

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, August 13, 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 participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

1. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION PLANS

Pursuant to Pima County Code, Section 16.30.050(B), quarterly report of District approved Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans.

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

2. CONTRACT

Title Security Agency, L.L.C., as Trustee under Trust No. 201924-S, to provide for Acquisition Agreement Acq-0999 and Warranty Deed for property located at 12801 through 12961 N. Musket Road, and 13031 through 13363 N. Musket Road, in Section 28, T11S, R10E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, Flood Control Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$275,400.00 (PO2400001250)

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 2:05 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, August 13, 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 participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

1. CONTRACT

Southern Arizona Sports Tourism and Film Authority, to provide an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) for baseball operations, promotions and marketing, and economic development, no cost/2 year term (SC2400002238)

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 he supported the item and hoped this entity would help the Tucson Saguaro with their challenges at the Kino Sports Complex.

Blake Eager, Executive Director, Southern Arizona Sports Tourism and Film Authority, stated that he would reach out to the Tucson Saguaro regarding their challenges. He stated that he had been working directly with Major League Baseball, World Classic Baseball and Mexican Winter League and would focus on the concerns of the community. He explained that their idea was to promote, assist and market the existing current professional sports, incoming professional sports or any possible events.

Supervisor Scott requested staff provide quarterly updates on the operations of the Sports Tourism and Film Authority, similar to the ones the Board received from Visit Tucson and other entities.

Supervisor Lee acknowledged Edgar Soto's leadership and assistance with the IGA.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 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, August 13, 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 participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:05 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 Danny Howe, Director, The Earnest House and The Howe Project.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Heinz expressed his gratitude to Deputy Michael McConaughy and Rural Metro Fire paramedics for their quick and efficient response to a medical emergency incident he witnessed on August 9, 2024.

PRESENTATION

5. Recognition of the "We A.R.E. Gems" Quarterly Recipients

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 23-5, Employee Recognition Program, the following employees have been selected for the quarterly "We A.R.E. Gems" recognition:

- Veronica Bustamante - Finance and Risk Management

- Anthony Gimino - Communications Department
- David Shafer - Information Technology Department
- Aime Kenoyer - Health Department
- Vanessa Valencia - Library
- Tobias Wehner - Library
- Kelsey Landreville - ~~Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation~~ **Conservation Lands and Resources**
- Luis Leon - ~~Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation~~ **Parks and Recreation**
- Celia Turner - Real Property Services
- Barbara Gonzales - Assessor's Office
- Marisa Samaniego – Sheriff's Department

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Nicole Olvera, Community Outreach Coordinator, Arizona Division of Child Support Services, proclaiming the month of August 2024 to be: "CHILD SUPPORT AWARENESS MONTH"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Kristy Diaz Trahan, Recreation Division Manager, and Grant Bourguet, Recreation Superintendent, Pima County Parks and Resources; Jodi Layton, Board Member, Drowning Prevention Coalition of Arizona; Lauren Dinauer, Environmental Health Program Manager, and Nicholas Rameriz, Environmental Health Supervisor, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the month of August 2024 to be: "DROWNING IMPACT AWARENESS MONTH"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Daniel Contreras and Gregorio Contreras, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, August 13, 2024 to be: "DANIEL 'EL GÜERO CANELO' CONTRERAS DAY"

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

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Kelley Ireland, Former Co-Lead, Be SMART Program with Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, proclaiming the week of August 26 through August 30, 2024 to be: "SMART WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

10. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Dave Smith addressed the Board regarding transparency and security during the election process. He indicated his suspicion with hackable voting machines and inadequate investigations.

Alan Young thanked the County for their prompt response in the clean-up after the Veterans Memorial and Korean War Memorial had been vandalized. He requested a copy of the memorandum issued by the County regarding the vandalism incidents and communication on the County's actions and future plans.

Jon Budynski, Employee, Information Technology Department (ITD), spoke regarding the long delay in processing the Classification Study appeals for his colleagues, who had their wages and titles misclassified. He requested that the Board expedite these appeals and that they ensured fair adjustments and back pay, and emphasized the importance of retaining skilled ITD professionals for the County's future.

Tim Laux expressed his opposition to the reduced time limit for speakers at Call to the Public and raised concerns about election administration and the use of non-party observers in ballot processing.

Jim Hannley spoke in support of the Heat Ordinance and stressed the need for specific protections and enforcement for County employees, including whistleblower safeguards and an advisory panel. He stated that Attorney General Kris Mayes supported the Ordinance, as well.

Rolande Baker expressed her support for the Heat Ordinance, urged protections for County employees, job security for those who reported violations, and the formation of an advisory panel.

Susan Kelly addressed the Board regarding improvements in the election process and there needed to be better training, stricter procedures and clear communication from the County to boost public confidence.

Gisela Aaron expressed her concerns with the certification of the primary election results by the Board, the lack of media coverage and highlighted security problems, which included unsecured ballot boxes and insufficient monitoring. She requested live feeds for ballot vault transparency.

Shirley Requard asked about the after-action reports and Call to the Public during the August 12, 2024 special meeting that she indicated was closed to the public. She stated that there was no meaningful public observation opportunities in elections. She called for various improvements, including secure ballot handling,

chain of custody procedures, Election Day reforms, and expressed concern with the Board's failure to address these issues effectively.

Robert Reus voiced his opinion on defending his petition for a new Jeffersonian party on the City of Tucson ballot, citing Jeffersonian principles and a commitment to election integrity. He expressed his frustration with individuals who strayed from those principles.

Paul Stapleton-Smith addressed the Board in support of the Heat Ordinance and emphasized the need for effective enforcement and protection for workers. He noted the encouragement from Acting Secretary of Labor Julie Su for local action on heat protection, acknowledging the County's potential for innovative solutions.

Sarah Roberts thanked the Board for the proclamation for SMART Week and expressed her support for the Heat Ordinance. She emphasized the need for a strong ordinance that ensured heat protection for everyone.

Don Hayles spoke regarding the prevention of accidental deaths of children. He voiced his opinion on abortion, border child trafficking and his concern with the lack of a tally for mail-in ballots that were dropped off on Election Day.

* * *

Supervisor Scott requested an update be provided to the Board on the status of all County employee appeals regarding the Classification and Compensation Study.

Chair Grijalva provided clarification to a comment made by Ms. Requard and on May 21, 2024, the Board approved a special meeting for August 12, 2024, that would be held virtually. She stated that the agenda for that meeting was posted on August 6, 2024, a summary of the meeting was posted after the conclusion of the meeting on August 12, 2024, at 11:46 a.m., and the video was posted online for the public to view.

Supervisor Lee requested that County Administrator look into the possibility of moving the Veterans Memorial so that it could be better safeguarded from vandalism. She requested information whether ballot boxes were picked up daily in rural areas of the County, and to provide a comparison of safeguards between Maricopa County and Pima County Records and Elections Departments to better understand the differences.

Chair Grijalva added on Supervisor Lee's request to include a comparison of the division of the Elections Department and Recorder's functions from both Maricopa County and Pima County to understand how they overlapped and differed.

Supervisor Lee asked if the Recorder's Office from both Maricopa County and Pima County did similar things.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was unaware and that was the reason she requested the comparisons.

Supervisor Christy suggested that the Pima County Air and Space Museum be considered as a potential new location for the Veterans Memorial, citing its security and relevance.

Supervisor Heinz provided clarification to a comment made by the last speaker and stated that the proposed constitutional amendment on abortion access did not address late-term or live-birth abortions, but aimed to restore Roe v. Wade protections.

Supervisor Christy stated the importance of recognizing that the Board could not directly dictate procedures or operations to the Recorder's Office, as it was led by a duly elected official. He explained that while the Board had some influence over the Recorder's budget, the Board did not have the ability to insist that certain procedures take place, however, it did not bar Board members from asking. He stated that the Elections Department was under the auspices and jurisdiction of the County and the Elections Director was hired by the County, so the Board had a more direct way to convey communications or issues to that department.

* * *

11. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:52 a.m.

12. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 12:33 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

13. The Board of Supervisors on July 16, 2024, continued the following:

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding the recent Maricopa County Superior Court decision related to local wage ordinances.

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

14. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding the recommended settlement in Commerce People, L.L.C., et al. v. Pima County, TX2024-000117.

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

15. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), for discussion regarding an update on federal investigation.

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

16. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement relating to the Broadway-Pantano Landfill.

At the request of the County Attorney's Office and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Scott stated the July 25, 2024, PAG Regional Council and RTA Board meeting was canceled due to lack of a quorum, and PAG staff was working to schedule a special RTA Board meeting for early September. He stated that the RTA Next Plan might be ready for public review in September. He stated that he represented the County on the Legislative Policy Committee for the County Supervisors Association (CSA), and the committee did not meet while the Legislature was not in session, but the annual CSA Policy Summit was scheduled for October 7 – 9, 2024, in Pinal County. He stated that Supervisor Lee planned to attend and encouraged the rest of his Board colleagues to attend, as well.

Chair Grijalva congratulated the Board of Health's newly selected President Charles Geoffrion and Vice President Mike Humphrey.

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

18. **Metropolitan Education Commission**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 38, of the Board of Supervisors, changing the "Appointments, Qualifications, and Term of Office" and "Commission's Officers and Rules" of the Metropolitan Education Commission, amending Resolution No. 1990-178. (District 3)

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

Supervisor Lee stated that the Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC) had been without a full-time Executive Director for two years and Rocque Perez was hired in the fall of 2024. She noted that it had only be recent since he was brought on board and he hit the ground running. She requested a brief summary of the resolution changes and why they were necessary.

Rocque Perez, Executive Director, MEC, explained that the MEC was unique compared to other boards, councils, and commissions because it was also a nonprofit organization, and within its founding there was no delineation between the Board of Directors and the commission itself. He added that a 39-member board had made operations difficult for someone that was not full-time and by stepping in it was to their detriment to begin the work. He stated that the resolution would provide additional framework for them to operate as a public body and a nonprofit organization, it reduced the size of the commission and stipulated eligibility among board members.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had previously served on the MEC two different times and felt that 39 members was a lot of people and reducing it to 29 was still large. She added that it had become problematic with quorum and the ability to meet on a regular basis. She stated that their presentations had to be recorded so they were accessible, but action could not be taken because quorum was not met on a regular basis, so she was still concerned with the reduced number of 29 members.

Mr. Perez responded that they intended to reduce it further within the next couple of years and that a new roster was included in the attachments for the item of members that confirmed participation or interest and 16 of them had been confirmed to join. He explained that the resolution adopted focuses, and around those focuses, those interested parties really wanted to get involved. He stated that an example for that was Literacy Connects, which they would love to proclaim Literacy Week and bring together local nonprofits around the topic of literacy. He stated there would be a north star for commissioners to invite their involvement and active participation and would allow for quorum to be met with excitement, rather than a sense of dread for time that historically had been the kind of feeling by commissioners.

Supervisor Scott thanked Mr. Perez for his proactive communication with Board offices since he became the Executive Director, and that in his quarterly meetings with the Economic Development Department, Ms. Maslyn indicated that communications were happening weekly regarding the operations of the MEC.

Supervisor Christy stated that he agreed with the observations about this resolution and that it was very complex. He asked if it had been reviewed by the County Attorney's Office and whether they found it to be satisfactory and in line.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative and that he had worked very closely with Mr. Perez and Supervisor Lee on the matter.

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

19. **2024 Primary and General Election**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding election issues raised during the July 16, 2024 Board of Supervisors' Meeting, including but not limited to the concerns expressed during the Call to the Public that day, and requesting that the Pima County Recorder and Elections Director be present to respond to such issues and concerns. (District 4)

Chair Grijalva stated that this was item was requested by Supervisor Christy and that Director Hargrove was in attendance. She asked Supervisor Christy how he wished to proceed.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, stated that she wanted to provide a few statements.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County Recorder was present, if not, why and what else could be done.

Chair Grijalva responded that she was not present and that the Recorder was a duly elected official and was not required to be in attendance when asked.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that the Recorder had notified her the previous day that she would not be attending as it was a high-volume time for her office, and they were currently verifying signatures for the statewide initiatives, which had tight statutory deadlines, but that she planned to present an After Action Report to the Election Integrity Commission and to the Board at a future Board meeting.

Supervisor Christy stated that he wanted to go over what was said at the last Board meeting during Call the Public, and that Ms. Hargrove could respond, and if she had any further statements, she could provide them at that time.

Chair Grijalva stated that Supervisor Christy could ask his questions with concerns he had and then Director Hargrove could respond and provide any statements she had at the appropriate times during the discussion.

Supervisor Christy indicated that there had been several statements heard about how important it was to have faith and confidence in the election system and that numerous people had done some diligent research and had real life experiences. He stated that it was very troubling that they had these experiences and it was important to allow a mechanism such as this discussion to have those concerns brought to the surface and illuminated so they could be addressed and answered in a very cogent way, so as to prevent any misunderstandings, or as it seemed to be a popular thing whenever questioning anything, that it was a conspiracy theory. He hoped this would allow those individuals with concerns to have their questions addressed. He stated that Ms. Hargrove had already made a statement regarding

the misprinting of the Primary Election date and asked for a quick response to what happened and if there were any other issues that might have come up.

Ms. Hargrove stated that as she had indicated, there was an error made in proofing. She explained that there was a team proofing the sample ballot, but the reality was there was no single person, or a staff of individuals assigned to proofing tasks in her office, so that meant individuals got interrupted and got called away to address things for other citizens and other voters. She stated the solution she came up with was a checklist that would allow them to know where to stop in the process. She stated that if they were proofing the sample ballot and they got to a stopping point due to being interrupted, they could check off where they were and be able to return to that point as opposed to either starting over again or missing something as they had done with the sample ballots that went out for this election.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that another thing they would do aside from Director Hargrove's list to ensure it did not happen again, was a checks and balance where there would be a full review by others not in the Elections Department following that checklist, and when done it would be shipped out to another department to complete a full review so that there was a second set of eyes and a checks and balance on that.

Supervisor Christy asked if there was any indication or idea of the impact the incorrect date might have had on the voting procedure.

Ms. Hargrove responded that she had not heard of anyone not receiving the postcard, but had received numerous phone calls from voters who received the postcard. She stated that the media picked up the story, published it and conducted radio interviews, and she was confident that the message got out to those voters who received the sample ballot with the wrong date.

Supervisor Christy stated that in elections, the Independent (IND) and the Party not designated (PND) issues were not political parties, yet they seemed to be treated as such. He asked what Ms. Hargrove's reaction was to that.

Ms. Hargrove responded that she was confused about what they were referring to and if they were referring to employees of the Elections Office, she was unaware of what party they were and they were not required to be Democrat, Republican or any other party. She stated that if they were referring to individuals working in the early boards at the polling places, those individuals were required to be of different political parties. She added that whether or not a PND or IND was a party, she could not define that, but that did have Democrats and Republicans. She stated that when the early board for the last election was advertised, they intentionally required them to identify what party they represented and all the individuals hired for the early board were Republicans, because that was the need. She reiterated that she was unsure what they referred to, but as far as poll workers, they had Republicans and Democrats, INDs and PNDs and clerks were not required to be of any particular party.

Supervisor Christy stated that there might be some controversy surrounding the issue and asked if Ms. Hargrove would be willing to personally review the concerns raised and respond to them accordingly.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy referred to comments made by Sarah Price at the last Board meeting regarding a public request made for chain of custody for documents from the 2022 election and the general election, which they found contained many inconsistencies and possible fraud. He asked if this was a Recorder's issue or an Election's issue.

Ms. Hargrove stated that the documents provided were from the Recorder's office and explained that in 2022 a lot of their chain of custody documents went to the Treasurer's Office with the other ballots and things that needed to be kept there, which meant they transferred chain of custody to the Treasurer, so they would have to get them from the Treasurer. She stated that the previous day she had sent some documents to the Clerk's office that were used in the vote center, one being the official ballot report. She stated that someone had spoken regarding not knowing how many ballots were sent to a vote center, or how much ballot stock was sent to a vote center, which was absolutely not true and the information was on the official ballot report when it went out. She added that in 2022, they sent emergency ballots to the vote centers and at the top of each page for each vote center was the number of ballots sent and because they had to send out ballots for each precinct and it was long document, whenever they used any of the emergency ballots, they were supposed to document on that report how many ballots they used, which was for their reconciliation. She stated that the Official Ballot Report (OBR) had gone through a couple of iterations where they modified it to work better with the electronic poll books currently being used. She showed the Board an OBR from 2023 and stated that they determined that it was easier for the vote centers to be able to have a section where they could physically count spoiled ballots and provisional ballots, as well as indicate the number of spoiled and provisional ballots that they checked-in on the electronic poll book, because the number could be different. She then showed the Board the most recent iteration of the OBR which indicated the amount of ballot stock sent to the vote center, and then they would indicate how many test ballots they printed, how many pieces of ballot stock were left in an open packet, and how many packages of ballot stock remained. She stated that this indicated that someone did not review their document, but maybe they reviewed the Recorder's document because this document showed that. She explained that the reason why there could be more spoiled ballots hand counted and more provisional ballots hand counted was because a ballot could only be spoiled in the electronic poll book if it was known who that ballot was issued to. She added that if they had to spoil a ballot outside of that, they had the physical copy of the spoiled ballot, but it could not be entered into the electronic poll book making the numbers different. She stated that provisional ballots were listed there because they realized that sometimes voters were not checked-in as provisional voters, rather as

regular voters. She stated for example if they had 20 provisional ballots, but they checked-in 15, they would know that the number of ballots cast should be less than what was checked-in on the poll book. She stated that the OBR was their chain of custody document for the vote center and there was a couple of other chain of custody documents that were used when the ballots and the materials were returned to central count. She stated that the boards they had on election night went through the materials, they reviewed the ballots and filled out the forms.

Supervisor Christy stated that IND and PND were not eligible to fill opposite party slots, which was the point that was trying to be made. He asked whether this information was correct, nebulous or whether it should be crystal clear.

Ms. Hargrove responded that was in statute for the boards that were at vote centers, and they could not fill an opposite party slot in a vote center.

Supervisor Christy asked if they had been doing so.

Ms. Hargrove clarified that they were clerks at the vote center.

Supervisor Christy noted that some statements for the Recorder indicated that in certain locations, the number and position of poll workers might not meet statutory guidelines, and it required the Board of Supervisors approval of poll workers for early voting. He inquired whether that issue had been brought to Ms. Hargrove's attention.

Ms. Hargrove responded that would be a question for the Recorder's Office.

Supervisor Christy asked if allot-drop off locations also fell under the Recorder's Office.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy referred to other issues including no ballot counts or emails exchanged between the Post Office and the Recorder's Office, and County employees or temporary employees that switched parties from Democrat to PND or IND, which had already been discussed. He added chain of custody, missing seals on mail-in ballots, delivery and pickup person signed for two people, ballot boxes on chain of custody documents, mail-in boxes received that had no seals or had damaged seals.

Ms. Hargrove responded those topics also referred to the Recorder's Office.

Supervisor Christy stated that unfortunately the Recorder was not in attendance to address his other questions and turned it over to Ms. Hargrove to provide her statements.

Ms. Hargrove stated that she had an email conversation with Mr. Laux about the ballots being dropped off from the Post Office at vote centers in 2022 and she was not aware of it until after they were dropped off, but she was made aware of those ballots being dropped off. She stated that it was not an uncommon practice across the country of that happening, but when she was informed by the Recorder that they may drop off ballots for the July Primary, she indicated to the Recorder that they would not be received because she had not spoken to the Post Office and arrangements had not been made, there would be no documents to transfer chain of custody, so they informed the Inspectors prior to the election not to receive any ballots from the Post Office.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was for the current election and if she referred to the incident from 2022.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative. She added that there was an email from Mrs. Aaron in reference to the electronic poll book on Election Day, that when they opened the polls at 5:45 a.m. and signed in, they saw a number on the poll book. She explained that the number was not for voters rather that number were for Delta files. She stated that once they programmed the electronic poll books the data was there and when the Recorder continued early voting and emergency voting, the Recorder uploaded Delta files. She stated that those were updates so that on Election Day, those individuals were marked as already voted. She stated that what was seen on Election Day of 3,839 and the other numbers on the electronic poll book were the total number of registered voters and the number of check-ins for that particular vote center, so there were no early voting numbers and no ballots cast at that location, except for the individuals that checked-in on Election Day.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the situation with cameras not working or installed in the vault rooms and things of that nature.

Ms. Hargrove explained that statute only required they had live feed in the tabulation room, and that live feed was only required when counting ballots, however, they had 24/7 video live feed of the counting room and the early board processing room, which was the room where the ballots came from the Recorder's Office into the Election's Department and that they processed, opened and prepared them for tabulation. She added there was also 24/7 feed of the adjudication room, which was mislabeled as vault, but it was not a vault, rather it was part of a vault that was renovated so that they could have that room to do other things in and it had been renamed adjudication room. She stated the camera was on there and the seal being referred to was on the door to the adjudication room, not the vault. She stated that there were cameras in all the vaults, but they were not live stream. She added that she would not live stream a vault because to her it was kind of a breach of security and would not want anyone to know where that vault was located outside of the election staff.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the difference between broadcast cameras and security cameras.

Ms. Hargrove explained that the broadcast cameras were the cameras located on their webpage that someone could click on the link for the video feed and view what was going on at any time, day or night.

Supervisor Christy asked about the location of those cameras.

Ms. Hargrove responded they were in the tabulation room, the warehouse, the early board room, and the adjudication room.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification if they were broadcast or security cameras and where the security cameras were located.

Ms. Hargrove responded they were broadcast cameras and that security cameras were located throughout the office and in the vaults, and they were there so that if anything happened, they would be able to review that video to determine what happened.

Supervisor Christy went over an additional comment from a constituent that wanted to provide an update of his experience working as a Marshal for the past 3 or 4 elections and had complained about the chain of custody to election officials, both with training and via phone to the main office and an issue with people dropping off multiple ballots. He asked how many ballots people could drop off and what they constituted as far as being legal and if there might be some kind of an issue that could lead to misunderstandings as far as the amount of ballots and where they were coming from that were dropped off.

Ms. Hargrove stated that statutorily, they could drop off ballots for family members and individuals that lived in their home and anyone they cared for. She stated that she could not speak to how many people lived in one house, so it could be any number with some large families or some small families. She stated that there were some individuals that believed that if more than one ballot was being brought, but it was not theirs, that there was some fraud, but she did not believe that was the case. She appreciated the comments made by the Marshal's statement regarding chain of custody and the process that happened prior to the election that reported that they had done what they had been instructed to do and that it had been a training process, and they were moving forward and improving, and it would provide her an opportunity to fine tune the process. She stated that provided her an opportunity to understand where individuals were concerned about the process and where they might be confused about the process and would allow her to articulate and provide the information that they sought, as well as make some changes that might make them feel like the process was more secure.

Supervisor Christy asked Ms. Hargrove if she would be willing to have continued open dialogue with individuals who had issues and would respond to them accordingly.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had strong confidence in the County's Elections Department, Recorder's Office and all the departments and teams that worked extremely hard for months that led up to and after each election. She stated she was grateful for their service to the community and for ensuring the security of elections and the ability to vote in Pima County. She added that just like the nearly 198,000 other Pima County residents, she cast her ballot for the July 30 Primary Election by participating in what former Congressman John Lewis famously called, "The most powerful nonviolent tool we have in a democratic society." She added that voters in this community practiced one of the most crucial civil engagements in the country. She stated that voting was not just a right, but a responsibility that allowed them to shape the future they wanted for their communities, however in order to exercise that responsibility, there needed to be faith in the election process. She added that she was confident in stating that in Pima County, elections had been and would continue to be professionally, smoothly and securely run as they prepared for the upcoming General Election. She stated that it was important that to assess where things went well and where there were areas for improvement to ensure that voters in the community felt confident that their vote counted, and ensuring that voters knew where to go, where to find answers to their questions, and that Pima County was doing their best to communicate effectively and thoroughly to every person in the community. She stated that she had no hesitation in voting to approve the canvass of the Primary Election results at the last meeting and she was glad that her colleagues joined her in unanimously voting to approve the results. She stated that together, they were better, more engaged, and a stronger community and she thanked the poll workers, Elections and Recorder teams and all of those who cast a ballot in the most recent election for participating in the voting process, contributing to shaping the future of communities and the country. She stated that she had some suggestions that would make the process more voter centric for the community, which was to make it easier to find the nearest vote center, particularly via cell phone. She stated that there was currently a website model, but it was difficult to navigate on a smartphone. She also suggested to make early voting sites serve on Election Day as Vote Centers whenever possible. She stated that there were some historic polling places in all the communities, for example, El Rio Neighborhood Center had been a longstanding polling place and people went there by memory, so they got there and found nothing there and nobody around to direct people. She stated that it was important whenever possible, to send information to those historic sites to show where the nearest center was. She stated that what she found frustrating when trying to help people locate their center, was that it was on a page not formatted for a cell phone, so they needed to scroll up, but not everyone knew what that meant. She stated that it could be something simple and she liked how the system generated three of the nearest sites closest to her based on the address entered, but it was hard to find that magnifying glass. She provided an example of how it could be done and stated that they had to think of a way to make it easier. She stated that she wanted to reestablish both an Early Voting Site and a Vote Center on the University of Arizona campus and would like them to explore public government or other location sites for

Vote Centers, like neighborhood centers, rather than private sites, or perhaps some of the more secular sites since the numbers were limited and she would like to ensure that these environments were as welcoming as possible. She suggested to not make the number of the vote center public as they were currently numbered 1-126, but many people still equated that with their polling place, and they did not correlate to precinct numbers. She added to also improve the data reporting post-election, so people could complete a deep dive and make it easy to find the information. She requested the Board be updated on other General Election voting issues before early ballots were issued and would reach out on the status of the suggestions she made and whether it would be easy or not to implement. She stated that the process of placing a ballot in the mail with the ability to follow it should be a national model and the County had done a good job in different areas and hoped they continued to make every process as voter centric as possible to help people. She requested links and phone numbers be sent to the City of Tucson Council members, Mayor's Office, and Board Offices, for when people had questions. She reiterated her confidence that the General Election would go well, and it was an opportunity to review what went well.

Supervisor Heinz expressed his concern, having been in multiple elections himself, about the process being called into question, which had gone very well in Pima County and most places in the country. He stated that if someone's candidate of choice did not win, it did not mean the process was flawed, or the system was rigged, as indicated by the former President. He stated that it did not mean they had to find votes, or to attack election officials or indicate that the witnesses were somehow corrupted or stuffing the ballots and that people needed to get over this. He added that having been through many elections, his first in 2006 when he ran for the Legislature and he worked very hard and lost, but he never once thought to claim that he was denied, or that someone took his votes away, or the ballot was confusing. He stated that he never thought of calling a reporter and yelling or accusing people of anything nefarious and that it had only been prevalent since the former President's time. He stated that the processes worked well, and the last election was the most secure the country has had, so he felt that kind of talk needed to be set aside so they could focus on doing the best they could to ensure counting the votes were cast by eligible electors.

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

20. Release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum

Discussion/Direction/Action to waive privilege and release to the public the Pima County Attorney's Office Memorandum written by Chief Civil Deputy Attorney Sam Brown dated July 25, 2024, regarding "Filling the Vacant Constable Position." (District 4)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to waive attorney-client privilege and release the memorandum. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva questioned why there was a request to release the memorandum.

Supervisor Christy questioned how a request for reconsideration related to the contents in an attorney-client privileged memorandum appeared on the agenda in such an openly disclosed manner.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, clarified that the legal advice in the memorandum was separate from the recommendation. He stated that the recommendation focused on procedure, specifically the Board's Rules and Robert's Rules, and how the Board might address the issue. He explained that the legal advice that preceded it was included in the memorandum.

Supervisor Christy noted that the attorney-client privileged memorandum was outlined in the request for reconsideration and he did not recall that the Board had released it to the public.

Chair Grijalva asked Supervisor Christy what he was referring to on the agenda.

Supervisor Christy responded Minute Item No. 21 and reiterated that it was in an attorney-client privileged memorandum. He sought clarification whether it was policy that the Board needed to vote to waive the attorney-client privilege and release it prior to it being released to the public and that was not done, but it had been outlined in distinct form and detail on the agenda.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had been asked by Legal to place Minute Item No. 21 on the agenda. She asked Legal Counsel if he had drafted the language on the agenda.

Mr. Brown responded that he did not recall.

Chair Grijalva asked if this was a violation.

Mr. Brown stated that there was a portion of the memorandum that contained a recommendation for how the Board might include an item, which was part of the attorney-client privileged memorandum, but it was about procedure and the inclusion of an item on an agenda. He explained that if the recommendation was followed, that portion of the memorandum would need to be expressed on the Board agenda as recommended by the County Attorney's Office.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the Board was going to be in any violation by acting on the item since it was attorney-client privileged and had not been voted on by the Board to release it.

Mr. Brown responded that he did not believe so.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was happy to move forward and release the memorandum.

Supervisor Christy stated that the process was irregular and indicated that it had not been fully thought out as to how it should have been presented.

Mr. Brown stated that it was an unusual circumstance.

Supervisor Christy called to question.

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

Chair Grijalva commented that when someone called the question, the Board then had to vote to call the question, but since they were already going to vote on the motion on the floor, they moved forward with the vote on that motion.

21. Request for Reconsideration - District 5

- A. Request to suspend Board of Supervisors' Rule No. H.2., pursuant to Board of Supervisors' Rule No. O.1.

Chair Grijalva stated that there were different parts due to the actions taken by the Board on May 21, 2024.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to suspend Board of Supervisors' Rule No. H.2., pursuant to Board of Supervisors' Rule No. O.1. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that his understanding of the procedures was that reconsideration was required to take place at the first meeting following the Board of Supervisors' action. He questioned why the need for a suspension and in his 8 years on the Board did not recall that they had ever been suspended. He also questioned if the Board had to suspend rules, then why the need for them, and once the rules were suspended and a vote was made, did the former rules revert into effect.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the rules related to parliamentary procedure and in the Board Rules it detailed reconsideration. She stated that a reconsideration generally had to occur within the same meeting or the following Board meeting. She stated that there was an assumption that if there needed to be an immediate reversal of position, then it needed a reconsideration, as heard from the County Attorney's Office. She stated that the rule did not presume that if the Board acted, the action was in place in perpetuity, and that should the Board ever decide that it wanted to revisit an item in the future, it could do that. She reiterated that the rules relating to immediately bringing back an item for reconsideration dealt with those being reconsidered, either at a meeting or very soon thereafter. She added that any of the Board members would understand that if they voted on

something in 2019, it did not mean that they could not vote on it again or reconsider it. She stated that the concern was whether it was done within that very short period of time, and out of an abundance of caution, was the reason why the item was on the agenda to appoint the Constable at that time, and because they did not believe that it violated any kind of rules regarding reconsideration. She added that the Board had released the County Attorney's position, that while not obligated to never reconsider an item, it dealt with when it might be considered.

Supervisor Christy asked what was unique about the situation, because it was messy, and what had caused it.

Ms. Leshner disagreed that it was messy and explained that what occurred was initially, the Board had considered refilling a Constable's position, but the will of the Board at that time was not to fill the position, which had gone back to consideration of this Board for some period of time about whether the positions of Constable were needed and whether those positions could be eliminated. She stated that it became clear with the vacant position that there was a time period by which the Board may vote to not fill the position, and it had to do with when the position was up for election and when the position could be filled. She stated that it was clear that at this point, because it was already on the ballot, and it was too late for the Board to remove the position, and the position would be filled. She stated that the question they came back to was to request the Board consider the position at this time and fill it, as the position would be filled in January 2025. She stated there was one individual on the ballot for this Constable position, and that individual would be elected in November 2024, to begin serving in January 2025. She stated another question brought up was regarding the workload of the vacant position that currently fell on the other Constables to complete and they received a request from the Constables for the Board to fill the position for the remainder of the current term, which would be through the end of the year.

Supervisor Christy sought clarification if they were voting to fill or not fill the position or to suspend the rules.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the motion was to suspend Board of Supervisors' Rule No. H.2., pursuant to Board of Supervisors' Rule No. O.1, so that they would be able to reconsider the item and she agreed it was complicated. She stated that some of it had to do with legal opinion to ensure that it was as clean as possible, that the Board was legally protected and that she was comfortable with it.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation whether legal counsel was comfortable with whatever action was taken by the Board on the items that they would be legally protected.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative and stated that the Board could have brought it back as an item and voted on it, but because there was a question from a Board Supervisor's Office, it led them to believe there might be questions regarding transparency, so they took a very

conservative approach of taking the extra measures. He added that it seemed messy, but they wanted to ensure there was public transparency and no questions about how these actions were arrived at, but he was confident they were appropriate and would withstand.

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

- B. If request to suspend Board of Supervisors' Rule No. H.2. is approved, proceed with the vote for reconsideration.

On May 21, 2024, the Board of Supervisors took the following action:

Constable, Justice Precinct 4

- B. Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a selection process to fill the vacancy of Constable, Justice Precinct 4.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to not fill the vacancy. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

Supervisor Christy requested clarification whether he could vote on the item, because the timeframe had already passed.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the Board had just voted to suspend the rules, and that on May 21, 2024, the Board took action to not fill the vacancy and Supervisor Christy had voted against that motion. She added that the Board was currently proceeding with the vote for reconsideration of the item.

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

Mr. Brown stated that per the Board's rules, the cause by a member of the prevailing side that justified the reconsideration should be articulated.

Chair Grijalva explained that the reason she voted to not fill the vacancy on May 21st was because a background check had not been completed. She stated that it had nothing to do with the qualifications of the individual or whether to choose to fill the vacancy. She stated that it was her understanding that since then there was documentation that a background check had been completed so she was willing to consider the item.

Supervisor Christy stated for the record that the last time he voted in support of filling the vacancy.

Chair Grijalva clarified that Supervisor Christy had voted against her motion to not fill the vacancy, which had been seconded by Supervisor Scott and passed by a 4-1

vote. She stated that Supervisor Christy wanted to fill the vacancy and that there was no longer an issue since there was a completed background check on the interested individual.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Heinz voted “Nay.”

- C. If motion to reconsider is approved, proceed with reconsideration of the following:

Constable, Justice Precinct 4

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a selection process to fill the vacancy of Constable, Justice Precinct 4.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the appointment of Tracy Ethridge-Nielsen to fill the vacancy of Constable, Justice Precinct 4. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that when the Board voted to not fill the position, the incumbent Constable had been recommended for suspension by the State's Constable Ethics, Standards and Training Board, and as a result, the Board moved forward with the suspension for the balance of the term. He stated that the Constable had resigned after the Board took that action, so it was decided not to fill the vacancy at that time because it was a moot point. He stated that there was already not going to be anybody in the position until the end of this calendar year, however, the Board had received a presentation from the Presiding Constable, which pointed out a lot of the logistical issues that the office had dealt with, and he requested the Board reconsider filling the position. He added that Human Resources conducted a background check on Ms. Etheridge-Nielsen, so he was comfortable moving forward with the recommendation received by the Presiding Constable and the County Administrator, to reconsider the item and fill the vacancy. He added that it seemed like a moot point back when the Board initially voted, and that there was no petition approved for the election.

Chair Grijalva stated that Ms. Etheridge-Nielsen was the only individual that could fill the vacancy, and if appointed, she could attend the training this month that would not occur again until January.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

22. Planning Design and Construction Department Presentation

Presentation by the Planning Design and Construction Director regarding an overview of the department.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that previously there were three different departments involved through the Facilities Management Department which included all day-to-day facilities, repair and maintenance, as well as construction and a separate department for Project Design and Construction (PDC). She stated that they moved Facilities Management into its own department to ensure the ability to keep the lights on and that the buildings were safe and secure. She stated that the other two departments were combined so that someone oversaw the construction of all County facilities. She stated that Mr. Rod Lane was selected to fill the director position for this department and that he had previously been the Divisional Director for Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) of Southern Arizona, and the decision was made to select Mr. Lane because every project under his direction in this area, was on time and on budget, and those were the kinds of things the County sought in terms of its projects.

Rod Lane, Director, PDC, provided a slideshow presentation and stated that the Board would learn about what PDC did, where they would go and how they intended to get there. He explained that there were five separate divisions within the department, one being the Renovations and Interiors Division where they utilized a team of architects, interior designers, design specialists and project coordinators, responsible for renovations and interiors of the County's remodel building projects and working environments that would maintain interior standards, including furniture, paint colors, flooring and window coverings, designs and managed installation of standard systems furniture using new products and existing furniture inventory, including systems furniture reconfiguration and teardowns, and provided ergonomic assessments. He stated another division was the New Buildings Division, which were a group of architects and design professionals that managed large, complex building projects under the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and project management included oversight of the project scope, budget, schedules, design consultants, construction selection, contracts, public art, furnishings and equipment, etcetera. He stated that projects ranged from \$1 million to about \$50 million, from new buildings to large renovations and expansions to existing buildings. He stated that the Public Works Division managed the design and construction of the Public Works Capital Improvement Projects, it managed the Art Program, assisted in long-term planning, construction estimates, insights, and short-term planning, and coordinated interdepartmental projects. He stated that the majority of the design and construction efforts included projects for the Transportation Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Regional Wastewater Reclamation, Department of Environmental Quality, Stadium District and occasionally department CIP projects as deemed necessary. He stated that the Construction Management Services (CMS) Division managed the construction phase of new buildings and renovation, and construction managers enforced the terms of construction contracts and kept the construction phase on schedule and within budget. He added that the construction phase started with a pre-construction meeting and continued with the development of the new buildings or weekly progress meetings, site visits and contract administration that affected changes to the construction contract scope and duration. He stated that the CMS team served as the bridge between the PDC design staff and the Facilities Management

Operation Program, such that design intent was maintained throughout the construction and the operability of the project was maximized. He stated that the Project Services Division was responsible for providing resource and project managers, procedures and coordination of the financial forecasting and analysis, budgeting, procurement, vendor payment processing and provisions of information for long-term financial planning and project reporting for Capital projects that PDC managed for the critical infrastructure needs of the County. He stated that they were a relatively new department, and their primary task was building trust and confidence with client departments and demonstrating they were capable and skilled at delivering the CIP projects on time and within budget. He stated that construction and unforeseen issues occurred, so open and honest communication was key to this being successful. He stated that the vertical side of the house functioned fairly well, and they recently hired a new Senior Architect and had two more openings they were currently filling, and the horizontal side had recently hired four new positions, including a Deputy Director that would oversee the horizontal work, along with three new Project Managers. He added that with the implementation throughout the County of the new Enterprise Software System, he saw an opportunity to use the data within that system to develop metrics and dashboards that would allow them to track and monitor projects and assist them to better communicate with their clients.

Supervisor Christy expressed his pleasure and privilege of working with Mr. Lane during his time as the ADOT representative of Southern Arizona and shared the same accolades the County Administrator had regarding his capabilities and talents. He stated that Mr. Lane would be a tremendous asset to County Administration.

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

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

23. Attractions and Tourism One-Time-Only Outside Agency Funding Requests

Agency/Fiscal Year/Amount/Program

Tucson Botanical Gardens/FY23-24/\$7,500.00/The Great Garden Express

Arizona Bowl/FY24-25/\$27,500.00/Snoop Dogg Arizona Bowl presented by Gin & Juice

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

24. Recommended Settlement in Commerce People, L.L.C., et al. v. Pima County Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the recommended settlement in Commerce People, L.L.C., et al. v. Pima County, TX2024-000117.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

25. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00014, Star Valley Block 8, Lots 1-312 and Common Area 'A1-A19', 'B1-B7' & 'C1-C2'. (District 5)

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

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

26. 2024 General Election - School District Cancellations

Staff requests cancellation of those uncontested school district governing board positions for the General Election on November 5, 2024 and appointment of those who filed the required nominating petitions or nomination papers.

Ajo Unified School District No. 15 - 2 Positions - Erik Krznarich, Lonnie Guthrie

Altar Valley Elementary School District No. 51 - 3 Positions - Sarah King, Dan Tankersly, Martin Hudecek

Amphitheater Unified School District No. 10 - 3 Positions - Deanna M. Day, Vicki Cox Golder, Patsy Harris

Continental Elementary School District No. 39 - 3 Positions - Kelley Allen, Laura Peters-LeFever, Andrew McGibbon

Empire Elementary School District No. 37 - 3 Positions - Three (3) Vacancies

Pima County JTED No. 11 (District 1) - 1 Position - Brenda Marietti (Write-in)

Pima County JTED No. 11 (District 4) - 1 Position - Wayne Peate (Write-in)

Pima County JTED No. 11 (District 5) - 1 Position - Robert Schlanger (Write-in)

Redington Elementary School District No. 44 - 3 Positions - Judith Dykes (Write-in), Mary

Smallhouse - 2-Year Term (Write-in), Lavita Wilkinson (Write-in)

San Fernando Elementary School District No. 35 - 3 Positions - Paul Bear, Deborah Grider, One (1) Vacancy

Sunnyside Unified School District No. 12 - 3 Positions - Ted Rodriguez, Beki Quintero, Edgar Bustamante

Chair Grijalva encouraged community members to become involved in this elected office and that it was arguably one of the most important local offices in the County.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve Minute Item Nos. 26 and 56. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott pointed out that Pima Community College (PCC) Board members served six-year terms. He explained that an individual elected in 2020 to represent his district had to resign for personal reasons and that an appointment was made to temporarily fill the position until the next general election when a new election was required to complete the term. He stated that the current appointee in the seat was not running to fill the remainder of the term, so Nicole Barraza would complete the remaining portion of the six-year term.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Information Technology

27. Pima County Superior Court, Amendment No. 4, to provide for co-location of computing and network equipment, extend contract term to 8/14/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000021)

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

PROCUREMENT

28. **Award**

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-24-233, Offsite Sweeping, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for roadway sweeping services. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$450,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: HURF Fund. Administering Department: Transportation.

Chair Grijalva requested clarification if the renewals would need to be brought back to the Board for approval.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded upon approval of the item, the renewals could be activated without having to be brought back to the Board.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had a concern regarding outsourcing services and would vote against this item.

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

29. **Award**

Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, to provide for janitorial services. These contracts are for an initial term of one (1) year in the total annual award amount of \$4,000,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General (88%) and FEMA SSP (12%) Funds. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

Group No.:Site/Contractor (Headquarters)/Supplier Contract No./Annual Award Amount

Group 1: Downtown "D"/Elite Building Services, L.L.C. (Tucson, AZ)/ SC2400001891/\$1,700,000.00

Group 2: Outlying Ajo Corridor "OA"/Office Keepers, L.L.C., d.b.a. Keepers Commercial Cleaning, (Mesa, AZ)/SC2400001892/\$750,000.00

Group 3: Outlying West "OW"/Office Keepers, L.L.C., d.b.a. Keepers Commercial Cleaning, (Mesa, AZ)/SC2400001893/\$500,000.00

Group 4: Outlying East "OE"/Robbins Equipment Company, Inc. (Tucson, AZ)/SC2400001894/\$500,000.00

Group 5: Outlying South "OS"/Robbins Equipment Company, Inc. (Tucson, AZ)/SC2400001895/\$550,000.00

Chair Grijalva stated that wanted to understand why this service was not being done in-house and she had similar concerns with Minute Item Nos. 28 and 30. She stated that she preferred these types of services be done in-house and had an issue voting in favor of it, and understood that the people that provided janitorial services had done an amazing job, however, she would like the County to pull back from outsourcing services.

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

Chair Grijalva reiterated that she would not be able to support this item because for the past three years she had asked there were so many contracts for outside services as opposed to bringing people into what was an amazing place to work in the County.

Supervisor Lee asked if there was ever a time that County employees provided this services and if so, when had that changed.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that both the cleaning services and security services had been done internally, but did not recall when that shifted. She stated that she asked staff for a full report of when they shifted, what the costs were, what the current cost estimates were, and how to evaluate the pros and cons of external versus current time and that the items the Board had considered were for external contracts. She stated that they wanted to continue the contracts and suggested continuing them so that there was not a loss in service, but it could be reevaluated through the first of the year to show what the cost benefit ratio might be to bring it back internally.

Supervisor Lee asked if the Board could approve the item for three months until an answer was provided.

Ms. Leshner replied that the contract being considered was for an initial term of one year.

Supervisor Heinz asked whether a 12-month term was needed if this was something that could be brought in-house. He expressed his assumption that cost savings was a factor and contracting out meant that these individuals were not on the County's retirement program or health care benefits, which was part of the cost savings. He agreed with Chair Grijalva that the County should not be contracting out and suggested a three-month term and to work on completing it sooner than 12 months.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the item was for an additional one year award and included four one-year renewal options and that her understanding was that those options would come back to the Board. She explained that she would vote against the item because she had asked about these services being provided in-house and nothing had changed, and hoped that they would be able to move towards bringing more people under the umbrella as County employees and that it would be difficult to negotiate a three-month contract that would end quickly. She voiced her appreciation that it was also a concern for her colleagues and that it made sense to move forward for a year, and in the meantime, collect hard data.

Supervisor Christy expressed his disagreement and stated that they should continue to look for opportunities to contract out workers, particularly janitorial services. He stated that it was a huge element of County operation, and he did not want to bring on the added burden of a very large workforce that would be integrated into the County's payroll with all of the issues and responsibilities that went with it. He added that everything had been working fine and encouraged County Administration, particularly with the work shortage and filling vacancies, that they should expand exploring the private sector for contractors in many other areas that could do the work more effectively, efficiently and free up staff that were overburdened with responsibilities. He stated his support to continue the contract and if there was going to be any change to the contract to bring it in-house, he requested a County Administration Budget Economic Report.

Supervisor Scott stated it was mentioned that in the past janitorial services were handled by County employees and then there was a decision to contract those services out. He stated that in his experience as a school administrator, he had worked in one school district that had janitorial services done by staff, and other school districts where they were contracted out because they were hard-to-fill positions, and it was difficult to compete with the private sector to get employees for those public sector positions. He stated that the reason the decision was made was before the tenure of this Board to contract those services out and requested the Board be provided with information regarding the history of these types of contracts.

Ms. Leshar responded that a report regarding the history of janitorial services for the County would be provided to the Board.

Chair Grijalva clarified that this item was for an initial one-year term and any subsequent yearly renewals would be brought back to the Board, as implied in the item.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4 1, Chair Grijalva voted "Nay."

30. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001493, Amendment No. 2, Central Pet Partners, L.L.C., to provide for shelter cleaning and pet care services.

This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$250,000.00 from \$1,135,000.00 to \$1,385,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$2,520,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Pima Animal Care Center.

Chair Grijalva questioned why these services could not be provided in-house. She stated that in a previous conversation with the director of the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), she indicated that the services were put out because employees did not want to perform these services. She wondered if salaries had been more competitive if they would be able to provide the services in house.

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

Supervisor Lee asked if the County Administrator could allot \$25,000.00 to provide these services in Ajo, which were constantly requested by the residents in that area. She also suggested that volunteers could bring the dogs from Ajo to PACC for the services.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Chair Grijalva voted "Nay."

31. CDW Government, L.L.C., to provide for software value added reseller services, General (50%) and Enterprise Funds, contract amount \$2,000,000.00 (SC2400001886) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

32. Economic Consultants Oregon, Ltd., d.b.a. EConorthwest, to provide for the Comprehensive Housing Market Study and Charrette Project, Regional Affordable Housing Fund, contract amount \$425,000.00 (SC2400001908) Administering Department: Community and Workforce Development

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," for discussion purposes.

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification whether the \$425,000.00 study was separate from the \$5 million that the Board had been annually dedicating towards affordable housing, or if it came out of it, which would reduce their ability to fund additional housing units in the future.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, clarified it came out of the \$5 million and explained that in 2021 and 2022, there was an affordable housing task force that made recommendations to the Board to create the commission, which was done and in 2022, there was an initial recommendation that this study be done at that time and it had currently come to fruition and would provide a baseline that did not exist and staff did not believe that they had the wherewithal to complete it.

Chair Grijalva stated that she had an issue with this because there was significant need for affordable housing and was unsure how an additional study telling them that, would change either the resources they had to address it, or the work that was currently being done. She stated that there was information that could be pulled from Emergency Eviction Legal Services, Community and Workforce Development services that Ms. Darland had mentioned, from the City of Tucson, and there were experts in-house in Pima County, like Marcos Ysmael, that they could tap into, or with realtor organizations. She wanted to understand the necessity for this comprehensive housing market study and had a hard time with it coming from the \$5 million allocated to affordable housing, which was not enough money to do what needed to be done.

Supervisor Christy asked if the item had already been voted on.

Chair Grijalva clarified the Board voted to discuss the item.

Supervisor Christy asked when had the Board ever voted to discuss an item.

Chair Grijalva further clarified that it was done earlier in the meeting with another item and the Clerk had reminded her that the motion made was for discussion purposes only.

Supervisor Lee stated that if the Board did not approve it, then the \$425,000.00 should be put back into the pot.

Supervisor Scott stated his understanding was that the housing commission the Board formed was going to complete this sooner in their existence because they needed to develop a long-term strategic plan, according to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, that dealt with the need for around 26,000 additional units of affordable housing. He added that the market study would also review what was needed in the areas of workforce and market rate housing, that it was a comprehensive market survey similar to what had been heard and seen with what was being done at the City of Tempe that had informed their work with housing. He asked what the rationale was for this study and how the commission would use it.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, reminded the Board that when the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission was established in January 2023, one of the items it considered were these recommendations that had emerged from the previous task force. He stated there was deliberation about exactly what kinds of information would be helpful to complete the strategic planning that needed to be done. He stated that everyone acknowledged that there was insufficient housing, but the question was where that housing should be and what kind of housing was needed, whether multifamily housing, workforce housing, low-income housing, or aggregate shelter. He stated that at that time, the Town of Oro Valley had engaged in a market study, which the County sought to piggyback on with the same

contractor to use their talent and for a regional approach, but it ended up not being completed and they went in a different route. He added that the direction and the desire of the commission was to come up with something comprehensive and they did not believe that a comprehensive review of the entire region from a market standpoint existed, had not been able to find it or identify other partners that might be able to share information, which was the reason why they moved forward with this particular Request for Proposal (RFP). He stated that it took resources from the \$5 million allocation to invest in trying to come up with a product that would allow them to complete serious planning moving forward and until they collected data to inform those discussions, they would be laboring in the dark to a certain extent.

Supervisor Scott stated that the data set was needed so that the commission could move forward with its long-term strategic planning, intelligently and thoughtfully. He understood the concerns raised by Chair Grijalva and Supervisor Heinz about where \$425,000.00 would come from and asked if the Board acknowledged the need for the study, but did not want to use that fund, was it possible to use contingency or some other source.

Ms. Leshar stated that it could be taken from contingency, but reminded the Board that contingency was at about \$600,000.00, they had added to it in the last year and were currently at \$4.6 million for the entire year compared to the prior year's \$25 million that had been spent.

Chair Grijalva stated that contingency was low and she could not support using it, but if the money was not allocated for affordable housing and it was known that the need was great, she did not feel comfortable with the timing and understood the need to have information in order to make better decisions, especially considering the position the County was in financially and with contingency being tight. She stated that at this point, they were not trying to leverage the \$5 million into larger amounts of money to be able to fund a comprehensive study for this housing market study and project would generate. She stated that they would have information on things, that if resources were available, they would be able to do, but they did not have the resources right now and she would rather put the money towards projects.

Supervisor Christy agreed with Chair Grijalva on why staff could not do this in-house, and pointed out there were renewals for this contract that totaled up to \$2 million. He stated that he could not support the item and asked why the commission had taken so long to procure the study.

Ms. Leshar responded that when the commission was formed, they identified what it was they wanted in a study, then it went into the Procurement process, which had taken a period of time.

Dr. Garcia clarified that the renewal language was standard renewal language included in contracts and the intent of the scope of work was for one-year and when the commission coalesced around the desirability of pursuing this study, they tried to come up with ways that were expedient and piggyback on other contracts and

contractors that were available in the area. He stated that they did not enter into the development of a normal Procurement process until later than they had anticipated, which took the standard amount of time for them to work with the Procurement team to move this forward. He stated that it was a complicated contract, and the RFP was informed by much of the discussion of the commission and other external stakeholders with a desire to maximize the final work product. He added that if they invested this much money, it should be something that could be used by a lot of different stakeholders.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he thought this was approved from Fiscal Year '23 funds that were carried forward funds, not reducing the \$5 million. He stated that the commission would be able to allocate moving forward, and either way, felt there needed to be a baseline.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the item. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Chair Grijalva and Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

Chair Grijalva hoped everyone understood the position that she was in, she was not opposed to receiving the information, but the money was precious.

33. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 3, to provide for computer software and related items, extend contract term to 9/30/24 and amend contractual language, no cost (MA-PO-24-78) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

REAL PROPERTY

34. GAC Star Valley, L.L.C., to provide a Development Agreement for the Acquisition of Off-Site Rights-of-Way for Public Improvements, \$1,500.00 revenue (CT2400000015)

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

35. Robert Parra and Trudy F. Parra, to provide for Sale Agreement No. Sale-129 and Special Warranty Deed for 23,976 sf parcel of land with a 1,588 sf single-family residence, located at 5001 N. Kolb Road, Lot 53 Quail Canyon, Tax Parcel No. 114-13-0700, contract amount \$389,000.00 revenue (CT2400000016)

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

TRANSPORTATION

36. State of Arizona, Department of Transportation, to provide for a Certification Acceptance Agreement, no cost/5 year term (SC2400002234)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

37. **Acceptance - Behavioral Health**

Arizona Office of the Attorney General, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Opioid Abatement Funding - Coordinated Reentry Planning Services Programs and extend grant term to 12/31/25, no cost (GA-BH-70326)

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

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

Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for the Pima County Countywide Rapid Rehousing Program, \$1,000,000.00/2 year term (G-CR-73048)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the difference between Rapid Rehousing and Emergency Eviction Legal Services (EELS) Program.

Francisco Garcia, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated that Rapid Rehousing was a federal term that referred to a range of interventions undertaken to prevent homelessness. He explained that the EELS Program was a term of the Board of Supervisors for a specific program created during the pandemic, with a specific fund source to intervene when individuals faced eviction. He stated that one was a federal term and the other was a County program.

Supervisor Christy stated that he understood the terminology, but asked about the difference of the programs.

Dr. Garcia explained that the (EELS) Program specifically helped individuals at the point of eviction by providing legal assistance, legal counsel and navigation services. He stated that the program served a relatively small number of people, as the County did not experience a high volume of evictions. He explained that many individuals who were houseless were never evicted and it was due to other factors.

He stated that under Rapid Rehousing the County did not provide any legal support or navigation services.

Supervisor Christy asked if there was more involved in the EELS Program than in Rapid Rehousing.

Dr. Garcia stated that the EELS Program was very specific and focused on legal navigation throughout the legal process, whereas Rapid Rehousing encompassed a much broader array of services that did not include any legal representation or support.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification how it was determined whether the homeless individuals they targeted were in unincorporated Pima County or in other jurisdictions.

Dr. Garcia responded that staff could compile a comprehensive response to address that and provide it to the Board. He explained that when staff received calls from places like Green Valley, they used these dollars to resource those calls based on the location of the problem. He stated that they based the assignments on the origin of complaints and inquiries. He stated that the distinction was important because separate funds were allocated specifically to the City of Tucson for individuals within its jurisdictional boundaries, which was why they made that differentiation.

Supervisor Christy reiterated that it depended on where the issue originated and asked if homeless individuals reported themselves being homeless in Green Valley, or if another entity in that area reported the presence of homeless individuals.

Dr. Garcia responded both and that referrals came from social service agencies and partners, such as the Green Valley Assistance League, as well as from individuals who self-referred themselves through the website when faced with housing-related issues.

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

39. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

City of Tucson, to provide for the County Summer Youth Program, \$200,000.00 (G-CR-72791)

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

40. Acceptance - County Attorney

Arizona Automobile Theft Authority, to provide for the FY25 Vertical Prosecution Grant Agreement, \$358,832.00 (G-PCA-72953)

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

41. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

U.S. Department of Justice and Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the Drug, Gang and Violent Crime Control FY2025 Award, DC-25-030, \$269,394.00/\$89,798.01 General Fund match (G-PCA-72955)

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

42. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

U.S. Department of Justice and Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the FY2025 Crime Victim Compensation Program Grant, \$458,858.07 (G-PCA-72933)

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

43. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

U.S. Department of Treasury and Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the FY2025 Crime Victim Compensation Program Grant, \$463,858.07 (G-PCA-72954)

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

44. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

United States Environmental Protection Agency, to provide for Section 103 of the Clean Air Act, \$80,870.00 (G-DE-70920)

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

45. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program and amend scope of work, \$691,245.00/\$69,124.50 Health Special Revenue Fund match (GA-HD-70311)

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 a significant portion of the grant was focused on prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery on COVID-19, as outlined in the scope of work, and it specified that the funds were intended for a public health workforce to support COVID-19 initiatives. He assumed the pandemic was over and if that was the case, questioned why there was a need to expand the workforce for COVID-19 prevention and response. He noted that in the grant, under Section 2.2.2.1., it specifically mentioned hiring additional public health staff to sustain ongoing COVID-19 response and recovery initiatives. He expressed his opposition to the item.

Francisco Garcia, M.D., M.P.H., Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that the language in the grant was boilerplate language that came from federal pass-through dollars from the Centers for Disease Control to the Arizona Department of Health Services. He stated that the boilerplate language was directly taken from the originating federal document. He clarified that no additional staff would be hired for COVID-19, the funds would be used to support existing personnel in the public health emergency preparedness component of the Health Department, which allowed the County to be prepared to respond to infectious diseases and other threats.

Supervisor Christy expressed his concern with that language in the grant and that phrasing stipulated more individuals would be hired to fight COVID-19.

Chair Grijalva stated the importance for emergency preparedness and it had been evident that the County was not prepared when the pandemic hit.

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

46. Acceptance – Health

State of Arizona, Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Arizona Parents Commission on Drug Education and Prevention Grant Program and amend grant language, \$199,765.00 (GA-HD-70317)

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

47. Acceptance – Health

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for sexually transmitted infection investigations and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-69948)

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

48. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Bobby Retz, Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, September 15, 2024 at 8:45 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and approve the permit. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Scott encouraged his colleagues to oppose this permit. He explained that Westin La Paloma continued to persist in offering fireworks shows to commercial gatherings. He stated that this permit was for an event by the Radiation Research Group, a professional convention, which would include 703 aerial effects, 253 aerial shells, and 450 basin effects for the course of 8 to 10 minutes. He stated that Westin La Paloma was located in his district and his office received complaints every time they had a fireworks show. He stated that they were an outlier when compared with other resorts in other areas of the County. He stated that he had been told that they were going to tell their business office and sales staff to no longer offer these packages to conventions like the Radiation Research Group, but that clearly was not a commitment they had followed up on.

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

49. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 299805, Amy S. Nations, Arizona Wine Collective, 4280 N. Campbell Avenue, Suite No. 155, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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.

50. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 299773, Amy S. Nations, Arizona Wine Collective, 4280 N. Campbell Avenue, Suite No. 155, Tucson, Series 7, Beer and Wine 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.

51. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 295119, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Red Roof Inn, 3704 E. Irvington Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control. No vote was taken at the time.

Supervisor Christy indicated that the Red Roof Inn had been involved with housing, quarantining, and sequestering migrants who were sick and questioned the decision to serve alcohol at the facility. He asked how it aligned with efforts to manage sick migrants and could create additional problems if the current practices were still in effect.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the Red Roof Inn had a liquor license and this was to change ownership.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was an ongoing liquor license.

Ms. Leshar responded that was her understanding.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that the liquor license was for a Series 10, which pertained to retail. He stated that involved offering individual-sized beer cans or bottles, and small wine bottles for purchase by hotel guests, but did not operate as a standard bar where guests could sit down and get served drinks that were poured from a tap. He expressed his support for this item.

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

52. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 297966, Felicity Ann Heron, Chevron Market, 3780 W. Magee Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

53. Pima County's Welcome Center on Drexel Road

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Drexel Road Welcome Center operations, including but not limited to the new lead shelter services provider. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that on June 28th Green Valley News made a statement on an article, and quoted it as follows: "The County followed the announcement with its own reporting, that privately owned AMI Expeditionary Health Care would fill CCS management." He stated that AMI's website showed them as a Limited Liability Corporation (L.L.C.) and AMI had to go through the Procurement process, which stipulated that they were not an agency or non-governmental organization (NGO). He asked if AMI was a for-profit entity and that the ongoing contract with AMI had been modified several times, but the contract was never been brought before the Board for approval and requested an explanation of the Procurement process for this contract.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, confirmed that AMI was a for-profit entity and stated that in early 2023 there was a significant surge in the population of individuals that stayed at the facilities, and the County was unable to provide the necessary staff under the current contract with Catholic Community Services (CCS), so there was an emergency Procurement to provide additional services and at that time, AMI began to contract with the County to provide those additional support services.

Supervisor Christy stated that the amount the County spent for AMI to complete the work was somewhere around \$2.7 million, granted, AMI was not a tenant of the County, and they may be providing a service, however, CCS was not a County tenant either, yet they were not charged rent due to the mission of asylum seeker activities. He asked how they squared not charging an NGO rent and also not charging a for-profit company rent. He stated that AMI was not an agency or NGO, rather they were a for-profit company which fully differentiated itself from any type of coalition or partnership with the County.

Ms. Leshner stated that the County contracted with AMI to provide a service, which was for staff services within that entity and were not leasing the facility to them. She stated that the County owned the facility and were providing a variety of services for which the County was the pass through as the fiscal agent and there was no rent to be charged to either entity because they were simply contracting with the County to provide those staffing services.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was policy that there would be exceptions of charging or not charging rent to for-profit agencies, like AMI. He stated that he had a list of County-owned properties being rented and leased by for-profit companies, like the Metro Tucson Convention and Business Center, Worldview Enterprises, and Banner Health. He recalled that he had asked former County Administrator Huckelberry if CCS was going to rent the former juvenile detention center, which became the Casa Alitas lease and was told no, that they were a charity and would not even be charged for utilities. He asked if there were other companies occupying Pima County properties that were not paying rent.

Ms. Leshar responded that the distinction was whether or not the County had a building to rent that facility to a for-profit organization, to provide a separate and unique service, such as like a World View or Southern New Hampshire University. She stated that in this case, they were not renting a facility to AMI, rather were contracting with them to provide a service within a building that they were not leasing.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County paid for the utilities at the Drexel facility.

Ms. Leshar responded the County received federal dollars that paid for that.

Supervisor Christy asked how not charging AMI, a for-profit company, rent at Drexel Road was not a violation of the State of Arizona's gift clause.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the County was not renting a facility to that organization and were not receiving a benefit in any way. She stated they contracted with them to provide a service, which was to provide staffing services and helping to operate a function within that organization. She stated they did not provide them a building and had not given them any undue gift, which would be a violation of the gift clause. She stated that under a very clear Procurement process, they procured a company to provide a service, and they continued to provide that service. She added that absent CCS, they expanded the number of individuals they had on staff. She stated for example, there was a report given by the Director of Emergency Management, which provided a weekly report to the Board and to many other people, that included the number of individuals AMI had on staff, which had been provided for a couple of years. She stated that the number was increasing and so they contracted with them to provide additional staff at that facility to provide a service, for which the County procured and was being compensated.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was established that AMI was not an NGO.

Ms. Leshar responded that they were a for-profit company, which was clear in all the documents in their procurement contracts.

Supervisor Christy stated there was a differentiation with other for-profit companies that had to pay rent and lease, and AMI was another that was providing a service contract as an NGO, but they were a for-profit company and were not paying rent.

Ms. Leshar stated that the analogy was closer to what was done earlier when they contracted with a cleaning service, the building was not rented out to that company, rather they provided a cleaning service or potentially a security service and they did not lease the building. She stated the County owned a building and with the Drexel facility, they contracted with a company that happened to be a for-profit company, similar to the County's cleaning companies and they came into the facility to provide a service for which they were being compensated. She added there were organizations such as Southern New Hampshire University, World View, Banner,

and Visit Tucson, that the County leased a facility to and they provided a service within that, but this was not to lease a building, rather to contract for a service.

Chair Grijalva stated that the analogy of the cleaning service made sense to her.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was a County-owned building that the County did not occupy, but was occupied by AMI.

Ms. Leshner responded the County contracted with AMI to provide a specific service.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Jenifer Darland, Director, Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions, stated that since the inception of this office six months ago, they had paid attention to the ongoing challenges associated with meeting the needs of people in the community experiencing homelessness. She provided a slideshow presentation and stated that it was a high-level summary of the point-in-time counts conducted in January 2023. She noted that there was not necessarily a substantial decrease, but there was also not a substantial increase in the level of homelessness since the pandemic. She stated that as the events happening in the community propelled and exacerbated housing insecurity, the first experience in Pima County that was remarkable was following the Great Recession of 2008. She stated the County had a noticeable increase in homelessness in the years that followed the Great Recession in 2009 and 2010, with the highest estimate being around 3,600 individuals. She stated that similarly, the next crisis that was seen in the community was the pandemic, which had a slight uptick, but that it had not returned to what was seen in 2010. She stated there actually had been a leveling off that had to do with the lessons learned through the pandemic and partnerships forged during the pandemic with community and jurisdictional partners. She stated that there was also the creation of the Pima County Emergency Eviction Legal Services Program (EELS), which was a significant investment that the County made in providing preventative investment in mitigating and interrupting what could be first time or returns to homelessness by meeting people at the time and potential loss of housing. She stated that it went a long way to ensure that even when people needed to be rehoused and could not quite overcome the challenges with that, there was a mediation that could prevent an eviction on their record, which could also make it very difficult for them to find housing. She stated that if the program existed back in 2010, the County might have been faced with a different outcome. She stated that over the course of the establishment of the office, they had taken a great deal of time to meet with a number of County employees and departments in the human service and the community sector, including the Health Department, Library, Community and Workforce Development (CWD), Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) and the Justice Services Department. She stated that it was important to

note that these services were available to all County constituents, but since the pandemic, a number of these departments had been working independently in their own efforts to help folks experiencing housing instability or homelessness and in strong collaboration with one another. She stated that the Library had worked with CWD for a once a week Resource Navigator to navigate individuals to employment and/or shelter, the Health Department worked with CWD for employment resources and housing, and with PACC to ensure that folks experiencing homelessness also had access to resources and items to help keep their family intact. She stated that they also had a significant amount of strength in the Public Works Department through the Parks and Recreation Department, the Flood Control District and the Conservation Lands and Resources Department. She added that a number of staff were in the field daily encountering individuals that were experiencing homelessness, and that was why they were so proud of Karina Yslas, who worked in strong partnership in the field with the Public Works teams and in direct contact on a daily basis with the City of Tucson (COT) Encampment assessors and their Public Works teams. She added that they all knew each other very well and were all collectively at the County and community partner level, problem solving daily and trying to find items and resources that could help address people's housing crisis. She stated that the number of individuals served in programming specifically for individuals experiencing homelessness for the programs were aligned with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, specifically for homeless individuals, were estimates per household and per unique enrollments in each of the programs. She stated that she stipulated that because it did not indicate how many individual programs a family might be eligible for and that each of the enrollments represented the engagement and the services provided chiefly out of the Homeless Services Division of CWD. She stated that the Coordinated Entry Housing Enrollments were households that had contacted County staff and identified themselves as experiencing homelessness and needing housing assistance. She added that an enrollment or an assessment for housing was not an immediate placement to housing, but it was an inquiry that was entered into the Homeless Management Information System, and it went through a process of where these individuals, based off of the criteria or the vulnerability of the household, could be matched to a housing provider. She stated that it could be a County, COT or other nonprofit agency program that administered housing for people experiencing homelessness. She stated that the Encampment and Street Outreach Programs stats were specific to those engagements that were led by Ms. Yslas, as well as other street outreach workers, engaged in that effort which were exclusive to programs operated by the County. She stated that the Homeless Prevention Hotline, excluding the EELS Program, was for people that called and might not have known about EELS or might not have qualified. She stated that these were people that needed to meet the HUD Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) income standard of 30% Average Median Income, to be income eligible, which was very low, and it was challenging to ensure they did not already experience homelessness by the time they were contacted. She explained that emergency shelter was funded by HUD ESG funds that the County received on a formula basis annually. She stated that the shelters had a limited number of days that folks could stay, and that the data point shown on the slide indicated the number of households

enrolled in shelter, either directly administered by Pima County or partially funded by the County's share of ESG funds. She stated that housing for individuals, families and youth was funded by HUD Continuum of Care dollars, as well as Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) and the number of individuals shown enrolled in those housing programs were for competitive grant awards. She stated that the overall investment was for eviction prevention and homeless prevention and those estimated funds were funds they competed for, so for instance, the EELS Programming was competitive grants made up of the Arizona Department of Economic Security and the Arizona Department of Housing, which was a multi-year award. She added that as competitive as the statewide grant programs had been, EELS had become a standard for the State and a program that did not exist before the pandemic, which had proven to have successful outcomes. She stated the program served approximately 1,500 households to date, 80% of which resided in COT, in multifamily buildings. She stated that Outside Agency was the investment that the Board made in General Fund dollars to support nonprofit agencies that also shared this work and engaged with individuals experiencing homelessness or at-risk and included shelter services for elder care in the community. She stated that CWD Navigators were a resource that evolved out of the crisis by ensuring that County constituents and the unincorporated areas of the County could readily identify and access information and resources to help mitigate their housing crisis, including employment, enrollment in rent and utility assistance, either through the Eviction Prevention Program or through the Community Action Agency, which was administered through the Pima County Community Assistance Division, a regional recognized Community Action Agency for years that administered hundreds of thousands of dollars in rent and utility assistance on an annual basis for low-income households. She added that the HUD funded programming, Continuum of Care funding for Rapid Rehousing, ESG and HOPWA were also competitive, which meant the County received a portion of federal funding based off data that aligned to census tract data and area of need. She stated that Encampment Cleanup was going to be the General Fund contribution to mitigate for the impacts of homelessness on parcels of property that were owned or maintained by Pima County. She added that the Transition Center was American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funded and allowed them to provide street outreach and engage and encourage people to accept shelter or even housing. She stated that if an individual had an active warrant, which was a significant barrier for them to obtain housing, allowed them to help squash their warrant. She stated that staff at the Transition Center were very knowledgeable and had the experience to assist these folks in navigating through the legal system and get them back on track to housing stability. She stated that another effort was to reengage with the shelter community and providers to hear some of the challenges they had been experiencing in trying to provide services to people experiencing homelessness. She stated that it was often heard from staff when asked about the over/under of people who were willing to go into shelter was about 8 for every 10 individuals encountered and 2 out of the 10 accepted shelter. She stated the reasons for that were different and complex and it depended on the individual, so they needed to better understand what the shelter setting was and how the County could more aptly partner for really comprehensive partnership including hearing their challenges and ways to work together

collaboratively to ensure people got into shelter. She stated that conversations had started on an ongoing basis through partnership with Mari Vasquez, the City/County Multi-Agency Coordinator. She stated conversations were in the early stages, but they were encouraged and looked forward to further discussion. She stated that for the next three years the USHUD would provide technical assistance to help operationalize a three-year funding opportunity that moved people straight from encampments into housing, which had been underway since after the first of the year and currently over 60 households have been housed. She stated that they were learning a great deal about this model, which was a five-team strategy being Navigation; Unit Acquisition, which meant to identify a property willing to work with an individual on a housing subsidy; Stabilization, which meant a multi-disciplinary team that kept people stably housed; a data team; and a communication team. She stated that one of challenges was to ensure that they could provide significant stabilization support after they were moved in, which meant anything from connecting people to employment, enrolling them into treatment programs or any other types of support that would allow them to be stably housed. She stated that this was where the County's ability as a robust portfolio of programs already had and had seen it play out with the intra-County collaboration and the Human Services Departments and over time could potentially support the agencies in the future and stabilizing households after housing that connected them to the right resources at the right time. She stated that their Housing Case Managers, a number of them being the County's nonprofit partners, were amazing people, but they could only do so much, and this was where the expertise and the diverseness of the County's portfolio could be beneficial. She stated that the collaboration between Pima County and COT was born out of the pandemic and was a crisis that really compelled them to work together in strong partnership to move people experiencing homelessness straight into non-congregate shelter settings to mitigate the impacts of COVID-19 for a population of individuals that would be most susceptible to challenging medical complications, if exposed. She stated that they did not duplicate their efforts, rather they worked to problem solve in a real, genuine partnership by communicating daily with each other to ensure they were doing everything in their power to mitigate these challenges together.

Chair Grijalva referred to the slide that showed the investment and support information and noted the asterisk that indicated total estimates reflected multiyear awards. She asked if that could be quantified with how the County contributed annually and what period of time the numbers reflected. She stated she would like the same presentation to be provided at the COT Mayor and Council (M&C) meeting, and Ms. Vasquez could be a part of that presentation. She stated that the M&C received regular monthly updates, and she wanted to ensure everyone was clear on how the County approached it collaboratively and regionally. She stated that it would help to collaborate to ensure every dollar was stretched, because these were a finite number of resources, but also so that everyone was clear that there was no agency or organization that was on its own. She added that there might be some areas that the COT, County or other municipality that would do most of the work, but in other areas the work was happening from other places. She stated that a list could be provided for the Board that included more information on the specific

programs that the County was either the sole lead on or a partner, that way everyone would know how they worked together or to show how they could work better together. She stated that she had met with Administrator Leshner, the Mayor and the COT Manager, and they had a good discussion about ensuring transparency on what each did and acknowledged where energy needed to be focused. She added there was an opportunity for them to hit refresh with the two new Presiding Judges and to include them into conversations because the courts and law enforcement needed to understand what the limitations were. She stated that Ms. Darland's team had done an amazing job, and COT had done the same and the problem was large, so they needed to figure out how they could work better together to do what was needed and know where it was that they were directing some efforts with gains not being seen, however gains were being seen in other places. She reiterated her request for a deeper dive on some of the financials, so that when they indicated that the County contributed \$13.6 million, and what it meant over the last two to three years, it was quantified. She stated those specific conversations were happening at M&C meetings and she wanted to ensure that the County could indicate how they helped and requested that they also quantified staff time dedicated to these efforts.

Supervisor Lee stated that she had mentioned to Ms. Darland and Administrator Leshner that the County's website did not have one place where someone could see what the different programs and services were for the County, COT and all the nonprofits in it together, and she had suggested that Ms. Vasquez could be responsible for ensuring that these were added. She stated that there was a St. Francis Men's Shelter at Sacred Heart Church, but she was unaware of it so how could anyone else find out about it or find out if there were vacancies. She stated there should be a central clearinghouse that included the COT, Pima County and nonprofit programs that wished to be part of that.

Supervisor Scott requested clarification whether the Board would receive these updates monthly at meetings that had no financial update.

Ms. Leshner responded in the affirmative and it would be included on the agenda for the first meeting of every month.

Supervisor Scott referred to Ms. Darland's Memorandum of July 9, 2024, which she recapped the five priorities for the office and as outlined in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 22, 2023, regarding the fourth priority to develop a strategic and continuous improvement plan with the goal of ensuring County programming was responsive, sustainable and equitably distributed. He then read from the July 9th memorandum as follows: "Central to an effective plan is ensuring the approach and delivery of programming is efficient, thoughtfully leveraged, and whenever possible, avoids duplication. This will require the development of a strategy that is informed by input from staff. Designed and intra County outreach, navigation, service delivery and or protocol responses, as well as be informed by and or aligned with regional efforts. Progress to date is still too early, with substantive detail expected following upcoming meetings among staff

and departmental leaders.” He asked if the Board could expect an update on Priority No. 4 at the September 3, 2024 meeting.

Ms. Darland responded that all County teams identified in Administrative Procedure 50-2, the protocol for responding to encampments on County owned and maintained properties, of over 30 individuals were invited for a very robust conversation and they were currently synthesizing the feedback received and hoped to have an update on that progress at the September meeting. She stated that it might not be an entirely fleshed out plan, but it would be a comprehensive update as to what was learned from that discussion and any sort of identified next steps and strategies.

Supervisor Scott asked about the alignment with regional efforts.

Ms. Darland replied that alignment with regional efforts was operational, and they knew about what the COT did and Ms. Vasquez worked on both, so they were both in it. She stated that they were writing things down to ensure folks in the field understood the processes, which was something they could provide an update on since it was a draft and had not been finalized. She added they could introduce it to folks in the field to receive their feedback on any clarifications that might need to be addressed.

Supervisor Scott requested the updates be aligned with the five priorities since they were the priorities outlined when the office was formed and that future updates be aligned with those five priorities, which would be helpful in terms of showing how they moved forward with the stated priorities. He referred to the fifth priority regarding developing means of tracking the efficacy of County assistance programs and working with departments and partner agencies and governments to develop attainable measures of success. He then read from the July 9th memorandum as follows: “As with Priority No. 4, activities are still too early for specific accomplishments. Nevertheless, the overarching goal remains to provide a robust framework that not only addresses immediate housing needs while also supporting long-term community solutions through coordinated efforts with regional partners and stakeholders, informed by mutually agreed upon goals, supported by data.” He stated that the public and certainly the 2,000 people dealing with homelessness throughout the community, in terms of that robust framework that addressed immediate housing needs and those long-term services that helped to get to the root causes of housing, was something that they sought in terms of what the County would do with working with its jurisdictional partners.

Ms. Darland responded that data was one of the areas identified through the conversation with staff by identifying the correct data points and the programming and what it was they wanted for a measurable goal. She stated that would continue along with respect to the public input, finding appropriate places to enter and query on what other items the public would be interested in learning.

Supervisor Scott stated on June 26th, he had a conversation with Ms. Darland and Administrator Leshner, in which she had made reference to the Housing Central Command structure, and he had asked how they could build on the framework built that was placed by the HUD Housing Central Command to enhance regional collaboration. He stated that she had indicated that three of the five teams were doing well, but that stabilization was the biggest area of concern, that COT's Continuum of Care staff had convened the teams twice a week to discuss what was or was not working. He asked if the twice a week meetings were still happening and if stabilization was still the biggest area of concern.

Ms. Darland replied that meetings still occurred and had evolved in nature, it was identifying opportunities to evaluate what was known so far and what they learned in this effort, and building it as they went along. She stated that it involved taking a moment to understand what the pain points were after housing, and for people experiencing homelessness for a period of time, stabilization took more time, but for others it was going to be immediate, and they could gain employment. She stated it would also involve listening to the case managers that were working on those plans and identifying opportunities of what additional resources could be brought into that partnership. She stated that there was an opportunity for County programming and information to also be able to flex into that space, because it could teach them about what they already did through this entire process, but it continued to be a challenge because there was a myriad of issues that would compel someone to fall into homelessness, and resolving it would take a long concerted effort and a lot of commitment from the people around them while they were getting restabilized.

Supervisor Scott stated that they had also discussed how fruitful it had been to have conversations with shelter providers, and that they were prioritizing people over placements and that the Coordinated Entry Committee for the Continuum of Care, their work was crucial in terms of continuing that prioritization described by Ms. Darland. He asked if there would be any follow up with the shelters and Continuum of Care staff and that there was going to be staffing changes in mid-July, that would help to hasten that.

Ms. Darland explained that the Continuum of Care was a volunteer body of individuals that participated according to HUD guidelines, and with respect to the Coordinated Entry Committee and all of the work of County partners in that space, were paying attention and there was a lot of active conversations about how to move the needle forward, there was active movement and active consideration as to what would improve the pace of housing there. She stated that even though through this experimental HUD technical assistance it showed for the rest of the community what had always been a pain point for housing providers. She stated the things learned here would help it inform the broader conversation and was something they continued to advocate for, to help inform the decision making at those committee levels.

Supervisor Scott stated that on July 9th there was a meeting of a group, which was headed up by Director Pereira, to follow up with a predominant concern of how to intervene with people that refused shelter and services. He noted that Ms. Darland had indicated the need to know what the service gaps were so they could help those folks in that very challenging segment of the homeless population and also deal with the effects, occasionally, of their behavior on the public. He asked about the outcome of that meeting and if there was any progress.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that they started that meeting to inventory across the system of where there were intercepts for substance use disorder and support and it was inventoried across a spectrum of places where there were touch points with individuals experiencing some substance use disorder within the criminal justice system. He stated that at that particular stage they mapped where those touch points could be and began to identify where there were potential gaps in that particular continuum of services. He stated that the group was due for another meeting, but it had not been scheduled yet, and it would require them to think about where those gaps were and what services to provide. He stated this also related to Supervisor Lee's concern and recommendation, to explore this with legislative action and that there was a nexus between those two conversations that were happening.

Supervisor Scott reiterated his request that future updates be aligned with the five priorities, and that the homeless population and the public at large, the provision of that robust framework that addressed immediate housing needs and supported long-term community solutions, was exactly the kind of sustained effort that he thought people were expecting from them.

Ms. Leshar stated that she had issued a report that was an update regarding the work that all the staff had been doing on an inventory related to the criminal justice system, which included a summary of what all the six interceptors were under that similar report and it related back to what was heard today, so their hope was that the Board would start to see all these intersects between the different programs, but more information on what those six buckets were and the conversation was detailed in the report.

Supervisor Heinz stated that if he was read the HUD statistics correctly, a fourth of those interviewed and enrolled in coordinated entry ended up in shelter or housing of some kind and that suggested to him that perhaps there was not adequate affordable housing units. He asked if this was a concern and wanted to know more about the experience for an individual that enrolled in coordinated entry in terms of the next steps that they were faced with.

Ms. Darland explained that when someone came in for coordinated entry, they did not always request shelter or housing right away, and whether or not they got placed in housing was determined upon their eligibility. She stated that they found that people in crisis or falling behind on their rent, or that were about to be evicted, would phone in for a coordinated entry assessment for housing, expecting to be

homeless. She stated that at the time they got matched to housing with a provider was when their eligibility for homeless households would be verified and getting into shelter did not have a requirement, the numbers only reflected the number of individuals that had access to shelter funded in whole or part by Pima County or by share of federal funding, which was why it was an estimated number. She added that it did not necessarily de-duplicate from that population that had been served in which or all of the programs and it did not tell the story. She stated that they might be housed or sheltered elsewhere with another provider, but they did not have access to that data, they were only programs that were directly contracted with Pima County and administered by the County. She explained that enrollment and coordinated entry was a process by which someone called and indicated that they were experiencing homelessness, they answered a series of questions that identified the length of homelessness, as well as any other complexity that added to their housing crisis, such as fleeing domestic violence, a medical condition or a diagnosis, and that referral was placed into a system which sent out households for placement to agencies that had requested those referrals, but those referrals were only sent out based off of the prioritization or the score that the household earned by the crisis they were having. She reiterated it was a process by which they applied for housing, assistance, or resources, however, how quickly they were connected to housing depended upon the severity of their housing crisis, which was a prioritization that was set at the local level with the Continuum of Care and their determination was based off of a type of criteria, and if they would be next to be served in housing.

Supervisor Lee stated that the Board had a meeting that the Crime Free Coalition had brought forward and there was legislation, a Senate bill that went through the prior year that considered involuntary commitment for substance abuse, however it had not passed. She stated that during that time, there was a handout that showed 36 states had some sort of legislation that did not allow for involuntary commitment for substance abuse and Arizona did not. She stated that she had met with Dr. Margie Balfour and Dr. Ford of the Crisis Response Center, and they indicated the majority of the individuals that came into the center were experiencing homelessness, and it did not surprise her because they were, unfortunately, seen every day in the street. She stated that one of the criteria in the 36 states was harm to self or inability to care for themselves. She added that this was seen in so many of the individuals who were homeless and on the streets. She hoped they could work with other stakeholders around the State because it was a State issue, to explore best practices on those 36 states to determine what could be done to move forward with something that allowed the ability to have involuntary commitment. She stated that she understood there was a whole other side with the issue with some that were raised around 50's and 60's when pendulum swung all over the place, but there needed to be a happy medium and it would be beneficial to this whole issue of homelessness to really explore something that could help. She stated that currently at the CRC people stayed for 72 hours and when released it was unknown what their success rate was until they came back, and it would be wonderful to have this continuum of care that circled back with those folks.

Ms. Leshar explained that this was a part of Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 36, which was part of the County's Legislative Plan. She stated that it was something they would be taken forward to the County Supervisors Association for state review, but this issue had come up for multiple years, and the State used Paula Perrera as their expert to look at how they could evaluate and implement Title 36 in different permutations around the State, and they had a couple of opportunities to keep an eye on it.

Chair Grijalva reiterated that this was a really comprehensive issue that was going to require everyone to put their hands together and work collaboratively, and it was not for any one person, City or County municipality to undertake by themselves.

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

55. Proposed Settlement for the Broadway-Pantano Landfill

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement relating to the Broadway-Pantano Landfill.

At the request of the County Attorney's Office and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

56. 2024 General Election - School District Cancellation

Staff requests cancellation of the uncontested school district governing board position for the General Election on November 5, 2024 and appointment of the candidate who filed the required nominating petitions or nomination papers.

Pima Community College District No. 1 - 1 Position - Nicole Barraza (2-Year Term)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on this item.)

57. CONSENT CALENDAR

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. Cooperative Extension Board

- Appointment of Maria Messenger, to fill a vacancy created by Alana Mozar. Term expiration: 6/30/26. (Committee recommendation)
- Reappointments of Justin Byrd, Amanda Ruboyianes, Jacqueline Bruhn and Micaela K. McGibbon. Term expirations: 6/30/26. (Committee recommendations)

2. Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee

Ratification of Town of Sahuarita Reappointment: Robert Smith. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (Jurisdictional recommendation)

3. Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee

Reappointment of Lara Iacobucci Paris. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (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

- John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, August 20, 2024.
- Clinton Kuntz, El Rio Health Center Foundation, Inc., The Westin La Paloma Resort & Spa, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, October 26, 2024.

5. Temporary Extension

- 14103017, Kevin Arnold Kramber, AMVETS Post 770, 3015 S. Kinney Road, Tucson, November 9, 2024.
- 07100326, Thomas Robert Aguilera, Tucson Hop Shop, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, Tucson, September 28 and December 7, 2024.

ELECTIONS

6. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Michael Ebert-098-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Michael Reed-013-REP, Harvey Ross-046-REP, Sergei Tarter-109-REP, Juliann Huerstel-117-REP, Vincent Giacomelli-158-REP, Richard Johnson-158-REP, Claudia Fleming-209-REP, Caroline Ulbricht-239-REP

TREASURER

7. Request to Waive Interest

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$610.45.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

8. Minutes: May 21, 2024
Warrants: July, 2024

* * *

58. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK