

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MEETING 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, January 7, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
 Rex Scott, Vice Chair
 *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
 Jennifer Allen, 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 participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:24 a.m.

1. CONTRACT

SFPP, L.P., Amendment No. 1, to provide a Facility Adjustment and Reimbursement Agreement for Gardner Lane UPRR culverts, extend contract term to 11/1/26 and amend contractual language, FC Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$3,395,260.00 (PO2400016804)

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

2. CONTRACT

Green Valley Council, Inc., d.b.a. Green Valley Council, Amendment No. 4, to provide for Green Valley Council Services, extend contract term to 12/31/25 and amend contractual language, Health, DOT, RWRD, DSD, RFCD Tax Levy and DEQ General (\$11,250.00) Funds, contract amount \$87,500.00 (CT-21-202)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy 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 11:55 a.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 7, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair
Rex Scott, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Jennifer Allen, 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 participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:24 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 Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, Pima County Attorney's Office.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

OATH OF OFFICE

4. Oath of Office to be administered by the Honorable Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, for elected officials of Pima County:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Rex Scott, District 1
Dr. Matt Heinz, District 2
Jennifer Allen, District 3
Steve Christy, District 4
Adelita S. Grijalva, District 5

ASSESSOR

Suzanne Droubie

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Laura Conover

COUNTY RECORDER

Gabriella Cázares-Kelly

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

Dustin Williams

SHERIFF

Chris Nanos

TREASURER

Brian Johnson

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

Erica Cornejo, Precinct No. 2

Charlene Pesquiera, Precinct No. 4

Alexander Ball, Precinct No. 6

Renee Ann Garza, Precinct No. 9

Robert J. Forman, Precinct No. 10

CONSTABLES

Mark Roosevelt, Precinct No. 1

Tracy Ethridge-Nielsen, Precinct No. 4

Bennett L. Bernal, Precinct No. 6

Thomas Schenek, Jr., Precinct No. 7

Christopher Toth, Precinct No. 8

John Cammarano, Precinct No. 10

The Honorable Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, administered the Oath of Office to the elected officials present. No Board action was taken.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

5. Board of Supervisors Procedural Organization

- A. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair.
- B. Appointment of the Clerk of the Board.
- C. Appointment of the Sergeant at Arms.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to select Supervisor Scott as Chair for 2025.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to select Supervisor Grijalva as Vice Chair for 2025.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to appoint Melissa Manriquez as Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to appoint John Stuckey as Sergeant at Arms.

PRESENTATION

6. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Olga Valenzuela, Administrative Assistant II, Transportation Department, for 42 years of service.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, expressed his appreciation to Ms. Valenzuela for her 42 years of dedicated service with Pima County. He stated that Ms. Valenzuela had worked at several departments throughout her career with the County, including Kino Community Hospital and the Transportation Department. He congratulated her on a well-deserved retirement.

Katrina Noble, Community Engagement Coordinator, Transportation Department, expressed her gratitude to Ms. Valenzuela for her work with the County. She stated that Ms. Valenzuela was patient, thorough and very knowledgeable about the County and had provided exceptional customer service to many constituents throughout the years.

No Board action was taken.

7. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Robert Reus addressed the Board and stated that he had attended at least 200 Board meetings since moving to Tucson in 2001. He explained that when he lived in Fayetteville, he helped vote in a new government and initiated a police reform process and hoped to do the same in Tucson. He indicated that the County needed a countywide sales tax change and he would continue to attend meetings until he could accomplish more of his goals.

8. CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to convene to Executive Session. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that discussing and formulating the County Administrator's contract in Executive Session was against any form of transparency or government responsibility to the taxpayers. He stated that he had several questions, but doubted that he would get answers and that the way this matter had been structured was

highly suspect. He asked why the draft contract was not included as background material on the agenda, stated that the Board would be voting to approve a contract that was not publicly posted and asked if that violated open meeting laws. He indicated that having to vote on approval of the County Administrator's contract on the day that her current contract expired created a certain element of duress and that the highest paid employee by the County needed to be discussed, analyzed and formulated in the public venue. He stated that he would not participate in Executive Session and hoped there would be some effort to create an atmosphere where the entire matter would be brought before the public before it was finalized, because what the County had at stake had dogged them since the last County Administrator.

Chair Grijalva stated that there was a handful of reasons for the Board to go into Executive Session and one of those reasons was for the employment contract of the County Administrator. She stated that the Board of Supervisors were responsible for formulating and negotiating that contract and it was unfortunate that Supervisor Christy was not going to be at the table when they had that conversation. She clarified that whatever was decided upon by the Board was voted on out in public, and that the document would be available for everyone in the community once it was approved by the Board.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had some discussion with Legal Counsel that he wanted to talk about on the Dais before the Board went into Executive Session regarding why he attached the County Administrator's current contract as background material for the item instead of a draft contract. He asked Legal Counsel to address the legal requirements in terms of what actually needed to be attached to the item, because he did not want there to be any supposition by the public or the media that there was an open meeting law violation.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the negotiation of the contract occurred in Executive Session and there was not a final contract until those conversations occurred in Executive Session. He stated that because of open meeting law, Board members could not discuss or negotiate as a group before going into Executive Session. He explained that Board members may each have different ideas or opinions of what needed to be included in the contract, but there was nothing to present to the public until there was a final version that happened after the negotiations.

Supervisor Scott stated that Mr. Brown's office and some of the Board offices had gotten questions asking why a draft contract was not attached to the item and appreciated Mr. Brown clarifying those requirements.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to convene to Executive Session at 9:38 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 10:26 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. 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 §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

11. Appointment of Board Members to Boards, Committees and Commissions

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the nomination of members of the Board of Supervisors to serve as the appointee to the following:

- Arizona Border Counties Coalition
- County Supervisors Association (Legislative Policy Committee)
- Pima Association of Governments
- Regional Transportation Authority
- Sun Corridor, Inc.
- Visit Tucson
- Metropolitan Education Commission
- Board of Health

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Allen to serve as Board representative to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Scott to continue to serve as Board representative on the County Supervisors Association (Legislative Policy Committee).

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to nominate Chair Grijalva to serve as Board representative to the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA). No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that at this particular time, it was a pivotal moment in the history of the RTA and Supervisor Scott was the one that had been most active on that Board and dealt with all of the issues that the County was facing with RTA Next. He felt it was important that Supervisor Scott continued in that capacity, as it would serve the public, RTA, PAG and this Board well.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy to nominate Supervisor Scott to continue to serve as Board representative to PAG and the RTA. It died for lack of a second.

Supervisor Scott expressed appreciation for Supervisor Christy's comments and the opportunity to represent the County on the PAG Regional Council and the RTA Board for the last four years. He stated that anytime he attended a PAG Regional Council meeting or an RTA Board meeting he represented the position of the County and had been well prepared by County staff before each meeting, and anyone that took on this position would have that same level of preparation. He stated that under previous Boards, one supervisor held that role for 15 years, which might have been their preference, but he felt it was important to rotate that responsibility. He expressed confidence in Chair Grijalva and she would engage in the same planning conversations with staff before attending any PAG or RTA meeting.

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

Chair Grijalva stated that since Sun Corridor, Inc., merged with the Tucson Metro Chamber she wondered if the Board should leave Supervisor Scott on the committee until the Board could figure out what was happening with that merger or if they should not have an appointment at all. She stated that the County provided funding for Sun Corridor, which was why a Board member was on the committee, but with the merger, she was not sure if the Board would have to decide whether they were going to continue that investment.

Supervisor Christy stated that the continuation of a historical representation was very important as the merger took place; Supervisor Scott had been in that position and knew the groundwork and intentions of both entities. He stated that as a result of the monies that Pima County contributed to Sun Corridor, he felt it would be in the best interest of the County to have Supervisor Scott continue in that position so he could monitor the merger and report his observations back to the Board. He stated that the merger was monumental with a lot of moving parts to it and would hate to see that the Pima County Board of Supervisors was not represented on that merger and thought that if anyone knew from the County's standpoint what this merger was all about, it would be Supervisor Scott. He stated that he recommended that Supervisor Scott retain that position.

Supervisor Scott appreciated Supervisor Christy's comments and stated that there was ongoing discussion about the composition of the 23-member Board that would come out of this merger. He explained that he sat in as the representative to the Sun Corridor Board when they voted unanimously to merge with the Tucson Metro Chamber and the Tucson Metro Chamber Board had voted in favor of the merger prior to Sun Corridor doing so. He stated that at that meeting he made the point that it was vital that the County be part of that 23-member Board, especially given the County's significant financial contribution to Sun Corridor. He also pointed out that there should be other public sector memberships on that board. He requested that

once they had a better sense of the composition of that 23-member Board, that he was the representative on that Board.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Chair Grijalva to nominate Supervisor Scott to continue to serve as Board representative to Sun Corridor, Inc. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva stated that if there were any changes where they eliminated Pima County to serve on that Board then Supervisor Scott would notify this Board.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Chair Grijalva to continue to serve as Board representative to Visit Tucson.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Scott to serve as Board representative to the Metropolitan Education Commission.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Allen to serve as Board representative to the Board of Health.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Medical Insurance for County Employees - Fiscal Year 2025/26

Staff recommends approval of the recommendations detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated January 7, 2025.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that this item was a request for approval of the premiums for County employees and employers regarding health insurance for next year, and approval of the continuation of the County's contribution to the Health Savings Accounts (HSA). She stated that the proposed rate would be that if the employee participated in the wellness program, they would see a reduction of \$12.48 each pay period and it would decrease for employees and spouses, and children and families if they participated. She stated that if they did not participate in one of the health programs the proposed rates would be an average of about 4.5% for the next year. She stated that the greatest increase set to occur was with an employee and family plan and that plan would go up about \$56.00, but the employee would have an opportunity to get almost \$50.00 off by participating in the wellness programs. She explained that the way that the rates were established was they set a requirement that the Health Trust Board needed between 4 to 6 months of projected claims and by continuing at that amount the County projected a balance of about \$30.7 million. She stated that the County needed between \$22.8 and \$34.2 million and believed this adequately put the funds where the County needed it to be to ensure that employees were covered when

they had incidents. She stated that for several years the County provided additional incentives for those who were on HSA of \$1,000.00 for an employee and \$2,000.00 for employees who covered additional dependents. She recommended approval of the premiums as displayed and to continue with the County's HSA contributions as delineated.

Chair Grijalva stated that she believed the County had amazing benefits, were competitive and offered a great incentive for employees to lower their premiums by participating in the Employee Wellness Programs.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the following recommendations as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated January 7, 2025:

1. Medical premium equivalents increased as detailed in Table 3.
2. Continue County HSA contributions as detailed.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

13. Quarterly Report on Collections

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending September 30, 2024.

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

PARKS AND RECREATION

14. Renaming of the Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 1, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the renaming of the Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission to the Pima County Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the County had recently split the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department into two different departments and this item was for the renaming of the Advisory Commission.

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

REAL PROPERTY

15. Designation of Public Right-of-Way

Staff recommends approval of a designation of Public Right-of-Way on a portion of River Road. (District 1)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this portion of River Road was a well-traveled area and asked why it had not already provided as a right-of-way.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that through research, it was identified that the roadway itself had not been dedicated. He explained that in this instance, the County acquired multiple properties that the roadway lied on and identified that it had not been dedicated as a right-of-way. He stated that in November, the Board took action establishing the roadway segment for maintenance, but the parcel area was bigger. He stated that the County Department of Transportation owned lands on both sides of the actual right-of-way alignment and this item was to officially dedicate the right-of-way portion to separate it from the lands on either side of it.

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

SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICT

16. Flowing Wells Irrigation District

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-642(B), presentation of the certified copy of the official canvass for the November 12, 2024 election conducted by the Flowing Wells Irrigation District.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

17. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program, extend contract term to 2/27/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002366)

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

18. Desert Dove Apartments, L.P., to provide an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for Desert Dove Apartments, General Fund:
- A. Contract expense amount \$1,000,000.00 (PO2400011991)
 - B. Contract revenue amount \$1,600,000.00 (CT2400000062)

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

Supervisor Christy expressed concern with the contract being retroactive and that they had been operating without an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) since 2022. He inquired about there being two contracts for this item and that the chosen contractor was located out of town, so how were they able to be selected to provide affordable housing in Pima County.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that there were two contracts because one dealt with the expenditures to the organization to provide the funding for the housing and the other dealt with a loan from a unique group of individuals that responded.

Supervisor Christy asked what Ms. Leshar meant by unique group.

Ms. Leshar stated that as the County dealt with some of the nonprofits, there had not been a need for loan repayments and on more recent Board agendas there had been bifurcation of revenue and expenditures on the same contract. She stated that she did not believe the Request for Proposal (RFP) included that one of the specific requirements was limited to individuals' business location; rather it was whether or not they provided the best service to the community in Pima County.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, clarified that the contract being retroactive was actually related to a different item on the agenda and not for the Desert Dove Apartment's contract. He concurred with Ms. Leshar's explanation of why there were two contracts and explained that this was for a 30-year loan. He stated the expense contract was for the issuance of the loan, and the revenue contract was for the repayment of the loan with interest over the 30-year period. He stated that a contract with both expenditures and revenue would have two contracts due to the way it was set up in Workday. He confirmed that there was no criteria that indicated out of State entities were ineligible to participate in the Gap funding process. He stated that the project resulted in 64 rental units that were accessible to families with income from 40% to 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) and the goal was to increase the number of affordable units in the community.

Supervisor Christy asked if having two contracts was standard industry practice.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that it was standard practice under the Workday system.

Supervisor Christy asked if that was the system implemented by Pima County Administration.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., clarified that Workday was the Enterprise Resource Planning system that the County had recently implemented and the functionality in that system segregated the expense component from the revenue component into two separate items.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the contact was related to Section 8 housing.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that to his knowledge, this item was not related to Section 8 housing, but staff could confirm that and provide additional information to the Board.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the element of affordable versus low income.

Chair Grijalva explained that there was an Exhibit A in the background materials that showed an income threshold from 40% to 60% AMI, which was how it was broken down and other housing units were at 80% AMI or more.

Kristopher Ortega, Managing Partner, GHK Properties and Desert Dove, L.P., addressed the Board and stated that the term, affordable housing, was a very general term when it dealt with workforce housing which included professions such as teachers and police officers that were in about the 80% to 120% AMI of that section. He explained that Section 8 was at around 20% and below, but they were catering to 40% to 60% AMI with one bedrooms starting at under \$700.00 and three bedrooms ending at about under \$1,300.00.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was accurate to describe it as some sort of backdoor rent control.

Mr. Ortega responded in the affirmative and explained that they were bound by Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH), and Federal Housing and Urban Development laws and rent had to stay at the 40% to 60% AMI for 15 years of ADOH and signed on to 30 years, since their loan was for 30 years. He stated that the rent would stay significantly low for low income and under ADOH requirements.

Supervisor Christy stated that the term affordable housing sounded like a marketing term and asked if that was how this item was being presented to the Board.

Mr. Ortega reiterated that it was a general term, but they went through the process of receiving the tax credits from ADOH, to being highly restricted from HUD, to strictly have low-income affordable housing. He added that the term had been used since the 1950's, but currently it was broken down in levels of 120%, 80% (Workforce) and 20% (Section 8) AMI.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had attended the groundbreaking in Midvale and there was overwhelming community support for this project. She stated that the need was significant, felt this would fill that need and was comfortable moving forward with it.

Mr. Ortega stated that these conversations needed to continue because once the terms affordable housing and tax credits were mentioned nothing else was understood, but more understanding would happen with more projects being done.

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

19. Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Emergency Solutions Grant - Emergency Shelter, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400016875)

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

Conservation Lands and Resources

20. Friends of Tucson's Birthplace, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the development, operation and maintenance of Mission Garden, amend contractual language and scope of services, CLR Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (PO2400015901)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this item included a master plan and asked what that master plan entailed. He stated that this was for a five-year contract and asked if the contract amount was for a one-time payment or if the County would pay \$100,000.00 each year for five years. He also inquired about the City of Tucson's (COT) participation since the park was located in the COT. He asked why this was not under the Parks and Recreation Department since it was described as a park, and that the funds were from the newly formed Conservation Lands and Resources Department under a special revenue fund.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded the total amount of the contract was \$100,000.00 that could be paid over the five years. She stated that the master plan dealt with the master plan of Mission Gardens.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification if the \$100,000.00 would be paid over five years.

Ms. Leshner responded that it would be paid in one payment.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, clarified that this was for a one-time payment to the Friends of Tucson Birthplace. He stated that they acquired additional assets that were buildings and land and that the funding would be used for the maintenance and operation of those buildings and land. He explained that the County had an agreement with the Friends of Tucson Birthplace that had been administered by the former Office of Sustainability and Conservation and was now

under the administration of Conservation Lands and Resources. He stated that it was a historic and cultural park for educational purposes and the decision was made to go back to the original contract and have it be administered on the historic and cultural side, not on the parks and recreation side of the operation. He reiterated that this item was for a one-time payment of \$100,000.00 for the operation and maintenance associated with the new assets.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the special revenue fund.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the Conservation Lands and Resources Department was funded through a variety of sources and this source was related to fees they charged for operations that were generated and maintained in a special revenue fund, separate from general fund dollars that they got for base department operations.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the COT's participation.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that he did not believe they contributed to this contract. He explained it was a County-owned property that operated as a County historic and cultural resources park.

Supervisor Christy inquired if it was located directly in the COT.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded yes.

Chair Grijalva commented that it was also located in District 5 in Pima County.

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

Facilities Management

21. Bruce Wayne, L.L.C., Amendment No. 6, to provide for a Sixth Amendment to 3550 N. 1st Avenue Lease, extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, Health and Grant Funds, contract amount \$94,663.33 (CT-19-323)

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

Supervisor Scott indicated that this item was connected with the Northwest Service Center and requested that an update be provided to the Board on the current status of that facility.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that an update would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that this was the sixth amendment for this contract and the idea was that the County would experience cost savings by consolidating all of

these functions into the Northwest facility. He inquired about the cost savings to date.

Ms. Lesher responded that this contract was to get the County through June and that when the County began to look at the development of the Northwest Service Center, there were multiple buildings and multiple leases that would be eliminated to move into the location. She stated that the overall scope of the Northwest Service Center had been more consolidated into the health functions. She stated that this amendment was to finish out the lease and to allow for the final movement of the First Avenue clinic into the Northwest Service Center.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board would receive a report on the cost savings.

Ms. Lesher responded that quarterly or bi-annual updates were sent to the Board regarding the construction elements of the Northwest Service Center and she would provide an update on the cost savings dating back to when the County purchased the building.

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

Parks and Recreation

22. Amphitheater Unified School District No. 10, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Coronado K-8 School utility assistance, General Fund, contract amount \$15,000.00 per year/10 year term (PO2400013013)

Chair Grijalva stated that this item provided utility assistance because it was a shared use space with the grounds.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative. She stated that the County entered into the agreement with the district when the County used 1997 bond funds. She explained that it was a shared use and part of that agreement allowed for the funding of the utility costs.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that through the 1997 bonds the County provided the infrastructure for the lighting of athletic fields, and that Pima County taxpayers, through those bonds, paid for the installation. He stated that now the County was being asked for the expense of operating the utility or the lighting, and asked if this operating expense should be paid by the school district. He asked how many other school districts were supported by the County with their utility bills, particularly when it came from the general fund.

Ms. Lesher responded that the County paid utilities for the portion of the athletic fields during the time in which they were being operated as County facilities. She stated that it was a shared use facility. She explained that there were times when

the fields were not used by the Amphitheater School District, and the County's Parks and Recreation Department utilized the fields as part of the complement of fields and athletic activities provided to the public. She stated that this item was to pay the County's share of lighting costs when the fields were used by the County.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that with the prior agreement the County paid a share of the utilities, as well. He stated that in addition to the investment in the amenities the County was paying over the term of the original 25-year agreement, the portion of the utilities and this was a continuation of that payment, for the period of usage outside of when the school district utilized the fields.

Supervisor Christy asked if the public had access to these fields.

Ms. Leshar responded that the public had use of those fields at the times when they were parks and recreational fields.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated that the County had an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the Amphitheater School District that was enhancing the use of athletic fields in a County that needed greater access to athletic fields for all of the different leagues that operated within the County. He asked if the Parks and Recreation Department could look into other possibilities of IGA's with other school districts, where the County could have a similar enhancement of use of athletic facilities. He stated that by having the fields lit again, it expanded the use of athletic fields.

Supervisor Christy questioned if there were any associated fees that were collected by the County.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded no.

Chair Grijalva stated that some of them were games and tournaments and depending on what the tournament was, sometimes they collected money, but she did not think that was the case in this agreement. She stated that the County had shared use agreements like the City of Tucson who had a shared use agreement with Menlo Park, so this was not uncommon, especially if they were in areas where there was many students that had many activities and the County did not have enough fields to host all of them. She explained that it did not happen often, but it was great to have another option.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was not clear that this was a joint venture and joint usage, it appeared like it was exclusive to the school district.

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

Procurement

23. Award

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002399, RWC International, L.L.C., d.b.a. RWC Group (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for the purchase of heavy trucks. The supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$1,450,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Fleet Services Ops Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

24. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001279, Amendment No. 2, AT&T Corp., to provide for AT&T wireless services, equipment and accessories. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$5,000,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$9,500,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.

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

Supervisor Scott stated that the amendment was doubling the contract amount and the background materials showed that the County had only expended less than half a million. He asked why the County needed to double the amount when the current not-to-exceed amount had not been reached.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that the unexpended amount referenced were in AMS and that contract was going away, and those dollars in the new contract was being transitioned into Workday.

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

25. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001752, Amendment No. 3, MBI Occupational Healthcare, to provide for occupational medical services. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$500,000.00 from \$250,000.00 to \$750,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,000,000.00 and appends the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention and Safety Plan provision to the contract, pursuant to Pima County Code 11.40.030. The increase is needed due to a greater quantity of services being required than anticipated. Funding Source: Risk Management Fund. Administering Department: Human Resources.

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

Supervisor Scott stated that this amendment tripled the annual award amount and that the reason was due to a greater quantity of services being required than anticipated. He asked why there had been such an increase in the amount of services required than what had been planned.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded this was another instance where the County had multiple contracts that were being consolidated into one contract for the County's occupational care. She stated that it was a co-op with other governmental entities and the increase was because of the consolidation. She stated that the most significant increase the County had seen was in tuberculosis (TB) testing. She stated that the cost had not only increased, but the County had to expand the number of individuals that were required to go through TB testing. She reiterated that the County had an increase in some of the expenditures in occupational health care and the most significant had been the increase in TB testing, but the biggest reason for the increase was the consolidation of contracts.

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

26. Bank of America N.A., Amendment No. 3, to provide for banking services, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400001048) Administering Department: Treasurer's Office

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

Chair Grijalva requested that staff look into if these services could be provided through a local bank.

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

27. Tucson Asphalt Contractors, Inc., to provide for the FY25 Pavement Repair and Preservation Program, High Volume and Low Volume Roadways, Avra Valley Area Pulverize/Mill and Pave - Board of Supervisors District 3 Project, County HURF Fund, contract amount \$2,971,971.00 (PO2400017341) Administering Department: Transportation

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

28. SMS Construction, L.L.C., to provide for the construction of the Tres Rios WRF Building 10 Digester 4 Lid Replacement, Capital Projects - Regional Wastewater Reclamation Obligations Fund, contract amount \$4,608,992.00/2 years, 5 months term (PO2400017413) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

Real Property

29. Prince 10 QOB, L.L.C., to provide a Landscape Maintenance Agreement to plant trees in movable steel planters on a portion of La Cholla Boulevard, no cost/25 year term (SC2400002405)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the area the movable steel planters were located in was in the City of Tucson and they protected County sewer lines. He asked how many sewer lines needed to be protected by the movable steel planters and how was the contract at no cost.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that in place of planting trees in proximity to the sewer line, the movable steel planters would create a protective barrier for the plantings. He stated that the County had standards for vegetation that could be planted near or in the areas of County sewer lines and this was an agreement to allow for landscape vegetation to be placed without posing a hazard to the sewer line that lied below it. He explained that the trees were being placed in the movable steel planters and it was not being done with the intent to protect the sewer line, but to prevent damage to the sewer line.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the vendor.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., explained that this project was west of the freeway, roughly between Prince Road and Miracle Mile, and it was a large industrial park and the County owned certain rights-of-way. He stated that it was along the Santa Cruz River and the Chuck Huckelberry Loop was at the western edge of it and there was a sewer alignment, sewer easements, a sewer pump station and odor control facility located there. He stated that the County owned assets on the periphery of this private development and was granting the owner of the development approval to do landscape beautification in the steel planters in proximity to the County's asset, at their cost.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

State of Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for the U.S. Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, \$168,620.00 (G-CWD-81408)

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

31. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

State of Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for the Department of Health and Human Services, Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program, \$276,072.00 (G-CWD-81168)

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

State of Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Department of Health and Human Services, Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program, amend grant language and scope of work, \$290,180.00 (GA-CWD-81168)

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

33. Acceptance - County Attorney

State of Arizona, Governor's Office of Youth, Faith, and Family, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Arizona STOP Violence Against Women Grant, extend grant term to 12/31/25, amend grant language and scope of work, \$147,196.00/\$49,116.00 General Fund match (GA-PCA-70382)

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

34. Acceptance - Environmental Quality

United States Environmental Protection Agency, to provide for the Inflation Reduction Act - Multipollutant Air Monitoring Project, \$662,489.00/5 year term (G-DE-75056)

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 - Health

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the PimaREACH Coalition: restoring cultures of health among Native American and Hispanic/Latinx communities in Pima County, AZ and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-70325)

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.

36. Acceptance - Office of Digital Inclusion

United States Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service, to provide for the Broadband Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement, \$487,733.00 (G-ODI-73264)

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.

37. Acceptance - Recorder

The Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for a Comprehensive Disaster Recovery Assessment, \$39,296.00 (G-RE-77765)

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.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

38. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 314122, Lisa Karina Yin, Circle S Saloon, 16021 W. El Tiro Road, Marana, Series 6, Bar, Person Transfer.

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, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

39. Hearing - Agent Change/Acquisition of Control/Restructure

Job No. 305183, Jose Pablo Rojo, BBQ Rush Restaurant, 5151 S. Country Club Road, Tucson, Acquisition of Control.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had received a confidential Sheriff's report regarding the applicant and asked what could be discussed in regards to that report.

Chair Grijalva asked if the Sheriff's report was confidential.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that it did not appear that anything on the report was confidential and that the information was available publicly.

Supervisor Christy stated that based on the Sheriff's report, there were some troubling matters and wondered if there was someone in Administration who was

more familiar with the situation. He stated that there were some felony issues that were later mitigated to misdemeanors. He asked if liquor licenses were approved with this type of past records, and if so, what was the purpose of going through a liquor license evaluation, if there was some sort of rationale as to why with several aliases of the applicant, a felony charge was reduced to a misdemeanor. He asked what the ramifications were regarding approval or denial of this license.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that liquor licenses did not go through County Administration for them to opine or review in any way. She stated that staff could review the exact process, but she was not familiar with it since it went through the Clerk's Office, and then were reviewed by others.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, explained liquor licenses were processed through the Clerk's Office for the Board's approval as the local jurisdiction and then forwarded to the State, and the State made the final approval.

Supervisor Christy stated that the location of this proposed venue was next to KOA campground and requested clarification if the Board approved the license, it would automatically go to the State level and they had the final say.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that the Board's recommendation was forwarded to the State.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the influence that the Board's approval had on the final dispensation of the State Board in Phoenix.

Ms. Manriquez responded that would be a question for the State to answer and she was unaware of the influence it had on their final approval of the license.

Supervisor Allen questioned why someone's misdemeanor was brought to the Board's attention for an agent change, acquisition of control of a restaurant and the relevance of it.

Chair Grijalva explained it was on an agenda previously with a note and they had requested more information about what that meant because that information was not normally seen. She stated that she thought it was because it was a felony reduced to a misdemeanor and that was the reason the Sheriff created a report.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. Chair Grijalva closed the public hearing and inquired about the pleasure of the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board could request that the applicant attend a meeting to ask questions directly.

Ms. Manriquez stated that a Notice of Hearing letter had been sent to the applicant and he had the opportunity to come to the Board meeting.

Supervisor Heinz commented that staff had reviewed the item and everything was in proper form and it usually did not come before the Board unless everything was appropriate regarding the distances from the establishment to nearby schools.

Chair Grijalva concurred.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the license subject to the Sheriff's Report, and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked for clarification whether the Board acted or not, if it was still going to go before the State and if so, which department.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that it was the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

Supervisor Scott asked if there was any sense of the process they went through in terms of the final approval.

Ms. Manriquez responded that she was unaware of the process, but this was for local jurisdictional recommendation set by statute, so even if no recommendation was made, she would need to send a letter that indicated no Board action was taken.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he recently went through this process the prior year, there was a process for anyone to object at the level of the State liquor board, and there was another process beyond just the recommendation of the local board.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the document the Board received from the Sheriff was in response to a question that read, "Is there any reason this application should not be recommended for approval?" He added that the Sheriff listed the alias of the applicant that he had a prior felony, in 2018 he was sentenced in that case to probation, and it appeared that the charge was later waived to a misdemeanor. He stated that it was unclear from what was written on the report that he was recommending disapproval. He stated that he was comfortable moving forward and the State Department could get into those issues at a more granular level in order to make the final determination, especially since whatever action the Board took, they would still have the final say.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be appropriate to continue the item.

Chair Grijalva stated that she thought the Board had already continued it previously. She stated that it was fairly common when an individual completed diversion programs and probation, part of the incentive for that was to not serve any jail time and stay with a clean record. She stated that she tended to support these types of programs in general, and fundamentally supported them. She stated that it was important to give people the opportunity to be contributing members of society, and if it was an egregious felony, they would not have had the opportunity to have it

reduced to a misdemeanor. She stated that sometimes felonies could be criminal damage over \$250.00 versus criminal damage of \$249.00 and other little nuances that considered it a felony. She stated that she felt comfortable moving this application forward to the State.

Ms. Manriquez indicated that a copy of the Sheriff's report would be included with the recommendation that would be forwarded to the State, and there was a deadline or a certain amount of days to respond, so if a recommendation was not sent, the State would move forward.

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

TRANSPORTATION

40. Hearing - Draft Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions Report and Infrastructure Improvements Plan

Staff recommends approval of the updated draft Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR) and Infrastructure Improvements Plan (IIP), as required by state statute.

Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs, Southern Arizona Homebuilders Association (SAHBA), addressed the Board in support of the LUAR and IIP. He stated that impact fees were an important tool in funding necessary public services to support community growth and new development. He stated that properly calculated impact fees would balance infrastructure needs and housing affordability within the statutory framework. He stated that the Department of Transportation team had proactively worked with stakeholders to include SAHBA and appreciated their efforts. He stated they conducted an initial review of the drafts, and they identified areas that could be potential concerns and looked forward to in-depth discussions on the details to include levels of service, detailed project costs, proportional allocation of costs and legacy projects. He stated that they looked forward to working with staff and recognized the importance of this issue and believed that a balance could be achieved to ensure that they continued investing in infrastructure needs while maintaining housing affordability.

Chair Grijalva closed the public hearing. It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Scott to accept the updated draft LUAR and IIP. No vote was taken at this time.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that no action was required of the Board, other than to hold the public hearing. He stated that the director of the Transportation Department was present to provide a brief slideshow presentation, but that these items would be brought back for action in February. He reiterated this matter was to open the public hearing, hear testimony, and then close the public hearing.

Supervisor Christy withdrew his motion. He stated that during this entire process, County Administration staff had worked very closely with SAHBA to work out any

details, issues, or speed bumps that might come in the way, but primarily to ensure SAHBA was intimately informed and participated in the entire process.

Kathryn Skinner, Director, Department of Transportation, provided a brief slideshow presentation to orient the Board on an update of the Development Impact Fee Program. She explained that State statute had established the ability to collect impact fees for those infrastructure needs that arose from new development. She referred to a slide that included a table of the most frequently used types of fees and also had a full listing on their website. She explained that there was a \$8,500.00 fee for a single-family residence, which was the most common collected fee and it was also collected for commercial purposes as well as residential and the County did not collect any impact fees for wastewater, parks or public safety. She stated that this was the first two reports of the three required reports, the LUAR and IIP, and that staff would be back in the spring and summer with the fee rate calculations. She added that they had 7 different collection areas geographically around town, in the north, south, east or west. She stated that since the implementation of the 2020 plan, they collected \$42 million in total and these areas were designed to have a nexus, so they could not have one area that covered the whole unincorporated County, because not everyone would necessarily use the road that they were going to improve, so they were geographically sized and they tried to get a nexus with every project. She stated they reviewed historic growth patterns to determine how much they expected to earn in each area.

Supervisor Scott asked why there would be no change to current service areas, if there had been a change proposed to current service areas, and what would be some reasons for the changes.

Ms. Skinner explained that one reason they decided to keep the same service areas was that they adopted a ten-year plan in terms of the project list, but they returned every five years to reevaluate these assumptions, the project list and the fees. She stated that if they changed the size and shape of these, the accounting and the reporting to the public would become much more difficult. She stated there were some minor tweaks and they had selected the center line of some roadways as a dividing point between south and southwest and moved it, so that it was at the edge of the right-of-way. She stated that an entire roadway was within one area or another, but those were minor changes. She explained that two of the things they looked at with the LUAR was how growth would be achieved in each area. She referred to the slide that showed a table of the historic housing permits since 2020 and what they would look at for the next ten years. She stated that as shown by the percentage of permits in each area, it was not uniform across the County where the growth was happening. She stated that it was not a surprise that the Southeast had the most growth, the West came in second, the North had a fair amount of growth and then the rest was fairly stable with low growth. She stated that they looked at projecting about 1,200 new permits per year, which was consistent with what the track record had been for the last ten years, and they also factored job growth. She stated there were also commercial fees assessed, as well as housing and looked at where that growth was. She stated that they reviewed much data in terms of the Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity, which looked at a 0.7% increase, Pima

Association of Governments long range plan looked at 0.6% and Eller College had assumed 0.9%. She stated that for the purposes of their report, they conservatively went with the 0.6% growth rate for the jobs. She explained that the last program had 28 projects, with eight completed and six currently in design or construction. She reiterated this was for ten years of projects that were included in the report, and they completed the first five years and half of the projects were in some point of development or completion, which was a big success. She showed some photos of them and stated that the Valencia Road widening was a rendering, it was not complete but was well along with design. She stated that the cost of construction had grown dramatically in the last five years and that growth started even before that. She stated that since the adoption of the plan in 2020, construction costs had increased by 80% for roadway projects. She stated that in developing this, they had to look at a balance between fee increases and what the project list looked like and the full picture at once. She referred to the slide and stated the full project lists were included with the item, but what was shown was the project list by area that was in the proposed plan. She stated that it was comprised of a combination of roadway widening projects, intersection projects and projects that would add turn lanes and these projects had to be capacity driven. She stated that they were not standalone safety projects or standalone drainage projects, but they dealt with the need for extra capacity due to this development growth. She went over the timeline and stated that the process started last July and these reports were publicly posted in November. She stated that this was the first visit with the Board and the public hearing and that they would be back on February 18th, for approval of the plans. She stated that the next steps, which was the same thing done with the fee study in April, would be posted publicly with a public hearing planned in May with the Board and in June requesting adoption, at which point the new fees would go into place in September if everything moved through the process.

Chair Grijalva stated that she knew the County was allowed to collect fees for wastewater, public safety, parks and recreation and water facilities and asked if they had explored what that would look like if they started doing that. She stated that it was a good discussion for the Board to have and consider the shared costs that the State had historically taken that Pima County would pay for. She stated that the last budget year was over \$121 million, and she was concerned that these were infrastructure costs that the County incurred. She wondered if the County should explore what the potential would be in collecting impact fees for some of these services.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated staff would provide a memorandum to the Board that outlined what authorities the County had, which was slightly different from municipalities and the County did not have statutory authority on all of those things mentioned. He explained that they had the authority to assess wastewater connection fees and sewer user fees, which were authorized by statute and adopted in County ordinance and it served as an impact fee of sorts.

Supervisor Christy stated that the item indicated staff recommended approval and asked if it would be brought back at a later time for approval.

Ms. Skinner responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the project list included First Avenue widening between Orange Grove and Ina Road. He stated that he was aware of a deferred Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) project that affected First Avenue between River Road and Ina Road. He asked if the project on this list was separate from that or in conjunction with it.

Ms. Skinner explained that there were a few projects that matched projects, either in RTA or the proposed RTA Next, so that would be the same project. She added there was also Houghton Road that was on the list, which was a City led project, but portions of it were in the unincorporated County. She stated that they matched the scope between what the proposed RTA Next Plan was and what was in the IIP.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

41. County Administrator Employment Contract

Discussion/Action regarding the employment contract for County Administrator Jan Leshner and authorize Finance to make any necessary transfers of Contingency to effectuate the vacation and sick payout as outlined in the County Administrator's contract which ended 1/7/2025. (District 1)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the County Administrator's employment contract effective January 8, 2025 through January 7, 2027, with an annual compensation amount of \$330,000.00 with the option to renew for up to two additional periods for one year each. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy recalled that during previous discussions on this matter Supervisor Heinz had proposed a performance review be conducted and asked if that had been done.

Chair Grijalva replied that it had not been done.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that this was a significant raise and there were a couple of issues that occurred under the current County Administrator that should be taken into consideration. He stated that he was unsure if the matters had been discussed in Executive Session, but the CBIZ compensation and classification study was delivered late, was over budget and created a lot of heartache and misconceptions to employees. He added that Pima1, also known as Workday, had been a disaster, paychecks had to be reissued because there was a mistake, and it seemed inconsistent because if this was in a private sector situation, there would not be a raise with these issues. He stated that he did not think there was enough deliberation into the performance of the County Administrator and not enough transparency in the whole deliberation. He added that the Board could at least

provide transparency, do the business of the public in public and discuss these items before instituting a new raise that was very substantial, especially given the consideration of what the average income was for a family of four in Pima County.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was extraordinarily comfortable moving forward with this new contract based on everything he had seen in terms of the County Administrator's performance, not only since she assumed this office, but also her previous performance as Chief Deputy County Administrator. He stated that considering her expertise and qualifications in the private sector, the public sector at all different levels of government, they would have to create her in a laboratory to find someone comparable that could do the job that she had done. He stated that he met with her weekly and talked with her more times than that and he thought that everyone, in terms of what had been heard from the public regarding the performance of all of the employees under her supervision and administration, could attest to the quality of her leadership. He stated that any time there had been issues, some of which connected with matters raised by Supervisor Christy, she had been forthcoming with the Board in terms of how they were going to be addressed. He pointed out that the Board had looked at comparable salaries of individuals in comparable positions around the region and the State, and felt that the increase brought her to a level where she was not under her original contract. He felt this change was fair based on performance and qualifications and it set the stage for where the County would be, if and when Ms. Leshner, or the Board decided that they needed to move to a new County Administrator. He stated that the reality was that there was a small number of people that worked like she did and they were doing right by the most significant employee and by the County moving forward with this contract.

Supervisor Allen stated that since her short time with the County she was comfortable with the contract and particularly the salary and with the understanding that the salary was not plucked out of thin air, it was grounded in the County's recently completed compensation study and fit within those parameters. She added that given the County Administrator's incredible track record, responsibility and experience that she brought to the County, she was very comfortable with the salary of this contract.

Chair Grijalva noted that she did not know anyone in the County that worked harder than Administrator Leshner. She stated that she was consistently the first one in the office each morning, worked on the weekends and was the last one out of the office. She stated that she was incredibly knowledgeable on many issues when it came to City, County, local municipalities, State of Arizona and Federal governments. She stated that the Board was incredibly fortunate to have someone with her expertise and that it made sense for them to look at like cities, to ensure that she was being fairly compensated and there was parity with other people doing a similar job, but that she did a better job in so many cases. She stated that Ms. Leshner was always very clear explaining situations and what was happening. She indicated that the County had not had a Class/Comp Study for decades and that someone could estimate how long that would take and it sometimes took longer. She stated that when it was implemented everyone understood, and she was very clear on how that

was going to roll out. She added that it was the same with changing over to Workday, those systems always took longer than anticipated and there were always bumps due to user error and some of it was changing implementation. She added that the fact that Administrator Leshar pushed the County to make the changes that were necessary for them to be more competitive was important. She stated that they could look at some other examples of where her leadership had been incredibly beneficial, and that was the reduced number of vacancies in Pima County and the fact of attracting people to the community.

Supervisor Christy inquired for the sake of transparency if they could go into the details of the contract as far as vacation, sick pay, pension, retirement and what they all represented dollar wise.

Chair Grijalva stated that all of those details were in the contract and that she would not discuss that at this time because then they would need to calculate her increase and the payout based on that and she wanted to ensure that if they were going to put any information out that it was accurate.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz abstained.

Supervisor. Heinz stated that the reason he abstained was because the appropriate comparison to other regions would put her salary at \$350,000.00 and he felt that they could do better on her salary, so he did not support that part of the contract, but did not want to vote against it because he supported hiring Ms. Leshar.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

42. Green Valley Council, Inc., d.b.a. Green Valley Council, Amendment No. 4, to provide for Green Valley Council Services, extend contract term to 12/31/25 and amend contractual language, Health, DOT, RWRD, DSD, RFCD Tax Levy and DEQ General (\$11,250.00) Funds, contract amount \$87,500.00 (CT-21-202)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

43. **Transportation Advisory Committee**

Appointment of Doug Kenyon, to replace Tom Berezny. Term expiration: 1/6/29. (District 4)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

44. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Environmental Quality Advisory Council**
 - Reappointment of Paloma Beamer. Term expiration: 8/31/27. (Staff recommendation)
 - Appointment of Avelino F. Arellano, Jr., to fill a vacancy created by Eric Betterton, Ph.D. Term expiration: 1/6/28. (Staff recommendation)
2. **Pima County Healthcare Benefits Trust Board**

Appointment of Linda Kile, to replace Thomas Burke. Term expiration: 12/31/27. (County Administrator recommendation)
3. **Election Integrity Commission**

Appointment of Lori Cinnamond, to replace Misty Atkins. Term expiration: 1/6/27. (District 1)

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

4. **Special Event**
 - Peter L. Schultz, San Xavier Moose Lodge No. 1964, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc., 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, December 29, 2024, January 3, January 18 and January 24, 2025.
 - Fred Narcaroti, Oro Valley Sports Alliance, Catalina State Park, 11570 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 22, 2025.
 - Rebecca Jane Roberts, Rotary Club of Green Valley, 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, February 4, 2025.

ELECTIONS

5. **Precinct Committeemen**

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

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Amelia Cramer-045-DEM, Carla Andrews O'Hara-077-DEM, Sharon Reinbott-181-DEM, Alexandra Wright-192-DEM, Michael

Horn-Mitchem-195-DEM, Catherine Bliven-257-DEM, Mary Saylor-010-REP, Gerald Spann-012-REP, Mary Spann-012-REP, Theodore Knight-016-REP, Cassandra Leddy-016-REP, Leilani Tedeski-095-REP, Laurie Abney-145-REP, Kathleen Spacone-158-REP, Nadia Larsen-171-REP, Justine Wadsack-184-REP, Kathy Lovin-205-REP

SUPERIOR COURT

- 6. **Hearing Officer Appointments**
Appointments of Hearing Officer of the Pima County Superior Court.

Soo Chang Conatser and Catherine V. Monro

- 7. **Court Commissioner Appointment**
Appointment of Court Commissioner:

Superior Court and Juvenile Court Commissioner
Michelle Cohen Metzger

TREASURER

- 8. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
Pan Wenhao \$633.52

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 9. Minutes: October 1, 2024
Warrants: December, 2024

* * *

45. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK