

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

1. CONTRACT

Town of Sahuarita, to provide for participation in the District's ALERT Flood Warning System, no cost/25 year term (CT-FC-21-366)

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

2. CONTRACT

Title Security Agency, L.L.C., Trust No. 202056-S, to provide for an exchange agreement for 101.67 acres of surplus vacant property located at the base of the Catalina Mountains adjacent to National Forest land north of east Redington Road, Flood Control Non Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$60,500.00 (CT-PW-21-372)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

1. AWARD

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-16-243, Amendment No. 5, Unique Management Services, Inc., to provide for library debt collection services. This amendment extends the termination date to 4/30/22 and adds the annual award amount of \$119,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$568,480.00. Funding Source: Library District Ops Fund. Administering Department: Library District.

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the Board's recent waiver of collection fees and inquired whether these costs were being incurred due to the waiver of debt collection fees.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the amounts waived were from uncollectible aged dues. He stated that those were items that still needed to be pursued for collection because they were short-term. He indicated that this contractor also provided additional library related services. He stated that he had requested additional information for the Library Director and that information would be provided to the Board when received.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the County or Library District were incurring costs for waiving the collection fees.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that these were costs for the services provided by the contractor. He indicated that there were multiple services provided by the contractor and that they were Library District expenses.

Supervisor Christy asked that the Board be provided with an itemized list of services.

Supervisor Grijalva also asked that the list include the amount of debt collected for these services.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that a report would be provided to the Board.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

3. Presentation of a proclamation to Lieutenant James Smead, proclaiming the week of May 2 through 8, 2021 to be: "CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK"

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

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Lieutenant James Smead, proclaiming the week of May 2 through 8, 2021 to be: "NURSES WEEK"

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

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Diane M. Marzonie, President, Tucson Association of REALTORS® Board of Directors, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, April 27, 2021 to be: "TUCSON ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS® 100TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY DAY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Andrew Pongrátz, Student Council President, and Linda Swango, Director of Student Affairs, Upper School, BASIS Tucson North High School, proclaiming the week of April 18 through 24, 2021 to be: "PIMA COUNTY STUDENT LEADERSHIP WEEK"

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

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Clerk of the Board read a submitted public comment and the statement was added to the record.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8. The Board of Supervisors on April 6, 2021, continued the following:

Tucson-Pima Historical Commission

Discussion/Action regarding proposal to split Tucson-Pima Historical Commission into jurisdictional commissions, as recommended by the State Historic Preservation Office. (District 2)

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

Supervisor Heinz recommended that the Tucson-Pima Historical Commission be split into jurisdictional commissions, as recommended by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Chair Bronson asked that clarification be provided.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that the Office of Sustainability and Conservation had received a report regarding separating the joint commission with each jurisdiction establishing their own commission. He stated that the City of Tucson recently approved the separation and staff was recommending the County follow suit. He indicated that the Office of Sustainability and Conservation would be responsible for reconstituting the commission, modifying policies and code, and presenting the reformed Commission to the Board for consideration.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0, to approve the item, as directed.

9. **Pima Association of Governments Regional Council and Regional Transportation Authority Board Retreat**

Discussion/Action regarding the topics to be addressed by members of the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) Regional Council and Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Board during a retreat scheduled for April 22, 2021. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott indicated that as the County's representative on the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) Regional Council and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Board, it was important that the County's priorities be voiced. He indicated that there were three key elements he would be undertaking as the County's representative: 1) The completion of the current RTA plan by 2026; 2) Working with PAG and RTA members and the Citizens Advisory Committee towards the development of the next RTA Proposal; and 3) Working with PAG on the County's annual agreement involving issues other than transportation. He asked that Board members provide a list of concerns, suggestions, or priorities for presentation at an upcoming retreat.

Supervisor Christy had the following inquiries: What cooperation, support, and enthusiasm was there from PAG and RTA for renewing the RTA into the next phase? What was the level of enthusiasm from other jurisdictions for the future? Was there any reluctance, if so, what were the issues?

Supervisor Scott indicated that the upcoming retreat would be the first opportunity for the group to meet. He stated that after speaking with individuals from various jurisdictions, everyone was committed to a consensual plan that could be presented to the voters for approval.

Chair Bronson indicated that the next phase should consider rural communities with failed roads. She stated that funding should be discussed since one-third of Pima County was unincorporated and the revenues received from HURF were less when compared to incorporated jurisdictions and Maricopa's allocations.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether the weighted voting process, currently utilized by Maricopa's RTA, could be changed by a majority of the RTA Board.

Supervisor Scott responded that the explanation he was provided was that when the RTA Board and PAG Regional Council were formed, representatives from Pima County and the City of Tucson renounced weighted voting for those jurisdictions so that there would be an inclusive and collaborative model. He added that other jurisdictions opposed weighted voting as well, with the exception of the City of Tucson's recent letter requesting that Tucson be considered for weighted voting.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that it was critical to have a variety of ways to get around our community and focus should not be limited to vehicular accessibility. She stated that having a variety of cross-town mobility options was critical and those projects should be expanded and discussed.

Supervisor Heinz indicated that the works of the PAG Regional Council and the RTA Board were too important to be relegated to four one-hour meetings throughout the year. He stated that it would be beneficial for PAG and RTA to return to monthly meetings, especially while preparing a plan for presentation to the voters. He indicated that members from the Transportation Department and their colleagues had a wealth of expertise to apply towards improving transportation, mobility and utilizing funding efficiently. He stated that the current process used by PAG/RTA did not allow for the experts to be involved in the process. He indicated that the RTA's process needed to be transparent. He stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) complained about not receiving enough information and not being allowed to debate issues, such as road projects and other jurisdictional priorities, for inclusion in the RTA package. He added that there had been no public forums. He urged Supervisor Scott to demand a radical opening up of the process to allow the public to express their needs and concerns. He stated that the original RTA package included funding for sidewalks, bicycle pathways and safety measures and these funds were reallocated to complete roadway projects. He indicated that it was important that the next RTA categorically fund sidewalks and safety improvements and protect that funding from being swept in the future. He stated the importance of roadway projects having flexibility before they were presented to the voters. He indicated that constituents, transportation experts, and the City of Tucson had requested increased transportation choices, improved safety and maintenance of existing infrastructure. He encouraged Supervisor Scott to specifically fight for those priorities. He added that the jurisdictional memberships should be driving the process, not PAG or RTA staff and that the PAG/RTA Executive Director's job performance needed to be reviewed.

Supervisor Scott encouraged Board members and the public to review the County's June 2020, RTA Next proposal. He indicated that it provided a holistic view of the County's regional transportation needs and the priorities to be emphasized as the County's representative on the PAG Regional Council and the RTA Board. He added that he would work in conjunction with jurisdictional representatives for a successful completion of the current RTA plan, and would ensure that the CAC had the resources needed to develop the next RTA plan.

Supervisor Grijalva suggested that Board members and citizens send their public comments to publiccomments@pagregion.com, to voice their priorities.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether there were community representatives available to convey comments at the retreat.

Supervisor Scott responded that he was not aware whether the CAC was set up with specific representatives from each jurisdiction. He inquired whether the County Administrator was aware of the composition.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that his recollection was that there was an application review process and individuals were selected. He stated that he was unaware whether selection was by jurisdiction.

Supervisor Christy suggested that a CAC membership list be provided so that input can be provided to those members from individuals residing within their general area of concern.

Chair Bronson concurred that CAC membership information be provided.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, indicated that appointments were not made with regards to their geographic locations. He stated a CAC membership list would be provided along with their geographical location.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

10. Fiscal Year 2020/21 Budget Authority

Staff requests approval to exceed the budget limit by approximately \$150 million, which represents the amount of unbudgeted COVID-19 grant funding received and expended this fiscal year.

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

Supervisor Christy expressed concern over exceeding the budget limit and stated that this was in conflict with the Arizona Revised Statutes. He indicated additional information was needed to explore the penalties that could be incurred by the County. He asked how other counties dealt with this situation and inquired about the \$70 million saved from the 2021 budget as a result of the 5% budget reduction.

Chair Bronson commented that the expenses were COVID related and this situation was unpredictable.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that there were no penalties, rules or regulations regarding these occurrences. He explained that the adjustment was appropriate because it was related to Federal funding received in response to the health crisis and pandemic. He stated that in October, the County would publish a detailed reconciliation report for the fiscal year ending on June 30th. He indicated that document would then be referenced in the Comprehensive Audit Financial Report (CAFR), and exceedances and transparency would be provided. He added that it was a technical matter of budget construction.

Chair Bronson commented that general accounting principles dictated the County's approach to this exceedance.

Supervisor Christy reiterated his concerns that this action conflicted with Arizona Revised Statute §42-17106.

Chair Bronson stated that this process was being undertaken by other counties; however, other counties were not providing transparency.

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

11. Updates and Action on COVID-19

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

12. Champion Schools Project

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 12, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the proceedings of the Industrial Development Authority of the County of Pima regarding the issuance of its not to exceed \$28,000,000.00 Education Facility Revenue Bonds (Champion Schools Project, 250 S. McQueen Road, Chandler, AZ and 1846 E. Bella Vista Road, San Tan Valley, AZ), Series 2021 and declaring an emergency.

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

Supervisor Scott inquired why the Board approved the issuance of bonds for charter school facilities located in Maricopa County.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the Pima County Industrial Development Authority (IDA) required Board approval prior to any issuance of debt.

Michael Slania, Attorney, IDA, indicated that under the IDA statutes, the governing body had to approve the bonds prior to issuance. He explained that the charter school had previously come to the County IDA and the jurisdiction of the IDA, in Arizona, was statewide.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether Maricopa County had an IDA.

Mr. Slania responded in the affirmative and added that a number of other authorities were available. He indicated that borrowers often selected which authority they would request issuance from based on their relationships with the underwriters or the entities.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed concern over approving projects for other jurisdictions. She asked why these were not presented to Maricopa County's IDA and inquired whether there would be consequences if denied.

Mr. Slania responded that this was a supplemental request for a 2017 bond issue that was brought before Pima County's IDA. He indicated the revenues were provided to the trustee who served for both bond issues. He added that approaching another IDA at this time would be difficult, because the revenues must first be applied to the 2017 bonds and then would require transferring the bonds issued for 2021.

Supervisor Scott asked for the history of Champion Schools bringing this project to Pima County's IDA.

Mr. Slania responded that Maricopa, Phoenix and Tucson's IDAs had the authority to issue statewide; however, for several years the Phoenix and Maricopa IDAs chose not to fund charter schools. He added that after consent from Pima County's Board, Pima's IDA was made available to them.

Supervisor Scott inquired why authority was granted by the Board in 2017 after Maricopa's IDA had denied the request.

Chair Bronson responded that a majority of the Board had expressed concern over the charter school being located in Maricopa County. She indicated that after discussion, the Board reluctantly approved the IDA with a caveat that future projects would be dealt with by Maricopa's IDA. She indicated that she was withdrawing her original motion and inquired whether Supervisor Scott was the seconder to her motion.

Supervisor Scott responded that he had seconded the motion for purpose of discussion.

Chair Bronson withdrew her original motion and inquired whether there was another motion on the floor.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether the item would fail from lack of Board action.

Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the item would fail from lack of action.

Supervisor Scott indicated that he would like to continue the Resolution to the next Board meeting. He asked that additional information regarding this matter be provided.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 4, 2021.

REAL PROPERTY

13. Sale of Real Property - Lot 381

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 13, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0032. (District 3)

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

14. Sale of Real Property - Lot 382

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 14, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0032. (District 3)

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

15. The Board of Supervisors on March 2, 2021, continued the following:

Hearing - Rezoning

P20RZ00011 MORTGAGE EQUITIES XVI, L.L.C., - S. SORREL LANE REZONING
Mortgage Equities XVI, L.L.C. represented by Rick Engineering Company, Inc., requests a rezoning of approximately 139.4 acres (parcel codes 138-29-002B, 002C, 002D, 002E, 002F, 002G and 002H) from the GR-1 (Rural Residential) to the CR-4 (Mixed-Dwelling Type) zone located at the northeast corner of the T-intersection of W. Hermans Road and S. Sorrel Lane. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 3.0. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 10-0 to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 5)

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

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
 - A. The property owner shall dedicate the south 30 feet of the site's southern property boundary for Hermans Road right-of-way.
 - B. A Traffic Impact Study shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Transportation with the Tentative Plat submittal. Offsite improvements determined

necessary as a result of the traffic impact study shall be provided by the property owner.

- C. The number, location and design of said access points shall be determined at the Tentative Plat review process and it is subject to approval from the Department of Transportation. Internal circulation shall be revised to accommodate said access points.
 - D. Roadway improvements to Sorrel Lane that meets Pima County Standards will be required for a distance of approximately 500 feet north of the intersection of Sorrel Lane and Hermans Road. Improvements to Sorrel lane shall match the existing roadway cross section width. The exact improvement length to Sorrel Lane shall be determined during the Tentative Plat/Development Plan review process.
3. Regional Flood Control District conditions:
- A. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approval of the Conditional Letter of Map Revision is required prior to issuance of the grading permit.
 - B. If determined to be necessary, certain drainageways shall be dedicated in fee to the District after construction has been accepted.
 - C. The developer shall provide all-weather access on Sorrel Lane.
 - D. FEMA floodwall standards must be maintained adjacent to Mission West subdivision.
 - E. Inspection and maintenance of drainage infrastructure shall be required after both the winter and summer storm seasons and after significant storm events.
 - F. Drainage improvements shall be enhanced with native riparian vegetation and Pima County Regulated Riparian Habitat mitigation shall occur on-site.
 - G. At the time of development, the applicant will be required to commit to water conservation measures identified in the Site Analysis Requirements in effect at that time sufficient to obtain 15 points.
 - H. A will serve letter from a Designated Water Provider shall be submitted with the Tentative Plat.
4. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
- A. The owner shall not construe any action by Pima County as a commitment to provide sewer service to any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner to that effect.
 - B. The owner shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
 - C. The owner shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
 - D. The owner shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
 - E. The owner shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.
 - F. The owner shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County and

all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

5. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s)/developer(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site; and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
6. Cultural Resources condition: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
7. Adherence to the preliminary development plan as approved at public hearing, including a maximum height of 30 feet and only single-story dwellings along the perimeter of the site.
8. Natural Resources, Park and Recreation condition: The West Branch of the Santa Cruz single-track trail ST-014 shall be dedicated to Pima County and built to County standards.
9. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
10. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P20RZ00011, subject to standard and special conditions.

16. **Hearing - Rezoning Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 15, Co9-08-08, Riverside Associates, et al. - River Road No. 2 Rezoning. Owners: Riverview Ventures, L.L.C. (District 1)

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

17. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 16, Co9-02-01, Swindell - Cardinal Avenue Rezoning. Owners: Daniel, L.L.C. (District 5)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

18. Tax Rate - Fiscal Year (FY) 22 Budget Planning

Discussion/Action regarding a measure directing the County Administrator and County staff to prepare the FY22 Budget under the assumption that the County will keep the total tax rate the same from FY21 to FY22. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz commented that he preferred not to reduce the tax rate; but, to maintain the same rate to cover additional expenses. He recommended that the tax rate for Fiscal Year 2022 remain the same.

Supervisor Grijalva asked what would be the impact on County revenue if tax rates remained the same.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the prepared Tentative Budget followed the policy adopted by the Board with regards to Pay-As-You Go (PAYGO), which directly affects both the secondary and primary rates. He indicated that the current rate was based on growth, about 6.08%, and the required drop in secondary debt service. He stated that the secondary debt service would be reduced from .54 to .47 cents. He indicated that the primary formula was based on 60% growth going to PAYGO capital financing. He stated that the primary rate would drop from \$3.92 to \$3.87. He estimated that maintaining the same rate would generate an additional \$12 million in revenue.

Supervisor Christy asked about assessed values and their impact on the budgetary process. He also asked what the difference was between growth and assessed values.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that the 6.08% tax base growth included two components, appreciation of the base and new construction. He indicated new construction was 1.2% of the 6.08% growth, which left the balance as appreciation. He stated that was the market value established by the Assessor for locally assessed values and by the State Department of Revenue for central assessed properties.

Supervisor Christy commented that property tax rates could not be determined until it was known what effects the assessed values would have on the process. He asked whether that was correct.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative. She indicated that maintaining the tax rate would impact individuals who could least afford it and they would see an increase in property taxes.

Mr. Huckelberry indicated that there were over 400,000 tax parcels and each would react differently to value influences in the areas they were located. He stated that was why averages were used because parcels could decrease or increase in value.

Chair Bronson indicated that the budget was a work in progress and the appropriate time to set policy would be during adoption of the budget when more information was provided with underlying instruction or direction from the Board. She indicated that she could not support this item and staff should be allowed to perform their duties.

Supervisor Heinz commented that it was the Board's responsibility to direct the Administrator and staff with regards to this process.

Chair Bronson indicated that the appropriate time would be during tentative or final budget adoption.

Supervisor Heinz indicated that he would present his recommendation at the appropriate time. He indicated that he wanted to allow staff the time necessary to plan appropriately.

Supervisor Grijalva asked whether this item could be considered during the budget process. She indicated that would allow for some flexibility and could make a difference to community services.

Supervisor Christy indicated that these issues are presented consistently and it would be beneficial to allow the process to evolve. He stated that would allow Board members the opportunity to insert their motion at the appropriate time.

Supervisor Scott concurred that it would be appropriate to consider both options simultaneously.

Chair Bronson indicated that the Board's consensus was that this matter be discussed at the appropriate time, which would be during tentative and/or final adoption.

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

19. **Presentation from Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT)**

Discussion/Action regarding a request for PCDOT Director Ana Olivares and Deputy Director Kathryn Skinner, to share the presentation they made to the RTA Next Citizens Advisory Committee on 4/12/21 with the Board of Supervisors, for the purposes of discussing our regional vision for smart mobility and future transportation investment priorities. (District 2)

A presentation was made to the Board by Ana Olivares, Director, and Kathryn Skinner, Deputy Director, Transportation Department. The following points were discussed in the presentation:

- Transportation Mission and Vision
- Existing Conditions
- Performance and Desired Outcomes
- Solution Strategies
- RTA Next Proposal

Supervisor Heinz expressed his appreciation to the presenters and thanked Supervisor Scott for his commitment to a transparent public conversation regarding transportation priorities. He commented on the importance of having safe, flexible, and resilient plans for a livable community and how important public education was in meeting the needs of the community.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

20. **Donation of County Vehicle as Surplus Property**

Staff recommends approval of a donation of a 2011 Chevy Express 3500 surplus property to the Children's Advocacy Center for reaching underserved victims in rural and remote communities.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

21. Cochise Private Industry Council, Inc., d.b.a. ARIZONA@WORK Southeastern Arizona, to provide for the H-1B Workforce Program, USDOL Employment and Training Fund, contract amount \$1,493,426.19/4 year term (CT-CR-21-356)

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

22. Goodwill Industries of Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 8, to provide for workforce development services in the ARIZONA@WORK - Workshops and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-20-410)

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

HEALTH

23. Banner-University Medical Group, Amendment No. 1, to provide for COVID-19 vaccination services, extend contract term to 5/31/21, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CT-HD-21-301)

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

24. Tucson Medical Center, Amendment No. 1, to provide for a COVID-19 Vaccination Agreement and amend contractual language, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$5,000,000.00 (CT-HD-21-291)

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

Supervisor Christy commented about the additional \$5 million which would double the contract's total and the contract's short existence. He inquired why this was being considered especially since there was a decline in vaccination activities.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the County was considering locating Type 1 Federal PODs within the County. He indicated the amendment would have covered costs incurred by the County for using the State Registration System and for providing vaccinators or pharmacists at the sites. He indicated that since the County was unable to reach an agreement, Type 1 PODs were not available. He added that the fallback was Type 5 Mobile PODs because the volume would be lower, and the costs for the registration system was no longer an issue. He indicated that this amendment was no longer necessary and requested that the item be withdrawn.

Chair Bronson withdrew her original motion and recommended that the County Administrator withdraw the item from the agenda.

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

25. Pascua Yaqui Tribe, to provide for an Intergovernmental Agreement for public health emergency preparedness and mutual aid, no cost/5 year term (CTN-HD-21-95)

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

26. Pause for Change, L.L.C., to provide for a Public Schools Task Force Group, Healthy People Healthy Communities Grant Fund, contract amount \$80,000.00 (CT-HD-21-336)

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

Supervisor Scott inquired about the membership of the task force and whether direction could be given, to the consulting firm, to include strategies and feedback from youths in the community.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that he was unaware of the composition of the task force.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, also indicated that he was unaware of the memberships and would provide that information. He added that the firm was retained because they were experts in including youth perspectives and strategies.

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

PROCUREMENT

27. Davis Vision, Inc., Amendment No. 6, to provide for employee prepaid vision insurance and amend contractual language, Employee Contributions Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (MA-PO-16-200) Human Resources

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

REAL PROPERTY

28. City of Tucson, to provide for an Acquisition Agreement, Special Warranty Deed and Grant of Aerial Easement for the 75 E. Broadway Boulevard Alley Right-of-Way, Acq-0780, General Fund, contract amount \$307,000.00 (CT-PW-21-337)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

29. Acceptance - Public Defense Services

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Title IV-E Federal Foster Care, \$325,574.72/\$1,574,673.29 General Fund Match (GTAM 21-90)

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

30. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

City of Tucson, to provide for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care Program - Supportive Services - Coordinated Entry Project Intergovernmental Agreement, \$44,100.00/\$11,025.00 General Fund Match (GTAW 21-139)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

31. Election Integrity Commission

Appointment of Misty Atkins, to replace Grady L. Rhodes. Term expiration: 4/19/23. (District 1)

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

32. State Board of Equalization

Reappointment of Jill Maratea. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 2)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

33. Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon the request of Supervisors Christy, Grijalva and Heinz to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 7 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISORS CHRISTY, GRIJALVA AND HEINZ

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

7. Knott Development, Inc., to provide for a predevelopment services agreement for Kino South Sports and Entertainment Complex, General Fund, contract amount \$1,825,000.00 (CT-PW-21-364) Public Works/Project Management Office

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

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the proposed development's inclusion of an ice rink and the fact that ice rinks have had marginal success in Pima County. She inquired about a 2009 request for proposals for an ice rink in Marana and what the outcome was. She expressed concerns that ice rinks had not been successful in Pima County and asked if the facility would have some versatility.

Chair Bronson indicated that the last proposal did not meet the criteria set and the proposal died. She stated that this proposal was different because it was a sports complex and not a single isolated facility.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, indicated that this was a new proposal which solicited for a qualified master developer for a sports and entertainment complex that had multiple uses. He stated Knott Development's proposal contained the required elements sought by the County, which included retail, hospitality, restaurant and an outdoor stadium. He stated that the process was a two-step solicitation; firms were required to detail their qualifications, they were ranked and interviewed, and two firms were asked to submit specific proposals and draft business plans. He indicated that the proposal before the Board was a Pre-Development Services Agreement that would allow the developer the opportunity to refine the design and provide estimates for the various facilities required. He indicated that if the Board approved the Pre-Development Services Agreement, a Master Developer Partnership Agreement would be presented in July. He indicated that there was a growing interest in hockey nationally, regionally and locally. He indicated in response to the flexibility of the ice

facility, this iceplex would have three ice sheets. He stated that each sheet could be configured to support other uses and if there was a decline in demand there was flexibility for incorporating indoor sports, with minimal reconfiguration to the indoor area.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the number of iceplexs previously located in Pima County.

Mr. DeBonis responded that he was not familiar with the past history of those facilities. He indicated that interest in hockey was growing at a rapid pace, faster than some of the other sports, especially at the youth level. He detailed the process steps for further clarification: 1) Solicitation for Qualifications; 2) Request for proposals; 3) Predevelopment Services Agreement; 4) Approval of the Master Developer Partnership Agreement. He stated that there would be a period of time in this process in which the developer would be required to submit detailed information on the facilities utilization. He added that would include the implementation of contracts or agreements demonstrating the actual usage of the facilities. He added that the Pre-Development Services Agreement focused on schematic design, design development, and refined cost estimation for the field house and the iceplex, in terms of construction costs for those facilities. He indicated that progress into the subsequent stage, Master Developer Partnership Agreement, will require review of the full business plan, cash flow estimates or forecast utilization estimates, percentages of use, operating and programmatic details, that would then be incorporated into the final agreement and the final business plan. He stated that before the County moved towards construction of these facilities, it required validation that the usage still existed.

Supervisor Grijalva reiterated her concern with the lack of interest for an iceplex and inquired whether interest was significant.

Mr. DeBonis responded that families and players were being turned away because ice time was not available for teams, leagues or practices. He added that there were unmet demands for this particular sport. He stated information regarding interest would be provided within the Master Developer Partnership Agreement and the business plan.

Supervisor Grijalva asked that a utilization and growth report be provided prior to the Board's consideration and investment of \$1.8 million in design.

Mr. DeBonis clarified that the designs included in the Pre-Development Services Agreement, were schematic designs, or 30% of the design plan, and were not the full design of the facility. He indicated that the information provided would be combined with other utilization information, cost estimates and operating and management agreements for presentation to the Board in July. He stated that after approval of these plans the County would be reimbursed \$1.8 million from Knott Development. He indicated that the

structure of this agreement did not involve County financing or funding. He added that usage information would be compiled through the progression of the process. He added that the outcome for the Pre-Development Services Agreement will result in refined cost estimates, without the benefit of having detailed designs.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the County's option to reconfigure plans and whether this would result in additional investments.

Mr. DeBonis responded that there would be the ability to make plan adjustments. He added that additional design work was needed and there was time to pivot, if necessary.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern over the project's costs to the County and eventual private/public partnership. He indicated that it was not profitable for the County to be a landlord. He commented about private capital investors not being willing to risk investing because of the County's history of shutting down businesses due to the pandemic. He added that County taxpayers would be responsible for this project, especially if it was shut down. He stated that controls were needed before stepping into something that was likely to fail. He added that the Health Department's power over these venues needed to be fully investigated, discussed, analyzed and controlled with transparent oversight. He stated that if there was a market demand for this type of complex, private developers would be submitting requests to Pima County. He added that this project should be solely driven by the private sector and not by Pima County.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about water usage for maintaining ice sheets. He asked that an analysis be included on potential water usage for maintaining the venues.

Mr. DeBonis responded that the proposed facilities were designed to include sustainable practices, both in the buildings as well as site amenities and features. He indicated that ice removals would be incorporated into the complex's harvesting and irrigation plans. He stated that the County had a long standing, well-renowned practice in the area of sustainability and those factors could be accommodated to mitigate water utilization. He stated that the design will be heavily dependent on increasing sustainability and reducing the carbon footprint of the facility.

Supervisor Heinz expressed the importance of ensuring that Knott Development's agreement contained language addressing standards for general and sub-contractors, such as safe job sites, workplace safety, paying prevailing wages, fair hiring and hiring locally, in accordance with State law.

Chair Bronson inquired whether Board members were hesitant in voting and inquired whether a vote was required. She also asked that the County Administrator address the concerns raised by Supervisors Grijalva and Heinz.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that if the Board took no action then it would delay implementation. He indicated that Knott Development's proposal would be reviewed, particularly as it related to ice and ice scheduling, and information would be provided to the Board. He addressed the water conservation concerns by indicating that the Kino Environmental Restoration Project was the largest urban water re-harvesting or harvesting project in the region. He stated that reclaimed water was utilized at both Kino sites for irrigation. He added that water reclaiming options would be explored and information would be provided to the Board. He indicated that issues related to construction activity, firms and hiring would be addressed regularly through the County's contracts with the community. He added that the County had invested over \$100 million and continuing to invest would attract the broadest of sports activities and would have an economic impact on the community.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed her reluctance on voting for this item without additional information on the facility's utilization.

Supervisor Scott expressed his support for the item. He indicated that the Board would have an opportunity to review additional information once the Master Services Agreement was presented to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz encouraged economic development and growth of amateur and professional soccer and continued support for FC Tucson.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that investing in Kino Complex was valuable; however, additional indoor facilities were concerning, especially three ice rinks, and additional utilization information was needed.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. Goodwill Industries of Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for youth - workforce development services, amend contractual language and scope of work, General Fund, contract amount \$27,049.85 (CT-CR-21-205)

2. SER - Jobs for Progress of Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for youth - workforce development services, amend contractual language and scope of work, General Fund, contract amount \$26,985.15 (CT-CR-21-226)

Forensic Science Center

3. Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of ASU's Center for Violence Prevention, to provide for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, contract amount \$20,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-FSC-21-96)

Pima Animal Care Center

4. Dee Kid and Sabra Boutari, to provide for a Donation and Donor Recognition Agreement, no cost/20 year term, (CTN-PAC-21-73)

Procurement

5. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-16-77, Amendment No. 8, Polydyne, Inc., to provide for Polymer. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$1,028,605.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$4,330,605.00. Funding Source: Wastewater Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

6. **Award**
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-21-157, NaphCare, Inc. (Headquarters: Birmingham, AL), to provide for Correctional Health Services Electronic Health Record (EHR). This master agreement is for a term of five (5) years in the not-to-exceed amount of \$1,386,000.00 (including sales tax). Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Behavioral Health.

7. Knott Development, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

8. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, to provide for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$1,064,923.00 (GTAW 21-138)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

9. Metropolitan Education Commission

- Appointment of Brian Eller, representing Health Care Community, to replace Nicole Pargas, R.N. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (Chair recommendation)
- Appointment of Mark Hanna, At-Large Commission Appointee, to replace Rex Scott. Term expiration: 3/19/22. (Commission recommendation)
- Appointment of Sascha Quarthey, representing African American Community, to fill a vacancy created by Dr. Da'Mond Holt. Term expiration: 5/16/22. (Commission recommendation)

10. Small Business Commission

Appointment of Moniqua Lane, to fill a vacancy created by Juan Francisco Padres. No term expiration. (District 2)

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

11. Special Event

Juli Suzanne Daley, Tucson Rebels Fastpitch, Brandi Fenton Park, 3482 E. River Road, Tucson, April 24, 2021.

ELECTIONS

12. Precinct Committeemen

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

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Candace M. Greenburg-070-DEM; Juan F. Padres-089-DEM; Leila Counts-099-DEM; Kurt M. Haumesser-113-DEM; Christina A. Early-154-DEM; Steven J. Early-154-DEM; Vincent M. Pawlowski-161-DEM; Joy R. Noriega-166-DEM; Katherine Maass-181-DEM; Marcella "Marcy" M. Eagan-182-DEM; Lee Anne Clavin-211-DEM; Kylie M. Walzak-245-DEM; Angie M. Walker-006-REP; Lana M. O'Brien-029-REP; Timothy E. Coon-054-REP; Michelle L. Uchmanowicz-055-REP; James H. Freund-067-REP; Margaret M. Michel-096-REP; Elizabeth B. Smith-104-REP; David S. Smith-104-REP; Elizabeth "Bettie" A. Thompson-141-REP; Edgar R. Melkers-146-REP; Tonya M. Davidson-148-REP; Elizabeth J. Crump-191-REP; Eric D. Crump-191-REP; Kathleen "Katta" Mapes-191-REP; Larry H. Shoemaker-194-REP; John C. Voorhees-205-REP; Ernesto W. Lopez-214-REP; Deborah Porterfield-231-REP; Sarah J. Ramsey-239-REP; Matthew A. Levitt-249-REP

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

13. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Sara M. Barrett \$39.16; HSL La Reserve Properties, L.L.C. \$762.85; St. Elizabeth's Health Center, Inc. \$7,453.44; St. Elizabeth's Health Center, Inc. \$1,222.97; St. Elizabeth's Health Center, Inc. \$2,009.55; Instrumentation & Controls, L.L.C. \$1,497.86; Jeanette Chappotin \$112.00; RHP Partner Splitter, L.P. \$581.79.

TREASURER

14. Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$185,723.89.

PROCLAMATION

15. Proclaiming the week of May 1 through 7, 2021 to be: "YOUTH WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

16. Minutes: March 16 and 24, 2021

* * *

34. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. Updates and Action on COVID-19

Verbatim

SB: Chair Bronson
SC: Supervisor Christy
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
MH: Supervisor Heinz
RS: Supervisor Scott
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
FG: Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services
TC: Theresa Cullen, Director, Health Department

SB: Alright, moving on to Item No. 14, COVID emergency updates. Mr. Huckelberry, anything for us?

CH: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, we will be very quick on this item. I sent you a fairly short memorandum. We have supplemented that with our mobile clinic experiences of this last weekend and the ones that are scheduled in the future. My guess is most of the discussion here will revolve around the Federal POD and I have not heard anything that would update it. Perhaps, Dr. Garcia or Dr. Cullen could, but let me give you the short version. The short version is that I believe last Thursday or Wednesday, our staff met with State staff to work on language. The language that I sent to the Board previously was language coming directly from the State. That had been modified quite a lot given our conversation with the State, but that language also had to go both to the State as well as the Federal Emergency Management Agency. A conversation that occurred I believe on Friday, between our staff, the ADH staff, the ADHS staff, FEMA staff and the DEMA, which is the Department of Emergency Management and Military Affairs at the State level, of which it was apparent that there was not going to be any agreement between the State and FEMA and in particular the legal representatives of both. They agreed to turn and communicate again, on I believe Monday and we understand those communications, I do not believe, made any progress in resolving the differences of opinion between the State and Federal agency. Hence our Federal POD that was going to be a type 1 POD, would appear to be not viable at this point in time. So what we have done is pivoted to a request of FEMA that is allowed under their rules, under a standard emergency public preparedness request and have asked for six mobile PODs to be provided by FEMA, supplemented with our staff as necessary. Each providing approximately 250 to 350 shots per mobile clinic, that means per day, and this allows us to have the greatest flexibility to get into the community and have folks actually come and be vaccinated. There is

a whole number of strategies being worked on by our Communications staff right now, as to how to get individuals who are either reluctant to be vaccinated or had obstacles placed before them in getting vaccinated. As you looked at the mobile clinics we had this last weekend, you saw that Sunnyside High School had 1,080, and Maldonado Elementary 380, that is fairly significant. Again, we removed a lot of the barriers with regard to registration, walk-up registration, drive-up registration. This would be the same approach we would use with the six, and these are what we call type 5 mobile PODS, that FEMA would support. So, we are going to make that request to FEMA and see where it goes and at this point, I do not have anything more other than perhaps either Dr. Garcia or Dr. Cullen can provide you any additional information with regard to that aspect of the discussion.

SB: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Any questions from Board members?

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I did have some questions for either Dr. Garcia or Dr. Cullen, regarding our continued mask ordinance. In a memo that Mr. Huckelberry sent to the Board, April 16, it said that the mask mandate could be lifted if we had two weeks of COVID-19 infections fall below 10 per 100,000 residents. I wanted to ask either Dr. Garcia or Dr. Cullen, how is that metric determined, that 10 per 100,000 figure? I have some follow-up questions after that.

SB: Do we have Dr. Cullen with us?

RS: You are muted Dr. Garcia.

SB: Dr. Garcia, you sound like a...like, okay talk now and see if it works. You are unmuted. Okay, cannot hear you. No, you are squeaky.

AG: Chair Bronson, can I ask a question, while I think he is going to try to log back on, it looks like?

SB: Okay now, go ahead, proceed.

AG: I just wanted to, because we are getting to the point where we are dealing with people who are resistant and have had the opportunity to vaccinate and have opted not to. I wondering if we can get examples during our Board meetings on this item on the kind of media buys? We are getting memos, but I am thinking a public presentation is helpful. How we are cooperating with schools and other organizations that represent a large number of people, churches and nonprofits. That you know, how do we, how do we do things a little bit differently as far as connecting with newsletters and really, I just, and then we could add the attachments to these items so people can download,

like, if it is a you know, a social media sort of image that people can come on to our site and download them. We can as supervisors or anybody else. I do think that you know, I went to the Rising Star pop-up this last weekend and I think there was some overall, we had a really great turnout the first time and the second time, we changed it to all walk-up. So, there was no drive-up option and some of the people that were there representing the church thought that perhaps that was one of the reasons why people were opting to come in because the thought of sitting outside was a little hard as far as temperature. So, I do think we are going to have to get really creative now in trying to convince people that have had the option several times to vaccinate and are choosing not to. I am interested specifically in the kind of media buys in Spanish language and who is creating those? Are they are on you know, are they commercial kind of images or are they radio images? I do think that some more detail would be helpful because I have been on a couple of calls where people have some pretty good ideas and I know the Health Department is surrounded by a lot of people who are really focused. Probably 100% of their time is trying to figure out some of these things and if we had more information as a public, we could let everybody know what else they could do and like the next steps. So, thank you.

SB: Thank you. Is Dr. Garcia back on?

FG: Chair Bronson, can you hear me now?

SB: Now we can hear you. Okay.

FG: I apologize profoundly. It seems like I always have an issue with chipmunks. Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, to your very specific question, the issue is where, where does the standard come from for the purposes of lifting the mask mandate? So just to be clear, the Centers for Disease Control has set certain thresholds for what is considered, for community transmission. Those thresholds are fairly sort of set in stone and well-articulated, and were articulated very, during the Fall, I am sorry, during the, yes Fall of last year. It sets certain thresholds and it says that when a community has more than 100 per 100,000 cases, it is in very high transmission. If a community has 100 to 100 per 100,000 cases or below, then that is substantial transmission. Moderate transmission is defined as 50 per 100,000 cases and minimal transmission is 10 per 100,000 cases. That minimal transmission that point in time when the virus is being minimally transmitted in a community, is when it is okay to relax mitigation standards, specifically masking and physical distancing standards. So, that is where the threshold comes from. It is available on the Centers for Disease Control website, as well as on the ADHS website.

SB: Thank you...

RS: Thank you.

SB: Dr. Garcia.

RS: And I had some follow-up questions, Madam Chair. The graph in the memo Dr. Garcia, that Mr. Huckelberry sent us, showed the infection rates for the last five weeks and the data for that graph, it said came from the Arizona Department of Health Services School Dashboard or the Centers for Disease Control COVID Data Tracker. My questions were, why two data sources and when is each one used? Because again the graph says or, ADHS School Dashboard or CDC COVID Data Tracker. So, it is hard to tell when each one is used and then the follow-up question I had is, why do we use those two measures instead of any other?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, very simply stated, the reason that, so the data that we rely on is the data that the State publishes on its website and is the data of record that is transmitted and uploaded to the Centers for Disease Control. Because of reporting lags, the ADHS does not typically, typically report things that have happened two weeks ago. Not, it does not report them on a day-to-day basis. So, from there, from their reporting record on the school's dashboard, you see that on February 1st, there were 98 cases per 100,000, on February 28th, there were 79 cases per 100,000, March 7th, 64 cases. A naiver on March 14th of 55 cases, going up on March 21st to 59 cases and most recently on March 28th to 61 cases and last week on April 4th, reporting 62 per 100,000 cases. The last data point in there is from the CDC COVID Data Tracker, so the reason that we included that data point in there was simply because the State had not yet reported what the cases per 100,000 and those usually track fairly tightly with each other. But to be clear, the Health Department relies on what the State is reporting up to CDC. So, you can see a clear trend that a naiver on March 14th, and it has increased slightly. We are still in the substantial transmission mode, but certainly looking much better than we were in January.

SB: Thank you.

RS: So just to be clear for the public, we are, when we are reporting on local infection rates, we are using data that is provided to us by the Arizona Department of Health Services, the Department of Health Services that is run by Governor Ducey's appointee, Dr. Christ? Because I think there has been some speculation in the community that the Pima County Health Department is using its own data. This is data that we get from the State of Arizona and that is then uploaded to the Centers for Disease Control. Correct?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, you are absolutely correct. The data flows from the State to us, and from us to the State it is ultimately reconciled by the State and reported up to the Federal Government.

- RS: I did, thank you for saying that and I just thought that was an important point of clarification for us to make publicly. The last question that I had was there has been a lot of reports dealing with reduced cases of seasonal influenza, not just in our area, but nationwide perhaps even worldwide. I wanted to ask, how much of that can be attributed to the sort of universal masking that we have been seeing as a mitigation measure? I do not know if you can state that with certainty, but it seems to me that if masks are an effective mitigation measure for preventing the spread of all respiratory diseases and seasonal influenza, just like COVID-19, is a respiratory disease, then that is going to be pointing to the effects of masks as a mitigation measure. Do we have any data on that or is there any research on that that you can speak to Dr. Garcia?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, the observation that you are making is an observation that is being made in a lot of different areas where masking has taken hold. It would be, it would be inappropriate and it would be, it would just be incorrect for me to say that there is definitive causal association but we certainly see a temporal association, that we believe is due to the many mitigation strategies that people are engaged in. Starting with masking, but inclusive of physical distancing, as well as precluding people from being gathered in large congregation. Those things are having an effect overall in terms of respiratory infection transmission, viral respiratory infection transmission, and I think we will know more as the flu season progresses whether we are having an atypically lower, more benign flu season or if it has just pushed it down the road. But I think it would be premature for me to speculate at this time.
- SB: Thank you, Dr. Garcia.
- SC: Madam Chair?
- SB: Supervisor Christy.
- SC: Yes, thank you. I have a couple of questions in the areas I would like to discuss. Good morning, Dr. Garcia, thank you for being here. You will be glad to know I am, I am hoping you will be glad to know, I received my first vaccine Friday, in the heart of District 4 at Vail Middle School. It went without a hitch. I am looking forward to getting my second one in a few weeks. Which brings me to the first question I have about policy, as well as an explanation on the Health Department, the Pima County Health Department's position on face mask wearing mandates after full vaccines have been administered to individuals? We were told that all would be resolved when the vaccines arrive and were administered and that no face masks for those who have already received the vaccines. If you are fully vaccinated what is the science? Where is the science showing it? What data proves it, that you have to wear a face mask after you have been fully vaccinated? And what is Pima County Health Department's policy on it?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, first of all congratulations, it really is super important. You have done a service to yourself, to your family and your community by entering into the social contract that we call vaccination and it is a good thing. But you asked a very pointed question and that is, how does being vaccinated or not being vaccinated drive the recommendations as to the layered mitigation strategies of mask usage, physical distancing, et cetera. To be clear, while we have been fairly consistent and what Mr. Huckelberry has memorialized in a variety of memoranda is that when we have achieved a substantial amount of vaccine coverage in the population of Pima County, that is about 75% of 18 plus adults, 18 plus residents. When we have achieved that threshold, it probably does make sense to start relaxing some of these mitigation measures, but until that time, it does not. I will tell you the reason it does not, because as long as the virus is circulating in this community at a high level, and per the ADHS website today, both for the State of Arizona and for Pima County in particular, the State notes that we are in a time of substantial transmission. Which mean it is not the worst but it is the second to the worst. As long as we are in a stage of substantial viral transmission, there are sufficient numbers of people who are at risk in this community by virtue of non-vaccination to become ill. The other thing is that unlike a superhero, the vaccination does not give you perfect protection. So, it is not a special shield that will protect you every single time, depending on your age, depending on your immune status, depending on how much virus you are exposed to in an environment, you may still have some susceptibility and therefore, we do know that occasionally we see cases of what we call, what we describe as vaccine breakthroughs. That is individuals who are fully vaccinated, who likely have mounted an immune response but who still get sick. So that is the reason why we need to continue to use masks. That is the reason why we would need to continue to encourage six feet of space between people.

SC: Well that, I am sure there are folks that are listening to your discussion and explanation and are going, gee, that is not what we heard when the vaccine was being rolled out. Once we received the vaccines, all was said and done and everything was good. Now, by your explanation, that does not account for anything anymore and even if you received all of the vaccinations, you are still required to wear a face mask, and this is problematic and I think it leads to a great deal of confusion and acrimony in our community. So having said that, let us go to another clarification. People do not understand, is it mandatory to wear a face mask when you are unable to physically distance or is it even when you are able to be physically distanced, you still must wear a face mask? Is physically distanced in the (inaudible) here where you do not have to wear a face mask if you can be physically distant?

- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, per your Resolution 2020-96, the way that the resolution is worded, is that masks must be used at any time that you are unable to physically distance, as well as some other provisos that are in that language.
- SC: So if you are able to be physically distance, be physically distanced, you do not need to wear a mask?
- FG: Per your...per my reading of your resolution, in those spaces and places where people can be physically distanced at greater than 6 feet, they are not necessarily required to wear a mask. But specifically, the part of the resolution, and I am looking it up right now, it says face coverings require, Section 1, every person must wear a face covering that completely and snugly covers a person's nose and mouth when the person is in a public place and cannot easily maintain a continuous distance of at least 6 feet from all other persons. It further goes on to define what constitutes an adequate face covering, as well as what constitutes a public place.
- SC: So it is either or. If you can physically distance, be physically distanced, you do not need to wear a face mask. If you cannot be physically distanced, you must wear a face mask, correct?
- FG: Sir, I am reading the language from your resolution and my read is, again, every person must wear a face covering that completely snugly covers a person's nose and mouth when the person is in a public space and is unable, and cannot easily maintain a continuous distance of at least 6 feet from all other persons.
- SC: Okay, I think we are on the same, it is just a matter of words there. Going back to what Supervisor Scott was pointing out, one of the issues that really is confusing is the conflict of data and the sources of data and the large disparity of data responses. For instance, the Johns Hopkins daily reports which they include Pima County, and I am assuming that somehow Pima County is contributing to Johns Hopkins information bank one way or the other. Their most up-to-date new daily cases per 100,000 people is 9.2. You go to the Carnegie Mellon University COVID case study, their compilation of Pima County as of April 16th, of cases per 100,000, are 7.3. As was pointed out by Supervisor Scott that in a memorandum dated April 16th, the County Administrator, his daily cases were 45, 57, 59, 55 and 62, way over what Johns Hopkins and Carnegie Mellon have stated as the case count. In your earlier rendition of recent case compilations, your compilation for April 4th was off from what the County Supervisors compilation, in his memorandum on April 16th was. On April 4th, he says 55 per 100,000, yet you said something different. So the thrust of my question here is: why is there such huge discrepancies? I can understand one or two, I can understand the lag in the reporting, but these are huge differences and by the way, these organizations that have provided these cases, and they are per 100,000

averages, they are no small states either. They are reputable, large medical operations. So why are we having this disparity and why are we not utilizing these studies?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, to be clear, we are using the data that is provided by the State of Arizona, and the Centers for Disease Control to do our decision making, period, full stop. You are not using, we are using that data because that is the data that drives the recommendations that are being made both at the State and at the Federal level. The threshold, the definitions are very consistent and very clear cut, and very unambiguous. We do not report to Johns Hopkins University. We do not report to Carnegie Mellon, the Washington Post, the New York Times, et cetera, et cetera. We do not, we do not have a statutory responsibility to do that kind of reporting. We only owe that to the State and that is who we report to and we report our data in the format and using the definitions that the State has. When you look at the Carnegie Mellon and the Johns Hopkins University, if you look at the definition of how they are describing cases, it is slightly different from each other and it is certainly different from what the Centers for Disease Control and ADHS is using. Those differences are small, but they are meaningful and what is important is not the precise number estimate, but rather the trend and as long as the State and the CDC continue to say that we are at substantial transmission, we are at substantial transmission, and that is how this Health Department will continue to act.

SC: Okay, so you are not reporting to Carnegie Mellon or Stanford, how does Stanford and Carnegie Mellon get this information?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, you would have to ask them yourself. I believe that there is some, I believe that they are pulling down some stuff from publicly available data sets, but it would be inappropriate for me to speculate.

SC: So you are not aware of how they are gathering their data?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I am not.

SC: Are you familiar at all with a recent study about the efficacy of face masks that was performed by Stanford, by the medical center for Stanford University that says basically at their conclusion, the physical properties of medical and nonmedical face masks suggests that face masks are ineffective to block viral particles due to their differences in scale. Have you had a chance to look at this? Are you familiar with it?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I am aware of that study and I am aware of the variety of different studies that come to different conclusions.

SC: And your, your response to this study?

FG: My response to that study, Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy is per the recommendations of your Arizona Department of Health Services and per the recommendations of the Centers for Disease Control, universal mask usage is appropriate and indicated and necessary as a mitigation strategy against the Coronavirus.

MH: Chair Bronson?

SC: These Stanford folks do not know what they are talking about, I guess. So having said that, Madam Chair, after discussion with Dr. Garcia and listening to the presentations, this agenda item does include action items I believe, updates and action?

SB: Yes.

SC: Therefore, Madam Chair, I would like to make a motion, and my motion is that I move that the Pima County Board of Supervisors effective immediately, rescind and remove its face mask mandate to all residents and that Resolution No. 2020-96 be terminated.

SB: Is there a second? Motion dies for lack of a second. Supervisor Heinz.

MH Thank you, Chair Bronson. Just to one of Supervisor Christy's points and to that, with regarding the masks blocking or not blocking viral-sized particles. That is not too surprising considering the virus is incredibly, incredibly small. But with regard to the recommendation for masks, I think it is important to keep that in place, because you are not worried about the virus itself flying around. That is not really how this disease is being transmitted. It is being transmitted from the respiratory droplets, those little small itty-bitty droplets of water, respiratory moisture that people exhale or that come out when you cough or sneeze or that in the normal conversation. So, I do not wear a mask, well I wear a mask because I work in a hospital and I have to, and it is what is right to do right now. But the reason I know it is important to do that is because it is not blocking a tiny little virus necessarily. It is blocking what is carrying hundreds of viruses, which is those little itty-bitty droplets. So that is just my side on that but, I do have a couple of things I wanted to talk about in terms of working on getting, you know, getting as many people vaccinated as possible. In terms of information distribution, I have had multiple recent conversations with nonmedical folks who are not anti, they are not opposed to the vaccine but they are just not necessarily all that informed about some of like how safe it is? How effective it is? How, you know, easy it is to get now that we are having enough supply. I think the County needs to, I know that they know this, but to our Communications, to the Health Department, we need to push out there, the most cost effectively as possible, which I think is digital, like digital and social media is something that most of us have used to some degree in political campaigns. While taking off our political caps now

and looking at this as a, still as a public health crisis, I think it would be very, very helpful for us to dedicate whatever we need to frankly because it is so much cheaper than like broadcast television ads and cable media ads and all that kind of thing. Is doing what we can to get those information, the information about the vaccine, how it was developed, what it does. People are actually still kind of freaked out about a new technology, what is this modified MRA business and how does it work? It is very, it is actually really, it is really neat, frankly and it works very, very well. It is very safe. It does not go and mutate your genetic material inside the nuclei or cells, none of that stuff. But the reason it is so effective is because of this technology. So having the County invest in digital, social media buys is important and as freaky as it is, you can get down to, you can get down to like census track and zip code, then you can really, so if there are particular areas where we are not seeing a lot of vaccine uptake, we can focus those social media buys into those areas just to make sure that the people that really need to get those messages are getting it. That is cost effective for us, and it is also, I think it is a really good thing to do. So yeah, I think you have to, people are not necessarily not getting this, it is not too much about personal health and safety for some of these folks. It tends to be, more effective arguments tend to be, hey, you can go hang out with your friends and family now safely. Or more personal freedom, you can travel safely or visit relatives in other places or help us to church, achieve herd immunity so we can open up the economy and get back to business as usual. I know we are opening up a lot of schools for in-person education. I personally think that that is a pretty big stick frankly, like kids get to go back to school now, if you can get yourself vaccinated. It is free and all that. So those are I think, pretty important messages to get out there. Then something that, I guess I should stop for a second and ask anyone from the Health Department, Dr. Garcia, Dr. Cullen or I do not know if Mark, actually I do not know who I would ask about the communications stuff? Maybe Mr. Huckelberry? In terms of our plan to do some of that. I am sure it is already ongoing but if you want to give a little update about that, that would be great.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, Mark has marshaled all of our Communications staff into a last couple of days of brainstorming session, about what to do and how to do everything I think you are asking. We should probably have the results of that fairly soon. We know that we just looked at a survey instrument and it probably is not yet in the field. So, I think there is discussion that we can have and probably even try and get him on this meeting if you have a few minutes and in addition perhaps Dr. Garcia can also give you his perspective from the Health Department.

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Dr. Garcia first.

SC: I am sorry, go ahead.

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Heinz, really good observations. So, the communication science is a complicated thing and luckily under Chief Deputy County Administrator Leshner and the Communications Department, we really have a team of professionals who are really sort of digging into this in conjunction with the Health Department. I really have confidence in that process and I really have confidence in the fact that we will come up with some new and innovative strategies. Having said that, having said that, we know a couple of things. We know that there are people that may be unmovable and one of the things that I have suggested all along is that we may need to just sort of accept that fact and move on. We also know that there are folks for whom vaccination is an inconvenience. It is an inconvenience for a variety of reasons because they do not have the technology, because they do not have the time, because they do not have the wherewithal, because they have mobility issues, language barriers, we need to decrease those barriers. We need to decrease those barriers. You can see that this is the same experience that is being felt everywhere else in this country. Philadelphia is patting itself on the back for doing mobiles with walk-up no registration. Well, we have been doing that for last four weeks. Mobile efforts without preregistration. You and Supervisor Grijalva and others have been at those mobiles to see how it works when we do that and we know that when we do that, that is exactly what happened at Sunnyside and at Maldonado, we know that the barriers go away. So, the team is very much focused on the strategy that Mr. Huckelberry just shared with you, that is going big on the mobile effort and that is part of the reason why this request for these six FEMA mobile teams becomes really, really critical. Because we just, it is much more labor intensive, it is much more resource intensive to do these mobile outlets. The reason that the big vaccinator events, whether it is at Glendale Stadium or elsewhere, do so well is because they are efficient. And if you drive your customers, if your customers can drive to that location, it makes your life easier. Well, we are done with the low hanging fruit in Pima County. I think it is very much a boots on the ground kind of operation, backed up with, you know, a fixed site. So, I will shut up after that. Thank you.

MH: That is actually, that is really a great point. In fact, I know that Supervisor Grijalva saw this as well, but when I have been to you know, now half a dozen or more of these mobile operations: A) they are very impressive, they are very well run. The fact is that you can literally see our constituents like sometimes coming across the street from where they live, getting a vaccine, asking if they can, how long we are going to be there. Then they will go back across the street and they will bring five neighbors or their aunts or someone, like people that are all eligible and all need to get vaccinated and because we are sitting right there in that elementary school parking lot or in that church parking lot right in their neighborhood. So, I think as a strategy to get

at, to get more folks, who are again not necessarily opposed to doing it, but just making it more convenient, overcoming transportation barriers that kind of thing, really getting into the community with these six mobile vaccine sites that would augmenting our current mobile vaccine strategy from FEMA, it would be, it would be great. I had two other quick things I want to talk about. I know we are taking a long time today, so I will be very quick. But one of the things that I want and I know that the Health Department is aware of this. We, because of COVID, obviously we are focused a lot on COVID, but what I am now seeing in the hospital, is a lot of the kind of unfortunate side effects of being, you know, in pandemic mode. That is a cancerous or precancerous colon polyp is now metastatic colon cancer in the liver, lungs and brain. I cannot tell you how many times and it is just heartbreaking (inaudible) I have admitted someone to the hospital who did not get their regular therapy with their oncologist or who did not get their heart disease taken care of, who did not go see their nephrologist for their kidney care for a year or more and now come into the hospital with uncontrolled. What once were stable, chronic issues are now acute and life threatening and, in some cases, they succumb to these diseases. So the pandemic is not just about the virus, the infection and the direct effect of these infections and its impact on the community and economy. But it is also having a tremendous and adverse impact on people who are not able to, for a while safely get in and see their doctors or their providers to care for these issues and have not been doing regular cancer screenings or cholesterol screenings or whatever. That is resulting in some of the most complicated patients who are acutely ill in multiple areas coming into the hospital every night and doing these shifts and I am seeing more and more of that. So, we just need to, I mean, keep that in mind as well because that is incredibly problematic what is going on with sort of the other effects of the pandemic that I think maybe we just have not talked about as much. And then lastly, and this may, I do not know, this should not be controversial but it may be, so one of the things that I have recently read, I knew this from just seeing a lot of people in the hospital. A remarkable number, 78% of patients hospitalized for severe COVID and obviously the over half million folks that have succumbed and died nationally, have suffered from some degree of obesity and that is something that is really, we you know, I think the Health Department going forward, once we are out of full pandemic mode. I want to see us really take this on. Because that is a huge problem, I mean, not only for heart disease and diabetes and high blood pressure and all these kinds of other things that can come from that. Our ability, our immune system's ability to respond to a pandemic, to an infection, is greatly diminished when we have, when we suffer from obesity. I think that is something that I also do not hear talked about very much, but when I saw that study, and I saw that incredibly, like, striking number, you know, I think that explains a lot of how things have gone in the nation, in our county. I would like to see the Health Department once transition to, I mean really just working to aggressively educate the community and make this a huge, huge priority like however we can. Because this will help decrease healthcare costs. It will help people live longer and happier lives and so it is a good thing overall. I see that as one of

the things that we can take away from the pandemic is, this is another thing we need to really, really focus on. As kind of a corollary I guess, the other thing I have seen a lot of, going up in the hospital, has been substance abuse and people there for

SB: Supervisor Heinz, I am going to interrupt. This is not really relevant to COVID.

MH: I think it is. But okay.

SB: No it is not.

MH: (inaudible)

SB: It is not COVID, know I mean these are all serious issues, health issues, but they are not COVID related so, and I believe Supervisor Christy, you had wanted to make a comment?

SC: Yes, thank you Madam Chair. I wanted to thank Supervisor Heinz for his explanation on the effects, efficacy of face masks. I understand you have the medical background. I just merely want to point out this is Stanford University's study and just to reiterate of they have found in this study, that face masks are ineffective to block viral particles due to their differences in scales. So, I want to make that clear that this is Stanford not me. And finally, my last question to Dr. Garcia, Dr. Garcia you mentioned that my health department, the State of Arizona is the one that you look to for the information and for the numbers of the cases per 100,000. Just for clarification purposes, who provides the Arizona Health Department with Pima County's case numbers?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, so the process for reporting is kind of complicated and multilayered. So, for case numbers, the labs are electronically reporting directly into the State. The State compiles that information, shoots it back to the County and that is when we start the case investigation, contact tracing process. So, it is kind of an iterative thing, but it actually starts with that electronic lab reporting that is automated, shooting that information straight to the State and then the State sending us back the relevant information for follow-up.

SC: So the Pima County Health Department does not compile the information and give it to the State?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, you are correct.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Okay.

AG: Chair Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: One other, I just wanted to make a note that I have heard a bunch of people say, well, I had COVID in December and so I am still immune and I do not need it. I think that might, I think that might be one of the avenues to help people understand that we do not know how long those antibodies will last. And then the other, is talking about what the requirements are to get the vaccine. If memory serves, just an identification, basically so we have an address to connect with the person but that we are not asking for documents as far as you know, citizenship or anything like that or you know, you have to live within this certain boundary. At this point at our pop-ups and everywhere else while we are focusing and doing outreach on those areas, we are accepting anyone for sites that have Moderna, 18 and up. Is that right?

SB: Is that correct?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Grijalva, you are absolutely correct. The point that you make is a really important one, which is people who have wild type infections, that is infection that was acquired in the community, we do not actually, well we know that they do not mount as strong an immune response as you do to a vaccination just in terms of antibody levels. We know that you probably have some degree of protection for about 90 days or so, but you are absolutely right. People who have a history of infection, as long as they are not currently sick, should still be vaccinated.

AG: Thank you.

SB: Thank you. Alright, I think given the time, we need to move on.

SC: Madam Chair, one quick one, please? Very quick.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you for your patience. I am just curious after Dr. Garcia, your explanation that the lab sends the data up to the State Health Department, then why did we just have the Health Department hire a new data collector employees? If it is already being done automatically, why did we hire health officials to collect data?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, so I think what you are referring to is our data analytics team and it, this is to precisely to be able to download, now geez, something like over 600,000 records to be able to go through them and put them in a way that makes sense for ourselves, for our own analysis, as well as for you as policymakers to be able to do that. These folks are doing

data entry. When people are called and asked about where they went when they were infected, who they came into contact, that is done by real people, and those data need to be input into systems of records. But I think you are conflating the issue of electronic lab reporting which happens on an automated basis by the labs directly to the State, with the issue of the information that we get from individuals who are infected in our process of case investigation and contact tracing.

SB: Thank you, Dr. Garcia.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. So let us move on now to Item No. 15.

DRAFT