

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, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Flood Control District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Flood Control District Budget in the amount of \$18,475,401.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.3235. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement 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, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the following County Improvement District Tentative Budgets for Fiscal Year 2022/2023:

<u>IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT</u>	<u>FY 22-23 PROPERTY TAX LEVY</u>
<u>Other Improvement District</u>	
HAYHOOK RANCH	\$ 40,000
<u>Street Lighting Improvement District</u>	
CARDINAL ESTATES	\$ 11,065
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1	\$ 7,775
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3	\$ 2,131
DESERT STEPPES	\$ 4,664
HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES	\$ 3,597
LAKESIDE NO. 1	\$ 5,906
LITTLETOWN	\$ 21,377
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1	\$ 8,439
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2	\$ 9,772
MAÑANA GRANDE B	\$ 6,662
MAÑANA GRANDE C	\$ 10,883
MIDVALE PARK	\$ 14,201
MORTIMORE ADDITION	\$ 25,803
OAKTREE NO. 1	\$ 22,746
OAKTREE NO. 2	\$ 16,893
OAKTREE NO. 3	\$ 29,531
ORANGE GROVE VALLEY	\$ 6,745
PEACH VALLEY	\$ 3,839
PEPPERTREE	\$ 9,848
ROLLING HILLS	\$ 21,587

SALIDA DEL SOL

\$ 13,753

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Improvement District Tentative Budgets as presented. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 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, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Library District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Library District Budget in the amount of \$46,600,637.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.5453. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Our Story - A Communities of Color Curation Project and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 22-83)

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

3. CONTRACT

Pascua Yaqui Tribe, to provide for cooperative library services, no cost/5 year term (CTN-LIB-22-143)

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Rocking K South Community Facilities 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, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Rocking K South Community Facilities District Budget in the amount of \$4,151,842.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Stadium District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Stadium District Budget in the amount of \$8,824,807.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 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, May 17, 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
Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott participated remotely.

**Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:43 a.m. and participated remotely. He joined the meeting in-person at 10:10 a.m. and left the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Michael Spotted Wolf, Finance Director, Tucson Indian Center. He performed an Honor Song.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Donna Piechura, Jeff Piechura's wife; Staci Piechura, daughter; Jared McGovern, family friend; Shane Clark, Director, Office of Emergency Management; Brad Bradley, Fire Chief; Northwest Fire District, and Gary (retired, Northwest Fire District) and Mindy West, family friends, in honor of the memory of Chief Jeff Piechura.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Christy made the presentation.

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Nancy Cole, Director, Capital Program Office, Pima County and Arizona American Public Works Association Board Member, proclaiming the week of May 15 through 21, 2022, to be: "PUBLIC WORKS WEEK"

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Bronson made the presentation.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Ericka Irvin, Executive Director, Mental Health America Arizona, and Michelle Crow, Southern Arizona Director, Children's Action Alliance, proclaiming the month of May 2022 to be: "MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Grijalva made the presentation.

7. Proclaiming Friday, June 3, 2022 to be: "GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Scott read the proclamation.

8. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Joyce Brazie addressed the Board in support of Constable Deborah Martinez.

Robert Reus reminded voters about the deadline for the City of Tucson's Special Election and expressed his displeasure with the County's rising property taxes.

Peter Norquest addressed the Board regarding his concerns with voting centers and the possibility of intentional and fraudulent activity throughout the various locations.

Sami Hamed expressed his concerns with the conduct of Constable Deborah Martinez. He asked the Board to investigate her actions.

Dru Heaton addressed the Board with concerns about the voting centers and thanked Jan Leshner, County Administrator and Constance Hargrove, Elections Director, for meeting with her regarding those concerns.

Chair Bronson asked staff to contact Ms. Heaton regarding her question on why the Libertarian Party was excluded from voting sites.

Marcelino Flores, Pima County Division Chair, AFSCME Local 449, addressed the Board in support of the proposed cost of living adjustment.

Amelia Cramer, former Pima County Deputy County Attorney, thanked the Board for their persistent attention to the intergovernmental agreement regarding initial court appearances.

Supervisor Scott directed staff to provide the Board with some form of guidance for future political appointments.

9. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Bronson and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:03 a.m.

10. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:25 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Lake v. Hobbs.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3), for legal advice regarding the Constable disciplinary process.

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

13. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board regarding the Tentative Budgets for FY 2022/2023. No one appeared.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

14. Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023 in the amount of \$1,932,712,979.00 at an effective tax rate of \$5.0652. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired if this was the appropriate time for discussion on the additional \$5.58 million the Board of Health had requested and the two agenda item

proposals that she requested regarding the addition of \$2 million for land preservation and purchasing and \$5 million for affordable housing initiatives.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that during the Tentative Budget adoption, it was the appropriate time for the Board to add any specific items and believed the question, at this point, was whether the Board would like the additional expenditure items placed in the Budget and to then come back to the Board with the Budget that included how those requests could be incorporated without an increase to the proposed tax rate.

Supervisor Grijalva responded in the affirmative.

Chair Bronson commented that she was not comfortable with that direction unless the recommended ceiling and tax rate remained the same. She questioned what the net effect would be on the County's reserve fund balance and indicated that the answer could be provided to the Board at a later time.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification on what the Board would be voting on.

Chair Bronson responded that they would be voting on keeping the proposed tax rate at \$5.0652 and asked staff how much of a decrease that would be to the primary rate.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was a .13 cent decrease.

Chair Bronson commented that even with the decreased rate, valuations were higher so property taxes would be increased.

Ms. Leshar concurred.

Supervisor Christy asked whether any changes to the budget could be made at this time by the Board.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative and stated that if Supervisor Grijalva's proposals were incorporated today, the calculation of a new tax rate would be needed and explained that by adopting the current rate, the requested funds would need to come from somewhere else within the recommended budget.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification that the Board was only voting on setting the budget ceiling.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that she was requesting an additional \$12.58 million.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether that would cause the ceiling to be raised.

Supervisor Grijalva responded in the affirmative and indicated that it should not cause any significant impacts to the County budget considering its size.

Ms. Leshar commented that staff could be directed to include both of the proposals made by Supervisors Grijalva and Heinz, and then bring those recommendations back to the Board showing how they were incorporated without increasing the current tax rate.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that worst case scenario would be a reduction of .12 cents versus .13 cents.

Chair Bronson commented that adopting her recommendation would not amount to a decrease and indicated that even with the adoption of the current tax rate, taxes would still be increased due to assessed valuations.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on whether the Board was voting on setting the tax rate or the budget cap.

Chair Bronson responded that they would be voting on both, and explained that voting on the tax rate set the budget ceiling and indicated that the Board could not exceed that rate when the final budget was adopted.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned how the additional \$13 million would affect that tax rate.

Ms. Leshar responded that \$1 million equaled one penny.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the Fiscal Year 2022 cash balance from all County accounts was \$239 million and indicated that there was enough capacity to adopt both proposals.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the General Fund balance was \$137 million and explained that additional fund balances were indicated, but were for special revenue funds that were fairly well restricted, and stated that more granularity would be provided.

Supervisor Scott asked Dr. Garcia for his comments on the additional funding suggestions that were made by the Board of Health and questioned how Supervisor Grijalva had determined the dollar amounts needed for affordable housing and land acquisition.

Supervisor Grijalva responded that it was through research of available properties and discussions with department directors and staff on what was attainable. She stated that it was the start of establishing the line item and indicated that those figures could be adjusted.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that he was not part of the discussion regarding the Board of Health's request and indicated that his main concern for the department was the fairly significant balance of un-hired full-time employees (FTE's). He explained that the Health Department had approximately 120 positions in different stages of recruitment and believed it was possible for the Health Department to hire 10 to 12 new FTE's per month, but indicated that the additional proposal by the Board of Health would put them way over that estimation and added that it would be a difficult task to accomplish in such a short period of time.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that it was not clear whether the request was for additional staffing or modification of some of the current positions. She stated that her biggest concern with the current vacancies was the salary and wanted to explore making some adjustments. She added that she felt that the Board of Health's objectives were important and should be considered.

Dr. Garcia concurred, but indicated that his concern was with the ability to hire that many more employees when currently the department was only able to on-board 10 to 12 per month. He stated that it was something that the department should be invested in and felt that it could be done in part within the current budget. He added that discussion on whether or not those needs had been met should be considered early on before the preparation of the Fiscal Year '24 budget.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether the Board was able to divide the question and consider each of the three items individually.

Chair Bronson stated it was not an option for the new items and indicated that the Board would have to vote on the budget as a whole.

Supervisor Scott commented that after listening to Dr. Garcia's feedback, he was unwilling to vote in favor of the additional funding request from the Board of Health, but indicated his willingness to vote in favor of the requests made by Supervisor Grijalva for affordable housing and land acquisition.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that both of the items were listed separately on the agenda and indicated that her concern was the approval of certain agenda items without the ability to accommodate them once the ceiling was set. She added that having established that it could be done with carry forward and other funds, she was comfortable with passing the tax rate and ceiling and continuing the discussion at the time of final budget adoption.

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

15. Review and adoption of the Debt Service Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Services Tentative Budget in the amount of \$99,266,568.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.3200. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

16. **Office of U.S. Senator Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona Presentation**

Discussion/Action. Presentation by Troy Kimball, Constituent Affairs Representative, Office of U.S. Senator Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, to provide an update to the Board on the Senator's work and priorities. Also, discussion regarding any issues or concerns that Senator Sinema's office can help with in providing assistance to the Board. (Districts 1 and 5)

Troy Kimball, Constituent Affairs Representative, Office of U.S. Senator Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, introduced himself to the Board and expressed Senator Sinema's commitment to Southern Arizona. He indicated that Senator Sinema's Office was available to provide assistance to the Board with projects, grants or any issues that would help the community.

This item was informational only. No Board action taken.

17. **Request for Reconsideration - District 3**

- A. On May 3, 2022, the Board of Supervisors took the following action:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (3/15/22, 4/5/22 and 4/19/22)

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.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to approve the draft agreement dated April 29, 2022, include the following language as recommended by Dean Brault, Public Defense Services Director, "The Court shall make an unambiguous written record any time when the general conditions of release set by the Court are different from the Pretrial Services report recommendation," and extend the agreement for 1 year. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Christy and Scott voted "Nay."

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (3/15/22, 4/5/22 and 4/19/22)

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.

It was moved by Chair Bronson to approve the 10 year extension of the intergovernmental agreement (IGA). She indicated that Judge Bergin had requested this item be withdrawn from the agenda so that staff could revise the IGA and bring it back to the Board at a later date. She requested clarification from legal counsel regarding whether the Board needed to approve the item first and then vote to withdraw it.

Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney, responded that it was at the Board's discretion. She explained that the Board could take action on Chair Bronson's motion to approve the IGA or could choose to withdraw the item from the agenda.

Chair Bronson withdrew her motion.

It was then moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Christy to withdraw the item from the agenda, as requested by Judge Bergin. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that there currently was no IGA in place since it had expired and the Board had voted in favor of reconsideration of their action taken at the last Board meeting.

Chair Bronson inquired if the Board honored Judge Bergin's request to withdraw the item, what would be the net effect of the withdrawal of the IGA.

Ms. Lukach responded that it would depend on what last meeting's vote actually accomplished.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that the Board had approved a one year time extension with modifications, but they had just voted to reconsider that action.

Chair Bronson concurred. She indicated that if the Board approved Judge Bergin's request to withdraw the item from the agenda, staff could work on revisions to the IGA and it would come back to the Board at a later date.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, restated the motion, to withdraw this item from the agenda.

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

Supervisor Grijalva requested clarification that this item would be revised and brought back to the Board in the near future and now there was no IGA with the Courts.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

18. County Administrator's Update

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, provided the following updates:

- She encouraged everyone to attend the 5th annual graduation ceremony for Pima County's Career Online High School, on Friday, May 20, 2022, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Flowing Wells Public Library.
- She congratulated Pima County's ECAP on earning the Circle of Excellence Award for the year and stated that 61% of County employees had participated and raised a little over \$270,000.00.
- She highlighted a new mini grant program, New Pathways for Health and Well-Being for Youth, which provided up to \$10,000.00, for help in addressing mental health and well-being in our youth. She indicated that applications were due on May 31st and were available on the website.
- She stated that the last day of the Pima County Fair, was a record breaking day with more people that day than ever in its history and thanked all of the contributing partners.
- She indicated that it was Public Works Week and encouraged everyone to attend the barbeque that was being hosted by the Department of Transportation's Management Team on May 19th for employee appreciation.
- She wished Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, a happy birthday and commented that she made the Board meetings wonderful.

19. Recommendation for Additional Sick Leave for those Negatively Affected by the April 2020 Stay-At-Home Order

Staff recommends the elimination of item three (3) from the criteria as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated May 17, 2022, and 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, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

20. **Modifications to Employee COVID-19 Vaccine Requirement**

In response to House Bill 2498, staff recommends approval of the following actions:

1. The general requirement for COVID-19 vaccination for the purpose of hiring or promotion be continued until HB2498 takes effect ninety days after the end of the legislative session.
2. The COVID-19 vaccine requirement as a condition of employment remain in place for the purpose of employee protection for personnel working in or having consistent exposure to environments where clinical care is delivered.
3. Continue the provision of incentives, including wellness points, for the documentation of COVID-19 (primary or booster) vaccination.

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 objected to vaccine mandates from the beginning and indicated that it was poor management to implement new policies when new legislation had just gone into effect. He stated that the County already had difficulty retaining employees and attracting new ones and indicated that those policies made the unvaccinated feel even more unwelcomed. He stated that he had received several comments from constituents regarding their concerns. He indicated that one of the individuals had referenced a May 12, 2022, memorandum from the County Administrator, which indicated her recommendation to extend the employee vaccination surcharge for another year since it was too early to assess the economic impact it had on employee related health care costs. He asked that the following two questions be addressed, "were unvaccinated employees the only ones who experienced long COVID," and "if the study concluded no excessive costs to the County by unvaccinated employees, would those employees receive money back for being unfairly penalized?"

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that the decision regarding whether or not individuals would be reimbursed was a policy decision by the Board. She explained that those were reviewed costs related to the overall assessment of fees.

Supervisor Christy asked for the total number of employees who were paying the insurance penalty.

Ms. Leshner responded that it was approximately 280.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that the employee surcharge had only been in place for about six months and was part of the reason why they were not able to provide the Board with a more definitive response as to whether it was a cost savings for the County. He stated that vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals were both capable of developing long-term COVID, but stressed that existing evidence suggested that the vaccinated experienced it to a lesser extent. He explained that the County Administrator had asked the Health Department,

Human Resources and Aetna, to take another look at this policy question and provide the Board with a factual basis on whether to continue with the surcharge or eliminate it. He added that it was still too early in the process to be able to provide that information.

Supervisor Christy questioned when that information would be available.

Dr. Garcia responded that it would be approximately six more months, and then a year's worth of data would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether it would come back as a policy issue.

Dr. Garcia responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy stated that another constituent had requested the reinstatement of terminated employees with back pay of lost wages and indicated that he wanted those options reviewed and included in the policy recommendations that were coming back to the Board. He added one last comment from a constituent who claimed that the County had stated that unvaccinated employees were not safe to be around the public or their coworkers and reminded everyone that vaccinated individuals were still getting sick and could spread COVID.

Supervisor Grijalva asked staff to explore options of giving County employees additional wellness points for getting boosted to encourage them to stay current on their vaccines and boosters.

Supervisor Scott concurred with Supervisor Christy's comments with regards to vaccinated people getting and spreading the virus, but asked staff to provide the Board with other reasons why it was still a good idea to require vaccine mandates. He indicated that he wanted staff to include and address viral load information along with other factors that made vaccinations a positive mandate.

Dr. Garcia responded that it was more deeply understood now than ever before and that the consequences of those infections were very different among the vaccinated versus the unvaccinated. He explained that infections among vaccinated individuals tended to have a shorter term and rarely led to hospitalizations and death. He continued that the findings were consistent not just in Pima County, but across counties within the United States and across the world, and indicated that among individuals who were unvaccinated, the likelihood of hospitalization and death was tremendously increased. He added that the findings were regardless of the particular variant that was circulating in the community and felt that no changes would likely be seen with that regard in the near future.

Supervisor Scott pointed out that the Board had taken a nuanced position with regard to which County employees were required to be vaccinated and stated that the mandate was only for those who worked with vulnerable populations. He stated that the Board had rejected a wholesale employee mandate and had also rejected

directing any of the surrounding employers to mandate vaccines. He concluded by stating that he found the state legislation referenced within the item to be an intrusion of the Board's authority to do what was best for their employees and what was best as the regional public health authority.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether all of those who were penalized worked directly with vulnerable communities.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would provide that information to the Board.

Supervisor Scott clarified that he was referring to the vaccine mandate and which employees were required to be vaccinated.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation that all of the affected employees worked with vulnerable communities.

Ms. Leshar responded that the information would be provided but wanted to clarify that there was a difference between those that were required to be vaccinated because they worked with vulnerable populations and those who were paying the surcharge for healthcare and added that they were two different groups of individuals.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

21. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Orthodox Christian Sisterhood of the Holy Unmercenaries, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2020 and 2021, for Tax Parcel Nos. 219-27-002G and 219-32-003C, and for tax year 2020, for Tax Parcel No. 219-27-003D.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

22. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 22.11, Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan Pension Funding.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

The Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2022, continued the following.

23. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 2.4, Board Policy on Non-Interference in Administrative Affairs.

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

Supervisor Christy requested clarification on what staff was asking the Board to approve since a number of policies were listed in the backup material for this item.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that at the last Board meeting both policies had been placed on the agenda separately, but were listed on one agenda item report together which made them appear as though they had been blended. She stated that she had asked for a continuation of Policy No. C 2.4 only, so that they could be bifurcated and discussed separately. She stated that at the last meeting action was taken on Policy No. 8-112. She explained that regarding this policy, staff's recommendation was to change a title from manager to administrator which would allow for the continuance of the noninterference language on behalf of the Board and would keep it in the policy. She added that the sunset clause was struck so that the noninterference language would not sunset.

Supervisor Christy asked whether an item had been removed from the agenda.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy inquired about a new Policy No. C 2.3 which stated, "No County employees or appointed officers shall take any action based on an order, instruction or request for action by any individual member of the Board of Supervisors or any member of the supervisor's staff in violation of the above described ordinance."

Ms. Leshar stated that C 2.3 was not listed on the agenda and this item was regarding C 2.4 only.

Supervisor Christy stated that the sunset clause had expired in 1993 and questioned why it needed to be added.

Ms. Leshar responded that it had been indicated that the Board had wished to keep the noninterference policy.

Supervisor Christy questioned when that had taken place.

Chair Bronson responded that it was said at the last meeting.

Supervisor Christy indicated it could not recall that discussion.

Ms. Leshar stated that the policy was brought back in order to keep that noninterference clause and indicated that what was before the Board today was almost a scrivener's error. She explained that the significant piece was simply to remove the sunset clause which would keep the Noninterference Board Policy in place and intact and in its current form.

Supervisor Christy asked for a more definitive description of that revision.

Ms. Leshar explained that if the sunset clause was removed from C 2.4, the Board policy on noninterference, it would remain intact as stated and articulated by this Board.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it was being acknowledged that the sunset clause expired in 1993.

Ms. Leshar responded that the sunset clause was discovered after staff's review of the policy and indicated that it was never adhered to or looked at and removing it would allow the Board to continue with that noninterference clause.

Chair Bronson commented that it was basically a scrivener's issue.

Ms. Leshar stated that was her understanding as well and indicated that should the Board wish to maintain a Board Policy on noninterference, it could be done with the approval of C 2.4, with the elimination of that sunset clause.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether noninterference was defined as not allowing any supervisor to engage or otherwise insert him or herself in the functions of any of the County Administration activities.

Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney, concurred and responded that the policy stated, "that the Board of Supervisors shall not deal with an administrative officer or employee appointed by or under the County Administrator, except through the County Administrator."

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification of the vote.

Chair Bronson responded that it was for the removal of the sunset clause.

Supervisor Grijalva stated for clarification purposes that the Board was voting on changing manager to administrator in Policy No. C 2.4, and that the only employee the Board could direct or talk to aside from their own staff, was the County Administrator.

Chair Bronson concurred.

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

RECORDER

24. Primary Election Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 26, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2022 Primary Election.

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

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the ballot boxes would differ from the ones used during the 2020 election. He asked for a description of the staffing at the individual sites.

Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder, responded that no changes would occur other than the Fellowship Bible Church becoming the replacement site for the east side location and the reopening of the Pascua Yaqui early voting site. She explained that it was necessary to relocate the east side facility due to its huge flow volume and lack of space and indicated that the new location was only a quarter of a mile down the road. She stated that staffing varied by location and indicated that at least two opposite party staff members were available at every site. She stated that some of the more rural locations had two staff members and explained that depending on the location, that number could be increased.

Supervisor Christy asked for an example of how the increased staffing would be provided.

Hilary Hiser, Assistant Chief Deputy Recorder, explained that staffing throughout their 15 locations varied and was dependent upon the volume at each location. She indicated that there was a minimum of 3 staff members per rotation that allowed for balanced party representation and stated that some locations had up to 7 or 8 staff members. She added that odd numbered staffing was preferred for the allowance of breaks.

Supervisor Christy questioned how staffing needs were determined.

Ms. Hiser responded that it was dependent upon the volume of ballots that had been received at each location during the 2020 election.

Chair Bronson commented that it was predictive modeling.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly stated that congressional elections typically meant decreased participation, but since 2020 data had been utilized, they had planned on continuing with that same level of preparation.

Supervisor Christy questioned how quickly those staffing needs would be addressed.

Ms. Hiser responded that their goal was to increase intermittent election workers by 130 and indicated that currently, about 100 experienced staffers were returning. She explained that there was adequate staffing for them to provide the needed rotations from opening to closing at all ballot drop off locations.

Supervisor Christy asked for a description of the ballot drop off boxes, their supervision and staffing, and the control measures that were being used.

Ms. Hiser explained that the boxes were standard drop off boxes currently being used at their locations for the City of Tucson's special election and added that metal ballot boxes were also used. She stated that the boxes were kept with a two party balance and explained that election staff wore color coded lanyards, dependent upon their party, in order to prevent two workers of that same party from working together.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly stressed the important distinction between Pima County and other counties such as Maricopa, and explained that Pima County had no unstaffed ballot drop boxes. She indicated that every single location would be completely staffed during the elections and a party balance would always be maintained.

Supervisor Christy asked for assurance that all drop off sites would be fully and consistently staffed.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded in the affirmative and stated that unlike other counties, Pima County had not moved towards unstaffed ballot boxes.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation that the Eastside location was closing and being replaced by a church as a voting center.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly explained that the Eastside location was going to remain open for recording and voter registration purposes, but any ballot replacement or early voting would occur at the Fellowship Bible Church.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the church would have the same staffing and business hours.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded in the affirmative and indicated that emergency voting and extended hours would be included during election days.

Marion Chubon, Program Coordinator, Recorder's Office, stated that the church would be staffed by their office and explained that the boxes were kept in a secure, locked location that only staff could access and added that safety measures referred to in the election procedures manual were also adhered to.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether that location transitioning process would be seamless.

Ms. Chubon responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy questioned the cost to the County for utilization of the church.

Ms. Chubon responded that it was going to cost approximately \$6,000.00 for six weeks, for both the primary and general elections.

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

25. General Election Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 27, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2022 General Election.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to adopt the Resolution.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

26. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 189955, Shelly Christine Gerrish, Monsoon Vermut, 6940 N. Bobcat Lane, Tucson, Series 13, Farm Winery, New License.

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

27. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 189681, Rebecca Debenport Safford, Tap and Bottle North, 7254 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Series 6, Bar, Location Transfer and Person Transfer.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva 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.

28. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Bobby Retz, Westin La Paloma Resort, 3660 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, May 22, 2022 at 8:00 p.m.

Chair Bronson stated that fireworks would depend on the fire conditions at the time of the event.

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

29. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Kevin Amidan, Sabino High School, 5000 N. Bowes Road, Tucson, May 26, 2022 at 9:00 p.m.

Chair Bronson stated that fireworks would depend on the fire conditions at the time of the event.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

30. Affordable Housing

Discussion/Direction/Action. A presentation of Pima County experts to the Pima County Affordable Housing Task Force recently identified nine county-owned parcels that could be used for affordable housing. The presenters said the county owns many other parcels that have potential use for affordable housing, but they have not been identified and inventoried. Pima County staff should be directed to compile a complete inventory of surplus county-owned parcels and buildings that could be used for development of affordable housing. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva stated that experts from Pima County Affordable Housing had recently identified nine county-owned parcels that could be used for affordable housing. She directed staff to compile a complete inventory of surplus county-owned parcels and buildings that could be used for that development.

31. **Cost of Living/Market Adjustment Salary Increases, FY23 Budget**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator and staff to implement a variation on the administrator's proposed market salary increases for the Pima County workforce in the FY23 Budget. Specifically, in place of the administrator's proposed 5% increase for employees who earn up to \$75,000 per year; 3% increase for employees who earn between \$75,001 and \$150,000 per year; and 1% for employees who earn more than \$150,000 per year, I move the following:

Current Employee Wage-Salary/Market Adjustment Increase, FY23

- A) Earn \$25/hour or less (\$52,000/yr or less)/8.5%
- B) Earn between \$25.01 and 36.057/hour (between \$52,001 and \$75,000/yr)/6.0%
- C) Earn between \$36.058 and 46.00/hour (between \$75,001 and \$95,680/yr)/4.0%
- D) Earn between \$46.001 and \$72.1154/hour (between \$95,681 and \$150,000/yr)/3.0%
- E) Earn \$150,001 and above/1.0%

See attachment for further details, including cost analysis. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to approve the item, as presented on the agenda. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva asked for clarification regarding the total budget cost was for this proposal.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that her May 16, 2022 memorandum had indicated that the General Fund subtotal was about \$12,759,000.00 and what was recommended in the current budget for increases was about \$7.5 million. She explained that it would be an approximately \$5.2 million dollar difference. She added that she wanted staff to recheck the numbers in order to make sure that the potential costs were accurately presented to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether a refined proposal would come back to the Board for approval.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and stated that she wanted to make sure that the exact costs of the proposal, as identified by Supervisor Heinz, were accurately captured and the correct numbers were given to the Board.

Supervisor Christy directed staff to also include the number of raises that were received by all County employees in the last four years, automatic and otherwise, along with those percentage amounts.

Ms. Leshar stated that she would include that information in her memorandum to the Board.

Chair Bronson indicated that staff direction had been given, but there was also a motion on the floor.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew his motion.

32. **Changes to the 2022-2023 Pima County Budget**

Discussion/Direction/Action. Changes to the 2022-2023 Pima County Budget:

- Allocate \$2 million from an appropriate place in the budget for the purchase of open space for conservation in accord with the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. The Office of Sustainability and Conservation would identify the lands as priorities for purchase.
- Allocate \$5 million from an appropriate place in the budget for the development of affordable housing in accord with recommendations of the Pima County Affordable Housing Task Force and at the direction of the Community and Workforce Development Department. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva directed staff to provide the Board with a budget report that included the allocation of \$2 million for the purchase of open space and conservation and \$5 million for the development of affordable housing.

33. **Public Posting of Board of Supervisors Directed Memoranda and Correspondence**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the apparent change in policy regarding the public posting of communications from the County Administrator to the Board of Supervisors. Several items transmitted to the Board recently remain unposted, yet the County Administrator's web page states the following:

Board of Supervisors Directed Memoranda and Correspondence

Review all memoranda and correspondence from the County Administrator to the Board of Supervisors from 2013 to present. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy asked whether changes had been made to the County Administration Policy regarding the posting of Board of Supervisors directed memoranda and correspondence and indicated that some recent correspondence had not been posted in a timely manner.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that no policy changes had been made and assured that future memoranda would be posted in a timely manner.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the time frame.

Ms. Leshner responded postings would be done the same day they were sent to the Board and indicated that postings sent towards the end of the day would be posted the next morning.

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

34. **Vote Center Implementation Plan**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update from the Pima County Elections Department and the Pima County Recorder's Office as to the current status of the vote center implementation plan. It is requested that the offices conduct a demonstration of the vote center model during the June 7, 2022 Board of Supervisors' Meeting. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy asked for an update regarding any issues the Elections Department faced with the implementation of the new vote centers.

Constance Hargrove, Elections Director, stated that she had spoken to one of the equipment vendors the week prior and it was guaranteed that the department would have 156 printers by the end of June and indicated that would be enough to have at least one ballot printer at each vote center. She stated that the electronic poll books had been received, but the small voucher printers would not be available prior to the primary election.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification on which equipment would not be available.

Ms. Hargrove responded that the small printers that printed the receipts with the voter's name and ballot style were unavailable, but were not critical to the process. She added that task could be done manually.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether their absence would disrupt the work flow.

Ms. Hargrove responded that it was not going to greatly affect the process and would only cause it to be a little more time consuming since the poll book officer would have to write the information down. She indicated that this would also be a double check of the information which would ensure individuals were provided with the correct ballot. She stated that the electronic poll books were continually being tested with a loaner printer from the Recorder's Office and added that staff from the Information Technology Department and the Recorder's Office were also preparing to test the cradle point device connectivity in rural areas later this week.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the date for the connectivity test.

Ms. Hargrove responded that she did not have the exact date, but that it would be done no later than Thursday of this week. She stated that an update on that process could be provided to the Board. She stated that practice runs would also be performed to ensure that all staff were aware and able to assess any issues that may arise at the vote centers.

Supervisor Christy inquired about staffing and asked which positions in the department still needed to be filled.

Ms. Hargrove stated that there was a supervisory position in the front office that would be responsible for managing candidate filings, campaign finance, etcetera, that needed to be filled and the deputy director position was budgeted for July. She stated that the deputy position would provide some leadership within the office and explained that she was currently assisting in those areas to make sure that staff had the needed guidance to perform their duties. She continued that the instructor from the company would be training the elections officers during the week of June 20th and stated that it was an extensive training on the back end regarding how things should work at the polling places and the vote centers. She added that it was to ensure that election officers understood the new technology and workflow.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether she had any major concerns with the implementation of this new process.

Ms. Hargrove stated that her only concern was having the bandwidth to manage the staff and the process and indicated that she had no concerns with regards to the equipment. She explained that if the printers were not received, she had asked staff to explore whether any additional locations were available in the instance that they needed to expand and not have a vote center. She added that she preferred not to have the elections staff manually handle as many ballot styles, and stated that a status update could be provided to the Board, no later than the beginning of next week.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether that constituted as a backup plan.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative and stated that it would come back to the Board for approval before implementation.

Supervisor Christy shared a few constituent concerns regarding voter partiality and the security of the voting systems that were being implemented. He stated that because it was such a new process, constituents were very much in favor of having a demonstration during one of the Board meetings and questioned whether that could be scheduled for the first meeting in June.

Ms. Hargrove indicated that a small demonstration could be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether that would include a connectivity test.

Ms. Hargrove responded that a small setup could be demonstrated with two electronic poll books, with a connectivity device and a printer.

Supervisor Christy asked whether that demonstration could be conducted during the June 7, 2022 meeting.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative.

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

35. Former County Administrator's Termination and Severance Payment

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding former County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry's employment status with Pima County and the amount paid in severance per Item No. 6 in his employment contract.

This item will allow, include, and not be limited to matters related to Mr. Huckelberry's changed employment status effective April 5, 2022. All documents pertinent to this item are requested for review. Further, it is requested that representatives of the Human Resources and Finance Departments who are familiar with these details be present. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy inquired about the current status of Mr. Huckelberry's employment with Pima County.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that Mr. Huckelberry was no longer an employee of Pima County.

Supervisor Christy asked that the Board be provided with a copy of Mr. Huckelberry's Personnel Action Form (PAF).

Ms. Leshar responded that it would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Mr. Huckelberry's County employment connections were nonexistent.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Mr. Huckelberry had received severance pay.

Ms. Leshar responded that he had not.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Mr. Huckelberry was currently employed as a consultant or if future plans existed to engage Mr. Huckelberry as a paid consultant.

Ms. Leshar responded that Mr. Huckelberry was not a consultant, nor were there any future plans for him to become one.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it was possible for Mr. Huckelberry to be engaged as a paid consultant at any time in the future.

Ms. Leshar asked for clarification of the question and inquired whether it was from a legal perspective or an intellectual or health perspective.

Supervisor Christy stated that in any point in the future would Mr. Huckelberry be considered as a candidate for a paid consultant position.

Ms. Leshar stated that he would not as long as she held the position of County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy questioned the name of the individual who had signed off on Mr. Huckelberry's PAF and what department they were from.

Ms. Leshar stated it had been signed by Sharon Bronson, since she was Chair of the Board and Mr. Huckelberry's supervisor.

Supervisor Christy asked to be provided with the signature date.

Ms. Leshar responded that it had been signed on April 8, 2022.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification of the protocol process for a resignation, retirement or termination of a County employee.

Ms. Leshar responded that it varied and was dependent upon the position, the position type and classification of that individual.

Cathy Bohland, Human Resources Director, stated that typically an employee submitted their paperwork to their supervisor for signature by the appointing authority and once signed, the appointing authority designated someone to complete the PAF.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether Mr. Huckelberry's PAF was returned to Ms. Bohland.

Ms. Bohland responded that she only received paperwork for individuals within her department.

Supervisor Christy asked if there was any opportunity for her to view his PAF at some point during the process or whether it was simply just a matter of processing.

Ms. Bohland stated that it was a processing matter and clarified that she only received paperwork when it pertained to her departmental staff.

Supervisor Christy questioned who received those types of PAF's for other departments.

Ms. Bohland responded that it was dependent upon the appointing authority for that individual.

Supervisor Christy questioned how many individuals or departments this process involved.

Ms. Bohland stated that the Human Resources Department was one of the departments since they received and processed all final PAF's, but indicated that she was not certain who was involved and what other departments played a part.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Human Resources and the Payroll Departments were both part of the process.

Ms. Bohland responded that she did not believe that the paperwork went through payroll.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation that Human Resources was involved.

Ms. Bohland indicated that notification to Payroll was done by Human Resources' actions of adding those PAF's into the system.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification on who Mr. Huckelberry had worked for.

Ms. Leshar responded that each employee had a supervisor that they reported to and indicated that all employees worked for Pima County. She asked legal counsel to confirm her assessment.

Lesley Lukach, Deputy County Attorney, concurred with Ms. Leshar's assessment.

Supervisor Christy questioned who County employees reported to.

Ms. Leshar stated that it was ultimately the voters and taxpayers of Pima County.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board worked for the voters and taxpayers and questioned who the reporting authority was for the County Administrator.

Ms. Leshar responded that she worked for the Board.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Mr. Huckelberry had also worked for the Board.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked who had been responsible for implementing the terms of Mr. Huckelberry's final contract.

Ms. Leshar stated that she believed it was the Board.

Supervisor Christy indicated that he had seen Mr. Huckelberry's contract. but had not seen his final termination paperwork or PAF and questioned whether there was any unfinished business lingering between Pima County and Mr. Huckelberry.

Ms. Leshar responded both directors from Human Resources and the Finance Department had confirmed that there were no unresolved issues.

Supervisor Christy requested assurance that there were no pending issues.

Ms. Leshar provided assurance that there were no pending issues with regard to Mr. Huckelberry's contract and employment status with Pima County.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the April 7th acknowledgment from the Chair to Mr. Huckelberry would have been released had he not questioned the issue.

Ms. Leshar responded that considering that it was a letter from the Chair she did not know in what context it would have been released and added that it had been requested by a Board office and was now a public document.

Supervisor Christy asked what had prompted that release.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was released due to her response to his agenda item regarding severance pay for Mr. Huckelberry.

Supervisor Christy commented that Mr. Huckelberry had tendered and offered his resignation and questioned whether it was under those conditions that he was not entitled to severance pay.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked for final clarification that his status as an employee no longer existed and was not impacted by this lack of severance.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that, legally, the County was permitted to re-hire Mr. Huckelberry as a consultant if it was needed.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was a legal option.

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

36. COVID-19 Premium Payments

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the incentive payments made during the pandemic in 2021 to certain employees within "Central Administrative Services and the County Administrator's Office", as discussed in the County Administrator's memorandum dated May 10, 2022. Discussion to include, but not be limited to, the criteria used for employee selection and in determining amounts paid. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that he had received a comment letter from JoAnn di Filippo, who claimed that one of her questions on her public records request regarding COVID premium payments, was not answered. He asked the County Administrator whether she was familiar with that request.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that Ms. di Filippo had made several requests, but she was not familiar with the one in question.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Ms. Leshar inadvertently overlooked it or whether the question was not realized.

Ms. Leshar explained that there was a group of individuals who responded to those public record requests and indicated that she had not withheld any documents. She added that the County's entire public records request process was to ensure that the public received any requested documents in a timely manner.

Supervisor Christy asked for an explanation of the County's ability and authorization to pay COVID-19 premium payments.

Ms. Leshar responded that under the American Rescue Plan Act, there existed an ability to provide additional pay to workers who were needed in order to maintain the continuity of operations within essential critical infrastructure and explained that during the pandemic individuals from 37 different departments throughout the County had received such pay.

Supervisor Christy asked whether that authorization had come from the COVID payment acts.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy questioned what criteria was used to determine which employees were eligible for COVID premium payments.

Ms. Leshar stated that a variety of criteria had been used to determine individual eligibility and discussed some of the tasks performed by those employees, particularly those who were part of central administration. She explained that during the early days of the pandemic new policies were being created almost on a weekly basis and different payroll processes were occurring. She discussed the weekly reporting requirements for telecommuting individuals and indicated that those processes and policies were able to be reviewed and approved by the County Administrator because of the active participation of a team of individuals who met every evening and during the weekends and indicated that was a necessary measure that ensured that the County was adhering to those policies. She gave department examples and indicated that staff from Information Technology had stood on curbs and helped individuals upgrade their laptop systems so that they could continue telecommuting. She indicated that her recommendations to the County Administrator were related to the human resource policies that were

changing daily and because of needed payroll changes that ensured that the different kinds of pay and accommodations were made. She added that grants were also monitored for assurance that each and every dollar from the \$197 million the County had received was accounted for.

Supervisor Christy asked what criteria was used to determine the amount of premium pay each employee received.

Ms. Leshar stated that she had made initial recommendations for some of the department directors and maximum amounts were reviewed. She explained that she worked with each of the directors in order to identify employees within their departments who had participated in certain activities. She stated that when looking at the department directors, she had chosen the ones who were in the building during the weekend and evenings and stated that choosing other individuals from their staff was done by determining which ones were there part of the time or ones who had participated in payroll functions related to telecommuting functions.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether Ms. Leshar had directed and authorized those amounts.

Ms. Leshar responded that her recommendation was submitted to the County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy questioned who had provided the final authorization.

Ms. Leshar responded that her recommendations were given to Mr. Huckelberry for his approval.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether it was Mr. Huckelberry who had the ultimate authority.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and stated he had approved this particular batch of \$1.4 million for a variety of additional COVID premium pay.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether this COVID incentive payment action was ever brought before the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Leshar indicated to her knowledge it had not.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether it should have come before the Board.

Ms. Leshar responded that Board approval was not required.

Supervisor Christy questioned why the employee vaccine incentive payment plan had been brought before the Board and the premium payment plan had not and indicated that for consistency purposes both should have come before the Board.

Ms. Leshar stated that she did not have specifics on what had happened during that time period but was happy to go back and review any of those documents Mr. Huckelberry had brought before the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it was the decision of Mr. Huckelberry to provide that information to the Board.

Ms. Leshar indicated that it was his decision to do so as the County Administrator.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether his decision had created confusion.

Ms. Leshar responded that there was a distinction between the two items and stated that one had dealt with an overall policy governing every single employee and indicated that she would be happy to provide the Board with an analysis of the two.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether future issues such as these would come to the Board for approval.

Ms. Leshar responded that one of the things County Administration had attempted to do during the last several months was to make sure that the Board had complete and total awareness of all of the actions that were taken. She stated that for transparency purposes they would continue to share and post all Board memoranda on their website for public review.

Supervisor Christy inquired who had approved the COVID payment policy.

Ms. Leshar responded that it had been approved by Mr. Huckelberry.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether other employees had received similar incentive payments since the pandemic was declared.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative and stated that individuals from 37 different departments had received a total of \$1.3 million.

Supervisor Christy asked for confirmation that the essential workers payment plan had come before this Board.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked if any of Mr. Huckelberry's closely held staff members, that were referenced in her April 15, 2022 Memorandum titled "County Administrator Retirement and Resignation Records," had received premium pay.

Ms. Leshar stated that it was possible that some of those individuals had been recipients of premium pay related to the pandemic if they had worked with payroll.

She added that she was not aware of all of the individuals who were involved or who had worked with Mr. Huckelberry during the final days of his contract.

Supervisor Christy commented that knowing that those closely held individuals were recipients of the COVID premium payments could cause concern.

Ms. Leshar stated that whether or not people choose to draw inappropriate or incorrect conclusions was out of her control. She stated that it was over a year ago that individuals were paid premium pay for their work related to the pandemic and it was possible that some of those individuals may have worked in personnel positions or other positions within the County that made them aware of the paperwork related to the termination of Mr. Huckelberry.

Supervisor Christy commented that Pima County taxpayers had lost jobs, livelihoods, businesses, and their children's schools and education were also disrupted during this pandemic. He indicated that knowing that certain County employees had received up to and over \$5,000.00 worth of premium pay, had never missed a pay check and never lost their jobs added insult to injury to those taxpayers who funded those bonuses in addition to their taxpayer funded salaries.

Chair Bronson commented that the Board had approved the COVID-19 premium pay on April 9, 2020 with a 4-1 vote and indicated that Supervisor Miller was the only Supervisor to vote against it.

Supervisor Christy indicated that he did not recall approving it and asked where Chair Bronson had retrieved that information.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that it was from the April 9, 2020 minutes.

Supervisor Christy asked the Clerk for confirmation that it was brought before the Board.

Ms. Manriquez stated that it was brought to the Board by Mr. Huckelberry.

Supervisor Scott commented that the premium pay was authorized by the previous Board and was allowed under the Federal Rescue Plan Act and questioned whether the vaccine incentives were just a matter of Board policy.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott expressed his objection to the implications that were made by Supervisor Christy during one of his questions that indicated that the employees who had received premium pay over the ten-week period during the pandemic, had received it because they were part of that closely held group. He stated that the implication had been bandied about in the community but felt that it was an inappropriate implication to be made by a Board member. He stated that those

employees had comported themselves with integrity and with no question of illegal action done by anybody. He concluded by saying that the one person who could answer some of those questions was unable to do so due to the extent of his injuries and concurred with the statements that were made by Supervisor Grijalva when she stated her hopes that these matters would not come up again on another agenda.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

37. Appointment of Pima County Public Fiduciary

Staff recommends the appointment of Justin Cluck as Pima County Public Fiduciary with an annual salary of \$109,990.40.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to appoint Justin Cluck as Pima County Public Fiduciary.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

38. Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds

Staff recommends approval to utilize Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds. Approval is required pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2314.03 and by Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 6.3, for the following:

- \$5,000.00 for the University High School Graduation Night.
- \$1,000.00 for 88-CRIME rewards.

At the request of staff and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 7, 2022.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

39. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a. Amphitheater Public Schools, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, U.S. Department of Treasury and ARPA-CSLFRF Funds, contract amount \$3,548,960.00/3 year term (CT-CR-22-353)

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

40. Mesch, Clark and Rothschild, P.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for legal representation of Pima County, et al., in Whiting v. Pima County, et al., 4:19-cv-00249 and amend contractual language, Risk Management Tort Fund, contract amount \$75,000.00 (CT-FN-21-346)

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

PROCUREMENT

41. Tyler Technologies, Inc., to provide for Tyler Technologies records management software, Recorder Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$2,393,260.00/5 year term (MA-PO-22-166) Recorder's Office and Information Technology

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

TRANSPORTATION

42. State of Arizona, Department of Transportation, to provide for the design and construction of improvements to Sunset Road: I-10 to River Road, Development Impact Fees and HURF Funds, contract amount \$22,359,000.00/5 year term (CT-TR-22-365)

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

CONSENT CALENDAR

43. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2, 3, 9, 10, 13 and 19 were 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 SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Facilities Management

2. El Rio Santa Cruz Neighborhood Health Center, Inc., to provide for El Rio Lease Agreement - Suite 130-140 Abrams Building, 1st Floor, contract amount \$2,716,743.42 revenue/5 year term (CTN-FM-22-128)

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 Banner Medical was leaving.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that University Medical Center and other providers had leased a section of the first floor of the Abrams facility throughout the years for the provision of a variety of clinical services to the community. She stated that she was not aware of the specifics because negotiations had occurred between El Rio and Banner, and added that the location would continue providing those services under the direction of El Rio rather than Banner.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the original lease terms with Banner.

Ms. Leshner responded that initial agreements went back to 2004 and included many amendments with different providers. She indicated that a follow-up memo that included the history of the original lease would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy commented that the amount of the lease seemed large for a non-profit medical facility. He questioned whether it was being paid through grant funding.

Ms. Leshner responded that the County's only involvement was approval of the site lease and indicated that the funding source was a contractual negotiation between Banner and El Rio.

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

3. Banner-University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Banner Lease early termination, contract amount \$51,318.50 revenue decrease (CTN-FM-13-54)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that his questions had been answered during the discussion of Consent Calendar Item No. 2.

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

Procurement

9. Jot Properties, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for hotel shelter services, extend contract term to 12/18/22 and amend contractual language, FEMA EFSP Humanitarian Fund, contract amount \$2,800,000.00 (MA-PO-22-30) Health and Community and Workforce Development

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 whether Comfort Suites was owned and operated by the City of Tucson.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it was privately owned and explained that some of the services were provided and paid for by the City of Tucson as part of the federally funded subcontract agreement with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Supervisor Christy asked whether the County was purchasing the property.

Ms. Leshar stated that this was not to purchase the property, but was for the continuation of the block purchase of rooms in response to the County's continued dealings with the legal asylum seekers situation. She stated that some of the asylum seekers were sheltered at congregate sites, such as Casa Alitas and some at non-congregate sites like this hotel, where the County received a block rate. She added that all funding was provided by the federal government through FEMA grants.

Supervisor Christy commented that the materials included with this contract made it seem as though the County was purchasing the property and asked staff for clarification.

Ms. Leshar responded that a block of rooms at a second hotel facility was added.

Supervisor Christy questioned the role of the Community and Workforce Development Department in this process since asylum seekers were meant to just pass through Pima County.

Ms. Leshar responded that rooms were initially purchased for the utilization of asylum seekers but when capacity allowed, they were utilized by Community and Workforce Development for the County's Eviction Program

for those individuals facing eviction and explained that it was through the use of a different contract and funding source.

Supervisor Christy stated the referenced hotels housed co-mingled communities for asylum seekers, COVID-19 exposed or infected individuals and individuals experiencing homelessness due to evictions and questioned if and how they were separated. He inquired whether there should be separate contracts.

Ms. Leshar explained that it was one hotel contract that provided two different areas of service for the delineation of those who were asylum seekers and those who were part of the eviction prevention program and indicated that there were separate areas for COVID-19 related individuals.

Supervisor Christy questioned why the Procurement Department had not sought approval from the Board for this allocation.

Ms. Leshar responded that every contract had come before the Board for approval.

Supervisor Christy asked which property had come before the Board for a rezoning approval.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that the Red Roof Inn had received approval of a comprehensive plan amendment.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the current designated use of the facility was consistent with the rezoning request.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., indicated that the rezoning request was unrelated to its current uses and explained that the current owner was contemplating a sale and the prospective buyer was considering transitioning the property from hotel use into short-term apartment type housing.

Supervisor Christy asked whether approval of this contract would impact the new owner's plan for constructing affordable housing.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., commented that no issues should arise and indicated that the prospective buyer was aware of the current uses and had given no indication that it conflicted with the future plans for the property.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether staff was aware that several types of uses were being processed through the contract that amounted to about \$7.8 million.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that current and future uses regarding the elements mentioned were characterized within the contract, but felt that any future uses were separate from the current contracted use of that facility.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether the utilization of the Comfort Suites had been added in anticipation of the sale of the Red Roof Inn.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that he believed it was a coincidental set of circumstances that had occurred.

Supervisor Scott questioned whether Comfort Suites would be available for the same usage as the Red Roof Inn since the Board had already approved the requested rezoning.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative and reiterated the fact that the two were not tied together and stated that the current volumes had dictated the need for the Comfort Suites contract prior to the rezoning.

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

10. Virgin Pulse, Inc., to provide for Employee Wellness Service, Health Benefit Self-Insurance Fund, contract amount \$800,000.00 (MA-PO-22-137) Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy commented about the invasiveness of the program and stated that he had explored their website and found that most of the employee user ratings were negative. He questioned why the administering department was Information Technology (ITD) and not the Health Department, and inquired whether it would be a mandatory plan for all employees.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that it had been placed under ITD since it was for the purchase of a software package that would ultimately be utilized by the Health Department. She explained that under the Health and Wellness Program, employees had options for choosing a variety of activities that helped defray health insurance costs and this was simply for the new company that would be providing those services.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether it was mandatory.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was not mandatory.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether there would be employee disincentives for those who chose not to participate.

Ms. Leshar stated there would be none.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

13. Acceptance - Grant Management and Innovation

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), National Board, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the FEMA, EFSP, Humanitarian Relief Fund - Advance Grant Award, \$1,600,000.00 (GTAM 22-78)

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

Supervisor Christy stated this item was an ongoing contractual supplement with the Border Coalition Partnership, the City of Tucson and Catholic Community Services for asylum seeker sheltering issues and indicated that the total amount for one year was \$11,659,000.00. He stated that the metrics collected for the grantor included a total number of sheltered and fed asylum seekers, along with the average length of their stay and asked to be provided with a copy of those metrics. He questioned the length that the County would be dealing with this issue.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the rise in the number of individuals being dropped into the community by the federal government for this "street release" method had caused the County's expansion of \$1.6 million per month in anticipated expenditures. She explained that the method was used by the federal government to drop individuals at airports, bus stations or different locations within the community. She stated that the County had requested \$35 million and was working closely with FEMA to make sure that it was the federal government that continued to provide the funding for the program. She added that the Board had indicated that the policy made better sense if the individuals had a place to go versus just simply being released into the community.

Supervisor Christy asked to be provided with the administrative cost percentages for each of the listed entities on the grant.

Ms. Leshar stated that a report would be provided to the Board.

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

ELECTIONS

19. Cancellation of Uncontested Precinct Committeeman Races

Staff requests cancellation of those uncontested elections for Precinct Committeeman on the August 2, 2022 Primary Election ballot and appointment of those who filed nomination petitions or write-in nomination papers.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he thought this matter had been approved at a previous meeting and questioned why this item was before the Board.

Constance Hargrove, Elections Director, explained that this was an ongoing process and when those positions were not filled, the cancellations and appointments would be requested. She indicated that there would be another request on the next meeting agenda.

Supervisor Christy asked whether a cutoff point existed.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative and stated that the information would be provided to the Board.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

County Attorney

1. City of Tucson, to provide for the Pima County Attorney's Victim Services Division, contract amount \$24,900.00 revenue (CTN-PCA-22-136)

Facilities Management

2. El Rio Santa Cruz Neighborhood Health Center, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
3. Banner-University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Health

4. Raquel D. Goodrich, d.b.a. Text, Talk, Act, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for connecting to mental health supports through mobile texting,

extend contract term to 5/31/23, amend contractual language and scope of services, CDC via ADHS Funds, contract amount \$84,000.00 (CT-HD-22-206)

Procurement

5. Award

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-107, Empire Southwest, L.L.C., d.b.a. Empire Machinery (Headquarters: Mesa, AZ), to provide for Caterpillar equipment parts, repair and service. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$353,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Fleet Services Ops Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

6. Award

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-161, Hill Brothers Chemical Company (Headquarters: Brea, CA), to provide for sewer system odor control chemicals. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$1,600,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: WW Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

7. Award

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-152, Precision Heli-Support, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Anchorage, AK), to provide for helicopter parts, equipment and service. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$343,850.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Sheriff.

8. Hach Company, to provide for Hach equipment, parts and service, WW Ops Fund, contract amount \$514,000.00 (MA-PO-22-138) Regional Wastewater Reclamation

9. Jot Properties, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

10. Virgin Pulse, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Transportation

11. Chevo Studios, Inc., to provide for South Houghton Road widening, artist services, Impact Fees Fund, contract amount \$216,000.00/2 year term (CT-TR-22-288)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

12. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Pima County DEQ Voluntary No Drive Day/Clean Air Program, \$268,250.00 (GTAW 22-113)
13. **Acceptance - Grant Management and Innovation**
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), National Board, Amendment No. 4, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
14. **Acceptance - Health**
First Things First, Pima North and South Regional Partnership Councils, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the First Smiles Matter Oral Health Program and extend grant term to 6/30/23, \$760,766.00 (GTAM 22-81)
15. **Acceptance - Health**
National Association of County and City Health Officials, to provide for implementation of overdose prevention strategies at the local level, \$170,141.23 (GTAW 22-112)
16. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the COVID-19 ELC Funding for K-12 School Reopening and extend grant term to 5/31/23, no cost (GTAM 22-80)

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

17. **Special Event**
 - Tamara M. Middleton, St. Rita in the Desert Catholic Church, St. Rita in the Desert Parish Hall, 13260 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, May 7, 8, 14 and 15, 2022.
 - Thomas G. Boyle, American Patriot Memorial, Veterans Memorial Plaza/Gold Star Family Park, Tucson, May 14, 2022.
 - Javier Salomon, Flowers and Bullets, 7532 W. Hermans Road, Tucson, June 18, 2022.
18. **Temporary Extension**
015100018334, Craig Stephen Ivanyi, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, 2021 N. Kinney Road, Tucson, May 14, 2022.

ELECTIONS

19. Cancellation of Uncontested Precinct Committeeman Races

Staff requests cancellation of those uncontested elections for Precinct Committeeman (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

20. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

El Rio Santa Cruz Neighborhood Health Center, Inc. \$3,927.08; Thien Dinh \$13,870.00; Merit Foods, L.L.C. \$560.56; Garcia Court Reporting \$679.60; Key Consulting, Inc. \$9,145.00; Northpoint Asset Management \$6,255.00.

TREASURER

21. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Title Security Agency, L.L.C. \$741.78 and \$810.30

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

22. Minutes: April 5, 2022

* * *

44. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK