

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
 Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
 John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

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

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

1. Truth in Taxation Hearing

Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-254, conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and the District's intent to raise the secondary property taxes over last year's level.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. Final Budget Hearing

Flood Control District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - FC3

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the Flood Control District Final Budget in the amount of \$18,202,680.00 with an effective tax rate of \$0.3271, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 – FC3. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

3. **REQUEST FOR DRAINAGE EASEMENT**

Staff recommends approval of a drainage easement to Fidelity National Title Agency, Inc. as Trustee under Trust No. 60,543, for property located across Pima County Flood Control Parcel No. 104-01-104F, \$500.00 revenue. (District 3)

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

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

1. FINAL BUDGET HEARINGS

Improvement District Final Budgets for Fiscal Year 2024/2025, as follows.

If approved, pass and adopt:

Resolution No. 24 in the amount of \$40,000.00 for Hayhook Ranch.

Resolution No. 28 in the amount of \$35,671.00 for Mortimore Addition.

Resolution No. 31 for the following districts:

Street Lighting Improvement District

CARDINAL ESTATES	\$14,771
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1	\$ 9,084
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3	\$ 3,112
DESERT STEPPES	\$ 5,452
HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES	\$ 4,672
LAKESIDE NO. 1	\$ 7,272
LITTLETOWN	\$28,115
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1	\$ 9,864
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2	\$11,420
MAÑANA GRANDE B	\$ 7,788
MAÑANA GRANDE C	\$12,720
MIDVALE PARK	\$15,972
OAKTREE NO. 1	\$24,797
OAKTREE NO. 2	\$20,526
OAKTREE NO. 3	\$26,898
ORANGE GROVE VALLEY	\$ 8,116
PEACH VALLEY	\$ 4,115
PEPPERTREE	\$10,769
ROLLING HILLS	\$19,622
SALIDA DEL SOL	\$15,825

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the Improvement District Final Budgets and adopt the Resolutions. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

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

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

1. Truth in Taxation Hearing

Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-254, conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and the District's intent to raise the secondary property taxes over last year's level.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. Final Budget Hearing

Library District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - LD₁

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the Library District Final Budget in the amount of \$51,495,204.00 with an effective tax rate of \$0.5537, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 - LD₁. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

* * *

3. **GRANT ACCEPTANCE**

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Library Services and Technology Act, to provide for the Writers in Residence in Libraries, \$7,500.00/\$300.00 Library District Fund Match (GTAW 24-158)

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

4. **GRANT ACCEPTANCE**

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Library Services and Technology Act, to provide for Serving Patrons' Psychosocial Needs in the Library, \$58,410.00/\$1,400.00 Library District Fund Match (GTAW 24-159)

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 this was a reimagined purpose for libraries. He expressed his concerns with libraries not being a child-friendly place because of people with psychosocial needs that sought out libraries for help. He opposed the implementation of psychosocial services in libraries or libraries becoming a mental health community center. He stated that it was not the role of the County or the libraries to provide those services.

Chair Grijalva stated that the grant would allow for an assessment of the demand for psychosocial services. She stated this grant would not specifically bring in any new patrons, but hoped that people who needed the services would go to them.

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

5. **AWARD**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-23-137, Amendment No. 2, Midwest Tape, L.L.C., to provide Hoopla digital services. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$400,000.00 from \$200,000.00 to \$600,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$800,000.00. Funding Source: Library District Ops Fund. Administering Department: Library District.

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

Supervisor Christy expressed the desire to look at how many library branches there were within the County that were needed because of the increase in online services. He mentioned how it seemed like all the services libraries offered were moving away from traditional library services. He spoke in favor of the item, but

directed that there be an analysis of the number of library branches with increased digital services.

Chair Grijalva stated this grant would expand the number of digital copies provided to the community. She explained that some library branches had more resources than the smaller branches and that this grant would provide access to the resources throughout County Libraries.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was required to be in the library to access digital resources.

Chair Grijalva indicated that if a person had a library card, they would have access to the resources online. She mentioned that not everyone had access to the internet or a digital device and libraries provided those resources.

Supervisor Christy asked that in addition to the analysis of the bricks and mortar issue, staff could also look into the consolidation of the current libraries needed to serve the community. He indicated that his concern was that libraries no longer fulfilled their traditional needs.

Chair Grijalva appreciated Supervisor Christy's concerns, but she opposed the idea of any reduction in the number of library branches. She recommended that an item be placed on a future agenda if Supervisor Christy would like further discussion regarding this matter.

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

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 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 special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

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

1. FINAL BUDGET HEARING

Rocking K South Community Facilities District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - RK2

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing, approve the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Final Budget in the amount of \$2,726,179.00, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 - RK2. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

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

1. FINAL BUDGET HEARING

Stadium District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - SD1

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the Stadium District Final Budget in the amount of \$10,153,658.00, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 - SD1. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

WILDFLOWER COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Wildflower Community Facilities District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

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

1. **FINAL BUDGET HEARING**

Wildflower Community Facilities District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - WCFD₁

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the Wildflower Community Facilities District Final Budget in the amount of \$0.00, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 – WCFD₁. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISOR' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 18, 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 E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

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

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Emerson Kuhn, Associate Director of LGBTQ+ Program Services, Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation (SAAF).

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Larry Starks, President, and members of the Tucson Juneteenth Board, proclaiming the day of Wednesday, June 19, 2024 to be: "JUNETEENTH CELEBRATION 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.

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Monica Dangler, Director, and Dr. Jennifer Wilcox, DVM, Chief Veterinarian, Pima Animal Care Center, proclaiming the week of June 16 through June 22, 2024 to be: "PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER VETERINARIANS APPRECIATION 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.

6. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Gisela Aaron addressed the Board regarding her concerns with Communists in the United States, the placement of the 5G towers and illegal immigration invasion.

Cory Stephens spoke about Minute Item No. 11 and expressed concerns about the areas that were denoted as high fire risk areas in Pima County.

Grace Stambaugh expressed concerns about Happy Acres' unsafe roadways and its relation to the Saguaro Bloom Development Agreement.

Robert Reus addressed Supervisor Scott about his involvement with RTA Next.

Tim Laux voiced concerns about the time limit on Call to the Public, gun rights, and COVID vaccines.

Dave Smith addressed the Board regarding his concerns with increases to taxes, illegal immigration invasion and COVID vaccines.

Carolyn Campbell spoke in support of Minute Item No. 56 on behalf of the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection.

Sharon Greene expressed her concerns about illegal immigration invasion and increases in taxes.

Anastasia Tsatsakis spoke in opposition of Minute Item Nos. 32 and 33. She expressed her concern on the illegal immigration invasion and climate change.

Brenda Marts spoke about her concerns with the government's involvement in housing prices, evictions and the illegal immigration invasion.

Elizabeth Thompson urged that there not be an increase in taxation. She recommended ways to increase tourism and contractor markets.

Joel Tiger voiced his concerns with the illegal immigration invasion.

Danny Flores expressed his opposition to tax increases, rebuilding libraries, and increased property appraisals.

* * *

Supervisor Lee requested that staff look into the concerns expressed about the Happy Acres' unsafe roadways.

* * *

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

7. Truth in Taxation Hearing

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-17104 and §42-17107, the Board of Supervisors will conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and Pima County's intent to raise the primary property taxes over last year's level.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. The following speakers addressed the Board:

Cory Stephens expressed her opposition to raises in property taxes and concerns with inflation.

Anastasia Tsatsakis opposed tax increases, and her concerns with inflation and taxes funding illegal immigrants.

Mike Aaron spoke about his concerns on how the Board spent the budget.

Tim Laux opposed increases in property taxes.

Joel Tiger asked the Board to consider the population that were unable to attend Board meetings and expressed concern with new fees.

Robert Reus expressed his concern with the County relying on property taxes for funding, increased housing appraisals, increased property taxes and late fees on late taxes.

Gisela Aaron opposed the tax rates for the County. She expressed concerns with the locations of 5G towers and the towers lowering property costs.

Danny Flores recommended that if the Board raised taxes that they would help businesses provide more jobs. He expressed concerns with increases in property taxes.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8. Final Budget Hearing

Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2024 – 27

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and approve the Final Budget in the amount of \$1,726,493,259.00, with an effective tax rate of \$5.1048, and adopt Resolution No. 2024 - 27. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott thanked County Administration and the Finance Department for their work on the budget and for being very responsive to concerns raised by Board members. He stated that he voted for approval of the tentative adoption and intended to support the adoption of the final budget because of the faith and trust that he had with the County Administrator and her team. He stated that it was unfortunate that not everyone that spoke at Call to the Public stayed for the presentation because the overall property tax rate would stay stable as a result of the vote the Board would take, as well as the vote taken on the tentative budget. He stated that the budget was almost \$34 million less than the '23/24 budget, the total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were below the number for the last pre-pandemic year and most importantly the services and supports to the over 1.1 million residents in Pima County would continue as a result of the budget. He expressed his concerns about FTEs and the number of positions that were in the recommended budget, but appreciated that the June 10th memorandum had outlined how 29 positions that had been vacant for more than 240 days were cut, which he felt was a telling preview of how the new vacancy policy would be implemented and go into effect the same day as the budget and that exceptions would be rarely made. He requested by way of direction that the Board receive a quarterly report, in terms of which positions were cut, positions that were vacant for more than 240 days, and if there were any exceptions. He stated that he had a good conversation with the County Administrator regarding her June 4th memorandum, which noted that grant-funded positions were 8% of total positions in the County, but 19% of vacancies. He asked for a recap on the ways the County would try to get a better handle on grant-funded positions, including those that may need to be cut because they had been vacant for 240 days or more.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that when General Fund positions were swept the dollars reverted back to the General Fund and that dollars designated for a grant could not be swept because they were to implement the grant. She stated that they established a process that if a position was open for 240 days, the grants management team would reach out to the department and walk through what occurred. She stated that the concern was not necessarily with that vacancy, but whether the vacancy was an indication that there would be any challenges in fulfilling the obligations of the grant and helped to know exactly where they were, if extensions were needed and what that conversation might entail. She stated they

also worked with departments, where on occasion, individuals that worked on one grant could move to another grant, however, there were some specific regulations, incumbent in the merit system that the Human Resources Department (HR) and the different departmental representatives worked with each department at that time.

Supervisor Scott expressed his appreciation of the memorandum the Board received on June 17th that recapped the 49 positions in the Sheriff's Department and the Recorder's Office and the special circumstances affecting those positions, and the effect that those 49 positions had on the total number of recommended FTEs. He appreciated the breakdown of vacancies by department and the breakdown of departments that had vacancy rates of 15% or higher, which was informative and that the stories behind the numbers were always very important to understand. He stated that he appreciated the outcomes of the benefits of what the Board had decided with regards to Class and Comp. and the effects that were expected to show on retention and recruitment, and addressing turnover and vacancy rates. He stated that it was clear from that memorandum that the early reports were very positive. He added that he also appreciated that the memorandum referenced hard-to-fill positions and the four criteria that were listed, and questioned how frequently the Board would be updated on hard-to-fill positions and how they planned to address them.

Ms. Leshar responded that a timeline had not been determined, but that the Deputy County Administrators met weekly with the HR team and Finance to review them and had planned to present them to the Board when the determination was made, for example, with the next batch of in-demand jobs. She stated they could summarize everything at that time, what had happened to date, and provide reminders of what they previously indicated were hard-to-fill positions, as well as others that would be included. She stated that if the Board wanted to set a regular schedule that could be done, but there might not be something new if there was no activity within the working group.

Supervisor Scott stated that he did not think he needed to request a regular update, but that Ms. Leshar knew the concerns of the Board and would share them. He pointed out that every local and State jurisdiction in the Country had received money during the pandemic to pay for the costs of the pandemic. He stated there were two relief bills that were passed by former President Trump and another when President Biden was elected, and the County was required to expend all the funds by December 31, 2026. He stated that when Supervisor Christy had requested a comparison between the '18/19 budget, which was the last pre-pandemic budget, and the current budget, it was pointed out that grant-funded expenditures in the former budget were only 4% of the total budget, but for the current year they were 16% of the total budget, with much of those grant-funded expenditures being pandemic relief funds that were slowly being paid down, and that it would decrease to 11% for the new fiscal year. He stated that the increase in the budget during the pandemic years would be something that the people in the community would also notice with the State budget and all local budgets throughout Arizona, and he reminded everyone that all jurisdictions were required to expend all the funds by

December 31, 2026. He added that he was very pleased and proud to support the budget.

Supervisor Christy stated that even though the tax rate appeared to remain stable people were going to pay more in property taxes and felt it was disingenuous to be said. He questioned whether it was true that people would be paying more in property taxes.

Ms. Leshar responded that there would be an increase if the assessed valuation increased.

Supervisor Christy stated that most people would have an increase in their valuations which had never really been discussed adequately in this venue, because what could be done would be to lower the primary property tax further to compensate for the rising valuations, but it had not been an effort of the Board. He added that to cloak it into the false idea that taxpayers would not be paying any more taxes was a misleading statement. He wondered how many of the positions created by the monies that came to the County with the COVID related programs had remained and would become institutionalized. He stated that the Board had heard from constituents and taxpayers about the struggles they encountered with rising costs, inflation, deciding on what to spend and added that the Board would also be discussing rising homeowner's insurance and this was not a time to keep the primary property tax stable, rather it was time to lower it due to forthcoming raises in valuations. He reiterated that this would not keep the overall property taxes lower and he would be voting against the budget.

Supervisor Lee stated that she had a different philosophy and had proposed an increase and wanted to explain her reasons for her proposal. She questioned whether \$121 million had been clawed back by the State, which year and if it was for five years.

Ms. Leshar concurred that it was five years, \$121 million, or about 27% of the entire budget that were cost shifts that came from the State.

Supervisor Lee commented that the State had recently passed their budget, and she was sure there would additional clawbacks. She explained that her philosophy was for small incremental increases. She provided an example that she had experienced when she was on the Pima Community College Board, where the State had removed \$23 million overnight and the college had to implement a layoff plan. She stated that what she had done as a board member was an increase to the levy max. every year. She stated that Pinal County had chosen not to for several years and then all of a sudden, they had a 19% increase one year, and everyone was upset. She added that there was inflation, and it was known that the State would not be in a good position for at least two years and that individuals that lived in Pima County had come to enjoy the services rendered. She stated for example, if there was an issue with roads, it would be addressed by being placed on a list to be fixed. She stated that it was not always a guarantee that the Health Department services

would always be available. She reiterated her philosophy of a small increase and reminded everyone of the 2007 bust, which affected the appreciation of houses and properties and did not want this to happen to the County. She added that she was aware that it would be very difficult for those that were at one spectrum of poverty, but those individuals had also taken advantage of the services provided by the County.

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

9. **Adopt Debt Service Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025**

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Services Final Budget in the amount of \$103,851,301.00 with an effective tax rate of \$0.1250. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

10. **Board of Supervisors Representative Updates on Boards, Committees and Commissions and any other Municipalities**

Supervisor Scott stated that he had co-facilitated a meeting with Chair Grijalva and Administrator Leshner, which included Ms. Dangler, Director, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), the new director of the Humane Society, Judge Kendrick Wilson from Justice Court who heard a great deal of animal welfare cases, and many of the County's partners in the community who were interested in PACC and its leadership role in protecting animal welfare and safeguarding animal rights. He stated that the meeting was the first of a series of meetings they hoped to have with PACC and community partners to maintain a sound relationship. He also provided an update from the PAG Regional Council and the RTA Board meeting held on May 30th where they heard a proposal from General Maxwell, Chair, and Governor's Southern Arizona Representative of the State Transportation Board, and each jurisdiction had taken the proposal back to their staff to discuss in preparation for their next meeting in July, and hoped to be closer to getting an RTA Next Plan out to the voters for the public review period.

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

11. **Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions Presentation**

Presentation from Director Barbara Richardson with Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions on Affordable Dwelling Insurance in Wildfire Prone Areas.

Chair Grijalva stated that this was an item initially brought forward by Supervisor Christy and that Supervisors Lee and Scott also had interest in it. She thanked Director Richardson for her willingness to provide the presentation.

Barbara D. Richardson, Cabinet Executive Officer, Executive Deputy Director, Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions, thanked the Board for the invitation to discuss insurance because it would be a long-term relationship with the County that would allow for open communication and provide other presentations for other topics. She stated they had offices in Phoenix and Tucson and other areas of the State, and that the Tucson office dealt mostly with fraud. She stated that she would be talking about why everybody across the State was concerned with wildfires and how it affected homeowners' premiums. She stated that homeowners' insurance companies had been filing a greater number of rate increases, especially since 2022, and consumers nationwide were rightly asking what was causing them and what could be done. She stated this was especially concerning for folks that might be showing even more significant spikes if they lived in high-risk or disaster-prone areas. She stated that she would discuss the prominent factors that caused homeowner insurance premiums to increase and what consumers could do to help lighten that impact. She explained that the price insurance companies charged for policies was determined by the likelihood that someone would make a claim on the policy, and what the cost of that claim would be to get it taken care of. She went over the basic factors that insurance companies considered in determining the premium, the first being the amount of coverage chosen. She stated that if higher limits were selected for a dwelling, personal property, loss of use, or liability coverage, there would be an increase in the premium, which also included the decision to buy a policy that covered actual replacement costs versus the market value of the home, should it be lost in its entirety. She stated that this was something that people really needed to be thinking about when purchasing homeowner's policies, especially since the cost of homes was rising, but if the cost to replace it was even higher. She stated that purchases for homeowner's insurance were done on an annual basis and every year there would be an option to consider this type of decision. She added that insurance carriers considered locations of homes and locations at greater risk of named perils, for example, windstorms, fires, which included wildfires, theft and ice, snow, sleet, which all increased the likelihood that someone would file a claim on the property. She stated that they also looked at the history of the property, claims' history, the type of property owned and how well the home was maintained and whether any mitigation was done. She stated this included steps taken to protect the home and the property to reduce the risk of loss. She stated there were also other factors that were out of the consumer's control that determined the price of a homeowner's insurance policy, such as inflation. She stated that had been slowing of the inflation rate, but the prices were still sitting high, and the question became whether or not that would affect it going forward in a positive way or a negative way. She added that another thing that had harmed the economy was labor shortages, which had significantly affected homeowners' rates, as well as materials and the cost of those materials, for example, according to data compiled by the Federal Reserve Bank, the cost of asphalt roofing shingles and coating materials had surged 32% since

2020 and the price to replace a roof was significantly higher than it was 4 or 5 years ago. She stated that lumber prices had risen and given the increases in construction and material costs, it was easy to understand that it would cost more to rebuild a home if it was damaged or destroyed by a named peril and that these price increases drove up the cost of homeowner's insurance. She added that other things affecting prices were supply chain and labor shortages, which had also hit the markets and affected the cost of home construction and reconstruction costs, which led to reconstruction and repairs costs to be higher and to take longer. She stated that if someone were required to evacuate their home due to a fire, another portion of their insurance coverage may kick in, which would be for the loss of use and would potentially pay for an alternative living arrangement and the terms had become longer than normal because it took much longer to get the materials and longer for the labor. She stated that another factor was changing weather patterns and an increase in the strength and number of natural disasters, which had also been experienced in Arizona with shifts in weather patterns and an observable increase in the severity of storms and natural disasters. She stated that as a result, homes were increasingly exposed to these natural disasters and catastrophic events, and the increased exposure to this risk had driven up the insurance costs based on the number and severity of claims. She stated that anytime there was an increase in the number or severity of claims, prices rose, which would also be seen with vehicle insurance. She stated if those things could be controlled, then the costs could be controlled, but of particular interest to the County was how the increase of wildfires and other, peril risks in the State were affecting its insurance premiums and also due to Arizona's dry climate and the development of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). She stated that if someone lived in the WUI, that was the line, or area, or the zone where structures and other human development met or intermingled with undeveloped wildfire or wildland or vegetative fuel. She stated there were also many new locations that were susceptible to wildfires and summer monsoon storms that caused damage. She stated that she was unsure how bad they were in the County, as far as causing damage, but she knew that there was a flood risk involved in those, including haboobs, high winds and atmospheric rivers that were coming out of California. She stated that it was easy to understand why homeowners in high flood, tornado, hurricane and earthquake zones paid more for their insurance, but the risks were different in Arizona. She stated that what her agency had done was focused on the insurance carriers for the risks in Arizona and not what was happening in other states as far as concerns or risks over and above the normal inflation costs to replace and cost of materials. She stated that Arizona had a predominant risk of wildfire. She stated that it was a normal thing for a wildfire in forest areas, but desert areas also offered significant risks and that was where it would mostly be seen in the southern part of the State. She stated that insurance claims were made for monsoons and brought high winds, but were not covered by standard homeowners' insurance. She stated that there was also an increase of flooding in the areas where wildfires had burned and that flood was defined as water that entered the home from outside a ground level, so this type of coverage required a separate policy that must be purchased in addition to homeowner's insurance. She stated that there was a perk in Arizona law that allowed for purchasing flood insurance which included a wait time, however, if a fire happened

the wait time was removed so the flood policy could be purchased immediately to cover the flood that might cause harm to the home right after a fire. She stated that homeowners wanted information on what could be done by themselves to help keep their home safe, which was the most important thing, and also to lower their insurance costs. She stated that her agency's concern first was to ensure that people did not lose their homes, their lives, or their property and although there were some sweeping economic and weather-related risks that were making home insurance more expensive, everyone's individual behavior and choices had a major impact on keeping the costs as low as possible. She stated that by reducing the known risk factors associated with losses due to weather related events, fire, and flooding, through mitigation efforts, was the best way to control increasing insurance premiums. She added that there were several ways to think about mitigation efforts such as community efforts and personal efforts. She stated that there were community and personal mitigation tools available that mostly focused on tools to help educate and understand the wildfire interface area, because that was where the fire made that leak into the homeowner's area and that her agency would get consumers involved in community organization mitigation efforts such as Firewise USA, the Federal Emergency Management programs, the Department of Emergency and Military Affairs (DEMA) programs, the Federal Alliance for Safe Homes and local fire department and district managers. She stated that they had tools available on how to make the community a safer place, and could help with grants, provide services and help to implement changes. She stated that DEMA was always excited to go into areas to lower the fire risk and they would like to have that conversation with the Board. She stated that her agency had looked into other community mitigation tools that had happened in other states, so they could coordinate to get the County in touch with other communities that made changes and efforts and actually effectuated change in their areas. She stated that would be based on the County's own risks and comparing it to a small community in the state of Washington that made significant changes, might not quite fit, but would provide an idea on how they did it, why they thought about it, and where they went to implement their changes. She stated that there were also opportunities for individual homeowners to undertake personal mitigation actions, which involved keeping yards clean of flammable debris, understanding how landscaping choices affected the way fires or embers interacted with homes, creating defensible space around the home, outbuildings, and using fire resistant building materials. She stated they had worked with the personal risk mitigation folks and the insurance companies to figure out how those pieces went together and what they determined was that one change would not be enough. She stated that for example, if a defensible space was done, they would also have to worry about addressing downspouts and the roof, ensuring outbuildings were far away, and ensuring coyote fencing was not used. She stated that any kind of work done would be recognized but that it had to be done in a thoughtful way and ensured that it was enough to be impactful. She stated that if someone happened to live in an area of high wildfire risk, due to the increased risks they may lose their home to wildfire, which was a concern that drove the public issues. She added that the hard part was if the price of the insurance premiums increased significantly, people could not afford it, and insurance companies had pulled out of the market because they could not afford to also

protect people's homes. She stated there had been a shift in the wildfire prone areas with insurance companies reviewing risks, for example, if there were 100 homes in a particular area, they would cut down their insurance footprint in that area to five homes and they asked other insurance companies to cover the rest of the homes because they would not be able to take the hit if the entire community burned. She stated that sometimes when companies indicated that they were no longer writing, what they were doing was altering their risk pattern. She stated that mitigation tools provided the opportunity for homeowners to take action to reduce their wildfire risk and thereby reduce the risk that a company would remove them from their insurance rolls. She stated that everyone personally and as a community made a difference and their agency worked to provide and would continue to provide all Arizona insurance consumers with resources and knowledge and information on more of a technical nature, because it would be needed as things progressed if that was something County wanted to pursue. She added that they had a website with information geared towards them, and other websites of other state agencies or federal agencies that also provided some support. She stated that focusing on reducing risk also gave a better chance of resiliency and the desire for the community to thrive was something to think about as the Board considered how this was going to work. She stated that insurance carriers recognized the efforts made when communities worked together to implement risk mitigation strategies as part of an overall strategy to lower the possible loss of individual homes in the communities, and therefore, would start to sell in areas which they would not have in the past because they knew that the community was also trying to work towards keeping people's homes safe. She stated that even though they could not fix everything right away they would work with everybody to do what they could and offer services. She added that her agency provided a listing of all those insurance companies who had indicated willingness to provide coverage in forest areas, forested and desert areas of the State, which was a much smaller list than it was in past years, but they were still willing to do that, however there was a need to research all options available like competitive prices, enlist an agent for help on finding a company for specific needs. She stated that they also pushed annual insurance reviews to follow up on how things had gone and how they would go moving forward.

Supervisor Christy stated that several people from affected areas had traveled to be in attendance for the presentation and hoped that the Chair would allow them to make a brief statement regarding their real-world experiences to the director.

Chair Grijalva stated that a couple of individuals could speak quickly and perhaps they could try to coordinate a meeting with this department that could be a larger community conversation. She stated that this could be a sampling of concerns for Director Richardson of Pima County community members and where they might be able to get some additional resources.

Sally Crum, President, Mt. Lemmon Homeowners' Association and Lead, Mt. Lemmon Firewise Community, addressed the Board and stated that many of the things discussed their community had already done. She stated that one of the

things that caused concern was the affordability and unavailability of insurance. She stated that their question remained with the unavailability, and that the state of California had the Fair Act, which was fair access to insurance requirements which had been put in place in the 1960s and Florida had the Citizens Property Insurance Plan which had been put in place in 2002, to assist homeowners as a safety net when they were unable to obtain insurance from any of the carriers, even after they had done the mitigation. She stated that Mt. Lemmon was a very active community, and they had their annual Firewise event in May. She stated that they lost over 350 homes with the Aspen fire and 100,000 acres had been burned with the Bighorn fire four years ago. She stated that they were surrounded by U.S. Forest Service property, which had done an excellent job recently to thin out the area, but they sought help for those that could not obtain any insurance. She asked if Arizona would consider a plan like California and Florida for those homeowners unable to obtain insurance and urged them to explore that option.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was important to note that Pima County had nine Firewise U.S.A. certified communities and many of them had been in existence for over 20 years, so this was very much a part of what Ms. Richardson had described as a step toward lowering premiums as well as available coverage, however this was something being done for a couple of decades, but the problems still existed.

Supervisor Lee requested that the list of providers be provided to the Board so that they could pass this information on to their communities.

Supervisor Scott requested the County Administrator follow-up with the County's lobbyist to review legislation to be added as part of the County's legislative program that would be developed in the next few months and perhaps the matters could be brought to the County Supervisors Association, as he was sure that there were constituents in the other 14 counties that dealt with similar issues.

Chair Grijalva asked whether Arizona was considering any sort of guaranteed insurance and that many people did not have access to fire insurance.

Director Richardson responded implementation of Fair Access to Insurance Requirements (FAIR) plans, as done with other states, would require agreement of a legislative change. She cautioned the Board if they considered it because the FAIR plans themselves only paid a portion of home loss, therefore, it was not full insurance. She stated that as the Board thought of a particular base plan, it was the same exact insurance companies that were currently walking away and capping it at a certain dollar amount.

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

12. Tobacco and Vaping

Discussion/Direction/Action: In 2018 and 2019, Pima County and the City of Tucson worked together toward adopting ordinances to raise the legal age for the purchase of tobacco and vaping products to 21 from the age of 18. The effort included requiring retail outlets to obtain permits from the local governments so they could enforce the tobacco and vaping restrictions. The City of Tucson in 2019 adopted such a program, but Pima County did not.

This proposes to direct the Pima County Administrator to revisit this issue by:

- Obtaining data from the City of Tucson regarding its tobacco and vaping products ordinance on how well it is working to achieve its goals - and to find if there are lessons learned after more than four years of implementation.
- Obtaining data from the Pima County Health Department, Pima County Courts and the Arizona Attorney General's Office related to the sale and use of tobacco and vaping products by youths under the age of 21.
- Working with tobacco and vaping products retailers and health-related interest groups to obtain their information on issues of youth purchases and use of these products.
- Returning to the Board of Supervisors with a proposed ordinance addressing these issues that is in accord with the referenced City of Tucson program. (District 5)

Chair Grijalva stated that this item was previously brought to the Board and voted on in 2019. She stated that it was supposed to be a City of Tucson (COT) and Pima County regional approach, but the Board had voted it down. She stated that this item would direct the County Administrator and staff to obtain data from COT regarding its tobacco and vaping products ordinance, on whether it was working and how they achieved their goals since they had four years of data; to obtain data from the Pima County Health Department, Pima County Courts, and the Arizona Attorney General's Office related to sale and use of tobacco vaping products by youth under the age of 21; to work with tobacco, tobacco and vaping product retailers and health-related interest groups to obtain their information on issues of youth purchases and use of these products; and to return to the Board with a proposed ordinance that addressed these issues in accord with what the COT program was and perhaps review ways to strengthen and update the ordinance, since she knew it had a series of compromises. She stated that perhaps with currently knowing the health effects of vaping and how damaging it could be in a very short period of time, the data would help inform and review for tighter restrictions. She stated it would be something the Board would vote on when the ordinance was presented, but this was to ask the listed entities to review this.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the state regulated age for vaping.

Chair Grijalva responded that it was 21 years old.

Supervisor Christy asked if that was the age Chair Grijalva had looked to raise in the County's ordinance.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was not just the age that she wanted in the ordinance.

Supervisor Christy commented that State law already had it at 21 years old and that this was for the information to be brought to the Board. He requested that the County Attorney provide a written opinion to the Board regarding the legality of matching or superseding a County Ordinance that already existed in the State Ordinance and whether it was a legal situation. He stated that he had voted against the item and that the real issue was not necessarily just the problems with vaping and the age, but it was with enforcement. He stated that it stemmed from the pressure being put on business owners, particularly the clerks behind the cashier that were being asked to be judge, jury, police force, nanny, to patrol and to control vaping and all the clerks wanted was to make their money, feed their families and go home safely from work. He stated that he hoped that when this was brought back to the Board, those issues would be taken into consideration.

Chair Grijalva stated that the basic question was asking someone for identification (ID) if they looked under the age of 21, and possibly up to 25, and that there were some signs at Circle K that said 30.

Supervisor Christy stated that one of the issues brought up were situations of people being very hostile and violent when asked for an ID, which happened more than people realized and the effect that it had on business owners and their employees was severe.

Chair Grijalva commented that it would make a huge impact at schools, high schools and all school districts and that if asked, any school administrator would confirm that the most disruptive thing that happened on campus was vaping, and the health effects were significant and she felt that having the Health Department provide input and perhaps provide some resources to schools and campaigns would be very helpful, but maybe this was not something that was needed. She stated that this would be to explore options and appreciated Supervisor Christy asking the County Attorney for a legal opinion because she had not suggested to supersede State law, rather, how things had gone and whether there was necessity. She stated that the County's young people had very easy access to a lot of vaping and tobacco products.

Supervisor Scott stated that federal action had been taken on December 20, 2019, and that President Trump signed legislation that amended the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and raised the federal minimum age for sale of tobacco products from 18 to 21 years. He stated that the legislation was known as Tobacco 21 or T-21 and became effective immediately and that it was illegal for a retailer to sell any tobacco product, including cigarettes, cigars and e-cigarettes, to anyone under age 21. He stated the new federal minimum age of sale applied to all retail establishments and persons with no exceptions.

Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated that at the end of 2019, the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act was amended to include the age of 21, but that the challenge was that for eight states, including Arizona, the minimum legal sales age was 18. He stated that the Attorney General was not able to enforce the federal standard because the State standard was 18 and so the legal conundrum that State and locals faced was a federal regulation that was not enforceable which led to confusion on the part of retailers and variability in terms of the kind of enforcement activity.

Supervisor Scott appreciated the request for the County Attorney to opine on this and questioned whether this would impact the County since counties were subdivisions of the State.

Dr. Garcia responded that the issue of whether this could be folded into the general public health authority of the counties had previously been discussed during the previous set of deliberations, and at that time, it was determined that it was allowable and legal for this County to consider a different standard.

Supervisor Scott inquired whether the previous Board had received an opinion from former County Attorney LaWall's office.

Dr. Garcia recalled that the County Attorney had weighed in, but was unsure if it was in the form of a legal opinion or if it was in the form of commentary.

Supervisor Heinz asked for clarification regarding Arizona's age limit for tobacco products.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the federal age limit was 21.

Supervisor Heinz commented that he was about to get a wine bar and that his employees could not sell alcohol to people under 21 and that gas station attendants could not sell a case of beer to people under 21 and that carding people was annoying, but he believed the vast majority of those that sold any kind of products were quite used to it and those were also establishments to most likely have vaping and tobacco products. He stated that this would help those folks align everything to the same age, it made more sense as this was the law, and it was a huge public health concern. He stated that the Board should move forward with it and that he would vote in support of an ordinance.

Chair Grijalva reiterated this was a request to gather information and that a proposed ordinance be brought back to the Board for a vote.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

13. Teatro Carmen

Discussion/Direction/Action: Allocation of additional funding for renovation of Teatro Carmen.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the County purchased the facility in 2022 for just about \$1.1 million and had also dedicated \$1 million at that time. She stated that recently there was damage to the roof and potential structural damage and that as noted in the memorandum, it was their hope that the emergency repairs would be able to be reimbursed by insurance. She stated that their focus was to explore whether they could get insurance coverage for the work that needed to be done following those emergency repairs and to deal with some of the structural concerns. She stated that the recommendation was to request an allocation of up to \$1 million in case insurance was unable to cover those repairs.

Chair Grijalva asked for clarification whether it would be to allocate \$1 million in case insurance was unable to cover the repairs, whether the Board would be informed on the status, if the allocation would come from the General Fund, and if this was County property.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the allocation of up to \$1 million in case insurance was unable to cover the emergency repairs. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that this was terrific project, and he was in favor of preserving the past in this significant barrio, however, he felt that it should have never been County property. He stated that if this was going to be some kind of a project, there needed to be more private sector involvement and if it was a venue for entertainment, that would be a perfect rationale for it, or use of outside grants. He added that County taxpayers should not be involved in purchasing properties, particularly those properties that were embedded in the City of Tucson and he would be voting against the item.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Scott was not present for the vote.

Supervisor Scott requested that his vote be recorded as "Aye" for this item.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, explained that the Board would need a motion to reconsider the item in order to include Supervisor Scott's vote.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to reconsider the prior approved motion in order to include Supervisor Scott's vote. Upon the vote, it carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the allocation of up to \$1 million in case insurance was unable to cover the emergency repairs.

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

14. Attractions and Tourism Outside Agency Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2024/2025

FY 24-25 Funding available: \$400,000.00

Agency/Program/FY24-25 Recommendation

Arizona Media Arts Center/Arizona International Film Festival/\$10,000.00
Arts Foundation for Tucson and Southern AZ/Arts and Culture Programs/\$21,800.00
International Sonoran Desert Alliance (ISDA)/Wayfinding and Signage for an Emerging Destination/\$12,500.00
Jazz in January, d.b.a. Tucson Jazz Festival/Tucson Jazz Festival 2023-2024/\$21,500.00
La Frontera Mariachi Conference, Inc./La Frontera Tucson Mariachi Conference/\$13,167.00
Light Up Lives Charity Foundation, d.b.a. Rockin' 4 Heroes/Rockin' 4 Heroes/\$10,000.00
Perimeter Bicycling Association of America, Inc./El Tour de Tucson/\$36,000.00
Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Chili Cook-Off/\$14,000.00
Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc./Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area/\$16,500.00
Southern Arizona Arts & Cultural Alliance/Oro Valley Holiday Festival of the Arts and Tree Lighting/\$10,000.00
Southwest Folklife Alliance, Inc./Tucson Meet Yourself Folklife Festival/\$30,000.00
St. Patrick's Day Parade of Tucson, Inc./2024 Tucson St. Patrick's Day Parade and Festival/\$10,000.00
Tucson Audubon Society/Southeast Arizona Birding Festival 2023/\$10,000.00
Tucson Botanical Gardens/FY23-24 Programs and Exhibits at the Tucson Botanical Gardens/\$46,750.00
Tucson Children's Museum/Museums for All, Discovery Nights and Art After Dark Programs/\$42,833.00
Tucson City of Gastronomy/Pueblos del Maiz Fiesta/\$15,800.00
Tucson Juneteenth Festival Committee/Tucson Juneteenth Festival Committee/\$10,000.00
Tucson Kitchen Musicians Association/Tucson Folk Festival/\$10,000.00
Tucson Pops Orchestra/Tucson Pops Orchestra 2023-2024/\$10,000.00
Tucson Presidio Trust, d.b.a. The Presidio Museum/Heritage and History Events/\$29,150.00
Tucson Rodeo Parade Committee, Inc./Tucson Rodeo Parade/\$10,000.00
Tucson Symphony Society/TSO Special Concerts - Calexico, Raiders of the Lost Ark and Verdi's Requiem/\$10,000.00
GRAND TOTAL: \$400,000.00

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

Chair Grijalva commented on the many projects funded that would make an impact on Pima County.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Scott was not present for the vote.

Supervisor Scott requested that his vote be recorded as “Aye” for this item.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, explained that the Board would need a motion to reconsider the item in order to include Supervisor Scott’s vote.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to reconsider the prior approved motion in order to include Supervisor Scott’s vote. Upon the vote, it unanimously carried 5-0.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

15. Monthly Financial Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a monthly financial update on the County's financial performance.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slideshow presentation on the financial update for April. She discussed the Economic Decision Guide which was published in May 2024 and noted that each of the economic indicators were unfavorable with the exception of inflation, which had stabilized. She explained that this meant the rate of inflation seemed to have stopped going up as fast as it had been. She stated that Pima County ended with a fund balance of \$124,474,195.00, which was above the County’s minimum, 17% was set aside for expenditures and that was good position to be in. She stated that they expected to receive approximately 2.2524% increase in total revenue at the end of this fiscal year and a decrease in expenditures, which had originally been budgeted at 11%. She mentioned that the State Budget Update slide was put together before the State had adopted its budget, so staff had not had the opportunity to go through what the County would receive. She stated that an update would be provided to the Board once staff reviewed the state’s budget. She stated that the County was ending the fiscal year in a good position.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that in a memorandum provided by the Sheriff’s Department on June 17, 2024, they were projected to be in the black at the end of the year after a \$7.5 million deficit. She praised the Sheriff’s Department for their efforts.

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

16. **Quarterly Report on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending March 31, 2024.

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

JUVENILE COURT

17. **Juvenile Court Center Family Counseling Program**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 28, of the Board of Supervisors, electing participation by Pima County in the Juvenile Justice Services Family Counseling Programs and providing \$15,144.00 in matching funds.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS AND RECREATION

18. **Pima County Cooperative Extension (PCCE) Appropriation of Funds for FY 2024/25**

Staff recommends approval of the appropriation of funds in the amount of \$151,400.00, to allow PCCE to enhance county services provided to the public.

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 funding source.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded the funding source was General Fund.

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

19. **Renaming of Winston-Reynolds Manzanita Regional Park Multi-Use Fields**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 29, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the renaming of Winston-Reynolds Manzanita Regional Park Multi-use Fields No. 5 and No. 6 for Coach Juan F. Tadeo, Jr.

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 adopt the Resolution.

PROCUREMENT

20. The Board of Supervisors on June 4, 2024 continued the following:

Contract

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

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

21. Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and professional, semi-professional, youth amateur and professional sports development and marketing, General Fund, contract amount \$5,600,000.00 (CT-ED-24-454)

Chair Grijalva stated that this contract was required by statute.

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

Community and Workforce Development

22. Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Emergency Home Repair Program and amend contractual language, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (CT-CR-24-178)

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

23. Arivaca Community Center, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Arivaca Community Center Park and surrounding facilities, extend contract term to 4/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$15,000.00 (CT-CR-23-376)

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

24. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., to provide for Emergency Eviction Legal Services Emergency Housing - Rehousing Assistance, Arizona Department of Housing - S.B. 1720 Housing Shelter & Services Fund, contract amount \$1,055,106.00/2 year term (CT-CR-24-468)

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.

25. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Emergency Eviction Legal Services - Emergency Housing, Arizona Department of Housing - S.B. 1720 Homeless Shelter & Services Fund, contract amount \$1,197,683.00 (CT-CR-24-475)

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.

26. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Emergency Eviction Legal Services - Emergency Housing and to terminate contract on 12/31/23, American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund, contract amount \$479,075.04 decrease (CT-CR-24-46)

Chair Grijalva clarified that this item terminated the funding from the American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund and that Minute Item No. 25 was the replacement contract.

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.

27. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 9/1/25 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$750,000.00 revenue (CTN-CR-21-126)

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.

28. Sunnyside Unified School District 12, d.b.a. Sunnyside Unified School District, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 5/31/25 and amend contractual language, City of Tucson Grant Fund, contract amount \$311,090.40 (CT-CR-21-430)

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.

29. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a. Amphitheater Public Schools, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, City of Tucson Grant Fund, contract amount \$466,635.60 (CT-CR-24-448)

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.

30. Friends of the Arivaca Schoolhouse & Historic Townsite, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Arivaca Schoolhouse facility improvements, extend contract term to 3/31/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (CT-CR-23-152)

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

County Attorney

31. Audilett Law, P.C., Amendment No. 6, to provide for legal representation of the Pima County Sheriff's Department, Sheriff Chris Nanos, Sergeant Mosely, and Deputy Caudillo pertaining to the Bradley Lewis Matter, extend contract term to 7/12/25 and amend contractual language, Risk Management Tort Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-FN-22-61)

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

Grants Management and Innovation

32. City of Tucson, to provide for Fiscal Year 2024 Shelter and Services - Allocated (SSP-A), U.S. DHS/FEMA/Grant Programs Directorate Fund, contract amount \$2,870,526.05 (CT-GMI-24-464)

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 if this was the activity that the Auditor General had an issue with.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded yes and clarified that the Auditor General's indication was this item would be resolved once it was approved by the Board and it needed to wait until June 30, 2024 for completion.

Supervisor Christy questioned if this issue had been resolved.

Ms. Leshar indicated that this was the final piece to resolve the issue with the Auditor General and it would be resolved once the Board voted on the item.

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

Health

33. Arbo Scientific, L.L.C., to provide for Vector surveillance, U.S. Department of Treasury American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, contract amount \$362,292.00/2 year term (CT-HD-24-425)

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 how this contract was paid for before the pandemic.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that the County had been doing vector surveillance on mosquito borne illnesses for many years, but one of the biggest challenges was funding and staffing. He added that the testing materials had been paid for by the General Fund and that the contract would increase funding for the studies, and would allow for more mosquitoes to be collected to be able to tell if West Nile Virus had risen or if the Zika Virus was here. He indicated that they were using ARPA Funds to increase the capacity and coverage of the County, specifically rural areas.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification that the contract would use ARPA Funds even though it predated the pandemic.

Dr. Garcia responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

Information Technology

34. Drexel Heights Fire District on behalf of Valley Emergency Communication Center, Amendment No. 4, to provide for data center racks and GIS services, extend contract term to 6/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, contract amount \$18,000.00 revenue (CTN-IT-20-89)

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

Procurement

35. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Multiple Master Agreements for janitorial services. These amendments extend the termination date to 9/30/24 and increases the not-to-exceed contract amount by \$348,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed

contract amount of \$25,382,538.58. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

MA & Version/Amendment No./Contractor Name/Current Not-to-Exceed/Annual Award Amount/New Not-to-Exceed

MA-PO-18-92, 31/9/JanCo FS2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/\$9,315,506.31/\$200,000.00/\$9,515,506.31

MA-PO-18-93,38/8/G&G Janco Enterprise, L.L.C., d.b.a. Janco Janitorial

/\$5,214,512.02/\$78,000.00/\$5,292,512.02

MA-PO-18-94, 33/9/JanCo FS2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/\$3,773,970.91/\$0.00/\$3,773,970.91

MA-PO-18-95, 30/9/JanCo FS2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/\$3,061,357.25/\$0.00/\$3,061,357.25

MA-PO-18-96, 29/9/JanCo FS2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/\$3,669,192.09/\$70,000.00/\$3,739,192.09

Totals: \$25,034,538.58/\$348,000.00/\$25,382,538.58

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

36. Motorola Solutions, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for Motorola Flex software and support, extend contract term to 7/10/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$1,000,000.00 (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 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

37. Cellco Partnership, d.b.a. Verizon Wireless, Amendment No. 1, to provide for wireless voice, data and accessories, extend contract term to 6/30/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-21-162) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

38. Application Software, Inc., d.b.a. ASI, Amendment No. 2, to provide for COBRA administration services, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, Health Benefit Self-Insurance Fund, contract amount \$25,000.00 (MA-PO-18-295) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

39. ADP, Inc. (formerly ADP, L.L.C.), Amendment No. 12, to provide for HR/Payroll, Benefits and eTime Management, extend contract term to 1/1/25 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$733,346.00 (MA-PO-13-202) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

Supervisor Christy asked if this extension was due to an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) delayed related expense.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that they had anticipated that the ADP contract would end in 2024, and this was to extend the contract to January 1, 2025.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification if staff anticipated the contract with ADP would be done and not that it was a delayed funding issue.

Ms. Leshar clarified that they believed the contract would be done on December 31, 2024, which was why they had asked for the extension.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the Human Resources version of their modular of the ERP had always been slated to begin on January 1, 2025 and this extension was not part of any delays, but was part of their anticipated timeline.

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

40. Arrington Watkins Architects, L.L.C., to provide for Architectural and Engineering Design Services: Pima County Adult Detention Complex Study (XMJSTY), General Fund PAYGO, contract amount \$820,858.00/2 year term (CT-CPO-24-52) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

Chair Grijalva commented that she had an issue with the item and felt that it was premature of the Board to move forward in this direction during an election year. She stated that the Board had received the Blue Ribbon Commission's final report on March 5th, on April 2nd the Board approved a new jail commission, and a proposal was supposed to be brought back by early August so that staff could finalize the scope of work in the membership of the new committee. She stated that the leadership of the new committee would be identified, staff assigned, and the initial work plan developed. She stated that with an election year, there could be a change in leadership, but the current Sheriff had been very clear about wanting a new jail, so she was unsure if it was beneficial to go through the process of hiring contractors and/or architects for redeveloping the current footprint, and she was opposed to expansion of the jail and would not be able to support this item.

Supervisor Christy agreed with Chair Grijalva and stated that his main contention with the item was that it was designated to be funded by PAYGO, but the previous Board had unanimously voted for PAYGO to center on street repair, not jail reimagination, and that it was premature to be going into this process before more avenues were explored with the jail situation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, reminded the Board that PAYGO was for road repairs and capital improvement projects, and that the recommendation was to start exploring what might need to be done with repair and maintenance, in consistence

with Board direction regarding the allocation of PAYGO and she understood the concern with the delay due to the election.

Chair Grijalva stated that if the leadership stayed the same, the Sheriff had been very clear about the need for a new jail, not revisions to the current jail. She stated that she had not heard any other indication from her colleagues to move forward in that direction. She added that it would be important for the Board to have a conversation with leadership and there would be an election in November which perhaps would be an opportune time to discuss it.

Supervisor Lee asked why this item had been placed on the agenda.

Ms. Leshar responded that what was clear through the conversations with the Blue Ribbon Commission and with staff, was the assumption that if a new jail would not be built, there was a significant amount of deferred maintenance that needed to occur, which required some professionals like this organization to evaluate what might need to be done with anticipation that the full analysis could take a year. She added that they began at this time so they could provide future recommendations about the costs for any kind of renovation, repair and deferred maintenance to help inform a future decision about what path the Board might take in terms of a new jail or not.

Supervisor Lee asked for clarification whether they would only be completing an analysis or completing building plans.

Ms. Leshar clarified a variety of things could be done under this contract, but the first phase was to evaluate what needed to be done with the basics of the deferred maintenance, plumbing, walls, etcetera. She stated that this was an organization that had a breadth of experience related to jails and if there was a determination at any point in the future for additional planning, that could be done.

Supervisor Scott recalled that this was a recommendation from the Blue Ribbon Commission and there had been discussion at the dais about addressing the issues related to needs of the current facility.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the jail was currently mortgaged by Certificates of Participation (COPs).

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and that there was a list of County properties that were used for the COPs and the jail was one of those properties.

Supervisor Christy asked if the lender required the County to upgrade or repair their mortgage holding.

Ms. Leshar responded no, it was not a requirement of the COPs.

Supervisor Heinz commented that it seemed this would not be a major expenditure and that it was for an in-depth analysis of cataloging what had to be done and that this kind of thing had to be done regardless of who got elected. He stated that it was not for a whole new jail or something that needed to be referred to the ballot. He stated that Banner South would not be able to operate in that hospital property if some of the situations seen in the jail were in the hospital, in terms of the deferred maintenance, and it was a County owned building. He stated that he was comfortable moving forward with this item because it was a limited scope and reiterated it was an analysis of what needed to be done and to determine what needed to be referred.

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

41. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, Amendment No. 4, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$533,000.00 (CT-WW-20-306)

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

Sheriff

42. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 30, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2024 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-10001 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-24-185)

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

43. Town of Marana, to provide for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount \$5,000.00 estimated revenue (CTN-SD-24-150)

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

44. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 4, to provide for dispatch services, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$354,481.00 revenue (CTN-SD-20-162)

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

45. Pima County Community College District, to provide for Adult Basic Education and Career Program at Pima County Adult Detention Complex, Special Revenue - Sheriff Inmate Welfare Fund, contract amount \$155,000.00 (CT-SD-24-455)

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

Transportation

46. Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, Amendment No. 11, to provide for regionalization of public transit and special needs transportation service and maintenance of effort, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, Non-HURF Transportation Fund, contract amount \$7,631,479.00 (CT-TR-20-115)

Kathryn Skinner, Director, Department of Transportation (DOT), stated that they often addressed the Board regarding the pavement on the road, but that the DOT oversaw many other elements that were important features of a complete transportation system. She provided slides and stated that this was contract for a Maintenance of Effort Agreement for transit services in Pima County with the RTA and that both the RTA and Sun Tran had administered different aspects of the transit system in the region. She stated that the County was served by many different types of transit services, including fixed routes, neighborhood routes within smaller communities, Dial-A-Ride service, complimentary Sun Van and Paratransit service for American with Disabilities Act (ADA) transit, and express routes. She referred to the slide that showed a list of ten Sun Tran routes, and that at least a portion were within the unincorporated County, and it had a fairly high ridership and service mileage in the areas. She encouraged anyone to use the Sun Tran website to plan routes. She also went over the Sun Shuttle routes and stated that the first few routes shown with numbers 412 or 413 acted as fixed routes, they seemed like regular busses, but they were actually administered by the RTA and they were more of a rural transit neighborhood circulator type route. She stated that the last three items shown were for Dial-A-Ride, so they were a different service mechanism for these rural areas, where instead of being on the fixed timetable, someone could call and find out when that route would come. She went over the express routes and stated that many county employees and others around the community used these express routes to get to work daily and they usually operated 2 to 4 times a day for those peak periods, but they were typically longer routes from the outskirts of town. She stated that one of the requirements of a transit service was having that complimentary ADA transit service, which was a door-to-door service for those in the community that were unable to get to the bus stop on those fixed routes, which was also administered through this contract. She referred to a slide and stated that it showed there had been increases yearly and from 2023 to 2024 there had been an increase from 13% and 14% on the Sun Van and Sun Tran routes. She went over the costs from the last 12 years and it showed an upward trend with a dip in 2021, which was when some of the COVID Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic

Security Act funding was used to offset the transit costs and that money went to the RTA, however they were able to negotiate down their contract for that year by about half, but generally it increased every year and was set in state statute and was based on the Gross Domestic Product escalation.

Supervisor Lee stated the slides did not show anything for Robles Ranch and she knew there was a pickup in Three Points. She asked which route was for Robles Ranch. She stated that it might be the Ajo to Tucson route and that there was a big transit issue for those in Three Points, and that people would get picked up by the community center.

Ms. Skinner stated that she was unaware, but would provide the information to Supervisor Lee.

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

47. Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, to provide for design and construction of improvements to South Houghton Road multi-use path (TIP ID 3.24), RTA, RTAG, Pima County HURF Funds, contract amount \$212,200.00/\$1,209,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT-TR-24-473)

Kathryn Skinner, Director, Department of Transportation, stated that there had always been discussions about funding and the challenges in funding with transportation and this was how they went about assembling a single project that had multiple funding sources and applications. She provided a slideshow presentation and stated this was for the south Houghton Road Project near Corona de Tucson. She showed a map of the location and stated it was a more rural area and the funding source used was only available for areas with a population between 5,000 and 50,000. She stated that there were two schools in the area, there was currently a facility that had no sidewalks, and there was a lot of commercial. She stated that it was an area that over the years had multiple requests for some sort of pathway. She stated that the following slide showed pedestrian usage on Google Street View and there were kids going either home or to school, which was not the most ideal facility for anybody to be walking in. She went over what they proposed; however, they did not have a final cross section, but explained that what was being shown would provide an idea. She stated that instead of being right adjacent to the roadway on what was a paved shoulder, there would be a separated pathway that would go about a mile's distance and would connect to an existing pathway that was right on the frontage of the schools, but it did not extend beyond that to where the kids would be walking. She added that this would provide better continuity. She went over the funding that would be needed and stated that instead of being one funding source, they would be using three different funding sources in order to deliver the project. She stated it would specifically include Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) match funding for the federal grant, but with all RTA Intergovernmental Agreements which captured all the funding that went into completing the project. She stated the funds included were for \$69,000.00 from RTA

match money to the federal Regional Transportation Alternative Grants which focused just on the population limitation of 5,000 to 50,000. She stated that this was for Fiscal Year 2026 federal money for the construction, and to ensure the timeline was met, the County would need to use local funds to complete the design work which would allow for acceleration of the design process. She stated that this would be for \$212,000.00 of County Highway User Revenue Funds.

Supervisor Scott stated that a comprehensive email had been sent to a constituent regarding the inquiry about the possibility of a multi-use path on Sunrise Road, from Kold to Sabino Canyon, which was also an area with two schools, Esperero Canyon Middle School and Canyon View Elementary School. He stated that there was also the Sabino Canyon National Recreation Area, which was about to get an expanded visitor center. He stated that this project would be paid for with a multitude of funding sources and questioned whether they could prioritize continuing conversations with the Forest Service, and potentially with the Catalina Foothills School District about the possibility of doing something similar on Sunrise Drive.

Ms. Skinner replied that they were always open to exploring new opportunities for grant funding for projects, but that the specific stretch of road Supervisor Scott mentioned would not have qualified for this funding source due to the population constraints.

Supervisor Scott stated that there were other funding sources that could be explored, including potentially partnering with the Forest Service and maybe the school district.

Ms. Skinner responded that was a possibility and that they had good relationships with both entities and partnered with them on other federal grants with the National Forest Service.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the proposed structure and whether there was a possibility to move the cyclists over and have a buffer zone for them as well, since they were also at risk from vehicular traffic, which he felt would not be a massive expense.

Ms. Skinner responded that was a great suggestion and stated that on County roadways, they typically kept that paved shoulder, which some cyclists chose to use, but they had envisioned this as a multi-use path or shared use path, so it would be wide enough to accommodate cyclists or pedestrians.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

48. Acceptance – Sheriff

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY 2022 Homeland Security Grant Program Award Reallocation, 220402-03 SWAT Rifle Rated Ballistic Shields, \$12,390.00 (GTAW 24-154)

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

49. Acceptance – Sheriff

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY 2021 Homeland Security Grant Program Award Reallocation, 210403-03 Bomb Squad X-Ray Panels, \$415.00 (GTAW 24-155)

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

50. Acceptance – Sheriff

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for FFY 2022 Homeland Security Grant Program Award Reallocation, 220402-02 Bomb Squad X-Ray Panels, \$3,585.00 (GTAW 24-161)

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

51. Acceptance - Transportation

Pima Association of Governments, to provide for the South Houghton Road multi-use path, \$1,140,000.00/\$69,000.00 Regional Transportation Authority Fund Match/5 year term (GTAW 24-156)

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

52. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 294194, Zhourong Ni, Ni's Asian Bistro and Sushi Bar, 7655 N. La Cholla Boulevard, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

53. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Natasha Bassi, Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, July 4, 2024 at 8:30 p.m.

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

Supervisor Heinz commented that he was still on a warpath with these permits for fireworks, and that the Board had a meeting a couple years ago regarding several interpretations of the rules. He stated that the County rule was for 10 mph, and if there were these winds, then fireworks could not be shot off. He stated that at that time, the Fire Marshal and Fire Department were present and had indicated it was for wind gusts of 15, 20, 25 mph and for that particular incident they shot off fireworks and bad things happened. He stated that as a result, he had a lot of trouble voting for these things, because there was a rule. He wondered whether it should also be enforced for July 4th and questioned whether applicants were made to sign or notarize something where they acknowledged that if there were winds of or above 10 mph, they would not move forward with their display, and asked what else could be done. He stated that he would like to be able to support these, but this was a huge public safety issue, and everything was ready to burn, especially during this time of year.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained what Supervisor Heinz had referred to was Pima County Code 9.04.080, Section E. which stated the following: "No fireworks display shall be held during any storm or wind, in which the wind reaches a velocity of more than ten miles per hour." She added that it was also notated on the letterhead of the Pima County Regional Bomb Squad's Inspection Form and that a Bomb Squad representative contacted the sponsors to discuss the site-specific information which included the language indicating that they would adhere to all sections of the Code, including that fireworks displays should be stopped during any storm or wind when it reached ten miles of velocity or more which was on the checklist of the bomb squad. She added that when the documents were signed by the representative of the organization, both the site representative and the operator's representative that signed these documents assumed criminal and civil responsibility for compliance with the provisions.

Supervisor Scott shared Supervisor Heinz's concerns and was pleased that his office heard from a representative of the Westin La Paloma and they indicated that they would scale back with selling fireworks shows. He stated they had come to the Board with more permit requests than any of the other resorts, however he was

comfortable voting for the July 4th shows. He mentioned that he had sent an email to the County Administrator and copied the Chair that noted that the current application for permits from the Clerk's office stated the following: "The local fire district and/or the state fire marshal may conduct an independent inspection which has the authority to override permit approval." He stated that given what occurred the previous year during the 4th of July show conducted by the Westin La Paloma, and given the current climate conditions which may persist through the 4th of July, he wanted the Board to know before a vote, whether the Office of Emergency Management (OEM) could reach out to all the local fire districts and departments to ask them the criteria they would use to allow any fireworks shows approved by the Board and asked what the Board could expect from the fire districts and fire departments.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and stated that they would follow up with a list and that staff had worked with Director Clark and the Deputy Director of OEM. She stated that they called each of the fire districts and touched base with them and that the following morning all the fire chiefs were meeting and she would ensure that this was one of the topics for discussion.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

54. Hearing - Rezoning

P23RZ00008, WOHLFORD - N. BONANZA AVENUE REZONING

Kevin and Sandra Wohlford, request a rezoning of approximately 6.07 acres from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to the CR-1 (Single Residence) zone, located on the east side of N. Bonanza Avenue approximately 1,500 feet south of E. Snyder Road, addressed as 4510 N. Bonanza Avenue. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 1.2. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Gungle and Cook were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

Elizabeth Atayde addressed the Board in opposition and stated that she had concerns regarding mitigation for the north end of the property on Bonanza Avenue. She stated that the floodplain had been adjudicated as being south, however, she felt that not enough attention had been paid to the north end of this property. She stated that if the soil was compacted any further, it would cause more water to flow down the wash that separated two parcels of her property and create even more damage than it already had in 2021. She stated that she was trying to dig the wash out and receiving estimates, which would cost her about \$2,200.00. She added that it deposited 8 to 10 inches of water from the monsoon, which she had submitted pictures to the Board. She requested a review of the permeable soils for the area,

because she did not think that they were permeable and water absorbent. She reiterated it would create damage to her property and perhaps lower the value.

Brian Connelly spoke to the Board in opposition and stated that the local homeowners felt it was fair and realistic to maintain the current esthetic integrity of all new construction in the area with possible height restriction, single-story up to 18 or 24 feet in the area. He added that they appreciated the applicant's investment in the area, but felt there should be some restrictions for new construction.

Kevin Wohlford, applicant, addressed the Board and stated that he and his wife were new to Tucson. He stated that they visited Tucson in January 2023 and liked everything about it, the people, the climate, the outdoor activities, the beauty of the Sonoran Desert. He added that he came from a construction background, so when they saw the property, it spoke to them. He stated that it included an old house with an elevator and was something he wanted to work on with his own hands. He added that the property also included six acres of natural, beautiful Sonoran Desert with Saguaros all over the place, mountain views in all directions, and javelina, and that he did not want to upset any of that. He stated that he was not a big city developer, but only wanted to build a house, and maybe two extra houses on that property, which he did not think would cause much of a disturbance. He added that he did not need six acres and only had enough money for one lot. He stated that what he would need to do was divide the property and would be unable to do so until it was split and could not split it until it was rezoned. He stated that the benefits to his neighbors and to the County would require him to protect the natural fauna of the property, that the home he had envisioned, which would be visible from Bonanza Avenue, would be architecturally attractive to complement the neighborhood and support property values. He stated that this would increase the tax base in the area and that it would increase pressure on the County to improve Bonanza Avenue. He stated that three of his immediate neighbors had two-story houses in addition to his house. He stated that two-story homes had a smaller roof area compared to the number of square feet in the house, which created less impact for runoff. He added that this was a low-density area of one house per acre. He stated that in his opinion, a house of this size from 400 feet away did not cause a very big impact on the view of the mountains and added that the house did not have to be 34 feet tall and it could be 24 feet tall. He stated that he would need a two-story house because the setback from the wash only provided 10,000 square feet, which was not enough for a one-story.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether there had been any other concerns or considerations brought up by staff or people in the affected area that would warrant additional consideration by the Board since the staff report had been written and since the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z).

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services Department (DSD), responded in the affirmative and stated that the Board had heard from Ms. Atayde who lived across the street, with concerns about overall density and potential impact as it related to flooding and also with Mr. Connolly regarding his idea of height. He

stated that he was present at the P&Z meeting, but was unsure how much those issues really teased out. He stated that there was always an ability for the Board to add, amend or strike a condition, as it had done historically.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether there would be any possibility for the Flood Control District to follow up on the concerns raised regarding flooding, by the report from the Flood Control District, and by speakers sharing their real-life experiences.

Mr. Poirier responded that the Flood Control District had a lot of the ability to complete a significant review on this rezoning and that it first came in with more lots, then it had been revised, and there was back and forth between the applicant's hydrologist and the County's Flood Control. He stated they certainly had a good review of it in their staff report and highlighted the concerns. He stated that the story would not end in regards to flood because as they sought building permits, they would again need to engage in flood. He reiterated that Flood Control had an ample review of the request and although there were no standalone rezoning conditions, the Flood Control District had attached their staff report which included certain comments and certain things that were very important.

Supervisor Scott asked if the comments made by the Flood Control District were on page four of the staff report.

Mr. Poirier replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Scott stated if the Board were to entertain any additional conditions based on flooding, he did not know that he had the capacity to be able to propose those and inquired whether that was something that could be recommended by DSD or followed up with the Flood Control District.

Mr. Poirier stated that they were prepared to come up with some appropriate language based on Supervisor Scott's concerns and that historically they had done this with other rezonings where they tried to facilitate a condition and provide a recommendation.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the condition or recommendation.

Mr. Poirier stated that with the flood concern, significant policy that drove the Flood Control District review of DSD rezonings had to do with maximizing avoidance of map floodways. He stated that there was a chance, if the Board was inclined, to try to eliminate the most major disturbance of the floodway as it related to this rezoning. He stated that in this case, the applicant had proposed three lots, one of them had an existing home, a second one would be along Bonanza Avenue south of the existing home, but the third one would require an at-grade crossing disturbing the floodway to obtain access to that third lot in the southeast corner. He stated that if the Board was inclined to minimize the density to reduce impact to the floodway, he would advise the Board to consider a condition that would preclude the ability to access that third home through the floodway, and only allow it if the applicant could

secure access from another property owner. He stated that this would only allow up to two homes along Bonanza Avenue, and the third one only be developed, provided there would be alternative access that did not disturb the mapped floodway.

Supervisor Christy welcomed the applicants to Pima County and questioned where they received their property tax bill.

Mr. Wohlford confirmed the property tax bill was sent to the property address, they sold their home in Iowa and were permanent residents of Pima County.

Supervisor Christy asked if the bills were sent to an Iowa address.

Mr. Wohlford responded that they sold their Iowa home.

Supervisor Christy commented that one of the issues they had in District 4 was that it was the gateway to the Tanque Verde Valley, and there was concern that people would come in and buy large lots that had been there for decades and would subdivide them, which had affected and impugned the integrity of the historic value of the Tanque Verde Valley. He stated that neighbors were concerned that the applicant would take these pristine, beautiful, natural large lots and subdivide them into several homes that would take away from the value, the beauty, and the initial essence of the Tanque Verde Valley. He questioned whether the applicant had placed a for sale sign on his property.

Mr. Wohlford confirmed that the photo was taken of his property and that the land was for sale.

Supervisor Christy questioned why the property was being advertised for sale if the zoning had not been completed and for how many houses total.

Mr. Wohlford responded that he was an optimist and had hoped to gain interest from people so that when the current process was done and that he would be unable to complete a sale before the zoning was finished. He added that he was under some financial pressure and that half the money he paid for the lot was due at the end of this month, but he did not have it. He stated that his hope was that this process would have moved faster over the last 2 or 3 months and was trying to get things done ahead of time. He added that his property sat as an island surrounded by miles of CR-1 and was one of the few remaining properties with six acres. He stated that this was not a really large lot where a developer would come in and put up lots like what had happened with the Sabino Canyon Golf Course, which were houses on an eighth of an acre lot. He stated that this would be for three total houses with the existing house on the entire six acres. He stated that he was also an advocate of natural preservation and did not want to disturb the natural flow of the wash or the Riparian Habitat. He added that by putting a through wash crossing, from his limited engineering experience, would have a negligible effect on the flow of the water. He stated that the water that came down from the mountains after a

100-year rain was not going to check the zoning to see if it could come through and fill the water and that the washes would fill up after a heavy rain.

Chair Grijalva stated that usually with rezonings, the Board had more information about the kind of property, what it would look like and what the footprint was going to be, and she felt the information was limited and some of the complaints heard from neighbors had more to do with the unknowns. She stated that she was aware it had already gone through P&Z and that she had seen a picture of the home which already had a portion that was two-story. She questioned if additional information could be provided to the Board before they voted, where the other two properties would be and how it would be consistent with the home already on the property. She stated that behind the home it already looked to have dense development, but she was unsure what the front looked like. She stated that these were some of her concerns and did not know if any of her colleagues shared the same concerns.

Supervisor Scott stated that in addition to Chair Grijalva's concerns, it would also be helpful for the Board to have something in writing for the additional conditions discussed by Mr. Poirier.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Grijalva to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of July 2, 2024. No vote was taken at the time.

Chair Grijalva inquired about some of the usual restrictions with these rezonings. She stated that restrictions that were already part of the proposal, including where it would be located, for one-story or two-story, was information that usually was negotiated with the community before it came to the Board. She stated that when individuals came to Call to the Audience to share their concerns and there were a lot of question marks, she did not feel comfortable voting on something when they did not allow the community to understand what the parameters were going to be, and if there were no parameters, then it be acknowledged and that this rezoning lacked detail.

Supervisor Scott stated that he understood Mr. Wolford's frustration if the item was continued, especially given the points that he made and felt that some of these issues should have been raised in front of P&Z and was unsure if some of the neighbors raised those issues in front of P&Z or if staff had, but he agreed with Chair Grijalva that having some of those issues addressed before the matter came before the Board would have been preferred.

Mr. Wohlford stated that when he began the process his original intent was to put in a road with a cul-de-sac, which would have raised other concerns in regards to planning, drainage and retention. He stated that with the current process, he had completely taken out the road out and simply wanted to rezone it. He added that they did not have house plans drawn up and did not know what kind of a house it was going to look like, but the only house that was going to be visible to the public would be the one next to his and that the other one would be way back on the lot

covered up by trees and cactus. He stated that those concerns were probably irrelevant and would not be able to provide additional information for the next meeting.

Chair Grijalva stated that Mr. Wohlford had mentioned the beauty of Tucson which was the reason why the County had so much natural vegetation was because the Board asked a lot of questions. She stated that they valued the desert landscape and the natural environment, and she understood the concerns from community members about the height and they lived in this area for the views and the natural fauna. She stated that there were too many questions for her to be able to vote in support of the item.

Supervisor Heinz stated that P&Z had unanimously voted for approval with two members absent and that he was comfortable with what the Board had heard from staff in terms of any flood mitigation and additional conditions, and that he could vote in support of this item.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz abstained.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

55. Suggested Update to Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding suggested update to Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations pertaining to decorum at Board meetings. (District 5)

Chair Grijalva stated that this item pertained to decorum at Board meetings. She stated that she had met with John Stuckey, the Board's Security Manager; Fabian Pacheco, Chief Investigator, Pima County Attorney's Office; County Administration, the Clerk of the Board and Lieutenant O'Connor, the Board's Sheriff representative, regarding discussion about some of the things that could possibly be done in practice that were not reflected in regulation. She stated that the biggest changes would be that members of the public would not be permitted to stand in the aisles, walkways or block exits, and members of the public could not stand or walk behind barriers intended for County staff. She stated that there was a situation where some individuals stood in the back of the Hearing Room and had heard from some of the people sitting in that area. She stated that it was also an issue for staff because staff reviewed and documented things and it was difficult when those areas were blocked. She stated that some exceptions that would be made were for the "We A.R.E. Gems" presentations or if there was an item where many people attended. She stated that the other change would be to the Board Rules and Regulations, Item No. 8, Removal, and read from that section of the rules. She stated that this would resolve some issues so that the Board could continue with the business of the County. She stated on Item No. 9, Signs would be changed to limit their size. She stated that some signs had blocked cameras and affected the livestream of the meeting, and people would be asked to put them down. She stated that she hoped everyone would comply, and she also acknowledged that when she listened back to

the video of the last meeting, her voice could be heard escalating, but nobody else's could and at times it could be deafening in-person, but not on the video. She added that Board members did not want to be in a situation where they felt threatened and there might be differing opinions on what was a credible threat or not, but in this day and age, she could not dismiss any of those concerns. She stated that these were suggestions and was willing to have further discussion.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated that Chair Grijalva had met with Mr. Stuckey and representatives from the County Attorney's Office to put these rules and regulations together and asked for the reasoning behind the changes of the rules.

John Stucky, Sergeant at Arms, explained that the language was designed to articulate expectations on behaviors, such as standing because evacuation routes needed to remain open and available, it would mitigate risk and was meant for everyone, including the Board, County staff, and members of the public. He stated that they specifically spoke about, and to Supervisor Scott's concern, why the process had not heretofore been articulated and what happened when they had challenging situations. He stated that if there were a disruption that required a removal or for individuals who refused to leave, they wanted to avoid a physical altercation at all costs and wanted to de-escalate or take a break in the action to provide an opportunity for members of the public to exit. He stated that hopefully everyone complied, but if not, then there would be a moment to stop, decisions made and move slowly with clear direction on how to proceed. He stated that in his experience there had been challenging situations and with this opportunity it made things better. He stated that it would provide clearer direction to himself, to Lieutenant O'Connor and to the security team on what was to happen and how things would proceed, so they had a plan in place and decisions were not made on the fly.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was absent from the Board's last meeting, but had seen a news report on statements that were made, and he was absolutely appalled and then contrasted that with this day, where some people made some very strong statements, but they did it completely within the parameters of the Board's expectations in terms of behavior and deportment. He stated that the Board needed the ability to respond to situations like the one at the previous meeting and that receiving informed and professional guidance from the Director of Security was entirely appropriate and he appreciated Mr. Stuckey's leadership on it.

Supervisor Christy commented that there had been removals in the past, but there was not a need to have any rules in place.

Mr. Stuckey responded that in his most recent recollection, Supervisor Christy was correct that no rules had been in place, and that they would be able to react to any situation, but he found it best to have a plan in place so that they did not have to make decisions on the fly, and that it would be at the direction of the Chair and Supervisors on how they expected things to go, with the opportunity to de-escalate

as much as possible, and to reduce risk to everyone in the room, including members of the public.

Supervisor Christy expressed his understanding but questioned where the threat was if the room was secure and people checked in through security.

Mr. Stuckey replied that the room was secure, in that there were no weapons allowed in the room, but that did not prevent a physical altercation and that was what they hoped to avoid.

Supervisor Christy expressed his concern that if the rules were installed, it would provide a carte blanche to the Chair to implement them, based on the Chair's discretion that perhaps would not be in the best interest of trying to de-escalate a situation, but instead, create a situation that could be used as a contrivance, or to make a situation appear worse than it was.

Chair Grijalva stated that this was one of the reasons why she wanted it to be in regulation, so that there was not as much discretion, because what made sense to her at the time, was not part of a policy and not something that the community knew was an expectation, and for that reason, she did not want there to be so much discretion, regardless of who was the Chair. She stated that this way they would know what was going to happen and if there was a disruption in the room for longer than reasonable, they still had to continue with the business of the County. She added that no one wanted anyone to get arrested unnecessarily and that tensions were very high and that some people may get a little more stressful as the election got closer to November. She stated that it made sense to have it in writing, what they did in practice and what might be done in practice. She stated that the Sergeant at Arms would notify the Chair if a break needed to be taken. She stated that she had watched what happened at the City Council Meetings and that they had a very short window of time, 30 minutes to submit speaker cards, which had been done due to the kind of environment that had been created there. She added that she would like to keep the Board's system as open and accessible to the public as possible, but sometimes people did not know about the meeting until the day of and there might be an issue on the agenda that they wished to speak on, so she would like them to do that and by setting up some basic standards on how the Board would comport themselves made sense. She indicated that she also felt threatened by the comments made at the previous Board meeting.

Supervisor Christy stated that it had been a three-to-five-minute gap between the comments made and when someone stated they felt threatened.

Chair Grijalva replied that Supervisor Christy needed to understand that there was also a time that the Board would leave the Hearing Room, but no one had their own security. She stated that with some of the anger that she had heard and seen, and those people approaching them was very concerning. She stated that perhaps those comments were not currently directed to Supervisor Christy and he might not feel it as much she did, but she felt their anger and felt uncomfortable walking out

from the dais, and that was not okay. She stated that people could be angry at the Board's votes, but there were more personal comments, and she wanted to ensure everyone felt safe.

Supervisor Christy stated that there was a lot to be said about the expectations that the Board had with the members of the public, and one of the things that he always had an issue with, and could not find any reference to was, the limitations to public speaker participation. He stated that if the Board would have expectations of the audience to strongly adhere to the rules of civility and decorum as indicated in the rules, then there should be some rules of civility and decorum printed somewhere. He requested a copy of the rules of civility and decorum that were referenced.

Chair Grijalva replied affirmatively and stated that she assumed they would be available, and she recalled the prior Chair announced it and that she had the same question and that it was very subjective to whomever had listened.

Supervisor Christy stated that if the Board would insist on an adherence to the rules, they ought to be printed and available.

Chair Grijalva replied that if the document Supervisor Christy had requested was not available, she suggested it might be clearer to direct people to a link of the Board of Supervisors' Rules and Regulations when it came to public participation.

Supervisor Lee stated that she felt Chair Grijalva had handled the situation from two weeks ago wonderfully because she de-escalated it without the changes, and it worked, and got the Board out of the situation. She stated that she felt much better about it, but that perhaps her colleague did not realize that one of the individuals had a website that stated something to the effect of, going to one of the Supervisors' homes and parking outside the home, and so it became very personal. She stated that her perception was that it was a threat and did not want to voice anything at that moment because that would not be appropriate for her and she waited to the very end when she had the opportunity to say something, however she did agree that the Board needed to be as specific as they could, but that they also needed to have some flexibility on what that was.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he knew that the public who went through Security probably did not have weapons with them, but he had seen several doors in the Hearing Room that simply required a two to three inch depression to open, that went directly to a public area where people could walk around. He stated that a metallic weaponless person could come through the magnetometer that could slowly make their way towards the back and then easily open the door with their elbow, which would be a problem. He stated that there was a need to plan and that there were definitely some individuals who were not well and because of the authority that the Board possessed, even though it was often not on the subject that they were most concerned about, the Board was going to be targets. He stated that perhaps doors should not be accessible to the public from the inside, unless there was a fire or an emergency, and there was a need to use them in an emergency to

evacuate, and that he did not completely agree that the Hearing Room was a secure weapons free zone when it came to that.

Chair Grijalva stated that they also spoke about executive session and the door that opened to the lobby and asked for more details about that.

Mr. Stuckey responded that there was an access point to the Board's executive conference room which was provided for Board members and their staff's access prior to the meeting, however, his direction to the Security team was that once the meeting started, access to that door would stop and everyone else would need to enter through Security. He stated that would minimize the total number of times the door opened to expose an entry point to the room, whether the Board was in there or not, and so that door would remain locked. He stated that exceptions would be if he was present and also applied to executive session and throughout the meeting. He added to Supervisor Heinz's point, it was true that fire exits on either side of the room easily opened, but reminded him that the gates on either side of the walkway were also secured, but they were also a fire exit and could be pushed open, however, it took a bit more of an action to get both of those gates open. He stated that one of the things done prior to each meeting was the entire Hearing Room, Conference Room and dais were swept, to ensure that all of the doors were secure from the exterior to ensure the meeting started off as secure as possible and that if the Board chose to make other changes in regards to participant, public behavior they could certainly implement that as part of their security protocols.

Chair Grijalva stated that the City of Tucson, Mayor and Council Meetings had more law enforcement presence, and the Board had one Officer that could arrest individuals. She stated that they did not have to put their hands on the individual because there were so many officers to encourage exit and that during the meeting, it was a very minimal disruption. She stated that the Board did not have that sort of set up, they had additional officers outside and security. She stated that kind of a combination of efforts made sense and was needed at all times. She agreed with Supervisor Christy that perhaps reference should be made to the Board of Supervisors' Rules and Regulations as opposed to a vague decorum type of statement.

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

56. Opposition to Interstate 11

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, affirming its longstanding opposition to construction of an Interstate 11 through pristine and invaluable Sonoran Desert Land in Avra Valley, and imploring Governor Katie Hobbs to direct the Arizona Department of Transportation to withdraw this route from further consideration. (District 5)

Chair Grijalva stated that this was a result of an article that came out with Governor Hobbs' statement, that she would not take a position one way or the other and that the Resolution outlined many of the concerns that had been brought forward. She stated that one of the most important concerns was the traffic for the understaffed ports of entry and not so much for I-11. She stated that the last time that this was considered was several years ago and without accounting for some of the other multi-modal transportation facilities, existing corridors had been expanded since.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he had been intimately involved in the creation of the section between Wickenburg north, down to the border, south through Tucson, on his days with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) board. He stated that there were significant reasons for this in addition to the excessive use of trucks and semis on I-10 and the damage that they had done to the road, as well as congestion, and unfortunately to the high rate of accidents along I-10. He stated that this was designed to be a bypass where they had these semis routed outside the area and had something to do with air pollution and things of that nature. He added that it also expedited the commerce and free trade between the countries and the free access to unfettered roadways. He stated that initially, the Governor at the time would allow it to be from Phoenix, Wickenburg to Las Vegas and the ADOT board vehemently indicated that if there was going to be a new interstate developed in the State of Arizona, that Pima County and Southern Arizona should be included in the conversation, at least to have a seat at the table. He stated that he wanted to bring attention to two issues, one being that road construction and highway construction had progressed over the last 30 to 50 years, to the point where it was very sensitive to wildlife, the environment and air pollution. He stated that currently it was very high tech, the environment was taken into consideration and that the environmental damage that could be incurred by something like this really was not of the melodramatic way that people talked about. He stated that it was very sensitive, very conscientious and very thorough with many completed studies. He added that many accommodations had to be made and would be made and completed before a spade was turned. He stated that the argument that it would ruin the environment and wreak havoc on wildlife, crossings, saguaros and things of that nature did not stand the test of reality. He stated that a second issue was that by asking the Governor to remove this from any kind of future plans would be removing Pima County from the table and that Pima County should be kept at the table in Southern Arizona for an area that was worthy of new transportation and to bring Pima County into the 21st century to be part of a transportation system that made sense and would benefit congestion, commerce, travel, trade, and all other good things that were related to having a free and unfettered transportation system. He added that the County would be bypassed for any future discussions for any future roads because of this type of activity to condemn it. He urged the Board to consider the future and bring Pima County and its transportation network into the 21st century.

Supervisor Scott stated that he supported the resolution and that it had been a long-standing position of the Board, but he also supported the construction of I-11. He stated that there were other alternatives to be considered. He stated that one of things he had heard most specifically was that I-11 would run parallel to the existing I-10 and he agreed with Supervisor Christy that I-11 was necessary for all the reasons that it came about in the first place, but the route had all the different environmentally sensitive areas, County, State and Federal properties that would be impacted by going the Avra Valley route. He reiterated his support to the resolution but did not think that supporting the resolution meant that someone did not support I-11.

Supervisor Heinz stated that it was always nice to have an affirmative and not just a no, so perhaps the subject for a different message to the Governor would be a transportation alternative that he thought made sense. He stated that the alternative would be for a high-speed rail between Phoenix and Tucson. He stated that eight years ago this project was close to shovel ready as it could be at that time and with a strong push from Governor Hobbs and a supporting vote from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, and the Pinal County Board of Supervisors, a lot of federal dollars could be drawn down and something great could be done to get the high-speed rail between Phoenix and Tucson, which made sense. He added that there were other things the Board could be advocating for in an affirmative way, not by indicating no.

Chair Grijalva asked if Supervisor Heinz wished to add language to the resolution regarding his suggestion.

Supervisor Heinz concurred.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated Supervisor Heinz's comments and stated that the prior year or the year before the Board had passed a resolution when there were funds available for a high-speed rail and a similar resolution was passed by the Pima Association of Governments Regional Council. He stated that a joint letter had been sent, signed by Mayor Romero and Mayor Honea, and there was a companion measure passed by the Pinal County Board of Supervisors, unfortunately, the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors did not pass one. He requested the Clerk of the Board send a copy of the Board's resolution to all District offices.

Chair Grijalva stated that the language change could be made to the 4th paragraph from the bottom of the resolution, which stated as follows: "Whereas, the purported need for an I-11 is based on traffic studies of many years ago that neglected to consider the rail alternatives and do not reflect modern transportation realities."

Supervisor Heinz concurred.

Supervisor Lee agreed in part with her colleague and suggested another change to the following paragraph, which stated as follows: "Whereas, such a new highway

would divert cars and trucks away from existing businesses that are dependent upon commerce generated from traffic on existing highways.” She stated it could indicate the Board’s support of adding on I-11 as adjacent to I-10, as mentioned by Supervisor Scott and that she had heard people were supportive of it.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was fine for that language to be added, but that the Board would need to amend the initial proposal. She asked Supervisor Heinz since he seconded the motion, if he agreed to this revision to the resolution.

Supervisor Heinz concurred.

Supervisor Christy suggested that since there were a number of revisions, that the item be continued until the revisions were made formally and passed around.

Chair Grijalva stated the only revision would be to add on that piece to support an alternative route adjacent to I-10.

Supervisor Lee clarified that the Board would support the route that was parallel to I-10.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was fine if the Board wanted to hold off, but she was comfortable moving forward with the change.

Supervisor Lee asked if a decision at the State level would need to be made soon.

Chair Grijalva replied negatively and stated that it was a reaction to the position of the Governor to not take a position.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

57. ~~Tucson~~ **Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Appointment of Gary Minor, to replace Julia Date. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 1)

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

58. **Board of Health**

- Reappointment of Miguel Rojas. Term expiration: 11/30/26. (District 2)
- Reappointment of Maia Ingram. Term expiration: 4/30/28. (District 2)

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

59. Library Advisory Board

Reappointment of Mariana Padias. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (District 2)

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

60. Planning and Zoning Commission

- Reappointment of Dr. Barbara Becker. Term expiration: 6/19/28. (District 2)
- Appointment of Valerie Lane, to replace Armando Membrila. Term expiration: 6/19/28. (District 2)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

61. Approval of the Consent Calendar

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Scott requested that Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr. follow up with staff at Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation (NRPR) regarding a discussion at the department level about a reduction to the number of appointees by Supervisors, from two to one, to the NRPR Advisory Commission. He stated that this was reported to his office staff and he would not be in support of that change.

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

- 1. Planning and Zoning Commission**
Reappointment of Ryan Maese. Term expiration: 6/19/28. (District 3)
- 2. Natural Resources, Park and Recreation Advisory Commission**
Reappointment of Carol Kovalik. Term expiration: 6/30/30. (District 1)

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

3. Duplicate Warrants – For Ratification

Alterra Owner, L.L.C. \$1,105.00; MHC Continental, L.L.C.-Alias/DBA Continental West \$4,827.58; One Green Heart, L.L.C. \$2,506.40; Johnson Controls, Inc. \$2,072.44; LN Curtis & Sons \$58,535.40; FABCO Enterprises, Inc. \$2,986.38; Henry Bryan B. Antones \$40.00; Applied Research Team, L.L.C. \$924.00; Applied Research Team, L.L.C. \$724.00; Hasa, Inc. \$9,629.87; Unifirst Corporation \$1,677.18; Jane Howard Jacobs \$14,301.50; Goodman Water Company, Inc. \$253.75; Goodman Water Company, Inc. \$257.80; Veronica M. Mero \$5.00; Faith Van Damme \$139.86; Lori Feingold \$1,000.00; Phoenix Defense Law Group, P.L.L.C. \$4,706.25; Samantha E. Dinning \$273.00; Diligence Systems, Inc. \$63,040.00; Dalila V. Perez \$73.50; The State of Arizona \$1,000.00; Muhammad Motala \$110.50; Ordway Corporation \$85.00; Secretary of State Notary Department \$43.00; Quadient Leasing USA, Inc. \$1,765.10; Jesse Moran \$69.00; Pillars & Bridges \$9,500.00; The Specialists on Oracle \$8,543.50; Academy On-Demand-Alias/DBA Academy for Caregiving Excellence \$3,435.00; KC Mechanical Engineering \$6,204.40; LN Curtis & Sons \$58,535.40; Gabrielle Brunt \$69.00; New Horizon Computer Learning Center of So. Cal \$5,000.00; Carlos David Armenta Bonilla \$331.00; Christine Teran \$130.00; Strohman Enterprise, Inc. \$621.60; R & G Psychological Services \$530.00; R & G Psychological Services \$530.00; Ser-Jobs For Progress Of Southern Arizona, Inc. \$8,424.46; Ser-Jobs For Progress Of Southern Arizona, Inc. \$45.85; Ta-Shara Yavonne Jordan \$15.00; Sharon A. Browning \$122.50; Montroy Supply Company \$1,593.84.

TREASURER

4. Duplicate Warrants – For Ratification

Li Shih \$1,067.57

5. Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$60,203.45.

6. Request to Waive Interest

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$415.95.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

7. Minutes: April 2, 2024

* * *

62. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT