



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 17, 2014

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: **November 18, 2014 Agenda Item 17 – Board of Supervisors Meeting Time**

Attached is information compiled by the Clerk of the Board regarding conducting Board of Supervisors evening meetings. The information includes estimated staffing and cost impacts to various County departments, as well as to broadcasting and live streaming of the Board meetings.

The Clerk of the Board also surveyed other Arizona counties regarding whether they conduct evening meetings, and the survey results are included in the attachment.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

c: Robin Brigode, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Proposal to Conduct Board of Supervisors Evening Meetings

BOS Hearing Room/Administration Building Support

Department staff that support the Board of Supervisors meetings were asked to provide information regarding the impact to their organization should night meetings be conducted.

It was noted that Department staff identified below would be required at least one hour prior to the meeting start time and most would be required at least one hour after adjournment.

Facilities Management

2 Electronic Technicians to work overtime hours and afterhours HVAC services. These are non-exempt positions that would have an approximate total hourly impact of \$135 per hour.

Information Technology

Overtime for three staff would be required (1 hearing room audio/video equipment operator; 1 client services representative to ensure all the internal network equipment and services are working; and 1 infrastructure person to troubleshoot, if needed.) Cost impact to the department has not been determined.

Securitas

4 staff for Hearing Room/First Floor and 2 additional to staff El Presidio Garage after 8:30 PM. Impact would be approximately \$90 per hour.

Clerk of the Board

2 staff would be required to attend, 1 minute recorder (non-exempt) and 1 troubleshooter (exempt) for the electronic agenda/broadcast. The Clerk of the Board's Office would then be short staffed to accommodate required flex scheduling.

County Staff Required to Attend Board of Supervisors Meetings

As is current practice, key Department staff must be available to present and discuss agenda items at the meeting. This fiscal/operational impact to departments has not been determined. It has been noted that after-hour access for employees returning from attendance at an evening Board meeting to some downtown buildings may be problematic.

Recent Survey of Arizona Counties

Arizona Counties were surveyed, with the following results:

Questions:

1. Does your County standardly conduct Board of Supervisors night meetings? If yes, how often?
2. Has there been an increase in public participation based on conducting Board meetings after regular business hours?

Apache	Does not conduct
Cochise	Does not conduct
Coconino	Yes; the second regular meeting of the month begins at 6:00 PM. All planning and zoning public hearings scheduled for that time.
Gila	Does not conduct
Graham	Does not conduct
Greenlee*	Does not conduct
La Paz*	Does not conduct
Maricopa	Does not conduct – very few exceptions, i.e. Stadium District establishment
Mohave	Does not conduct
Navajo	Does not conduct
Pima	Does not conduct
Pinal	Does not conduct
Santa Cruz	Yes, recently changed meeting schedule. Now meets twice a month, on the first and third Wednesday. Third Wednesday meeting begins at 5:30 PM. No noticeable increase in attendance.
Yavapai	Does not conduct
Yuma	Does not conduct
*Information based on a review of online meeting schedules/agendas/minutes.	

Broadcast/Livestream

There would be no impact to either the livestream of the video or the broadcast of the meeting on Cox Channel 96 or Comcast Channel 96. However, according to current scheduling, the broadcast on City of Tucson Cable Channel 12 would likely be preempted by the Tucson Mayor and City Council Meetings.

History

The proposal to conduct evening meetings of the Board of Supervisors was considered on a Board agenda in February 1996, at which time, the Board did not vote to approve the measure.