

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, April 19, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Sharon Bronson, Chair
Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair
Rex Scott, Member
Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

1. CONTRACT

Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for project services and related research, education and employment and amend contractual language, Flood Control Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-FC-19-154)

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library 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, April 19, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Sharon Bronson, Chair
Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair
Rex Scott, Member
Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

1. AWARD

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-19-17, Amendment No. 6, BiblioCommons, Inc., to provide for BiblioCommons Website Platform. This amendment incorporates the "BiblioEmail - Tier C" service into this agreement, exercises the annual renewal option to extend the termination date to 4/27/23, increases the annual award amount by \$20,000.00 from \$250,000.00 to \$270,000.00, and adds the revised annual award amount of \$270,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$978,000.00. One (1) renewal option remains. Funding Source: Library District Ops Fund. Administering Department: Library.

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 19, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Sharon Bronson, Chair
Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair
Rex Scott, Member
Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Tribal Council Member Herminia Frias, Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy commented that citizens should be allowed to address the Board uninterrupted and asked the Chair for more leniency during Call to the Public.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Diane Alexander, President, and Linda Hurst, Team Evaluator, Pet Partners of Southern Arizona, proclaiming the day of Saturday, April 30, 2022 to be: "NATIONAL THERAPY ANIMAL DAY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Jeff Conn, Acting Superintendent, and Cam Juarez, Community Engagement/Outreach Coordinator, Saguaro National Park, proclaiming the week of April 24 through 30, 2022 to be: "NATIONAL PARK SERVICE WEEK"

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

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Stephanie Kirk spoke in opposition to mask mandates for children and expressed her support for the passing of House Bill 2616. She expressed her displeasure with being interrupted during Call to the Public.

Bruce Hamilton addressed the Board regarding his concerns with the recent appointment of Deborah Martinez as Constable for Justice Precinct 8.

Keith Van Heyningen addressed the Board regarding violation of civil rights and racism.

Dru Heaton spoke to the Board regarding the Libertarian Party's opposition to the adoption of vote centers and e-poll books in Pima County and talked about the voter fraud security measures that were suggested in Arizona Senate Bill 1120.

Dan Wann thanked the Board for the Pause 4 Paws Program and for dealing with the Tucson Water differential rate issue. He asked the Board to hold open forums for discussions on the controversies that were dividing Pima County.

Ernest Graves expressed words of appreciation for Mr. Huckelberry's many years of service to the County and commented that he had been a tremendous asset to the community.

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:19 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:55 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice, and for discussion or consideration of any matter within the scope of A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (1), regarding the employment contract for County Administrator Jan Leshner. As required by A.R.S. §38-431.03(D), any legal action must be taken in public session. (District 3)
This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. **Approval Process for Modifications to Line Items for American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed approval process for modifications to line items in the American Rescue Plan Act Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, establishing a 10 percent threshold for additional review and approval.

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

Supervisor Grijalva questioned whether indirect costs were being utilized.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative but clarified that indirect costs could only be used on specific items.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether those costs were centralized and reallocated, as needed, and asked for more specifics about how the process worked.

Ms. Leshner responded that the indirect costs reverted to the Grants Management and Innovation Department and were then allocated as needed to the various departments.

Supervisor Grijalva asked that information be provided to the Board regarding all of the allowable indirect cost amounts.

Ms. Leshner indicated that the information would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned why the Board was only reviewing those items that had a 10% overage of their original project cost.

Ms. Leshner responded that the 10% requirement was a federal standard and indicated that staff had looked at ways of providing greater transparency as to how the County was spending that \$203 million. She explained that this would provide an opportunity for the development of a process requiring Board approval of any allocation or reallocation of that funding and explained that staff had attempted to

delineate by line items and in order to avoid burdening the Board by not adhering to a federal standard that would only require approval on \$20 million or more.

Supervisor Christy questioned what the Board approval threshold would be.

Ms. Leshar responded that it would be any change or modification of more than \$500,000.00.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Scott to reduce the Board approval threshold from 10% to 5%. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott commented that the 10% threshold seemed aligned with the federal requirements.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned whether the modification list, attached to the bottom of Ms. Leshar's memorandum, was for the entire ARPA funding period.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva asked to be provided with a list that was based on fiscal year.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide that information.

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

Supervisor Grijalva commented that she would be happy to approve the item but wanted to see the information broken out either by fiscal year or category. She questioned whether the item should be continued.

Ms. Leshar stated that she understood the Board's direction to continue with the 10% and use the number by which it was based, for reallocation and breakdown by either fiscal year or category. She added that no issues would arise if the Board decided to continue the item.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether the concerns raised by Supervisor Grijalva could possibly be addressed on a yearly basis during the annual budgeting process.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was possible to receive a reallocation request that was not concurrent with the annual budgeting cycle.

Upon roll call vote of the original motion, it carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

12. **Intergovernmental Agreements for the Provision of Animal Care and Related Services**

Staff recommends the new intergovernmental agreements retain licensing fee revenues continue to be collected on behalf of the partner jurisdiction to offset licensing and related enforcement expenses and request the balance of services including sheltering, veterinary care and community programming be funded through a direct general fund appropriation.

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

Supervisor Christy questioned the dollar amount of the projected shortfall in revenue and inquired how it would impact the General Fund.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that it was a general fund appropriation of about \$4.6 million and explained it was a general tax provided by the taxpayers throughout Pima County regardless of which incorporated jurisdiction they resided in. She added that it would remain in effect for as long as there was a policy in place that indicated other jurisdictions would not be charged.

Supervisor Christy commented that the jurisdictions would no longer be charged, but the revenue shortfall would come from the General Fund.

Ms. Leshner responded that it was paid for by the taxpayers of those jurisdictions.

Chair Bronson agreed with the County Administrator, and stated that it was fair and equitable and reflected the behavior of the region.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the Town of Marana and Sahuarita would be contributing to this process.

Ms. Leshner responded that she had met with the Mayor and Town Managers of both jurisdictions and had advised them of the possible policy change. She explained that they had chosen to have their agreements with the Humane Society and were pleased with their services but indicated that with this possible change, it may be revisited at some point in the future. She added that discussions with the Humane Society indicated that no negative impacts would be attributed to them.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether their decision to not participate affected the shortfall.

Ms. Leshner explained that although those jurisdictions were not part of the agreement, the taxpayers of both the Towns of Marana and Sahuarita paid property taxes into Pima County for Pima Animal Care Services.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

13. **Compromising Taxes, Interest and Penalties**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18124 and Board of Supervisors Policy C 4.4, Sterling Real Estate Investment, L.L.C., is requesting that the Board compromise taxes, interest and penalties incurred for the following:

Parcel Nos./Tax Years

134-27-0040/1986 - 2021

134-27-0050/1986 - 2021

134-27-0060/1986 - 2021

134-27-0070/1986 - 2021

134-27-0090/1986 - 2021

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

Supervisor Christy commented that the Board should follow and adhere to the recommendation made by the Pima County Treasurer, which was an independent appraisal should be obtained for the purposes of negotiating a reasonable amount for compromising the taxes, interest and penalties that were due on the property.

Ed Hermes, attorney, Snell & Wilmer, representing Sterling Real Estate, stated he agreed with the staff recommendation and commented about the property's uniqueness due to its past usage as a city landfill. He stated that their goal was to get the property developed and usable at its current state but indicated that that was not possible due to the penalties, interest and past property taxes that had accrued over the years.

Beth Ford, Pima County Treasurer, responded that the taxes, penalties and interest due on the property amounted to approximately \$4 million, and stated that the taxes went back to 1986. She explained that there had been no interest from investors to pick up a tax lien on the property and indicated that due to its environmental risk, the County had also declined trying to foreclose on it. She added that she did not foresee any possibility of collection on those taxes or interest unless the property was compromised.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether that compromise would come from an independent appraisal.

Ms. Ford responded that that was her recommendation but the ultimate decision was at the discretion of the Board.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that Ms. Ford's recommendation offered them the ability to either compromise the full amount today or condition it upon the completion of an appraisal. He indicated that the information received regarding the value associated with that appraisal could help with making the decision to either compromise the full amount or some lesser amount based on that new information.

Mr. Hermes stated that they were willing to cooperate and work together with the Treasurer to complete the independent appraisal and then bring the item back to the Board for approval.

Chair Bronson withdrew her motion.

Supervisor Scott questioned who would be responsible to conduct the appraisal.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that it was the responsibility of the applicant to conduct the appraisal and indicated that Real Property Services staff were available to answer any questions from the Board.

It was then moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item pending the completion of an independent appraisal.

FLEET SERVICES

14. Donation of Surplus Property

Staff recommends approval of the donation of a surplus vehicle to Marana Domestic Water Improvement District, to safely haul tools and materials needed to support the water services provided to their customers.

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

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the application process.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that once a vehicle reached its useful lifespan and was no longer in service, it was deemed surplus and scheduled through an auction by a contracted vendor. She indicated that she would provide the Board with a report that included the specifics related to the process by the contracted vendor.

She indicated that she did not have all of the specifics regarding the process of the vendor but would provide the Board with a report.

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

REAL PROPERTY

15. Abandonment by Vacation

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 19, of the Board of Supervisors, for the disposition of a portion of Avra Valley Road, a public roadway, as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0061, within Sections 8 & 9, T12S, R12E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

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

SUPERIOR COURT

16. The Board of Supervisors on March 15 and April 5, 2022, continued the following:

Initial Court Appearances

Staff requests approval of a ten (10) year extension for the Intergovernmental Agreement between Superior Court, Justice Court, and the City of Tucson Court, to provide for joint participation and pro-rata cost sharing for initial appearances and/or misdemeanor arraignments.

Joel Feinman, Public Defender, addressed the Board and requested approval of the item. He stated that an arrested individual was scheduled for an initial appearance within 12 hours of their arrest and that the category of arrest, whether it was for a misdemeanor or felony, was not relevant to that time period. He stated that this applied to every individual. He stated that individuals were held in jail for felonies, misdemeanors, or both and expressed his disagreement with comments made by speakers at previous Board meetings, that indicated presiding judges at initial appearances lacked any criminal experience. He commented that he disagreed with the assessment that the problem was Pretrial Services and praised their incredible work under very challenging conditions. He felt that one of the problems was the holding of individuals charged with misdemeanors which were the lowest level of offenses and were usually nonviolent, with the exception of domestic violence, and were mostly the result of their failure to appear in court. He stated that he had tracked data for the last two weeks and had assessed that 109 individuals were being jailed on misdemeanor warrants. He commented about the staggering cost to the taxpayers and explained that the current booking fee for the first 24 hours was \$422.00 and each additional day was \$123.00. He requested that the Board extend the contract for one year and proposed that it include rigid and rigorous data collection requirements on the reasons judges were holding those defendants. He suggested that one way to decrease the burden on County taxpayers would be to charge the City of Tucson more for holding individuals with low-level, nonviolent misdemeanors in the County jail. He stated that he would provide the Board with a memorandum that included his suggestions. He recommended that the Public Defense Services Director or a member of his staff, be included in all future

meetings in which criminal justice issues would be discussed and indicated that there had been no representation from the Defense Bar during previous discussions. He stated that it was important for all sides of the criminal justice system to be represented.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 3, 2022. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that he had appreciated the comment made by Ms. Conover at the last meeting regarding her willingness to work with all stakeholders moving forward on this issue and indicated that it was one of the reasons why he supported the continuation of the item. He expressed his appreciation of Mr. Feinman's statement about the necessity of having all members of the bar represented during future discussions with the Board. He directed the County Attorney's Office to include in their discussions at the next meeting, more expanded definitions for data collection should the IGA be extended for an additional year and indicated that it would help the Board make a more informed decision.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

17. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 188063, Phuljit Singh, Border Chevron, 195 S. Sonoyta Way, Why, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

18. Hearing - Conditional Use Permit

P22CU00001, FOREST INVESTMENTS, L.L.C. - N. SABINO CANYON PARK

Request of Diana Osborne, representing Forest Investments, L.L.C., on property located at 12849 & 12857 N. Sabino Canyon Park in the RVC (Rural Village Center) zone, for a Type II Conditional Use Permit for an expansion of the Mount Lemmon Lodge (outdoor garden), in accordance with Section 18.41.040 of the Pima County Zoning Code. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL. (District 4)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P22CU00001.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

19. Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 8, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Risk Management; amending the Pima County Code, Title 3, Revenue and Finance, Chapter 3.04, Section 3.04.120, to increase the approval authority amounts for the settlement of claims.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Scott to adopt the Ordinance. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on the dollar amounts associated with the ranges of claims and their department distributions.

Maria Luna, Risk Manager, Finance and Risk Management Department, explained that the settlement amounts would increase to the latter amounts listed in the background material.

Chair Bronson questioned whether the item should be continued until the corrections were made.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, recommended that the item be continued for two weeks for completion of those changes.

Chair Bronson withdrew her motion.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that corrections were not needed and clarified that the background material showed the current range amounts in comparison to the proposed new range amounts.

Ms. Luna concurred with the clarification.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

20. Employment Contract for County Administrator

Discussion/Action regarding the employment contract for County Administrator Jan Leshar. (District 3)

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson to approve the employment contract, as presented. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she had expressed concern with some of the areas of the contract and asked Ms. Leshner to address those concerns.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that the former County Administrator had held the position for about 29 years and during his career, had gone through a number of contract negotiations with the Board. She believed what had occurred, was that in lieu of significant salary adjustments, he had received additional compensation such as deferred compensation and a variety of other incentives that amounted to significant dollar amounts. She explained that her contract had been created using the same format but indicated that the extremely controversial clauses and all of the additional compensation opportunities had been eliminated. She stated that it continued to provide her with the opportunity to purchase County benefits at the same rate as any other County employee with the same number of years of service and also contained very specific language regarding Board review of any changes or modifications. She stated that she felt the proposed salary was fair and was aligned with her experience and years of service and indicated that she hoped to develop an evaluation system for the position so that accommodations or modifications to that salary could be made in the future, if the Board deemed it appropriate.

Supervisor Christy stated that he would be voting against the new contract for various reasons. He indicated that he was disappointed with the application and search process and stated that many of the controversies the Board had dealt with could have been avoided had the process been conducted differently. He commented that he would have preferred a one-year contract versus four years and that it should have included a probationary period. He added that this new contract seemed to be a replicated version of the previous one, only with some significant deletions and that a new slate of leadership was needed in the County Administrator's Office.

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

21. Employment Contract of Former County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the events, involved Pima County staff, pertinent documentation, and any other items or individuals with knowledge of the employment contract of former Pima County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry.

This item will also allow, include, and not be limited to matters related to Mr. Huckelberry's changed employment status effective July 4, 2021, and the events surrounding it, as well as his resignation. All documents pertinent to this item are requested for review. Further, it is requested that representatives of the Human

Resources and Payroll Departments who are familiar with these details be present. Mr. Huckelberry's personal attorneys are invited to answer questions regarding their client's employment contract. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that Mr. Huckelberry retired on July 4, 2021 and changed his status with Pima County as a contractor with no notification to the Board. He read the following from County Administrator Lesher's April 15, 2022 memorandum into the record:

"Here is what I know about Mr. Huckelberry's decision to receive retirement benefits and continue working as County Administrator under the terms of his contract. Mr. Huckelberry notified ASRS of his intent to retire in the ARS, ASRS system and his retirement was effective July 4, 2021."

Supervisor Christy questioned when Ms. Lesher knew about Mr. Huckelberry's decision to receive retirement benefits, whether it was after July 4th and how she was informed.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, replied that she could not recall the exact date, but that it was sometime after July 4th. She added that Mr. Huckelberry told her that he had drawn down his retirement benefits and had planned to do that. She clarified, for the record, that there was a difference between drawing down retirement benefits and retiring from Pima County. She indicated that as an eligible employee he activated the ability to access retirement benefits through the State and it did not affect the wording of his contract or that he was a full-time County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy commented that the Board was caught by surprise with this information and he wanted to talk about how the process evolved and what the results of his actions did to transparency in government. He questioned if Ms. Lesher knew when Mr. Huckelberry made the decision to receive retirement benefits and continue working as County Administrator.

Ms. Lesher replied that Mr. Huckelberry told her that he had done so.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Ms. Lesher would have been in a more comfortable position if Mr. Huckelberry had told her that he had done this.

Ms. Lesher stated that it was his right to draw down his retirement benefits and indicated that approximately 500 current Pima County employees had also accessed their retirement benefits. She added that it was a part of the retirement system and it was his personal financial arrangement with the State and his years of service with Pima County and part of his relationship with the members of the Board.

Supervisor Christy commented that the Board was left in the dark and that it would be in the best interest of the Board to look at ways to prevent this from happening

again. He questioned when had Mr. Huckelberry instructed his chief executive assistant, Monica Perez, to work with the Human Resources and Finance Departments to ensure compliance with ASRS on his retirement benefits.

Ms. Leshar replied that she did not know the date of that action, but that Mr. Huckelberry had access to an availability to draw down his benefits. She stated that he wanted to ensure that it be done in accordance with the provisions of his contract and the requirements of the Arizona State Retirement System (ASRS).

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the requirements were met and if it was at Ms. Perez's discretion to determine if the requirements were met.

Ms. Leshar stated that her understanding was that the requirements were met. She added that Ms. Perez had worked to ensure they were met and she had no reason to believe that anything was not done in accordance with the rules and regulations. She also stated that the Human Resources and Finance Departments involved also had to adhere to a variety of standards of confidentiality for Mr. Huckelberry, as well as every County employee. She relied on them to not share specifics of employees' withholding. She added that one of the reasons she was not involved was that Mr. Huckelberry was working directly with personnel from ASRS and with individuals specifically designated to ensure that it was done in accordance with the requirements of ASRS, the law and his contract.

Supervisor Christy questioned if the Human Resources and Payroll Departments had knowledge of this when the items were presented to ASRS and whether they approved the changes to Mr. Huckelberry's contract as being in compliance.

Ms. Leshar concurred and clarified that Human Resources and Payroll did not have a subjective cut on it, they only checked to see if they were in accordance with the requirements of ASRS, the law and his contract.

Supervisor Christy asked when was the accordance met by both departments.

Ms. Leshar replied that she did not have that date in front of her, but was sure they had it because they would have been cross-walked and approved in order for him to begin to receive retirement benefits.

Supervisor Christy questioned who and what departments they were cross-walked and approved by.

Ms. Leshar replied they were cross-walked and approved by the individuals who ensured the accommodations made to his payroll check and the information received from ASRS were correct. She added the individuals worked within the Finance and Payroll Department.

Supervisor Christy questioned how the Board would be assured that all of the elements were properly executed.

Ms. Leshar stated that it was a function of the Payroll Department to be regularly audited by a variety of individuals, including the State, to ensure compliance for every employee who retired or made modifications to the payroll system, was done in accordance with the employee's request or by ASRS or any other legal accommodation.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether these individuals were managers, or if they had received approval from their superiors that it was done properly.

Ms. Leshar replied there were checks and balances within the system, but there was not an individual person within the organization reviewing each of the changes.

Supervisor Christy read from Ms. Leshar's April 15, 2022 memorandum into the record:

"He instructed a limited number of staff to closely hold this information."

Supervisor Christy questioned who were the limited number of staff and what information was closely held.

Ms. Leshar stated that she did not know the names of the specific individuals, but that it was personal financial information relating to what Mr. Huckelberry was about to access through his state retirement system with no desire for it to be widely known because it was his personal financial information.

Supervisor Christy questioned when was Ms. Perez instructed to closely hold this information.

Ms. Leshar responded that she did not know the date and that Ms. Perez worked closely with Mr. Huckelberry as he walked through the various elements when he began to access his retirement funds.

Supervisor Christy commented that ASRS required that an employee had to verify with their employer that the ending payroll verification form be submitted online to ASRS and that the Board was his employer, but had never received verification.

Ms. Leshar commented that the forms that were required through the State required notification to Pima County as the employer, not to the five individual members of the Board of Supervisors, and they had been provided.

Supervisor Christy questioned why any type of body, organization or department was not notified when an employee made a change to their ASRS.

Ms. Leshar explained that staff had begun to send out termination reports to all Board members that showed employees who changed status of employment with the County and would continue to provide these reports moving forward.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Ms. Leshar could acknowledge the lack of trust and transparency and inherent issues with the system that needed to be addressed and the reason why they were at this point.

Ms. Leshar replied that there were issues related to each County employee for which the system was developed and that they would continue to maintain the strictest confidentiality regarding those employees. She stated that it was a separate issue regarding the former County Administrator and whether they were a part of that overall structure and that the County was responding to the individual in the same way. She felt it was appropriate to bifurcate the issues to provide a different standard of transparency to the Board and the public.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the Board could receive documentation of the actions to acknowledge the steps taken and to whom it was delivered to.

Ms. Leshar stated that she would work with the Board to continue to expand the terms of transparency and documentation moving forward. She stated, that in moving forward, she hoped that they maintained confidentiality and respect to every County employee regarding what their individual holdings or actions may be. She stated staff would continue to work with the Board on evaluating every piece of paper that involved her or any future County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Ms. Leshar would be in a position where this type of system of changes in important areas of a pay plan would take place without notification or illumination.

Ms. Leshar stated that would not take place.

Supervisor Christy questioned purchases made by Mr. Huckelberry of Indian jewelry in certain locations at various times in an amount more than \$2,580.00.

Supervisor Scott requested a point of clarification and questioned if this subject was related to the item.

Supervisor Christy clarified that the connection was that the purchases happened after Mr. Huckelberry retired and it appeared that he charged personal items with a County P-card. He questioned if contractors were assigned P-cards.

Ms. Leshar stated that the County sold a variety of jewelry items and pottery items that came from Mexico in the County gift shop. During COVID there were challenges with supply chain and Mr. Huckelberry regularly traveled to Mexico and Las Vegas to visit family, so during these travels he purchased items from the Wikiup Jewelry Store or from Mexico. She added that staff had all required receipts and documentation of the inventory and audits showed everything was accounted for.

Supervisor Christy asked if Mr. Huckelberry used the P-Card to buy inventory for the gift shop as a contractor.

Ms. Lesher responded that Mr. Huckelberry drew down his retirement benefits from the State, but did not retire from Pima County, so he continued to work under this contract as County Administrator.

Chair Bronson concurred with Supervisor Scott and stated that the question was out of order.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that the concern was that this came as a surprise that the Board did not receive regular communications from Human Resources and that they should receive information in regards to new employees, retirements, employees separating from the County or for whatever reason. She stated that Mr. Huckelberry should have notified the Board directly and that the change in status was the responsibility of the Board, but it was not articulated in his contract. She added that this was a learning opportunity to work with the new County Administrator to get inline on a more equitable balance.

Chair Bronson agreed.

Supervisor Scott commented that the Board should have been more explicit on the constructing of Mr. Huckelberry's contract and that they needed to ask these questions to Mr. Huckelberry, but he was not in attendance. He read the following from Ms. Lesher's April 15, 2022 memorandum into the record:

"The changes complied with all the rules and requirements of ASRS, County policies, and Mr. Huckelberry's employment contract."

Supervisor Scott stated that it was important for the public to know that all of the rules and requirements of ASRS, County policies and his contract were adhered to. He added that County employees acted with the greatest amount of professionalism and with respect for privacy of Mr. Huckelberry as an employee. He indicated that the Board needed to talk about process, not legality or illegality and that they were not questioning the actions of any of the employees who had performed with integrity and professionalism.

Supervisor Christy commented that with the line of questioning, there were more questions unanswered and an attempt to not fully be forthcoming of who knew what, where and how, who was involved in the process and who had knowledge. He stated that it enhanced skepticism and the lack of confidence in administrative leaders. He restated that what he needed to know was what employees, in what departments, what time, knew exactly what was going on. He indicated that if he had that information then they could move on, but that his questions had not been clarified.

Supervisor Scott reiterated that if questions were left unanswered it was because Mr. Huckelberry may be the only person who could answer them. He stated that the public should know that the employees who continued to work for Pima County comported themselves with the greatest amount of professionalism and integrity in dealing with the matter. He added that he did not have any question about how Ms. Leshner or any other County employee comported themselves throughout this matter. He added that it may seem that it gave the impression that something was awry, but there was no reason to make that assertion.

22. **Board of Supervisor Policy Regarding Senior Leadership Notification and Consent of Retirement and Return-to-Work**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator and County staff to draft a new Board of Supervisors' Policy/Policies or Administrative Policy/Policies - for Board approval - to outline the protocols and procedures necessary for when a member of the senior County leadership (deputy department director or higher on the organizational chart) or a "highly paid employee" in any department (defined as earning 60% or more above the County's median wage for a full-time employee) chooses to retire and return to work for Pima County, either full or part-time, for any period of time, per ASRS rules and state statute. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz to direct the County Administrator and County staff to draft a new Board of Supervisor (BOS) Policy or Administrative Procedure, to outline the protocols and procedures necessary for when a member of the senior County leadership or a highly paid employee in any department chooses to retire or return to work for the County, either full or part-time, for any period of time, according to ASRS rules and state statute. In the case of the retirement of the County Administrator, a return to work for the County in any capacity or under any circumstances shall be allowable only with the consent of the BOS, through action taken in a properly noticed BOS meeting, prior to such return-to-work becoming effective. Such a return to work shall be for a finite and defined period as expressly authorized by the BOS and shall necessitate the creation and execution of a new employment contract for said period. In the case of the retirement of a deputy county administrator, assistant county administrator, department director and deputy director, or other highly paid employee, a return-to-work for the County in any capacity or under any circumstances shall be allowable only with the expressed written consent of the County Administrator with timely notice provided by the County Administrator to the BOS. Under no circumstances, shall the County Administrator or any person in a County leadership role be able to retire and return to work without the full knowledge of the BOS, as well as the public. The motion died for lack of a second.

23. **Personnel Policy - Change in Employment Status**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator and County staff to draft a new personnel policy - or amend existing policy/policies as necessary - regarding protocols and notice expectations for an employee looking to retire,

resign, take a paid or unpaid leave of absence, or otherwise leave their post indefinitely or for an extended period.

An employee wishing to initiate such a change in their employment status, if eligible, must provide written notice to their department director, Human Resources, and the County Administrator, and receive written acknowledgment or approval of same, before initiating the change. In the case of the County Administrator or Clerk of the Board, such written notice shall be delivered to the full Board of Supervisors, both by email and hard copy, at least 90 days prior to the desired date of such change. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Christy to direct the County Administrator and County staff to draft a new personnel policy or amend existing policy/policies, as necessary, regarding protocols and notice expectations for an employee looking to retire, resign, take a paid or unpaid leave of absence, or otherwise leave their post indefinitely or for an extended period of time. An employee wishing to initiate such a change in their employment status, if eligible, must provide written notice to their department director, Human Resources, and the County Administrator, and receive written acknowledgment or approval of same, before initiating the change. In the case of the County Administrator or Clerk of the Board, such written notice shall be delivered to the full Board of Supervisors, both by email and hard copy, at least 90 days prior to the desired date of such change. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy commented that he was in agreement with the policy's proposal but asked for it to be reviewed by either the County Attorney, Human Resources or Payroll Department prior to Board approval.

Chair Bronson concurred with Supervisor Christy's comments and indicated that conflict may also exist with the Arizona State Retirement System and stated that the item required further analysis by the Human Resources Department and the County Attorney's Office.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, indicated by way of direction, they would work with the County Attorney's Office and draft a policy that met the criteria established for review by the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva asked for it to also include the current procedures and how the proposed modifications would affect them.

Chair Bronson reiterated the possibility of privacy issues.

Supervisor Christy stated that a non-interference clause currently existed which prevented the Board from interfering with employment or termination decisions that were made by department heads and asked staff to include a determination of that clause with their analysis.

Chair Bronson commented that the clause had come into effect because of previous Board interference that had cost the County nearly \$5 million in settlement fees.

Supervisor Christy questioned when the draft policy would be available for Board review.

Ms. Leshar stated the draft policy would be available in approximately two weeks.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew his motion.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

24. Education Reimbursement Program

Staff recommends approval of \$500,000.00 in General Funds be set aside each fiscal year to support the Education Reimbursement Program. Reimbursement would be made to employees on a first-come, first-reimbursed basis until the funds are exhausted for that fiscal year. Should the Board of Supervisors approve the dedicated funding, the Education Reimbursement Program Administrative Procedure will be implemented for the 2022/23 fiscal year.

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

Supervisor Christy questioned why the program had ended in 2008.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, indicated that it was one of the benefits that had been removed when funds were being cut during the great recession.

Supervisor Christy questioned the cost to the County.

Ms. Leshar responded that this request was to set a cap at \$500,000.00, to be included in next year's budget which would allow the County opportunity to review the process with regards to employee usage. She explained that the recommended dollar amount had been based on discussions with other jurisdictions and communities to determine the appropriate amount that would encourage the educational advancement of County employees.

Supervisor Christy commented that job development grant opportunities seemed to be readily available to existing employees and questioned the need of adding this additional cost to the County budget.

Ms. Leshar responded that other funding opportunities were available but this was an added benefit that would encourage new employment and retention. She indicated that current employees could use this benefit to further their education, increase their skills, and become better members of the County workforce.

Supervisor Christy commented that it could also be motivation for individuals to further their educational background, become more highly qualified, and seek better opportunities outside of the County.

Ms. Leshner responded that it was not necessarily an issue that had been experienced by other institutions that offered educational reimbursement programs. She indicated that it would be one of the areas evaluated by staff, if the item was approved by the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that she was pleased to see the item on the agenda and hoped that it would address some of the concerns that were raised by many of the department heads regarding employee retirements and not having qualified in house staff to fill those positions. She expressed her support for the item and hoped that it helped with furthering the education of current employees and would create more employment interest in Pima County.

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

25. **Recommendation for Additional Sick Leave for Those Negatively Affected by the April 2020 Stay-At-Home Order**

Staff recommends approval of 80 hours of supplemental sick leave for full-time employees and 40 hours of sick leave for part-time and intermittent employees who were required to use their leave accruals during the Governor's Stay-At-Home Order in 2020.

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the cost and a cost estimate.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that there would be additional hard costs to the County with disbursement of these hours. She explained that the expended hours were not eligible for payout upon employment termination and were merely an attempt to ensure employee and public safety. She explained that this would afford some of those employees who had exhausted all of their sick leave during the stay-at-home order access to additional sick leave without any increase in pay.

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

26. **Appointment of Pima County Public Defender**

Staff recommends the appointment of Megan Page as Pima County Public Defender.

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

TREASURER

27. Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$442,228.54.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

COUNTY ATTORNEY

28. Struck Love Bojanowski & Acedo, P.L.C., Amendment No. 4, to provide for legal representation of Pima County in Taylor v. Pima County, et al., and amend contractual language, Risk Management Tort Fund, contract amount \$200,000.00 (CT-FN-21-151)

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

Supervisor Christy commented that he thought this legal matter had been settled and requested clarification on this item.

Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the criminal matter had been settled, but the civil case was ongoing and explained that this was an extension for Outside Counsel for the civil case.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether it involved the matter of wrongful prosecution.

Mr. Brown responded that it was for damages related to his imprisonment.

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

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

29. Southern New Hampshire University, Amendment No. 4, to provide for a lease agreement for property located at 97 E. Congress Street and amend contractual language, contract amount \$1,521,928.14 revenue decrease (CTN-FM-20-32)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

30. Public Art and Community Design Committee

Appointment of Mel Dominguez, to replace Lucia Lagarda. No term expiration. (District 2)

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

31. Election Integrity Commission

Reappointment of Levoy Hurley. Term expiration: 4/2/24. (District 4)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

32. Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2 and 7 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

Upon the request of Supervisor Grijalva to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 2 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISORS CHRISTY AND GRIJALVA

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

2. Child-Parent Centers, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program Extended Day Head Start, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CT-CR-21-496)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired if the original \$10 million would be returned to the General Fund and whether the funding would be charged to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA).

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that the General Fund would be reimbursed and APRA funds would be used through the remainder of the program. She indicated that it was part of a plan which was delineated and approved by the Board in December 2021. She stated that this amendment would identify that in the contracts.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the funding plan when ARPA was no longer available.

Ms. Leshar explained that legislation had passed that allowed for education programs to be provided through the tax base in the Library Department and the Library Tax Funds. She indicated that there had been discussions regarding migration of the program as an ongoing program, funded at the discretion of the Board, by the Library Department.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the ARPA program completion date.

Ms. Leshar indicated that ARPA funding was designated through the end of 2024.

Supervisor Grijalva commented about the creation of a sliding scale for the current requirements and questioned whether a change in funding sources would hinder that development.

Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant, County Administrator's Office, responded that the Grants Management and Innovation Department had been consulted regarding any constraints or flexibility that could result from the funding change and indicated that some flexibility was available. She explained that under the different category, it was possible to get up to the 300% poverty level versus the current 200%, which boosted the annual income requirement from \$36,000.00 or under, to approximately \$45,000.00 or under, for a single parent with a child.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she would support the item as long as some flexibility remained with the creation of that sliding scale.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

7. Award

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-26, Amendment No. 2, AAA Cab Service, Inc., d.b.a. AAA Full Transportation, to provide for short distance transportation services for asylum seekers. This amendment increases the award amount by \$250,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$500,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

Supervisor Christy asked why the transportation services were transferred from the Community and Economic Development Department to Fleet Services, and questioned the reasons for providing asylum seekers with cab services.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that this was part of the ongoing federally funded contracts for the County's assistance with the continuation of movement for those legal asylum seekers brought into the community by the Department of Homeland Security. She explained that part of the responsibility provided by the federal government in funding was to get those individuals onto their next step and out of the community by providing transportation to the bus station or airport. She stated that the County worked with a variety of transportation services to achieve this task, but indicated it was done primarily with the cab service. She added that Fleet Services had the best understanding related to those needs and since they handled all County transportation contracts, felt it was the more appropriate department.

Supervisor Christy commented that the background material indicated that the funding source was from the General Fund.

Ms. Leshner responded that the funds were replaced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds and indicated that regular reports had been provided to the Board on all spending and reimbursement.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the General Fund would be reimbursed.

Ms. Leshner responded in the affirmative.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

1. Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the promotion and enhancement of tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$900,000.00 (CT-ED-21-510)

Community and Workforce Development

2. Child-Parent Centers, Inc., Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
3. Nancy Chow, Amendment No. 3, to provide for academic tutoring services and amend contractual language, State Equalization Fund, contract amount \$1,500.00 (CT-CR-21-353)

County Attorney

4. Epidaurus, d.b.a. Amity Foundation, Amendment No. 5, to provide for the Specialty Courts Initiative - Residential Treatment, extend contract term to 4/14/23 and amend contractual language, DTAP-SAMHSA/Drug Court (\$40,000.00) and DOJ BJA (\$20,000.00) Funds, contract amount \$60,000.00 (CT-PCA-19-407)

Elections

5. Town of Marana, to provide for election services, contract amount \$77,346.00 revenue/3 year term (CTN-EL-22-121)

Procurement

6. **Award**
Award: Purchase Order No. PO-PO-22-39, Johnson Controls, Inc. (Headquarters: Milwaukee, WI), to provide for two (2) new 800 ton chillers for downtown central plant. This contract is for a one-time award in the discrete amount of \$976,197.70 (including sales tax). Funding Source: Capital Improvement Project Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

7. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-26, Amendment No. 2, AAA Cab Service, Inc., d.b.a. AAA Full Transportation, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

8. StreetLight Data, Inc., d.b.a. StreetLight Data, Amendment No. 4, to provide for traveler mobility data and analysis interface, extend contract term to 6/12/23 and amend contractual language, Transportation Ops Fund, contract amount \$325,000.00 (MA-PO-19-207) Transportation
9. Tucson Recycling & Waste Services, L.L.C., Amendment No. 4, to provide for outsourcing of landfill and transfer station operations, extend contract term to 5/31/33 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$4,051,080.00 (MA-PO-13-513) Environmental Quality
10. Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 9, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services for Old Nogales Interceptor/Aerospace Corridor/Park Avenue Sewer Augmentation Project No. 3ASC15 and amend contractual language, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount \$829,240.50 (CT-WW-16-208) Regional Wastewater Reclamation

Real Property

11. I-10 Avra Valley Mining and Development, L.L.C., to provide for an exchange agreement, Special Warranty Deed and Quit Claim Deed, for 4.0358 acres of property located at Avra Valley Road and Interstate 10, in connection with Avra Valley Gateway Specific Plan Co23-07-01, Finance Special Projects Fund, contract amount \$7,700.00 (CT-RPS-22-313)

Sheriff

12. City of Tucson, to provide for the Pima County Mapping Administrator position, contract amount \$60,000.00 estimated revenue (CTN-SD-22-122)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the HUD Continuum of Care Program - One Stop Rapid Rehousing and extend grant term to 11/30/22, no cost (GTAM 22-63)

14. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

Arizona Department of Education - Health and Nutrition Services Division, to provide for Supply Chain Assistance Funds, \$5,000.00 (GTAW 22-105)

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

15. Special Event

Edward P. Sheffer, St. Thomas the Apostle Roman Catholic Parish Tucson,
5150 N. Valley View Road, Tucson, April 2, 2022.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

16. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

The Primavera Foundation, Inc. \$5,552.17; The Primavera Foundation, Inc. \$1,423.12; HSL Skyline Gateway Properties, L.L.C. \$7,682.81; HSL Skyline Gateway Properties, L.L.C. \$6,896.00; Casa De Los Ninos, Inc. \$743.75; Casa De Los Ninos, Inc. \$63.75; City of Tucson \$84,761.27; City of Tucson \$45,501.45; HSL Montebella Properties, L.L.C. \$5,317.17; HSL Montebella Properties, L.L.C. \$7,257.31; BW Capital, L.L.C. \$3,711.14; Funeraria Azahares, L.L.C. \$2,455.00; Funeraria Azahares, L.L.C. \$3,700.00; City of Tucson \$83,810.48.

SUPERIOR COURT

17. Judge Pro Tempore Appointments

Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore of the Superior Court for the period of July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023:

Judges Pro Tempore (Voluntary Attorneys/Without Pay)

Michael Aaron; John Aboud; Michael Aboud; Gustavo Aragon; Rebecca Assini; J. Emory Barker; Richard Beck; Laura Belleau; Elizabeth Benavidez; Mark Bockel; John Bolt; John Brady; Suzanne Brei; Lindsay Brew; Caleb Brown; Luke Brown; Victoria Lea Buchinger; Dan Cavett; Dean Christoffel; Douglas H. Clark; Peter Collins, Jr.; Danielle Constant; Roger Contreras; Katrina Conway; Suzanne Diaz; James Egbert; Melissa Errico; Erin Fox; Roberto C. Garcia; Abbe Goncharsky; Ann Haralambie; Phoebe Harris; Megan Hill; Daniel Huff; Gary (Todd) Jackson; Jane Jacobs; Michael Johnson; Daniel Jurkowitz; Leonard Karp; Shaun Kenney; Thabet N. Khalidi; Brian Kimminau; Kevin Kinghorn; Reagen Kulseth; Zelma Letarte; Robert Lewis; Jennifer Manzi; Analisa Masunas; Peter Matiatos; Kathleen McCarthy; Lisa McNorton; Timothy Medcoff; Andrew Meshel; Kathryn Nelson; Karen Nygaard; Natalie Ann Evans Parkman; J.C. Patrascioiu; Alyce Pennington; Riisa Petersen Mandel; Karen Pollins; Terri Pones; Carrie Rednour; Annie Rolfe; Nathan Seth Rothschild; Dee-Dee Samet; Susan Marie Schauff; Ted Schmidt; Denise Shepherd; Dev Sethi; Marissa Sites; Russell Stowers; Grant Lamond Stratton; Edina Strum; Merle Turchik; David Burr Udall; Geoffry Knapp Ulreich; Erika Volpiano; Nanette Warner; Robert Way; James Whitehill; Paul Willman; Jeffrey Wohlford; Sarah Wright; Dawn Deann Wyland; Kaytlyn Yrun-Duffy; Ronald Zack; Raymond Zirkle

Court Commissioners to serve as Judges Pro Tempore (With Pay)

John Assini; Randi Burnett; Lisa Bibbens; Jane Butler; Julia Connors;
Jennifer Espino; Geoffrey Ferlan; Patricia Green; Lori Jones; Nicholas
Knauer; Jennifer Langford; Cathleen Linn; Bunkye Olson; Deborah Pratte;
Gilbert Rosales; Lisa Schrinier Lewis; Helena Seymour

Judges Pro Tempore/Hearing Officer (With Pay)

Howard Fell; Teresa Godoy; Renee Hampson; June Harris; Lee Ann Roads

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

18. Minutes: March 1, 2022

* * *

33. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK