

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 5, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

1. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION

Staff requests approval of a Riparian Mitigation In-Lieu Fee Proposal in the amount of \$4,303.29 for the commercial development at 2171 W. River Road, located within Regulated Riparian Habitat classified as Important Riparian Area with Underlying Hydromesoparian Habitat. (District 1)

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 5, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Ryan Roher, Sergeant at Arms

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Clerk of the Board read submitted public comments and the statements were added to the record.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

3. Board of Supervisors Procedural Organization

A. Selection of the Chair, Vice Chair and Acting Chair.

Supervisor Scott inquired whether the appointment of Acting Chair was required.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the statute only required that a Chair be appointed. He stated that the other positions were established within the Board Rules, and were not legal requirements.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Vice Chair Bronson to select Sharon Bronson as Chair and Adelita S. Grijalva as Vice Chair. No vote was taken at this time.

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Vice Chair Bronson and Supervisor Scott withdrew their motion.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Vice Chair Bronson to select Sharon Bronson as Chair.

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

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson to select Adelita S. Grijalva as Vice Chair.

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

B. Appointment of the Clerk of the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether this appointment was for a one-year term.

Chair Bronson responded that the appointment was traditionally for a four-year term. She asked that the County Attorney provide clarification.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that there was no statutory provision for the term of the Clerk of the Board.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Chair Bronson to appoint Julie Castañeda as the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for a period of one year.

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

C. Appointment of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Chair Bronson inquired whether Sheriff Nanos had conveyed his preference for the appointment.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that he had not received any notification regarding the Sheriff's preference.

Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board, also responded that the Sheriff had not provided a recommendation.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to appoint Sgt. Ryan Rohr as Sergeant-at-Arms for the Board of Supervisors for the period of one year and ask that Sheriff Nanos confirm that appointment. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that the Sheriff consider expanding the diversity of the person representing the Sheriff's Department in the position of Sergeant-at-Arms.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

4. Petitions for Redemption of Property Tax Exemption Waiver

Staff recommends approval of the petitions for redemption of property tax exemption waivers.

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

5. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Wat Lao Buddharam of Tucson, a.k.a. Wat Buddhasamakhiram of Tucson, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of Real Property taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax year 2019, for Parcel No. 130-05-6460.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

6. Final Plat With Assurances

P20FP00008, Whetstones Shadows II, Lots 27-43. (District 4)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve P20FP00008.

HUMAN RESOURCES

7. The Board of Supervisors on November 10, 2020, continued the following:

Modifications to Administrative Procedure 23-32

Staff requests approval of the modifications to Administrative Procedure 23-32, Meet and Confer Process, to reflect prior version, dated March 6, 2019.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott to continue this item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 19, 2021.

Chair Bronson seconded the motion and offered a friendly amendment that the continuation date be February 2, 2021, to allow the new Board members additional time to examine the item.

Supervisor Scott accepted the friendly amendment to the motion. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that additional information, comments and suggestions be provided by Administration for the Board's consideration.

Supervisor Heinz asked that background information be provided with regards to the proposed amendments and what prompted those changes.

Supervisor Christy asked the County Administrator to provide an overview.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, explained that the current modification was presented to the Board without input from County Administration or County Management, which was a violation of the procedure. He added that the time period provided for Administration to provide a response was also limited. He stated that the discussions that were conducted were not productive and a Meet and Confer Agreement was not reached. He recommended that the language be reverted back to the previous version to insure that the changes requested be resubmitted in accordance with the procedure.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether continuing the item would cause any issues. He also asked how Administration felt the issue should be resolved.

Mr. Huckelberry indicated that there was no urgency in resolving the matter. He stated that it set the parameters for entering into the next discussion with American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees to reach a Meet and Confer Agreement. He indicated that staff would provide an outline detailing the difficulties that occurred in reaching an agreement.

Supervisor Scott directed staff to provide a memorandum to the Board outlining the Administration's position on the matter.

Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of February 2, 2021.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

8. Hearing - Concurrent Plan Amendment and Rezoning

P20CR00003, SUKI INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. - W. MAGEE ROAD CONCURRENT PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING

Suki Investment Group, L.L.C., represented by Craig Courtney, requests a Concurrent Plan Amendment and Rezoning to amend the comprehensive plan from the Medium Intensity Urban (MIU) to the Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) designation and to rezone from the TR (Transitional) to the CB-2 (General Business) zone on approximately .88 acres, Parcel No. 225-44-5770, located at the northwest corner of W. Magee Road and N. La Cholla Boulevard, in Section 33, T12S, R13E, in the Tortolita Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Bain and Hook were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

Completion of the following requirements within five years from the date the rezoning request is approved by the Board of Supervisors:

1. The property owner shall not further lot split or subdivide residential property without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
 - A. Adherence to a development agreement for assessment and payment of all non-residential impact fees.
 - B. ~~Traffic Impact Study will be required if there is a substantial change that results in an increase in the buildable square footage over the current approved Preliminary Development Plan for Lot 5, or there is not a sufficient reduction in the approved buildable area to accommodate a more intense parking use so as not to exceed the allowable building area under the current rezoning, based on a combined Development Plan for the subject property and the remnant parcel. Any Traffic Impact Study, whether it contains any portion of the Magee Center properties, including one from the adjacent development utilizing the Magee Center access point on Magee Road, that determines off-site improvements are necessary, will not be the responsibility of the Owner(s)/Developer of any Magee Center properties. A traffic impact study will be required at time of development or building plan submittal to determine if mitigation is needed. Any mitigation required by the Traffic Impact Study for higher trip generating uses such as drive thru restaurants, convenience store and gasoline station will be the responsibility of the Owner(s)/Developer of any Magee Center properties.~~
 - C. Access and maintenance agreements shall be required between the rezoning and adjacent properties.
 - D. No additional access to Magee Road is allowed from the site.
3. Flood Control condition: A drainage plan requiring on site detention and first flush retention for Lots 5 and 6 shall be designed and approved by Pima County Regional Flood Control District to mitigate the 100 year peak discharge.
4. Wastewater conditions:
 - A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the plan amendment/rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.
 - B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the plan amendment/rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and / or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
 - C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the plan amendment/rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
 - D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the plan amendment/rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
 - E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the plan amendment/rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

- F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the plan amendment/rezoning area.
5. Environmental Planning conditions: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
 6. In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State Laws ARS 41-865 and/or A.R.S. §41-844 require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for the repatriation and reburial of the remains by cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
 7. Lot 5 and 6 shall be developed as an integrated site and subject to general adherence to the preliminary development plan for Lot 5 from Resolution No. 2020-061 as approved at public hearing.
 8. Less restrictive rezoning applications may not be submitted under the approved comprehensive plan designation. A separate comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning are required for less restrictive zoning.
 9. The use of the property is limited to restaurants with or without a bar and CB-1 zone uses except for automotive related uses other than retail sales and fueling bays, and stand-alone bars.
 10. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
 11. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, Chapter 8, Article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. §12-1134(I)."

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak in opposition to the item were submitted. None had been received.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson to close the public hearing and approve P20CR00003, subject to standard and special conditions. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott commented that the request was for the property to be rezoned in order to match the adjoining property and the conditions required that a traffic impact study be completed.

Chair Bronson indicated that due to several rezonings in the area, a traffic impact study was needed.

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

9. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 1, Co9-99-43, Rivroad Associates, L.L.C. - River Road Rezoning. Owners: Underdown Gary Revoc. Trust, et al. (District 3)

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak in opposition to the item were submitted. None had been received. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution.

TRANSPORTATION

10. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 1, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating parking on Vahalla Road in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak in opposition to the item were submitted. None were received. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

11. Multijurisdictional COVID Meeting

Discussion/possible action. Schedule meeting in January 2021 of the Board of Supervisors with the Mayors and Councils of the Cities of Tucson and South Tucson and the Towns of Oro Valley, Sahuarita and Marana to discuss coordination of COVID-19 pandemic response issues including but not limited to vaccine rollout, testing, mask usage, curfew, evictions, business restrictions, etc. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that the County should engage with other municipalities to discuss and coordinate COVID-19 pandemic response issues. She stated that this was a good opportunity to engage the City of Tucson and South Tucson as well as other municipalities. She stated that Administration would be asked to reach out to the Mayor's offices to coordinate joint meetings.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to direct Administration to coordinate a joint meeting with the City of Tucson, Mayor and Council Office, and to coordinate joint meetings with the City of South Tucson and the Towns of Oro Valley, Sahuarita and Marana. No vote was taken at this time.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that the process currently being utilized was a weekly meeting with Managers, which was followed by a Mayors meeting. He stated that he would discuss this matter with the Mayors and how they would like to coordinate a joint meeting, to include the Clerk Offices to ensure adherence to open meeting laws.

Chair Bronson asked that the County Administrator provide Board members with a memorandum detailing the results of the meeting.

Supervisor Scott commented that the intent was to promote regional dialogue and collaboration with jurisdictions on significant issues.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Updates and Action on COVID-19

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item. Verbatim was necessary due to the nature and evolving circumstance related to COVID-19.)

13. Contract

County Administrator Employment Contract, 2021 through 2025. Discussion/Action.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to deny the renewal and extension of the County Administrator's Employment Contract, effective immediately. The motion died for a lack of a second.

It was then moved by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 19, 2021, to allow the time required to agendaize an Executive Session and properly notice the employee and to extend the current contract until that time. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy expressed concerns with conducting contract discussions in Executive Session and urged the Board to conduct these discussions in a public forum.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that the intent of the Executive Session was to discuss the contract's legal terms and requirements with counsel.

Supervisor Christy requested that the County Attorney provide an opinion regarding the legitimacy of discussing this contract during an Executive Session.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that it was appropriate for legal questions, regarding the terms of the contract, to be discussed either in a public forum or Executive Session. He explained that there was a statutory provision allowing for personnel related discussions to occur in Executive Session, provided that the employee was properly noticed.

Supervisor Christy inquired of Chair Bronson whether previous Boards had conducted executive sessions with regard to the County Administrator's contract or whether that discussion took place in public.

Chair Bronson responded that both circumstances had occurred.

Supervisor Heinz expressed concern that two weeks was not an adequate time frame for new Board members to make an informed determination.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Heinz to approve a twelve-month extension of Mr. Huckelberry's current contract, under the current terms, with the provisions that the annual salary remain unchanged at \$302,000.00 and a formal and comprehensive evaluation of the current state of County government be conducted by a third party, including written feedback from multiple stakeholders. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Supervisor Scott questioned what annual performance review document was currently being used to evaluate the County Administrator.

Chair Bronson stated that there was no formal evaluation of the County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy also commented that he had not seen or discussed a performance evaluation during his term.

Supervisor Heinz commented about the lack of a comprehensive evaluation on the effectiveness or efficiency of Pima County and its executive leadership. He added that an assessment was needed.

Supervisor Heinz offered a friendly amendment to increase the length of the continuance to twelve months and maintain the County Administrator's annual salary at the amount of \$302,000.00.

Supervisor Grijalva declined the friendly amendment to her motion.

Supervisor Scott commented that although the contract would be discussed in Executive Session, it would ultimately be discussed in regular session as well.

Supervisor Christy maintained that given the nature of the contract, the amount of the contract and the tenure of the County Administrator, engaging in Executive Session discussion on Mr. Huckelberry's contract would give the appearance of secrecy and he urged the Board to conduct all discussions in a public forum.

Supervisor Heinz concurred that all discussion should be held in a public forum.

Supervisor Scott asked for clarification on the types of contract related issues that were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session and those items that were not.

Mr. Flagg responded that a discussion of whether certain terms were legally required or could be negotiated was appropriate for Executive Session, but terms that were advantageous to the County from a policy perspective would be outside the scope of the legal advice portion of the executive session statutes. He also stated that the personnel provision allowed for discussion of personnel related issues that were not associated with legal issues.

Supervisor Heinz inquired whether the purpose of the two-week continuance was strictly to allow for Executive Session or whether Board Members were expected to complete the research necessary to make a well informed decision.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that the two-week time frame was to enable proper notice of an intended Executive Session for the purpose of discussing legal questions with counsel.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Christy and Heinz voted "Nay."

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

14. Sahuarita Mission Apartments

Staff recommends approval of the following related to the transfer of the Sahuarita Mission Apartments and County legal agreements securing HUD funds provided by the County:

- Assignment, Assumption and Modification of Loan Documents
- Subordination Agreement
- Amendment No. 1 to the Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

15. City of South Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for management and implementation of the Community Development Block Grant Program and extend contract term to 9/30/21, no cost (CT-CR-21-231)

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

GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

16. Ha:sañ Educational Services, to provide for the Grant-in-Aid Indian Gaming Revenue Funding Agreement, Tohono O'odham Nation 12% Gaming Revenue Sharing Grant Fund, contract amount \$75,000.01 (CT-GMI-21-275)

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

17. Homicide Survivors, Inc., to provide for the Grant-in-Aid Indian Gaming Revenue Funding Agreement, Tohono O'odham Nation 12% Gaming Revenue Sharing Grant Fund, contract amount \$75,000.00 (CT-GMI-21-276)

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

PROCUREMENT

18. Davis Vision, Inc., to provide for the employee prepaid vision plan, Employee Contributions Fund, contract amount \$470,000.00 (MA-PO-21-103) Human Resources

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

19. **Acceptance - Transportation**

City of Tucson, to provide for the Pima County Bus Stop Improvement Program, \$200,000.00/\$50,000.00 General Fund Match/2 year term (GTAW 21-79)

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

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

Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Housing Trust Fund - Rental/Eviction Prevention Assistance Program and extend grant term to 3/31/21, \$360,000.00 (GTAM 21-63)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

21. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

1. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-16-335, Amendment No. 7, NetApp, Inc., CDW Government, L.L.C., Custom Storage, Inc., d.b.a. CStor, DLT Solutions, L.L.C., d.b.a. DLT Solutions, EPlus Group, Inc., d.b.a. EPlus Group, Inc., Insight Public Sector, Inc. and World Wide Technology, L.L.C., to provide for NetApp computer storage hardware and support. This amendment extends the termination date to 7/31/21 and adds a shared one-time increase of \$153,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$831,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.
2. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-20-56, Amendment No. 2, McKesson Medical-Surgical Government Solutions, L.L.C., to provide for medical supplies. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$250,000.00 from \$250,000.00 to \$500,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,250,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Health.
3. **Award**
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-21-118, Synagro of California, L.L.C., to provide for biosolids land application management services. This Master Agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual not-to-exceed amount of \$2,192,190.00 and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Wastewater Enterprise Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.
4. Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C., to provide for carrier and broadband services, Telecom Internal Service Fund, contract amount \$1,500,000.00 (MA-PO-21-58) Information Technology

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

5. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Program, \$37,200.00 (GTAM 21-60)
6. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**
Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs, to provide for the FFY 2020 Emergency Management Performance Grant, \$597,291.47/\$597,291.47 General Fund Match (GTAW 21-98)
7. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Women, Infants and Children and Breastfeeding Peer Counseling Programs, amend grant language and scope of work, \$149,625.00 (GTAM 21-61)
8. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Oversight Council on Driving or Operating Under the Influence Abatement, Amendment No. 1, to provide for DUI enforcement and extend grant term to 6/30/21, \$80,000.00 (GTAM 21-64)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

9. **Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**
Reappointment of Geoffrey Ellwand. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 3)
10. **Workforce Investment Board**
Change category appointment of Abra McAndrew from representing Governmental, Economic and Community Development (GECD); WIOA Title I - Adults, Dislocated Workers and Youth to representing Education and Training; Higher Education.

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

11. **Temporary Extension**
 - 06100203, Randy D. Nations, Hot Rods Old Vail, 10500 E. Old Vail Road, Tucson, January 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, February 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, March 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28, 2021
 - 12103183, Samuel William Fox, Wildflower Grill, L.L.C., 7037 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, December 11, 2020 through May 31, 2021.

- 12103862, Thomas Robert Aguilera, Ginza Sushi, 5425 N. Kolb Road, No. 115, Tucson, December 20, 2020 through September 20, 2021.
- 12104138, Scott Bradley Mencke, Boss Swell, L.L.C., d.b.a. Fini's Landing, 5689 N. Swan Road, Tucson, December 20, 2020 through April 30, 2021.

ELECTIONS

12. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Barbara J. Hernandez-069-REP; Dianna Patrick-187-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Ronald J. Conn-048-REP; Laura A. Cortez-Estrada-084-REP; Kevin W. Oberg-099-REP; Nancy Oberg-099-REP; Thomas A. Woodrow-105-REP; Frank J. Giunta-163-REP; Thomas R. Cotton-214-REP

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

13. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

American Tire Distributors, Inc. \$1,766.14; FPG Arizona, L.L.C. \$13,000.00; Arizona Board of Regents \$25,989.83; Arizona Board of Regents \$8,079.76; Arizona Board of Regents \$6,194.68; Arizona Board of Regents \$12,675.55; Arizona Board of Regents \$8,847.78; Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. \$934.17; Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. \$800.00; Dell Marketing, L.P. \$65,143.89; Southwest Human Development, Inc. \$231.56; Solis Engineering Co., L.L.C. \$35,430.73; Solis Engineering Co., L.L.C. \$18,484.53; Yolanda Solis \$2,800.00; Metro Water District \$3,095.03; Arizona Machinery, L.L.C. \$4,149.89; J & J, Inc. \$7,575.00; Mark Kaufman \$1,450.00.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

14. Minutes: November 17, December 1 and 4, 2020
 Warrants: December, 2020

* * *

22. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Updates and Action on COVID-19

(Clerk's Note: Due to technical difficulties, not all comments were fully audible.)

Verbatim

SB: Chair Bronson
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
SC: Supervisor Christy
MH: Supervisor Heinz
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
RS: Supervisor Scott

SB: Moving on to Item No. 4, Updates and Action on COVID. Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Madam Chair and Members, I did send you a communication on December 31st, that basically outlined through, I think, six pages some various issues that we are dealing with. I am not going to basically revisit that, unless you would like me to in specific areas. What we have learned even today, is that through the first four days of January, we are at approximately 6,100 case infections, just in the first four days. That is significant. One of those days was on January 3rd, where we actually had 2,214 cases reported, the highest daily count we have had during the pandemic. Those numbers will vary, as I said in the memorandum. They get adjusted back on a weekly basis and then they get readjusted again by the State. Following our numbers, which are reported every day, you will see a slight difference from the State numbers. We do produce a G.I.S. map that has more red on it today than it has had in a long time and it is the weekly count of infections that occur within the region. Every infection has basically an identifier, which is an address and they can then be plotted geographically within the region, and so we have a fairly good idea. We have been doing that kind of plotting since the entire pandemic. We have a weekly snapshot of what is occurring. This particular week's snapshot that ended on January the 2nd, which was a Saturday, we had about 4,600 infections. That was the highest it has ever been in a particular week. It has been kind of bouncing back and forth the last three or four weeks between about 3,500 and now this 4,500. Deaths are sporadically reported, simply because it is the State reporting through the death certificate process. Today we have 53 deaths reported. So that is kind of the state of where we are. We also produce a graph that talks about rolling seven-day average infections per 100,000 people. It is that little graph that I think we attached to our memorandum that talks about it has probably never been higher than it is now. We have also provided some information on what we call medical or hospital capacity, and that is also provided in a snapshot. We can provide much more detail with the daily reports that come out of the Health Department through

the surveys of all the hospitals. We can obviously attach the Board to that distribution, so that is an easy thing. I would ask that you, as much as possible not widely distribute that. The hospital is a little sensitive about the distribution of that information. But it gives you a good idea of where we stand in capacity and basically for about the last week or maybe more, we have very little, if any capacity in the medical system that is existing. I have also talked about contact tracing and as you know, we contact trace every case. If we can get people to answer the phone, we will go through a series of questions about where they have been and contact tracing is really trying to isolate individuals who may be infected, who may have been in contact with an individual and keep them from spreading the virus. That information is fairly self-evident. What I would like to do is spend a little bit of time on vaccination, because I think that is the phase that we are actually starting to move into fairly aggressively with our public health agency. If you look at the vaccination process to date, it has been concentrated on what they call the 1A groups and the 1A groups are those medical providers, hospitals, folks in direct care of COVID patients. It has now gone through the process to where it is evolving down into the secondary care areas, et cetera. Our estimate, where there are 67,000 or 68,000 qualified healthcare workers, we hope to be through that process by the 12th of January and then we can move into what we call phase 1B. Phase 1B is teachers, essential workers, and those are the type of first responders that we see out there. They will all be in phase 1B, all the essential workers, as well as the individuals who are over the age 75. When you add that group together, along with 1A, you have about 200,000 plus people who are eligible for vaccination. Then we look at what we have been actually able to accomplish. To date, and it depends whose data you look at, from last night, we have about 18,000 vaccinations that have been placed in arms. The State actually reports that as 18,700. We think the difference is that independent of our actions where we have stood up the points of dispensing at Tucson Medical Center and Banner, there is also CVS and Walgreens pharmacies going now to long-term care facilities and assisted living facilities to provide those vaccinations. So that is in process as well. As we move further and, again, we hope to be through 1A by the 12th to the 15th of January, if you look at our vaccination rate, and the State just put up a new web page yesterday or the day before, that talks about the number of vaccinations given per 100,000 population in each County in Arizona. So far, Pima County leads the pack by basically having, the way I looked at it, about 1,700 or 1,800 per 100,000. We still need to proceed and move quickly. We are also talking now with our public health agencies and others about standing up, what we would call, five Regional Vaccination Centers. Those are in locations where the model that we visited yesterday, which is initially set up for the healthcare workers at TMC, is a drive-thru model. You are required to have a very large parking lot because you have to register, you have to inoculate and you have to monitor. That means people stay in that process about 15 to 25 minutes, depending on how long it takes on the front end, before they are released and we ensure there is no adverse reaction to the vaccination. We will probably look at setting up four additional centers, obviously, keeping TMC, and Banner is another center. Those are the kind of hospital-based centers. We will be looking at the drive thru models at the Rillito

Racetrack and at Kino Stadium on the South. We were in direct conversation this morning, I was, with the City Manager about the Tucson Convention Center. In addition to that, we will be looking, and we have had conversations that have been successful, with the University of Arizona, and actually all of their employees and students and the surrounding communities, to where those surrounding communities near the University could also gain access to that center. That is basically our report. What our goal is, is to basically have sufficient vaccination capacity to outstrip the supply. Simply meaning, that we do not want vaccines sitting around in freezers or refrigerators. We want to get them in their arms. If you look at the task that is ahead of us, we are a community of 1,100,000 people. If you assume there are about 200,000 under the age of 18, which at this point are not eligible, there will be another 20% of the eligible that frankly will not want to have a vaccine, so that leaves us at about having to vaccinate 640,000 people. That then puts us, probably, into June. The concept to get through 1A and 1B is to try to get all of those done, and remember, if you add them all together, it is over 200,000, by about the end of March. We think that is feasible. It is a logistics issue. Putting the shot in the arm is not the difficult part. It is registration, preregistration, follow-up, identification, monitoring and all the logistics that goes to getting the people to the right spot at the right time. So with that, let me answer any questions you might have.

SB: This is Chair Bronson. We are looking at 1A, 1B and a June time frame to get just the 1A and 1B. Is that correct?

CH: Chair Bronson, I think that our estimate is that we can get 1A and 1B by March 31st.

SB: 1A and 1B and then it is the rest of the population by June?

CH: Correct.

SB: And how are we paying for it?

CH: At this point, we are hoping and anticipating that the new Federal CARES Act, which identifies specifically both testing and vaccination as an eligible expense, that we will be reimbursed. Until we receive allocations from that, we are basically pledging our General Fund assets or our General Fund fund balance. It should be, I think, fairly obvious that those who are doing the work need to be reimbursed. We anticipate that happening. We cannot tell you time frame. We cannot tell you the allocation. The law that was recently passed and signed into law by the President contains 1,500 pages. We found a few pages where it says local governments are eligible to be reimbursed for those continuing expenses. I should say that given the state of the pandemic, where we are right now, those expenses are accelerating. When I talk about 6,000 plus infections in four days in January, it compares with the very first month where we had about 170 infections. So you can imagine the magnitude that we are doing with regard to testing. We have not slowed testing down at all.

We continue at a very rapid rate and have opened more centers for testing and will continue to do that. I think our goal is to make sure that in the vaccination process, we have enough vaccination capacity and logistic capacity with the vaccine, to basically outstrip the supply of vaccine that is distributed from the State.

SC: Madam Chair? This is Supervisor Christy.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Two questions, Mr. Huckelberry. First, how will the general public know and how will they know how to deal with, getting the vaccination, once 1A and 1B have been accomplished? What is the process where the public will have access to that completion date and how then, at that point, can they receive the vaccination and who will be receiving vaccination?

CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Christy, there will be, obviously, a series of and multiple communications issued by the public health agency and others with regard to organization, how basically to gain access. That is one of the logistics problems we are working out right now. We do not have all those answers. The key is, and we also understand that there may be some individuals who do not have access to a computer to get into a portal to get registered. We are making provisions for that with regard to having, just like we did in testing, a line for a manual setup to where someone else who is in our staff will be actually registering those folks as they come in. It happens today. It happened yesterday at Tucson Medical Center, where an individual just got in the queue. Was not really registered. Did not know how to register. They were then pulled over into another line and registered and then received a vaccination. I think through a series of combination of communications. As we get through 1A, we will be through about, we will say, 60,000 inoculations and then the second dose on top of that. CVS and Walgreens will probably run 20,000 as it goes to the long-term care centers. The difficulty with some of the long-term care centers and assisted living is that the State indicated to those centers, they needed to register. A fairly significant portion of them did not register, so we are now backpedaling and getting them back into the system to get registered and to get vaccinated. It is almost a day-to-day process.

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: My second question. You have indicated that the General Fund will be subsidizing a certain amount of expenses related to the vaccinating and the tracing and other elements of the pandemic. The first part of the question is: What do you predict will be the impact on the General Fund, as far as a dollar amount? Second of all: How long do you think that dollar amount depletion will remain? Third is: How will the impacting of the General Fund affect other projects or issues that we have already established as objectives by using the

General Fund money? How is this going to affect the future projects that are in line with monies represented?

- CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Christy, I indicated in the memo that our public health agency has said that if they keep it up at the same pace, with the largest expenses being related to testing, contact tracing and vaccination, that they estimate it could be as much as another \$55 million between January 1st and June 30th. That is then this fiscal year. That would pretty much, if not reimbursed, that would pretty much exhaust what we call the General Fund's fund balance that was carried over from the previous year and we know that that is about \$90 million. If you take 55 off of it and then you basically look at other areas of expenses, you can see that it will be a difficult year for General Fund departments in the coming budget, if we are not reimbursed. At this point, it is hard to say when and how much we will be reimbursed, but the moment that we know that, through either distribution from the agencies that are Federal agencies holding these funds, we will obviously let the Board know immediately to determine if we need to take any budget control measures in order to retain a balanced budget.
- SC: Finally, Madam Chair, just one follow-up question. Mr. Huckelberry, do you foresee any immediate impact on any kind of items scheduled for the General Fund money as a result of this?
- CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Christy, I do not, and the reason is, is simply because we carried over another \$20 million from the previous year. I have great faith that we will be reimbursed some portion of that \$55 million and if we are, it is unlikely it will have a huge impact on the General Fund in the coming budget year 21-22. Where the problem will be is in the following budget year, because, again, you are spending one-time monies and if you continue the same pace of spending in the public health agency, you will run out of the one-time monies in the fund balance and have to either cut the budget accordingly or raise taxes accordingly.
- SC: That is my concern, is that the alternative, I am hoping will not be that because of this depletion in the General Fund, that the Administration will find it necessary to impose or raise some sort of tax to make up the difference. We can live within our means and not have to rely on any kind of additional tax. Your comments?
- CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Christy, we have begun the budget process. I had the first meeting yesterday. It is structured such that it complies with the Board's policy on PAYGO funding and further reduces the tax rates and the primary and secondary debt service. We are anticipating that we will be reimbursed those funds and that the same policies that have been adopted by the Board will carry forward with regard to the budget.
- SC: Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Supervisor Christy, no further questions?

SC: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

SB: You are welcome. Any other questions from Board Members?

MH: Yes. Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Heinz, I think.

MH: Yes. Mr. Huckelberry, you have spoken about this just a little bit in response to Supervisor Christy's questions. Do we have any idea at all, in terms of the anticipated funding support for the 9 [Inaudible] dollar most recent federal assistance package was adopted and signed? I believe there was a twenty [Inaudible] point 4 billion [Inaudible] look like it [Inaudible] supposed to be to assist local jurisdictions with the, to compensate for [Inaudible] of that would be [Inaudible]

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, before you answer, there seems to be some problem with Supervisor Heinz's speaking. He is getting a lot of background noise.

CH: Supervisor Heinz, I think I got about every other word. You were kind of cutting in and out, but I think your question was, "What do we anticipate the most recent allocations, which had billions of dollars identified for vaccines and contact tracing, as well as testing." We do not know. We know that we just got a couple yesterday. Advisories. They have been sent over to our Grants Management and Innovation Department to try to digest where we might fall out with regard to reimbursements from those categories. I think one of the points I wanted to make in my update memorandum to the Board on December the 31st, is that it is the public health agencies of this country that are bearing the burden of all of the, we will say, responses that are related to public health. That means testing, contact tracing and now vaccination and that is universal throughout this country. If you look at public health agencies by county, 93% of the population of this country is in a community that is greater than 500,000. It falls to the public health agencies. We are confident and hopeful and pointed out to our representatives on the federal side that it is the counties who bear these responsibilities and therefore we need to have that appropriate consideration when the money is distributed in the second CARES Act.

MH: Thank you.

SB: Any other questions, Supervisor Heinz?

AG: Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

- AG: I am looking at the map that indicates by zip code and region. We have all the little red dots and then we have the blue ones indicating where we have more than five cases. The vast majority of the really red highlighted areas are in District 5 and District 2. I am wondering, as we do this rollout and as we look at where we are going to have these sites, where the outreach is going to go, I am going to be asking for a lot of cooperation with Spanish language media, with the television, with press releases. All of that to insure that the communities that are the hardest [Inaudible] are getting the information and I do not want us to assume that everybody has access to the internet. That they have access to social media to get the information out. When we are doing these public notices, how are we going to be getting in touch with the communities that may not have the same kind of access to internet or social media, that are really adversely affected at this point? Based on...
- CH: Supervisor Bronson, or Chair Bronson and Supervisor Grijalva, we have, we will use the same action that we took in trying to basically get the word widely distributed to the community and to the Hispanic community with regard to the prevention measures, the mask. We will go through, and we have enough funding left such that we can, in fact, have a public campaign for that, the similar way we did the last time with Spanish language radio, with magazines, with media. I think it will be the same approach trying to reach the entire community.
- AG: I also think that outreach, just with the news. It does not have to be a cost for the County, but working with our churches and neighborhood associations and everybody has their own list serve to make sure that we get information out in a timely manner. Many people that I know, reach out to me personally on social media, on email, or text to say, and these are people that I think are fairly knowledgeable and kind of in touch, to say, "Where is it that I go to get tested if I am not feeling great?" I do not think that it is as wide spread, especially to be looking at the map in District 5 and in District 2, just because we have a concentration of a lot of positives. If these [Inaudible] really [Inaudible] in delivering those [Inaudible] and try to come up with some additional options, not to say that what we did before [Inaudible] we could continue to add more.
- CH: I think that is fine and we are open to basically any suggestions.
- SC: Madam Chair? Follow-up. Supervisor Christy here.
- SB: Proceed.
- SC: Regarding comments by Supervisor Grijalva, we have concerns in our District with the very vulnerable community in Green Valley. They have, as we know, closed down the Health Department office in Green Valley. There is a great deal of concern that folks down there, in order to be tested or vaccinated, would have to travel great distances. They actually feel they are kind of isolated in an island of non-attention and I understand that there are situations where distributing the vaccine requires [Inaudible] but nonetheless, the Green

Valley community is a large community. They are at-risk. They are vulnerable. I would certainly hope that they are on the front burner for testing and for vaccine rollout and that there are opportunities space-wise, facilities-wise to accommodate that situation. I want to make sure that they are represented and heard just as much as any other group is heard, particularly seeing as how COVID strikes lethally in that age group that is very predominant in Green Valley. Thank you.

- CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Christy, we are in conversation with the CVS's and the Walgreen's in Green Valley to talk about their continued participation after they do the vaccinations of the long-term care facilities and we are also looking for a site in Green Valley for a smaller, what we call, point of dispensing. We are doing that in all of the smaller rural communities that exist within the County, such as Lakeside, Arivaca, Ajo, Three Points and the rest. We know that we have a large urban population but we also know we have to serve a more remote or rural population.
- SC: A follow-up to that Madam Chair. Mr. Huckelberry, there are, as has been noted in recent articles, particularly the Green Valley news, that there is a significant amount of retired LPN or registered nurses and even active ones who are there living in the community that are very eager to help, in any kind of way, with the dispensation of the vaccine. I think we have a lot of resources down there that we could easily use with minimal expense to deliver the vaccine in a very efficient manner. I am glad to hear that you are in contact with those entities, but remember that the Green Valley folks are very concerned with this issue and are most willing to agree to do anything they can to cooperate with the County on that particular level.
- CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Christy, we saw the article in the Green Valley News and we will basically be talking to the Green Valley News with some more information about having all of those individuals who think they are qualified and able to help, sign up for our medical reserve corps. That is how we are staffing some of the actual sites now, through the medical reserve corps of the County.
- SC: I think that is terrific. I think it will be a source of relief and gratefulness on the community of Green Valley for that effort. Thank you.
- SB: Any other questions from Board Members?
- RS: Supervisor Bronson?
- SB: Supervisor Scott.
- RS: Mr. Huckelberry, in your memorandum, you recommended that the stay-at-home order for nonessential employees be ended on, I believe, January 11th. I have a few questions associated with that. First of all, just for my own knowledge and edification, there are different types of leave that employees

can use when they have to comply with the stay-at-home order. What is pandemic leave and when can an employee exercise pandemic leave?

CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Scott, there are several types of leave. The County, at the onset of the pandemic, granted what we call County Pandemic Leave. That was 80 hours of leave. That was soon followed by Federal legislation that added another 80 hours of leave for pandemic purposes, to be potentially reimbursed by the Federal Government if spent by a local government in a stay-at-home order of the Governor or the Nation. That was to cover the Governor's stay-at-home order. In addition, there had been another 12 weeks of leave that could have been taken, or can be taken, by employees who are providing child care or if, in fact, the school is not in session and the children are required to be at home. That leave is available. Then County employees have standard accrual rates of both sick leave and vacation leave and that leave is also available for those purposes. I just looked at our most recent stay-at-home order, or stay-at-home plan. Not an order, because it cannot be an order. We had, I think, about 20 employees out on what we call furlough. Furlough was the process by which they could then apply for unemployment insurance, and that is out of almost 7,000 employees. We have, during the plan, we also allowed, and the Board allowed, expansion of the telework process. We increased the number of teleworkers by about 140-150. It may go up a little bit more. That teleworking is really at the discretion of the Department Head. I do not really have anything to do with it. It is that process that is how you get leave. You can actually have telework at home, and then we have, again, part of the difficulty is, we need to recognize that there are a number of jobs that cannot be done teleworking. The biggest impact is where we have transportation workers, wastewater workers, providing direct utility services or road repair. We have to staff and man the Adult Detention Center with our correction officers. Our law enforcement officers do not get to telework. We typically, at any one time, have about, I would say, anywhere from, I think during the peak of the pandemic, when we were, back when the stay-at-home orders, we had maybe 1,500 employees teleworking. We now have probably in the range of 900.

RS: A follow-up question, Mr. Huckelberry. Is it reasonable to assume that those 20 workers who had to go on furlough are the only County employees who have not been able to be paid during this time or is there another way of sharing the number of employees who actually have not been paid?

CH: Madam Chair and Supervisor Scott, I can provide that information to you by department and you will see the largest department affected is the library system. That is because the library is closed. As we reopen libraries, we will be reopening libraries in a more controlled manner. When the stay-at-home plan ends, I expect those to basically come off furlough. It is not as if we are going to open up the libraries immediately. What we will do is do more library work associated with book pickup and other items. The unfortunate part is that we still cannot open up the libraries, or we probably will not open up the

libraries for any computer work. That is unfortunate, but we find now that a lot of our library traffic is to come in and use our computer systems.

RS: Thank you very much. I would like to know, through a memorandum to the Board, the number of employees per department who have not been paid because they have exhausted leave or for other reasons. Given that the stay-at-home plan ends on Monday, could we also include in that memorandum, Mr. Huckelberry, two other reports? Number 1: How many people per department are eligible for telecommuting and have requested permission to do so? In other words, eligible and also actually taking part. Then the third item would be: What safety measures are being put in place per department so that both essential and nonessential workers can feel that they are being reasonably protected while they are in the workplace?

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Scott. I just need to ask everybody who is not speaking to mute, please and that includes Dr. Garcia, our Clerk of the Board, Alexander and Jan Leshner. You are all unmuted and that is what is causing a lot of the echo. Mr. Huckelberry, do you want to comment?

CH: Sure. Madam Chair and Supervisor Scott, we can provide you a list of all the departments and the employees that have been on furlough and the number of furlough in the past, versus just this last period. That is one set of data we can provide you. We can provide you with every department and the number of people in that department who are teleworking today. We can also probably estimate the number that might be able to, but not, because some of the teleworking is sporadic, meaning, it is in two days and gone three days. So we will try to break that out for you as well. The third request was for what safety measures and we can go through the safety measures that are standard procedures in the County that says wearing a mask in common areas of buildings, ensuring that we have the proper or greater than 6 feet separation and even when we are in the building, to be kind of in your own space area as opposed to others. We have more frequent disinfection requirements that are imposed on departments. Those protective measures are all pretty outlined specifically. We have, from time to time, received complaints from employees and departments that some employees are complying and some are not. We follow up with all of those to try and ensure compliance. I also sent the Board, and I can send this weekly if you would like, the number of new infections per department. That will tell you where infections are occurring within the County organization. The most recent one I sent to you indicated that 40% of our total infections over the entire pandemic time frame have occurred in the Sheriff's Department.

RS: Thank you very much, Mr. Huckelberry. Then, just if there are any department specific safety measures based on the nature of the work done in those departments, if you could share that as well. I appreciate that all departments are expected to comply with our general requirements. Thank you very much, Mr. Huckelberry and Madam Chair.

- SB: Thank you, Supervisor Scott. Those were intelligent questions. Appreciate it. Any other comments from Board Members?
- AG: Supervisor Bronson?
- SB: Supervisor Grijalva.
- AG: I am looking at the item and we are being asked to vote on this item, correct? This is an action item?
- SB: No, it is not an action item. It is information only.
- AG: It is just information. Okay. I guess I am wondering why we are ending the stay-at-home plan on January 11th, when the numbers are incredibly high at this point. Yesterday was the first day that I was able to actually come into the building and there were a number of people that were behind glass panels that did not have masks, but you could see around them that they were within 6 feet of other people. People that are in the lobby that came down from an elevator without a mask. There were a couple of those. I was floating in between two buildings going from H.R. and other places and this was not a condemnation of any specific department. It really is just the fact that people do not appreciate how contagious this COVID is and that any time that you are in a space with somebody and they do not have a mask, even if you have one and they have one, there is still a chance. I do think that people get comfortable and they also get tired of being super vigilant about it. I understand all that, but I do think considering the numbers and the data that you just shared with us, that we should be looking at an expansion of telecommuting and expanding the January 11th date.
- SB: Thank you, Supervisor Grijalva. This reminds me, and I am finally in our new building today, but we have a number of workers who are not County employees, who are involved in ongoing contracts with the County, that are not in compliance. I am wondering if Mr. Huckelberry could respond to that.
- CH: Chair Bronson, our contractors are obligated to follow all of our same procedures and so if they are not complying, we need to know about it. We can make them comply.
- SB: Thank you. Any other comments by Board Members?
- MH: Madam Chair?
- SB: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. Mr. Huckelberry, I am wondering and looking at this particular item with regard to telework. Do our County employees know that their respective Department Heads or Appointing Authorities have the ability to develop telecommuting or telework programs and then approve them for the employees on a case-by-case basis? How are they informed of that?

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, it has obviously been a Board motion. It was promoted. It was approved. We have indicated to all Department Heads they should indicate to their employees when they can telecommute, they can. We can reemphasize that, but at this point, again, I think when you see the distribution of teleworkers by department, you will understand that there are some departments where it is difficult to do that. It is difficult to maintain the parks in a telework environment. So I think it is better to take a look at that list. If I were to tell you today, I think the greatest number of teleworkers we have are in the County Attorney's Office, in Public Defense Services. In some cases, that is 60 to 80% of their employee base are teleworking. So those are the ones who had the capability of teleworking because they have the equipment, they have the knowledge and they have done this before. I think what you will find, if you go department-by-department, is that we might be able to squeeze another 100 or 200 out into teleworking but that is probably about it out of the employee base of 6,500.

AG: Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: I appreciate that. We are having the same situation in Tucson Unified, where there are some people that have to be on campuses working, other people that can work from home. I appreciate that. What I would [Inaudible] is trying [Inaudible] people that can work from home really helps everybody in reducing the total people that are in one space. It helps everybody if we are able to do it. Which is one of the reasons why I am glad that we are doing this meeting virtually, although we have a little bit of hiccups and I am sure we will get those worked out, because this is one less space that we have to have security, that we have to have people, custodial services cleaning up in the Board Room and those are all things when you reduce the volume of people, you can focus on areas that are higher traffic areas. I really do think that we should get a little more creative about the opportunity to telecommute.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Grijalva. Any other comments? All right. I think we have given direction to the County Administrator on a number of items.