

## **FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES**

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:34 a.m.

### **1. SURPLUS PROPERTY**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 471.05 square feet of a well site located on a portion of unimproved land, Tax Parcel Nos. 222-35-0650 and 222-35-0660, Section 18, T11S, R14E, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

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

### **2. CONTRACT**

Insight Hydrology, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for rating curve development for Pima County Flood Warning Gauges, extend contract term to 11/6/25 and amend contractual language, Flood Control Ops Fund, contract amount \$45,000.00 (CT-24-143)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott 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 1:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:34 a.m.

### 1. **CONTRACT**

Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson and Arizona Soccer Holdings, Inc., d.b.a. FC Tucson, to provide for a Hospitality and Promotional Agreement, KSC-2024FD (\$40,000.00) and General Contingency (\$40,000.00) Funds, contract amount \$80,000.00/2 year term (PO2400013748)

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

### 2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

---

CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES**

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:34 a.m.

### **1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Bruce Donahue, Justice Services Navigator, Pima County Transition Center.

### **3. PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

### **PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

### **4. Presentation of a proclamation to Janay Arenas, Chair, and Valerie Pullara, Commissioner, Pima County Small Business Commission, proclaiming the day of Saturday, November 30, 2024 to be: "SMALL BUSINESS SATURDAY IN PIMA COUNTY"**

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

### **5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Gisela Aaron addressed the Board regarding her concerns about the 2024 General Election results, polling numbers and the number of ballots cast.

Mark Keyes stated that he was the Director of a non-profit Co-Op that operated a well that was located on property controlled by FEMA and his business wanted to purchase the property, but did not want to go through an open public auction.

Joseph LaSalvia expressed concerns regarding the unresolved noise complaint he had filed with Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) and the barking from his neighbor's dogs caused grave distress in his life, both personally and professionally.

Dave Smith expressed his concerns with the 2024 General Election ballot counts and that all Board members should be concerned that Pima County was still counting ballots a week after Election Day.

\* \* \*

Supervisor Christy requested that the Elections Department Director address Ms. Aaron's issues, and that staff address the property purchasing issue raised by Mr. Keyes. He also requested that staff speak with Mr. LaSalvia regarding his PACC noise complaint.

Supervisor Scott also asked that staff address the issue regarding the well that Mr. Keyes spoke about since that item was on the agenda.

\* \* \*

6. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 10:27 a.m.

7. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:13 a.m. All members were present.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

8. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice, and for discussion or consideration of any matter within the scope of A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(1), regarding the employment contract for County Administrator Jan Leshner. As required by A.R.S. §38-431.03 (D), any legal action must be taken in public session.

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

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

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

Supervisor Scott stated that he was a member of the Executive Committee of the County Supervisors Association (CSA) and several of the committee members met with Governor Hobbs and her staff to discuss legislative priorities and what they hoped would be included in the State budget in the coming year. He explained that it was his fourth year with the CSA and all County Supervisors in the State were members of the Association. He stated that there were Republicans and Democrats on the Legislative Policy Committee, and he was on that committee as well and they met while the Legislature was in session. He recalled only one instance of a partisan disagreement within the CSA, and noted that the interests of Counties were the interests of Counties, regardless of the party affiliation of the Supervisors. He expressed gratitude for the Governor's responsiveness and attentiveness to County needs and hoped to see those priorities reflected in the budget.

Supervisor Lee congratulated Chair Grijalva for receiving the "Women Achievers of Arizona" award, which recognized top women in the public service profession and noted that she was the only recipient from Pima County. She stated that the Metropolitan Education Commission held their Annual Teen Town Hall at the County Courthouse on November 13, 2024, and there were approximately 100 students in attendance from various schools in the community. She stated that the event had several breakout groups with local elected officials who presented to the group. She stated that the USDA Federal Office of Rural Development visited and presented awards to Ajo and Why. She stated that the award presented to Ajo brought fiber to homes in that area, which was a major achievement for the community, and the Why Water District won a grant for a new water well, and that project would be monitored by the County's Department of Environmental Quality.

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the National Certificate of Recognition for the Firewise Program awarded to Mt. Lemmon and its community. He stated that they had successfully completed the Firewise USA Program's annual requirements for 2024 and remained in good standing for the upcoming year. He stated that the community removed approximately 425 cubic yards of vegetation and spent \$112,255.00 in monetized hours, up from \$61,000.00 the previous year, and that demonstrated consistent improvement. He expressed condolences for the tragic passing of John McLean, who had been a member and homeowner in the Mt. Lemmon Summer Haven community. He shared that Mr. McLean had been a remarkable man and his untimely death was mourned.

Supervisor Scott thanked Supervisor Christy for the tribute to Mr. McLean. He mentioned that during the CSA's Executive Board meeting with Governor Hobbs, they expressed gratitude for the Governor's formation of a working group to examine the cost and availability of insurance, particularly in fire-prone areas. He asked who the County's representative to that working group would be and when the Board could expect a report from that group.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that a working group had been formed to work with the Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions on issues. She stated that Mr. DeBonis, Jr., would serve as the County's representative on that group, however, she was unable to provide specific details about when the group would convene or when a report would be delivered to the Board.

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

## **CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES**

### **10. Pima County Cooperative Extension Annual Report**

Presentation of the Pima County Cooperative Extension Annual Report.

Claire Zucker, Director, Pima County Cooperative Extension (PCCE), University of Arizona (UofA), provided a slideshow presentation regarding their yearly annual report. She explained that the PCCE was a unit within the UofA's Cooperative Extension and was a nationally authorized institution implemented through land grant universities. She stated that their goal was to bring agriculture and other education to the people of the counties they served using Federal, State, County, philanthropic and grant funding. She stated they had four offices in Pima County; the main office was located at River and Campbell, which was a building owned and operated by the County. She added it was a bond effort in the 70's and 80's to build that building for their purposes. She stated they also had the Tucson Village Farm located adjacent to their main office, which was a UofA owned and operated building. She added that they rented two buildings from the County, the Garden Kitchen in South Tucson and another in Green Valley and every year they requested an appropriation from the County budget which would be in the upcoming process in June. She explained that they reported to the Board and the public by way of the PCCE Annual Report, and their Roundup e-newsletter, which had a distribution of nearly 17,000 people in Pima County. She stated they also provided quarterly reports to the County's Conservation and Land Resources (CLR) Department that discussed the impacts of their programs. She explained that their overall reach in the County was 55,000 engagements in the prior year with over 130,000 hours of education. She stated that they were able to accomplish that with 40 staff, student workers and AmeriCorps and they had a huge volunteer program which consisted of 1,200 different volunteers throughout and they engaged with those volunteers to ensure they had the information to reach out to the public and to educate the region. She explained that Agriculture and Natural Resources was one of the main pillars of their organization, focusing on horticulture in the County with the Master Gardener Program. She stated the program had approximately 250 volunteers and 23,000 people were engaged yearly. She stated the public approached them with questions about horticulture, from the type of grass in their yard, to how to landscape or how to deal with the orange tree issue. She stated they helped green their space, created cooling around their houses and provided mental health support through the greenery at their locations. She stated that they also had a successful Invasive Species Program, which was funded through County

appropriations, and they were moving into coordination with Stinknet, other partners and CLR. She stated they had a landscaping professional training program called the Smart Scape Program, which was funded entirely by the City of Tucson (COT), and they taught landscaping professionals how to incorporate low water use techniques in their landscapes and how to have that common knowledge. She highlighted a boot camp program for COT employees that included everything from transportation to their parks group and anyone that interfaced with the land at the COT went through a Smart Scape Program class so that they had a common language and a common system of addressing landscaping issues. She explained they had a number of different health programs like the Garden Kitchen located in South Tucson, a very critical place and safe haven for many people that taught nutrition, gardening and how to help themselves activities. She stated they had a mobile van, the PLAZA Mobile Market which provided locally grown produce to underserved communities, with the ability to use SNAP dollars and other support dollars to buy fresh vegetables. She added they also had parenting classes, including an ethnic program, which was a low-income nutrition education program. She stated they went out to various communities and provided long-term classes to help them understand their issues and how to be better with nutrition and health. She stated that the Family Engagement Program taught parenting, and they worked with incarcerated populations at the three family resource centers that were new to their area. She explained that they had the Pima County 4-H Program throughout various locations of the region, with 700 youth and many hours of education and a very dedicated cadre of volunteers they depended on. She stated they had a Tucson Village Farm Program, a seed-to-table program, which helped to bring education to many people, both adults and youth interacted with this program that had many summer camps, arts and outdoor activities. She stated they had a Field Trip Program from the prior year which had fluctuating numbers. She stated that the Tucson Village Farm field trip had schools attend for the day to learn about health and nutrition and other things. She added they were not making gains with current funding but were holding firm at about 5,000 youth yearly. She stated that they had received a comorbidity Covid-19 grant from Pima County Public Health and had seen great results. She stated that participation was up 1,200 youth this year with the Field Trip Program, and they hoped to increase it by 2,000 so they would have 7,000 kids by the end of the year. She thanked the Board for their support and stated that it was critical to their operations and helped them beat back many invasives, reach the youth and the lower income people of the region with really important educational information.

Supervisor Scott stated that in the Fiscal Impact section of the Agenda Item Report, and was referred to in the presentation, it read, "Discussions are underway to evaluate funding levels in relationship to program elements currently funded by the County and through Pima County Conservation Lands and Resources, and to evaluate the potential for county support to expand the Tucson Village Farm school field trip program." He stated that it was mentioned that PCCE had not met demand from the various school districts based on current resources. He stated that County Administration indicated that there were discussions underway to evaluate the potential for county support, but questioned the need of the program and where the County was in assessing that part of the fiscal impact.



Ms. Zucker explained they had teamed up with the Health Department to increase field trips and that was the segment of money they were hopeful of adding to the appropriations. She stated they had estimates on what that would be and what it looked like, it would fund someone to run the volunteer organization and many parts of the program to keep those increased numbers and it also had a subsidy to schools that did not have field trip dollars and to youth for which \$7.00 for a field trip was beyond their means. She stated they had about 800 kids that received that and 10 schools, so this was the dollar amount they proposed and discussed with the County Administrator and those conversations were in the early stages.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that two years prior, they had moved this program funded from Outside Agency requests. She stated that given the nature of the program and what the UofA and this program had meant to the County, they moved it out of that allocation process into the CLR budget to ensure review each year. She stated that the previous year without funding, they directed PCCE to contact the Health Department to redirect some grants that were coming into the department at that time. She added they had met the prior day and discussed how much was in contingency for the current year, but it looked like it would be for next fiscal year. She stated they did not have a number at this point, but it was in the budget as a placeholder, and there were current discussions with CLR on the possibility of expansion.

Ms. Zucker added that the Field Trip Program touched on health and poverty because healthy eating was linked to it and early childhood education, and there were many links to the priorities of the County in that program with the ability to be flexible and to look at it geographically to determine whether they were reaching people in all of the districts throughout the county.

Chair Grijalva asked if they were also collaborating with the COT on funding.

Ms. Zucker responded no, that the PCCE worked directly with the counties, statewide and nationally. She stated that in the State, the UofA waived any overhead with the County appropriations, which was one of the reasons it was moved there, so that arrangement was not possible with the COT. She stated they had a very large COT funding, but it was with the Water Department for the Smart Scape Program, which included overhead.

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

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **11. Monthly Financial Update**

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

Ellen Moulton, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slideshow presentation on the Period 3 forecast, which included the actuals through September 30th with projections through the end of June 2025. She explained the revenues for the General Fund were projected to be \$776 million, which was approximately \$2 million more than what was budgeted. She stated that the General Fund revenues were broken down into three categories, the first being taxes, which were budgeted at \$464 million and was currently projected to be just slightly under budget at \$463 million. She added the second was the non-departmental revenues, which were budgeted for \$254 million, and currently projected to come in at \$256 million, about \$2 million more than budgeted, which was in the area of State shared sales taxes, with a slight uptick than what had been budgeted at the beginning. She stated the third area was departmental revenues, budgeted at approximately \$30.6 million, with projections to receive about \$31.3 million, approximately \$600,000.00 more than budgeted and overall the revenue side was stable. She explained that General Fund expenditures currently was expected to be on target for the year end. She stated that the Sheriff's Department had indicated that they would be over a considerable amount of money, with current projections of being over budget by approximately \$4.7 million. She stated that they also had the same projection as the previous year and the majority of these costs were in personnel, specifically in overtime that was primarily related to the jail. She stated that the County was projecting to be on budget, which meant other departments were coming in under budget, making up that overage at the Sheriff's Department.

Supervisor Scott stated that the last paragraph of the financial report indicated that several General Fund departments had expressed concerns about meeting the 2% budget reduction included in the Fiscal Year 2024-25 budget and departments were requested to address it for the Period 4 forecast. He requested a subsequent report that included which departments indicated they were going to have trouble meeting that budget reduction.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that a report would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he did not understand the Sheriff's current situation compared to three years ago. He understood the need for overtime and being understaffed, but their current recruitment reports showed they were fully staffed. He stated that he did not understand why this department did not follow the rules that every other department followed and there should not be overtime, because in many cases it padded retirement and would put the County on the hook forever.

Ms. Leshner stated they had begun some conversations about the parameters of the opportunities for central Finance to work with departments to ensure they knew what would happen if they went over budget, or what the hole might be, as done with other departments, but they did not have that ability with all elected officials and were exploring what the various legal parameters might be.

Chair Grijalva stated that ultimately the Board approved the overall budget, including approval of the Sheriff's Department's budget, and any other requests were going to have to be considered by the Board. She stated that depending on what the overage was caused by, it would have consequences if the Board did not vote in favor of the increase in the budget. She stated that it was incumbent on every department to work within the budget that was already approved, especially considering that the Sheriff's budget was one of the largest and it would be hard for the Board to consider increasing it, especially since there were so many other projects and the Board's Contingencies were very small and did not have the capacity to do more.

Ms. Leshar commented that when they began providing these reports to the Board, there were multiple departments highlighted each month for being over budget and she commended Ms. Moulton, the Finance and Risk Management team, and every department in the County that had done a terrific job ensuring they stayed within their budget.

Ms. Moulton went over the last slide for the budget timeline on the development of the '25/26 budget. She stated that they were going to be on the new system called Adaptive, and the current timeline stacked up the same as the previous year, however, there were two items that she wanted brought to the Board's attention. She stated that the first one was for a review of the supplemental requests with the Board, which they had requested to receive that information earlier in the budget cycle. She added that their plan was to come to the Board on February 18th to discuss all of the supplemental requests that had been received by the County. She stated that the department budgets were due on January 17th, including all supplemental requests, and that gave Finance and County Administration time to put together a packet and deliver it for discussion on February 18th. She stated that the second item was a review of the Capital Improvement Plan with the Board, which they also requested to receive some of this information earlier in the process. She stated that would be placed on the second meeting in March, prior to the County Administrator's recommended budget being put together.

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

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **12. Road Establishment**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 63, of the Board of Supervisors, providing for the establishment of a portion of River Road, a County highway situated within the southeast quarter of Section 15, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

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

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **County Attorney**

13. Assistance Dogs of the West, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Courthouse Dogs Program, extend contract term to 9/30/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-24-31)

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

### **Facilities Management**

14. Valencia Tech Park, L.L.C., to provide a lease agreement for space located within 3000 E. Valencia Road, Suite 190, for the Pima County Recorder's Office, General Fund, contract amount \$1,284,154.28/5 year term (PO2400004442)

Chair Grijalva stated that this item was for \$1.2 million for five years with the assumption that it was roughly \$256,000.00 per year, however her calculation came out to \$196,700.00. She wanted to raise attention to this issue with this item and several other items and stated that the County had to come up with a math problem, and then everyone needed to fill in the blanks on what that was, for example, if it was \$1.2 million for a five-year term, it was misleading and was done differently throughout the agenda. She stated that they needed the amount or an average of the amount, for the year and then if there was a five-year term, the assumption would be that it was multiplied by five. She stated that was not the case in this situation, but there had to be consistency. She stated that if it was not an easy math problem, then they had to define it differently because during the agenda reviews for Board meetings, Legal, the County Administrator, the Clerk and herself, had to thoroughly review the materials to figure out what it meant or what the correct amount should be. She stated that the whole purpose of these items was that it would be easier for the public to know what would be considered by the Board without them having to do their own research and every time the situation was different. She stated that in this case, the math did not add up and questioned if there were any front-loaded fees and if the amount was for a five-year term, if it was for the entire contract, and the amount that would be expended annually.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that there were two sections on the lease agreement, \$4.4 million, the numbers that Chair Grijalva referred to, which added up to \$773,000.00. He stated that section four was the actual base rent, and this was where there could potentially be confusion and section six in the same agreement had operating expenditures broken down into utilities, maintenance and insurance, which were all estimated costs. He stated that the \$1.2 million was the estimated operational costs that ended up with the annual total lease agreement at \$1.2 million and it referred to roughly as \$150,000.00 and there was another \$100,000.00 in operational expenditures, which were estimates. He clarified that when they made these lease agreements, they worked with estimates for insurance, improvements and maintenance costs, which was why it showed

more of a rounding and not an actual figure in the operational costs that were added to the base amount.

Chair Grijalva asked if this was an all-inclusive lease and if the County was paying Valencia Tech Park for all of the utilities, insurance and related expenses.

Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative.

Chair Grijalva stated that usually the insurance was something that the County covered because they insured the property and then the payee would be the County as opposed to if the County was paying them all of those fixed costs for insurance and related expenses. She added that was her question and it did not make sense why they were doing it that way. She stated that in operating year one, the tenant's portion of the operating expenses would be fixed at this amount. She questioned if the County was the tenant. She stated it was confusing, and she had to go through each of the items to add up the total that the Board would be voting on and wanted to ensure that the total amount being turned over to Valencia Tech Park was not expenses the County would incur.

Mr. Holmes explained those were actual tenant proportionate shares and this was one of those agreements where the County had a huge interest in this particular building, but the tenant had other commitments there and these were negotiated pieces of that. He added that there were insurances that the County covered on its own, but these were more of the maintenance operation estimated types of improvements that would be made at \$1.2 million which was at the top end of what was estimated. He apologized for the confusion because they had dealt with unknowns as they entered the building, and as the Recorder settled in, there may be some expenditures that would come up. He stated that they did their best to estimate those yearly expenditures, but to try to get an actual dollar amount, they asked Facilities Management to look at similar buildings and provide a proportionality of what they thought.

Chair Grijalva reiterated that the County would pay Valencia Tech Park for utilities and insurance, which was an all-inclusive lease and was the reason she was confused, because it seemed to her that if the Board approved a contract, the contract amount was only what was going to be paid to them, not anything else that the County might be incurring.

Mr. Holmes stated that moving forward they would try to ensure that was outlined more in the summary statement because it was embedded in the lease, but it was still confusing when read through and there were agreements that they understood from the technical standpoint, but it would be better to have a breakdown.

Chair Grijalva reiterated that they could come up with a simple math problem with what it was for a five-year lease and the average, so when someone looked at the agenda, they knew what it meant. She expressed her gratitude that the Recorder was present because this was for an expansion and requested that she discuss the necessity.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification whether a motion was needed to discuss the item.

Chair Grijalva stated her concern was that she was unsure if she would approve the item.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, for discussion purposes only.

Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder, explained they would be moving into a much larger facility, which shared the same parking lot as their current facility. She stated they were currently in 7,000 square feet and were able to conduct an entire election in that amount of space, but it was not sufficient. She stated that they were bumping up against each other, and it actually slowed the signature verification process, so they would be moving across the parking lot into the new facility. She stated the new facility was 14,000 square feet and would allow them to test and store their own equipment, to have their own training space and had built in office areas. She stated it was a wonderful space and a good fix for their space needs. She stated that Pima County was growing exponentially, they were going to have more voters and as they continued to grow, their facilities needed to match that. She stated they needed to have enough space for the 200 plus election workers that were hired during an election cycle.

Chair Grijalva asked if they would be vacating their current space.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that it would take some time, but had not yet committed to giving it up because they would need to determine what they could design with the space given, and it depended on the need and growth, there was an opportunity there, but she was not ready to commit to that.

Chair Grijalva asked if the current space was leased.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that it was County-owned property.

Chair Grijalva asked whether the expense for the new facility would result in an increase in their budget.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that the expense was an increase, but it had been included in the prior budget.

Supervisor Christy questioned who paid for the tenant improvements of the lease.

Mr. Holmes responded that tenant improvements were the County's responsibility.

Supervisor Christy stated that normally when moving into someone else's lease settings, the tenant improvements were made by the owner and asked why the County was paying the tenant improvements.

Mr. Holmes responded that was part of the negotiation and was where they landed, and was their only way to acquire that particular building in the negotiation.

Supervisor Christy questioned the storage element of the move and the requirement to move accordingly and if they would be storing equipment.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded in the affirmative and explained that in the current and previous administration, the office utilized U-Haul storage units. She stated that they were not temperature safe for much of their equipment that needed to be secured and currently, they had equipment stored in loaned locations. She added that in the 2022 cycle, they were in the jail and were currently using space in the jail, not for storing sensitive election equipment, but for a large number of printers that needed to be temperature regulated. She stated that they needed a facility to be able to do that and also needed to complete testing prior to every election. She stated that it was currently done in a loan facility by Facilities Management, but was not a permanent or ideal solution. She added that they needed a place where they did not have to go to multiple locations to stage their equipment in order to open up the early voting sites.

Supervisor Christy asked if comments could be made on the fact that the Recorder's Office stopped charging fees and now they were requesting monies from the General Fund to pay for a new location and facility.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained her department stopped charging fees on the recording side of the house, which was a separate budget item. She stated the reason was that people had the right to have access to those public records and should not be charged for them. She stated that her department acted as a repository for public documents, which belonged to the public. She stated that to have the records online and available to the public was in the best interest of the County and after consultation with Legal Counsel, there was no reason for them to be charged, because the records did not belong to the Recorder.

Supervisor Christy commented that the Recorder had indicated there were no plans to move from downtown as a result of this move.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained the Recorder's Office had three locations. She stated that the downtown office was open year-round, they had a shared lobby for voter registration services and recording services. She stated that it was a highly used beautiful space, but they were also outgrowing that area, which was a discussion for another time. She added they had a micro office on the east side, which was a former early voting site location that fit five people and was a much more accessible location. She stated that the downtown location required people to pay for parking, and handicapped parking was located far away from the building, which was a burden for many, so they would drive further to the east side. She added that they had their ballot processing facility, which was open during an election cycle and throughout the year for other activities, like trainings, and they had computers there for large quantities of data entry more so than at the downtown facility. She stated

they also had testing equipment and staging and preparation for each election. She added that since she had been in office for the past four years, there had been an election and they were already reviewing the upcoming City of Tucson election cycle where they provided signature verification services, and also for Proposition 123, maybe a statewide election, which would require them to provide early voting opportunities for the County, so all three locations were constantly being used.

Supervisor Christy asked which facility had recently received \$50,000.00 in approved upgrades and security enhancements.

Chair Grijalva asked if Supervisor Christy was referring to the grant acceptance for upgrades, such as concrete rounds and windows.

Supervisor Christy stated that was in the recorder/elections area and now they were moving out of that upgraded facility into another facility altogether.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that without the upgrades that were completed, they would not have been able to be successful in the 2024 election cycle. She stated that the amount of space they had, the noise level and the flow of the space was taken into consideration. She stated that some upgrades were done there and upgrades at the downtown facility and had planned another upgrade to house more folks in their facility. She stated that it was ongoing, but they were struggling with space, which was a major concern and the higher demand they had seen was expected to continue. She stated that she has tried alerting the County about how dire the needs of the elections space were and how it continued to grow. She stated that they looked at other facilities throughout the State, Pinal County recently had a ribbon cutting on a large facility that was specifically designed and dedicated to election services. She stated that was the type of facility that was needed in Pima County since they had 14% of all voters in the State.

Supervisor Christy commented that vote centers that were implemented were designed to cut costs, and it seemed every time they turned around after the vote centers had been enacted, they were spending more and more money. He stated that it was ironic to him that something that was supposed to bring cost savings was now being more and more costly. He asked if there had been an inventory done of Pima County owned buildings that could be utilized instead of having to lease a \$1.2 million facility with all the tenant improvements and the inclusive costs encumbered with that. He stated the County had many buildings, like the one at Toole Avenue and the Recorder stated that she needed storage space and was certain there had to be something that could be applicable and not cost nearly as much. He added that the more locations they had, the higher and more frequent expenses were.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained they explored a variety of County spaces and what they could be used for, but what was critical to this specific property and their reason for hoping to lease it was the proximity to the Elections building. She stated that this would then become the third location that the Recorder would have and just simply moving those different locations. She stated that they



did not have a space adjacent to Elections that could accommodate this need. She stated that they might be able to look at other facilities should there be storage requirements but that was different than what they looked at in terms of operating the Recorder's Office out of this location.

Chair Grijalva recalled that the vote centers were not about cutting costs, rather about being accessible to voters and that anyone could go to any location as opposed to individual polling places. She felt that they were labor intensive and so reducing the number of polling places actually made it easier for them to be able to fill the need of the different people and parties that had to be in every location.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly clarified that her office was not responsible for vote centers, they were responsible for the electronic poll books which enabled vote centers to function, however, they were not setting up those vote centers. She stated that was an important distinction that she hoped everyone understood. She stated that her responsibility was for the early voting locations, and in the past, they were able to have 18 of those locations. She stated that one of the largest issues with precinct-based voting locations was the high number of provisional ballots that were issued in each cycle. She stated that in the 2020 election cycle, there were 18,000 provisional ballots that were issued to Pima County voters and due to a Supreme Court decision, they had to be wholly discarded if voted out of the precinct. She stated that if someone showed up to the wrong location, it would invalidate that person's vote, so by moving to vote centers in 2022, that number went from 18,000 to 2,500. She added that in this past election cycle, it went to 6,500, which was a drastic reduction in the number of people that encountered a problem at the polling location, which enabled more people to participate and counted more ballots for voters in Pima County. She stated that in addition to that, as they talked about the importance of investment in their election infrastructure, she felt everyone could agree that it was paramount that they continued to invest in the people's most fundamental of rights as Americans.

Supervisor Christy recalled that it was a joint presentation by the Election's director and the Recorder on the cost saving element of vote centers, which had played into the scheme, and he thought of adding it as a future agenda item for discussion.

Supervisor Scott thanked the Recorder for her attendance at the meeting and stated that he served on the Executive Board of the County Supervisors Association. He stated that their current President was Supervisor Miller from Pinal County who had recently opined that because Pinal County still used precinct-based voting, one of the challenges they found was having enough people to staff all of their precincts. He stated that they were one of three counties that still had precinct based voting and asking if that was correct.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that Pinal County was the only County that was precinct based only and the others were hybrids, which offered a combination of precinct based with the additional opportunity to also provide ballots on demand.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Recorder mentioned that she was unsure if she would give up the current space, and it seemed like they were not going to because the word “additional” had been used under Program Goals and Predicted Outcomes and under Public Benefits in the background materials. He stated that most likely they were talking about additional space, and that they would retain the current space because of this and some of the things that she touched on during dialogue.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that it was incredibly complex because they never operated at the function that they needed for what they currently did. She stated they had 400,000 ballots come through their possession and they were not familiar with the space that they were using. She explained it had been pieced together and were using it the best they could. She added it was not designed for optimization, but once they were able to design the space and address some of their needs, there was a possibility they would give up that space, but they could not guarantee it. She stated that one of the things they had struggled with was training space and ensuring that they were evened throughout because they hired people for such long periods of time, sometimes as much as seven days, to work in an early voting site, sometimes two to three weeks and for early voting sites for weeks or the entire time of signature verification or data entry. She stated that they were also struggling to secure space, in addition to the Elections Department, they were also running out of space and they were right on top of each other and she knew that it would be beneficial for them, but she could not guarantee anything at the moment.

Supervisor Scott asked whether the lease would also be potentially advantageous to Elections.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott requested clarification of faster, more efficient processing of ballots and other County Recorder related activities and improved security, that was listed under the metrics section.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that they were limited on the number of workstations that could be set up in that location and were tapped out of the number of computers they could set up, which were needed for signature verification. She added that in order for them to move any further, in this cycle for instance, they ran two separate cycles. She explained they had a morning shift and an afternoon shift that went into the evening and people were there from 6:00 a.m. to almost 10:00 p.m. every single day and there were times where every single seat was filled and they could not achieve any more within that time period, because there was not enough workstations. She stated that they did not have enough space to prepare turnovers and at one point, contemplated whether or not they could use their storage room or break room, but determined that was not going to be secure for the ballots in either of those spaces. She stated that it was not open and monitored in the way that their larger areas were, so they could not guarantee that. She stated they could not increase the number of people within that space and another concern they had was when the Secretary of State's Office completed an assessment of their space and one of the things they pointed out was that at the end of each night,

they were covering the ballots in tarps, physically placing blue tarps over ballots in case of fire or in case the sprinkler system went off. She stated that they did not have a waterless fire suppressant, and were running out of space to store the ballots they received all at once, and to have them in a secure space and out of the facility. She reiterated they needed more space so that they could have more computers, more people, and ensure that everything had the cameras that were needed, the swipe key access for ballot rooms. She stated that they wanted to make it where people were not crossing right in front of each other while completing separate functions that required security. She stated that for example, they were setting up early voting sites and staging equipment, and at the last minute, they had to pack up all of the ballot stock, which had to be secured, and that was done with bipartisan teams. She stated that once they left the ballot room, they were constantly being watched by two people and it was challenge for them to leave the facility, because when they were in the middle of a turnover and also had more ballots coming in from the postal run, they were required to complete certain functions and stop others and they were running into those types of things every single day during a high volume election.

Supervisor Scott stated that with the faster, more efficient processing of ballots, the statutory deadline for turning over the ballots to Elections for tabulation was the 15th and he was aware they had met that deadline. He asked if the Recorder anticipated that they could do better than that deadline with this additional space.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly replied that the number of workstations they would be able to have would drastically cut down on the number of the bulk that they were sending over to Elections. She stated for this election cycle they had five calendar days after the election where they had to continue to hold on to unresolved ballots. She stated that they were still going to have those statutory requirements, but for all other ballots that had been signature verified, they would be able to turn those over much quicker to the Elections Department if they had more people, more space and more computers and ballot processors. She stated that another thing they had planned, but was not part of this conversation, was changing the envelope format. She stated they currently used two envelopes, but they would use one that was a combined ballot affidavit and return envelope with a hope of an increase. She stated that they definitely knew they would see an increase because in this last election cycle, they removed all of the yellow envelopes as people dropped them off and the ballots that were processed in that way went through much faster.

Supervisor Scott asked Ms. Leshar if there were additional benefits to Elections that had not been addressed during the discussion with the Recorder.

Ms. Leshar responded that she believed everything had been addressed.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the costs for tenant improvements.

Mr. Holmes responded they would not know those costs until they were there, but he verified that one of the reasons that was negotiated in the lease was because

they believed they could complete the tenant improvements at a cheaper cost. He stated that they could provide an estimate to the Board once they moved it.

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

### **Fleet Services**

15. Northwest Fire District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for County fuel site access, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue/4 year term (CT2400000060)

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

### **Health**

16. Helping Ourselves Pursue Enrichment, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Pima CARES Project, extend contract term to 8/31/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Fund, contract amount \$179,999.90 (PO-CT-24-239)

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

### **Kino Sports Complex**

17. Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson and Arizona Soccer Holdings, Inc., d.b.a. FC Tucson, to provide for a Hospitality and Promotional Agreement, KSC-2024FD (\$40,000.00 and General Contingency (\$40,000.00) Funds, contract amount \$80,000.00/2 year term (PO2400013748)

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

### **Procurement**

18. Sundt Construction, Inc., to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Superior Court - Public Service Center Tenant Improvement Project (XSCPSC), Non-Bond Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$266,168.00/5 year term (PO2400005178) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

**This project is expected to have multiple GMP's for construction services. The CMAR contractor's construction budget is set not-to-exceed \$18,000,000.00.**

**Board of Supervisors to authorize the Procurement Director to execute all modification, including one or more Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)**

**packages, provided that the cumulative total of all GMP's and Pre-Construction Services does not exceed \$18,000,000.00 and the contract expiration date does not exceed November 18, 2029, which allows for all contract close-out activities and final submittals.**

Chair Grijalva requested clarification regarding the contract amount and if it was the total for a five year term.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated this project was for the courtrooms and judges' chambers that began over three years ago and the design work began in 2023, with approximately \$1.8 million spent, and this was one contract within that project for a total amount of \$266,268.00, which was a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) for preconstruction services for that one part of the project that would ultimately be an \$18 million project.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that the contract manager at risk approach was an alternative delivery method to the design bid build and a design consultant was hired to provide a complete design through 100% construction drawings. He stated they took that design out to bid and a contractor bid on constructing the improvements and that was normally split up into the design consultant and then the contract to construct the improvements. He stated that in this instance, it was a bit of a hybrid and the Board approved a design consultant contract with DLR Group and they took the design through 60% of the plan completion stage and then staff took that 60% design and sought a contractor to work with the design consultant for completion of the plans through 100%. He stated that vendor could provide valued engineering and expertise in constructing the improvements to reduce the costs and shorten the timeframe. He stated that the first step was the preconstruction services contract for \$266,168.00 and approval of up to \$18 million for the complete construction of the project. He stated with approval of this contract there would be amendments to the contract and it was also requested that the Board authorize the Procurement Director to approve those amendments which would be in the form of GMP amendments. He understood that the language listed on the Agenda Item Report for this item was not clear and hoped this provided additional clarity, that in addition to the amount for preconstruction services for a five year term, it included amendments in the form of GMP amendments for up to \$18 million total project cost estimate.

Chair Grijalva stated that she felt the item needed to include language about the renovation of the courtrooms for up to \$18 million and that it included amendments to the contract. She stated that one of her concerns was the language listed on the agenda should be easy to read for anyone that looked at the agenda so that they did not have to open the attachments to understand what the Board would be voting on. She asked staff if they could provide additional information to the Clerk so that the agenda item language could reflect that revised language.

Ms. Leshner suggested the following language from the Agenda Item Report be added to the agenda language for this item, "This project is expected to have multiple GMP's for construction services. The CMAR contractor's budget is set not-

to-exceed \$18,000,000.00. Board of Supervisors to authorize the Procurement Director to execute all modification, including one or more Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) packages, provided that the cumulative total of all GMP's and Pre-Construction Services does not exceed \$18,000,000.00 and the contract expiration date does not exceed November 18, 2029, which allows for all contract close-out activities and final submittals.”

Supervisor Christy requested clarification if the tenant improvements and the reconstruction were being made for the City of Tucson.

Ms. Leshar responded no, this was for the Superior Court.

Supervisor Scott referred to the memorandum that was attached to the item as material for the item and under the Procurement of CMHA services section it stated that during evaluation of the appropriate construction delivery method a construction manager at risk delivery was determined as the optimum choice for the project and the CMHA delivery method hires the contractor on a qualified qualifications based selection during the design phase of the project to utilize their construction expertise to align the scope of the project with the construction method, the CMAR delivery method allows the construction scope to be separated into bid packages, which allows portions of the work to start or long lead time materials to be ordered, while the remainder of the design is completed and bid later, regardless of whether staff separated a bid. He stated that it sounded like the CMAR method should be the County's default method, and asked why it was not.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that there was a rubric that the project design teams used to determine the appropriate method for delivery and additional information would be provided to the Board.

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

### **Real Property**

19. Silver Bell Mining, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County License for Right-of-Way encroachment, total contract amount \$8,750.00 revenue/25 year term (\$350.00 per year) (CT2400000055)

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

20. Western Area Power Administration, to provide an Agreement for Exchange of Real Property, Contract and Grant of Easement, and Quit Claim Deed, to relocate existing transmission lines located south of Aerospace Parkway and north of Old Vail Road, no cost/3 year term (SC2400002356)

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

21. Primavera Foundation, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for an amendment to Quit Claim Deed with Nondisturbance and Estoppel Agreement, extend contract term to 11/18/54 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002360)

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

### **Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

22. Town of Marana, Amendment No. 3, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 11/30/25 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$102,000.00 (CT-WW-21-224)

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

### **Sheriff**

23. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 64, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-1016H between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000052)

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

24. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 65, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-962 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000045)

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

25. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 66, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. WG-CR-0073 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000046)

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

26. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 67, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-930 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000047)

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

27. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 68, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-984 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000048)

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

28. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 69, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-10001 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000049)

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

29. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 70, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-997 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000050)

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

30. RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 71, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces FY 2025 Agreement for Case No. SW-AZT-1005H between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Pima County for assistance in law enforcement operations during Fiscal Year 2024 - 2025, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2400000051)

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



## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

### **31. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

City of Tucson, to provide for Tucson-Pima Extreme Weather Shelter, \$15,000.00 (G-CWD-79525)

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

### **32. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 11, to provide for the Community Action Services Program and amend grant language, \$2,066,356.50 (GA-CWD-70943)

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

### **33. Acceptance - Health**

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Overdose Data to Action: LOCAL - Pima CARES and amend grant language, \$2,544,375.00 (GA-HD-69959)

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

### **34. Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the American Rescue Plan, \$2,655,000.00 (G-HD-79202)

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

### **35. Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**

Arizona Companion Animal Spay/Neuter Committee, to provide for the public-owned Spay/Neuter Program, \$10,000.00 (G-PAC-73872)

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

36. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**

Arizona Companion Animal Spay/Neuter Committee, to provide for the PACC Community Cat Spay/Neuter Program, \$9,500.00 (G-PAC-74753)

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

37. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**

Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Pima County Victim Restitution Assistance Program, amend grant language and scope change, no cost (GA-PDS-66301)

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

**FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

38. **Hearing - Bingo License**

24-05-8049, Maricela Robles, Rocking K South Master Homeowners Association, 7735 S. Rocking K Ranch Loop, Tucson, Class A - Small Game.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Revenue.

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

39. **Hearing - Rezoning**

P24RZ00007, YBARRA - S. BUTTS ROAD REZONING

John and Denise Ybarra, request a rezoning of approximately 3.35 acres from the SR (TDR-RA) (Suburban Ranch - Transfer of Development Rights - Receiving Area) to the CR-1 (TDR-RA) (Single Residence - Transfer of Development Rights - Receiving Area) zone, located on the west side of S. Butts Road, approximately 900 feet south of the T-intersection of W. Irvington Road and S. Butts Road, addressed as 5050 S. Butts Road. 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 3)

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(s) shall dedicate 30 feet of right-of-way for Butts Road along the east property boundary.
  - B. The property shall be limited to one (1) access point on Butts Road.
  - C. A shared access easement for legal access between the properties is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - D. Surface treatment for dust control purposes for the private drive(s) shall be determined at the time of building permitting.
  - E. A 1-foot no access easement shall be provided along the east property boundary adjacent to Butts Road excluding the access point.
  - F. The property owner(s) shall accept responsibility for the maintenance, control, safety and liability of privately owned roads, drives, physical barriers, drainageways and drainage easements.
3. Flood Control District condition: The mapped Regulated Riparian Habitat on the western most parcel (labeled as Parcel 1 on the sketch) shall remain undisturbed. Any disturbance to the riparian habitat vegetation will require mitigation.
4. Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
  - A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.
  - B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) stating 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(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
  - C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
  - D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
  - E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
  - F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system is permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.
5. Cultural Resources condition: A caution must be noted concerning human burials. 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.

6. Environmental Quality conditions:
  - A. It is the responsibility of the owner to obtain a Construction Authorization from Pima County prior to constructing onsite wastewater treatment facilities; additionally, a Discharge Authorization must be issued by PDEQ before connecting and discharging to the aforementioned onsite wastewater treatment facilities.
  - B. Prior to the commencement of construction of any grading, land clearing or earthmoving of more than one (1) acre, any road construction of more than fifty (50) feet, or any trenching of more than three hundred (300) feet, an Air Quality Permit shall be obtained.
7. Adherence to the sketch plan as approved at public hearing.
8. 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.
9. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "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 anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24RZ00007, subject to standard and special conditions.

#### 40. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

##### P24CU00004, AMERICAN LEGION MADERA POST 131, INC. - S. I19 FRONTAGE ROAD

American Legion Madera Post 131, Inc., represented by Philip Veneziano, request a Type II Conditional Use Permit for a private club in accordance with Section 18.13.030.B.16 of the Pima County Zoning Code in the RH (Rural Homestead) zone, addressed as 3122 S. I19 Frontage Road. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

##### Standard Conditions & Requirements per the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A private club is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.16.

##### Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

The following Special Conditions incorporate detailed input provided by the Development Services Department, the Department of Transportation, and the Regional Flood Control District.

1. A private club is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.16. This approved conditional use permit is for a private club and its customary attendant uses only, including the service of food and alcohol. No other additional commercial uses are authorized.
2. Development of the site shall occur in substantial conformance with the site plan as submitted with this conditional use permit application. Any substantial change from the

- submitted site plan shall be reviewed the Chief Zoning Inspector, who shall determine whether a revised conditional use permit application and process may be warranted.
3. A minimum setback of one hundred feet (100') shall be provided from the main building to the adjoining west property boundary with Encanto Estates. Vehicular access to/from the site shall occur only via the I-19 Frontage Road.
  4. A full Development Plan/Site Construction Permit package is required in conjunction with this use so as to ensure that all related infrastructural, traffic, drainage, and construction-related protocols are properly addressed.
  5. Regional Flood Control District review and approval is required at the time of permitting.
  6. The location of the regulatory wash and the associated floodplain boundary shall be determined at the time of permitting.
  7. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development practices distributed throughout the site.
  8. The location and design of the primary access point on I-19 Frontage Road, and any off-site improvements on this road is subject to approval by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). Proof of coordination with ADOT is required prior to development plan approval.
  9. Coordination, approval and improvements required by the Arizona Department of Transportation shall be completed during the Site Construction Permit process. No occupancy of buildings or use of the site shall occur prior to construction work required on the frontage road being completed.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

Larry Ashby indicated that the statute for the RH Conditional Use Permit (CUP) stated that the purpose of the RH zone was to preserve the character of the rural area in the County. He stated that every Homeowners Association in the area had architectural guidelines that called for brick and stucco buildings, yet the applicant's proposal was for a commercial steel building that served food to the general public. He stated that for more than 40 years, the I-19 west frontage road south of the Chevron station at the Continental exit and to the town of Amado, ten miles to the south and in a different County had always been residential. He stated the statute indicated that development should be allowed only where appropriate and necessary to serve the needs of the rural area, but if this was for a private club, then it would not serve the needs of the area, only its members. He stated that if it was allowed to be open to the public, for seven out of ten of their meals, they requested that the Board consider the change that this decision could have on their area of residential homes that had been popular in part because there was no non-conforming commercial development in the area. He suggested alternative locations such as Canoa Ranch on the De Anza Trail or the mine or golf course that was operated by the County.

Morgan Girdler provided a packet to the Board which included an aerial photo and survey that had been in the possession of Encanto Estates Incorporated Board and the document did not notate ownership of the wall to the east of her property. She stated that the general population of Encanto Estates believed they owned the wall and asked if the American Legion had provided their most recent survey to Encanto Estates to prove ownership of the wall. She stated that approval of the CUP should be delayed until proper ownership was determined. She stated that she was an American Legion Auxiliary member and enjoyed many of the social activities at their Legion, but was concerned with the large amount of social activity because it

increased traffic especially late into the evening. She expressed concern with the traffic patterns that the calendar of events created for the new Legion location and the possibility of increased traffic with the approval of the site. She added that the entrance on I-19 was a two-lane blind spot over the speed limit with no lighting and no turn lane area.

Manuel Beltran, Commander, American Legion Department of Arizona, stated that they were the largest organized Veterans organization and there was a demand for this because veterans needed an outlet where they could be and gather together. He stated that their mission statement was "Be the One," they were there to save lives and it was important that they mingled with each other and got help. He added that the American Legion contributed to their community would be a great asset for this area.

John Backer stated that he had served on the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Town of Sahuarita for eight years, most recently as the Chairman, and he also served on Pima County's Board of Adjustment, District 4. He stated that through his service in both committees, he found that if there was a will there was a way. He stated there had been some worthy statements in opposition of this item, and if it was due to the architectural style of the building they could paint it a color that did not make it look like a steel building or could potentially stucco the building. He urged the Board to support the item even if it required some mitigation to make it fit within the community and satisfy the concerns of the neighbors.

Chair Grijalva closed the public hearing and asked if Board members had questions.

Supervisor Christy stated that this had been a very highly profiled issue in the Green Valley community that had a number of community meetings and that the Green Valley Council had weighed in on it and facilitated a lot of communication with the community. He stated that Bill O'Malley, the Chair of the Green Valley Council, Planning and Architecture Committee, had forwarded him the committee's recommendation which indicated consideration of the CUP be delayed until the applicant could obtain Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) approval for access on the site. He stated that the project had not established that there was adequate capacity on the I-19 frontage road. He stated that he felt a number of issues that had been present over this entire subject had been addressed and either been removed or modified to ensure that the neighborhood was taken into consideration and it seemed that the feedback he received was that the neighborhood was very receptive to these changes and the Post had worked diligently to try to be good neighbors, to try to accommodate the objections and to look for a resolution that would be satisfactory to all parties concerned. He understood that they had an update with new conditions and asked if the Board could be led through the most current status with this issue and perhaps they would find a clear pathway that ensured everyone was on board with this item.

Thomas Drzazgowski, Chief Zoning Inspector, Development Services Department (DSD), explained staff provided a memorandum update to the Board that outlined

what had occurred since this case was heard by the Pima County Hearing Administrator. He stated that there was a public hearing held by the Green Valley Council and the applicant made changes to the site, removed RV spaces, made some oriented changes to the building to positively impact noise and light impact on neighbors, and one of the other concerns addressed was traffic generation from the frontage road. He stated that one of the items DSD was proposing was a new condition that required the applicant to secure ADOT approval prior to the site construction permit, so should this be approved, they would start their improvement project, but would be required to get ADOT approval, which may include right turn lanes, a light, improvements to the road, and all of those things would be done prior to the issuance of any site construction permit before any work occurred on site.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification whether the project could proceed until ADOT completed a study and it was presented to the community and to the project ownership. He asked if this was a first step to approve the special conditions and the project would be pending until ADOT's study was provided.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, DSD, responded in the affirmative and that in terms of sequencing, this was the correct approach. He stated that there was enough information for the Hearing Administrator and staff to make their recommendations. He stated that there was also enough information for the Board to decide on the CUP and ultimately, they would not be issued a permit until they secured access with ADOT to use the frontage road.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Chair Grijalva to approve P24CU00004, subject to the revised standard and special conditions. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott expressed support to the motion, but for public information, read the second sentence in the special conditions, "No occupancy of buildings or use of the site shall occur prior to construction work required on the frontage road being completed." He asked if there was a timeline as to when they could expect completion of that work.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that would occur during the site construction permit process and would be dictated by the applicant and how quickly they prepared plans, worked with ADOT and secured all the approvals, so it could be as quick as a few months or could take years.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the motion included the revised standard and special conditions outlined during the discussion, along with any updates made since the item was posted. She emphasized that this information would be provided to the Clerk to ensure clarity about what was being approved by this Board.

Mr. Drzazgowski confirmed it would include the conditions proposed in their memorandum and it would be provided to the Clerk.

Supervisor Christy commented that he publicly wanted to state that all parties, the neighborhood, the Homeowners Association and the Post leadership, should continue to work together and try to keep an even keel on the whole discussion because he felt there were some mutual beneficial elements, but they would only be that way with continued communication and dialogue.

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

#### 41. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

##### P24CU00005, VAIL EQUIPMENT RENTALS, L.L.C. - S. WILMOT ROAD

Vail Equipment Rentals, L.L.C., requests a Type II Conditional Use Permit for an outdoor RV and boat storage facility in accordance with Section 18.13.030.B.40 of the Pima County Zoning Code in the RH (Rural Homestead) zone, addressed as 16095 S. Wilmot Road. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

##### Standard Conditions & Requirements per the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A recreational vehicle (RV) and boat storage facility is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.40.

##### Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

The following Special Conditions incorporate detailed input provided by the Development Services Department, the Department of Transportation, and the Regional Flood Control District.

1. The project is required to obtain site construction and building permits.
2. The maximum number of spaces is set to 95, however site design and regulatory requirements during the site construction permit may require fewer maximum spaces.
3. Normal business hours are from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, with access available to customers outside normal hours at 5:00 am to 8:00 am and 5:00 pm to 10:00 pm.
4. Storage containers on the property must be painted with natural desert colors and all shipping company logos or writing must be removed or painted over.
5. Storage of inoperable vehicles will not be permitted.
6. Regional Flood Control District review and approval is required at the time of development.
7. The development plan shall meet the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Street Standards at time of permit application, including but not limited to the gated entry, onsite circulation, parking areas and parking aisles (access lanes).
8. The turnaround area shall be located within the development boundary outside of the Wilmot Road right-of-way.
9. In order to control particulate matter, all parking areas and parking aisles (access lanes) shall be paved. Paving may not be required in storage areas that are access controlled. However, those areas shall still use surface treatments such as gravel or decomposed granite to ensure dust control.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24CU00005, subject to standard and special conditions.



42. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

P24CU00006, NOBLE-WOLFF ENTERPRISES, L.L.C. - S. SONOITA HIGHWAY

Noble-Wolff Enterprises, L.L.C., requests a Type II Conditional Use Permit for a winery tasting room in accordance with Section 18.13.030.B.40 of the Pima County Zoning Code in the RH (Rural Homestead) zone, addressed as 18585 S. Sonoita Highway. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

Standard Conditions & Requirements pre the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A winery tasting room is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.40.

Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

The following Special Conditions incorporate detailed input provided by the Development Services Department, the Department of Transportation, and the Regional Flood Control District.

1. This conditional use permit approval is for a winery tasting room and its customary related operations only. No other commercial uses are expressly authorized or allowed.
2. Special events and publicly advertised activities are considered outside of the above scope of approval and will require a separate conditional use permit application. It is the Hearing Administrator's expectation that the applicant will engage County departmental personnel to discuss the scope and frequency of future special events, along with the appropriate level of infrastructure necessary to properly serve them.

Colton Noble, applicant, addressed the Board and clarified that his request was to amend the conditional use permit for Charron Vineyards to include a new tasting room. He explained that in 2016, Pima County approved a tasting room permit and in 2018 they received a letter of occupancy for the new tasting room. He stated they were trying to add this new tasting room to their conditional use permit that was done as part of a negotiation with County staff, who requested paving a three-quarter mile driveway from their business to Highway 83. He stated that it was an estimated \$2.5 million project to pave the road which also included an engineered bridge over Davidson Canyon Wash, which he could not afford and it made his project unviable. He noted strong community support, with approximately 70 letters of support from neighbors and clients submitted to the Board and highlighted that their tasting room served as a community hub for elections and small events. He requested that the Board approve the item while removing the special conditions proposed by County staff that he felt were nebulous and costly. He added that he was not opposed to adding infrastructure or improving the road, but he wanted to do it in a way that was balanced with the RH homestead and maintain the rural aspect of the area. He emphasized their commitment to preserving the area's rural character while improving infrastructure responsibly, and approval without the conditions would benefit their business, the neighborhood, and the County.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

Nicole Harris expressed her support for the item and stated that she and her husband, who was on active duty in the military, had found a strong sense of community at Charron, making Tucson their favorite duty station. She praised the owners' intelligence, generosity, and consideration for neighbors, noted their

contributions to the Davis-Monthan Spouse Club and urged the Board to support their efforts.

Liane Ehrich expressed her support for Sarah and Colton Noble. She opposed paving the road, emphasized the need to preserve the area's rural character and noted that traffic from the Vineyard only affected the first third mile of the road. She praised the Vineyard for fostering community in a rural area and stated that it as a place that connected people to the land. She commended the Nobles' dedication and urged support for their small business over large corporate developments.

Lori Magnuson shared her journey to Arizona, where she and her husband Rick discovered Charron Vineyards, chose to settle in Pima County and began working at the Vineyards in 2022. She highlighted the Vineyards' role as a community hub, supporting local businesses, organizations, and crafters while attracting visitors who boosted the local economy. She noted its unique charm, breathtaking views, and volunteer-driven harvests, which have grown in participation each year. She emphasized the value of the new structure, designed to provide patrons with a modern yet intimate space to enjoy the wine, views, and community while preserving the boutique winery's character.

JJ Lamb spoke about Charron Vineyards' role as an economic driver and cultural hub in the greater Vail area community for over 30 years. She highlighted its importance as the gateway vineyard to Sonoita and Elgin and its location within Vail's Main Street corridor. She expressed support for Charron's improvement plans and opposed the requirements to pave the road, build a bridge, and cap guests at 15, citing the financial harm and disruption to the rural setting. She urged the Board to approve the plans without these conditions, and emphasized Charron's contributions to the community and local economy.

David Burhans stated that he had been a resident of the area for the last 50 years and supported the expansion and opposed paving the road. He noted there was a dirt road that was well maintained by the community and while a bridge was appealing it was cost-prohibitive. He praised Charron Vineyards' community contributions, including partnerships with the Arizona Trail, and described it as a valued gathering place for neighbors and families. He stated that as a regular visitor to the Vineyards, he supported their need for more space to accommodate growth in the area.

Chair Grijalva closed the public hearing.

Supervisor Christy praised Charron Vineyards as a valuable asset to the community and southeast region, noting its economic impact, role as a tourist attraction, and their importance as a gateway to the growing vineyard industry. He expressed support for the vineyard's mission and progress while emphasizing the need for transparency in addressing compliance issues. He raised concerns about safety factors potentially creating liability risks and requested updates from staff on the current situation and the status of the conditions and compliance requirements.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services Department, explained that staff and the Hearing Administrator supported the vineyard and its continued operation. He stated concerns arose over events like weddings or large gatherings, which could bring visitors unfamiliar with the area to a primitive setting that required access across Davidson Canyon Wash. He noted the conditions imposed by the Hearing Administrator and staff were supportive of the continued use of the Vineyard, but introduced requirements for larger events, that included all-weather access to prevent issues during storms, proper parking to ensure emergency vehicle access, and compliance with development plan standards like paving and engineering.

Supervisor Christy stated that the numerous letters of support he received acknowledged the Vineyard's current operations as low-impact gatherings like wine tastings and art classes with 15 to 20 guests and understood that concerns stemmed from larger events, such as weddings or graduations hosting 100 to 150 people, due to safety and compliance issues. He requested clarification of the Vineyard's future plans and recommended continued discussions between the owners, DSD, the Hearing Administrator, and the community. He recommended the item be continued for 60 days and directed that the dialog continue between all parties in order to address compliance needs and explore solutions that would balance the County requirements, with the business' growth and ability to prosper.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to continue the item for 60 days.

Chair Grijalva questioned the necessity of a vote unless the Board intended to deny it and have the item resubmitted. She questioned what constituted an event and if this required rezoning. She stated that in her district, District 5, there were venues with no surrounding neighbors that had shifted from occasional to frequent events, which caused parking challenges. She proposed drafting clear guidelines for event definitions, such as accommodating small weddings or wine tastings, to ensure flexibility and proper planning. She recommended postponing the decision to allow staff to revise the language, and emphasized that merely delaying without changes would be counterproductive. She stressed the importance of addressing zoning and use permits to prevent recurring issues and suggested that the applicant plan for future uses, which considered factors like capacity and parking. She stated that she was not opposed to the current proposal, but believed proactive adjustments would benefit all parties in the long term.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether a motion was necessary.

Chair Grijalva did not believe so and suggested direction to staff to bring the item back before the Board with revised language and noted that returning the item unchanged would not address the problem.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that there was a motion on the floor to continue the item for 60 days and asked if there was a seconder to the motion.

Supervisor Christy withdrew his motion.

Ms. Manriquez sought clarification on whether the item could be brought back or postponed without requiring another public hearing, since the public hearing had been closed.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the item would be brought back as a public hearing item.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the public would be allowed to speak when the item was brought back to the Board.

Chair Grijalva responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the current methods people used to traverse the wash due to the absence of a bridge.

Mr. Poirier explained that the current crossing was at-grade, which was allowed in residential settings and approved for the Vineyard under the assumption of minimal events and visitors. He stated that increased commercial activity would raise concerns requiring further action.

Chair Grijalva inquired about the reference to a business that utilized the same road for industrial purposes and sought confirmation of such activity. She emphasized the importance of facilitating community-driven expansion while ensuring the County addressed potential liabilities.

Mr. Poirier clarified that the zoning in the area across the wash was designated as RH, and there were no known legally permitted industrial users that operated there. He expressed support for the Vineyards' plan to expand its tasting room, and stated that the conditions established were designed to facilitate this expansion. He stated there was concern about the broader implications of the request which was initially submitted as a conditional use permit for a wine tasting room and the request had been refined through discussions with the applicant, staff, and the hearing administrator. He cautioned that if the proposal evolved into something larger, such as an event center, the conditional use permit process would need to restart. He recommended proceeding with the current request while allowing the applicant to submit a new proposal, if necessary, and emphasized that the Board's decision must align with the current scope of the conditional use permit for the wine tasting room.

Chair Grijalva stated that the intention was not to complicate matters, though building a bridge seemed excessive. She suggested the applicant provide an estimated calendar of events, such as monthly or weekly. She acknowledged the community's support, but stressed the need to ensure accessibility without creating prohibitive costs. She stated that it was important to have a venue that people could visit.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on whether a vote was needed to continue the item.

Chair Grijalva clarified that if the item was being continued as is, a vote would be required, however, if it was to be brought back in a revised form, no vote would be necessary. She hoped for a reasonable solution, and noted that requiring paving and a bridge would be overly costly relative to the benefit. She stated that discussion would continue, and that the item, as presented, did not appear to be a workable solution.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that direction had been provided to staff to bring the item back with revised language and requested clarification on whether that direction included that the item be brought back in 60 days.

Chair Grijalva responded that the 60 day timeline was removed and that the item could be brought back by staff whenever it was ready.

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **43. 2024 Election Ballot Measures**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposal to ask the County Administration to analyze and report findings to the Board of Supervisors the fiscal and operational impacts on the county of these voter-enacted 2024 election ballot measures:

- Proposition 311, relating to first responders
- Proposition 312, relating to property taxation
- Proposition 313, relating to child sex trafficking sentencing
- Proposition 314, relating to state enforcement of immigration law (District 5)

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

Supervisor Christy requested a friendly amendment to the motion, that Proposition 139 be included in the report.

Chair Grijalva and Supervisor Scott accepted the friendly amendment.

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

### **44. Request for Independent Investigation**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Request for an independent investigation by the office of the Arizona Attorney General and/or the office of a non-conflicted County Attorney regarding the actions taken by Pima County Recorder Cázares-Kelly with respect to Early Voting in the 2024 General Election, including but not limited to, the

circumstances that led to the cancelation of voters' accepted online Ballot by Mail requests, in apparent violation of A.R.S. §16-542. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that there were numerous media articles regarding this, with one stating, "I'm requesting an investigation into an early ballot request blunder." He stated there was one by Mr. Stellar of the Star, and another by the Sentinel. He asked if the Recorder had a chance to review the articles.

Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder, stated that she had not reviewed the articles.

Supervisor Christy synopsised the reason he brought this to the Board in addition to the fact that it was in the media. He stated that the whole issue arose, due to the portal that accepted requests for ballots, but then the Recorder shut down the portal unannounced. He stated that the voter received an email from the Recorder to call her office to request a ballot even though voters completed the process, and it canceled what voters had completed online. He stated that the Elections Procedure Manual specifically stated that a voter could request a ballot by mail, orally or in writing, including in-person, online, by telephone, email or by fax. He stated that there were penalties for noncompliance, such as A.R.S. §16-1009 and read as follows, "A public officer upon whom a duty is imposed by this title, who knowingly fails or refuses to perform that duty in the manner prescribed by the law, is guilty of a class three misdemeanor." He stated that A.R.S. §16-1010, read, "A person charged with performance of any duty under any law relating to elections, who knowingly refuses to perform such duty, or who is in his or her official capacity, knowingly acts in violation of any provision of such law, is guilty of a class six felony." He added that the news media stipulated that Marion Chubon, the Deputy Director of the Recorder's Office, indicated that the law requiring ballots to be sent within 48 hours of request was a consideration, and they were not going to fulfill those requests in that time, so they chose the more effective option. He stated that the article stated that State law did not provide for County officials to discard requests for vote-by-mail ballots. He stated that there was obvious knowledge of the two statutes and Ms. Chubon stated that she considered them so that it explicitly pointed out that she had knowledge of those statutes, and that for whatever reason, she was not able to fulfill those requests, and so she chose another option that went against the statutes. He stated that it added a two-step process for what was supposed to be a one-step process. He read from the article as follows, "One step for the voters was a dangerous thing, the first step, noticing an email is not to be assumed, since we get all so much junk email and not everyone checks their email regularly. The second step phoning the Recorder's Office, it also took initiative." He reiterated that what was supposed to be a one-step process turned into multiple steps. He stated that with these items, he sensed that his colleagues were going to use the assertion that there was really nothing to be seen here, no nefarious activity or no criminal intent, so they would sweep it under the rug and not address it. He advised if this was his colleagues' position and they wished to dismiss this incident, by indicating it was simply a clerical error or a clerical decision, he felt was a very dangerous thing, because then the majority on this Board would suffer the taint of protecting an elected official who happened to be of the same party. He stated that it

was important because of what this Board had done in regards to the Sheriff's activities and if they looked at the severity of several very tight, close, important high level elections, the Sheriff, the one in LD17, the one in CD6, the numbers of voters that potentially could have been disenfranchised and suppressed, which was not known at this point, could very well have affected those votes and affected those elections. He requested that the Board approve an independent investigation, whose duty it was to determine the degree of either malfeasance or incompetence or nefarious activity, and it was not up to this Board to have the gradations or the judgment to make those decisions, it was up to an independent investigator. He stated this was the reason he requested this investigation, and it should not be dismissed as simply something that had no real issue, effect or meaning. He added that there were other very troubling issues in these reports.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, asked Supervisor Christy if there was a motion for further discussion because it seemed that it had been clarified what was being requested with the item.

Supervisor Christy stated that discussion was on the same topic and asked why a motion was needed.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the discussion was continuing and there needed to be a motion for discussion.

Supervisor Christy pointed out one last troubling issue that was stated in the Tucson Sentinel and read as follows, "The Recorder's Office didn't inform the press about the issue because they didn't think it was a story." He stated that was quoted from the Deputy Recorder and was why they needed an independent investigation.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, for discussion purposes only.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that this was a culmination of a lot of different situations. She stated that this was through no fault of their own conditions that they could not control and there were some changes that were made to data that was utilized by the Elections Department in order to design ballots. She stated that was a change made within the County, and the Recorder's Office and the Elections Department were not notified until a much later date, which was a much larger issue. She stated that what happened as a result of it was their printer was then delayed in being able to send out the ballots on time, and because the ballots were coming 90,000 at a time, as opposed to 400,000 at a time, being delivered to Pima County, they saw many people panic and many people that were on the active early voting list already had a ballot on their way had then flooded the online portal. She stated the online portal was something that she inherited, and it had never reached the capacity that it had during this election cycle, and so the way that these used to be processed was very manual. She stated that a voter would submit their information via their online portal, the document would then get printed and put into a basket and then their voter staff would come and take a little handful at a time, and they would manually enter the ballot request for that individual voter throughout

the entirety of the election cycle. She clarified that the portal was not tied to their voter database, and so if there was someone who was receiving a ballot through the active early voting list, it would not show up or alert the voter that they already had a ballot on the way. She added that if that voter had an inactive account, which meant they had a bad address that needed to be updated, and that was not in their system, they would not have been able to send them that information, or if through user error, that voter entered their wrong birth date or wrong address and believed they had 663 of those voters that either entered an error through their name or their birth date, or something that made it difficult for them to find that voter because of those types of situations. She explained that once they submitted that request, they automatically received an email receipt confirming receipt of their request, and they received another email once it had been processed. She stated that the person would know to look for an additional correspondence from their office. She stated that they recognized that the majority of the voters that submitted these requests were submitting duplicate requests, so 60% of those voters that had a pending request were ones that were already being fulfilled. She reiterated that because this was a manual system, it had received their attention and was in the process of being redesigned, and it would happen again. She added that the majority of those voters were taking staff time to serve the voters that actually needed those ballots and by recognizing the surge they decided to close the portal.

Supervisor Chirsty asked who made that decision.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly stated that they made the decision to close the portal so that there was no additional requests that came through and it was not mandated that they have the portal, but was a convenience to the voters that they did. She stated they wanted to have it and it made sense to have it, but they were not infringing on anyone's constitutional rights by not having an online request form available. She stated that they closed it because they were running into concerns about the timeliness of being able to respond to these requests, they asked voters to call their office and they also provided a media release this morning. She stated they wished they could have done it during that time period, it was a very busy time and they were trying to be most responsive to the voters and the voters that were impacted and did not want to create public panic. She stated that was something they had seen and people had taken the situations out of context and flooded their phone lines, creating a longer wait for phone lines and those kinds of things. She stated that the day after they submitted that email request, the next Monday morning, they were flooded with phone calls, but the average wait time was around four minutes. She stated that the week prior, it was three minutes, and so they had every available staff member that was trained on the phone, available to provide the voter with information that they needed so that they would actually receive that ballot. She stated that one of the huge driving concerns they had was many of the voters that were submitting additional requests did not have sufficient information to send them a ballot. She stated that they were concerned that they would assume that they had done everything that they needed, when in fact they needed to submit an address update or they needed to contact the office to remove themselves from inactivation, which required follow up and so the majority of the calls they received from voters were very appreciative of this communication. She stated that they were able to



resolve their issues and of those voters, 39% were able to address those issues with the other 61% being voters that already received their ballots and so those were not needed. She stated that they did not know the full impact, but many of the voters that had spoken to made alternative plans to show up to vote early in person, and take care of their paperwork while there. She stated that they saw a large increase in the number of site issued early voting and in a normal cycle in any general cycle they typically saw at most 10,000 people using the early voting site in person options. She stated that in 2020, during the pandemic, they saw 29,000 and thought that was extremely high, and they had planned for that. She stated that in this cycle they saw 45,000 people that came through their early voting sites, which was phenomenal, because it was an incredible amount of people coming through and voting in person early, the majority of them having to resolve situations with their address, updates, or with their registration and they were able to complete that on site with trained staff and immediately receive their ballots.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had received four emails from constituents who attested that they never received their ballot. He asked who made the decision to close the portal.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that the decision to close it was made by her chief deputy and she stood firmly behind her, that this was their only option to best serve the voters. She stated that the four voters who contacted Supervisor Christy might have a variety of reasons why they had not received their ballot. She explained that sometimes it had to do with people being misinformed about their registration and the City of Tucson election confused a lot of people. She added that people expected to automatically receive their ballot and then they found out that they were not signed up for active early voting lists. She stated that sometimes there were address issues and they made changes with the post office that did not automatically update a voter registration, which was a separate requirement. She stated that if they had a full mailbox or had a forwarding address on a postal box that could create an issue for that voter and would result in a returned ballot to their office. She stated that they did send notifications out through the mail to that voter to inform them of that situation, however, it was a condensed time period and so those individual voters should contact her office to investigate why they had not received one. She stated that if there was even a situation with the post office, they had the ability to track that ballot and track it all the way up to the delivery driver. She stated that if they had a situation with people in an apartment complex that did not receive their ballots, they would be able to address those issues and follow up and investigate those, so it was not a clear situation of four people that had not received their ballots, it was a very individual process that required specific attention to the details of those voters.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had heard from the Recorder words to the effect of "beyond our control" or "unexpected", which he felt denoted the fact that the Board needed an investigation more now than ever and it was the Board's fiduciary obligation to ask for such an investigation in order to clarify the issue, because if there was no clear cut, unbiased investigation, this cloud would hang over the Recorder's Office and their voting system indefinitely.

Chair Grijalva stated that there was a motion for discussion and asked Supervisor Christy if he wanted to make another motion to move the item.

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

Supervisor Heinz thanked the Recorder for being present and stated that the pending requests, 60% of which sounded like they were duplicated, were already on the early active voter list and might not have remembered, but the 40% of those pending requests that did not have their ballot request fulfilled, sounded like they received an email to that effect. He asked if they knew the quantity or number of people that were affected.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that they originally emailed 3,900 voters, and of those, they fielded about 3,500 phone calls and processed 1,858 vote-by-mail ballot requests via phone on the Monday alone. She added that between that day and Friday, October 25th, the office fielded 8,643 phone calls, which resulted in 4,919 requests for early ballots processed by staff over the phone. She stated that they emailed these voters the first time then they were able to pull data from that initial mailing and sent out an additional email to 1,100 voters. She stated that from that, they further had an additional 663 that they sent a third email to and then they looked up the information for those 663 voters and were able to contact and talk to 63 of them over the phone. She reiterated that many of the people were entering errors on their requests which was not tied to their database and so it was not entirely accurate.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he wanted to ensure that voters were able to find some way to actually cast a ballot and asked if they were able to determine that.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded yes, and that although they directed voters to call their office, they were also corresponding with them via email and were still able to fulfill many requests. She stated that if people were from far away and they could not call during office hours and they responded to their email, they would be able to ensure the information confirmed that the information that they needed to send them the appropriate ballot was in their system and then helped that voter vote in that way. She stated that they felt confident that they were able to communicate with all of these voters and letting them know that a situation was delaying the processing of their ballot. She stated that they tried multiple times and these were people that were efficient enough to have navigated to their website, submitted an online form and were instructed to check their email. She stated that was already a part of the process and so the communication was there and that it would be more concerning if it were people that were somehow not able to request that information, but because these were higher level users, people that were familiar with online systems and email confirmations and that type of practice, they were able to reach the majority of the voters.

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification whether someone from her team had checked to ensure the 3,900 folks that received an email were able to file a ballot or vote in the 2024 election and requested confirmation of how many of those voters were able to cast a ballot once the Recorder was able to gather the data.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that they whittled down their list by being able to pull matching data through other reports and they knew that a large number had been served. She stated that she was unaware of the final numbers but was in the middle of canvassing the election results and were trying to finalize all of their numbers and audit those numbers so that they could turn those over to the Elections Department. She stated that it was something they could do, they were concerned about that and wanted to ensure they understood the impact. She reiterated that when this happened, they wanted to ensure that the voters knew the best course of action for those individual voters to take in order for them to get the ballot that they needed and that was why the focus was on the voter, rather than the media in that regard.

Supervisor Scott stated that he did not feel that any Board member wanted this swept under the rug or took partisan considerations into concern. He stated that what needed to be determined was if they agreed with the item regarding whether there were enough concerns for them to call for an independent investigation by either the Attorney General or a non-conflicted County Attorney because of actions taken of the alleged apparent violation of Arizona Revised Statute. He stated they could certainly have questions and concerns and ask that they be addressed here, for the record, or in the after-action report, which he knew the Board would receive from the Recorder and the Elections Department without necessarily agreeing that there needed to be a criminal investigation. He stated that the Recorder mentioned that the portal was not tied to the voter database and asked whether some of the changes she was exploring would tie the portal to the voter database in the future.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly replied in the affirmative and that it was brought to their attention during this election cycle because of the number of duplicates and the high volume they had seen compared to any of the other election cycles. She explained the increase in volume was due to it being a Presidential election and people were not familiar with checking their voter registration or the impact of having a forwarding address on their record through the post office and they also had a delay in ballots, which was beyond their control and not nefarious in any way. She stated that this highlighted for them how labor intensive it had been and how difficult it was to communicate with the voter after the fact. She stated that as a result, they were working to make this a much easier process to determine whether they had login credentials, to be able to see whether or not they were already expecting a ballot or if they needed to request one, if they needed to update their address, if they were on the inactive list, and the steps needed to remove themselves from the inactive list, which would be considered when they redesigned the portal to make it much more user friendly for everyone.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Recorder mentioned that 61% of the requests that came through the portal were people that were on the automatic early voter list, but

they did not receive a ballot yet, and they were concerned, so they filled out a second request. He asked if this statistic was correct.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded that out of the 20,465 requests their office processed before removing the online form, 12,645 were not sent because the voter already voted. She clarified the voter already had a request because they were on the active early voting list, the voter was not registered, the voter gave insufficient information to fulfill the request, it was a duplicate request or the voter's record required an address update. She stated that in addition to those issues, it was something that had also been highlighted, the fact that it was not tied to the voter database, so people thought they had done their part, only to find out that they were inactive, not registered or whatever the situation was.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Recorder also mentioned that there was no statutory or constitutional requirement to have a portal, but there was a statutory requirement that an early ballot request be fulfilled within 48 hours. He stated that this was the basis for the decision made to close the portal and that it sounded like she and her team had solid ground to make that decision. He asked whether they consulted either with the Secretary of State's Office or the County Attorney's Office before the decision was made.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly replied that they made the decision over the weekend as they worked to try to fill those requirements and recognized even on a weekend with lower call volume or any communication, but they still had their problem ballot line and general line open. She stated that they were still getting phone calls from voters, but there was an increase online and the number of staff they had working on those online requests far exceeded the number they continued to see for the online portal, and it grew by the day because of the delay. She stated this prompted them to determine this over the weekend and then immediately communicated with the Secretary of State's Office and also with their legal team to inform them of the situation and the status. She stated that they had been reassured that they were not disenfranchising voters by closing that portal, because voters still had an opportunity to request a ballot, either by calling them by phone, fax, in-person, and requesting it at an early voting site or on election day.

Supervisor Scott asked whether the Recorder's legal team was the Pima County Attorney's Office.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott requested that everything being discussed and everything the Recorder's Office and the Elections Department were considering be addressed in robust detail in their after-action reports.

Supervisor Lee commented that she had heard from her neighbor that they had not received their ballot yet and they were an early voter. She wanted to know more about the issue with printing of the 90,000 ballots printed versus 400,000 because it seemed that was the crux of it and if everyone had received their ballots within 1 or

2 days, then this might not have happened and the portal would not have been inundated.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that this was one of those situations that was very much well outside of their control because an error regarding school districts was identified by the Treasurer. She stated the Treasurer had connected with the Assessor's Office and the Geographic Information System (GIS) team and changes were made to the district boundaries.

Chair Grijalva inquired about GIS.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly stated GIS meant Geographic Information System, it was the County's GIS Department, and they confirmed that this error was a 20 year old error that was identified, needed to be corrected and not knowing the connection between the GIS mapping and the Elections Department's use of the data, they made those changes without communicating those changes to either the Elections Department or to the Recorder's Office and were completely unaware. She added that the last day for them to submit their first list to their printers in Phoenix was September 26th at 6:00 p.m. and she had received a call from the Treasurer at 5:00 p.m. to alert them of the changes. She stated that they placed an immediate hold on all of the data that they were trying to send to the printers at that time and she immediately communicated this concern to the Elections Department to ask whether or not there was going to be any impact to them. She added that they found a small group that had to do with ballot styles, which inherently was a ballot design issue that her office did not control, and was completely housed within the Elections Department for which they were responsible. She stated that without finalizing the ballot styles, the printer could not send to the voters and as a result, it impacted the Recorder's Office early voting, and her office was responsible for sending out those ballots. She added that they were in a situation where they either sent out the wrong ballots and then had to correct that in some way, or those ballots were delayed. She stated that the Elections Department was able to finalize whatever was needed and they had since resolved all of those situations. She stated that they came together and had multiple conversations about what to do going forward if something like that was identified, especially so close to an election and people did not know about this connection between their offices and the reliance of that data or changes that were made within that time frame. She added there had been turnover in the County, but they had a set procedure in place where they knew where they received the data from, who was responsible for it, and how it was distributed throughout the rest of the County. She stated that the vendor did such a wonderful job after the pause that the County had in regards to ballot design and after they had the green light to move forward. She stated that it did interfere with the vendor's other deadlines, because they supplied ballots for the rest of the country, so they were also in the middle of a high-volume time and they were assembling the County's ballot packets. She explained they had completed pre-assembly, but the final ballot that remained which was the delay and they were then distributing those ballots as quickly as possible. She stated they were grateful to Runbeck for their time because they went above and beyond to get as many ballots out for them as possible, working day and night, in multiple shifts and they did a tremendous lift for the County to try to get

those ballots out within that time period. She added that they were also appreciative of the U.S. Postal Service because the ballots were trucked from Phoenix all the way to Cherrybell in Tucson, and then they were distributed in Tucson. She stated that the letter carriers were phenomenal in trying to prioritize the distribution of those ballots to get them out as fast as possible, however, it was important to know that they had received angry phone calls about missing ballots back in August. She stated that in August and September people said they had not received their ballot and the amount of stress and anxiety they had was unreal, so with a one day delay or two day delay, it made everyone so concerned and then it was also Indigenous People's Day, a holiday that Monday when the post office was closed, which added an additional day to when many people received their ballots. She stated that people were incredibly impatient, angry and upset and they ended up going to their website and flooded them by placing multiple requests.

Supervisor Lee thanked the Recorder and stated that she would probably not be on the Board when the after-action report was presented, but it seemed to her that it was more than just these silos that involved other entities and hoped that when the report came out, it included a best practice that would be followed and used as a whole, so this did not happen again because it unfortunately caused a domino effect.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was important to note that what she had read online and the news stories was focused on the role of the Recorder, but there were so many other departments that fit into all of it. She thanked the Recorder for being present and stated that there was a motion and second on the floor to move forward with the investigation as outlined on the agenda.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 1-4, Chair Grijalva and Supervisors Heinz, Lee and Scott voted "Nay."

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

45. Osborn Maledon, P.A., Amendment No. 4, to provide legal representation for Pima County in Knott Development MQ Phase One Leases and Subleases and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$75,000.00 (PO-CT-24-56)

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

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

46. **Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council**

Appointment of Cecilia Valdez, to replace Paul Rubin. Term expiration: 12/31/28.  
(District 5)

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

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **47. Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

\* \* \*

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

### **1. Special Event**

- Mitchel Dean Busby, San Xavier Lodge No. 1964, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc., 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, November 23, 2024.
- Rebecca Jean Wilson, San Xavier Lodge No. 1964, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc., 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, December 6, 2024.

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **2. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Mamma Coal \$1,050.00; Linev Systems US, Inc. \$20,800.00; Banner University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C. \$80,274.08; Sarah N. Sowers \$407.00; Precision Tool & Construction Supply \$844.44; Hunter Contracting Co. \$16,649.41; Dell Marketing, LP \$62,016.68; Pima Special Programs No. 99 \$10,875.00; Printing & Finishing Solutions \$1,885.00; Georgetown Enterprises, L.L.C. \$4,237.00; Sunpointe Gardens Apartments \$3,119.17; RWK Sonoran SPE, L.L.C. \$1,479.78; Workforce Training Academy \$500.00; Workforce Training Academy \$500.00; Workforce Training Academy \$500.00; Marie Tavormina \$160.00; Georgetown Enterprises, L.L.C. \$3,000.00; The State of Arizona \$67.00; The State of Arizona \$67.00; National Food Group \$4,265.93; Jim Click Ford \$2,366.27; Workforce Training Academy \$4,000.00; Green Valley Marana Auto Supply, Inc. \$113.98; Daniel Vatterrodt \$55.00; Anixter \$34.58; Anixter \$419.69; Arizona Daily Star \$12,880.00; 5055 Tamarus Street, L.L.C. \$3,407.00; 410 N. Grande Ave., L.L.C. \$4,502.80; Aaron Burkhardt \$2,900.00.

## **TREASURER**

### **3. 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 \$24,664.93.

## **CORRECTION FOR THE RECORD**

4. On June 18, 2024, the Board of Supervisors approved the IGA. The BOSAIR incorrectly listed an expense amount of \$212,000.00 and a revenue amount of \$1,209,000.00. Those amounts reflected a combination of RTAG, RTA and local HURF funding. This item contains the corrected BOSAIR which lists a revenue amount of \$69,000.00 and no expense amount. There are no changes to the language of the IGA.

### **Contract**

Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, to provide for design and construction of improvements to South Houghton Road multi-use path (TIP ID 3.24), RTA, RTAG, Pima County HURF Funds, contract amount ~~\$212,200.00/\$1,209,000.00~~ \$69,000.00 revenue/5 year term (~~CT-TR-24-473~~) (CT2400000022)

## **RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

5. Minutes: September 3, 2024

\* \* \*

## **48. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK