

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, January 9, 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. Slyvia M. Lee, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:28 a.m.

1. **Contract**

Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for construction and maintenance of Santa Cruz River Path CalPortland Segment, Flood Control Non-Bond Projects Fund, total contract amount \$670,000.00/2 year term (\$335,000.00 per year) (CT-FC-24-283)

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

2. **Contract**

Borderland Construction Company, Inc., to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services for Santa Cruz Cortaro Narrows Training Structures (55CNTS), Flood Control Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$122,554.83/2 year term (CT-FC-24-229)
Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

3. **Contract**

Green Valley Council, Inc., d.b.a. Green Valley Council, Amendment No. 3, to provide for Green Valley Council Services, extend contract term to 12/31/24 and amend contractual language, Health (27.1%); DOT (25.7%), RWRD (17.1%); DEQ (12.9%); DSD (8.6%); and RFCD Tax Levy (8.6%) Funds, contract amount \$87,500.00 (CT-PW-21-202)

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

4. Request for Drainage Easement

Staff recommends approval of a drainage easement to Alvernon & I-10 Partners, L.L.C., for property located along the alignment of the Julian Wash Drainageway lying within Section 4, T15S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, \$500.00 revenue. (District 2)

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

5. Request for Electric Easement

Staff recommends approval of an electric easement to Tucson Electric Power Company for Dish Wireless, for property located along Walker Road, lying within Section 6, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, \$500.00 revenue. (District 3)

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

6. Request for Electric Easement

Staff recommends approval of an electric easement to Tucson Electric Power Company for Dish Wireless, for property located along the Rillito Regional Park, lying within Section 19, T13S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, \$2,100.00 revenue. (District 1)

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

7. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISOR' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 9, 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 Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:28 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 Alejandra Acedo, Municipal Intern, City of Tucson, and Masters of Public Administration Student.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. OATH OF OFFICE

Oath of Office for Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, District 3 Board of Supervisors' appointment, to be administered by Brooke Lee Harris, daughter, and Dr. Roger Anderson, partner.

The Oath of Office for Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, District 3 Supervisor, was administered by Brooke Lee Harris, her daughter and Dr. Roger Anderson, her partner.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

5. Board of Supervisors Procedural Organization

Selection of the Chair, Vice Chair and Acting Chair.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to retain Adelita S. Grijalva as Chair for 2024.

It was then moved by Supervisor Lee, seconded by Chair Grijalva and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to retain Rex Scott as Vice Chair for 2024.

6. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Acknowledgement of Linda Mayro, Director, Office of Sustainability & Conservation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that Ms. Mayro began her career with the County as their first archeologist and did great work with historical properties around the community. She presented her with a Philabaum and thanked her for all the work and dedicated services she provided to Pima County.

Linda Mayro thanked Ms. Leshar and the Board and stated that she enjoyed working for Pima County.

No Board action was taken

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Marion Chandler addressed the Board regarding issues she faced during her employment with the County. She stated that she had recently retired after 16 years of employment with the Human Resources (HR) Department and only now felt comfortable to speak about the issues. She explained that after April 2018, there was a decline in the support she received and believed it was due to the fear of the new HR Director. She stated that the Director gave out misinformation and contradictory information and removed any employees that were educated on the rules, policies and procedures within the County.

Robert Reus stated that he would be advocating his sales and property tax reform program while he ran for the District 1 Supervisor position. He expressed concern regarding an increase in property tax that forced struggling individuals and families out of their homes and he would use 75% of the new revenue stream to reduce property taxes in the County.

Laurie Moore expressed concern regarding migrant children that came into the County and into the school systems and there was not enough bilingual teachers to help them, which led to an education decline in the classrooms. She urged parents to attend classes with their children.

Sharon Greene expressed concerns regarding Covid-19 vaccine deaths.

Susan Kelly addressed the Board regarding the County's failures with money and the need to close the border. She explained that individuals that crossed the border were a diversity of races and ethnicities and urged the Board to stop funding immigrants and to start funding the homeless populations.

Daniel Butierez addressed the Board regarding his false imprisonment and tax money being used to violate his rights. He explained that an attorney notified him that if he continued asking for the things that were stolen from him the courts could take everything else that he had built for himself.

Cory Stephens expressed concern regarding open borders and asylees acquiring sponsors that were not legal citizens. She indicated that immigrants were provided with more services than homeless individuals.

Don Hayles addressed the Board regarding his opposition to Minute Item No. 8 and urged the Board to vote against the item. He spoke about Minute Item No. 18 and requested a list of medications and supplies that would be purchased. He also spoke about Minute Item No. 27 and urged the Board to restrict spending to legal immigrants.

Jim McFadzean stated that the Freedom Works Pack was going to seat a Republican Board for the upcoming election and expressed his concerns regarding Minute Item Nos. 22 and 27 and the way the County was using their budget for these items.

Dave Smith addressed the Board about overspending within the County, that the Board had not acknowledged the day to be Law Enforcement Recognition Day and expressed concern about "black swan events" that could take place in the County.

De Well Duhr addressed the Board in regards to acquiring a monument for the deaths caused by the Covid-19 vaccine. He also expressed concern with Minute Item Nos. 22 and 27 and that taxpayer money was being used to fund the illegal immigrant invasion.

* * *

Supervisor Scott directed the County Administrator to follow up with Mr. Butierez and to provide him with contact information for staff at Superior Court who could provide answers to his questions.

Supervisor Lee requested the County Administrator follow up with Ms. Chandler regarding the issues she spoke about to the Board.

* * *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8. The Board of Supervisors on December 5, 2023, continued the following:

Outside Agency Program Funding

Discussion/Direction/Action: Increasing the overall budget for the Outside Agency Program social services category grants (CWD grants) for FY25 from the current \$3.26M to \$3.86M, an increase of \$600,000.00. As we know, the pandemic exacerbated long-standing inequalities in American society, including here in Pima County. Those who experienced the greatest hardship in terms of housing, employment, food insecurity and more, were those who already were among the most vulnerable in our community. The needs, therefore, for additional support for our community members who are low-income, elderly, disabled, and the young, are greater than ever before. The Outside Agency Program is funded through the General Fund. All programs are administered by nonprofit partners across the county through a competitive RFP process. (District 2)

At the request of Supervisor Heinz and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 23, 2024.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

9. **Amended Meeting Time for the January 23, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Propose to amend the Board of Supervisors January 23, 2024 Meeting start time from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., to allow for Board members and staff to attend the Governor's State of the State.

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

Supervisor Scott thanked the Southern Arizona Leadership Council and the Tucson Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for their joint sponsorship of the event and explained it was an annual event where the Governor provided a summarized version of the State of the State Address and was appropriate for the second largest County in Arizona. He stated that the previous year Board members arrived late due to a scheduled Board meeting. He added that this year's event would start at 10:00 a.m. and approval of the time change would allow Board members and staff the opportunity to attend the event.

Supervisor Christy commented that the Board should maintain the scheduled time of the meeting and that historically the Board had not accommodated their meetings for the State of the State Address. He expressed that a change in the meeting time would set a bad precedent and urged Board members to keep their established historical precedent related starting time at 9:00 a.m.

Supervisor Heinz agreed with Supervisor Christy and stated that he was previously scheduled to work at the hospital and had arranged his work schedule weeks ahead of time to ensure that he could attend Board meetings and was unsure how much of the meeting he could participate in if there was a change in the the meeting time.

Chair Grijalva apologized for not considering Supervisor Heinz's hospital work schedule and felt that it made an impact, and that it was important for Board members to be present at meetings as much as possible.

Supervisor Christy asked if someone could speak with the Governor about amending the time of the event.

Chair Grijalva replied that she was approached by Mr. Elias from the Tucson Hispanic Chamber of Commerce requesting the Board attend the event and she conveyed to him that she was unsure of that possibility due to the scheduled Board meeting and the time it took to conclude meetings.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the length of the State of the State Address.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it was an hour.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the Board meeting could start at 10:00 a.m. instead of 9:00 a.m.

Chair Grijalva clarified that the event started at 10:00 a.m.

Supervisor Christy asked if meals would be served.

Chair Grijalva did not believe a meal would be served, but she did not have enough details to confirm. She asked for clarification whether Supervisor Heinz' workday started at 1:00 p.m.

Supervisor Heinz responded in the affirmative and clarified that he had some capacity to start later, but did not want to be too late.

Chair Grijalva stated that she would like to attend the Address but it was more important to be present at Board meetings.

Supervisor Scott withdrew his second to the motion. He stated that he wanted to be respectful of Supervisor Heinz's hospital work schedule and he would also like to attend the event, but the concern raised by Supervisor Heinz was more significant.

The motion died for lack of a second.

10. **Remembrance of January 8, 2011**

Remembrance of the tragic events of January 8, 2011, and Pima County's commitment to a permanent Memorial - where citizens gather to reflect and remember; a place where citizens engage and exercise their most basic fundamental rights; and a place where we honor those that gave their lives in pursuit of a better democracy. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott stated it was a privilege to join the public at the January 8th Memorial to take part in the solemn ceremony honoring those who lost their lives that day, who were injured and who responded to the call to service. He acknowledged and thanked Patricia Maisch, a District 1 resident and someone that was a heroin on January 8, 2011. He explained that she contacted his office to inquire about what the County could do to ensure that the events of January 8, 2011, were appropriately remembered this year. He stated that her caring leadership resulted in the previous day's events. He also thanked County Administration for aiding in gathering the community together in memory and recognition of the January 8, 2011 events. He stated that although the tragic shooting event took place in District 1, it affected each of the Board members and residents in the County. He stated that Nancy Bowman, a nurse who tended to the injuries of those shot that day told the public at yesterday's ceremony that each of them remembered the events of that day in different ways and for different reasons. He stated that former Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, who was grievously wounded that day was asked to share a few words and she responded, "fight, fight, fight." He explained that many of the people in the community and across the country stood with Gabby in the courageous fight against gun violence, which had been the cause of her life since that day. He stated that no matter how the January 8, 2011, event were remembered the most important and fitting thing the County could do was remember and treasure the memories of those that were lost that day. He stated that he was asked by a former colleague to speak at a ceremony last month honoring her son and others who lost their lives defending our nation. He stated that he had read the following verse at the ceremony, and felt it was also appropriate to read on this day, *"At the rising sun and at its going down; we remember them. At the blowing of the wind and the chill of winter; we remember them. At the opening of buds and in the rebirth of spring; we remember them. At the blueness of the skies and the warmth of summer; we remember them. At the beginning of the year and when it ends; we remember them. As long as we live, they too will live, for they now are a part of us as we remember them. When we are weary and in need of strength; we remember them. When we are lost and sick at heart; we remember them. When we have joy, we crave to share; we remember them. When we have decisions that are difficult to make; we remember them. When we have achievements that are based on theirs; we remember them. As long as we live, they too will live, for they are now a part of us, as we remember them."*

A slideshow was then played to honor the victims of the tragic events of January 8, 2011.

Patricia Maisch, District 1 Constituent, thanked Supervisor Scott for accepting her request and for the touching slideshow and poem. She explained that memories were all that people had to remember their loved ones. She stated that in addition to the memorial that was built, the County was instrumental in creating the Gabe Zimmerman Trailhead off of Marsh Station Road, as well as the Christina Taylor Green Park on the Loop. She explained that most of those memorials were donated by individuals in the County. She stated that the reason she requested the event be remembered every year was because of the amount of gun violence there was in the country. She explained that over 100 people every day died by gun, and two-thirds of those deaths were by suicide and anything could be done to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people than that should be done. She explained that if an extreme order of protection was made then the tragic events would have been avoided, the parents, Pima Community College, and the military knew that the shooter had issues, which could not be legally addressed. She stated that Gabby Giffords was the leader of the organization Giffords and she and her speech therapist Fabby were the leaders of Friends of Aphasia that served the community which were the outcomes of the tragic event. She stated that she hoped the Right-to-Life groups would consider the lives beyond the womb and thought that the 100 people that died daily should be a part of the Right-to-Life movement and hoped they would join them in supporting common sense regulations.

Chair Grijalva offered a moment of silence. She stated that the January 8, 2011, memorial was the perfect place to sit and reflect because it was peaceful. She stated that it was nice to see everyone in attendance and to have the opportunity to be in community with people that were directly affected by the tragic events.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

11. Revisions to Personnel Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Personnel Policy No. 8-117, Pay Plan.

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

Supervisor Christy referred to the background material and stated that there was a discrepancy between information on the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report (BOSAIR) and the policy.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, requested clarification on Supervisor Christy's reference.

Supervisor Christy explained that the BOSAIR stated that only department heads were permitted to hire up to the 1st quartile, but the policy document stated that Elected Officials and department heads were permitted. He stated that

Administration had everything on a flow chart from below the County Administrator but nothing above that. He explained that he did not want the County Administrator dictating to Elected Officials what they could pay their staff so long as the Elected Officials maintained it within their budget. He clarified that the way it was worded in the County Personnel Policies was that the County Administrator could determine what Board Supervisors could pay their staff.

Chair Grijalva stated she was still unclear what Supervisor Christy was referring to.

Supervisor Christy clarified that he was reading from the discussion section of the BOSAIR and from page two, item "D" of the policy.

Ms. Leshar explained that the Human Resources (HR) Rules for the County applied to the other Elected Officials of the County because they were still apart of the HR process and had afforded the flexibility in what they wanted to pay, but it was up to the Board to set the budget and the pay categories and classifications. She stated that those Elected Officials were still under the HR Rules and were therefore proposed to be under the personnel policy. She stated that if the distinction was to amend the item to include "other than the Board of Supervisors" than that could be done.

Supervisor Christy stated that was what he desired and asked if it could be accommodated.

Ms. Leshar responded that would be an amendment from the Board.

Chair Grijalva stated she had an issue with an amendment and stated that Board members had always been able to set staff salaries as long as it was within their budget. She explained that her concern was that if Elected Officials were added it would apply to all Elected Officials who worked with the County Administrator on their budgets, and she preferred that to continue. She stated that the only time she thought an exception could be made was when paperwork needed to be signed for their own staff and currently each Board Supervisor had been doing that.

Supervisor Christy commented that each District had a budget, and it did not matter what was paid to staff, it was up to the Board Supervisor to decide their pay, not the County Administrator.

Chair Grijalva stated that she did not think Supervisor Christy's concern would impact that piece of the policy, rather it was to identify the basic pay plan for the County.

Supervisor Christy asked if Board Supervisors could be segregated from the policy and what was the purpose of the item.

Chair Grijalva asked for clarification of the changes. She stated there was a summary of the revisions available.

Ms. Leshar explained that the County had gone through a significant amendment to the classification/compensation system and employees had been appropriately aligned within each department. She stated that the prior policies indicated people could be hired at different rates, i.e. 2.5%, and it would be at odds with the classification/compensation system. She explained that the intention of the item was to hire at the first quartile rather than at the 2.5% and that the policy would mirror the work that had been done within the classification/compensation study and would allow for a smoother process to get people into the system without causing complications or anomalies.

Chair Grijalva stated this ensured that years from now the Board would not be in a position where they had people doing the same job and getting paid very differently with the same level of experience.

Ms. Leshar replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Christy stated he had no problem with the policy being changed to that extent, however, his issue was that he did not want it to be under the auspices of the County Administrator to determine what he paid his staff as long as it was kept within his budget. He asked if there was a way to segregate the issue so that it did not affect the Board Supervisors.

Chair Grijalva indicated that she did not see a concern that would require the Board to change the pay plan policy.

Supervisor Christy replied that there was a discrepancy with the background materials.

Ms. Leshar clarified that what was written on the BOSAIR was generally a summary and it did not specifically list Elected Officials, but the proposed policy document did list Elected Officials, which would rule over the language on the BOSAIR.

Chair Grijalva commented that the BOSAIR included language for the meeting, but the policy document was what was being proposed.

Supervisor Christy asked if the item could be continued until clarification was provided as to the inclusion of the wordage for Board Supervisors.

Chair Grijalva stated that she was comfortable moving forward with the proposed policy revision, as presented.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Scott to remove Elected Officials from the policy revision and segregate the Board Supervisors from the plan, as stated in the BOSAIR. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked what the ramifications would be if the item was continued to get further clarification on the concerns addressed by Supervisor Christy.

Ms. Leshar responded that she did not anticipate any issues arising if the item was continued. She stated that the question would be what needed to be clarified and whether it was for Elected Officials and department heads or was it Elected Officials, not including the members of the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Christy responded that all Elected Officials should be removed from the plan.

Chair Grijalva disagreed and stated that in the discussion item it stated, "permit Board of Supervisors and County Administrator to provide pay adjustments in certain circumstances." She explained that she did not share the same concern and believed that the discussion was not about all County employees, just about the ones that were in the Board members' offices.

Supervisor Christy stated that all Elected Officials should have the right to set their own priorities.

Chair Grijalva stated that for a countywide system, the Elected Officials worked with the County Administrator in order to set policies and ensure there was equity across different departments and that was important, and she did not want that to change.

Ms. Leshar stated that the Elected Officials included Justices of the Peace, Constables, and Judges and County Administration worked closely with them to provide flexibility, but they were also County employees that had to adhere to HR rules and policies and by eliminating all Elected Officials from being able to hire at any point would quickly cause budget ramifications.

Chair Grijalva stated that the substitute motion was to postpone the item and asked for clarification.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, clarified that the substitute motion was to amend the language by removing the Elected Officials and segregating Department Director language from the policy.

Supervisor Christy clarified that his substitute motion was to remove all Elected Officials.

Supervisor Scott asked whether Supervisor Christy's concern was not with all Elected Officials, but with the Board.

Supervisor Christy replied that it was an example of utilizing it, but clarified that all Elected Officials had their own budgets and control over what they paid their staff and for HR or the Administration to determine what a duly Elected Official, including the Board of Supervisors, was going to pay their staff was wrong. He explained that when viewing the flow chart there were separate and duly elected that were not under their control other than their budget and as long as they stayed within their budgets there would be no problem. He stated there should not be any opportunity

for County Administration to go into an Elected Official's department to determine whether pay plans were right or wrong according to equity.

Ms. Leshner explained that another concern was that some departments of Elected Officials had requested to use vacancy savings for salary increases. She stated that vacancy savings were one-time monies that went away by the end of the year and by increasing salaries there would be a significantly different budget that would come back to the Board and the Board would be put in a position to cut salaries or individuals. She stated for clarity that County Administration was not directing anyone what to pay their staff, and the policy indicated that if an Elected Official wanted to increase the salary for individuals outside of the first quartile, it would require permission and approval. She explained that all Elected Officials had been part of the classification/compensation analysis and currently had those positions within their departments which were consistent with the change. She explained that there were concerns because there had not been a system review since 1957 which resulted in anomalies, and they wanted to ensure that people who were providing the same function in one department was earning somewhere near or the same of what another individual in the same job was doing in a different place in the County and the request was to have everyone in the same guidelines.

Chair Grijalva asked whether the Board wanted to proceed with a vote on the substitute motion or if Supervisor Scott wanted to withdraw his second to the substitute motion, which would then die for lack of a second and they would go back to the original motion.

Supervisor Scott withdrew his second to the substitute motion. He explained there were significant ramifications when comparing Board Supervisors with staff of three or four people and other Elected Officials who had hundreds of staff. He stated that the ramifications of Supervisor Christy's proposal and what that could mean for the budget and staffing were significant.

Chair Grijalva stated that the Board was back to the original motion. She asked for clarification on the maker and seconder of the motion.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that the original motion was made by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott for approval of the item.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Capital Program Office

12. Green Valley Council, Inc., d.b.a. Green Valley Council, Amendment No. 3, to provide for Green Valley Council Services, extend contract term to 12/31/24 and amend contractual language, Health (27.1%); DOT (25.7%), RWRD (17.1%); DEQ (12.9%); DSD (8.6%); and RFCD Tax Levy (8.6%) Funds, contract amount \$87,500.00 (CT-PW-21-202)

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

County Attorney

13. Community Bridges, Inc., to provide for implementation of the Felony Drug Diversion Program by ensuring access to needs-based drug treatment and wraparound recovery support services, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission Pre-Trial Intervention Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-PCA-24-233)

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

Chair Grijalva requested the County Attorney's Office provide clarification as to why the program was not being done in-house within the County.

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

14. Kodi Foundation, Amendment No. 3, to provide for implementation of enhancements in support of the Pima County Drug Court Program Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP) and the Specialty Courts Initiative, extend contract term to 9/30/24, amend contractual language and scope of services, DTAP-SAMHSA Fund, contract amount \$5,000.00 (CT-PCA-23-124)

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

Facilities Management

15. Downtown Tucson Partnership, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Downtown Tucson Partnership lease agreement located at 220 N. Stone Avenue, Suite 170, extend contract term to 1/17/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-FM-21-51)

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

16. Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, to provide a lease agreement located at 3950 S. Country Club Road, Suite 330, contract amount \$1,311,319.24 revenue/5 year term (CTN-FM-24-30)

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

Health

17. Arizona Superior Court in Pima County, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Supportive Treatment and Engagement Programs Peer Support Specialist, extend contract term to 12/19/24 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-HD-23-82)

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

Procurement

18. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-20-56, Amendment No. 8, McKesson Medical-Surgical Government Solutions, L.L.C., to provide for medical supplies. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$200,000.00 from \$800,000.00 to \$1,000,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$3,550,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Health.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the Pima County Health Department (PCHD) wanted \$200,000.00 to purchase vaccines that the Federal Government no longer provided for free, to continue to dispense vaccines. He stated that it may be a moot point because the item was backdated to December 8, 2023, but funds were added before it came to the Board to avoid disruption in medical services. He stated that it appeared that PCHD had already been provided with the amount requested in General Fund money without Board approval. He asked why the money was added without Board approval, why it was structured this way knowing that the money would end in December and how often did this type of request happen. He added that the Board of Supervisor Agenda Item Report (BOSAIR) indicated the increase was needed due to the commercialization of vaccines and increases in the clinical service delivery that required the purchasing of the additional medication and supplies.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated that both Minute Item Nos. 18 and 19 involved a series of contracts that allowed the County to purchase a range of vaccines, which included Pneumococcal, Meningococcus, Varicella and COVID. He explained that the dollars used for the provision for the actual purchase of the vaccine came from a variety of sources, some of them being General Fund dollars, but many were funded through the Arizona Department of Health Service (ADHS) and ADHS gave the money to the County's program and then the County would purchase the vaccine product or the other medical products. He stated that some of the other medical products purchased were antibiotics, syringes and a variety of drugs and devices for the care that was provided in County facilities.

Supervisor Christy asked if PCHD had already received the money to accommodate the purchases.

Dr. Garcia responded that the funding for the actual purchase of a variety of supplies that the County used for the purposes of family planning, maternal and child health programs and vaccine programs had continuously come to the Board for approval as part of a series of grants and contracts accepted by the Board. He stated that this was a master agreement with two suppliers, McKesson and Cardinal Pharmaceuticals, which were the funds used to purchase supplies from the master agreement that would come from a range of different sources.

Supervisor Christy questioned what it meant by “commercialization” as indicated on the BOSAIR.

Dr. Garcia explained that it was specific to the set of vaccines that were provided for free by the federal government and when they were authorized to be licensed and the Food and Drug Administration authorized the entry of those products into the retail market, the price controls that had been placed on those items evaporated and the federal subsidies and federal controls on the price of those items evaporated and most of those drugs increased in price.

Supervisor Christy commented that the BOSAIR indicated the funding was retroactive.

Dr. Garcia replied that the master agreements for Minute Item Nos. 18 and 19 were retroactive to December 18, 2023, but the funding for those had already been approved.

Chair Grijalva amended her motion to include the approval of Minute Item No. 19.

Supervisor Scott agreed to the amendment, as the seconder to the motion.

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

19. Cardinal Health, Inc., d.b.a. Cardinal Health 110, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for pharmaceuticals and amend contractual language, Health Department Operations Fund, contract amount \$2,000,000.00 (MA-PO-20-113) Administering Department: Health

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 18, for discussion and action on this item.)

20. Toshiba America Business Solutions, Inc., d.b.a. Toshiba Business Solutions, to provide for multi-functional leased devices and maintenance, Various Funds, contract amount \$6,750,000.00 (MA-PO-24-45) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

21. Arizona Recreation Design, Inc., to provide for Ebonee Marie, Sunset Pointe and Picture Rocks playground systems, Capital Improvement Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$449,684.96 (PO-PO-24-14) Administering Department: Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

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

22. Jot Redroof Properties, L.L.C. and Jot Comfort Properties, L.L.C., Amendment No. 11, to provide for hotel shelter services, extend contract term to 6/18/24, amend contractual language and scope of services, Immigrant Emergency Care and Testing Grant Fund, contract amount \$2,750,000.00 (MA-PO-22-30) Administering Department: Health

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 funding source listed was new and asked whether the funding was from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Border Patrol or from other source.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded the funding was from the State of Arizona Department of Health Services.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was a new funding source.

Ms. Leshar responded that the County had received a variety of funds from the State of Arizona Health Department and clarified that it was a new funding source directed to the lease of Jot Properties.

Supervisor Christy referred to the background material and asked for a definition of "respiratory season".

Ms. Leshar responded that part of this was regarding congregate and non-congregate shelters for individuals with health concerns to ensure they were not placed with the general population.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, explained that respiratory season started in August and ended in late May.

Supervisor Scott asked if the County had made use of funds from the State Department of Health Services in this instance because the County had rapidly drawn down federal funds.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott commented that he had consistently voted for the County to use federal funds that were provided to border counties to deal with the ramifications of federal immigration policy in terms of the shelter and care of legally processed asylum seekers. He stated that he would continue to do that because he felt the federal government should ensure that border counties, such as Pima County, were not expending their own funds, however, if at the end of February the funds ran out, he would no longer vote to use General Fund monies to pay for the consequences of federal immigration policy. He stated that if the loss of funds caused street releases in the City of Tucson, which had not happened, unlike places like El Paso, San Diego and San Antonio, because of the work led by the County; and the Board started to receive complaints from constituents, he would ask them to direct their calls to Capitol Hill and the White House. He expressed his appreciation for Ms. Leshar's comments in the media regarding how important it was that the federal funds should not end and Chair Grijalva's efforts to visit Washington, D.C. on the same points. He felt it was important to publicly state that he would not vote to use General Fund monies for purposes that the federal government should be supporting. He hoped that members of Congress, members of the Administration and also the President from the previous Administration would hear this because it was not something that Pima County should be asking local taxpayers to take on.

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

23. High Point Networks, L.L.C., to provide for Mitel VoIP system maintenance and support, Telecom Services Fund, contract amount \$1,375,000.00 (MA-PO-24-76)
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

24. Pima County Parklands Foundation, to provide an acquisition agreement and warranty deed for 311.56 acres of fee land, Tax Parcel Nos. 306-01-002B, 003B, 005E, 005F and 005G, CPR.OSAD23-PAYGO Fund, Open Space Capital Projects, contract amount \$1,068,000.00 (CT-RPS-24-291)

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

Jeffrey Teplitsky, Director, Real Property Services, provided a brief slideshow presentation and stated that this was for the acquisition of 311 acres of vacant land adjacent to Colossal Cave Mountain Park located on pristine land and would add to the purpose of the County's mandate to acquire open space land property as requested by the Board and the funds that were generously provided by the Board. He explained that the Parklands Foundation currently owned the property, and the County would acquire it in all cash for \$1,068,000.00. He stated that along with the

land came almost 7,000 acres of grazing lease currently controlled by Parklands, but the County would acquire it for no cost and assigned as part of the acquisition. He referred to the slideshow and stated it showed what the County was acquiring, which included 311 acres and 6,936 acres of grazing lease and reiterated it would be assigned to the County as part of the acquisition. He showed pictures of the topography and its steepness of area including an old derelict property that had no value which would be taken down and also showed pictures of the wildlife in the area.

Supervisor Christy asked how the Parklands Foundation originally acquired the property and when, who or what was the Parklands Foundation, why was the Parklands Foundation mailing address the same as the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation (NRPR) Department, and inquired about the funding source of Parklands. He stated their 990 form was pulled and much of their funding came from District 4, the Anza Trail, memorial benches, southeast shooting range, NRPR facilities and Canoa Ranch. He questioned why these specific funding sources in their 990 form were listed and what had the Parklands Foundation done with 7,000 acres of grazing lease. He stated there were many issues with the Parklands Foundation and the relationship with NRPR and was concerned with how the money was filtered through to purchase the property initially. He asked that if it was closely tied with NRPR, why would the County pay over a million dollars for the land. He stated that he did not want to put anyone on the spot with his extensive questions and suggested the item be continued to the next Board meeting unless the questions could be answered at this time.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that her office would provide an in-depth report on the Parklands Foundation. She asked whether there were any concerns that might arise with the closure of the property if the Board continued the item to January 23, 2024.

Mr. Teplitsky responded no and that the County was contractually bound to acquire the property and believed it could be extended if needed. He stated that he could not answer all of Supervisor Christy's questions and was not aware of Parkland's status, but they were a 501(c)(3), non-profit organization. He stated that he was unsure how they came to acquire the property or what funds they used to acquire the property and surmised that when they acquired the property, the grazing lease was part of it at that time.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was 7,000 acres.

Mr. Teplitsky replied affirmatively, but clarified that he had surmised the information and was unsure if its accuracy.

Ms. Leshar stated that she would provide a full report to the Board.

Chair Grijalva asked why it mattered how Parklands acquired the property. She stated that she was unaware how long Parklands had the property, but regardless of how they acquired it, they were willing to sell it to the County.

Supervisor Christy stated the County would be paying a million dollars for this property, and it would be from PAYGO Open Space Capital Projects Fund, which had always been a red flag for him because of PAYGO. He asked why the County was utilizing PAYGO to buy open space, it was unknown who Pima County Parklands Foundation was and that was the reason he wanted a more in-depth explanation about the Parklands Foundation and reiterated wanting to know what their stream of revenue was, how they acquired the property, and how they received the 7,000 acres of grazing lease.

Ms. Leshner clarified that it was known who the foundation was and that due to the various questions she felt they could be better answered in a memorandum.

Supervisor Christy asked if a motion needed to be made to continue the item.

Chair Grijalva answered that she felt comfortable moving forward with this item and then receiving the information afterwards, as her vote would not change with the additional information.

Supervisor Christy stated that his district was possessive of the Colossal Cave area, and believed that if he acted on their behalf in a manner that did not receive all the information would have justifiable ramifications and was a matter of his due diligence and fiduciary responsibility. He stated that he should ask these questions and receive the answers before the Board voted on it.

Chair Grijalva understood Supervisor Christy's concerns and asked whether the questions were provided to Ms. Leshner ahead of the Board meeting.

Supervisor Christy confirmed that he had not provided his questions ahead of time.

Chair Grijalva explained that it would be beneficial to provide the questions before the meeting as opposed to continuing the item. She explained that having Pima County better protect this area would be appreciated by District 4 constituents.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Lee to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 23, 2024, and to direct staff to provide answers to all of the questions from Supervisors in the form of one memorandum. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva thanked staff for bringing the item to the Board and for all of their hard work.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

25. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 1, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the continuum of care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2023 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), \$421,492.00/\$105,373.00 General Fund match (GTAW 24-88)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the grant was for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and there was a General Fund match of over \$100,000.00. He asked if this was more money for something that had previously been approved by the Board.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative and that the HMIS had been in the County for at least 15 years.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the last time the Board approved acquisition money.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that it was last approved as part of the Community Workforce Development budget and it was one of the items that was part of that master budget.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the uses of the database.

Ms. Leshar responded that through HUD, the federal government provided continuity of care and through the program each jurisdiction had a designee that provided the continuity of care that dealt with homeless housing programs. She stated that each of those then had a HMIS system, it was not unique to Pima County and was part of the HUD Continuity of Care System nationally and what it did in the County was ensured individuals who were homeless or could potentially become homeless were connected with services and housing in the community.

Dr. Garcia concurred with Ms. Leshar and stated that the HMIS was the bean counting system that was commonly operated by all Continuity of Care across the country. He explained that it was what HUD expected in terms of how the County could account for the individuals that were serviced through the variety of agencies across the community both operated by government, as well as non-government. He stated that all those agencies provided information into the HMIS system and then that system was used to look at outcomes and see how these various agencies and programs were performing. He explained that it was used by the federal government in order to know if the County was doing a good job.

Supervisor Christy inquired about metrics.

Dr. Garcia responded that there were a variety of metrics involved and the metrics were particular to each of the individual programs. He stated that for instance, rapid rehousing had different metrics than the metrics used for encampment assessments. He explained that there was a broad portfolio of housing and homeless related services being conducted by a variety of partner agencies, as well as the County. He stated that staff could provide the Board with an update, as needed.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 2, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Renewal Grant Agreement for Fiscal Year 2023-2026 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$1,425,283.00/3 year term (GTAW 24-90)

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

27. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for immigrant emergency care and testing and amend grant language, \$1,764,999.96 (GTAM 24-41)

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

28. **Acceptance - Health**

Center for Disease Control and Prevention, to provide for the PimaREACH Coalition: restoring cultures of health among Native American and Hispanic/Latinx communities in Pima County, AZ, \$539,256.00 (GTAW 24-91)

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

29. **Acceptance - Justice Services**

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Safety and Justice Challenge Focused Racial Equity Cohort, extend grant term to 6/30/24 and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 24-36)

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

30. Acceptance - Public Defense Services

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 15, to provide for the Title IV-E Foster Care Matching Funds Project and amend grant language, \$392,929.48 (GTAM 24-40)

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

Supervisor Christy referenced the background material which listed the grant as retroactive with a disbursement date of November 24, 2023 and the first available Board meeting date as January 9, 2024. He asked if the funds had been received on November 24th and questioned the timeframe that it was submitted to the Board for consideration.

Chair Grijalva asked if the disbursement date was when the federal foster care matching funds released the funding or when it was received by the County.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it was when they released the funds.

Chair Grijalva commented that the County might not have received the funds at that time.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had several meetings before January 9, 2024.

Chair Grijalva explained that was why she asked that question because if the funds were disbursed on November 24th, it did not necessarily mean the County received the funds on that date.

Ms. Leshar responded that the item was brought to the Board for consideration once all the required signatures were received and she could gather information on what caused the delay in paperwork.

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

31. Acceptance - Sheriff

Department of Justice, to provide for the BJA FY2023 State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, \$159,865.00 (GTAW 24-80)

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 it seemed convoluted with all the dates listed for each step that was completed for the grant.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that the County was dealing with the federal government and that was why it specified each time the document went through another step in the process and included the date of submission to Administration for approval and placement on an agenda for consideration by the Board.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

32. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Bobby Retz, Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, January 29, 2024 at 7:30 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 Lee to close the public hearing and approve the permit. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that several meetings prior staff from the Rural Metro Fire Department and Westin La Paloma Resort had attended to answer questions. He explained that one of Westin La Paloma staff members told the Board that they had a very aggressive Sales Department that worked to sell fireworks shows. He pointed out that page nine of the background material showed the show being sold by Westin La Paloma staff. He reminded the public that the last time a fireworks permit was before the Board for consideration, he told Westin La Paloma staff that he would no longer vote for approval of permits for shows at their resort that were done purely for commercial purposes. He understood firework shows for the 4th of July and other events of note, but the Westin La Paloma stood out amongst all the other resorts in terms of selling fireworks shows. He stated that his office received many phone calls and emails regarding complaints about these shows and the disturbance that they caused for neighbors surrounding that resort and there were many residential properties in that area. He told his constituents that he would oppose these moving forward and urged his colleagues to join him in opposition to the permit request. He felt this was an instance where individuals wanted to find out if you meant what you said and he would vote against it.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Heinz and Scott voted "Nay."

33. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, February 22, 2024 at 8:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

34. Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

P23CA00005, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY TUCSON, INC. - W. MARS STREET PLAN AMENDMENT

Habitat for Humanity Tucson, Inc., represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., requests a comprehensive plan amendment of approximately 4.77 acres described as Mars Landing Lots 1-14, Common Area "A" and Common Area "B" (Map 63039), from the Medium Low Intensity Urban (MLIU) to the Medium Intensity Urban (MIU) land use designation. The site is located on the north side of W. Mars street, approximately 600 feet east of N. Camino de Oeste, in Section 31, T12S, R13E, in the Tortolita Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 7-0 (Commissioners Maese, Matter and Gungle were absent) to recommend APPROVAL TO MEDIUM INTENSITY URBAN. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

Chair Grijalva asked whether this was the property that had come forward under the Affordable Housing GAP funding program.

Rory Juneman, Applicant Representative, Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., responded that he did not believe the property was funded by that program.

Chair Grijalva stated that she asked because she thought it was the same property that was previously approved, but it may have been under the Habitat for Humanity umbrella.

Charlie Buchanan, Chief Executive Officer, Habitat for Humanity, explained that Habitat for Humanity submitted two projects for proposal of GAP financing with the County and this project was selected, but they had yet to receive a formal notification which was currently in the dispute period and confirmed they won the grant award with the highest scoring proposal.

Chair Grijalva explained that the process seemed backwards because it was brought to the Board to be rezoned and would be brought back again if funding was approved. She asked if the Board approved the item, would it come back for other permits and requested an outline of that timeline.

Mr. Juneman stated that this property required an adjustment to the underlying comprehensive plan designation, and it needed to be done prior to rezoning. He explained that the current process was requesting a map change to move the project to a Medium Intensity Urban planning area in order to move forward with the

rezoning and if approved, would start the process over and would be brought back to the Board in four to six months to request approval for the rezoning.

Chair Grijalva stated that this was a plan amendment and based on approval it would come back to the Board for rezoning and then in theory the County could approve the GAP funding recommendations and approve this before the Board approved any rezoning. She stated that the process was disconnected, but understood the processes and she asked those questions due to the amendment of the designation.

Supervisor Lee requested a staff report.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services, stated that this property was already rezoned in 1998 from SR to CR-3 and that rezoning included an allowance of up to 15 units. He explained that in 2007, the then property owner took the time to engineer it and went through the platting process which was the final details of a development which was then approved by the Board in 2017 for 14 lots. He stated that thereafter, Habitat for Humanity acquired the property and was currently taking the precursor steps to a rezoning, but first had to amend the underlying comprehensive plan designation from CR-3 to CR-4 to be eligible for the rezoning. He explained that this was a request for a map amendment if the plan amendment was approved then the applicant would come back to the Board with more detailed plans, more public hearings, more public engagement and request a slight increase in the overall zoning from CR-3 to CR-4. He stated that they needed a few more units and envisioned a different product so instead of a freestanding single-family home, they explored the idea of potentially a series of duplexes that required the CR-4 zoning. He reiterated that the property was previously rezoned and staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of this request. He explained that some of the reasons for the staff recommendation was that this project was an infill project, it was surrounded by a similar density at this time and would be very compatible with the surrounding land uses and it was a slight increase of what they were trying to get to. He stated that they currently had an entitlement, and they could put up homes now, but they wanted to provide a few more.

It was moved by Supervisor Lee and seconded by Supervisor Scott, to close the public hearing and approve P23CA00005, subject to standard and special conditions. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Grijalva asked about the project's proximity to public transit.

Mr. Juneman responded that the project was about a quarter of a mile north of Ina Road and there were two transit stops on Ina Road.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, requested clarification whether there were standard and special conditions for the item.

Chair Grijalva replied negatively and clarified that it was for approval to Medium Intensity Urban.

Mr. Poirier concurred and stated that this item had no proposed conditions.

Ms. Manriquez asked if Supervisor Lee wanted to amend her motion and remove subject to standard and special conditions.

Supervisor Lee replied affirmatively.

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

35. **Hearing - Modification (Substantial Change) of Rezoning Conditions**

P15RZ00005, PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL PROPERTIES, L.L.P. - N. THORNYDALE ROAD REZONING
Fidelity National Title Agency, Inc., Tr 60466, et al., represented by Projects International, Inc., request a modification (substantial change) of Rezoning Conditions No. 1A and No. 2 (Parcel Codes 225-33-375A and 225-33-375B) to allow a 64-lot residential subdivision and amend the preliminary development plan for the proposed mix of uses. Condition No. 1A requires submittal of a development plan if determined necessary by the appropriate County agencies and Condition No. 2 requires "Adherence to the preliminary development plan as approved at public hearing". The 8.19 acre subject site is zoned CB-1 ® (Local Business - Restricted), located at the northwest corner of N. Thornydale Road and W. Cortaro Farms Road. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 7-0 (Commissioners Maese, Matter and Gungle were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

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

1. ~~The owner shall:~~
 - A. Submittal of a development plan or subdivision plat if determined necessary by the appropriate County agencies.
 - ~~B. Recording of the necessary development related covenants as determined appropriate by the various County agencies.~~
 - ~~C. Provision of development related assurances as required by the appropriate agencies.~~
 - ~~D. Prior to the preparation of the development related covenants and any required dedication, a title report (current to within 60 days) evidencing ownership of the property shall be submitted to the Development Services Department.~~
 - B. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Adherence to the revised preliminary development plan (Exhibit B) as approved at public hearing.
3. Transportation conditions:
 - A. The property is limited to 3 access points as depicted on the preliminary development plan.

- ~~B. The property owner / developer shall dedicate 45 feet of right-of-way for Cortaro Farms Road within six (6) months of Board of Supervisors approval.~~
 - ~~C. The property owner / developer shall dedicate 45 feet of right-of-way for Thornydale Road within six (6) months of Board of Supervisors approval.~~
 - ~~D. No building permit final inspections shall be approved or certificates of occupancy issued prior to completion of construction of the Thornydale Road and Cortaro Farms Road improvements, or entering into an acceptable Development Agreement with the Department of Transportation.~~
 - B. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Transportation with any subdivision plat or development plan submittal. Offsite improvements determined necessary as a result of the traffic impact study shall be provided by the property owner(s).
4. Flood Control conditions:
- A. First flush retention (retention of the first ½ inch of rainfall) shall be provided for all newly disturbed and impervious surfaces. This requirement shall be made a condition of the Site Construction Permit.
 - B. Post development floodplain and Pima County Regulated Riparian Habitat shall be contained in permanently protected on-site Natural Open Space identified for the rezoning site under Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System conservation guidelines and shall be identified on the development plan.
 - C. Water conservation measures identified in the Preliminary Integrated Water Management Plan shall be implemented with the development. Where necessary, some measures may also be required to be included in the project's CC&Rs and a Final Integrated Water Management Plan shall be submitted to the District for review and approval at the time of
 - D. Maintenance responsibility for the drainage infrastructure including the detention basins shall be determined prior to recordation of the replat of the proposed residential development for the commercial and residential portion of this project.
5. Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
- A. ~~The owner(s) / developer shall not construe no any action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development to provide sewer service to any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) / developer to that effect.~~
 - B. The owner(s) / developer shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) stating that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and / or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) / developer shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
 - C. The owner(s) / developer shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
 - D. The owner(s) / developer shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
 - E. The owner(s) / developer shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

F. The owner(s) / ~~developer~~ shall complete the construction of all necessary public and / or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system ~~is will be~~ permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

6. Environmental Planning conditions:

A. The property owner(s) / ~~developer~~ shall achieve compliance with the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System conservation guidelines by providing a minimum of 46 acres on-site as Natural Open Space (NOS). Prior to the approval of the Development Plan, the 46-acre on-site NOS will be permanently protected as natural open space by a separately recorded legal instrument acceptable to the Pima County Planning Official or their designee.

B. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) / ~~developer(s)~~ shall have a continuing responsibility to remove invasive non-native species from the property, including those below. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner. ~~Prior to issuance of the certificate of compliance, the owner(s) / developer(s) shall record a covenant, to run with the land, memorializing the terms of this condition.~~

Invasive Non-Native Plant Species Subject to Control:

Ailanthus altissima	Tree of Heaven
Alhagi pseudalhagi	Camelthorn
Arundo donax	Giant reed
Brassica tournefortii	Sahara mustard
Bromus rubens	Red brome
Bromus tectorum	Cheatgrass
Centaurea melitensis	Malta starthistle
Centaurea solstitialis	Yellow starthistle
Cortaderia spp.	Pampas grass
Cynodon dactylon	Bermuda grass (excluding sod hybrid)
Digitaria spp.	Crabgrass
Elaeagnus angustifolia	Russian olive
Eragrostis spp.	Lovegrass (excluding E. intermedia, plains lovegrass)
Melinis repens	Natal grass
Mesembryanthemum spp.	Iceplant
<u>Oncosiphon piluliferum</u>	<u>Stinknet</u>
Peganum harmala	African rue
Pennisetum ciliare	Buffelgrass
Pennisetum setaceum	Fountain grass
Rhus lancea	African sumac
Salsola spp.	Russian thistle
Schinus spp.	Pepper tree
Schismus arabicus	Arabian grass
Schismus barbatus	Mediterranean grass
Sorghum halepense	Johnson grass
Tamarix spp.	Tamarisk

C. The property owner(s) / ~~developer~~ shall provide safeguards for the natural open space parcel as follows:

- 1) Light standards shall be located and fixtures shall be oriented so as to allow no light scatter onto the adjacent open space parcel.
- 2) The western and northwestern boundary of the commercial development shall be buffered from the on-site natural open space. Buffering will employ techniques and materials suitable for mitigating noise and discouraging wildlife access to the commercial development; suitable buffering techniques

and materials may include, but are not limited to, structures, natural materials, wildlife-exclusionary fencing, or vegetative screening. Suitable buffering techniques and materials will be authorized by the Planning Official in consultation with the Office of Sustainability and Conservation prior to approval of the development plan.

7. Cultural Resources condition: Prior to ground modifying activities, an on-the-ground archaeological and historic sites survey shall be conducted on the subject property. A cultural resources mitigation plan for any identified archaeological and historic sites on the subject property shall be submitted at the time of, or prior to, the submittal of any tentative plan or development plan. All work shall be conducted by an archaeologist permitted by the Arizona State Museum, or a registered architect, as appropriate. Following rezoning approval, any subsequent development requiring a Type II grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with Pima County's cultural resources requirements under Chapter 18.81 of the Pima County Zoning Code.
8. The property owner shall execute and record the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act Prop 207 rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."
9. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.

Jim Portner, Applicant Representative, Projects International, Inc., provided a brief slideshow presentation and stated that the original rezoning was approved in 2015 and this request was for a modification to an already approved rezoning. He stated that zoning was in place but there was an issue of use of the property and in 2015 it encompassed about 55 acres, but through pre-submittal discussions with staff, the Coalition, the former County Administrator and District 1 Supervisor, it was decided that in the best interest of all concerned parties, the smartest approach would be to preserve as much of the site as possible in compliance with both the Conservation Land System (CLS) and also with the larger community conservation objectives. He explained that the majority of the parcel of about 45 acres was decided to be set aside and that had already been granted to Pima County and the County owned and managed that property. He stated that their project was to carve out at the immediate corner of the intersection, and it was slightly over 8 acres. He explained that they could have gone to 10 acres and still met the CLS guidelines for 80% preservation, but realized that 8 acres worked for the project and so the total conservation set aside was almost 85% of the original property. He explained that the proposal for their 8 acres was a complement of two uses, the northern area had 64 individual homes and then the southern area was three commercial pads, all of which had their access off of Cortaro Farms Road. He stated that everything was under construction, and they had gotten all of their plans approved, permits in place and the construction was proceeding. He clarified that they were not asking for approval of the uses listed, they were requesting approval of the area with the 64 rental homes, which had become popular and tenants wanted to purchase them for individual owned private residences. He stated that even though the homes were initially designed as rental home communities there were a couple of things that

differentiated these units from typical rental home projects. He explained that most rental home properties had on-street parking and a few covered parking spaces but with an apartment type feel. He stated that their project had no on-street parking, however it could be done and was allowed, each unit had an enclosed two-car garage which was more spacious than typical rental homes. He explained that people were interested and in the current market it had become more challenging for people to afford single family traditional larger homes on larger lots and were looking for other ways to get into the homeownership market. He reiterated that they had been approached with a request to sell the units and to do that they needed to ask for a subdivision plat. He stated that County staff was unable to complete a plat due to restrictions of an original rezoning condition that indicated no further lot splitting without approval by the Board of Supervisors. He stated that the applicant requested Board approval to allow them a subdivision plat that would then allow them in the future to offer these homes for sale. He clarified that the subdivision would not happen right away, they wanted the community to mature and let the landscaping mature and have a nice, finished look to it before the homes would be offered for sale.

Chair Grijalva asked whether the County-owned area adjacent to the property was designated as open space.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services, confirmed that the land was donated to the County as part of the original rezoning, and it was designated as open space.

Supervisor Lee asked about the approximate square footage of the homes and their cost.

Mr. Portner responded the square footage ranged from 1,500 square feet to 1,900 square feet. He stated that the cost was difficult to calculate due to the project not being completed for a few years. He stated that they might range from the mid to high \$200,000 price range, which would allow people that were trying to get into the market the ability to do so. He explained that those prices could increase due to increases in materials and labor, but that was the price range for the homes to sell.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P15RZ00005, subject to modified standard and special conditions.

36. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2024 - 1, P22RZ00011, Martinez Jose & Cordova Tonatazin - E. Catalina Highway Rezoning. Owner: Martinez Jose & Cordova Tonatazin CP/RS. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Christy seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

37. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 3, P17RZ00011, Tucson Mountain Ranch, L.L.C. - W. Valencia Road No. 2 Rezoning. Owner: Tucson Mountain Ranch, L.L.C. (District 5)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution.

38. Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 4, P23CA00002, SBH Sendero, L.P. - Repeal of Rezoning Policy RP-110 Ajo Highway / Valencia Road Plan Amendment. Owner: SBH Sendero, L.P. (District 5)

Chair Grijalva requested clarification on the repeal of rezoning policy.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services, explained that it was a repeal of a rezoning policy with a comprehensive plan and when the comprehensive plan amendment was originally approved there was a set of policies that listed requirements to be achieved. He stated the applicant later came back through the Commission and the Board and got permission to strike those requirements. He stated that the proposed resolution was simply memorializing a previous Board action. He stated that this was on south Ajo Highway and had been approved by the Board a few months prior. He explained that approval of the proposed resolution would enable the applicant to ask for changes to the existing zoning without the interference of the old policy.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution.

39. Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 5, P23CA00003, Thornydale Ranch, L.L.C. - N. Thornydale Road Plan Amendment. Owner: Thornydale Ranch, L.L.C. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Resolution.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

40. Southwest Border Executive Situational Report Presentation

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Pima County Office of Emergency Management's Southwest Border Executive Situational Report, for the period of December 21 to December 27, 2023, with the OEM and GMI Directors presenting. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy expressed his appreciation to the Office of Emergency Management staff for their weekly updates on the County Administrator's website, however, he noticed certain irregularities within the update that had caused confusion. He provided an example of the report for the week of December 21st through 27th that indicated street releases continued for legally processed asylum seekers (LPAS) in Tucson, Douglas, Nogales and other communities, but it also indicated that no street releases occurred in Tucson. He asked for clarification as to whether street releases had occurred and the timeline.

Shane Clark, Director, Office of Emergency Management, clarified that after the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Tucson Sector encountered and apprehended asylum seekers, they went through a vetting process to determine if they could obtain legal status to be in the United States and once the individual obtained legal status, they would have a coordinated drop off in Tucson, Douglas, and Nogales. He explained that they were referred to as LPAS and the County had been told that CBP conducted vetting, proper background checks and other tasks that allowed the individual to become legally processed. He added that the County would then take on the obligation to help by utilizing the Casa Alitas Welcome Center, the County's primary humanitarian partner, and assist them in reaching their final destination. He clarified that in the past they were referred to as street releases, but that was a term that should be corrected because at the time they were brought into the humanitarian sector with wraparound services they were LPAS. He confirmed that during the weekly period indicated in the report, there were no uncontrolled street releases by border patrol into the communities.

Supervisor Christy questioned if there were two different types of street releases or whether both could be listed under one heading.

Mr. Clark clarified that CBP were releasing LPAS and there were no occurrences of street releases that were not able to be transitioned from CBP directly into the humanitarian sector.

Supervisor Christy asked if assurances could be made that the statements in the report regarding street releases in Tucson were factual.

Mr. Clark responded in the affirmative and reiterated that all LPAS were transitioned directly into the humanitarian sector.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Drexel facility provided respite focused on family, but the Board was told that family units were housed at Casa Alitas and single males were housed at the Drexel facility. He inquired about that arrangement.

Mr. Clark explained that as the County went from the transition of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program to the Shelter and Services Program there was reduced funding and an operational decision had been made to try to become more efficient in taking care of the vulnerable population. He stated that the amount of LPAS that were released into the humanitarian sector was well over 50% every week and the number of those released was a large number. He added that knowing the potential of reduced funding could lead to the potential of uncontrolled street releases in the future, Casa Alitas Welcome Center made an operational shift to determine what locations would best be suited to handle the most vulnerable. He stated that it was at that time that single adult males were transitioned out of the Drexel facility and also placed family units within the Drexel facility to take care of the vulnerable in addition to the family units and the most vulnerable that were already housed at the Casa Alitas Welcome Center Ajo location.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification regarding what happened to the single adult males and where were they housed.

Mr. Clark responded that single adult males were transitioned into one of the non-congregate hotel settings.

Supervisor Christy stated that the report indicated that congregate and non-congregate shelters including the Redroof Inn and the Comfort Suites Airport showed zero for guests served, guests sheltered and overnight rooms used and the County was in a situation of moving single adult males from the Drexel facility to non-congregate or congregate shelters. He indicated that according to the report, they had not gone to the Redroof Inn and asked where they went, what the difference was between congregate and non-congregate shelters and for examples of those shelters.

Mr. Clark explained that congregate sheltering referred to the Drexel facility, a location where there were cots and everyone was under one setting and was a reason why the Casa Alitas Welcome Center transitioned from single adult males to family units so they could better utilize the Drexel location to serve the most vulnerable individuals. He added that the Drexel facility was a congregate facility and non-congregate settings were hotels or the Casa Alitas Welcome Center Ajo location with individual rooms.

Supervisor Christy reiterated that the report indicated there were no use of the hotels by anyone, but Mr. Clark had stated hotels were being utilized by single adult males.

Mr. Clark clarified that the Redroof Inn and Comfort Inn Suites Airport had been segregated off of the additional non-congregate shelters because they were directly

related to a County contract and those additional non-congregate shelters in other locations were being utilized.

Supervisor Christy asked for examples of the other non-congregate shelters and if they were run by the County or the City of Tucson (COT).

Mr. Clark responded that the Ramada Inn was a non-congregate shelter and was not run through a County contract, but with the COT.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County was leasing for any purpose, any COT owned, operated or rented properties.

Mr. Clark explained that the COT was a subrecipient that the County worked in operational coordination with.

RK Kelly, Director, Grants Management and Innovation, explained that the County had a subrecipient agreement with the COT and one of their major responsibilities was to facilitate and oversee the non-congregate hotels.

Supervisor Christy asked if the single male adults were going to non-congregate COT operated shelters.

Ms. Kelly responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked how many went to COT shelters because the report showed zero for County facilities, but did not include information for COT shelters.

Mr. Clark responded that in mid-December there was a County contract with Jot Redroof Properties, specifically for the Redroof Inn and the Comfort Inn Suites, and when that contract was about to expire there was a need from the Pima County Health Department to continue to be able to provide supplemental care for those that had medical needs to maintain the cooperative agreement. He stated that the reason the report indicated zero usage of the hotels during that time was due to the transition.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was because the County had run out of money.

Mr. Clark clarified it was when the County had transitioned from utilizing those spaces under the Shelter and Services Program to another funding from the Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS).

Supervisor Christy commented that his Board colleagues would vote to approve \$2.7 million to fund the operations and the contracts with the Redroof Inn and Jot Redroof Properties expired on December 18th. He asked where the County had been housing the infected migrants during and since that time.

Mr. Clark responded that the transition occurred over to the Comfort Inn Suites Airport as the primary location.

Supervisor Christy asked if that was a Jot property and stated that the money had run out.

Mr. Clark replied affirmatively and clarified that the funding transitioned to ADHS dollars in order to take care of the medically vulnerable.

Supervisor Christy referred to the report regarding the numbers for weekly arrivals and releases with record releases of 1,507 and the number of arrivals had risen that week to 9,525 and of those arrivals only 32 had been tested, which was supposed to be supplanted by a \$1.8 million grant. He added that the report further showed that 9,525 arrived and 17,745 were served and asked where the 8,000 individuals went and why the County allowed only 32 arrivals out of 9,500 to be tested.

Mr. Clark responded that as indicated in the report, many of the LPAS that entered the humanitarian sector had a one to three day stay and that the touch point repeated itself on that second and third day if the LPAS at the Casa Alitas system still had not left for their final destinations.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, reminded the Board that per the federal protocol all individuals processed through the asylum seeker process were being screened by a paramedic with a set of questions, observations and interventions. He stated that when individuals were transferred to the care of the County contractor through Catholic Community Services operating as the Casa Alitas Welcome Center, they would be re-screened which meant that a medical professional would ask a series of questions, made observations and if deemed appropriate, referred those individuals for care within a County facility. He confirmed that county testing had decreased tremendously as COVID protocols for testing had changed so only individuals that were symptomatic would be tested.

Supervisor Christy asked where the money was transferred from to pay for testing.

Dr. Garcia clarified that no money was transferred and explained that historically under the previous funding mechanism there was some flexibility of using some of those federal dollars for the purposes of public health intervention. He stated that subsequently the County had used a different set of dollars from ADHS and Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs (DEMA) specifically for the care, testing and screening of migrant populations that were in transit.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had been given assurances from the Health Department that those coming into this country were being screened for illnesses and that this process was under control, but the report stated only 32 out of 9,500 were screened. He questioned the accuracy of those numbers.

Dr. Garcia reiterated that all 9,000 of those individuals were medically screened by County personnel or by contractors and each individual was evaluated, asked a series of questions, observations were made and when appropriate, testing was performed and that the number of tests performed were currently less than in the past. He added that any individual that appeared ill would be tested and any individual that appeared to need medical support would be provided with those ADHS and DEMA resources.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated there was a need to clarify the distinction between the medical screening that occurred briefly and ensure it occurred with the 9,500 and whether additional medical care was required which was the smaller number that Supervisor Christy had referenced. She stated that the report would be modified to appropriately capture the numbers.

Supervisor Christy referred to the report highlights section regarding the number of arrivals and releases and asked for a report of releases, where they were released and what was the meaning of the release.

Mr. Clark explained the report reflected the number of releases that CBP had processed and became LPAS and entered into the humanitarian sector. He clarified that on November 26, 2023, CBP released 1,507 LPAS into the County's humanitarian sector, and from December 7 through 23, 2023, CBP released 10,187 LPAS into the County's humanitarian sector. He further clarified that all the prior weeks since May 11th and with the ending of Title 42, the Department of Homeland Security's website, which directly rippled into the County's humanitarian sector, reported record numbers every month that showed increases. He stated that as the numbers had risen the need for the County's humanitarian partner to balance it had risen and it was done with a concentrated effort to avoid community street releases. He stated that as indicated in the report, releases occurred in three different locations and the County tried to help the communities and their humanitarian partner to maintain a respite until the individuals arrived at their final destination. He clarified that the numbers were released by CBP before they were entered into the County's humanitarian sector.

Supervisor Christy commented that he tried to understand the reports, but it was confusing, misleading and the terminology utilized was not understandable. He added that there needed to be clarification and definitions of the terminology within the reports. He stated it appeared the reports were produced using a template and felt it was imperative that the community had a better understanding on what was happening and who was paying for it and expressed his concern for the lack of distinction between the meaning of short distance and long-distance transportation. He hoped to receive clarification on the numbers and definitions of the terminology used because it caused troubling discernment.

Ms. Leshar stated that the reports had been previously released internally on a weekly basis, and then they realized important information needed to be shared with the public, so it had been distributed publicly and to the Board. She added that

there may be jargon used that might not be clear and needed clarification and appreciated the feedback so that they could adjust appropriately. She stated that if any more questions needed to be clarified by Board members it could be provided.

Supervisor Christy commented that there were different euphemisms used and that more transparency and clarity was needed.

Ms. Leshar explained that the intent was to provide transparency and that was why the reports were sent directly to the Board and they began as internal documents that contained certain language and rather than scrubbing and cleaning the documents it was decided to share the reports with the Board and the community in real time. She understood there was additional clarity needed.

Chair Grijalva stated that she thought it was important to note that the language and terminology that was in the report was similar across other agencies. She explained that if terminology was changed it would become confusing for all the other partners that were reading the same document. She added that if there was a glossary of the terminology and their meaning, and she felt it had been explained and wanted to ensure it was not changed to the extent that everyone else reading the reports would be confused because of the County's partners and other partners that used the same terminology. She stated that from her visit in Washington D.C., everyone spoke the same language when it came to how they were classified.

Supervisor Christy stated that his last request was to provide a listing of what the COT was operating as far as related sheltering of infected, migrant or eviction individuals and where the facilities were as opposed to what the County was operating.

Chair Grijalva inquired about the funding for the services provided by the COT.

Ms. Leshar responded that she could provide the information in a report. She explained that the funding came from the same federal funding that supported the initiative and working with the COT as a subrecipient and that it would be identified.

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

41. Arizona Auditor General Financial Audit

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding correspondence received from the Arizona Auditor General's office and the delay in its completion of the Pima County financial audit. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy asked legal counsel's opinion and direction whether there was anything in the email that was sent to all five district offices, the County Administrator and the Finance and Risk Management staff that would be considered not for public discussion.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, asked for clarification on which email was being referenced.

Supervisor Christy responded that it was the email from the Arizona Auditor General that was sent to the Board on December 14, 2023.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a specific concern.

Chair Grijalva stated that the email was attached as background material, which had already been made public.

Supervisor Christy concurred.

Mr. Brown stated that it was made public and was part of the item.

Supervisor Christy clarified the reason he asked was because the email indicated that their communication was made part of Pima County audit and should be considered confidential and protected by Arizona Revised Statutes, but it had been circulated publicly.

Chair Grijalva commented that in hindsight it should not have been attached to a public item and asked if that was the question.

Mr. Brown responded that he did not have the answer at that time but would review the issue.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it was known what had or had not been submitted to the Auditor General.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that there were two areas of concern, one had been completed that related to the opioid funding that was received by the County. She stated that the County had been requesting information about how the opioid funds should be reported and they received some final information in December 2023, about how those 2022 funds needed to be added to the County ledgers which had been clarified and submitted. She explained that the remaining information related to funding and the financial statements coming from the School Superintendent's Office. She stated she had conversations with the County Treasurer who had been helping with the monthly reconciliations and it was her understanding that all the reconciliations would be completed by the third to fourth week of the month and then all of that information would be submitted to the Auditor General.

Supervisor Christy asked what kind of impact the delay and no submittal of the information requested had on the County or the County's processes.

Ms. Leshar stated that it had been highlighted in memorandums to the Board that there would be a finding in the County's audit and a finding in the 12 school districts

for which the Superintendent managed the funds. She stated that the prior year the Board had findings in the Audit and it was reported and presented before the Board by the Auditor General and then there would be a response.

Supervisor Christy expressed his concern that there had been no correspondence or communication regarding this by County Administration since the email communication was received.

Ms. Lesher explained that a note was sent in November and subsequent to that ensured the Board was made aware of information from the Auditor General at a prior Board meeting that with discussions related to reports from the Superintendent of Schools. She added that she could review the memorandums and emails that had been provided to the Board that were related to this item and if additional information needed to be brought forward, she would ensure it would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that he did not recall a memorandum that specifically addressed what the Auditor General had requested.

Ms. Lesher responded her office had previously sent memorandums regarding the Auditor General, but did not currently have the information of what the findings were and would provide additional information.

Supervisor Christy commented that it appeared Ms. Lesher's office was on top of it and her office was very good about sending memoranda and he did not recall this topic being addressed, but could be wrong.

Ms. Lesher stated that she could also be wrong, but the concern about a finding or any communication with the Auditor General was something her office followed very closely. She explained that she had met with the County's financial staff and with the County Treasurer to ensure that the County moved forward on all fronts and to ensure that the Auditor General received all information. She stated that she would ensure that it was communicated to the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked for a timeframe on the requested updates.

Ms. Lesher stated that the opioid information had been finalized and in meeting with the Treasurer the prior Friday, she was hopeful that they would finish the reconciliations by mid-January and once the reconciliations were done, the additional financial information could come through hopefully by the end of January, they did not have control for when the information was received, but could provide regular updates to the Board about the status of the response to the Auditor General.

Chair Grijalva commented that this was a reason why she had brought the item forward at the previous Board meeting because it affected every one of the school districts and would be a finding on the County and she was concerned how it would

impact rating and other things. She added that while the finding was on another elected office it still would have an overall impact on the County.

Supervisor Christy stated that he remembered the discussion and did not remember any resolution for it.

Chair Grijalva indicated that there was no resolution because the individual that could answer questions was not in attendance.

Supervisor Lee stated that although the issue stemmed from another elected position it put a blemish on the Board of Supervisors. She questioned if there was anything that could be done by the Board to rectify the situation.

Ms. Leshar stated that when her office initially became aware of concerns, she spoke with the County Attorney's Office about what exactly the County Administrator's authority or the Board's authority was related to the finances of those other departments and discovered she was very limited. She stated that Supervisor Lee's question called for a more robust answer than what she had received from the County Attorney and did not believe there would be any action, but would review these issues and report back to the Board.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

42. Proposed Amendments to Pima County Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the proposed amendments to the Pima County Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations, to eliminate the position of Acting Chair.

Supervisor Christy expressed his confusion regarding the item being placed under the County Administrator's purview and did not recall that the County Administrator had the authority to decide how the Board was situated or made up. He asked who had brought the item forward.

Chair Grijalva stated that the topic was discussed at the prior Board meeting and the Acting Chair position had not been filled for quite some time. She stated that Supervisor Christy was currently the longest serving Board member and asked him when the last time was that the Board appointed an Acting Chair.

Supervisor Christy responded that there was an Acting Chair for as long as he had been a member of the Board.

Chair Grijalva clarified that there had not been an Acting Chair for the last three years.

Supervisor Christy stated that the position might not have been utilized but it had always been in existence. He reiterated his question of who from the Board brought the item forward. He stated that a Board member should have brought this item forward and asked why the County Administrator placed it under her agenda item.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it had been discussed at a prior meeting and there had been conversations about reviewing the bylaws. She explained that she had created a draft of the proposed amendments, and whether it was placed under the Board of Supervisors or County Administrator, Supervisor Christy was correct that she did not govern the rules, but at the request of the Board she brought forward documents for the Board to review.

Supervisor Christy stated that he would like the item to be continued until the item was properly posted, noticed and assigned to whoever on the Board originally brought it forward. He felt it was not appropriate for the County Administrator, someone that the Board was the boss of, to define what the role of the positions of the Board of Supervisors were. He stated that that if a Board member had ideas or preferences about how this should be done then that Supervisor should take responsibility for it and claim it as their own and it should be brought forth as their own.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to continue the item until it could be brought back by a Board member. The motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Grijalva stated that the reason why the item was presented was because the Board had voted on its leadership and Acting Chair was not a position that was added in the time that she had been a Supervisor. She explained that when she had asked former Supervisor Bronson about the position, she informed her that Acting Chair was not utilized and that the Vice Chair would act as Chair in the absence of the Chair.

Supervisor Christy asked if Chair Grijalva brought the item forward.

Chair Grijalva replied in the negative and stated she thought it had already been addressed at a prior Board meeting and when Minute Item No. 5 was presented that listed Acting Chair, she was reminded by the Clerk that the Board did not have an item on it.

Supervisor Christy stated that his motion for a continuance failed for lack of second and it went back to the County Administrator because it was under her heading. He asked if it would be appropriate for the County Administrator to define and justify the requested changes.

Chair Grijalva indicated that the Board discussed it at a prior Board meeting and that was why it was on the agenda and that it could have been placed under the Clerk's Office. She reiterated that the County Administrator could put items on the agenda and that it did not necessarily fall under the District 5 Office either.

Supervisor Christy stated that this was under the Board of Supervisors auspices and not the County Administrator. He explained that since his motion failed it was incumbent that the County Administrator interpret, define, and justify the requested changes.

Ms. Leshar stated that the item was brought forward at the request of the Board and there were many items on this agenda that her office brought forward.

Supervisor Christy asked who requested the item.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was discussed at the last Board meeting.

Supervisor Christy stated that it might have been mentioned by the Chair about delaying it until the next meeting when the Board had the vacant District 3 position seated, but was never discussed at length, and it was never put forth by a Board member. He stated that this was a Board of Supervisors proposal and not a County Administrator proposal.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the item was brought forward for consideration by the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked who would explain the discrepancy.

Chair Grijalva stated that she did not understand Supervisor Christy's concern and that the issue was that there had not been an Acting Chair for three years.

Supervisor Scott stated that in January 2021, the Board appointed Supervisor Bronson to be Chair and Chair Grijalva to be Vice Chair and then were reappointed to the same positions in January 2022. He stated that in January 2023, the Board appointed Chair Grijalva to be Chair and himself to be Vice Chair. He explained that during all three meetings the Board chose not to appoint an Acting Chair and that at some point the previously seated Board might have had an Acting Chair, but the current Board never had. He reiterated that at the last meeting the Board discussed removing that position and it had been discussed every January, but had never been appointed and became superfluous.

Supervisor Christy asked legal counsel what the legality was of the County Administrator presenting changes to the Board of Supervisors. He stated that it seemed inappropriate for the County Administrator to determine the formation of the Board of Supervisors.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that he believed that in similar instances, the County Administrator simply proposed changes and not defined anything. He explained that it was up to the Board to adopt, revise or deny the proposed changes.

Supervisor Christy stated he appreciated the clarification and asked the County Administrator to explain her proposal.

Ms. Leshar explained that based on previous discussions and the fact that there had not been an Acting Chair for the last three years, there was a request to remove that position from the Board of Supervisors (BOS) Rules and Regulations. She stated that her office had brought forth proposed amendments that eliminated Acting Chair from the BOS Rules and Regulations and believed her office's function in it was ministerial.

Supervisor Christy stated he did not want to belabor the point, but he was not comfortable with someone that worked for the Board to describe and bring forth how the Board should be situated.

Chair Grijalva stated this was a discussion item for the Board and that if the Board did not want to move forward with it they did not have to, but the Board had not had an Acting Chair for three years and confirmed with former Supervisor Bronson that it was not used as such.

Supervisor Christy stated he was unconcerned with the Acting Chair position, but his concern was with an item being brought forth by someone who technically worked for the Board and found it inappropriate to be placed under the County Administrator.

Chair Grijalva stated that she did not think it would be appropriate for the item to be placed under a district office because it was a conversation for the Board and that it would either be placed under the County Administrator or the Clerk's Office, and there was a header for Board of Supervisors that was used when a Board Supervisor sponsored the item.

Supervisor Christy stated that a Supervisor could have sponsored the item, but that had not happened.

Chair Grijalva stated that if she had placed the item on the agenda the argument would then be why she wanted the Acting Chair removed. She added this would clean up language in the Board policy that was not used.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the amendments and eliminate the position of Acting Chair from the BOS Rules and Regulations.

43. Proposed Amendment to Pima County Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the proposed amendment to the Pima County Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations, to add the following under Section B. Chair:

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

Chair Grijalva explained that historically the Chair had the authority to assign Board members to different committees and believed that was something that should be a shared governance and the ability for all members to weigh in on the person that would be representing the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that a Board member should own this action because it took place on the Board and someone needed to own it and justify it and a member of the Board should be associated with it, not the County Administrator.

Chair Grijalva read from the County Administrator's memorandum dated December 28, 2023, that outlined the proposed amendments and process to appoint Board members to Boards, Committees and Commissions (BCCs) which included the Arizona Border Counties Coalition, County Supervisors Association, Pima Association of Governments, Regional Transportation Authority, Sun Corridor, Inc. and Visit Tucson. She stated that there were two other BCCs being the Board of Health and Metropolitan Education Commission which were not added to the list, but felt it was something that should be discussed.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, explained that the Board of Health and the Metropolitan Education Commission were not included because they were maintained by the Clerk's Office which meant that the Clerk's Office sent out Loyalty Oaths and the Conflict-of-Interest forms to members appointed to these BCCs. She clarified that her office did not have any involvement with the other outside agencies listed by Chair Grijalva.

Chair Grijalva stated that although those BCCs were not listed, she felt those positions should be part of the process and that the function of the Oath of Office would continue to go through the Clerk's Office and the other BCCs were part of the Board of Supervisors but had their own conflict waivers and the County was not in charge of that piece of the process. She reiterated that this process would be to allow the Chair to nominate a Board member and vote on the specific BCC.

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that he did not think it should be the Chair to nominate, but suggested the Chair facilitate the nomination of members. He stated that any Board member should have the ability to nominate a member and requested a friendly amendment to the language that added, "The Chair shall facilitate the nomination of members..." and to strike out "...the Chair shall nominate..." in the last sentence.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern about removing the power of the Chair which had historically been in its place with no previous issues. He asked if the removal of authority from the Chair was being transferred to the County Administrator since it was being presented as such.

Chair Grijalva disagreed and stated that it was giving the authority back to the five governing members and it should not be the Chair's authority to assign someone without input from other Board members. She stated that she believed all of the Board members in a shared governance model should be given the same opportunity to weigh in.

Supervisor Christy stated what came to mind was the old saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Chair Grijalva accepted Supervisor Heinz's friendly amendment to her motion.

Supervisor Lee stated that one potential amendment could be that if no decisions were made, the Chair would still have the opportunity to assign members.

Chair Grijalva agreed and stated that if, hypothetically, one of the BCCs did not have an appointment then the Chair could assign it, but she would like it to be acknowledged and accept participation, but logistically if there was one that did not have an appointment then it could be discussed at that time.

Ms. Manriquez asked for clarification purposes whether the Board of Health and the Metropolitan Education Commission would be included in the list or if they would be kept separate.

Chair Grijalva responded that those BCCs should be included.

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

44. **Appointment of Pima County Representative and Alternate to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition**

Since the formation of the Arizona Border Counties Coalition, representation of the County has been designated by resolution of the Board. Staff recommends the following:

1. The Chair of the Board of Supervisors nominate and the Board of Supervisors appoint, on an annual basis, the Pima County representative and alternate to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition;
2. Pima County will continue to provide staff support for the Arizona Border Counties Coalition; and
3. The County Administrator determines which department shall provide staff support to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, to appoint Supervisor Lee as the representative to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, to appoint Chair Grijalva as the alternate to the Arizona Border Counties Coalition.

45. **Appointment of Board Members to Boards, Committees and Commissions**

Discussion/Direction/Action: The Chair of the Board shall nominate for consideration and confirmation by the Board of Supervisors a representative to the following:

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

Supervisor Scott read the following statement, *“When considering Board leadership positions, I think it's important that each of us determine where our individual efforts should be directed, those considerations should be guided most by what is best for the people we represent as Supervisors but also by thoughts about how the Board can best work together. Our learned experience and how we hope to build on it should also be significant considerations. With all those factors in mind I want my colleagues to know that my highest priority is to continue to serve as the County's representative to the Pima Association of Government's Regional Council and the Regional Transportation Authority Board. I have served in that capacity since January 2021, and have developed strong, respectful, working relationships with the other members of those bodies. Prior to any meeting I sit down with Ms. Leshner, Deputy County Administrator DeBonis and Department of Transportation, Director Skinner to review the agendas and ensure that I am prepared to represent the interests of the County in those meetings. Last month the RTA Board unanimously approved a motion I crafted in partnership with the County team that is helping to move the development of the RTA Next Plan forward. I hope to continue to be our strong advocate on those two Boards as we work together with the other members to get an RTA Next Plan on the ballot in the spring of 2025. My second priority would be to serve as the County's representative to the Sun Corridor Board, the County's Economic Development Strategic Plan which we approved last year has a regional focus. The County pays Sun Corridor a significant amount of money each year to support their efforts to bring major employers into our region. I have engaged with Sun Corridor staff on a frequent basis and have attended many of their events and meetings. My hope would be to work in partnership with the other members of the Sun Corridor Board and to ensure that Sun Corridor commitments to Pima County are met in full. If my colleagues are willing, I am also ready to continue my service as our representative to the Legislative Policy Committee of the County Supervisors Association. This body which meets every Friday morning while the Arizona Legislature is in session consists of 15 County Supervisors one from each County and we discuss and consider whether to support, oppose or remain neutral on bills that affect the interests of counties. CSA staff then follows up with*

our state legislators. Members of our committee are also often asked to contact legislators to encourage them to support the positions of Arizona counties. Given the pressing and vital nature of addressing those priorities, although I am currently the Vice Chair, I will not seek the Chair of the Board this year. If Chair Grijalva wants to continue in that role I will support her because she has led us with fairness and skill. I look forward to working alongside each one of my four colleagues as we do our best to represent the people we are privileged to serve.”

Supervisor Christy asked if that was a nomination.

Chair Grijalva answered that it could be a nomination.

Supervisor Scott stated that he wanted to make that statement before the Board discussed each position individually.

Chair Grijalva stated that in the last three years Supervisor Scott represented the Board at the County Supervisors Association and she did not hear that on the list of things in his statement.

Supervisor Scott confirmed that the County Supervisors Association was on the list.

Chair Grijalva asked Supervisor Scott if he was willing to continue to serve in that position with the PAG/RTA and Sun Corridor, which was the committee that former Supervisor Bronson had served on.

Supervisor Scott responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Lee, to nominate Supervisor Scott as representative for the Board to continue to serve on the County Supervisors Association, the Pima Association of Governments, Regional Transportation Authority and the Sun Corridor Board. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained.

It was then moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Lee, to nominate Chair Grijalva as Board representative for the Visit Tucson Board. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained.

Chair Grijalva stated that she currently served on both the Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC) and the Board of Health but was willing to share with any other Board members.

Supervisor Lee stated she was willing to serve on the MEC.

It was thereupon moved by Supervisor Lee and seconded by Chair Grijalva, to nominate Supervisor Lee as Board representative to the MEC. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained.

Chair Grijalva asked if any other Board members were interested in being appointed to the Board of Health.

It was moved by Supervisor Lee and seconded by Supervisor Scott, to nominate Chair Grijalva to continue to serve as Board representative to the Board of Health. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained.

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

46. Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum Projects Approval

Staff recommends approval of the expansion projects for Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

47. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Environmental Quality Advisory Council

- Appointment of Ursula Nelson, representing Environment/Conservation, to fill a vacancy created by John Kozma. Term expiration: 1/8/27. (Staff recommendation)
- Appointment of Angelantonio Breault, representing Public/Environmental Interest, to fill a vacancy created by Katie B. Gannon. Term expiration: 1/8/27. (Staff recommendation)
- Reappointment of Megan Garvey, representing Mining Industry or Utilities. Term expiration: 12/31/26. (Staff recommendation)

2. Workforce Investment Board

- Reappointment of Karla Morales, representing Business. Term expiration: 9/30/26. (Staff recommendation)
- Reappointment of Michael Guymon, representing GECD. Term expiration: 9/30/26. (Staff recommendation)

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

3. Special Event

- Melvin Lee Molstad, Esperanza En Escalante, Voyager RV Resort, 8701 S. Kolb Road, Tucson, January 26, 2024.
- Craig Stephen Ivanyi, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, 2021 N. Kinney Road, Tucson, March 23, 2024.

ELECTIONS

4. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Brian Radford-024-DEM, Dorothea Kernwright-084-DEM, Linda Evans-088-REP, Robert Workman-145-REP, Anita Brubaker-179-REP, Charlotte Ovitz-205-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

George Beverly Jr.-041-DEM, Nicolette Seckeler-056-DEM, Judith Holley-074-DEM, Mary Connell-084-DEM, Orjiskor Isiogu-141-DEM, Janelle McCormick-209-DEM, John Duclos-218-DEM, Daniel Murray-031-REP, John Cammarano-115-REP, Tom Payne-145-REP, Virginia Blankenship-174-REP, Kathleen Winn-179-REP, Kristine Lumsden-205-REP

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

5. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Banner-University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C. \$61,908.46; Dalila V. Perez \$58.50; Greenview Housing Partners, L.P. \$1,885.02; Custom Cleaners \$175.40; Brittany Borquez \$93.50; Joi Hollis \$681.23; Michelle Christiansen \$194.00; Robson Publishing \$4,226.10; 7700 Speedway REI, L.L.C.-Alias/d.b.a. Peaks at Redington \$8,792.45; Vertical North Apartments \$6,990.60; Verizon Wireless \$344.79; Arag Insurance Company \$7,215.74; Sean Abrigo \$4,500.00; 4283929 Delaware, L.L.C. \$4,207.50; Arivaca Helping Hearts \$30,625.00; Joseph Stazzone \$775.00; Rio Viejo Apartments \$4,928.00; Santa Cruz River Apartments \$2,310.00; Off Duty Management, Inc. \$1,661.24; Krista L. Riley \$70.00; Ellison-Mills Construction, L.L.C. \$212,713.96; Kary Environmental Services, Inc. \$609.20; Saralee Burkett \$100.00; Nick Wessels \$510.00; Elma Nunez \$73.50; Trajen Flight Support, L.P. \$3,717.82; Pima Corrections Association \$1,508.00; Victory Supply, L.L.C. \$16,705.80; Andrea Gonzales Espinoza \$132.50; Arizona Community Health Workers Association, Inc. \$5,336.49; Cirrus Visual Communication \$2,145.74; Quikprint \$261.97; Serena Elena Mendoza Paine \$1,250.00;

Veronica M. Mero \$5.00; Siani Ramos Hernandez \$4,098.00; RWK Sonoran SPE, L.L.C. \$4,956.59; BGO Las Brisas, L.P. \$2,523.00.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 6. Minutes: October 17, 2023
Warrants: December, 2023

* * *

48. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK