

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, February 20, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting remotely at 9:11 a.m. He left the meeting at 12:01 p.m. and rejoined at 12:17 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Kevra Rich, MTSS Coordinator, Cragin Elementary School, Tucson Unified School District, sang the Black National Anthem.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Dr. Tonya Strozier, Director, African American Student Services, Tucson Unified School District.

3. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Chair Grijalva offered a moment of silence for the passing of Marion Lee Pickens. She stated that Ms. Pickens represented Southern Arizona in the Arizona House of Representatives from 1990-1992. She stated that she was also a teacher and very active community member.

4. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION

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

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

- Alina Barcenas, Clerk of the Board
- Kelsey Miller, Finance & Risk Management
- Robert Walls, Finance & Risk Management
- Daniel Arthur, Community & Workforce Development
- Sam Chia, Health Department
- Leslie White, Library
- Patrick Donovan, Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation
- Greg Saxe, Regional Flood Control Department
- Ryan Call, Assessor's Office

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Kevin Dahl, City of Tucson Vice Mayor and Vincent Pawlowski, HPV Cancer Survivor, proclaiming the day of Monday, March 4, 2024 to be: "HPV AWARENESS DAY"

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

7. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Lezley Shepherd addressed the Board regarding the one-day one-vote paper ballot hand count being promoted for the upcoming election and read articles from the United States Constitution. She also spoke about a biblical citizenship class that addressed black history that was not taught in the schools.

Keith Gregory spoke about the Rio Azul Project and asked the Board to reconsider their position regarding the funding for this project.

Laurie Moore expressed concerns regarding the illegal immigration invasion at the southern border. She stated that immigrant activities were funded by the Board and Catholic Charities. She urged the public to vote conservative.

Sharon Greene expressed her concerns regarding illegal immigrants coming into the country, and the need for government to support the Constitution and the people.

Don Hayles expressed his concern with the lack of training for poll workers at multipole ballot drop-offs. He also expressed opposition for Minute Item Nos. 6 and 37. He opposed the vaccines used to prevent HPV and County money should not be spent on immigration activities.

Raf Polo expressed opposition to the County's open border, illegal immigration and the use of taxpayers' money to support immigration activity. He also stated that speakers should be given three minutes to speak at Call to the Public.

Dave Smith spoke about the importance of following extant laws rather than creating new ones. He stated that if laws were followed the County would not have a border issue and there would be a decrease in crime rate. He asked the Board to enforce the laws.

Mia Burcham expressed support of the County Administrator's decision to not put forward the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations regarding a new jail. She stated that the County should invest in healthcare, housing, community based services and safety to reduce the amount of incarcerations.

Caroline Isaacs, Executive Director, Just Communities Arizona, expressed her support of the County Administrator's recommendation to convene a new commission to study the jail issue more comprehensively and recommended that the new commission adequately reflect the stakeholders in the process and be directed to conduct an assessment on existing initiatives that were designed to address the issues at the jail.

Roger Score stated that the Board had attacked the public's rights by limiting their time allotted at Call to the Public. He voiced his opinions about the people's rights and the invasion of the border.

Constable Oscar Vasquez addressed the Board regarding his hearing and asked that they postpone the agenda item to allow him more time to gather his information.

Angie Anderson expressed her concerns regarding asylum seekers and urged the Board to close the border.

Tim Laux stated there were 109,000 active voters with no voting history. He expressed his concerns with the maintenance of the voter roll by the County Recorder and indicated that people were allowed to vote after the deadline dates, which was illegal.

Doyle Taraba urged the Board to close the border. He expressed support for Supervisor Christy and criticism of the other Board members.

Reverend Tracy Howe expressed support for the decision to not pursue the building of a new jail and urged the Board to continue to pursue a vision of care and flourishing for all people.

Cory Stephens expressed her concerns regarding the status of asylum seekers and claims of illegal activities that were taking place at Casa Alitas.

Tiera Rainey expressed her support for several of the County Administrator's recommendations on the Pima County Adult Detention Center Blue Ribbon Commission.

Isa Mundo shared her opinion regarding a new jail and provided a brief rundown of the free responses written in the Blue Ribbon Commission's survey.

Drew Fellows expressed support of the County Administrator's memorandum advocating to not build a new jail and asked the Board to put forth funds to prevent the root causes of crime itself.

Lauren Beall stated that she was a former Pima County Public Defender and spoke in opposition of a new jail. She expressed concerns with current issues in the County jail. She stated that the jail's population was arranged by race, violence was imposed as a form of control, Correction Officers made inmates fight each other, health care was abysmal and there was a rampant use of solitary confinement.

Raye Winch thanked the Board for their vote to support the Prosperity Initiative, spoke in opposition of a new jail and asked the Board to instead use the funding for housing, mental health services and detox facilities.

Andrea Curtis addressed the Board regarding Minute Item No. 11 and stated that there was a lien with the possibility of foreclosure on her family's church. She asked that the Board approve the Church's petition for relief of taxes.

Christopher Thomas, Representative, Sonoran Prevention Works, expressed concerns regarding the lack of services provided to inmates after release from the jail and urged the Board to fund organizations that helped those with drug addictions.

Molly Block thanked the Board for their decision to not move forward with the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations.

Christine Carino spoke in opposition of a new jail. She stated that if the Sheriff focused on the mental health of inmates and created a safer environment, there would be fewer deaths.

Robin Ford spoke in support of Minute Item No. 11 and urged the Board to approve the petition for relief of taxes.

Constable Bill Lake addressed the Board regarding his complaint to the Constable Ethics, Standard and Training Board to remove Constable Vasquez from office due to his failure to appear for work and abandonment of his job.

* * *

Supervisor Lee directed staff to look into the issue of solitary confinement at the County jail. She requested the number of individuals who had been placed in solitary confinement over the last few years and their length of time in confinement.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8. The Board of Supervisors on January 23, 2024, continued the following:

Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with City of South Tucson to Support Provision of Fire and Emergency Medical Services

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County to enter into an IGA with the City of South Tucson to support the provision of Fire and Emergency Medical Services to the businesses and residents of South Tucson, through which the County shall provide the City of South Tucson with \$400,000.00 this fiscal year for this purpose, from the County's FY24 Contingency Funds; and declaring an emergency. (District 2)

At the request of Supervisor Heinz and without objection, the item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of March 5, 2024.

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

Chair Grijlava stated that the Visit Tucson Retreat was held on February 5th at the Leo Kent Hotel and that Austin Wright from the Tucson Airport Authority provided an update regarding how flights were created, what that designation looked like, and the legislation involved. She stated that there was 100% capacity on outbound flights, mostly due to people who sought asylum and who were traveling to their final destinations. She stated in 2023 there were 5.2 million visitors in Tucson, which was approximately the population of Colorado. She stated that Visit Tucson had a healthy advertising budget reforecast, which was one seventh of Phoenix's advertising budget and the equivalent of one hotel in Las Vegas. She stated there would be discussion on the upcoming strategic plan and values that might require Board input. She reported that the Board of Health (BOH) held virtual meetings with their last being on January 24th and that the BOH Budget Committee sent a letter to the Board requesting support of supplemental budget items for the Health Department. She indicated that their next meeting would be held on February 28th. She stated that they had a table at the resource fair for the Black and Brown Health Fair, which was held at the Donna Liggins Recreation Center on February 17th, and was incredibly well attended.

Supervisor Lee provided an update to the Board. She stated that Dr. Daisy Rodriguez Pitel had served as the Interim Executive Director for the last two years for the Metropolitan Education Commission and had done a fabulous job, but they sought a new Director, and one had been hired and she would provide the name at

her next update. She reported that the Arizona Border Counties Coalition (ABCC) consisted of Yuma, Santa Cruz, Cochise and Pima Counties and that she attended her first meeting and was impressed with an update provided by Santa Cruz County's consultant, Luis Ramirez, which highlighted actual Trade partnership with Mexico, specifically for the San Luis, Yuma, Douglas and Nogales Ports of Entry. She stated that these were the largest ports and the majority of Trade had come through Nogales, but the ports were going through some reconfigurations and updates to make Trade more robust. She stated that she was surprised to learn that Mexico had surpassed China as the United States (U.S.) number one trading partner, which showed the importance of these ports. She stated that as of 2023, the Arizona borders had almost \$36 billion in Trade that came through the ports and went to all the destinations across the U.S. She indicated that it was a benefit to everyone to support the border ports. She asked the Board if they were willing to invite Mr. Ramirez to share the same data he shared with the ABCC so that the community would be aware of the importance of the County's Trade partners with Mexico.

Supervisor Scott provided an update to the Board. He stated that he provided a presentation at his first meeting at Sun Corridor, Inc.'s Board of Directors. He stated that was pleased to have had the opportunity to pay tribute to former Supervisor Bronson, who had been a member of that Board since Sun Corridor was created. He stated that the Sun Corridor Board wanted updates on Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Next development, the Prosperity Initiative, and the County's Economic Development Strategic Plan. He added that the RTA Board had a special meeting scheduled on February 22nd, to further consider development of an RTA Next Plan with regular meetings set for March and May, and an additional special meeting set for April. He stated they wanted to provide an RTA Next Plan public review period in the second half of 2024, due to the election being planned for the Spring of 2025. He stated that he asked staff for information on topics that were being discussed by RTA Board members because the County's focus was the hope of finding common ground for all nine members of the RTA Board. He reminded the Board that the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) of the County Supervisors Association (CSA) had met every Friday, except during weeks when monthly Board of Directors meetings occurred, which was when the LPC was part of the Board of Directors agenda, when it came to whether or not to support, oppose or stay neutral on a bill. He added that CSA staff often made recommendations to the LPC and reminded the Board that any Supervisor in the State could take part in LPC discussion, however each County only had one vote.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

10. Blue Ribbon Commission Final Report

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Pima County Adult Detention Center Blue Ribbon Commission Final Report.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, provided a slideshow presentation to the Board that showed a brief history of the commission, their final recommendations and the recommendations that would be considered by the Board. She stated the commission was comprised of ten members tasked with reviewing a variety of information and specifically charged with reviewing three assessment areas: the current conditions of the jail to determine whether there was a need for design and capacity improvements and/or construction of a new facility; best practices and standards and other factors impacting operations; funding options available for facility improvements and/or construction of a new facility. She reminded the Board that the commission was chaired by Danny Sharp, former Oro Valley Police Department Chief with a total of ten individuals divided into three working groups, which consisted of Facilities, Operations and Finance. She stated that a variety of individuals from the private, community and business sectors and individuals who had previously worked at the jail were in the groups. She stated they had a variety of meetings over ten months, held public hearings, had conducted a public survey and made final recommendations. She stated there had been concern that this had taken a long time and it was due to the County asking ten volunteer individuals who had day jobs to focus on this and in addition the survey was available for a full month to the public. She referred to the commission's executive summary and highlighted a few of the commission findings. She stated there was insufficient evidence to characterize the current situation as a crisis as it related to the construction of the facility, jail facilities exceeded their useful life in many areas, design deficiencies limited the full benefits of direct supervision, design of health care, mental health and detoxification units were obsolete, a recurring dedicated source of funding for maintenance improvements was needed, the jail incarcerated more people than its capacity limit, overcrowding occurred in notable areas such as detoxification, health care and the mental health units, and the jail population numbers were impacted by many external causal factors. She stated that the commission's recommendations were as follows:

1. Jail facility improvements are necessary regardless of the jail population.
2. Expert professional assistance was required to evaluate building conditions, define options for remediating problems, develop cost estimates and assess operational impacts.
3. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of the criminal justice system to identify measures to reduce the inmate population.
4. Initiate a process to program, design, fund and construct jail improvements.
5. Appoint a commission to research proven methods of reducing jail populations and proposed changes to public policy, legislation, criminal justice services and community based services.
6. Identify a multifaceted approach that includes both improvements to the jail and programs to minimize jail population.
7. Involve the community in any discussion on potential funding mechanisms.
8. Board levied taxes should be an option of last resort.

Ms. Leshar stated that there were several conclusions in the report that addressed jail conditions that were not simply about the physical facility itself, and that a multi-faceted strategy was needed to modernize the facility to encourage public safety,

rehabilitation, cost savings and reintegration into the community. She stated that based on the work of the commission and the public response the County must address the physical infrastructure to ensure that the facilities were safe, right-sized, clean and conducive to the population; implement programs aimed at reducing recidivism; look at the criminal justice system to address sentencing policies, gaps and alternatives to incarceration for those nonviolent offenders; support the reintegration post-release with community partnerships; and promote accountability and transparency in all systematic issues. She indicated that a report was provided to the Board that included four recommendations and summarized them. She thanked Diana Durazo, who was the key staff person for the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) over the last ten months, her support staff and others that worked on the survey and analysis.

Chair Grijalva stated that she wanted to ensure focus on comprehensive analysis and evaluation and reaching out to community members and community organizations that provided service at the table were part of that commission. She stated that it was critical to have people that were serving the population that the County was trying to address services for and it was critical to have people that had been a part of those programs to know what was relevant and what was or was not working. She stated that she remembered having been interviewed about drug use at the libraries, and she had three people identified as former addicts tell her that if black lights were placed in bathrooms, they would be unable to see their veins. She stated that might deter people from using drugs in those bathrooms, but that was something she would never have thought of and it was not something that was looked at. She added that it was important to talk about some of the solutions that might be available, and it highlighted the importance of having people at the table that had gone through different programs. She stated that another part was prevention, which was not spoken about much, but it could look at how to help the youngest in the community stay away from drugs or behavior that would get them involved in the juvenile justice system and investing more money in diversion programs for young people, and also for the adult population. She reminded the Board that 80% or more of the jail population was for people detained that had not been convicted of a crime. She stated that was important to look at and that when she toured the jail, there were definite signs of deferred maintenance and structural issues that had not been addressed. She added it was a very dark and oppressive space for detainees and for staff and could imagine that mental health on either side was very oppressive and she left with the feeling that it would be a very difficult space to be in each day. She stated that they also needed to ensure that the transition center had the proper staffing in order to continue that work and provide those kinds of wraparound services to help reduce recidivism. She stated that as funding was discussed, she did not want to automatically increase funding for correctional health services until it was clearly understood how funding already allocated to the jail was utilized because 21% of the County's overall budget was in the Sheriff's Department and 41% including all legal services, which was a significant investment. She stated that as someone being asked to make decisions about the budget she wanted to understand how current funding was being utilized before continued investment. She added there had been some modifications to the jail that did not align with how it was originally designed and it was important to

review that, as well as review underutilized spaces to know how to capitalize on the space currently in the footprint to increase some of the care that was being provided to detainees. She added that if people had access to preventative and community health before being detained, they would not need the kind of services that were now critical and long-term care, which was a consequence of long-term deferred health care checkups and some of the huge increases because of this and by partnering with community health, like El Rio and other programs, it was critically important to try to provide preventive and wraparound services.

Supervisor Lee stated that she was very fortunate to have been taken by Deputy County Administrator Holmes to the transition center at the jail and she had heard that the program had helped reduce the number of misdemeanors in the jail to 5%. She stated that she had also met with Kate Vesely, Director, Justice Services Department, whom she felt should also be involved due to her knowledge of the system. She added that she met with Presiding Judge Bergin and had discussed the steps program that they had implemented. She stated that some best practices had already begun in the County, and both Ms. Vesely and Judge Bergin had knowledge about a program in Miami Dade and their best practices and that more research should be done.

Supervisor Scott referred to Superior Court Judge Bergin's memorandum dated December 15, 2023, regarding an update of the pretrial workgroup recommendations and stated that Judge Bergin had appeared before the Board to discuss the topic. He stated that he had a number of questions for Judge Bergin and submitted them in writing to the County Administrator and had yet to receive a response, which he was disappointed by, however that issue dealt with the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for Initial Appearances and the recommendations from the BRC and the County Administrator were two topics that were very much connected. He referred to the third recommendation from the BRC and the County Administrator and stated that the BRC report indicated that over 90% of the people incarcerated in the jail were charged with felonies, but Just Communities Arizona had reported that 55% were there for nonviolent offenses. He referred back to Judge Bergin's memorandum and read his second question as follows: "The memorandum from Judge Bergin cites the four areas of bail outcomes where data should be collected. The first, third, and fourth items on that list apply to people arrested for felonies and they are people who have been detained preventatively and/or are unable to secure release due to a financial condition of bail, people who are arrested for one or more violent felony charges and people arrested for one or more felony charges who have been released with the condition they be monitored by Pretrial Services and are rearrested for new felony charges, which occurred during the time they are supervised by Pretrial Services." He stated that the Board was told per the report that Pretrial Services could "coordinate the reporting in the above categories for defendants with felony charges." He indicated at that time that it would have been helpful to receive that data when the Board considered the recommendation from the BRC regarding the existing jail and whether a new facility was needed and had requested the data, but the Board had yet to receive it. He stated that he hoped these concerns could be incorporated along with other items into a new commission being recommended. He read his

sixth question as follows: "How will the new presiding magistrate address concerns raised by the Board and the community about excessive bail being imposed during Initial Appearances? Shouldn't this topic be addressed by the Superior Court Working Group given its charge?" He felt that this question needed to be addressed by this new commission. He read his seventh question as follows: "On May 2nd of last year, the Board heard from Deputy County Administrator Holmes regarding the concept of a Consolidated Warrant Resolution Center and its possible development. He said this entity could help to deal with the burgeoning number of Failure to Appear cases. A center could bring in judges and prosecutors to work in partnership. Can the workgroup and County Administration look into moving this concept forward given that Failure to Appear concerns remain substantial and significant?" He thanked Mr. Holmes for his discussions with the Justice Court about implementing a Warrant Resolution Center and felt this was something that needed to be discussed. He read his eighth question as follows: "I forwarded an email to Ms. Leshar on December 20th that was sent to me the day before by Amelia Kramer, former Deputy County Attorney. It included the following language, the Board also has an interest in avoiding liability in litigation that could be brought against the Administrator of the Courts, the City and the County on behalf of arrestees in properly detained on bail known and intended to be excessive not only by the judge's handling Initial Appearances who are imposing bail, but also by the Administrative Judges aware that excessive bail is a pervasive practice with code amounts shared among Judges, such as \$2,499 and \$999 for homeless people." He stated that he had tried to get sense of what the means for potentially reducing the jail population and the composition of the jail population was and it was almost impossible to determine that composition and made deliberately impossible. He stated the Board could not possibly consider both two topics, the IGA for initial appearances and the recommendations from County Administration and the BRC separately and they had to be considered together. He requested that the charter for the new commission take his considerations into account.

Supervisor Christy stated that the BRC had done tremendous work, and they were comprised of private citizens and elected officials and they spent hours under very adverse conditions with a lot of controversy raging one way or the other. He stated they devoted and donated their time to the community to try to address this issue and they needed to be acknowledged and he commended them. He stated that the report provided five alternatives or pathways to address the jail situation; three of them were deemed not feasible and two were deemed feasible. He stated one alternative was to remodel and add to current existing facilities in addition to building more new facilities and a final alternative was to build a whole new complex in of itself with the first costing roughly around \$650 million and a complete new jail construction costed approximately \$850 million. He asked which alternative was recommended by the BRC.

Ms. Leshar responded neither recommendation had been made.

Supervisor Christy inquired what the purpose of the commission was if they could not provide a recommendation. He stated that they provided several examples of

what needed to be done and they were charged with providing a solution, but had not done so. He stated that he took issue with this after time, effort and energy were expended to come to a solution to address the jail situation and the BRC offered two solutions, but had not made a recommendation for either solution. He stated the Board was faced with considering the County Administration's recommendations due to this and with contracting a third-party consultant to initiate a high level Feasibility Study on the conditions of the Adult Detention Center and provide them with the Commission's final report as part of the information. He questioned why the third-party consultant was not involved from the start, why the need to establish a new commission to consider possible improvement alternatives that explored a lower bed capacity, why the BRC had not already done that work, why the need for a County finance working group and why it was not part of the BRC. He stated this would postpone dealing with the problem with more commissions, more studies and more time of community volunteer hours to come up with something that should have been addressed in the original commission. He stated that with all the insertions of how the needs of the jail situation should be addressed by reduction of beds, sentences, population and more programs, he felt the Board was pontificating plans that were thought to be essential in reimagining incarceration activity, yet they had no authority because it was under the purview of the Sheriff. He stated the report indicated 80% of the jail population was incarcerated for felony charges which were not small infractions and they needed to be addressed as serious issues. He stated the biggest problem he had was that the Board was trying to tell the Sheriff how to run his jail and try to insert new programs that had no legal basis. He requested the Board's Legal Counsel look into the legality of what the Board could insert in the actual running and operations of the jail and its policies. He stated that the Board had no authority for it and some people might not like the Sheriff. He asked if the County wanted a new jail under the current Sheriff or perhaps with a new Sheriff, which was another issue. He added that the commission fell short and there would be new commissions because the BRC could not come up with a conclusion and the issue would be opened up for more diversion and distraction from special interest groups that wanted to insert certain regulations, policies and practices in the current jail and on its operation. He felt that it would create more opportunities for disruption and more issues not being addressed. He added that the County was sticking to the main course of determining whether or not to fix the old jail or build a new one and that all other discussions, programs and policies could be developed at a later time. He stated that he saw no indication that the Sheriff had been consulted and the Sheriff was a duly elected official with the right to run and operate the jail as he saw fit. He added that the County was getting involved in areas that opened it up to legal issues and would create internal issues for the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Leshar responded that the hope of the commission was that it would initially look at what the physical concerns were within the jail and recalled that the Sheriff approached the Board and indicated they were in crisis and that there were significant concerns that were of a crisis proportion in the jail. She concurred that the commission had not given a resolution, but that one of the responsibilities that the County had, even with the Sheriff running the jail, was that as the body that

developed the budget for this organization it could be determined whether or not what had occurred in the jail from physical ramifications and physical construction was safe to those in the jail who worked there or were incarcerated. She stated that there were experts around the country and they were being asked to provide a determination and the commission early on decided that they would conduct a Request for Proposal for consultants of this nature who were available and it was identified that there were. She added that the commission felt that they would continue with their work before they made a recommendation about what needed to occur and because there was not a conclusion, she recommended moving forward with that process to determine what was needed for the basic safety for those within the facility. She stated that she thought that as the commission began on its deliberations the key to the conversation was the capacity of the jail. She stated it needed to determine how many beds were needed and what future construction would be required based on the number of beds, which had then very quickly expanded the conversation and the discussion at the request of the commission. She stated that they began to look at the operations of the organization to determine whether they would review based off current numbers and the assumption it would continue in the future with current rules and regulations or whether other services and programs could be reviewed simultaneously to determine what was needed to decrease the jail capacity or what it would be to construct the jail. She stated that was why the commission began to consider those other areas of concerns and although while the initial direction was to determine how to construct a jail, it became clear that a key element of that was the size of the jail that needed to be constructed and also critical was how to deal with amending the population.

Supervisor Heinz stated that commission members had completed much work and time on this, but it was a difficult subject and he agreed with the speakers that presented their points of view. He stated that there were too many people in the jail and specifically too many black and brown people in the jail. He stated that population had decreased and the key to addressing a new jail, modified jail change, remodeling jail and correctional and getting things up to date in terms of the way carceral systems were supposed to work, especially the health and behavioral health aspects were great, but none of it could be addressed by this Board. He believed that until the underlying problems with the overpopulation of the jail were addressed and echoed remarks made by his colleagues. He stated that the jail population had been successfully reduced in the past by the MacArthur Safety and Justice Challenge with an 18% reduction between 2013 and 2019, which the Sheriff had acknowledged, then it would have otherwise had it not been implemented. He stated that everyone came together, the County Attorney's Office, the presiding judge at the Superior Court, Adult Probation, and all of the individuals that contribute to the jail population came together during COVID and were able to safely reduce the jail population to the high 1200s for several months. He stated that it was possible and could be done if everyone agreed to it. He felt it was the job of the Board to figure out how to induce it because they had the power of the purse string. He stated that if Supervisor Scott did not receive the data from the courts, then the Board might not be able to arrive at a budget for the Superior Court and it would be on a month-to-month basis as Congress had done in the past. He stated that it was

suboptimal, but being ignored again and again about these important issues could not continue. He stated the Board had the ability to address the jail population and could get it to less than a thousand moving forward until 2030 and that should be the Board's goal. He added that all other problems of where to put individuals how to put them there, how to safely monitor them, how they were provided with health care, and other things would become much more doable when there was a much more reasonable population. He stated there was at least 60% of nonviolent people in the jail and the vast majority had not been convicted of anything and they were still in the carceral system.

Supervisor Christy reiterated that he felt the Supervisors needed to stay in their lane because it was not the Board's purview or responsibility and unfortunately the BRC had not addressed a number of issues as to which direction to go. He asked where the County would go from here and what the County would do from here.

Chair Grijalva stated that Administrator Leshar had put forward a plan and Board members had some additions. She felt that the critical piece was with support and the Board could not provide direction to the Courts or the Sheriff, so the only responsibility the Board had was the purse strings as Supervisor Heinz outlined. She felt this was important because the community demanded that something be done and it was important for the Board to move forward. She asked whether any of the information provided by Board members had significantly changed the recommendation and if the item needed to be brought back for more input and to add to what the different commission might look like. She stated it was done in the past with the BRC and it was important to note that support by the Sheriff's Department was needed to be able to go into the jail and make recommendations.

Supervisor Christy asked how much money was allotted to the BRC to operate and what the cost of the consultant might be, in order to get an idea of where the County would go under the guidelines in the County Administrator's memorandum.

Ms. Leshar stated that there was no budget allocated for the BRC and that only coffee and print materials were provided to them.

Supervisor Christy asked if the rumors that the BRC was allocated roughly \$400,000.00 to operate were false.

Ms. Leshar responded yes. She stated that as this moved forward the consultant issue would need to come back to the Board. She stated that initial studies had been estimated at \$300,000.00 of what it might take in order to go out when they worked with the Procurement Department to find that organization. She stated that the specific dollars were not known and would be brought back through the Board. She stated they had not moved forward but there would be a cost to bring in national experts to evaluate and review what needed to be repaired to deal with deferred maintenance. She stated that she could provide a report to the Board. She stated the costs spent on the BRC were de minimis based on coffee provided at meetings. She added that she recommended being allowed to move forward with the understanding of what it might be to complete that analysis and investigation.

She felt that those who were currently operating within the jail, whether they be families, inmates, or those who worked in the jail, would tell you that there needed to be some addressing of the deferred maintenance that occurred, but she did not have a full sense of what was needed. She stated that they wanted to look at what it would take to simply fix some of the deferred maintenance. She stated that item number two did not require action today, but would review the behavioral health contract and recommendations in next year's budget regarding the provision of dental and medical and behavioral health services since it was a recommendation for next year and that it would be brought back as part of the budget. She stated that item four would be to begin to review what it might take and to analyze and understand if there was a determination at any point that additional capacity was needed either for a facility that was significant and/or for the services that might be provided or how what might be funded that could easily be done internally. She stated it could be by bonds or districts and could provide information regarding what others were doing. She stated that work would be done on item three to charter a new commission that would be brought back to the Board on a later date or at the March 5th meeting with recommendations for the commission and potentially a charter for that commission based on this discussion.

Supervisor Christy questioned if any more information could be divulged regarding the pathways to finance the items that were presented in the report.

Ms. Leshar responded that the BRC identified a variety of options and staff needed to provide the Board with an understanding of the impact of those options. She stated that for example, if a bond was needed, it would require bonding authority and what that meant and what it would cost or if a jail district or a funding district would be an easy recommendation to drill down and provide the Board the additional granularity needed about its impact and would be reviewed to provide more granularity based on those different recommendations.

Chair Grijalva asked if there was a motion, or whether the discussion and direction were enough or if Administrator Leshar needed the Board to take action. She stated Ms. Leshar mentioned bringing an item back that was part of the recommendation.

Ms. Leshar commented that she felt the Board could proceed with understanding the financial granularity, reviewing the contractual health services contract for next year and understanding what the contract might look like for basic renovations. She requested direction by the Board and perhaps action was not needed, but she could return on the March 5th meeting with the charter for the new commission for the review and analysis by the Board that included the feedback from the Board and the public.

Chair Grijalva stated that she felt more comfortable with that and none of the items County Administration would be working on had any budget implications other than staff time. She stated that official action could be taken at the March 5th meeting. She thanked staff and the BRC for the report. She also thanked the community for attending and listening to this discussion.

CLERK OF THE BOARD

11. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §~~4342~~-11109(E), Silverbell Grace Brethren Church, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, for Tax Parcel No. 115-21-008A.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

12. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00005, Wildflower Reserve, Lots 1-91 and Common Area "A" (Open Space, Private Drainage and Utilities). (District 1)

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

ELECTIONS

13. Vote Centers

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-248, designation of polling places for the March 19, 2024 Presidential Preference Election.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

14. Monthly Financial Update

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

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that a memorandum with updates had been provided to the Board and it would be posted online. She indicated that staff was available if there were any questions.

Supervisor Christy inquired why Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) income was not designated in any of the categories listed in the report.

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, responded that HURF income was delineated in the other revenues from the State and was not specifically

lined out in the report. She stated that she could break it out and provide that information to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had previously seen HURF income delineated in the report and requested that be done.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

15. Department of Veteran's Affairs, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the co-location of services at Kino Veteran's Workforce Center, extend contract term to 3/31/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-CR-22-102)

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

16. Tucson Preparatory School, d.b.a. Tucson Prep, Amendment No. 2, to provide for United States Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care Program - La Casita, extend contract term to 6/30/24, amend contractual language and scope of work, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$154,063.00 (CT-CR-21-499)

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

17. Living Streets Alliance, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Los Ranchitos Safe Routes Walkability Improvements and extend contract term to 12/31/24, no cost (CT-CR-22-274)

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

18. Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Financial Wellness and Emergency Financial Assistance Program, extend contract term to 9/30/24 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-23-189)

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

Facilities Management

19. C-Cubed Unlimited, Inc., d.b.a. Quik Print, to provide for an Amended and Restated Lease Agreement for property located at 33 N. Stone Avenue, Suites 145 and 160, contract amount \$170,894.09 revenue/3 year term (CTN-FM-24-113)

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

Health

20. The Arizona Partnership for Immunization, Amendment No. 2, to provide for third party billing, extend contract term to 12/1/24 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$1,100,000.00 revenue (CTN-HD-22-71)

Chair Grijalva stated that this item was for billing and the vendor took 40% of the revenue generated and inquired why this service could not be provided in-house.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that the County had looked at the ability to bill in-house and the infrastructure and overhead that was required to do that. He stated that at this point the County was not prepared to bill and collect for this range of services. He stated that the County had a positive relationship with this non-profit entity, which allowed the County to collect a significant amount of revenue. He reiterated that the County was continuing to look at the possible opportunity to bill and collect in-house.

Chair Grijalva stated that it would be more beneficial for the County to do these services in-house rather than contracting elsewhere.

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

Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

21. Arizona Game and Fish Department, to provide a collection agreement for the repair of Pima County ranch roads, General Fund, contract amount \$14,359.00/\$40,000.00 revenue (CTN-PR-24-111)

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

Procurement

22. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-18-349, Amendment No. 8, Senergy Petroleum, L.L.C., to provide for gasoline, diesel and diesel exhaust fluid. This amendment extends the termination date to 4/30/24 and increases the contract amount by \$650,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$13,128,384.58. Funding Source: Fleet Service Operations Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

23. Award

Durazo Construction Corporation, to provide for Richard Elias-Mission Library Expansion and Renovation (XREMLB), Non-Bond Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$7,168,471.00/2 year term (CT-CPO-24-330)
Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Real Property

24. Lago del Oro Water Company, Inc., to provide a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (CTN-RPS-24-116)

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

25. Quail Creek Water Company, Inc., to provide a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (CTN-RPS-24-115)

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

26. Campbell AZ Partners, L.L.C., to provide a Pima County License for Right-of-Way Encroachment, contract amount \$4,375.00 revenue/25year term (CTN-RPS-24-117)

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

27. Gail Dent, Amendment No. 5, to provide a license agreement for use of a portion of the Children's Memorial Park located at 4875 N. 15th Place and extend contract term to 1/31/25, no cost (CTN-PR-17-151)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

28. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Social Services Block Grant - Employment Services and amend grant language, \$41,708.00 (GTAM 24-49)

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

29. Acceptance - Facilities Management

U.S. Department of Energy, to provide for the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program Equipment Rebate Voucher, \$368,820.00/\$40,950.00 Pima County PAYGO Funds/2 year term (GTAW 24-111)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he was going to vote in favor of the item, but it seemed like PAYGO funds were going to be used for chillers or evaporative chilling units. He asked how this item qualified as a PAYGO expenditure.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that when the capital improvement projects were brought to the Board for the year the County identified funding allocations for the PAYGO dollars. She explained that some of the PAYGO dollars went towards road repair and some went to capital improvement projects that were developed and approved by the Board.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that each year the PAYGO funding recommendation was part of the annual budget that was presented and approved by the Board. He explained that capital equipment replacement was part of what the County funded out of PAYGO. He stated that the Board could expect to see those types of items going forward, such as end-of-life equipment and major equipment components on County buildings that were eligible for use of PAYGO.

Supervisor Christy asked if the chillers did not qualify as general maintenance replacement and upgrades.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the items could be listed under different types of funding. He stated that there were other funds that could be utilized, but these items were included in that category within the current approved PAYGO funding recommendations.

Supervisor Christy commented that he did not agree with PAYGO funds used as a general funding source for items when County roads still needed repairs.

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

30. Acceptance - Health

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for immunization services, extend grant term to 6/30/25, amend grant language and scope of work, \$578,734.00 (GTAM 24-51)

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

31. **Acceptance - Health**

The National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) - FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program, to provide for 2024 Training Optional Add-On grant to attend the NEHA Annual Educational Conference for Professional and Leadership Development, Food Safety Retail Program Standards Engagement, and present NEHA Leadership Academy final projects, \$5,625.00 (GTAW 24-101)

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

32. **Acceptance - Health**

National Environmental Health Association - FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program, to provide for the Pima County Retail Program Standards Mentorship Program, \$18,000.00 (GTAW 24-102)

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

33. **Acceptance - Justice Court Green Valley**

Arizona Supreme Court - Administrative Office of the Courts, to provide for Court Security Improvements, \$3,695.00 (GTAW 24-99)

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

34. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) - U.S. Forest Service, Amendment No. 1, to provide for a Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreement between the Pima County Sheriff's Department and the USDA, Forest Service Coronado National Forest and 2023 - 2027 Operating and Financial Plan, \$38,000.00 (GTAM 24-43)

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

35. Hearing - RFP CWD-AHF-RFP-02-2023, FY23/24 Pima County GAP Funding for Affordable Housing Development and Preservation

A. Appeal of Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission's (PCRAHC) Recommendation

Pursuant to Pima County Code 11.20.010(H), Rio Azul Partners, L.L.C. and Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation appeals the scores received, and the Evaluation and Award by the PCRAHC regarding RFP No. CWD-AHF-RFP-02-2023.

B. FY23/24 Pima County GAP Funding for Affordable Housing Development and Preservation

Staff recommends acceptance of the recommendations, as endorsed by the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission, totaling \$6.875 million for 835 affordable housing units - representing new development, home ownership and rental and preservation of existing units.

Brent Davis, Representative, Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation, addressed the Board and stated they were a developer of affordable housing units based in Tucson and their recent projects were located in the underserved area of south Park Avenue, which included the 100-unit Rio Viejo and the 107-unit Rio Mercado projects. He stated their newest elderly housing project as for Rio Azul, which had been visited by some members of the Board, and hoped that all members could visit, had been extremely successful in providing a dignified, affordable living environment for their occupants at 50% to 60% of the area median income. He stated that Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation filed an appeal regarding the grant funds awarded in this cycle and while it was their opinion that the awarding may not have accurately reflected all the requests for funding submissions. He stated that they understood that a process was followed, and the results announced and they had conversations with many County staff about their concerns with the Procurement process and hoped that it could be analyzed in the future. He provided a review of the Procurement process that identified five projects to fund, totaling 850 units, and stated there were some projects that were just below the funding line, including their Rio Azul project for elderly housing. He stated that the Board had discussed the idea of earmarking an extra \$2.2 million for affordable housing in this cycle and Southwest Nonprofit Housing encouraged the Board to increase the amount so that other projects could be funded, and more units could be brought into the Pima County market. He stated that the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission (PCRAHC) recommended 50% of this year's actual County surplus be earmarked for affordable housing and in an earlier meeting, Supervisor Heinz indicated that he would be willing to make a motion to add an additional \$2.2 million to the funding for affordable housing, and Supervisor Scott indicated that he would be willing to second the motion, depending upon what the results of the RFP produced and this was a situation where the County could do that. He stated that

when considering the County's projected \$8 million surplus, together with the expected employee vacancy savings of about \$7 million, the County would have upwards of \$15 million to deal with any budget adjustments, although he knew there would be a \$10 million shortfall in the health benefit from the County's numbers, which left approximately \$5 million in actual surplus funds. He stated that Southwest Nonprofit Housing recommended that the County provide an additional \$2.2 million for affordable housing, which would fund another five projects for an additional 75 units. He added that the modest approach did several things; it funded another five projects to increase the affordable housing units to more than 920 and allowed five more organizations to move forward with their new construction for single family and rehabilitation for the most part, shovel ready in this fiscal year. He stated that it went a long way in meeting the PCRAHC's recommendations and respected the County's overall budget and would leave a projected surplus. He added that it helped address one of the major problems in Pima County which was homelessness and affordable housing and addressed the wishes of constituents in all five supervisorial districts, fund affordable housing and offered some potential relief to the affordable housing issue seen on the Pascua Yaqui Nation.

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

Supervisor Scott asked whether Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation was dropping their appeal.

Mr. Davis responded no and stated that they formally had to file an appeal, and they had some concerns about the procurement process and he could address those issues, but felt that the solution was a positive solution to fund five more projects.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had meeting with Ms. Darland and Ms. Lundin prior to the appeal and the recommended projects before the Board and they confirmed that they provided evaluators and applicants with an understanding of how proposals would be evaluated. He stated that they also conducted consensus meetings after evaluations were done to discuss overall scores. He added that Director Dan Sullivan's memorandum that was shared with the Board stated that there were variations of up to 30 points in how individual projects were scored by different evaluators and used his authority to designate another department director to hear the submitted appeal. He added that staff confirmed that they did not conduct individual project reviews even when the noted variations in scoring were observed and he felt that should have happened. He stated that consensus meetings discussed overall scores, but they had not gone through each individual project when there were variations between evaluators of an individual project and that needed to happen. He stated that a rubric should be tight enough that there should not be great variations and if there were then that would be a necessity for the evaluators to come together and talk about why there were those variations in scoring and that fact that had not happened raised legitimate concerns about inter-rater reliability. He stated that he also felt that as a fault of the Board, and he did not know if the Board had given authority to Director Sullivan, or if it was just inherent in the process, but one director should not designate another to handle an appeal. He

stated those matters should be addressed by one of the Deputy County Administrators or the County Administrator, but Director Sullivan had the authority to ask Director Chiordi-Vescovi to handle the appeal and he felt that the Board should grant this appeal for those reasons, even if not, he called for these issues to be proactively addressed the next time the Board considered proposals for GAP funding. He stated that the importance of getting more housing on the market was hindered if there was any basis for questioning County processes and respected how this second round was informed by things learned in the first round, which was absolutely apparent, but things were learned in this second round that should inform future processes, including having evaluator debriefs with big variations within an individual project and not having appeals be completed at the same level as the department director.

Chair Grijalva commented that she respected Supervisor Scott's opinion, but also knew that evaluations were inherently subjective based on each evaluator and as long as that individual was consistent throughout their evaluation, it might not match up when evaluating the same project, but as long as they were consistent project by project and scoring individually, she felt that was fair. She added that the Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation received \$2.125 million in the last round of funding.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, reminded that the Board that on June 20, 2023, the Board awarded approximately \$2.65 million in GAP funding to Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation, as well as Family Housing Resource Houses and that was to ensure the development of two projects, which together provided 203 additional affordable housing units. He stated that at that time, the Board provided some substantive feedback about how the balance of that \$5 million affordable housing allocation should be used and the idea of developing different types of affordable housing opportunities. He stated that was done fairly expeditiously and in consultation with the PCRAHC issued a second RFP and the funding amount per the direction of the Board was in the amount of \$6.875 million, which was earmarked GAP funding in three specific categories for new development and rental, new development in home ownership and preservation and rehabilitation. He added that the dollar amounts were not distributed evenly, but were distributed based on the counsel of the PCRAHC.

Jenifer Darland, Deputy Director, Housing and Community Development, stated that staff took the feedback and direction from the Board to go back to the applicants from the first round and have a discussion to ensure more for funding recommendations in the second subsequent round and staff held conversations with those applicants and incorporated the feedback along with the comments from the Board and from the commissioners, and comments on ways to improve from evaluators. She stated that the subsequent RFP for the fiscal year 23/24 funds included carryover balances that were left unspent from the prior fiscal year allocation and combined with the fiscal year 23/24 and the release of the RFP was drafted with the improvements in front of the commissioners who had reviewed the RFP and all of the changes, and subsequent conversations on the categories and how much should be funded or budgeted per category was also reviewed and

endorsed by the commissioners. She stated that the RFP was released in early September and was due on October 31st. She stated that it was important to note that between two RFPs in less than 12 months' time, the first RFP yielded seven responsive applications and the second round at 21, an increase of three times as many applications. She stated that to the credit of the Board and its previous investment in the space were ahead of the curve in making meaningful investments in this space of addressing affordable housing. She added that at the time that the applications were vetted by staff to ensure that they met all of the low minimum requirements to proceed to evaluation, staff identified those projects with the commission so that they could then identify a non-conflicted member to serve within the evaluation process, which had been changed from the prior round and based off of feedback from the commissioners to have more of a subjective point of view from the commission's perspective versus the technical expertise that was previously provided in the previous round. She stated that they had had five total evaluators, Deputy Director Rhonda Piña, Division Manager Joel Gastelum, Housing Planner Ryan Stevenson, and Program Manager Tom Drzazgowski with Development Services, who brought their expertise from the fields of Workforce Development, Finance, Project Development, Community Planning and Innovative Practices and Approaches to Development and Community Resources and Support to ensure that folks were housed in these projects and were stably and meaningfully connected to ongoing processes and supports to ensure that they remained stably housed. She stated that the process took longer than anticipated, but they managed to stick with the timeline as published in the RFP. She reiterated that they were able to meet and confer to discuss the outcomes category by category, the way that the projects fell within their rating and rank and discussed whether or not there were significant deviations from the outcomes that did not fall into alignment with individual evaluator's perspectives. She stated that when there was such broad, expansive perspectives in that evaluation process, it lent to certain things that percolated up from evaluator to evaluator. She stated that what the County looked for was any lack of application expertise in a particular category that had been previously applied in the evaluation of another application to ensure that there was not some sort of bias that might be applied in that evaluator's review and she understood that could absolutely be tightened up, but it was challenging at best to identify how to best remediate with a community member, of subject area expertise in the space of anything around the development space, however, it was still a very deliberative conversation after a very holistic review of all 21 applications and it was a heartening opportunity that unlike the prior experience, they felt very confident in putting forward the recommendations for the funding projects.

Supervisor Scott understood that category by category consensus meetings were held, but asserted that it should be done project by project. He reiterated that if a rubric was designed in such a way that there should not be big variation between evaluators of the same project and when that variation occurred, it provided an opportunity and necessity for those evaluators to talk with each other about why they came to such variations in determination if they used the same rubric and felt there was missed opportunity when they did not go project by project.

Chair Grijalva stated that she felt the process would get better every time it was done and the feedback was helpful, but reiterated that her take was that if every individual evaluator was consistent with their scoring, the end result would be positive.

Ms. Darland provided a slideshow and stated that the evaluation panel, upon the outcomes of the scores and the discussion, decided to put forward as a recommendation for the commission, the endorsement of eight total projects, which included five for new development/rental, one for new development/home ownership, and two for existing adaptive reuse rehab. She stated that of the five, there was a total of \$4.5 million budgeted for that particular category, however within that category, they were not able to fund at 100%, the fifth project, which was only funded at \$500,000.00 versus the \$750,000.00 it had initially requested. She stated the evaluation panel had recommended that staff go back to Emery Park Place Project Development team and Family Housing Resources and Southern Arizona Land Trust and also to the El Camino Affordable Housing Development Partnership of Casa Maria and their consultant, Compass Affordable Housing and inquire with both of those project partners if they would be willing to accept an amount lesser than what they applied for, and if so, to provide in writing a guarantee that they would be able to secure additional funding that would ensure that their project would remain viable and to provide it within five business days before the recommendations went before the commission for endorsement. She added that those commitments or agreements were received in writing from both of those particular project developers and the recommendations went before the commission at their December meeting and a quorum of non-conflicted commissioners was not met so staff made several more attempts later to convene a special meeting to earn the endorsement of the commission. She stated that they were unable to reach a quorum of non-conflicted commissioners, so to ensure that other applications would not be hindered by a delay in a notice of funding award, they proceeded to publish the notice of funding award, which had led to two protests and the subsequent appeal. She added that the recommendations the Board needed to consider were the two projects in new rental development and in existing projects, that agreed to take less than what they had applied for based off of the funds available in that category. She stated that pending the decision on the appeal, if the Board took action today, it would yield in total between two fiscal year allocations of \$9.5 million, which generated a significant investment in 1,038 total units. She stated that about a year ago they worked with the commission on releasing the first RFP.

Chair Grijalva stated that there was a suggestion that the Board add \$2.1 million in order to fund some of the other projects. She asked if all those projects were ranked high enough for staff to feel comfortable moving forward with those, or with that suggestion to put more funding in, would the funding be for the last two projects, and what was the difference in amounts for those projects.

Ms. Leshar responded that \$5,750,000.00 was requested for those rental projects of which \$4.5 million was recommended. She stated that \$1 million for Rio Azul and Emery Park Place, which scored just above Rio Azul had requested \$750,000.00 and recommended at half a million, totaling \$1,250,000.00.

Chair Grijalva appreciated the suggestion since everyone was supportive of having more housing, but her concern was ensuring from administration that they currently had the capacity, and what it would look like in the future. She stated that she would be willing to consider if the Finance Department could crunch numbers or whether it was something that could be brought back if the Board moved forward with the current award recommendations and then review the potential to make the two projects that were already funded on the list to get them closer to their request.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation on the amount being requested by Mr. Davis.

Chair Grijalva commented that he recommended all the projects submitted.

Mr. Davis responded that they recommended a total of \$2.2 million be added to fund the next five projects on the list, which would be an increase of 75 units of affordable housing.

Chair Grijalva asked if the Rio Azul Project would be part of the extra five projects.

Mr. Davis responded yes.

Chair Grijalva stated that she did not feel comfortable moving in that direction only because she wanted to hear from evaluators and the committee. She stated that if there were any concerns for any of the projects because there were some other projects the last round that just missed the cut off and were not funded and were not funded this time either. She felt that there were other reasons for that, and she did not want to assume that this would fix the issue, but she tried to look at the longer term.

Mr. Davis commented that one of the concerns mentioned by Chair Grijalva was the idea that they received funding in the previous round, as did at least one other project, but that was not in the criteria the County published, whether or not previous funding was received and they would not want that to be used to either affirm or deny funding for anyone.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was highlighting the fact that the process worked last time for the two projects. She added that she knew it was revised and sometimes programs did not get funded, definitely not the full funding. She stated that she did not want to approve an additional \$2 plus million to pull in all the other projects that may or may not be as shovel ready, and she did have any recommendation for those other projects.

Supervisor Heinz stated that perhaps a modified situation could be done and instead of the \$2.2 million, fund an additional \$1.7 million and limit it to four projects that all scored sufficiently high through the vetting process that the Board set up. He stated that as mentioned by Supervisor Scott, the process could be tightened up a bit more. He stated that the inclusion of Rio Azul apartments, Barrio Anita Casitas,

Curley School Apartment, and Esperanza and Escalante Apartments would total \$1.7 million, and they scored high enough to move forward, and it increased the total number of units being built from 835 to 910. He added that it would address an incredibly important issue of the 20,000 units of affordable housing that was currently short by nearly 1,000 and he felt it needed to be done before the County no longer had the opportunity due to the State shifting costs and other looming financial concerns.

Chair Grijalva stated that there were two projects on the list of award recommendations that did not get full funding, so the amount Supervisor Heinz suggested would cover that amount. She stated that she wanted more housing and putting the money there was something the Board advocated for and she thought it was a great thing for Pima County to be a part of this process. She felt comfortable moving forward with the proposed award recommendation shown on the slide and requested that the County Administrator to go back and review those other projects for any other issues. She did not think that it was something that the Board needed to do for this meeting and thought that the Board could wait to receive additional information, but wanted to move forward with the approval of the current award recommendations. She stated that the County had other budget constraints and other things coming up that had not been approved. She wanted to ensure that the Board worked with the budget that had been anticipated and if there was a way to accommodate more housing, especially in areas in the community that desperately needed more affordable housing, she was supportive of that.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the award recommendations, as presented and request the County Administrator to come back within two weeks regarding what the potential funding of the other projects requested and for full funding of the other projects already awarded. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was happy to support the motion because he thought that the Board needed additional information from staff as to what capacity was and also additional information about all of these projects and he felt it was important to mention the two reforms that needed to be incorporated into future processes, but this was still a robust process and felt that it could be improved moving forward.

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board was not done, but she wanted to ensure that the County expend the funds that had already been allocated in the budget, and come back later with the potential to do it for shovel ready projects and if funding was available they could move forward. She added that there had been a couple on both lists that were not recommended and was still trying to figure out why and as someone who has written grants for 25 years, she knew how frustrating it could be.

Mr. Davis appreciated the analysis of the process and stated that if the County wanted to move toward with even less bias, to try the Olympic model, where the high and the low recommendations were thrown out, which would even more bias and with the reforms suggested by the Board. He thanked the Board for moving

forward with these types of projects and stated he worked behind a dais 40 years ago and there were homeless problems then and it had gotten worse. He stated that over the years elected officials talked about homelessness, and nothing was done about it, but this Board was doing something about it.

Chair Grijalva thanked Mr. Davis for his advocacy and stated that looking at funding projects that addressed the need for the most vulnerable in the community was really important and she wished they had all the money to do it.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, requested for clarification of the motion since there was a two-part vote required.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to deny the appeal by Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the FY23/24 Pima County GAP funding for Affordable Housing and Development and Preservation as recommended and endorsed by the PCRAHC, totaling \$6.875 million for 835 housing units representing new development, home ownership, and rental and preservation of existing units and at the March 5, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting, for the County Administrator to bring back for review other funding opportunities for the other projects and other feedback from staff and the PCRAHC. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott added that it would also include any budgetary information.

Chair Grijalva concurred.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

36. Constable Ethics, Standards and Training Board Recommendation

Discussion/Direction/Action: Based on the February 12, 2024 recommendation of the State of Arizona Constable Ethics, Standards and Training Board, suspend Pima County Constable Oscar Vasquez without pay or declare his office vacant and begin a process to replace him. (District 5)

Supervisor Scott stated that the Board received a report from the State Constable Ethics, Standards and Training Board (CESTB) that referenced a similar matter in Maricopa County, which included a letter sent to the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors that had been jointly signed by the Chair of the CESTB and the presiding Judge of the Maricopa County Superior Court. He asked that if the Board proceeded to move forward in a similar way to declare the office vacated, would the Board need a similar letter signed by both entities.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that he did not believe so. He stated that there were three recommendations and one was to refer the matter to the presiding Judge, so if the Board referred the matter to the presiding Judge, and the Judge made the determination to vacate the office then it would be the Board's responsibility to find a replacement.

Supervisor Scott asked if the Board decided to move forward with the recommendation from the CESTB to suspend Constable Vasquez without pay or to vacate the office, what would be the basis for appeal for either of those actions for Constable Vasquez.

Mr. Brown stated that he was not sure if there was any basis for appeal and it was something he could explore, but he believed the decision would be final.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to suspend Constable Oscar Vasquez without pay for the remainder of his current term through December 31, 2024. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva commented that it was not the Board's responsibility to evaluate the job of Constable Vasquez, but indicated Board members were required to be present and active in their jobs and if they were not actively working for three months, they would be subject to the same action.

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

Mr. Brown provided a correction to his response to one of Supervisor Scott's questions. He stated that Supervisor Scott asked who Constable Vasquez could appeal to and he thought Supervisor Scott had alluded to whether Constable Vasquez could appeal to the Board of Supervisors. He clarified that Constable Vasquez could appeal to the Superior Court.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

37. Status of Legal Asylum Seeker Program in Pima County

Update Discussion - Status of Legal Asylum Seeker Program in Pima County.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that since April 2019, the County began assisting with the issue related to Legal Asylum Seekers in the community, the County indicated it would fund this uniquely federal program as long as there were federal dollars available. She stated that Pima County nor its contractors, partners, or the individuals were the authorities that determined whether or not an individual was here legally or not and that determination was made by Customs and Border Protection (CBP). She stated that those who were brought to a County facility had been determined by CBP to be legally seeking asylum. She stated that since this time, tens of millions of dollars flowed through from the federal government through Pima County to address this issue. She stated at its last meeting, the Board considered a variety of contracts, many of which had dates that would be ending in

March or April and some through the end of the year. She clarified that at this point, the County did not have another funding opportunity or a new tranche of funding coming from the federal government. She stated that the County benefited uniquely in Arizona from the unanimous support of those from Senator Sinema, Senator Kelly, and all of the County's congressional delegation representing and working with Southern Arizona, including Congressman Ciscomani, Congressman Grijalva, Congressman Stanton and many others that worked diligently with County staff and with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and all of the Department of Homeland Security to ensure the additional dollars, but it appeared that the dollars were coming to an end and the County always indicated that this was not a responsibility of the General Fund. She stated that they asked staff what they thought it would cost, and what options there might be should the federal funding run out and the program continue. She stated the Board had been provided with the information and explained that they reviewed how they could move to other locations, or to fund on a limited basis and any way it was presented would cause a significant impact to the General Fund. She stated that without further action and direction from the Board, they worked with County partners to wind down the County's responsibility and partner participation with the program as those dollars ended and the contracts ended, which she believed would be March 31, 2024. She stated it was previously indicated they thought it could be April, but the reality was with any of these programs there were always contracts, bills, and invoices. She stated they wanted to ensure that County ended the program while there was still dollars available so that there would be no residual impact on the Pima County taxpayer. She stated that they worked with Catholic Community Services, the County's primary partner, and they were exploring other funding sources and opportunities, but they had already provided 30 days' notice to the majority of their employees to let them know that they would not be provided in this system as well. She stated that the next steps would be to continue working with the City of Tucson and all of the other jurisdictions and everyone in the community. She added that Pima County had become involved in this process a long time ago because of its concern of the impact on the community with street releases. She stated the concern has always been what happened to those individuals being released, but it was significantly important of what happened in our community if what had been in excess of 1,000 people on occasion were released at a Greyhound bus station and it was known that there would be a negative impact. She stated that she hoped to find ways in the next six weeks to address this concern which was up to the federal government to begin to look at the spigot of individuals crossing the border into the community legally through CBP. She stated this information was provided to the Board as a heads up and gave an opportunity for the Board to provide direction or additional guidance, if necessary, to indicate the County remained committed to end the program when federal funding ended.

Supervisor Scott stated that it was known that the County defeated border compromise legislation in the United States Congress, including funding to continue Pima County's system for housing and caring for Legally Processed Asylum Seekers (LPAS) when being released into the community. He asked if there were any chances through an emergency appropriation for, or any means, for Congress to act before the funding ran out at the end of next month.

Ms. Leshar responded, "Hope springs eternal" and stated that perhaps there would always be an opportunity for additional funding and that she would keep the Board posted. She stated that one of the concerns, as they discussed with staff of emergency management and the many people involved from Catholic Community Services, had been that funding was being received a month at a time and due to the numbers being brought into the community, the operation could be in excess of \$1 million per week or \$4 million per month. She stated that people would come back and say the County allocated another \$2 million and another \$1 million and with all due respect, the County certainly appreciated those dollars, but it was another week or another two months. She added that their request to the federal partners was that they determine that there would be additional funding and determine that the program be funded with some amount of time that allowed the partners and all of those involved in this operation to know that there was an opportunity for the funding to continue rather than to be piecemealed along the way.

Supervisor Scott stated that the existing system operated so that LPAS were in the County's community for no more than 48 to 72 hours. He asked what could be the estimated amount of time they would stay here if the federal government failed to continue funding.

Ms. Leshar stated she did not know the answer to that question, but would find out if there was any kind of information or data and provide a memorandum to the Board.

Supervisor Scott asked if it was possible to also receive that information from other cities or counties where they had dealt with street releases. He stated that the Greyhound bus station and other public places were where LPAS would be released. He asked if the federal government failed to continue its funding, what would the County need to do to protect public health and safety, and which County departments might be involved. He stated that he agreed with Ms. Leshar's recommendation that no local funds should be used for sheltering or caring for asylum seekers.

Ms. Leshar stated that there was some time to respond. She stated that over the weekend, Mayor Romero and the City of Tucson's staff were in touch with the Chairman and with County staff with concerns of what this impact might be within the city limits of Tucson if people were released at the Greyhound bus station. She stated that she knew the City of Tucson added an item to their study session agenda to begin to look at this, but she did not think there was an immediate answer and would be something that all of County partners representing the delegation, the State of Arizona, the impacted jurisdictions, as well as the County would all work together to find the answer. She stated that she would report back to the Board.

Supervisor Scott requested that the County's congressional representatives and representatives from the administration think about the impact this would have on the people of Pima, Cochise and Santa Cruz counties. He stated that this entire region was going to be incredibly affected by a failure of federal leadership and

hoped that that was something that they would take into consideration between now and March 31st. He stated that the County should not have to be in this position because the County had a five-year record pointed to with pride in terms of what the County had been able to do and to prevent.

Supervisor Christy stated that at the last Board meeting, Administrator Leshar had revealed that the county had taken between \$60 and \$70 million for this asylum seeking business situation over the last five years, since 2019, that Pima County was receiving an administration fee and that the Board would receive the information, but he has not received it. He stated that he viewed an interview with Chair Grijalva on a local TV station the prior day and she made a point that it really did not matter how the County got to where they were, it mattered how it was dealt with. He stated that he respectfully disagreed with her comments and felt it was important to note how the County got here today, the reason was due to the current Board majority and the prior Board majority who could not wait to get their hands on federal money to process people coming here seeking asylum. He questioned if there were concerns regarding street releases, why would the name of the facility be called Casa Alitas Welcoming Center and why would the word be spread to the world that if they came to Pima County they would be taken care of because they would be fed, clothed, medicated, housed, airline tickets paid for which made it someone else's problem in another area of the country. He stated the County was enabling the process and had quickly transformed the Juvenile Justice Center, and that the former County Administrator could not wait to transform it into the Casa Alitas Center and the County could not wait to buy the Drexel facility because they knew federal funds were coming in. He stated that for his colleague to say that was the federal government's fault, it was not, it was the County's fault because they accepted the first dollar and became an enabler and addicted to this money. He stated that the County had five years to figure out a way to deal with this, and now all of a sudden, it was staring them in the face and was a federal problem. He added that the federal problem did not shove the money down the County's throat, but the County took it and now it was paying the price. He suggested to the County Administrator that the quickest way to resolve this was to dissolve all remnants of asylum seeking in Pima County. He stated that there could be a jail or an incarceration facility. He stated that the County needed to close down the Drexel Road facility and put it up for sale and get the County's money back and liquidate everything associated with the asylum seeking mistakes that were made. He stated that it should be known to the world, in Washington, and all of the agencies to not bring people from out of the country into Pima County, because there were no services and no sheltering. He stated they needed to find another place, and they would find another place if they were not accepted here. He stated that if there were street releases and problems of a street release issue it would be on the hands of the Board majority because they should never have accepted the money in the first place.

Chair Grijalva clarified that during the interview Supervisor Christy mentioned, she had referred to when there were street releases downtown on I-10 and Broadway, that it would not matter how we got here, it was how they would solve the problem. She stated that one of the things that the Board should do, and it depended on

whether the board was interested, that a letter should be sent to all of the County partners letting them know the date that the County would have to close its doors and that the County would not be able to provide these services because there would not be any more funding for it. She added that the County should send a joint letter possibly with the cities that were going to be impacted, the mayors from the cities that were going to be impacted, the Chairs from Santa Cruz and Cochise Counties to let the Southern Arizona delegation know of what the impact was going to be. She stated that when she visited Washington D.C., she spoke at length about the impact. She stated that she was not on the Board five years ago when Casa Alitas was renovated to provide these services for asylum seekers, but she thought one of the reasons why was because the County's small communities had people that had crossed the border and had nowhere to go and hearing from Lukeville and every border community that like. She felt that Pima County stepped up and had done a really tremendous job in keeping the community safe and provided a pathway for Legal Asylum Seekers to get to their final destination. She stated that she did not feel that the County should be using its own resources that were desperately needed for County programs to fund federal programs. She stated that the County needed to figure out a way to be able to support the City of Tucson with their transition plan and be partners in any way to help support that or perhaps they wanted to utilize some of the County's spaces and did not think it should cost the County anything to go through that process.

Supervisor Christy questioned if there was potential for street releases of folks migrating and seeking asylum, would they be classified as homeless and fall under the purview of the County's homeless program that was supposed to take care of its own homeless in Pima County, or would they be integrated into that at the taxpayers' cost.

Ms. Leshar stated that at this point, that was not the plan.

Supervisor Scott supported Chair Grijalva's suggestion to draft a communication to the County's congressional representatives. He questioned who would be responsible for that or if it would be the responsibility of the County Administrator.

Chair Grijalva replied that if Administrator Leshar could draft it and she would work with her to call her colleagues in the other counties. She stated that it was important to work as collaboratively as possible with the City of Tucson because they would be the most significantly impacted and they were in the same situation as Pima County with their budget decreasing. She questioned how the County would be able to partner and provide some assistance to its nonprofit organizations. She stated that this was incredibly politically motivated, and the timing was not an accident or a coincidence, and perhaps FEMA might support the County if the crisis was unfortunately as significant as it was thought to be.

Supervisor Scott stated that he agreed regarding the timing, but felt there would be a significant impact on the County's congressional delegation if the County ensured that all Supervisors in the area of both parties were signatories to that letter, if possible.

Chair Grijalva stated that was possible, but that logistically, it might be easier to get three people to sign a letter. She stated that everyone could sign on, and there was no issue with that.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

38. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

4. Fair Horse Racing Commission

Staff recommends approval of the By-Laws adopted by the Fair Horse Racing Commission.

Supervisor Christy stated that this item did not include a red lined version of the document that showed the revisions proposed by the Fair Horse Racing Commission and there was no way of knowing what was being revised in the document or anything to compare to the new document. He asked if the item could be continued in order for the commission to provide a red lined version of the document that showed the revisions.

Chair Grijalva asked if this was for the creation of bylaws since the commission did not have any bylaws.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

Chair Grijalva clarified that there would not be a red lined version of the document since the commission had not had any bylaws.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was a new document of proposed bylaws.

Ms. Leshner responded yes. She stated that the commission created the bylaws for the operation of the commission that had not existed before and they were brought to the Board for approval.

* * *

Upon the vote for approval of the Consent Calendar, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**
 - Reappointments of Steve Foley and Scott Oldendorph. Term expirations: 3/1/28. (District 1)
 - Appointment of Alejandra Fraijo Arce, to fill a vacancy created by Corin Marron, representing Environmental Advisory Committee. Term expiration: 3/1/28. (Organizational recommendation)
2. **Community Action Agency Board**
 - Reappointment of Willie Blake. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 2)
 - Reappointment of Ana Maria Medina. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 3)
3. **Election Integrity Commission**

Reappointment of Connie Delarge. Term expiration: 5/2/26. (District 2)
4. **Fair Horse Racing Commission**

Staff recommends approval of the By-Laws adopted by the Fair Horse Racing Commission. (PULLED FOR DISCUSSION)

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

5. **Special Event**
 - Barbara J. Peck, Friends of Western Art, Inc., The Casitas at Smokey Springs, 1451 N. Smokey Springs Road, Tucson, April 20, 2024.
 - Michael J. Kwinn, Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Parish - Tucson, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, February 24 and March 22, 2024.
 - John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 20 and March 16, 2024.

TREASURER

6. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$30,701.37.
7. **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 \$77.88.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 8. Minutes: December 5, 2023
Warrants: January, 2024

* * *

39. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK