

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:06 a.m.

1. CONTRACT

The Sonoran Institute, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Living River Project; consulting services, extend contract term to 10/31/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, Flood Control Ops Fund, contract amount \$143,378.10 (CT-23-75)

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

2. CONTRACT

KE&G Construction, Inc., to provide for the Santa Cruz River Pedestrian Bridge Project (5SCRPB), Flood Control District Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$3,127,540.00/17 month term (PO2400009855) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the funding source for this item.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that the funding for the project came from the Regional Flood Control District Tax Levy and those dollars went into operational expenses of the Regional Flood Control District, as well as the Capital Improvement Project. He stated that the bridge was part of the current annual Capital Improvement Project list that the Board approved as part of

the budget and it provided access across the banks of the Santa Cruz. He stated that there was a significantly large gap that prevented users from getting from one side of the Loop to the other along the Santa Cruz and this helped fill in that gap.

Supervisor Christy asked if any of the funding allocated for this project could be redirected for repairs or maintenance of County roads since this project had a transportation element in it.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded no.

Supervisor Christy asked why.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded the Flood Control District levy was intended for improvements to Flood Control assets and the Santa Cruz River was one of the major waterways. He stated that the basis of the Loop was for access for maintenance for the Flood Control District to the Santa Cruz River and the other major watercourses. He explained that during the 1983 floods, there had been significant property loss and the Flood Control District needed to access those major watercourses during flood events, which was the primary purpose of the path that followed the 140-mile stretch of the major watercourses. He stated that this item was a Flood Control specific improvement, not a transportation improvement, although there were secondary uses such as the recreational amenities for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, it was not eligible for transportation road repair.

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

3. **U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

Staff recommends approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between Pima County, Pima County Regional Flood Control District and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Santa Cruz River Wildlife Partnership.

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

Supervisor Scott requested clarification on Section 5 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which referenced the implementation plan that would be developed between the County and the Fish and Wildlife Service. He stated that he was unsure if that plan would come back before the Board for review or approval, but expressed his interest in reviewing the plan, to understand which entities would be responsible for which projects. He requested that the Board be provided with the annual report referenced in that same section.

Chair Grijalva stated that the MOU would enable the County and the Regional Flood Control District to work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service towards the creation

of a Santa Cruz River Urban National Wildlife Refuge. She stated that this effort would further protect the river and its invaluable riparian habitat for wildlife to thrive, for us and future generations to enjoy. She commented that the Santa Cruz River was dry over much of its course, but it was the reason humans inhabited Tucson and Pima County and it provided sustenance for our indigenous forbearers for many centuries. She stated that it now flowed in three perennial stretches and there was a potential for more. She expressed her support for approval of the item.

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

4. **REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF PIMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT MSCP MASTER COVENANT WITH PIMA COUNTY MSCP MASTER COVENANT**

Staff recommends approval of Combined Amendment No. 3 to County MSCP Mitigation Land Master Covenant and Site Specific Agreement, and Amendment No. 3 to District MSCP Master Covenant, to remove and replace Covenants to align with current County and District ownership.

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:06 a.m.

1. **AWARD**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002336, Baker & Taylor, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Charlotte, NC), to provide for book leasing services. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$500,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Library District Ops Fund. Administering Department: Library District.

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

Chair Grijalva expressed concern with the cost of the lease agreement and asked why leasing was preferred over buying paperback books.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that meeting the demand of patrons at the libraries was increasingly complex and there were three main ways of doing that: through digital offerings, which was immensely popular and constituted more than half of the checkouts; the physical collection; and the continuous issue of popular items. He stated that their popularity was difficult to predict and when their popularity increased the market made those offerings more expensive. He stated that the solution was to lease books for a period of time, which was being done by many libraries across the country and this approach helped meet patron needs while staying within budget, as physical books typically lasted about 20 checkouts before they had to be retired.

Chair Grijalva clarified that once a leased book reached approximately 20 checkouts, it would be retired and replaced with a new copy, without any additional charge.

Dr. Garcia responded in the affirmative.

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

2. **AUTHORIZING FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE LIBRARY DISTRICT DONATION DOCUMENTS**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - LD², of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Free Library District, to authorize the Director of Pima County Finance and Risk Management Department to execute documents on behalf of the Library District.

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

Supervisor Christy asked if there was currently no authorization in place for the execution of these types of documents.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that during a review of administrative directives and documents, it was identified that there was no specific document in place that authorized the Finance Director to receive donations for the Library District. She stated that this item was to formalize a process that may have been practiced, but had never been a specific procedure of the Board.

Supervisor Christy inquired if there had been any issues.

Ms. Leshar responded that while there had not been any issues with receiving those donations, there had been an occasional lack of a variety of overriding documents and she hoped that by formalizing the process it would prevent any future problems.

Supervisor Christy asked whether this issue had been brought forward through the Library Advisory Board or from County Administration.

Ms. Leshar clarified that when the Finance Department began reviewing the authorizing documents needed to allow the Finance Director to receive funds, they discovered that there was no formal policy in place. She stated the item was brought forward for Board approval.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:06 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Dr. Karletta Chief, Director, University of Arizona Indigenous Resilience Center.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. PRESENTATION

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:

- Diego Rocha - Assessor's Office
- Byron Christopher - Community and Workforce Development
- Steve Burklow - Conservation Lands and Resources
- John Stuckey - County Administration
- Adela Gonzales - Health Department
- Mayra Jeffery - Health Department
- Mannde Chiasson - Parks and Recreation

- Mark Hotchkiss - Pima County Attorney's Office
- Daniel Karbon - Pima County Attorney's Office
- Marco Diaz - Regional Flood Control District

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. John Arnold, Chief Executive Officer and Founder, PPEP, Inc., proclaiming the day of Tuesday, November 12, 2024 to be: "PORTABLE PRACTICAL EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION, INC. DAY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Scott Blades, Executive Director, Leslie Kahn, Board President, Arlan Colton, Board Treasurer, George Vissichelli, Board Member, Jess Losoya, Paul Sanchez, Geoff Litteral, John Consedine, and Cathy Davis, Volunteers, Tucson Interfaith HIV/AIDS Network, proclaiming the day of Thursday, October 17, 2024 to be: "TUCSON INTERFAITH HIV/AIDS NETWORK APPRECIATION DAY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Professor Chad Shoopman, Band Director, University of Arizona, proclaiming the day of Friday, November 15, 2024 to be: "PRIDE OF ARIZONA DAY"

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

8. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Cory Stephens addressed the Board regarding Sheriff Nanos who brought a loaded weapon through Tucson International Airport and allegedly avoided consequences, but ordinary citizens would have faced severe repercussions. She defended Lieutenant Lappin and Sergeant Cross and urged the Board to investigate the Sheriff for election interference and called for his censure.

Emily Bressler stated that some Board meetings should be held in the evening to increase community participation. She expressed her opposition to Proposition 312 and proposed regulating short-term rentals to address housing challenges, following models from other Arizona cities.

Dave Smith expressed his frustration over the ongoing counting of ballots and that the ambiguity created suspicion and distrust. He called for bipartisan action to improve the election process and tackle local issues like the Sheriff's Department problems, rising taxes, and housing costs, and criticized the lack of early voting observers.

Lane Myers spoke about his ongoing prosecution regarding his arrest for booing at a Tucson City Council meeting and pointed out that a similar case in Surprise, Arizona, had been dismissed. He stated that his case should be dismissed as it involved an unconstitutional attempt to control political speech and he expressed frustration that the Pima County Attorney's Office had taken over the case after it had been referred to them from the City.

Keith Van Heyningen expressed his frustration with local government, particularly over waste and fraud. He praised Supervisor Christy for opposing tax increases and his dissatisfaction with the treatment of residents.

Anastasia Tsatsakis spoke about her frustration with the Recorder's Office disenfranchising voters and the mishandling of the election. She also commented that Supervisor Heinz should have been censured for his remarks during COVID instead of calling out others to be censured.

Mary Dolciame, Retired Pima County Deputy, addressed the Board regarding Sheriff Nanos' overspending of taxpayers' money and that Lieutenant Lappin and Sergeant Cross should not have been placed on paid leave for exercising their constitutional rights.

9. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 10:15 a.m.

10. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:19 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding the Supervisor Heinz request for an Emergency or Special Meeting.

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

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Udall Law Firm's request for a conflict of interest waiver to represent City of Tucson.

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

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding an update from Snell & Wilmer and proposed course of action in Pima County v. City of Tucson - Potential Resolution regarding Differential Water Rates.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

14. **Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule**

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of November, 2024, to add a Special Meeting on November 21, 2024, at 9:00 a.m., for the Canvass of the General Election. This special meeting will be held virtually.

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

Supervisor Christy expressed his concern about the issues raised at Call to the Public, in the media and throughout the community, and questioned whether the canvass would be ready on time. He asked if there was a possibility that they would be up against a deadline without all of the votes tallied or the proper completion of the ballots.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the reason for the requested date was because it was the last day allowed legally by state statute to approve the canvass. She stated that the Elections Director had indicated that the last of the current ballots would be counted on Wednesday and there were some provisional ballots that needed to be verified and processed for final counting.

Supervisor Christy stated that with the number of outstanding votes that still needed to be tabulated and the length of time it had taken up to this point, he did not have a sense of security that the final tabulation would be completed in time and asked if there was a Plan B.

Ms. Leshar responded that it would be completed.

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

15. **Motion to Censure Sheriff Nanos and Request Investigation**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Motion to censure Sheriff Chris Nanos for violations of the First Amendment Free Speech rights of Lieutenant Heather Lappin and

Sergeant Aaron Cross on dubious and false claims of electioneering while in uniform, which neither of them did. Lt. Lappin is the Republican nominee for Sheriff in this election in which early voting began October 9th, and Sgt. Cross is the president of the Pima County Deputies Organization union, which has taken a vote of no confidence in Sheriff Nanos.

Motion to censure Sheriff Nanos additionally for violations of federal and/or state laws regarding free speech and election interference, for his actions taken during this election to put his chief political rival on paid administrative leave during an active general election for dubious and shifting reasons, prohibiting her from speaking to the public about the alleged reasons for the leave, and even prohibiting her from leaving her home during regular business hours, thus impeding her ability to campaign freely for the position of Sheriff.

While the sheriff, in his 10/15 press release about the matter, noted that “referrals will be made to the Arizona Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation,” again, attempting to use his office to smear his political opponent just weeks before Election Day, it is clear that the Board of Supervisors must in fact act to ensure accountability.

Motion, therefore, to ask the Arizona Attorney General’s Office, and the United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, to investigate the matter and any state or federal laws that may have been broken by Sheriff Nanos in using his official capacity as sheriff to attempt to silence his political opposition during an election. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz expressed disbelief that the situation had reached this point, considering it should not have been necessary. He stated that he was stunned that an elected official, entrusted by voters in 2020 with ensuring public safety, that led the largest law enforcement agency in southern Arizona, decided for what appeared to be personal political gain, to violate the oath taken to uphold the U.S. and Arizona constitutions. He stated that removing a political rival’s ability to campaign and speak while people voted was a foundational principle of the Republic, particularly the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights and that the Board had to certify elections and guarantee that they were free and fair. He stated that this County official used the substantial authority and power, as Sheriff, to place his opponent on paid leave and utilize the resources of the Sheriff’s Internal Affairs Department to investigate and release a memorandum. He believed the charges against the Sheriff’s political opponent were unsubstantiated and that the Sheriff had the authority to fire the individual because she worked for him. He called for action, acknowledging that while the Board did not oversee elected officials, they could bring attention to this issue for the public and request that the appropriate authorities, specifically the Attorney General and the U.S. Attorney for Arizona, investigate the matter. He stated that he had spoken with multiple lawyers on the clear violations of federal statutes protecting political campaigns and the right of individuals involved in them to freely speak, engage with the public, and share their ideas with the community and with the public. He stated that it was unconscionable to use County resources

by an official in government to impair their political opponent and to make matters worse it was by a Democrat, but emphasized that the issue should not be seen as partisan. He pointed out that similar threats had been made by political figures, including the incoming president, who had suggested imprisoning individuals like Hillary Clinton, Adam Schiff, or Nancy Pelosi, for their disagreement, which he found unacceptable and hoped they were not serious plans. He stated that he had hoped the Sheriff would have attended the meeting and that Supervisor Christy had also brought forth a couple of items, but he failed to attend. He stated that it was frustrating and given the circumstances he was uncertain of the Sheriff's response because it seemed clear to him that the Sheriff had violated the law in multiple ways for personal political gain, using County resources. He stated that he would not want to be in the Sheriff's position over the situation and hoped that the Sheriff would publicly apologize for betraying his oaths, for the actions taken against his political rival, regardless of the outcome of the still-uncalled race. He stated that his hope was that the Sheriff would step aside and resign given this calamitous series of events and his decisions to abuse his office and betray the people of the County. He proposed that Board consider and vote on a censure and refer this matter for criminal review of the various statutes that he violated to the U.S. Attorney for Arizona, and also to Attorney General Mayes for an immediate review with the hopes they take it forward to a removal, if necessary, if determined that he had violated these laws.

Chair Grijalva asked Legal Counsel whether it was possible for the Board to censure another elected official.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the negative.

Supervisor Heinz asked why.

Mr. Brown stated that while they could look into the matter for a more specific answer, the general response was that the Board did not have the express authority to censure another elected official.

Chair Grijalva stated that some of the stress that the Sheriff's Department had experienced, specifically in having two people in the same department running for an office, was an issue the Board should consider, because she anticipated it would be happening more often. She stated that people should have the right to run for office, but that there should be some limitations and changes. She stated that in the past, the County had an outline of their individual schedule when they ran for office so that it was clear. She stated that she did not believe there was enough information and that she would not be opposed to asking the Attorney General or FBI to review the matter. She mentioned that Sheriff Nanos had sent a communication to the Board on October 23rd, essentially stating the same thing, that he would not be opposed to that and reiterated that the Board could not censure, which was her concern with placing this item on the agenda.

Supervisor Christy asked what the ramifications were if the Board moved forward with censure of Sheriff Nanos. He stated that it seemed that there was an ability by the Board to express displeasure, concern and ability to address a problem, but also circumvent the concerns that the County Attorney had expressed would be appropriate. He stated that Supervisor Heinz had explained the situation eloquently and he agreed with him wholeheartedly. He stated that it was not political as Supervisor Heinz pointed out, because voting had ended and that was one of the high road levels reached by putting it on the agenda a week after the election. He added that there were also issues in the Sheriff's Department that had been discussed by the Board that had been put through the community on different situations that were still pending that had not been addressed by the Sheriff. He stated that there was a need to address the morale of the Sheriff's Department, and the Board needed to take a stand as community leaders and representatives of Pima County regarding this type of behavior, even after the Sheriff had acknowledged that it looked bad. He stated that by the Board reprimanding and censuring him it would not matter, however, the Board needed to express dissatisfaction and displeasure and put it into a different framework of words so that they were not subjected to any potential lawsuit, which he was in favor of and would be willing to second a motion if there was one.

Mr. Brown provided clarification regarding liability to the Board and stated that the prudent approach from a legal perspective would be to request an investigation and then depending on the results of the investigation, the Board could perhaps decide what action it wanted to take, but a decision to censure before an investigation seemed risky.

Supervisor Christy expressed his understanding.

Supervisor Heinz asked for clarification if the Board could censure.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the words reprimand, expressing displeasure or concern were all inappropriate to use.

Mr. Brown clarified that a censure was a formal discipline and there may be another statement that the Board wanted to make, as it would perhaps, with any type of resolution, but a censure was something that the Board could implement to one of its own members.

Supervisor Christy replied that he has been unsuccessful when he tried to censure in the past.

Chair Grijalva stated that she would not be in favor of imposing some sort of discipline before there was any official results of an investigation, and would not feel comfortable with the censure terminology for the reasons outlined by Mr. Brown, but if the Board requested an outside entity to conduct an investigation, she was comfortable with that.

Supervisor Heinz asked if he could revise his motion.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was unaware that Supervisor Heinz had made a motion and thought it was for discussion. She asked Supervisor Heinz if he wanted to proceed with making a motion.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Christy to refer this matter for criminal review and investigation to the Arizona Attorney General's Office, the U.S. Attorney's Office District of Arizona, and any other appropriate third parties determined by the County Administrator for review. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked why the item was placed on the agenda if it had already been an understanding that the Board was not allowed to censure, because the public was under the impression leading into this meeting that the Board would be voting on whether or not to censure the Sheriff based on what was in the published agenda.

Chair Grijalva responded that when she first became Chair, she recalled asking if items could be reviewed by Legal to ensure that the items that were reflected on the agenda were actually not anything that the Board would find themselves in a position of legal consequences later on, but that was shot down. She stated that otherwise, if members had a caveat there, that Legal would be able to advise the Board, and go back to the Supervisor to request a change in language that would make it clearer on the agenda. She stated that currently, a Board member could place anything on the agenda.

Supervisor Scott stated that when the Board had that discussion mentioned by Chair Grijalva, one of the reasons he voted against it was because Mr. Brown had indicated that he always had the ability to let the Board know if what they put on the agenda violated the law. He asked if this was correct.

Mr. Brown concurred and stated that it was not the Pima County Attorney's Office, or his role, to keep an item off an agenda or to rewrite an item. He stated that he did his best to reach out to offices to raise concerns, and to have language accurately reflect the law and what would be possible or legal, but he did not always have the opportunity to have that conversation.

Supervisor Scott asked if he had that conversation with the sponsor of the item.

Mr. Brown responded that he did not.

Chair Grijalva clarified that they also did not have the authority to take anything off, as it was part of the Board Rules and Regulations, so Mr. Brown could review it and if he had concerns, would let them know so that they could be on alert when the item came up. She reiterated that any of the five Board members could put something on the agenda that may or may not be something legally that they were able to do.

Supervisor Scott stated that it was conceivable if Supervisor Heinz had known about those concerns prior to the meeting, he might have reworded his item, just like he had in his motion.

Supervisor Lee stated that she thought the word censure could be the same as reprimand or something similar, but in addition to the motion, the Board should express that their belief of what happened could have been avoided. She stated that for example, in this business of leadership, perhaps a warning could have taken place rather than immediately going to leave without pay. She stated that there were steps a leader could take, and as many people as the Sheriff managed, there were other options for those two individuals, which was probably what should have happened. She stated that from her point of view, she was in favor of moving forward as discussed in the motion, but felt that the Board should use a select word or phrase, on the belief that it was hastily done, even though the Board did not have all of the details, but that a reprimand might have been what should have happened, and maybe a reprimand was what the Board should publicly state and vote on it.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that it was well known that this item was coming before the Board and was curious why a legal opinion was not prepared for this meeting because everyone knew it was coming up and that Board members were going to ask for the legalities of it and it seemed to him that it would be a compelling issue to have a legal opinion prepared for this meeting.

Supervisor Heinz asked whether this was nomenclature, if it was supposed to be called a resolution of displeasure or something else and if the actual disciplinary action of censure could not be done by this Board for any other elected County official, should this have been done in a form of a resolution and would it be legal.

Mr. Brown responded that the Board could collectively voice its displeasure with the acts of another elected official, but there may be ramifications for doing so. He stated that if the Board cared to discuss that in executive session or in a more appropriate session context, he was happy to do so.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

16. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, provided a slideshow presentation regarding the Transition Center and where they were at after a year of operations. He stated that from August 2023 to August 2024, they served over 1,100 individuals and one of the primary functions was to reduce the amount of people that were rearrested. He noted that with much of this population they tracked data on misdemeanor offenses, with the controlled group of 28% rearrested down to a 10% average over the course of the year, and they saw as low as 3% in one month for

some of those people rearrested. He stated that this was the aggregate report, but it was good to note that this resulted in 158 fewer bookings, which resulted in a savings to the municipalities of over \$80,000.00 in booking fees and 99% of the individuals received services. He stated that he had discussed this before, but wanted to highlight Operations; they had four Navigators funded by the County, along with one from the City of Tucson (COT), and a second one was in recruitment. He stated that one of their goals was to operate seven days a week, including weekends, but at this point they were only able to operate on weekdays. He stated that they had positive feedback from the Tucson Police Department (TPD), businesses, Judges and the initial appearances that were very supportive of the work being done. He stated that their impact included some warrant resolutions, calls from the COT for encampment cleanups to provide that outreach, family support for people that wanted more information on what they needed to do if some of their folks were incarcerated. He added that equally important, virtual services were enhanced, which was important for people that wanted initial appearances. He stated that their priorities for entering year two was sustainability because much of this was funded with American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), so they had to explore their funding mechanisms for the following year to determine how to prioritize some of this work. He stated their priority for expanding weekend hours would allow them the ability to work with initial appearance Judges that were eager to assist, but it required that they were open seven days a week in order for them to create some parity in that work. He stated that another important priority would be to expand emergency shelter options because as people left the vicinity, they were still looking for shelter and although they had good connections that still continued to be a challenge. He stated that their final priority would entail reviewing outside data evaluation for this system, there was an internal evaluation in the report, however they wanted some validation from a third party. He referred to the slide that showed a note from some of the folks that had visited, and it made some impact on them. He added that they submitted a full report late last week for the Board's review, but this presentation encapsulated a brief highlight of what was happening in the Transition Center.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the individuals being sent into the Transition Center and through the Navigator process had actively been involved in criminal activity, such as vandalism, theft, public lewdness, as opposed to living in a wash. He asked what type of criminality they were involved in.

Mr. Holmes clarified that the vast majority of individuals were being shepherded through the Transition Center via the Pretrial pre-booking module, which meant they had committed a misdemeanor offense or had been charged with an offense that they were still awaiting trial for. He stated that a majority of those were the misdemeanor type crimes, nuisance crimes, petty theft, things that were not felony related, which included trespassing. He added that with the trespassing piece, some of the TPD folks were looking to work with Pretrial on zone restrictions, which had previously been discussed with the Board, and it continued to be a vehicle for that, as well.

Supervisor Christy asked whether those individuals going through the process were mostly located in either the COT or the County.

Mr. Holmes responded that the majority of the individuals that went to the jail were coming from the COT.

Supervisor Lee complimented Deputy Administrator Holmes, Director Vesley and the other individuals she had met for their tremendous job. She stated that when she toured the Transition Center, this preliminary data showed that they were on the right track in making a big dent with helping those individuals that were there for misdemeanors and should not be in the jail.

Supervisor Scott thanked staff for all of the notable successes at the Transition Center and the Board was aware they had some long-term goals in terms of expanding its operations. He asked when the Board could expect to hear some kind of proposal as to what it would take to expand hours and operations.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that a specific date could not be provided at this time, however, they were exploring and discussing options due to the need to rotate out of ARPA and it was an active part related to the budget, so they would come back to the Board with initial conversations regarding the budget later on in the year or early next year and those details would be provided at that time.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had sent an email on October 24th, asking that the next time the Board had this recurring item on homelessness, that they discuss the Board's statement on the probability of using the Mission Annex as a place for the provision of services to the larger homeless community, and perhaps use some of the lessons learned from the operation of the Transition Center. He asked if the Board could receive an update as to where things stood with the work at that facility.

Mr. Holmes replied that they had opened the Mission Annex for testing, as a cooling center, and they had many individuals that stopped by for justice related services, so it still remained in the community, as a hub. He stated that a lot of the paperwork was still being supported through some of their jurisdictions that still had that location as a place to go to watch initial appearances and those types of things. He stated that they had actively been pursuing some pretty competitive grants for the ability to create some shelter space at that location, specifically for people that were coming out of the criminal justice system, not as an open shelter, but as a shelter for folks coming out of either the Transition Center, or out of being felony arrested from the jail. He stated that continued to be an area they were pursuing, but they knew that based upon the limited time it was open during the cooling center hours, that there was a lot of interest in that space, but to operationalize it at the scale needed, particularly as they were starting to house people, that was going to require some fairly robust investments. He stated that this was the reason they hoped to partner with the COT on what kind of resource they may have to put in that space. He stated that as mentioned by Supervisor Christy, many people were from the COT,

so they would like some support from the other local municipality to help create the space necessary. He added that as the big vision was starting to unfold, it became clear that it would be great to use that as a respite center for folks in need of a couple of days to stay as they came out of either incarceration from the jail or left the Transition Center, and without a necessity for them to go back to where they may have gotten in trouble in the first place.

Chair Grijalva stated that any kind of sheltering services that was going to happen at the Mission Annex was already a very stressed area and there were two mobile home communities right across the street, one being for older individuals, so she did not want it to become a blanket drop-in center. She stated that she understood the need for that type of facility, but had some real concerns about that kind of facility there and especially considering some of the previous talks by the Board. She stated that a lot of it had to do with whether there were resources for a hub of services that were available, that a lot of community members needed. She stated that the first time she visited, Ms. Vesely was at the front desk and someone came in and they were a victim of a crime and a TPD Officer had literally just handed them a form moments before and they walked on the first day of the opening of the cooling center. She stated that she knew that shortly they would have some really cold temperatures in the community and asked if they were thinking about opening up that space again as sort of a warming center, because she felt it would be needed at some point for the deep freeze and one of the issues in the past was where people could go to get out of the extreme cold.

Mr. Holmes responded that was something they could explore as they worked in partnership with County departments that ran those operations to see if that was a location that was operational and if they had the staffing for that.

Chair Grijalva indicated that the Salvation Army provided extra help when there was a deep freeze, so it was likely they would need the space, it was not a permanent solution, but just for those times where it got really cold.

Supervisor Scott asked if some of those topics of discussion could be delineated that were occurring between the COT and the County in terms of the use of that space and asked for a better sense of what was being discussed.

Mr. Holmes explained that many of the conversations were twofold, and he would split it into two areas. He stated that the first area was specific discussions with TPD and in their conversations with Chief Kazmar, he was very interested in making better utilization of that space and making better utilization of the Transition Center. He stated that they were making some inroads with TPD on better utilization of the Transition Center and there were more recent conversations in the community meeting that Ms. Vesely held, of interest from community members on what was happening with the year-end report. He added that equally important, there was TPD management there that had an epiphany on why this was going to be a really good place for them to make better utilization. He recalled mentioning two meetings prior, that much of the strategy had been cited and released, which did not get

people into having discussion with some of the staff and so there was greater interest in that area. He stated that the reason why he prefaced it with that first step in the Transition Center was that until they had a good partnership with TPD, part two into the Mission Annex, to be able to grow that was kind of that work in progress. He added that there were some conversations happening with Superior Court, particularly with Pretrial Services and if they could relocate there over time, to also provide that type of one stop kind of shopping place for people that needed that kind of support. He stated that other conversations with the COT outside of TPD, included interest in investments from some of their housing grants to make utilization of the annex and maybe even move some of the funds from other areas or other properties that were exploring to maybe make an investment into the annex. He stated that the second piece still being discussed and mentioned by Chair Grijalva was that they wanted it to be more purposeful for justice involved people, and not just a drop off for people that were coming out of encampments. He stated that was a strained community and that by making it another shelter, he was not sure it was going to have the impact as much as if it were more closely tied to some of the work already being done in the criminal justice area, and that in the future, it be a proof point for them for more larger grants and sustainability.

Supervisor Scott stated that when the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions was formed, there was reference to the need for development of a strategic and continuous improvement plan. He added that they were coming up on almost the one-year anniversary of the formation of that office and it seemed that some of the topics Mr. Holmes had discussed might factor into that kind of comprehensive plan. He inquired about the status of the development of that plan and when there might be something presented to the Board.

Ms. Leshar responded they did not have a date, but perhaps at a December meeting and they were looking at what that one-year report might entail to determine that.

Mr. Holmes stated that they did not necessarily have a date, but one of the conversations they were currently having was prior to setting this strategy in place, they were focusing on alignment and coherence in their systems, which seemed to be where they were spending more of their efforts on internal flow of how they were working together.

Supervisor Scott questioned if it was the County systems.

Mr. Holmes responded that the County systems needed prioritization before they could review it systemically and they were prepared to have a broader conversation on what the alignment and coherence looked like in the County's own system prior to unrolling a more strategic effort regionally. He stated that it would be provided during the next presentation as a precursor to receiving feedback on what a larger strategic plan could look like.

Supervisor Scott asked whether they would recommend the Board not consider a study session or a series of study sessions until that report was provided in December.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would figure out exactly what date the report would be provided and then they could decide when to schedule meetings around that.

Supervisor Christy stated that they mentioned the report that was coming up and about alignment and outreach and things of that nature, but felt it was also important in that final year report that was referenced earlier, that the Board also be provided a sense of how the community, neighborhoods and businesses were either benefitting or had not felt the effects of this. He stated that he certainly hoped they would be engaged in that report before any kind of final edition was presented and it was important to hear from those that were the most affected by the criminal activities surrounding homelessness and that the County needed to know if these efforts had been effective in achieving the goals that businesses, neighborhoods, and communities were looking for. He stated that one resource that he felt would be optimal to include in the report, would be from the Tucson Crime Free Coalition to provide the feedback the Board was looking for as a business community, to show how effective those efforts had turned out to be.

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

17. Appointment to Fill a Vacancy of the Position of Constable, Justice Precinct 9

Staff recommends the Board begin the process to fill the position of Constable in Justice Precinct 9, that will be vacated on January 1, 2025, with the following:

- Candidates will be required to provide the Clerk of the Board a Letter of Interest, Resume, Financial Disclosure Statement, and Conflict of Interest Forms, no later than 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 27, 2024.
- The Clerk will verify with the Recorder's Office that the candidate is a registered voter residing in Justice Precinct 9 and is over the age of 18.
- In coordination with the Human Resources Department, the Clerk will verify education and experience, and that the candidate has no criminal background.
- The Board of Supervisors will select a Constable at the regularly scheduled meeting of December 17, 2024, to be appointed effective January 1, 2025.

Chair Grijalva noted that there was no specific mention of a political party affiliation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the seat in question would be vacated at the beginning of the year which meant there was no incumbent.

Chair Grijalva stated the position would become a vacated open seat so any person could apply regardless of party affiliation.

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

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, requested clarification whether it should also be advertised in the Daily Territorial or only on the County webpage.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was fine to only advertise on the County webpage and that it be made clear that there was no party affiliation requirements for the open seat.

CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES

18. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Memorandum of Understanding

Staff recommends approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between Pima County, Pima County Regional Flood Control District and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the Santa Cruz River Wildlife Partnership.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

19. Final Plat Without Assurances

P24FP00010, A Replat of Bacardi Acres, Lots 1-13 and Common Area "A". (District 4)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

20. Pima County Recorder Voter Registration Rolls Fund from House Bill (HB) 2862 General Appropriations

Staff recommends that budget authority from non-general fund contingency be allocated to the Pima County Recorder's Office, Special Revenue Fund, to expend the funds provided from the State Treasurer's Office to review the accuracy of the voter registration rolls as outlined in HB 2862.

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

Supervisor Christy questioned the timing of this item, when had the County received the funds for the grant and why it was being presented after the election. He asked whether there would be assurances that the funds would be used to ensure that the

accuracy of the vote rolls would be obtained. He stated that they had their contractor, Theelios, and asked if he would be a recipient of any of these funds and if it could be used to bring that contractor's responsibility back in-house, rather than at his location. He stated that the Recorder's website showed an early ballot status report of Sunday, October 20th, that indicated there were over 1 million total ballots sent, and then on November 11th, that total ballots sent dropped from over 1 million to 563,715. He reiterated if the funds would provide assurances that these types of discrepancies and issues could be alleviated by the utilization of it.

Chair Grijalva stated that she did not believe staff from the Recorder's Office was present to answer Supervisor Christy's questions.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained this was funding allocated as clearly identified by the State legislature and it was simply allowing the Recorder's Office the spending authority to receive it and spend it.

Supervisor Christy asked when the funds were received.

Ms. Leshar responded that she was unsure, but would provide the date to the Board. She added that if it was passed in last year's legislature, it was known at that time, but was unsure of the exact amount or the reason for the delay.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on the justification for presenting this item to the Board after the election and inquired about the timing of the decision.

Ms. Leshar responded that the materials were dated October 9th, so the funds had been received prior to the election, and this was the first meeting listed on the Board's meeting schedule that the item could be placed on an agenda, which was her understanding of the timing.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the amount.

Ms. Leshar responded it was for \$478,448.00.

Supervisor Christy stated that since there was no one from the Recorder's Office present to respond to his questions and given all of the issues they were currently going through with the delayed tabulation, the length of time it had taken, the several discrepancies of the voter rolls and voter tabulations that had been incurred by the County, he wanted some assurances from the Recorder's Office that the half million would do what it was intended to do, and that they would not have to deal with the types of things that they were currently dealing with. He stated that his hope was that the funds were used to ensure that their elections could be counted on to be timely, accurate and fair.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the intent of the legislature when this bill was passed and whether it was signed by Governor Hobbs or Governor Ducey.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide a report to the Board that listed the specifics regarding the history of the legislation, its intent, or which Governor signed it.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the State Treasurer informed the Board that the funds were available in early October.

Ms. Leshar clarified that she was unsure of the exact day they were informed, but she was informed when the Finance Department brought the item forward for the spending capacity during the first week of October, specifically on October 9th.

Supervisor Scott expressed his curiosity as to why the State Treasurer would not make it available to Counties earlier in the process. He stated that he wanted to know the intention of the legislature and the Governor when they were debating HB 2862, which became law, and when they wanted Counties to fulfill the intent of the legislation. He recognized that this was not something that was under the County Administrator's Office, but asked that it be conveyed to the Recorder or to Mr. Rossi, so that the Board could get some sense of what the legislative and gubernatorial intent was and why funds were not made available to Counties until a month before the election.

Supervisor Christy stated that he believed Governor Ducey had signed it, and to Supervisor Scott's point, he had raised a number of serious and pertinent questions and suggested the Board continue the item to the next meeting until they were addressed.

Chair Grijalva stated she did know how it was going to change accepting the funds, because the funding was available. She stated that requesting more information was fine, however, she believed they had already accepted these funds. She asked if this was correct and whether this was to codify it with the vote.

Ms. Leshar clarified this was to provide the spending authority to spend the funds.

Supervisor Scott inquired if it was due to the funds having been released.

Chair Grijalva responded in the affirmative.

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

OFFICE OF DIGITAL INCLUSION

21. Arizona Commerce Authority Presentation

Presentation by Erin Lorandos, Digital Equity Program Manager, and Kelly Krusee, Community Engagement Manager, State Broadband Office, Arizona Commerce Authority, to provide a status update on the Broadband Equity, Access and Deployment (BEAD) and the Digital Equity Programs in Pima County.

Kelly Krusee, Community Engagement Manager, Arizona Commerce Authority, presented a slideshow presentation regarding Broadband, Equity and Access Deployment (BEAD) and Digital Inclusion Programs. She stated they had been trying to visit every County in the State to talk about BEAD and Digital Equity. She stated that BEAD would provide historic funding from the federal government with \$42 billion coming out of the administration that would help connect every home in the United States and that the goal was to connect homes that had no access to broadband or high-speed internet. She stated that it was historical funding due to the amount and also to the household, which was not middle mile, this was to the specific household and that the amount awarded to Arizona was almost \$1 billion. She stated that this was a lot of money, and they were aware that this was taxpayer dollars, so it was taken seriously. She stated that they had been working for years to map out the plan for how this was going to work in Arizona and their initial plan was approved in August, which was called Volume Two. She stated that the program was for people at the household level and also for Community Anchor Institutions, which included things such as schools, libraries and hospitals, places where people went to use the internet or Wi-Fi for free. He stated that the focus was on little or no access to high-speed internet, either unserved or underserved. She stated that in Pima County there were almost 21,000 eligible households, which meant 21,000 homes in the County were either unserved or underserved.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the distinction between unserved and underserved.

Ms. Krusee explained that the timeline as far as when it happened, was getting toward the end of this particular timeline. She stated they were in late fall and were about to open the application window. She stated it would open on December 20th and that they were currently in pre-registration. She explained that unserved and underserved was based on speed and latency and that the unserved locations had 25/3 Megabits Per Second (Mbps), or 25 Mbps download and 3 Mbps upload, underserved locations were at 100/20 Mbps.

Supervisor Scott inquired about latency.

Ms. Krusee explained that latency was a delay and that with the program they identified the unserved and underserved locations and household locations that should have access to high-speed internet. She explained that how it worked was by Internet Service Providers (ISPs), nonprofits and even Counties could apply to be subrecipients of that funding and demonstrate what they would do to serve those unserved and underserved locations. She added that Eligible Community Anchor Institutions enhanced access for vulnerable populations.

Erin Lorandos, Digital Equity Program Manager, Arizona Commerce Authority, explained that the connection speed for community anchor institutions had a significantly higher threshold due to the larger number of users, which was at a gig symmetrical up and down. She explained that the BEAD Program would create the road that people were driving on to access the internet, and Digital Equity was

driver's education. She stated that it was all of the resources, the conversations around affordability and accessibility that went into accessing a resource that people may not have had access to before. She stated that it established three separate programs, but in Arizona, they allocated just over \$16 million to enact the goals and objectives laid out in their statewide Digital Equity Plan (DEP). She stated that in the DEP they addressed the barriers met faced by various covered populations, Congress's way of talking about people historically that had been less able to access these resources. She stated that the resources might not be built for them, or there were special considerations, language barriers, individuals who lived with disabilities, etcetera, that played into this. She stated that the most important thing about the list of people was that in Arizona, over 80% of all Arizonans fell into one or more of these groups. She stated that when they talked about barriers that were faced by members of these covered populations, faced by themselves, their families, and communities. She stated that a number of goals and objects were laid out in the plan that they felt would help break down those barriers to access and adoption and had lumped them into some overarching buckets that included support for local planning efforts. She stated that at the County level, they wanted everyone to look like Pima County because they were primed for this piece of the puzzle due to all of the work that the Office of Digital Inclusion had done, and they wanted to be able to support that work in other Counties as well. She stated that they also wanted to leverage and expand Digital Navigator Programs, which were in-person ways for the members of those communities to gain the skills that they lacked. She stated that they also considered telehealth access points and Digital Health Navigators. She stated that overall, they wanted to increase opportunities for digital literacy upskilling tailored to the needs of the covered population. She stated for example, that might look like classes hosted in other languages or in other formats that were accessible to people living with disabilities. She stated that this was also historic in that the federal government would look at the access as well as the barriers to access all together and it was awesome that everyone was doing this work in the same office, and being able to hear the needs at the local level was going to be very important when they moved into implementation.

Ms. Krusee shared their Stay Connected slide with a QR code to sign up for their newsletter to stay updated weekly during their pre-registration period. She stated that if entities were interested in applying the pre-registration portal was open, and they would be conducting guidance, webinars, and information about how to do it. She added those recordings would be posted on the website and included their contact information.

Chair Grijalva thanked them for the presentation and stated that sometimes there were questions when this subject came up, with how it would work in the community, and she felt more information was better.

Supervisor Lee thanked them for the presentation and stated that they had mentioned underserved locations, and that the majority of District 3 was rural. She stated that Director Simon had visited Ajo and there was a USDA, rural

development grant, and it was a loan to a private provider. She asked how USDA monies dovetailed with the monies that came from the Infrastructure Bipartisan bill.

Ms. Lorandos explained that their office had spent significant time figuring out de-duplication. She stated that it was federal funds, so they could only use one federal dollar to fill that need and their website contained a map of available funding, and where there were no funds was where BEAD came in, so they worked together with the other programs.

Ms. Krusee added the term was Prior Enforceable Commitments, they could not overbuild on federal funding, which was very clear with BEAD. She stated that their maps included a QR code to their Navigator portal. She stated that the map had taken years to build, and it started with the FCC map, which identified what homes/locations might or might not have access, and it helped to identify funding. She stated that they had been building upon it so that they could identify what funding existed and where funding could go.

Supervisor Lee stated that the funding she mentioned was intended for private providers to expand internet access, particularly in rural and impoverished communities. She inquired whether any of this funding would help support very low-income families in affording both the internet service and the associated costs.

Ms. Krusee stated that was a great point, and reiterated that the BEAD portion was about creating the road and getting the access, however, subscription and affordability were separate pieces. She stated that part of what was written into BEAD at the federal level and the Notice of Funding Opportunity was that as entities applied, they could indicate that they wanted to apply for money to be able to include low-cost options for an identified audience and population that they needed to serve. She added there were eight covered populations, part of it being low income and so they needed to be able to offer low-cost options and entities that applied would need to address that. She stated that rural areas were their priority with underserved and unserved, which tended to be in Arizona. She added that 80% of the population lived in Maricopa County, so the majority of their population was already covered, and they wanted to serve those that did not have it.

Supervisor Christy stated that in his district, District 4, they had underserved folks in what they called Internet deserts, but they were not identified members of that targeted community. He stated that he was concerned about them and they seemed to be left out of this whole process. He stated that along those same lines, as shown with the hurricanes in the East, how the infrastructure for communications and Internet were destroyed by the effects of the hurricane, and then Starlink was provided and it seemed to cure the problem, or certainly enhanced the communicative abilities very simply, without having to dig deep into the infrastructure to replace that. He stated that he had not heard any kind of discussion with Starlink in this whole program, and it seemed that what the Board had seen was a 20th century solution for a 21st century problem. He asked if they were behind the whole trajectory of more efficient communications by not utilizing Starlink

and, asked about the areas in District 4 that were underserved and were not targeted communities.

Ms. Lorandos explained that one thing to keep in mind when looking at those covered populations was that those groups were being served by the Digital Equity Act. She reiterated that BEAD was to connect every underserved or unserved household, regardless of whether or not they happened to be rural or fell into low income or had a disability. She stated that while these programs were meant to work in tandem, they were not the same and that list of eight covered populations did not have any direct correlation to building Internet to that household. She added that as they looked at the map of underserved or unserved households in the State, many of those people also fell into those eight covered populations, but one was not exclusive of the other. She stated that if a household did not currently have 100/20 Mbps service, it would be in a project area that an ISP would ultimately serve as a result of the BEAD funding. She added they were going to create programming and training opportunities for members of the covered populations because they knew the barriers they faced, because they were told through their research in creating the DEP. She stated that they would create resources for those eight covered populations, but the household would get connected regardless of whether or not a member of that household was in one of the eight covered populations.

Ms. Krusee explained that broadband was fiber and fiber was the priority type of technology. She stated that based on the geography of the State, with canyons and mountains, some areas were impossible to have broadband so there were alternative technology options, which would be licensed wireless and Starlink. She stated that there would be households that would not be able to have fiber to the home, instead they would have Starlink, which meant they would receive a kit itself.

Ms. Lorandos added that as it related to low-cost options, the plans at all State levels were written when the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) was still enacted, and that was something they were also considering as far as the sustainability pieces were concerned. She stated that there would be changes to how States dealt with the cost consideration as a result of the ACP going away, but acknowledged it was still on the table in their plans.

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

REAL PROPERTY

22. Designation of Public Right-of-Way

Staff recommends approval of a designation of Public Right-of-Way on a portion of Richey Boulevard. (District 2)

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

23. **Deed**

Staff recommends approval of a deed with David and Lorena Torrez for the dedication of 15 feet of 7590 W. Yedra Road, Tax Parcel No. 210-41-037A. (District 5)

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

24. **Removal and Replacement of Pima County Flood Control District MSCP Covenant with Pima County MSCP Master Covenant**

Staff recommends approval of Combined Amendment No. 3 to County MSCP Mitigation Land Master Covenant and Site Specific Agreement, and Amendment No. 3 to District MSCP Master Covenant, to remove and replace Covenants to align with current County and District ownership.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

25. La Frontera Partners, Inc., to provide for an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for the West Point II Apartments Project, General Fund, contract amount \$1,000,000.00 (PO2400010219)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Lee was not present for the vote.

Detainee and Crisis Systems (Formerly Behavioral Health)

26. Banner Health, Amendment No. 2, to provide for inpatient court ordered evaluation services pursuant to A.R.S. Title 36, Chapter 5, extend contract term to 9/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$889,541.00 (CT-22-86)

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

Supervisor Lee mentioned that a small group was working on expanding Title 36 to allow for substance abuse to be included, but in a very restricted way. She explained that under the current law, if someone was brought to the Crisis Response Center and it was determined within the first 23 hours and 59 minutes

that their mental illness they were experiencing was due to substance abuse, they had to be released because Title 36 allowed for involuntary commitment if due to a mental illness only. She stated the limitation was a statewide issue and that the proposed change would allow for short-term involuntary commitment, to help individuals stabilize enough to make informed decisions about their health and future.

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

27. UHS of Tucson, L.L.C., d.b.a. Palo Verde Behavioral Health, Amendment No. 2, to provide for inpatient court ordered evaluation services pursuant to A.R.S. Title 36, Chapter 5, extend contract term to 9/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$700,000.00 (CT-22-87)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion related to this item.)

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

28. Sonora Behavioral Health, Amendment No. 2, to provide for inpatient court ordered evaluation services pursuant to A.R.S. Title 36, Chapter 5, extend contract term to 9/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$1,500,000.00 (CT-22-88)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion related to this item.)

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

29. Connections Southern AZ, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for inpatient court ordered evaluation services pursuant to A.R.S. Title 36, Chapter 5, extend contract term to 9/30/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$75,000.00 (CT-22-404)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion related to this item.)

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

Grants Management and Innovation

30. MGT Impact Solutions, L.L.C., f.k.a. MGT of America Consulting, L.L.C., Amendment No. 4, to provide for contractor's legal name change and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400012655)

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

Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security

31. Avra Valley Fire District, Drexel Heights Fire District, Golder Ranch Fire District, Northwest Fire District, Rincon Valley Fire District, Santa Rita Fire District, f.k.a. Green Valley Fire District and City of Tucson Fire Department, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Hazardous Material Response Program, extend contract term to 1/5/30 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000018)

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

Pima County Wireless Integrated Network

32. Pima Community College District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for subscriber services, extend contract term to 8/6/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$11,700.00 revenue (CTN-WIN-20-2)

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

33. Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs on behalf of Silverbell Fire Department, to provide an intergovernmental agreement to add Silverbell Fire as a public safety service participant, contract amount \$11,544.00 revenue (CT2400000024)

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

Procurement

34. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, Amendment No. 2, to provide for original equipment manufacturer (OEM) warranty parts and repairs and appends the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention and Safety Plan provision to the contracts, pursuant to Procurement Code 11.40.030. Supplier Contract No. SC2400001575 increases the shared annual award amount by \$10,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$134,799.98. Supplier Contract No. SC2400001576 increases the shared annual award amount by \$170,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$666,338.59. Funding Source: Internal Services Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

Supplier Contract No./Supplier Name/Current NTE Amounts/Increase Shared Annual Award Amount/Cumulative NTE Amounts

SC2400001575/Holmes Tuttle Ford, Inc., d.b.a. Holmes Tuttle Ford
Lincoln/\$124,799.98/\$10,000.00/\$134,799.98

SC2400001576/Watson Chevrolet, Inc./\$496,338.59/\$170,000.00/\$666,338.59

SC2400001577/DT Automotive Center, Inc., d.b.a. Desert Toyota of Tucson/\$62,399.99/-/\$62,399.99
SC2400001578/O'Reilly Chevrolet, Inc./\$127,661.37/-/\$127,661.37
SC2400001579/Jim Click, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Dodge/\$96,109.57/-/\$96,109.57
SC2400001580/Jim Click Ford, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Ford Lincoln/\$312,000.00/-/\$312,000.00
SC2400002319/Jim Click, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Hyundai/\$28,690.50/-/\$28,690.50
Total: \$1,248,000.00/\$180,000.00/\$1,428,000.00

Supervisor Christy recused himself from voting on this item.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy recused himself, to approve the item.

35. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001662, Amendment No. 5, Pencco, Inc., to provide for ferric chloride. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$400,000.00 from \$237,500.00 to \$637,500.00 (including sales tax) for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,275,000.00. Funding Source: WW Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

Supervisor Scott asked what struvite was and why was it needed.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that struvite was a byproduct of the wastewater treatment process, similar to calcium deposits that built up. He referred to pipes that filled up with calcium deposits, which would cause them to stop flowing properly and controlling the buildup of struvite in the wastewater pipes and treatment system was necessary to maintain proper flow and function.

Supervisor Scott pointed out that the materials mentioned that the use rates of ferric chloride had been consistently higher than initially expected. He inquired why they did not have a better sense of what the use rates would be, given the significant increases over time and asked if it was difficult to anticipate those rates.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that there were multiple factors. He explained that ferric chloride had been the traditional method used to reduce struvite buildup and control odors that were generated in the wastewater system, but new technologies had been introduced that were intended to prevent the creation of struvite within the system which would reduce the necessity of ferric chloride and that they were in the process of fine tuning the new technology. He stated that the department had indicated changes in staff expertise which meant they needed to assess its estimates for ferric chloride usage. He indicated that they also had no control over the pricing of that material within the marketplace, so there was a cost increase component. He stated that the current amendment did not include a sufficient

increase in the overall contract capacity and that the department planned to bring another item before the Board and he offered to provide a presentation or update on their efforts to improve the accuracy of those estimates in the future. He also suggested a personal tour of the treatment facility for any Board member who was interested in that.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had toured the facility and it was quite fascinating.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had also visited the facility and concurred with Chair Grijalva.

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

36. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001116, Amendment No. 7, Douglas Food Stores, Inc., d.b.a. Douglas Equipment, to provide for Commercial Kitchen Appliances, Equipment and Supplies. This Amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$325,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$795,800.00. Funding Source: Capital Projects - Sheriff (79%) and Welfare (21%) Funds. Administering Department: Stadium District - Kino Sports Complex.

Chair Grijalva requested clarification whether the kitchen supplies were for the Kino Sports Complex and the County jail.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it was for commercial equipment needed at the jail.

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

Supervisor Christy requested clarification of the funding sources and noted that the Stadium District Kino Sports Complex was listed as the administering department.

Ms. Leshar explained that there were a variety of funding sources for the contract as it involved food services at different locations. She stated that this amendment was related to the kitchen renovations at the jail, so the funding sources were from the Sheriff's budget.

Carmine DeBonis Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that Kino was part of the amendment, but was not ordering new equipment. He explained that Kino administered the master agreement and this particular increase was related to equipment that was being purchased for the kitchen renovation project at the jail. He stated that the two funding sources were specific to the Sheriff's Department.

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

37. dormakaba Workforce Solutions, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for dormakaba time clocks and related software, amend contractual language and scope of services, Non-Bond Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$110,000.00 (SC2400001810) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Human Resources.

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

38. Granite Construction Company, Amendment No. 1, to provide for West Silverbell Road, Blanco Wash Bridge Project (4SRBWB), extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, Federal Highway Administration Off System Bridge (19.16%) and Silverbell-Tortolita Impact Fees (80.84%) Funds, contract amount \$318,632.50 (CT-24-144) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

39. ADP, Inc., Amendment No. 13, to provide for HR/Payroll, Benefits and eTime Management, extend contract term to 12/31/27 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000788) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

Real Property

40. Casadobes, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County License for Right-of-Way encroachment, contract amount \$23,750.00 revenue/25 year term (CT2400000056)

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

41. CCTM1, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide a Nonexclusive Right-of-Way Use License for wireless communications facilities, extend contract term to 11/2/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$112,393.92 revenue (CTN-IT-15-14)

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

42. Sprint Communications Company, L.P., Amendment No. 1, to provide for a Nonexclusive Right-of-Way Use License for a Fiber Optic Communications System, extend contract term to 9/20/29 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$468,105.18 revenue (CTN-PW-20-84)

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

43. Death Trap Holding Company, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for a ranch management agreement, extend contract term to 8/3/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002344)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 60, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the continuum of care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2024 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for One Stop Rapid Rehousing, \$248,285.00/\$62,071.25 General Fund match (G-CWD-70937)

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

45. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

City of Tucson, to provide for the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant, \$195,112.00/4 year term (G-PCA-70366)

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

46. **Acceptance – Elections**

Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for Pima County Secure & Safe Elections, \$32,000.00 (G-EL-78208)

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

Chair Grijalva inquired if this was for large concrete balls on the exterior and bulletproof glass.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

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

47. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Pima County Department of Environmental Quality Voluntary No Drive/Clean Air Program, amend grant language and scope of work, \$257,272.00 (GA-DE-70922)

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

Chair Grijalva indicated that the grant had previously been approved and this amendment was for a reduction to the total dollar amount.

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

48. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide services for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Breastfeeding Peer Counseling Programs and amend grant language, \$2,210,136.00 (GA-HD-70308)

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

49. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide services for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Breastfeeding Peer Counseling Programs and amend grant language, \$105,998.00 (GA-HD-70318)

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

50. **Acceptance – Health**

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, to provide for Pima County Aquatic Safety Education and Enforcement Enhancement Project, \$396,314.66/2 year term (G-HD-79188)

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

51. **Acceptance – Health**

State of Arizona Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Health Department Chronic Pain Initiative and extend grant term to 9/30/25, \$199,860.00 (GA-HD-79252)

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

52. Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY2024 Pima County Community Resiliency Initiative, \$8,332.00 (G-OEM-79008-1)

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

53. Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY2024 Southern Arizona Multi-Jurisdictional Training and Exercise Initiative, \$150,000.00 (G-OEM-79008-2)

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

54. Acceptance – Sheriff

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the DUI/Impaired Driving Enforcement and Training related professional and outside services: (Borkenstein Courses), related out-of-state travel (transport, lodging, meals for Borkenstein Courses), and related materials and supplies (portable breath tests, impairment goggles), \$17,283.00 (G-SD-78225)

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

55. Acceptance – Sheriff

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for accident investigation training related professional and outside services (Institute of Police Technology and Management (IPTM) Symposium and Courses), and related out-of-state travel (transport, lodging, meals for IPTM Symposium and Courses), \$8,852.00 (G-SD-78651-1)

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

56. Acceptance – Sheriff

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for occupant protection education related materials and supplies (car seats distribution to communities for education and awareness), \$4,750.00 (G-SD-78651-2)

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

57. Acceptance – Sheriff

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the Selective Traffic Education Program education related materials and supplies (traffic data collector, tablet, tint meters, RADARs), \$22,458.00 (G-SD-78651-3)

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

58. Acceptance – Transportation

Central Federal Lands Highway Division - Arizona Federal Lands Access Program, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Sabino Canyon Park Road: Carter Canyon Road to USFS Gate Project (4SCPRD), amend grant language and scope of work, no cost/\$185,000.00 Highway User Revenue Fund match (GA-TR-75959)

At the request of staff and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

59. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2024 - 15, P23RZ00008, Wohlford - N. Bonanza Avenue Rezoning. Owner: Kevin and Sandra Wohlford. (District 1)

Chair Grijalva inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board.

Kevin Wohlford, Owner, addressed the Board and provided a summary of his rezoning request.

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

60. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 61, Co9-07-21, Stewart Title & Trust Tr 3652 - N. Como Drive Rezoning. Owner: Stewart Title & Trust Tr 3652. (District 1)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

61. Naming the Courtroom of the Green Valley Justice Court in Honor of the Late Tomas Ayala

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 62, of the Board of Supervisors, naming the Courtroom of the Green Valley Justice Court in Honor of the late Tomas Ayala. (District 5)

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

62. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 3.19, Naming of County Facilities and Programs to Recognize Donors.

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

Supervisor Christy questioned why this item was on the agenda.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that staff received requests and there had been instances where staff had named facilities or rooms and upon review of the policy as it related to another agenda item for the naming of a courtroom, they discussed how it was ultimately the Board's responsibility to name facilities. She stated that the existing policy only applied to naming facilities, programs, or buildings in relation to fundraising, a policy which had been developed during the construction of the Pima Animal Care Center facility to facilitate charitable donations. She indicated that they had been looking to revise the policy to clarify that it specifically related to the naming of buildings for financial purposes, and to establish a policy that only the Board had the authority to name any part of a building or program.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether from that point forward, any naming or renaming of County properties would be brought to the Board for approval.

Ms. Leshner responded yes.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was surprised that such a process was not already in place and felt the process made sense, as it ensured a formal vote. She emphasized the importance of establishing this process.

Supervisor Christy asked how the Judge Hooker lobby located at 33 N. Stone was named.

Ms. Leshar responded that she was unaware of the history of the building, but would look into it. She stated that staff believed there should be a Board policy in place for these types of matters.

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

63. **Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 3.21, Naming of County Facilities and Programs.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 62, for discussion related to this item.)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

64. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission**
Ratification of City of Tucson appointment: Andrew Paredes, to replace Ben Carpenter. Term expiration: 12/19/26. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
2. **Workforce Investment Board**
 - Reappointment of Karen Molina, representing Business. Term expiration: 9/30/26. (Staff recommendation)
 - Reappointment of Brad McCormick, representing Workforce; CBO. Term expiration: 9/30/27. (Staff recommendation)
3. **Flood Control District Advisory Committee**
Ratification of Town of Oro Valley appointments: Dennis Roberts, P.E. to replace John Spiker and John Lynch, P.E., alternate representative, to replace Dennis Roberts, P.E. No term expirations. (Jurisdictional recommendations)
4. **Pima County/City of Tucson Outdoor Lighting Code Committee**
Ratification of appointment: Miranda Jackson, to fill a vacancy created by Carlet Castro. Term expiration: 9/24/28. (City of Tucson recommendation)

5. **Arizona Municipal Property Corporation**
Reappointments of Frank Y. Valenzuela, Stanley Lehman, Kenneth M. Silverman, Diane Quihuis and John H. Payne. Term expirations: 11/19/25. (Corporation recommendations)

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

6. **Special Event**

- Kirsten Lee Polivchak, Foothills Service Club, Inc., Affinity Kitchens Plaza Colonial, 2840 E. Skyline Drive, No. 110, Tucson, October 19, 2024.
- Cathy L. Hutton, B.P.O.E., No. 1576, 350 N. Yermo Street, Ajo, October 26, 2024.
- Kenneth M. Gallagher, St. Rita in the Desert Catholic Church, 13260 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, November 8 and 9, 2024.
- Theresa Marie Marcus, Christ Lutheran Vail Church, 14600 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, December 7, 2024.
- Riley Janette Matulewic, American Heart Association, Westin La Paloma Resort, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, November 1, 2024.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 38 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, November 16, 2024.

TREASURER

7. **Fill the Gap**

Staff requests approval of the annual certification, as directed by A.R.S. §41-2421, that the five percent set-aside "Fill-the-Gap" funds in the amount of \$1,050,936.13 be transferred to the Local Courts Assistance Fund for supplemental aid to Superior and Justice Courts for processing of criminal cases.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

8. Minutes: August 19, 2024
Warrants: October, 2024

* * *

65. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:49 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT