

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Jan Leshar, Acting County Administrator
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Katrina Martinez, Deputy Clerk of the Board
Eric Thompson, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

1. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION

Staff requests approval of a Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plan and In-Lieu Fee proposal in the amount of \$4,420.00 for placement of a guest house located at 10200 E. Kleindale Road, located within Regulated Riparian Habitat and classified as Xeroriparian Class C. (District 4)

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

2. CONTRACT

Jeremy Ryan Moore and Erin Maureen Moore, to provide for Acquisition Agreement No. Acq-1143 and Warranty Deed, Tax Parcel No. 109-05-2090, located in Section 3, T13S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, Flood Control Capital Projects Non-Bond Fund, contract amount \$540,065.00 (CT-RPS-23-247)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Katrina Martinez, Deputy Clerk of the Board
Eric Thompson, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Chair Bronson observed a moment of silence for the passing of Congressman Jim Kolbe. She stated that for over 20 years, she worked with Congressman Kolbe and he had crossed boundaries and had made a huge difference in Pima County.

Supervisor Scott shared an anecdote that spoke to Congressman Kolbe's humanity and commitment to the people of Southern Arizona.

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Crystal Miller, Manager, Tribal and Direct Services, Native Nations Institute, The University of Arizona.

4. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

5. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Grijalva commented that flu and COVID-19 vaccinations were available in the Turquoise Room at the Old Courthouse, for the day.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Dolores Encinas, Tobacco Prevention Program Specialist, and Elvira Suarez Din, REACH COVID Community Advisor Board Member, proclaiming the month of December 2022 to be: "INFLUENZA VACCINATION AWARENESS MONTH"

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

PRESENTATION

7. **Tucson Conquistadores**

Presentation of a Certificate of Appreciation to Ben Korn, Bobby Verenna and Aaron Crowley, board members of the Tucson Conquistadores, on the occasion of its 60th anniversary of service to the greater Tucson Community. (District 4)

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

8. **Angel Charity for Children, Inc.**

Presentation of a Certificate of Appreciation to Karen Farrell and Jill Brooks, 2022 Chair and Vice Chair of the Angel Charity for Children, Inc., recognizing its 40 years of dedication to improving the quality of life for children in our community. (District 4)

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

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Dr. JoAnn di Filippo spoke about election ballot boxes at vote centers, concerns with the American Battery Factory, Inc. and Buckelew Farms, L.L.C., contracts and about elected officials who favored political candidates through social media.

Shirley Requard shared her concerns with the COVID-19 vaccine and the recent election of Katie Hobbs.

Keith Van Heyningen addressed the Board regarding his beliefs on the COVID-19 vaccine, the government, abortion, the border and politicians.

Robert Reus commended the Chair for always allowing everyone in the room to speak during Call to the Public and explained his plan to get a Jeffersonian candidate on the ballot.

Josh Jacobsen thanked the Board for their work with the Tucson Crime Free Coalition and reminded them that the goal was to find treatment for people living on the streets.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

10. Constable, Justice Precinct 1 Appointment

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding how to proceed with filling the vacancy for Constable, Justice Precinct 1.

Chair Bronson stated that the Clerk's Office had received a letter of interest, resume and financial disclosure statement from two individuals, but neither applicant met all of the statutory requirements to be eligible for consideration to fill the vacancy. She indicated that the Board could extend the application submission deadline and proceed with the previously established process. She inquired about the extension deadline dates.

Katrina Martinez, Deputy Clerk of the Board, replied that if extended, the application submission deadline would be Friday, December 23, 2022. She added that the vacancy would be re-advertised in the Daily Territorial on Monday, December 12th and 19th, and that the appointment to fill the vacancy would be placed on the January 10, 2023 Agenda. She added that the vacancy appointment process would also be available on the County's webpage.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz to leave the position unfilled. He questioned if it had to be filled since there were no applicants. The motion died for lack of a second.

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to proceed as outlined by the Deputy Clerk. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy commented that there were specific requirements to be a candidate for Constable, such as residency requirements within the precinct. He asked why it was so difficult to fill the vacancy and how did one go about looking at the requirements. He stated that his office received a District map that showed the Constables precincts, but it was very difficult to read. He stated there was a need to do something to provide better information to applicants and the requirements that they must live in the district. He stated that it took a lot of work to do and did not understand why people could not have easier access to the information to make an educated decision about running for the position. He requested that the Clerk's Office reexamine how the information was dispersed and made available to the public with all requirements.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that someone applying for the position in a certain precinct was important and questioned that if they could not find the information, then should they have the position. She stated that individuals could search by their

address to find out what precinct they lived in and that it was not that complicated. She stated that some individuals thought that they could move into the District after they were appointed and that some elected offices allowed that. She stated that she did not know whether it was a statutory requirement if once appointed, you must live in the district or you could not apply until you lived in the district.

William Lake-Wright, Presiding Constable, addressed the Board and commented that he did not see an issue with someone living within the precinct. He stated that he was appointed by the Board and that he had moved into the precinct to seek the appointment. He stated that he did not know whether the two applicants did not understand the rules. He added that there were changes to the district boundaries and that Justice Precinct 1 had grown. He stated that he would appreciate if the Board continued advertisement of the position and that the Constables Office was understaffed. He stated that he wanted to make sure that their office could cover all papers received and that they were processed correctly. He added that other Constables had reached out within the community to get individuals to apply to the previous vacancy in precinct 10, but was unsure if the same effort was made for Justice Precinct, 1.

Supervisor Heinz questioned what Constable Lake-Wright's thoughts were, if permitted by a statutory change, a constabulary that looked more like the Recorder's Office, with one position and a professional staff. He added that he could get back to him with the answers.

Constable Lake-Wright responded that whatever changes were decided had to be legislative and he could not say that it would be great if they had one Constable and Deputies like the Sheriff's Department. He stated that they had Constables for each of the justice precincts and that was what they were trying to work with. He commented that until the legislature changed, he could operate under that as well. He stated that they could set requirements for Deputies and Deputies would be required to be AZ Post certified, which meant they had to go through the academy, obtain certificates, and go through mental health checks and criminal background checks. He stated that as an elected official he did not have to go through any of those things. He added that if they had Deputies, they would have guaranteed training and authority. He stated that Constable candidates did not need to have law enforcement experience and did not have to know what the job entailed, but were given legal authority for the position. He stated that a Constable had to go through mandatory training and AZ Post courses, but they were not certified. He added they were working on changing that, but that if they did not want to go through certification they did not have to.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if Constable Lake-Wright felt safe as a Constable.

Constable Lake-Wright replied that a lot had changed since the August 25th tragedy with the loss of Constable Martinez-Garibay. He stated that one Constable stopped showing up to work from that date and two other Constables had retired, whether directly or indirectly, as a result of that incident. He stated that they worked closely with the Tucson Police Department, Oro Valley Police Department and the Sheriff's

Department to change the way they operated. He added that they were radioing in every job, that way they were logged and the dispatchers knew their location in order to have faster response times. He stated that they were relying on another agency, which was also overtasked and understaffed, and if the agency had other higher priorities, their response times would be delayed. He stated they had a great working relationship with Sheriff Nanos, but that was only within Pima County and not within the City of Tucson. He stated they had a great relationship with Chief Kasmar, but that the Constables would be taking the police officers away from their own duties to assist them. He added that they also had body armor and had upgraded their Tasers, and that they would be supplied with body cameras soon. He stated that he would love to work in teams and that they were the only agency in the State that went into a house by themselves to extract occupants. He stated that the Sheriff and Tucson Police had multiple officers present to do that, but they had been doing it like this for years. He stated that people expected them to serve a civil paper, not high risk, not criminal, but when you took away someone's house that was when people tended to get violent. He stated there was a rise in lack of respect to police officers and there had been violence against them, which was a reason for Constable Dorer's resignation.

Supervisor Scott commented that discussion on this item had moved away from the motion on the table and that Constable Lake-Wright's comments would better go with Minute Item No. 19.

Chair Bronson called the question.

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

11. Tucson Crime Free Coalition

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update from the County Administrator on Pima County's efforts to develop a regional plan to reduce crime on the streets of our community, in support of the Tucson Crime Free Coalition's efforts. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy asked for an update on the results or progress made since the last Board meeting.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that a memorandum has been provided that highlighted the four specific motions that has been approved by the Board.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that at a recent meeting, with all members involved in Pretrial Services, there had been agreement to place wrap-around services in the vicinity of Pretrial Services and potentially moving them to the currently vacant Mission Annex. He stated there needed to be follow-up on minimizing discretion for drug offenses. He added that it paralleled with the discussion of the Sheriff and the jail. He stated that a lot of the root causes associated with the behaviors were specific to drug abuse. He indicated they wanted a facility that would tighten up the flow were people could receive wrap-around services and detox services. He stated the County currently had access to

the front two buildings of the Annex and after the remaining repairs were completed on the rest of the building with accessibility in the summer. He added they would try to fast track for other services, but they were working on relocating Pretrial Services and procure a group or agency that could also perform detox and match services at the Annex, to help with all aspects of drug abuse.

Supervisor Christy asked if there was any possibility of moving the date of completion of the Mission Annex forward since the Annex would not be ready until September 2023.

Mr. Holmes commented that the February 1st timeline for the pretrial services building was a more realistic goal since there had to be significant changes to the current infrastructure to ensure that the safety issues were up to standards to get the building running. He stated that there were discussions about an expedited timeline for repairs on other parts of the Annex.

Ms. Leshar stated that staff would move into the building once repairs had been made on each pod in stages and gradually the entire complex would be completed in September 2023.

Supervisor Christy commented that the County could keep pressure on the suppliers and contractors to move the project along in hopes of a sooner completion date. He asked about the City of Tucson (COT), Tucson Police Department (TPD), Sheriff's Department and the County Attorney's Office involvement had been in the project so far and how the County interacted with them. He also asked if there were any funding limitations.

Mr. Holmes stated that the COT and TPD had been present at meetings with staff and had shared their frustrations and suggestions about the project. He shared that the Tucson Police Chief gave reassurances from TPD on the pathway that the County was taking in the judicial system. He stated that the Sheriff was not opposed to the work that was being done, but there still needed to be details fleshed out of how much they needed to rely on the Sheriff in a custodial environment. He added if the back area was made more residential and treatment services were expanded, then conceptually, the back area could be used to free up the jail population that received detox services. He stated that if they went in that direction, they would need Corrections Officers in that portion of the building. He added that another option would be a non-custodial environment and subcontract with a detox provider, which created its own set of challenges. He stated it may be the first go round for the first phase of implementation. He explained that it would be important to look into using unexpended American Rescue Plan Act funding on the project and to continue to make the work a priority.

Supervisor Christy commented on the importance of making sure that everything was being done by the County, as the leader of the project, to ensure that the process was completed in a timely fashion. He asked if there were any more hurdles from any of the other administrative entities involved in the project and whether good progress had been made. He asked if County Administration was

regularly meeting with all of the players in the project and with the Tucson Crime Free Coalition.

Mr. Holmes stated that the next critical step of the process was to bring together the County's Presiding Judge, Court Administrator, along with the COT leadership and City Courts. He expressed the need for discussion to clarify the functions within pretrial services since both the County and the COT were factors. He added they would be brought to the table to discuss a possible agreement to minimize discretion on the topic of drugs and nuanced crimes. He stated there was a need for clarity and potential revamping of the current systems. He stated that he felt progress had been made, but there was a sense of urgency from all parties and had hoped that progress would continue to be made. He explained that there had been weekly meetings with the Tucson Crime Free Coalition and the COT. He added there had been difficulty coordinating schedules with the Courts to find a time to meet, but that would be the next step.

Supervisor Scott shared that he had a number of questions that he would provide to County Administration for answers.

Supervisor Heinz shared that it was important to make sure that people who were helped by these services were not always referred to as criminals. He expressed the need for the language to change when referencing these individuals and to view them as neighbors.

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

12. **2022 Election**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the After-Action Reports compiled by the Pima County Elections Director and Recorder for the 2022 General Election, as well as the new voting system implemented for the 2022 Election cycle. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy thanked the Elections Director for her willingness to come before the Board in person to address issues and concerns. He reiterated the Elections memorandum dated December 2, 2022, that explained the total number of registered voters used to canvass the November 2022 election. He questioned who provided the initial registered voter numbers.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, responded that the Recorder's Office initially submitted the numbers. She added that she believed it was common practice to submit the active numbers, as displayed on the Recorder's website. She stated that if someone voted who was inactive, it skewed the turnout and precinct results which made it look like less people registered to vote in a precinct than people who voted. She stated that was why she included the inactive voters in the memorandum.

Supervisor Christy questioned how the number of registered voters could change after the registration deadline and why there were two amounts. He stated that his

understanding was that inactive voters and active voters were eligible to vote and asked why inactive voters were segregated.

Ms. Hargrove responded that the numbers did not change, but that the numbers only included the active voters. She added that the inactive voters were not included on the Secretary of State's website or the Recorder's website. She confirmed that inactive voters and active voters were eligible to vote. She stated that she could not answer the question of why the inactive voters were segregated, but she included those numbers so that the information received on Election Day showed all voters.

Supervisor Christy questioned if it was a reporting mistake.

Ms. Hargrove responded that she did not think it was a mistake, but that it was regular practice in the State. She indicated that there had been a discussion with the Secretary of State's Office, which prompted her to provide the memorandum and added that other counties had asked the same question.

Supervisor Christy asked if inactive voters had voted.

Ms. Hargrove indicated that inactive voters could vote, but was unsure if they had voted. She stated she would get that information from the Recorder.

Supervisor Christy asked if the inactive voter lists were from the Primary Election and requested Ms. Hargrove look into who submitted that list.

Ms. Hargrove responded that the list provided to them was received after the voter registration deadline. She added that anyone that was inactive in August that may have voted or updated his or her information was no longer on the inactive list. She stated that she would look into who had submitted the list.

Supervisor Christy commented that people could come to conclusions on why there were different numbers with inactive and active voters.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she was concerned with the discussion since the Recorder was not present and Ms. Hargrove could only answer for the portion under her purview. She added that the Recorder had provided a memorandum, which notified Board members that she was unable to attend this meeting and it was important to have both people present to answer questions.

Supervisor Christy requested that the two different voting numbers be included in the Recorder's after-action report.

Chair Bronson stated that Ms. Leshner could provide that direction to the Recorder and added that she also had questions for the Recorder and hoped the answers to her questions and concerns would be included in her after-action report.

Ms. Hargrove stated that they received the voter registration numbers from the Recorder and that her after-action report was separate from the Recorder's report.

She stated that she would need to have a conversation with the in order to come to a consensus as to what would be presented in the future.

Supervisor Scott commented that he also had questions for the Recorder and asked what the definitions were for an inactive and national inactive voter.

Ms. Hargrove responded that an inactive voter was someone that the Recorder's Office received return mail for and were placed on inactive status, which was a precursor to them being removed from the voter list. She stated those individuals would need to come into the office to qualify and verify their address. She stated that a national inactive voter was a federal voter, but she was not clear on that list.

Supervisor Scott questioned what the most helpful components of the new poll worker manual were and what was the nature of the detailed content to be added.

Ms. Hargrove responded that she worked with Sarah Ramsey and other poll workers, inspectors and trainers. She stated that they added information as to the law that applied to poll workers, what they were supposed to do and listed the authorized representatives. She added that it provided information on what was required with detailed step-by-step instructions on how to process a voter. She stated that they received concerns from poll workers about provisional ballots, which were a challenge for everyone. She stated that the issue was nationwide and that she had the same issue at her previous employment. She added that they needed to understand how to process different provisional ballots, why they processed them and what to do with them after being processed. She stated that she wanted to make sure that issues were cleared up and provided them with all the information they needed.

Supervisor Scott commented that Ms. Hargrove made her own analysis of how things went at the vote centers and had received feedback from poll workers on what needed to be added to the manual. He inquired about express votes.

Ms. Hargrove explained that express voting was their handicap accessible equipment at the polling places. She stated that it was required by the Help America Vote Act, which was a ballot marking device. She added that it did not count votes, but helped the person produce a ballot, and in the event of a printer failure, they could use the express vote instead of ordering paper ballots. She stated they worked as a contingency as opposed to paper ballots.

Supervisor Scott asked what some of the key components to the contingency plan for vote centers were, especially for ones implemented in the past election.

Ms. Hargrove responded that one of the primary contingencies was that if there were connectivity issues, those individuals would have to vote using a provisional ballot. She stated that they had one vote center where that occurred. She added the other contingency was if the printer failed, they could either open the boxes of printed ballots or use the express vote to allow the voter to produce a ballot.

Supervisor Scott questioned if in the future they would discontinue printing as many ballots and make greater use of express votes.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott questioned if her recommendation to include three new positions to the Election Department would be part of the department's budget proposal or brought before the Board separately.

Ms. Hargrove replied that they would likely be brought forth as part of the budgeting process.

Chair Bronson stated for the record that the County Administrator agreed with Ms. Hargrove's statement.

Supervisor Scott questioned if Ms. Hargrove's prior experience in another state was helpful to her in terms of working for Pima County.

Ms. Hargrove responded that being an Elections Director or Administrator required project management because of all the moving pieces in an election. She stated that it was critical to be able to put all the pieces together and get individuals behind you to implement changes. She stated that her skill in bringing individuals together is what she brought to the table.

Supervisor Heinz asked if Ms. Hargrove had any behavioral health training.

Ms. Hargrove replied that she was close to completing a Master's degree in Marriage and Family Counseling.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned if additional e-poll books identified in the improvement plan would be brought forth as part of the budget request. She stated that the Secretary of State's website listed 419,142 inactive voters, which meant that maybe they did not change their address and it was not only an issue in Pima County.

Ms. Hargrove concurred and stated that the inactive list was part of the Help America Vote Act with the national change of address that happened every year. She stated that there were different ways that these individuals were flagged by mailing election materials, return mail or matched on the national change of address database from the post office.

Supervisor Christy asked what happened to the return mailed in ballots.

Ms. Hargrove responded that was a question for the Recorder.

Supervisor Christy asked how Ms. Hargrove viewed the procedures and expectations of the upcoming recount.

Ms. Hargrove stated that the impending recount would begin later today. She stated that from the state's perspective, they delegated the recount to the Board of Supervisors, and the Board delegated it to the Elections Department. She stated that they created a plan where they would complete logic and accuracy testing of all the voting equipment because it was a statewide office. She added they would come in and bring their test deck, which would run through the scanners that had been programmed to only count the two offices, which were the Attorney General and Superintendent of Public Education. She stated that if a ballot was handled excessively they would need to do a hand count or outsourced to another bin to be duplicated. She provided an example of how that could happen. She stated that after everything was re-run, the results were run. She added the results were sealed and sent to the Secretary of State and the only person that opened the results was the judge. She stated that they would post the number of ballots processed every day, and at the end of the recount, they would conduct a post logic and accuracy test. She added that the political parties participated in the test to make sure the machine programmed at the beginning still operated the same at the end. She stated they would then have a hand count audit on December 17th, where political parties came in and actually hand counted ballots and submitted the results to the Secretary of State.

Supervisor Christy asked if they hand counted all the ballots, a portion or percentage of them, and if she could provide an after-action report on the recount.

Ms. Hargrove responded that they hand counted 2% of the ballots and stated she could provide a report in January. She thanked the Board for entrusting her with the tremendous task of running elections in Pima County.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

13. County Administrator's Update

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, provided the following updates:

- She commented that the Pima County Health Department was awarded \$12 million to assist with the public health infrastructure and workforce.
- She congratulated the Pima Vocational High School on receiving an A rating, which only 15% of alternative schools have received across Arizona.
- She reminded everyone that the groundbreaking for the new Medical Examiner's facility would take place on December 8, 2022.

14. Pima County Wireless Integrated Network (PCWIN) Board of Directors Representative

Staff recommends approval of the recommendation detailed in the County Administrator's memorandum dated December 6, 2022.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the appointment of Javier Baca, Information Technology Director, as the County representative, and Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, as the alternate member, on the PCWIN Board of Directors, effective January 1, 2023..

15. **Medical and Dental Insurance for County Employees - Fiscal Year 2023/24**

Staff recommends approval of the recommendations detailed in the County Administrator's memorandum dated December 6, 2022.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to approve the recommendations as detailed in the County Administrator's memorandum dated December 6, 2022. No vote was taken at this time.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, asked for clarification if the approval was for Option 1, as listed in the memorandum.

Supervisor Grijalva asked that graphics be included in future memorandums to avoid confusion. She read Option 1 listed in the memorandum.

Supervisor Scott asked if there were five other recommendations at the bottom of the memorandum.

Chair Bronson clarified that the recommendation was for approval of the following:

- Approve Option 1, as detailed in the memorandum.
- Adopt Medical premium equivalents increased, as detailed in the memorandum.
- Continue offering up to \$35 per pay period for participating in the HLPD program.
- Increase Self-Funded Dental premium equivalents, as detailed in the memorandum.
- Continue current fully insured dental premiums, as detailed in the memorandum.
- Continue County HAS contributions, as detailed in the memorandum.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

16. The Board of Supervisors on April 19, 2022, continued the following:

Compromising Taxes, Interest and Penalties

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18124 and Board of Supervisors Policy C 4.4, Sterling Real Estate Investment, L.L.C., is requesting that the Board compromise taxes, interest and penalties incurred for the following:

Parcel Nos./Tax Years

134-27-0040/1986 - 2021
134-27-0050/1986 - 2021
134-27-0060/1986 - 2021
134-27-0070/1986 - 2021
134-27-0090/1986 - 2021

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve staff's recommendation of a full compromise of the taxes, interest and penalties on the subject properties without requiring a remediation timeframe and that the compromise total be updated to reflect the total amount of taxes, interest and penalties as of the date of approval.

ASSESSOR

17. **Request for Redemption of Waiver of Exemption**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11153(B), the Pima County Assessor has determined that the applications for Redemptions of the Waivers of Tax Exemptions for Tax Year 2022 qualify for exemption under the applicable statutes and requests the Board of Supervisors redeem the waivers.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

18. **Quarterly Reports on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Reports on Collections for the period ending September 30, 2022.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

19. The Board of Supervisors on November 15, 2022, continued the following:

Classification/Compensation

The Constables Office requests approval to create the following new classification, associated costs will be funded through Contingency in the current year:

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

7304/ Deputy Constable/ U2(\$51,396-\$107,848; Hiring Rate ~~\$55,000~~ **\$55,000.00** per annum)/ 4/ NE*

*NE = Not Exempt (paid overtime)

Chair Bronson stated there was a correction to the hiring rate, which should reflect \$55,000.00 per annum.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to approve the item, as amended. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that her issue was that the Constables Office was not fully staffed or trained. She added that if this item came back in March or April she would be more willing to consider it. She stated that the Constables' Office could provide additional information that showed where they were, what their workload was and why they needed the assistance. She referenced a memorandum by former Deputy County Administrator Napier that indicated there was not enough work for the Constables. She requested additional data on how many times Constables had to serve papers that ended up being an extraction and if having a second person for safety would have been helpful. She stated that she felt like they were being asked to supplement staffing when current vacant Constable positions had not yet been filled.

Chair Bronson concurred with Supervisor Grijalva's comments and stated that she was unsure if these positions were necessary. She indicated that they may want to revisit this in January or February, but that she could not support the item at this time.

William Lake-Wright, Presiding Constable, responded that the memorandum by County Administrator Leshner, had provided information about how the Constables' number of papers had decreased over the last five years. He stated that for 2022, the numbers had increased and that the Constables Office was down one Constable since the elimination of Justice Precinct (JP) 5. He stated that it skewed the numbers because they had less people doing the same amount of work. He indicated that the numbers differed based on the precinct. He stated that this was a safety issue, if they went into houses alone. He explained an instance when he had to help JP 10 and it had taken 5 hours and assistance from a Deputy Sheriff. He stated he could not regularly take 5 hours out of his day to help since it took him away from serving in his precinct.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that they only asked for two people and they would still need to decide their workload.

Constable Lake-Wright responded the highest workload was for the midtown area with the highest population and the lowest socioeconomic area.

Chair Bronson commented that was why they needed a consolidated Constable.

Supervisor Christy stated that they were given a great deal of information on the need for Deputy Constables. He stated that the workload differed in different areas and the amount of papers to be served varied from district to district. He added that the vision he thought was being expressed was that these positions would be floating Deputy Constables throughout all the districts, on an as-needed basis and that to him, it made perfect sense. He stated it would free up the Constables to be able to do what they were supposed to do and there might be times when the Deputy could fill in by processing less demanding paperwork. He stated that he could support the item.

Supervisor Scott commented that a requirement of a Deputy Constable was that they be AZ post certified, which was not a requirement for an elected Constable. He stated that brought to mind the safety concerns. He added that he saw a newspaper or television interview where Constable Bernal was quoted that they could call on a Tucson Police Department Officer or Sheriff Deputy if they felt that they could not go in to a situation alone, but that they had to often wait until an officer or deputy became available. He indicated his support of the item because of the two safety considerations and questioned what other additional information his colleagues needed to be able to support the item.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she had concerns with staffing levels and training for new people. She mentioned that there would be new Justices of the Peace at the beginning of the year that would not have the same workload. She stated that once everyone was trained she was not opposed to reviewing this item in February or March.

Chair Bronson commented that the former Chief Constable provided data that indicated they were not overworked and she felt uncomfortable moving forward.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if instead of a Deputy Constable would a process server or other temporary staffing be helpful to even out workloads until the Legislature could initiate reforms.

Constable Lake-Wright responded that if they were to look at only numbers and to even out workload, they were looking at it wrong. He added that it was primarily a safety issue and that other Constables had pitched in and covered the vacant areas. He indicated that he could talk with each of the Board members individually about the workloads in the different areas. He stated the safety issue was key and that he did not want to have a repeat of the August 25th tragedy.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if Constables could work in pairs when issuing evictions and if that could be implemented temporarily.

Constable Lake-Wright replied that would not be possible because of the workloads of different areas and that other areas would then be neglected. He added that they were duly elected to work in their own precinct.

Supervisor Scott stated that what he was understanding from Constable Lake-Wright, was that even if the Constables were fully staffed, the safety justifications for being AZ post certified Deputy Constables could be assigned as an on-needed basis were not going to change. He questioned if that was accurate.

Constable Lake-Wright responded that times had changed and there were higher crime rates and drug rates.

Supervisor Christy stated that for point of information, everyone should be reminded that Arizona statute permits only the Constable and the Sheriff to serve writs, which was not allowed for private servers, municipal police officers or other County employees, to enforce evictions or asset seizures. He stated that the County could not outsource.

Chair Bronson responded some of it could, but that Supervisor Christy was right about those items. Chair Bronson called the question.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Bronson and Supervisors Grijalva and Heinz voted "Nay."

20. **Revisions to Personnel Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Personnel Policy No. 8-107, Special Leaves of Absence With Pay.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS AND RECREATION

21. **Arizona Game and Fish Shooting Range Development Grant**

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 73, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve application to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission for the clay target center shooting range.

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

22. **County Fair Horse Racing Meet 2023**

Staff recommends approval of the Pima County Fair Horse Racing Commission's request for four (4) County Fair Horse Racing Days: February 4, February 5, April 1 and April 2, 2023.

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

REAL PROPERTY

23. **Contract**

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 74, of the Board of Supervisors, for the conveyance of Pima County property to Arizona Air National Guard for munitions storage purposes, situated within Section 33, T15S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, \$1,847,791.00 revenue (CTN-RPS-23-76)

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

24. **Contract**

American Battery Factory, Inc., to provide for a lease-purchase agreement for property located at the Aerospace Research Campus for developing a battery manufacturing facility, in Section 31, T15S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, contract amount \$23,316,690.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-RPS-23-81)

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

Supervisor Grijalva questioned if Chair Bronson had called for a vote on the item.

Chair Bronson replied in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva requested to hear the presentation before the vote occurred.

Chair Bronson stated they had already voted.

Supervisor Grijalva responded that she wanted to change her vote to no because she did not realize that they had voted on the motion.

Chair Bronson withdrew her original motion.

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

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that this was a lease purchase agreement that would allow American Battery Factory (ABF) to expand over \$1.2 billion and employ approximately 1,000 individuals, and would ultimately result in over a \$3 billion economic impact into the community. She stated the proposal was the market value lease with very clear, verifiable employment, and wage benchmarks. She added there was a potential purchase at market value that could ultimately provide benefit to the County of about \$23 million. She stated that several individuals who had worked for a period of time on a good package for both the people of Pima County and ABF.

Paul Charles, Chief Executive Officer, ABF, stated that they were a 10 year old company based in Utah that made energy storage products seen in Costco by a company called Lion Energy. He stated that they produced everything from portable solar generators that could be recharged in about 90 minutes instead of using gasoline to power the generator. He added that they had recently sent about \$400,000.00 solar generators to the Ukraine to be used on the ground in the area. He added that they also made energy storage for residential applications, commercial and up to the grid level. He stated it amounted from 40-foot shipping containers to something that was luggable. He understood that they needed to onshore all their productions. He stated that they designed and tested their products in Utah, but that like the rest of the battery business, they were made in China. He stated that they started the process of onshoring, but they missed one key ingredient, a battery cell. He stated the prospect of making it in the United States (U.S.) was quite daunting. He added that their premise was that in order for the electric vehicle revolution to occur, there was a need for an optimized stable grid that worked at different levels from home to a utility level. He stated that in order to use renewable energies, there was a need to use batteries. He added their focus was on making the battery cell in a clean, safe environment. He stated they were able to put together a number of multinational partners that would make the Pima County location a showcase of what Americans could do if given the opportunity. He stated that the key reasons they chose Tucson was because of the people, quality of life and the progressing nature of the community. He added that one of the first proposals at the State level was from Arizona, which quickly became the standard to which was actually compared to every other state's proposals. He stated that they viewed the Tucson location as a generational opportunity for their company and wanted to make an impact at every level for the citizens. He stated that their goal was to have a location from which many other factories could go out. He added it would be a decentralized approach to their factory and a modular design. He stated that factories went up quickly because they were built in North America and it took 10 weeks to build a 5,000 square foot structure. He stated their timeframe by the end of quarter 4 of 2023, anticipated 300 employees and a six month timeframe for commissioning and bringing them online. He added that by the second half of 2024, they would have a factory in Arizona that produced a safe, clean and green battery cell, that used cobalt or nickel and were built to last 20 to 30 years.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that Pima County was in the middle of a mega drought and the County demonstrated its commitment to water sustainability and conservations through the Sustainable Action Plan. She questioned where they would get the 15,000 gallons of water per day to be used when fully operational, if it would come from groundwater or reclaimed water and what was in the wastewater. She stated that in District 5, they had per- and polyfluorinated substances cleanup sites and trichloroethene plumes and the community that kept getting hit was in that area.

Mr. Charles responded that at full operation, they would have approximately 16 gigawatts of production with over 267 acres. He stated it was a campus environment and they anticipated their water usage to be 8 swimming pools per day. He added that items produced in scrap and waste would be recycled and that

there would be no disbursement into groundwater other than simple sewage. He stated that this was a showcase of clean and green, and that when new technologies came on board, they would implement them. He stated that the amount of water used was small compared to other factories. He added that they would start with a couple swimming pools per day and progress to about eight, projected over a five-year timeframe, supplied and contracted with the local water supplier.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned if the water would come from groundwater.

Carmine Debonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that the water provider was Tucson Water, which had a renewable supply through the Centralized Arizona Project where they had aquifer storage and retrieval.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the number of benchmarks and requirements in the agreement would be revisited, whether they were too restrictive or if they provided a freedom that was needed to operate.

Mr. Charles replied that they were pragmatists and they were in the business to make profit and contribute to the community economically. He stated that they needed to hit the benchmarks because their outtake agreements required them to have product in the hands of their customers. He added that they felt comfortable with the numbers extended forth and that they also tried to be conservative. He stated that he was given assurances that if something unanticipated occurred, they would be able to have discussions if things needed to be altered.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the legal department were involved with the lease and whether legal had approved it. He stated that the County had gone through several years of conflict with World View and would hate to see someone like the Goldwater Institute come back in the future and say things were not approved on the legal side.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the County Attorney's Office was in close communication with the Economic Development Department and County Administration on this project. He stated that they approved it, as to form, and provided legal analysis regarding gift clause and other issues. He clarified they were part of the team that developed the agreement. He added that they could not stop Goldwater from challenging the agreement, but that they would do everything in their power to make sure it was airtight.

Ms. Leshar commented that they also engaged with additional legal counsel on the issue.

Mr. Debonis, Jr., responded that they worked with the County Attorney's Office as well as outside counsel. He stated that outside counsel had advised the County with respect to litigation involving World View and that they had gone through the agreement with a fine-tooth comb. He added that this agreement had many details that were different from the agreement with World View. He stated that this was a

market rate lease and purchase based on appraisals, and they believed that all items associated with gift clause were adequately addressed.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether there was a rush to make the deal happen, if it was done methodically and in line, and not under pressure of any threat of it blowing up.

Mr. Debonis, Jr., reiterated that they went through the agreement very detailed with ABF, the County Attorney's Office, and outside legal counsel and they felt confident that it was structured in a legally appropriate way.

Supervisor Scott questioned if there were any updates on the negotiations regarding incentives from the City of Tucson and the Arizona Commerce Authority and how the number of employees at different increments and phases were agreed upon.

Mr. Charles replied they did not have any further update, other than things were progressing positively along, and at the state level, those were performance based. He stated that for the employee numbers, they took a modular approach to the factory because of risk mitigation. He explained that in the design, every time another pod was added, they needed additional workforce. He stated they started out with a single shift, and then dual, which would run 24/7. He added they had two hours a day of preventative maintenance, that coincided as they added modules. He stated it may be expedited, but they also wanted to be conservative over a five-year period. He stated that the need and demand in the marketplace was tremendous. He added that everything they could possibly produce, they could project for the next ten years would go into allocation.

Mr. Debonis, Jr., explained that from the County's perspective, the employee numbers were based on production and operational needs of ABF. He stated the County did not provide input to alter the numbers. He added that they worked with the projections that ABF provided and ensured they were incorporated into the agreement in such a way to be measurable and trackable.

Supervisor Scott asked if the County Attorney's Office could provide an opinion in terms of the analysis their office went through to make sure the County was complying with the gift clause and any other applicable statutes.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned how many of the 300 to 600 full-time jobs created would be from Pima County or coming to Pima County from within the company that had an expertise or skill set.

Mr. Charles indicated that they wanted to hire as many local people as possible. He stated that it was extremely difficult to find some of the technical expertise in designing, manufacturing and volume, a battery cell that had not been produced in the U.S. He stated as they found the individuals, they would be invited to come here, but their full intent was to work with the local schools. He stated that they had an apprenticeship program that they would continue to expand that would start in

the high schools and go through Ph.D. programs. He stated they would work with local tech schools that could do the training for the individuals that worked within the factory. He added that it would be the most automated factory of cell manufacturing in the work utilizing U.S. technologies and the employees who worked there would be the ones to learn how to program and oversee the next generation of workforce with unique skill sets, which were quite marketable.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if there were any studies or data that showed the green and clean importance of the environment, and assurances to the community of what would happen and what contaminants would be in the water.

Mr. Charles reiterated that every piece of waste and scrap would be recycled or sent off site. He added they had no plans to disperse anything into the ground, other than simple sewage. He stated that the chemistry with this was as safe as any chemistry already scaled on a global basis. He assured that the water was dispersed in steam and there was currently no technology that captured pure steam, and if there was, they would certainly look at that. He added that was why they were able to bring down the amount of water used and that it was mixed with synthetic graphite. He stated that they would continue to improve on it, but that they had a stewardship to the land and to the people.

Supervisor Christy asked, for the record, if they were adequately capitalized to begin the project, after it was up and running, and whether they would run out of operating capital.

Mr. Charles replied that their financial partner was Guggenheim. He stated they did not want to go into the capital market until they had a definitive location, and if approved, they would be able to move forward with that. He stated they worked with them over the past year and were offered multiple 100% financing for all their capital equipment. He added that it was a semiconductor business in terms of capital expenditure. He stated there were very few opportunities for clean and green U.S. production of cells, and that they would continue to expand here, and other factories throughout the U.S. and the world. He stated that they felt confident that they would be able to have adequate capital to do it. He stated that this location would be an epicenter for building clean and safe batteries and would be inviting offtake contract partners here.

Supervisor Christy asked if they were privately owned or publicly traded.

Mr. Charles replied that they were privately owned.

Supervisor Heinz asked if there were any plans to use photovoltaic energy generation to offset the high energy demands.

Mr. Charles replied in the affirmative and stated that Tucson Electric Power (TEP) provided them the ability to stand up quickly. He stated that as they looked at sites across America, adequate power was a factor in the extensive list of criteria in order for site approval and evaluation. He added that in the future, they would like to be

able to look at photovoltaic energy generation coupled with energy storage. He stated that one of the critical things with TEP was their ability to guarantee that they would have power by the end of next year.

Supervisor Scott requested data from County staff on comparable public and private sector facilities in the County and their use of both water and wastewater generation.

Supervisor Grijalva responded that she had that information, which had been provided by Mr. Debonis, Jr., and that she would share it.

Supervisor Scott asked for it to be distributed to all Board members.

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

SHERIFF

25. Pima County Adult Detention Complex

Discussion/Direction/Action: An update from Sheriff Nanos regarding the Pima County Adult Detention Complex.

Chris Nanos, Pima County Sheriff, addressed the Board and stated that the issues at the Pima County Adult Detention Complex (PCADC) were about safety for inmates and staff. He stated that they were in a state of crisis and were over 90% capacity, and that if it operated at its full efficiency, the capacity would be at 85%. He stated that even though implemented reform efforts had reduced the misdemeanor population, they currently had a population of 95% felons compared to 65% last year. He stated that with 95% felons, it showed that the most dangerous people were in the facility, but that increased tension with staff and inmates. He commented that as in the Albuquerque Journal article provided, issues that had occurred in Albuquerque that caused riots were also occurring at PCADC. He stated that they had understaffed personnel, overcrowded conditions, inmates sleeping on the floor, no time in the day room and no time in the yards. He added that if they were to give two hours in the day room or the yard, it would be exceptional, but they did not have the staff to provide that. He stated that they had 323 Corrections Officers, which put them 170 below their high, which was over 500 in 2016. He requested to have an opportunity to work with the County Administrator to find ways to not just fix, but to rebuild a new facility. He stated that if the existing facility was repaired that would be like putting a Band-Aid on it. He added that when he came into office he toured the facility and the same problems he saw then, were still present. He stated that the flooding, mold, deteriorations and infrastructure itself were irreparable. He commented that the facility in its current condition was unlivable for inmates and a disgusting place to work. He stated that staff showed up every day and worked there and that it was a tough job. He added that staff put in 16-hour work days to cover shifts, and they needed personal time, which caused call outs and individuals falling asleep on duty. He mentioned that mistakes were bound to happen, like erroneous releases that had occurred, which were concerns

and a risk to staff, inmates and the community. He stated that he wished there was time to do a study and ask the community for signatures on a referendum for a special sales tax, a jail tax or Jail District, but there was no time. He added that the Board had the authority to do the right thing. He asked to allow them the opportunity to put together funds to stand up against Defund the Police. He stated that he had the opportunity to work with every law enforcement leader in the valley and every one of them supported the idea. He added that they worked together on very complex issues because it impacted everyone. He stated that there was need to regionalize their efforts which they had seen with the Pima County Sheriff's Department and other law enforcement leaders throughout the valley to create a critical incident team. He added that they recognized how successful and reasonable efforts could be to work together to get the work done. He asked to be allowed to create a half cent sales tax from the Regional Transportation Authority and Pima Association of Governments that could raise \$100 million per year and they could dedicate a percentage to build a new jail in the next four to five years. He stated that he welcomed the coalition to be part of an oversight committee that would oversee the funds were used for what they said they would be used for. He added the oversight committee could also meet with law enforcement officials, with the Board of Supervisors, and City of Tucson Mayor and Council on ideas.

Chair Bronson agreed that they could not defund the police. She stated that they saw what was happening with the homeless issue and the need for a new jail. She added that these were challenging times as they looked at a recession, hyperinflation and other things, but that the main statutory responsibility of the Board was justice and law enforcement.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, commented that she had been working with Sheriff Nanos and unfortunately, her office was not ready to implement this at this time. She welcomed an opportunity to work with him and come back to the Board at the first meeting in January, to look at what options there might be for a Jail District for various funding sources and provide a report that included an analysis of what the expected jail population was, the current conditions of the jail, what the projected costs would be and potential timelines.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if structural engineers inspected the facility for structural issues or cosmetic issues. She stated that she had recently had a walkthrough at the jail, which raised concerns for her. She indicated that there were pipe leaks and engineering issues and she wanted to make sure they utilized available resources because the largest part of the County budget was for safety. She added that if the County deferred maintenance on some of the issues, than it was on the Board. She stated she wanted to understand how those pieces fit into the condition of the current facility.

Sheriff Nanos replied that as items were being repaired, they had learned that some concrete was deteriorating from the inside out because it had been improperly mixed 50 years ago. He stated they could complete patchwork and fix it for \$160,000.00 of a 4-foot concrete wall throughout the facility. He added that there was mold, water on the floor, and the floor was sinking. He stated that they had

spent \$1.5 million on the kitchen floor that was still not correct, and in the new facility built in 2006, 100 linear feet of floor was collapsing and there were deteriorating walls.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned if the building was faulty to begin with, if materials were faulty, and if there was something that could be done about these issues. She stated that patch jobs would not resolve the issue, but things like the water issue did not make sense because of the newness of the facility. She added that 16 years was not that old.

Sheriff Nanos responded that maybe some of it was salvageable. He stated that maybe there was a better location for the jail, like next to the courthouse so they did not have to transport 100 individuals each day to and from the courts. He stated there was a number of strategies and things learned from the last jail, but that the current jail was a direct supervision jail. He explained they understood the principles of it, but you had a Corrections Officer in the pod with inmates, which was a safety issue. He added that in the old types of systems, the guards were outside controlling the facility and the inmates inside. He stated they had gone away from direct supervision because they did not have the staffing for it and that the 2006 model had moved them backwards in that design. He stated that the design and what existed now were things that could be done in a study as they moved forward.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that it was important to look at the role of the courts in the jail population, which they did not have control over. She stated that it was also important to look at the people in detention that would benefit from a detox rehab environment. She added that the court had an opportunity to help support moving populations that did not have to be incarcerated, and move them into environments more beneficial to bring the population in the jail down to 85%.

Sheriff Nanos stated that they currently had 652 inmates in the jail that had been waiting over 120 days for trial that he attributed to a backlog because of COVID. He added that if staffing levels with the courts and County Attorney's Office were like his, then they were beating a dead horse.

Chair Bronson commented that Ms. Leshner and Sheriff Nanos would continue conversations on the topic and bring recommendations back in January.

Ms. Leshner replied she would come back with a proposal and a plan, and that they would evaluate the numbers and take into account Supervisor Grijalva's concerns regarding population, and a cost benefit analysis of new versus what they could do with maintenance that could occur now.

Supervisor Christy stated that the County had a capital projects list and those projects could be reshuffled to include the jail issues. He encouraged County Administration to look at that particular piece, because it was a substantial amount of money used to renovate County buildings. He questioned if a Corrections Officer job was the most challenging in law enforcement.

Sheriff Nanos responded that it was the most difficult job.

Chair Bronson commented that there was a time certain on another agenda item and they needed to move on.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had not had a chance to ask questions.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to allow Supervisor Heinz to ask his questions before moving onto the time certain agenda item. Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Bronson and Supervisors Christy and Scott voted "Nay."

Supervisor Scott asked if they could return to this item after the time certain item, to allow Supervisor Heinz the opportunity to ask his questions.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative.

(Clerk's Note: Discussion continued on this item, after discussion/action on Minute Item No. 24.)

Supervisor Heinz asked if during the pandemic, the population of the jail was at 1,300.

Sheriff Nanos concurred.

Supervisor Heinz commented that as of December 1st, the population of the jail was at 1,840.

Sheriff Nanos replied that as of today, there were 1,844 inmates.

Supervisor Heinz questioned if 65% of the population in the jail was nonviolent offenders mostly from drug offenses, failure to appear or parole violations.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he could provide the exact numbers to the Board, but that as of now, 95% of the jail population were felons and 5% misdemeanors. He added that their booking rate was at 200 or 300 people, which had a booking rate of 56% misdemeanor and 44% felon. He stated that at one time it was 70% misdemeanor and 30% felon. He added that they closed a gap, but that was only for booking and not who was housed there. He reiterated that 95% housed were felons, but would provide exact numbers to determine violent and nonviolent crimes.

Supervisor Heinz indicated that based on the December 5, 2022 memorandum from Justice Services, data showed 639, or 35%, were violent offenders and the remainder were not. He stated that the Board could help in terms of the issues addressed, but that they should look at a multifaceted approach and pull in the County Attorney's Office and others to address if someone should be in jail.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he has looked at some reform issues, but it was an area that needed navigation. He stated that his role in reform was that he could provide a program. He commented on the 95% success rate of ankle monitors, but pretrial services, probation and the courts did not want to use them. He added that when he met with the judges and attorneys on reform measures, it was evident to him that his opinion was political. He commented that was not reform and wanted to move forward because the jail was in a crisis and he had a responsibility to his staff, inmates and the community to keep them safe.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the Board had some ability through the County budget to induce or encourage reforms because it was better for the people and for the Sheriff.

Sheriff Nanos stated that the reduction of the jail population should be looked at.

Supervisor Christy asked what impact the mandatory COVID policy had on the staffing situation and whether it would be worth it to rethink it in order to attract, retain and keep staff that were terminated due to not being vaccinated.

Sheriff Nanos responded that it was not necessary to look at that because those cases went through a due process with the Merit System Commission. He stated that 17 of 21 people were back at work. He stated that they also hired some back with the Merit System Commission because of health issues and other considerations.

Supervisor Scott asked if the short-term measure to be taken was for the 7.5% salary increase for Corrections Officers and Corrections Sergeants that would be brought to the Board on December 20th. He asked if the immediate half cent jail tax and Jail District would require a unanimous vote of the Board to enact a tax.

Sheriff Nanos responded in the affirmative regarding the 7.5% salary increase for Corrections Officers and Corrections Sergeants.

Ms. Leshner explained that a general sales tax, if adopted by the Board, could designate it for a specific reason, but it would be up to the voters. She stated that if the Board were to establish a Jail District and it was implemented, that tax would go directly and legislatively to support the jail problem. She added that if it was a sales tax, the only legislative piece that could be legally implemented would be the half-cent. She stated it would be an administrative action by the Board that would designate it for the allocation to the Jail District, but the half-cent could be used for any purpose.

Sheriff Nanos replied that 11 of the 15 Arizona counties have incorporated a jail tax and Jail District for taxation purposes.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that the Board had the opportunity to review the intergovernmental agreement with the courts, which had not been implemented for two years. She stated that she did not want the Sheriff to be put in a position to turn

away certain crimes because of capacity issues. She added that she wanted to make sure that they were safe.

Sheriff Nanos responded that arrestees would not be turned away.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

26. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 207495, Joseph David Taylor, Simon Hazel Cellars, 6960 E. Sunrise Drive, No. 160, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

Supervisor Heinz recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest.

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

27. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 209310, Sumit Thathi, Oracle Chevron, 5960 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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

28. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 211391, Hilda Ramirez, Casa Ramirez Mexican Food, 15930 N. Oracle Road, No. 116, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

29. Pima Community College Governing Board

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 75, of the Board of Supervisors, calling on the Arizona Attorney General to investigate alleged violations of open meeting laws by members of the Pima Community College Governing Board. (District 2)

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

Supervisor Heinz read the Resolution into the record.

Chair Bronson stated that there was a current investigation by the Arizona Attorney General regarding the allegations.

Chair Bronson called the question. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

Chair Bronson explained her vote with the caveat that she was concerned with the Board's interference with the process of another elected body and spoke highly of the partnership between the County and Pima Community College.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that Pima Community College was a big part of Pima County and all of the schools in the County. She stated that the allegations had been brought to the public's attention and there had not been any action taken, so the Resolution would ensure that action would be taken.

CONSENT CALENDAR

30. Approval of the Consent Calendar

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13 and 16 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

At the request of Supervisor Grijalva to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 17, 18, 19 and 21 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

At the request of Supervisor Heinz to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 42 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

2. Our Family Services, Inc., to provide for Emergency Solutions Grant - Homeless Prevention Program, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$165,000.00 (CT-CR-23-84)

Supervisor Christy stated that Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5, could be heard together.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to approve Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the target clientele that the contract would assist and if there was any capacity that analyzed the reasons individuals were about to lose their homes. He requested a quarterly report that included background on the programs that would be implanted with the contracts and that could track the performances.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated that they addressed rapid rehousing services for the homeless and those individuals that were about to become homeless, and case management and support services to help keep individuals in their homes. He stated that a report would be provided to the Board, which would include all of the components and partners involved in the services provided.

Supervisor Grijalva noted that the programs and services supported 55 families, not just 55 individuals, and that it was important to recognize the community partners that helped provide those services.

Dr. Garcia stated that information was gathered on both households and individuals to maximize the number of individuals impacted.

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

3. Our Family Services, Inc., to provide for CARES Act rapid rehousing individuals, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (CT-CR-23-87)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

4. Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services, to provide for Emergency Solutions Grant - CV Cares Homeless Prevention Program, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$106,000.00 (CT-CR-23-86)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

5. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., to provide for CARES Act rapid rehousing individuals, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (CT-CR-23-85)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

Health

8. STHealth, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for a data, informatics and analytics consultant, amend contractual language and scope of services, COVID-19 Containment grant from the CDC via ADHS Fund, contract amount \$98,600.00 (CT-HD-22-80)

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

Supervisor Christy asked if there were any Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) violations with the use of medical information found on the vendor's website.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that there were no concerns about any HIPAA violations and there were safeguards to prevent any violations. He explained that the scope of services were to help the County better understand how vaccination and related services were being delivered.

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

Procurement

13. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-19-128, Amendment No. 5, Shamrock Foods Company and U.S. Foods, Inc., to provide for food products. This amendment increases the shared annual award amount by \$2,200,000.00 from \$2,200,000.00 to \$4,400,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$10,800,000.00 and appends the Forced Labor of Ethnic Uyghurs provision to the contract, pursuant to A.R.S. §35-394. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Sheriff.

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

Supervisor Christy provided background on past amendments to the contract and questioned why the Procurement Director had approved those amendments. He asked why increased food costs were not anticipated and why the funding was from the General Fund and not from the Sheriff's annual budget request.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that there had been anticipated costs, but not to the amount that would be needed to continue to provide food to the jail this year. She commented that she would provide information to the Board regarding the history of the contract and the contract amendments.

Chair Bronson called the question. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy abstained.

16. Axon Enterprise, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for video/audio storage and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$1,345,050.00 (MA-PO-17-183) Pima County Attorney's Office and Public Defense Services

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

Supervisor Christy provided background on the item. He asked what the attorney premier bundle included, why the previous amendments were not brought before the Board, why the services were performed by the County Attorney's Office and Public Defense Services, and not the Sheriff's Department, and who had authority over the captured videos.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the amendment was an advancement in the body cam software which would include multiple camera angles, redactions to the discussion and translation of the discussion that was not previously available. He commented that the history of the contract and amendments could be provided to the Board, but the current amendment was for a significant increase in cost and software. He stated that the footage captured by the body cams were part of the evidence gathered by the Public Defender and County Attorney.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, confirmed that the prosecutors and attorneys within the County Attorney's Office and Public Defense Services were the ones that controlled and had access to the evidence received. He stated it was also used for public record requests or shared with judicial parties.

Supervisor Christy asked why the funds were coming from the General Fund and not the departments' funds.

Mr. Holmes clarified that the money was allocated to the departments' funds from the General Fund.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR GRIJALVA

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

17. Yellow Jacket Drilling Services, L.L.C., to provide for SERP replacement well drilling (SERPWR), General Fund (FY22 PAYGO), contract amount \$861,081.00 (CT-CPO-23-204) Capital Program Office

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

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about more detailed information on the project, why City of Tucson Water was not being utilized, and if there was any reclaimed water or rainwater that was being utilized.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that the contract was to construct a new well at the fairgrounds, which would replace the failing well that supported the shooting ranges, motor sports park and the Musselman circuit track. He stated that the well was in unincorporated Pima County, which was not within the City of Tucson Water service area, and if it were to be, there would be issues with the distance of the existing water lines on Houghton Road and the connection to the fairgrounds. He explained that there was no easy access to reclaimed water and pointed out that there would not be an increase in the amount of water that was produced from the well.

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

18. Kapp-Con Incorporated, to provide for Martha Cooper Library Expansion (XMLBEX), FM Capital Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$6,812,034.00/2 year term (CT-FM-23-260) Facilities Management

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

Supervisor Grijalva highlighted that the Martha Cooper Library was currently closed and planned to reopen in the Spring of 2024.

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

19. M. Anderson Construction Corp., to provide for Manzanita Park Improvement Project (PMZSCR), Miscellaneous (79%) and General (21%) Funds, contract amount \$3,634,252.50/2 year term (CT-CPO-23-162)

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

Supervisor Grijalva questioned whether this meant that the County would be moving forward with this project, since there had not been action on the project for a few years.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, confirmed that the project would be moving forward and was hopeful that the fields would be operational by 2024.

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

Real Property

21. Buckelew Farms, L.L.C., to provide an Acquisition Agreement and Warranty Deed, Tax Parcel Nos. 208-54-136B and 208-54-136C for open space/conservation purposes, NRPR Open Space Projects Fund, contract amount \$694,600.00 (CT-RPS-23-254)

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

Supervisor Grijalva asked for more information on the project and what funds were being used.

Victor Pereira, Director, Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation, provided background on past contracts with Buckelew Farms, L.L.C. He explained that the County entered into ten year contract with the Common Ground Farm Collective to cultivate the 50 acres depicted on the map. He stated that the three main goals of the Common Ground Farm Collective were to farm organically, provide new opportunities for farmers to learn how to farm and to use regenerative and sustainable farming techniques. He explained that it was beneficial for the County to acquire the 10.35 in holding headquarters because it underpinned the guiding documents and Board of Supervisors policies, it was currently in line with the Sustainable Action Plan for County Operations implementation strategies, expanded the number of County acres under agricultural production and reinforced the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. He added that it strengthened the alter value resource

plan, which combined the entire property. He stated that the acquisition gave the County complete control of all of the resources on the property. He added that water was critical to farming and the irrigation ditches transected the headquarters property. He stated that it would ensure uninterrupted water activity from the East and West wells and it provided a sustainable headquarters for tenant farmers to base their operations. He stated that they were in negotiations with another farmer for future expansion to take over the remaining 250 acres, similar to the Common Ground Farm Collective that focused on sustainable materials. He indicated that the property had been fully vetted by the County's assigned conservation land acquisition team and it met all of the established criteria.

Supervisor Christy asked if an appraisal had been completed and its comparison to the purchase price.

Mr. Pereira confirmed that multiple appraisals had been completed, but the most recent one depicted the cost of \$675,000.00 for the property, which was purchased for \$690,000.00 plus closing costs.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR HEINZ

SUPERIOR COURT

42. Judge Pro Tempore Appointments

Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated, Green Valley and Ajo Justice Courts for the period of January 1, 2023 through June 30, 2023:

Bobbi Berry; Oscar J. Flores, Jr.; Robert Forman and Virjinya Torrez

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Chair Bronson to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 24, 2023. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz commented that there were a few continuing and newly appointed Justices of the Peace, and it would be appropriate to allow them to come to a consensus on whether or not they needed to fill the Judge Pro Tempore positions, and which candidates they would want appointed to those positions.

Chair Bronson shared her concern regarding names that were not included in the list that were normally appointed. She stated that it had been standard practice at the courts that if Judges that had been elected chose to be Pro Tems, then they were provided that option.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she was concerned with the consolidated courts in Green Valley and Ajo, since they needed immediate support and she would support this item since it was for those areas. She stated that more information would be important.

Supervisor Scott offered a friendly amendment to the motion that the continuation date be changed to a date after March 30, 2023. He indicated that the Board had received a memorandum from two sitting judges that requested a delay in approval of this item, in order to evaluate the need for more Judges Pro Tempore. He asked that it be continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of April 4, 2023.

Supervisor Heinz accepted the friendly amendment.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Behavioral Health

1. Tucson Centers for Women and Children, Inc., d.b.a. Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse, Amendment No. 1, to provide for renovations to emergency shelter, extend contract term to 1/30/24 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-BH-22-208)

Community and Workforce Development

2. Our Family Services, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
3. Our Family Services, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
4. Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
5. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

County Attorney

6. CBS Consulting Group, Amendment No. 1, to provide for professional grant writing services and amend contractual language, Anti-Racketeering Fund, contract amount \$1,404.00 (CT-PCA-22-375)
7. Kodi Foundation, f.k.a. Elise Townsend, Amendment No. 2, to provide for implementation of enhancements in support of the Pima County Drug Court Program Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program (DTAP) and the

Specialty Courts Initiative and amend contractual language, DTAP-SAMHSA/BJA Funds, contract amount \$21,649.00 (CT-PCA-23-124)

Health

8. STHealth, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
9. City of South Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for disbursement of opioid settlement funds, no cost/5 year term (CTN-HD-23-48)

Pima County Wireless Integrated Network

10. National Park Service, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$14,688.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-23-27)
11. National Park Service, to provide for public safety service participant, contract amount \$39,960.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-23-26)

Procurement

12. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-20-8, Amendment No. 7, CDK Design, L.L.C., d.b.a. Arcadia Landscape, to provide for landscape maintenance and repair services. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$160,000.00 from \$440,000.00 to \$600,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,870,000.00 and increases unit prices and/or frequency of site visits each month for an aggregate increase to the contract costs of approximately 32%. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.
13. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-19-128, Amendment No. 5, Shamrock Foods Company and U.S. Foods, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
14. **Award**
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-23-94, Mobile Maintenance & Towing, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide for vehicle towing and auction services. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$530,000.00 and estimated annual revenue amount of \$537,275.00 with four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Sheriff's Special Revenue and General (2%) Funds. Administering Department: Sheriff.
15. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., to provide for Canoa Ranch sewer extension segment 2 design (3CRAEX), RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount \$326,250.00/2 year term (CT-CPO-23-225) Capital Program Office

16. Axon Enterprise, Inc., Amendment No. 5, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
17. Yellow Jacket Drilling Services, L.L.C., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
18. Kapp-Con Incorporated, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
19. M. Anderson Construction Corp., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Real Property

20. Friends of Robles Ranch, d.b.a. My Friend's Closet, Amendment No. 2, to provide for a lease agreement at Robles Ranch Community Center located at 16150 W. Ajo Way, extend contract term to 12/31/23 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN- RPS-22-72)
21. Buckelew Farms, L.L.C., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Transportation

22. Rocking K Development Co., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the second amended and restated Rocking K Development Agreement and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-TR-20-116)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

23. **Acceptance - County Attorney**
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, to provide for the BJA FY2022 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, \$398,091.00/\$145,413.34 In-kind Fund match/3 year term (GTAW 23-68)
24. **Acceptance - County Attorney**
Arizona Attorney General's Office, to provide for the Arizona Attorney General's Office FY2023 Victims' Rights Program Award, \$138,400.00 (GTAW 23-69)
25. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the Public Health Improvement Program, \$113,700.00/5 year term (GTAW 23-71)
26. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for hazardous materials emergency preparedness, \$42,300.00 (GTAW 23-70)

27. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**
Arizona Companion Animal Spay/Neuter Committee, to provide for the PACC Community Cat Trap-Neuter-Return Program, \$10,000.00 (GTAW 23-73)
28. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**
Best Friends Animal Society, to provide for the Best Friends National Adoption Weekend, \$4,675.00 (GTAW 23-75)
29. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**
Arizona Companion Animal Spay/Neuter Committee, to provide for the PACC Public Spay-Neuter Program, \$10,000.00 (GTAW 23-76)
30. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 10, to provide for Title IV-E Federal Foster Care Matching Funds, \$455,151.96 (GTAM 23-33)
31. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
State of Arizona - Department of Public Safety, to provide for the Border Strike Force Bureau, \$253,900.00/\$63,475 General Fund match (GTAM 23-39)
32. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the Governor's Office of Highway Safety Prop 207 One Police Package BMW Motorcycle, \$31,222.90 (GTAW 23-72)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

33. **Flood Control District Advisory Committee**
Ratification of Town of Marana appointments: Jennifer Flood, to replace Howard (Gus) Myers and Dustin Ward, alternate representative, to replace Jennifer Flood. No term expiration. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
34. **Cooperative Extension Board**
- Appointment of Jacqueline Bruhn, to fill a vacancy created by Hector Campoy. Term expiration: 6/30/24. (Committee recommendation)
 - Appointment of Justin Byrd, to replace Daniel Pacheco. Term expiration: 6/30/24. (Committee recommendation)
35. **Metropolitan Education Commission**
- Appointment of Dave Mason, representing Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, to fill a vacancy created by Devon Scheitrum. Term expiration: 12/5/25. (Commission recommendation)
 - Appointment of Leila Williams, representing Disabled Community, to replace Steven Freeman. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (Commission recommendation)

- Reappointment of Dr. Treya Allen, representing African American Community. Term expiration: 5/16/25. (Commission recommendation)
 - Reappointment of Leslie Ferre, representing Teachers, Grades 5-9 (AZ Education Association). Term expiration: 10/15/25. (Commission recommendation)
 - Reappointment of Kathy Prather, representing Commerce, Business or Industry (Sun Corridor, Inc.). Term expiration: 11/19/25. (Commission recommendation)
 - Reappointment of Jon Lansa, representing Education Foundations. Term expiration: 10/17/25. (Commission recommendation)
 - Reappointments of Dr. Karen Tam, representing Minority Group (Asian American Community) and Marla A. Franco, Ph.D., representing Minority Group (AZ Hispanic Community Forum). Term expirations: 3/19/25 (Commission recommendations)
36. **Transportation Advisory Committee**
- Appointment of Sean Samsel, to replace Albert Letkus. Term expiration: 12/31/26. (District 1)
 - Reappointment of John Bernal. Term expiration: 12/31/26. (County Administrator recommendation)
37. **Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission**
- Appointment of Mark Clark. Term expiration: 12/5/26. (County Administrator recommendation)
 - Ratification of Town of Oro Valley appointment: Milini Simms. Term expiration: 12/5/26. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
 - Ratification of Town of Sahuarita appointment: Anna Casadei. Term expiration: 12/5/26. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
 - Ratification of Town of Marana appointment: Lisa Shafer. Term expiration: 12/5/26. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
38. **Workforce Investment Board**
- Appointments of the following members, term expirations: 9/30/25. (Staff recommendations):
- Peter Loya, representing Business.
 - Ramon Serrato, representing Business.
 - Aric Meares, representing Business.
 - Karen King, representing Workforce, Labor Org. Representative nominated by Local Labor Federation.
 - Frank Grijalva, representing Workforce, Labor Org. and Joint Labor Mgt.
 - Natalya Brown, representing, Workforce; CBO.
 - Dr. David Dore, representing Education and Training; Higher Education.

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

39. **Special Event**
Concha Maria Montes, Ajo Community Market, Inc., Ajo Plaza, 38 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, December 10 and 17, 2022.
40. **Temporary Extension**
012100012055, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Barnfire Mesquite Grill, 8310 N. Thornydale Road, No. 180, Tucson, November 18, 2022.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

41. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
Villa Sorrento, L.L.C. \$3,649.99; Matthew Martinez Pate \$374.18; Sunrise Ridge Apartments \$3,792.00; First Avenue Investment, Inc., d.b.a. Batteries Plus Bulbs No. 101 \$1,972.58; Fleming Family Limited Partnership \$2,322.36; Arizona Capital Representation Project \$8,244.00; Janice Lewis \$15.00; Johnny's Auto Collision \$1,316.00; Hector Acevedo \$60.00; Consolidated Electrical Distributors, Inc. \$1,528.36; P5 2021-2 Borrower, L.L.C. \$13,707.37; Phillip H. Young \$102.40; Nutrien AG Solutions, Inc. \$1,055.69; Affordable Home Realty, L.L.C. \$4,870.00; Angelita M. Nelson \$6,250.00; Affordable Home Realty, L.L.C. \$9,765.00; Villa Sorrento, L.L.C. \$6,142.35; Drake T16 La Mirada, L.L.C. \$3,203.55; Sycamore Creek Apartments \$9,855.96; Estrella Lucero \$100.00; Ana S. Guerrero \$64.11; The Bria Family Irrevocable Trust \$3,375.00.

SUPERIOR COURT

42. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

TREASURER

43. **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 \$142,765.57.

44. RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

Minutes: October 4, 2022
Warrants: November, 2022

* * *

31. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:09 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:09 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT