asked whether another entity would take over for Pima County.

Ms. Leshar stated that was their goal.

Supervisor Christy referred to a historic flight log from the World Atlantic Airlines in Tucson sourced from Flight Radar 24, which had been termed as lateral flights in previous reports which meant they involved moving migrants to their next destination specifically if there was no space at Casa Alitas that showed 21 flights in two weeks. He questioned who paid for the flights, what they were for, who was on them and what was the capacity per flight.

Shane Clark, Director, Office of Emergency Management (OEM), stated they had no involvement with those flights, CBP coordinated flights funded by the federal government and transported those that would not be infused into the legally processed asylum seekers local system. He reiterated that he did not have knowledge of the number of flights and they were not coordinated by Pima County and did not have specifics regarding the capacity.

Supervisor Christy stated that the flights were going to Laredo, El Paso, McAllen, Guatemala City and questioned Mr. Clark's capacity as director of OEM and his inability of direct knowledge regarding what the flights consisted of, why they were there and who paid for them.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide a report to the Board and that as Director Clark mentioned the flights were being run by CBP and the federal government. She added that they could find out more information about the planes and their capacity.

Supervisor Christy questioned when it was foreseen when the \$21 million would be received.

Ms. Lesher stated she was unaware when it would happen, but it may come back to the Board. She emphasized the importance of the program being funded by federal dollars and when they notified the Board previously with the concern that the program might be ending, they indicated March 31st out of an abundance of caution to ensure it would not be paid for by County taxpayers. She stated she understood the taxpayers also paid at the federal level, but others as well and reiterated that she would provide more information on the dates, the current burn rate and how to decrease the costs.

Supervisor Christy stated that at the outset there was a possibility the County would run out of money and the federal government would not provide the money and it would come out of the General Fund.

Ms. Lesher replied negatively and stated that the concern had been that there would be street releases, but they managed the program to ensure it was always paid for by federal dollars. She added that if the numbers continued to decrease and they had the capacity to lower the costs with the operations of the facility, their intent was that it would never be paid out of the General Fund or by local taxpayers.

Supervisor Christy asked whether there was a finite date of when the funds would run out.

Ms. Lesher reiterated that with the current burn rate, they could make it through the calendar year, but they would continue to provide updates.

Dr. Garcia stated that staff was in the process of preparing an agenda item for the following Board meeting that would bring those federal dollars for Board approval.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if the federal government had ever failed to follow through on reimbursing the County for the exact amount requested for asylum seekers and the handling of lodging, food services and wraparound services.

Ms. Lesher responded that she believed they never failed to reimburse the County for those dollars.

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

75. **Study Session**

Discussion only: Study Session regarding the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Recommended Budget.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that the hope of the study session was to receive feedback, questions and comments regarding the recommended budget. She recalled that budget hearings were conducted a few years ago, but there was limited staff available, but she would answer as many questions as she could with the support of Finance and the Deputy County Administrators and would note other

questions with the commitment to provide a written response and posted within 48 hours.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance & Risk Management, provided a slideshow presentation on the recommended budget for Fiscal Year 24/25. She stated that similar to the prior year, there were four budget focus areas or pillars and their various goals that would have been seen as part of the strategic planning presented at a prior Board meeting. She stated the areas were Core Functions and Excellent Service, Improve the Quality of Life, Critical Infrastructure and Economic Growth, and Conservation, Sustainability and Climate Resiliency. She explained that each of the pillars consisted of a variety of goals and processes that they would attempt to achieve, which reflected how they produced the budget. She stated that there were seven economic indicators in the U.S. showing unfavorable trends that were concerning which included inflation, housing, retail sales, gasoline sales, federal funds rate and unemployment. She stated they showed moderate to high headwinds for the economic outlook which impacted the '24/25 budget, including the uncertainty of the State adopting its budget and the amount required that the County needed to pay in relation to the shared-tax revenue and State cost shifts. She stated that inflation was still prevalent and while her prognostic skills were not that great, she believed it would not turn down anytime soon. She referred to the slide and stated it was a representation of the '24/25 budget showing the revenues by source & fund balance, and expenditures by functional area for the entire County. She stated this was for a \$1.7 billion expense budget with an expenditure of \$550 million for General Governmental Services, \$109 million for Health Services, \$403 million for Justice and Law, roughly \$480 million for Public Works, and \$185 million for Community Resources which made up Pima County as a whole. She stated there was approximately \$1.9 billion in revenue and fund balance, comprised of \$574 million for property taxes, \$254 million of charges for services, \$580 million intergovernmental revenues mainly from State shared sales tax grants, \$60 million other revenues, and \$465 million for fund balance from various County funds. She showed a slide with a budget breakdown by fund including General Fund, Special Revenue Fund, Grants, Debt Service Fund, Capital Project Fund and Enterprise Fund which were business related as the Wastewater Fund, parking garages and Development Services. She explained the graph was broken down to show the beginning fund balance, the revenues, the transfers in, less then expenditures and the transfers out. She stated that for the General Fund the starting balance was \$125 million, and it ended with a zero-fund balance, which meant of all the money received was planned to be spent including the \$97 million of General Fund Balance Reserve per the policy.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the Fund Balance Reserve was mandated or whether it was used in their process.

Ms. Moulton clarified that the General Fund, Fund Balance was a Board policy and that \$97 million was included in the budget as part of the State requirements to be budgeted to spend, which was why it was included in the expenditures. She stated that the following slide explained what was in the General Fund which came

primarily from property taxes of \$464 million, State and other tax revenues at \$235 million, departmental fees and administrative overhead charges of about \$40 million, other revenues of \$17 million from General Fund departments charging for services provided such as the Records Office or the Courts and the Fund Balance at \$125 million, and transfers in of \$17 million which were payments from other non-general fund departments paying for general fund services such as Finance, Procurement, and general County overhead and that another portion was made up of the indirect cost allocation that was charged to various Grants to pay for those same General Fund services. She explained that the largest percentage of the General Fund money was spent in Justice and Law, which was made up of the Sheriff's Department, the County Attorney, Courts, and Public Defense Services. She stated that the next largest area was General Government Services, followed by Health Services, including the Health Department and Behavioral Health. She stated that next followed Public Works, Community Resources and Transfers Out which represented payments to other funds, transfers to Capital Project Fund to fund capital projects that were paid for via property taxes. She stated the next slide showed the Restricted Funds and Taxing Districts which encompassed all funds outside of the General Fund, including the Library District, Flood Control District, Health Department or Special Revenue Fund that were restricted to be spent on specific purposes. She explained that the breakdown of the funds represented \$1.3 billion such as Health Services, Justice and Law, General Government Services, Community Resources, Public Works, etcetera. She stated that the following slide showed the expenditures for the same Restricted Funds and Taxing Districts totaling \$1.1 billion and in some cases the County received more money than what was allocated to spend in the current year and any differential would flow into the fund balances of those restricted funds to be used for future projects or Capital projects that might be needed in the future. She went over the Fiscal Year 2024/25 recommendations to maintain the overall Pima County tax rate unchanged at \$5.1048 which was the overall tax rate, but there were changes within the four types of taxes, however, were requesting to keep the total rate flat. She stated that the recommendation for expenses would be \$15.8 million in supplementals to the General Fund and \$1 million for the Class and Comp Phase 3 implementation. She added that they were also recommending reductions and were using ARPA reallocation funds to reduce expenditures by \$10 million, were recommending a 2% cut across all General Fund departments of approximately \$11.5 million which also applied to elected and non-elected officials, and an Outside Agency reduction of \$300,000.00. She stated that the following slide included additional information to help the Board with another discussion item to provide a sense of where the County was. She stated that if there was a 1% reduction in expenses to the General Fund it would equate to about \$5.7 million and an increase in the primary property tax rate of \$0.01 would garner approximately \$1.1 million in revenue and would cost the average homeowner with a home valued at \$225,000.00 approximately \$2.24 per year. She stated this served as a frame of reference for when the tax rate and revenues were reviewed. She stated that further information would be provided within 48 hours if the Board had questions that she could not be answer during this discussion.

Supervisor Scott referred to the County Administrator's Memorandum dated April 26, 2024, Section I. Overview of Recommended Budget, and read the second paragraph which related to the supplemental requests. He added that the last page of the budget book contained a list of the supplemental requests and stated what was striking was the number of ongoing requests which amounted to \$43.7 million and one-time supplemental requests were for \$24.4 million. He requested more detailed information on all the supplemental requests due to the substantial impact on the budget.

Ms. Leshar stated the information would be provided to the Board regarding all the supplemental requests. She added that the \$43.7 million was ongoing, which had also been a concern for them, including their notes of recommendations of those that were or were not moved forward.

Ms. Moulton explained that each department submitted a detailed form for supplemental requests and would provide access to the Board.

Supervisor Scott again referred to the transmittal memorandum on Section III. General Fund Ending Fund Balance for FY 2023/24 and read from the first paragraph and stated that this was a big change from what was projected. He stated that it seemed to always be higher than what was projected. He questioned what lessons were learned from the prior year compared to this year that could be applied moving forward to avoid large gaps in the projections. He stated that he realized that it was an inexact science and that they also dealt with other numbers, such as from the State, but he felt it was always big.

Ms. Moulton indicated that Supervisor Scott was correct in his assessment that it was a significant number. She explained that it came from three areas this year with higher-than-anticipated State Shared Sales Tax, which was lower than the previous year, and they budgeted more in line with what the State told them in 2024 which was an increase of \$4 million. She added that they also had a significant increase in Interest income, which was challenging to predict during budgeting 18 months prior. She stated both items were taken into consideration during creation of the 2025 budget. She stated that another area was for vacancy savings, which was significant in the County depending on the time of year and the positions. She added that they had taken stock of the changes of the reality of what was budgeted versus what actually happened and tried to implement that knowledge into the 2025 budget. She stated that time would tell if things went better, and she anticipated a positive outcome with the help of the new Board policy on vacant positions that would allow them to properly identify where the savings were earlier in the year. She stated that part of the issue with vacant positions was the optimistic outlook that the positions would be filled, but as they moved along in the year it did not happen. She added that in the latter months of the forecast, departments realized they would not be able to fill the positions and were actually open for longer than they thought.

Supervisor Scott sought additional details beyond what the transmittal memorandum provided regarding the decreased expenses and higher-than-

anticipated general government revenues, particularly interested in the Monday-morning quarterbacking they had done to improve future estimates. He stated that another area he was concerned about was for vacancy savings. He stated that the budgeted full-time equivalents (FTEs) were 23 more than the prior year, which was mostly attributed to the Sheriff's Department to ensure they kept up with recruiting and hiring, but that the vacancy summary the Board received on Monday showed 950 vacant positions. He stated that the new policy would go into effect on July 1st, but he wondered if this figure had been a staple for many years and questioned why current vacancies were not taken into account during creation of budgets. He stated that it seemed to him that the optimism Ms. Moulton referred to pervaded all departments. He questioned why the long-standing vacancy rate did not better inform budget development. He stated that out of the 12 departments with a vacancy rate of 16% or higher, 5 were budgeted more FTEs the following year than this year, 5 had less and 2 were roughly the same, but the largest reduction was for the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department (NRPR) due to some being moved into the new Conservation Lands and Resources Department (CLR). He stated that he failed to understand why a County that had historically 900 to 1,000 vacant positions at any given time during any given year was not considered when creating their budgets. He stated that maybe they were waiting for the policy, but the budget had been discussed months prior to the policy. He added that all directors and Elected Officials were budgeting around the FTEs for slightly more or less and he requested that this be taken into account. He stated that there was time before May 21st to follow up with them and appreciated the vacancy summary and the comparison memorandum because it helped show the changes and felt these vacancies were not taken into account.

Ms. Moulton stated that when you looked at the County as a whole, the 900 to 1,000 vacant positions remained evident and the overall FTEs increased by 23, but by reviewing the comparison memorandum individually it showed NRPR was split and CLR formed, the Sustainability and Conservation Department was also folded into CLR. She stated that individual departments reviewed some of their FTEs and stated that, for example, Fleet Services decreased 1, Grants Management and Innovation increased by 11 FTEs, Public Defense Services decreased by 9, and Real Property decreased by 1 and each department had made their own assessments and if they were critical enough those positions were open for discussion.

Supervisor Scott stated that although he agreed that it showed the departments reviewed their vacancies, he felt their assessment was based on the optimism that Ms. Moulton mentioned. He added that history would belie being optimistic and he hoped they could be re-reviewed to take into account the history of the vacant positions.

Ms. Leshar responded that on Supervisor Scott's third point, they would provide the individual analysis. She stated that, for example, Facilities Management had a variety of positions, like a Locksmith, open for a long time which were on the top of the list for the compensation and classification analysis and would remain there until

they could be filled. She stated that those were critical positions that they hoped to address the ability to fill the position by reviewing them through the Class and Comp Study and reviewing the vacancy savings. She stated that she could provide the crosswalk to the Board. She addressed the significant increase in the Fund Balance and reminded the Board that for the past couple of years, they wanted to ensure it grew closer. She stated that the Fund Balance was estimated generally between \$40 to \$42 million and then the year ended with \$125 million. She added that each budget started with a summary of the recommendations and was paid for with the additional \$80 million. She stated that what they tried to do was ensure that rather than indicating that if \$40 million was available, but there may be additional dollars made by vacancy savings and wanted to provide complete transparency of what the Fund Balance was. She added they had yet to find where the math needed to go but the difference between \$93 million and \$125 million was better than \$40 million and hoped to continue moving in that direction.

Supervisor Scott again referred to the transmittal memorandum regarding a table for budgeted FTEs and stated that it showed 7,100 positions for current fiscal year, but the vacancy summary report the Board had received listed 7,478 positions. He asked whether the additional 378 positions were grant funded.

Ms. Moulton explained that would require a review, but throughout the year additional positions were added. She stated that the budget number was set in May, and if new grants were acquired or if departments requested additional Position Control Number (PCNs) and if they could be funded, the positions were reviewed.

Supervisor Scott stated he was fine with the explanation and understood that it was a combination of grant funded positions and at times additional PCNs were requested and granted.

Supervisor Christy requested an analysis comparing the 2019 budget versus the proposed budget that focused on the important factors that stood out to allow a comparison between the two budgets.

Ms. Moulton stated she would be able to provide the analysis, however, could not commit to it being completed in 48 hours.

Supervisor Christy clarified that it could be provided when possible.

Ms. Leshar stated that the time period was pre-COVID versus the current time, which would be close to Supervisor Christy's request.

Supervisor Christy clarified that it was for a budget comparison pre-COVID versus what was currently being proposed. He also asked if a road map could be provided on where the County needed to be for a revenue neutral Primary Property Tax rate.

Ms. Moulton stated that the latter information requested by Supervisor Christy could be provided within 48 hours and they had done the math on it.

Chair Grijalva stated for the record that Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Supervisor Lee referred to the County Administrator's Memorandum dated April 16, 2024, Section IV., A. 2., b., and read from the fourth paragraph as follows: "*The benchmark set by the state Truth and Taxation statute is more stringent than the county's maximum allowable primary levy limit, which is linked to a moderate annual inflation rate of 2%, as stipulated in the Arizona Constitution. As per the maximum allowable primary levy limit, the County can increase its primary rate to \$4.71, which is \$0.61 higher than the recommended general fund rate. Consequently, the constitutional imposed levy limit is 530 million surpass the recommended primary property tax rate by 69.6 million, or 13.1%.*" She asked for further clarification of it.

Ms. Moulton responded that there were a couple of different statutes and constitutions that governed how much the County could raise property tax rates in any given year. She explained that the maximum allowable property tax limit indicated they could have a general primary property tax rate of \$4.7175, but they were recommending a \$4.0102 rate for the General Fund, which was where the \$0.6185 came from and if they were to take the \$4.7175 maximum allowable primary levy limit and multiply that by the net assessed value, it would be \$539 million for the maximum amount of General Fund levy that the County could impose if it went to the total maximum limit.

Supervisor Lee asked if the maximum levy the County was allowed to impose was for \$69.6 million or 13.1%.

Ms. Moulton responded no and stated that the maximum levy limit was \$530.9 million, which was higher than their recommendation of \$69.6 million.

Supervisor Lee asked whether the Board could go up to the high table and that she had reviewed a table in the memorandum regarding the levy.

Ms. Moulton responded in the affirmative and stated that she had a separate table that showed the prior 10 years and provided a copy to the Board.

Supervisor Lee stated that she was concerned because when she was on the Pima Community College Board, they had always gone to the maximum levy at 2%, due to inflation and State cuts. She noted that since 2014 the County had lost \$30 million in State funding and questioned if this amount was correct.

Ms. Moulton stated that if Supervisor Lee was referring to the State cost shifts then \$30 million was appropriate.

Supervisor Lee stated that what was seen with the current budget and the cuts would not change in future years because the State would be in no better shape and in the past, the State would not provide additional monies. She stated that she

was concerned with the health of the County and as the County continued to take cuts and a reduction in FTEs, it spoke to not being able to provide the services as it had in the past. She stated that due to the COVID funding they might not have felt the impact, but she believed it would be felt moving forward when the monies were gone. She added that there was \$97 million in contingency, but the question remained how to determine the use of an emergency to utilize it. She asked what constituted an emergency and the use of the \$97 million.

Ms. Leshner asked for the documents regarding the tax rates to be shown on the projector for the public, but did not currently have the answer regarding the contingency.

Supervisor Lee questioned whether \$30 million of decreases since 2014 constituted an emergency, if the \$16 million in the prior year and the current year's reduction constituted an emergency and at what point could it be used.

Ms. Moulton stated that the Board policy stated that by vote the Board determined what an operating emergency was, whether it be unanticipated budgetary shortfalls or shortfalls within the General Fund, or with other funds and any such action must provide a plan to restore their unrestricted fund balance to the minimum required balance within two years. She stated that per the policy, the declaration of emergencies was up to the Board as long as there was a plan to refund the Fund Balance Reserve.

Supervisor Heinz stated that the problem lied within the House of Representatives. He stated that what was worse than having to potentially consider an adjust or raise an assessment for property taxes in an election year would be the same as not completing their constitutional duty on behalf of the people of the County. He stated this was the reason he continued to ask questions and brought up the \$5.6 million a couple cycles ago that the Board forewent. He stated he also asked many questions of the County Administrator, and he received a memorandum that included the answers. He provided an example of his Republican parents purchasing a house in Pima County and had questioned how schools were being funded due to the low tax amounts. He stated that Pima County was not over-assessed and the data he received showed the County's tax rates had dropped over the years. He stated that the median property taxes and a percent of income in comparable counties, Pima County was third from the bottom. He stated that Governor Ducey and the legislature imposed a flat tax on individuals for State income taxes. He stated that the County had an obligation, and they had a revenue debacle, and did it for political talking points and due to the laws and constitution, the legislature required a 67% vote to raise any type of tax or to remove an existing tax credit compared to Utah, which was at 50% up or down. He stated that the County had an obligation to set it at the highest point to frame things for the adoption of property taxes and the need to raise it to not restrict themselves. He stated the rate would not be set until August and if things were kept at the same level it would remove some of the tools they had. He stated the lever could be moved slightly and it was the least regressive form of taxation and the vast majority of people that were property owners or

landlords received a massive State income tax cut. He stated that the County could not provide the services without the funds and this needed to be kept on the table when the highest tax limit was considered on May 21st. He stated that Board also had the option to decrease it, but the options should be considered. He stated for example if it was raised by \$0.10 the average homeowner equaled \$2.00 over the course of the year. He felt the amount was de minimis and that other important work like affordable housing and workforce development was needed. He questioned how the Sheriff's Department went \$11 million over budget in the previous cycle but were providing an additional \$11 million in the new budget.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the Sheriff's Department was about \$3.7 million over budget and the difference in the delta was for the Classification and Compensation Study. She stated that it was for the approved budget, and it was revised to allocate \$19 million for the study and that each month it had decreased.

Supervisor Heinz stated he wanted to ensure it aligned with the Prosperity Initiative while preserving investments in areas like Community and Workforce Development. He emphasized the need to do better as a County and not let the legislature win, stating that \$126 million needed to be raised in property taxes which was brought down from the State legislature. He expressed the importance and urgency to keep flexible options on the table to be able to preserve programs and services and urged his colleagues on the Board to consider potentially raising the levels on May 21st and as it got closer to reevaluate to perhaps keep things level, but he did not want the County to be restricted.

Ms. Leshar requested that if there were any more questions from the Board, they could provide them to her and staff would post the responses for the Board and for the public to view.

Chair Grijalva noted that the slideshow and additional handout would also be attached to the online agenda item as additional material.

Supervisor Scott asked if he needed to provide his questions from earlier in writing.

Ms. Leshar responded that was not needed and she meant any new questions that were not addressed at the meeting, that they be sent in writing and staff would post a response before the May 21, 2024 Board meeting.

Supervisor Scott clarified the timeframe for the responses, given his third question regarding the expenditures.

Ms. Moulton indicated that an answer would be provided within 48 hours.

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

76. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Animal Care Advisory Committee**
Reappointment of Marguerita “Robin” Crehan. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (District 3)
2. **Board of Adjustment, District 3**
Appointment of Eileen M. Ratajczak, to fill a vacancy created by John Bjelland, M.D. Term expiration: 5/6/28.
3. **Flood Control District Advisory Committee**
Appointment of Jonathan Horst, to fill a vacancy created by Ann Youberg. No term expiration. (District 5)
4. **Flood Control District Board of Hearing Review**
Appointment of Jonathan Horst, to fill a vacancy created by Ann Youberg. No term expiration. (District 5)

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

5. **Special Event**
Tamara M. Middleton, St. Rita in the Desert Catholic Church, 13260 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, May 4 and 5, 2024.
6. **Temporary Extension**
012100012055, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Barnfire Mesquite Grill, 8310 N. Thornydale Road, No. 180, Tucson, May 18 and June 22, 2024.

ELECTIONS

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Alison Jones-073-DEM, James Pollack-010-REP, Valerie Pollack-010-REP, Kristi Broderick-011-REP, Paul Broderick-011-REP, Carol Lindsey-084-REP, Leiann Anderson-141-REP, Beth McGwire-172-REP, Lyle Aldridge-243-REP, Sherrylyn Young-243-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Mary Ellen Saylor-010-REP, Bailey Mothershed-011-REP, Leiann Anderson-074-REP, Miriam Diamond-104-REP, Debra Thompson-104-REP, Dominic Campbell-Gonzalez-115-REP, Bertrand Jalbert-149-REP, Sherrylyn Young-178-REP, Guadalupe Hernandez-181-REP, Sergio Hernandez-181-REP, James Sordyl-182-REP, John Druke-188-REP, James Pollack-205-REP, Valerie Pollack-205-REP, Riley Rasmussen-229-REP, Guadalupe Jacob-237-REP, Elizabeth Minich-237-REP, Courtney King-238-REP

SUPERIOR COURT

8. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Judge Pro Tempore of the Ajo Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025: Frederick S. Klein and Juanita L. Escalante
9. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Judge Pro Tempore of the Green Valley Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025: Frederick S. Klein and Erika Acle
10. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Judge Pro Tempore of the Superior Court to fill the vacancy of Division VE in Superior Court: Tracy Miller
11. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Judge Pro Tempore of the Pima County Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025: Jerry Landau, Ronald Newman and Thaddeus Semon.
12. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments (Volunteer)**
Appointments of Judge Pro Tempore of the Pima County Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025: Darlene Chavez, John Davis, Carmen Dolny, Maria Felix, Oscar Flores, Jr., Robert Forman, Charles Harrington, William Parven, Susan Shetter and Virjinya Torrez.
13. **Small Claims Hearing Officer Appointment**
Appointment of Small Claims Hearing Officer of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025: Christopher Holguin

TREASURER

- 14. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
Blue Dog Holdings Trust \$7,269.19

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 15. Minutes: February 20, 2024
Warrants: April, 2024

* * *

77. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK