

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, June 7, 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, Acting County Administrator
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:12 a.m. and participated remotely. He left the meeting at 1:38 p.m.

1. PUBLIC SEWER EASEMENT

Staff recommends approval of a sewer easement on property located at Section 5, T15S, R12E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

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

2. CONTRACT

Tucson Airport Authority, to provide for Regional Drainage Facility - Tucson International Airport, Flood Control Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$720,000.00 (CT-FC-22-370)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:51 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, June 7, 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, Acting County Administrator
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
Juan Carlos Navarro, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:12 a.m. and participated remotely. He left the meeting at 1:38 p.m.

1. AWARD

Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-170, Baker & Taylor, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Charlotte, NC), Brodart Co. (Headquarters: Williamsport, PA), and Midwest Tape (Headquarters: Holland, OH), to provide for library materials and related services. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the shared annual award amount of \$4,000,000.00 and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Library District Fund. Administering Department: Library.

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:51 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, June 7, 2022. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:12 a.m. and participated remotely. He left the meeting at 1:38 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgment Statement was delivered by Anthony Francisco, Jr.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

The Pima County Animal Center showcased animals available for adoption.

PRESENTATION

4. Presentation of the Dr. June Webb-Vignery Advocacy Award from the Metropolitan Education Commission presented by Dr. June Webb-Vignery and Mrs. Mary Belle McCorkle, to the Pima County Board of Supervisors in recognition of their extraordinary work during the pandemic. (District 3)

Dr. June Webb-Vignery and Mary Belle McCorkle presented the Board with the Crystal Apple Award. Mrs. McCorkle commended the Board for their work with keeping children safe in schools during the pandemic. She stated that the award was specifically for educational advocacy and showed her appreciation for the work of the Board.

5. **E-Pollbook Demonstration**

Electronic pollbook demonstration provided by the Elections Department.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, explained the process of using electronic pollbooks and printers for voting at a vote center.

David Wiseley, Program Specialist, Elections Department, provided a demonstration of the equipment and the process that would occur on Election Day.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the status of the ballot on demand printers.

Ms. Hargrove stated that she had received assurance from the vendor that all of the printers and equipment would be delivered by the end of June and that the training for poll workers would be completed in July.

Supervisor Christy asked if all E-pollbooks had been received, how many printers were waiting to be delivered and if the internet connection had been tested at various voting centers.

Ms. Hargrove confirmed that all E-pollbooks had been delivered and 260 printers still needed to be delivered. She stated that multiple remote voting locations had been tested and the goal was for each vote center to be tested for any internet connectivity issues prior to Election Day.

Mr. Wiseley responded that 30 remote voting locations were tested for internet connectivity problems and 2 locations displayed questionable signal strength. He stated that more in-depth testing would be done at all 129 voting locations.

Chair Bronson inquired about the locations with internet issues.

Mr. Wiseley responded that Sopori Elementary School was one of the locations that had displayed internet connection troubles. He stated that both locations were located in the more remote areas. He explained that cellular vendors would be involved in the next round of testing to fix any problems that arose.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Matthew McGlone, Community Outreach Coordinator, Pima County Office of Emergency Management, Ken Drozd, Warning Coordination Meteorologist, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and Courtney Slanaker, Executive Director, Southern Arizona Red Cross, proclaiming the week of June 12 through 18, 2022 to be: "MONSOON SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK"

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

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Gayle Hartman, President, Save the Scenic Santa Ritas, spoke in opposition of open-pit mining and the Copper World Project due to the issues it would cause with water, air, aesthetics and the heritage in the community.

Stu Williams, Executive Director, Save the Scenic Santa Ritas, spoke in opposition of the Copper World Project.

Tony Bruno voiced his support for the Amado Youth Center and for the community's need for greater internet capabilities.

Amy Bass, Executive Director of Prevention, Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., expressed her support for the Amado Youth Center.

Mike Humphrey, Pima County Board of Health, spoke regarding the need for firearm violence prevention.

Nancy Bowman spoke about the need for gun violence prevention in the community.

Grace Stambaugh expressed her concerns with crime in Marana and with the Community Bond Program.

Dru Heaton spoke against the COVID vaccine.

Dan Wann expressed his opposition to the Joint Task Force to Address Poverty and to the Small Business Commission, COVID-19 Response Task Force.

Peter Norquest expressed concerns with the Recommendations for Election Workers and the COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate.

Robert Reus spoke about the negative effects of partisanship in one-party government.

Donna Arersa spoke in support of the current Procurement process used for the selection of the attorney for the Merit System Commission.

Molly McKasson expressed the need for gun violence prevention and the concerns of domestic terrorism in Pima County.

Mike Hellon, Chair, Pima County Merit System Commission, spoke on behalf of the Commission and requested that the Commission be allowed to select their own attorney.

Supervisor Scott directed staff to review the proposals from Mr. Humphrey and to provide a response to the Board on whether any of the proposals could be undertaken by the Health Department.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8. Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council Attorney

Discussion/Direction/Action. The five Board of Supervisors-appointed members of the Pima County Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council unanimously object to the attorney hired for them by way of a procurement process (see attached May 10, 2022, letter). The Commissioners want to hire their own attorney when the current attorney's contract is up for renewal on February 8, 2023. The Commission hiring an attorney outside of the procurement process is permissible under Pima County Code 11.04.020(C). Board action is proposed to direct the quasi-judicial Commission to hire its own attorney, effective February 8, 2023. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva stated that the Merit System Commission recently sent a letter regarding their concerns with the selection process used to hire their Commission's attorney. She explained that the current attorney's contract expired on February 8, 2023 and that a modification should be made to include additional members of the Merit System Commission on the selection committee.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, confirmed that the modifications would need to be made at the end of the current contract. She stated that until the end of the contract there could be a review of the Procurement process. She asked for clarification on the selection committee and who would be part of that committee.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that the selection committee did not have to exclusively be members of the Merit System Commission, but wanted to include additional members to balance out others on the committee.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification of Supervisor Grijalva's direction.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that there had not been a majority or 50/50 representation of the Merit System Commission on the last selection committee that had selected the current Commission's attorney, and that it could be worked out by staff on who would be included on the selection committee to be more inclusive of members of the Commission.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the buyout of the current attorney's contract.

Ms. Leshner stated she would provide that information to the Board.

9. **Community Bond Program Update**

Discussion/Direction/Action. The Pima County Board of Supervisors on December 1, 2020, approved a Community Bond Program to provide county-supplied bail bonds for those accused of non-violent criminal offenses for which bail is set at \$30,000 or less. The program is to reduce county costs for unwarranted jail detention stints and to improve circumstances for indigents accused of relatively low-level offenses. It is now 18 months since the Board action and no program is in place. Please provide an update on this situation and suggest solutions that can get this beneficial program underway within a reasonable time. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva explained that there had not been any movement on the program since it had been approved and requested an update and a plan to move forward with the program.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that there had been issues with the procurement process for outside vendors, and there had been difficulty procuring an external company to manage the program. She asked for direction from the Board to manage the program internally.

Supervisor Grijalva asked whether or not the Justice Services Department was formed when the program was first approved.

Ms. Leshner confirmed that the department had not been formed at the time of the approval of the program.

Kate Vesely, Director, Justice Services Department, stated that the Request for Proposal (RFP) was sent out last year and was extended due to lack of bids. She stated that the paperwork to start the RFP recruitment process had begun again, pending direction from the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva asked County Administration to look further into moving the program to the Justice Services Department in order to implement the program. She stated her concern with an external search because of a possible disconnect on the mission of the program and the lack of capacity in the community.

Ms. Leshner stated that staff would bring two proposals back to the Board that would show what it would look like for the program to be sourced internally and would track the status of the current RFP process for external options.

Supervisor Scott asked for more details on how the current RFP process differed from the first RFP process.

Ms. Vesely stated that the process had been discussed at length and had been looked at on how to better advertise the program to external organizations. She explained that the program had not yet been created, so organizations had the opportunity to find ways to fit the Community Bond Program into their current programs already in place.

Supervisor Scott requested a more detailed explanation on how there could be a higher risk for greater capital on the bond fund and the increased liability of the program. He asked who the other stakeholders were that objected to an in-house operation and reasons for their objections.

Dean Brault, Director, Public Defense Services, explained that organizations objected to an in-house operation due to unfamiliarity with the Procurement process and the criminal justice system. He stated that the department was working to further educate companies. He stated an objection came from the past Deputy County Administrator that was responsible for Finance because of the appearance that some in-house services were at odds with each other.

Supervisor Christy asked if there has been a formal cost-benefit analysis done to compare in-house operations versus an outside agency.

Mr. Brault stated that a formal cost-benefit analysis had not been completed.

Supervisor Christy requested a formal cost-benefit analysis be completed to see which would be more effective and efficient for the County in terms of cost and liability. He stated that there were benefits of an external vendor that had no connection to the County.

Supervisor Scott agreed that a cost-benefit analysis would be beneficial.

10. Joint Task Force to Address Poverty

Discussion/Direction/Action. Request that Bonnie Bazata present "Poverty in Tucson: A Pre- and Post-Pandemic Picture" to the Board of Supervisors (attached). Take action to direct the County Administrator and appropriate County staff to join with the City of Tucson to form a Joint Task Force on Poverty; and, in collaboration with the City, provide the Task Force with the resources necessary to do its work. A similar item passed unanimously at the Mayor & Council meeting on April 19, 2022. The Task Force would involve both City and County departments, outside nonprofit partners, individuals with lived experience, and other private sector partners, and will identify strategies to make ending poverty in our community "everybody's business." (District 2)

Bonnie Bazata, Program Manager, Community and Workforce Development, provided a PowerPoint presentation on Poverty in Pima County.

Supervisor Heinz showed his appreciation for Ms. Bazata and her team for their work. He stated that at a City Council meeting, Council member Santa Cruz proposed a Joint Task Force on poverty with Pima County.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to form a Joint Task Force with the City of Tucson, to address poverty. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Bronson stated that the motion was vague and there was no information regarding the costs associated with the formation of the Joint Task Force and who would be a part of the task force. She stated that she agreed with the idea of the task force, but the proposal lacked important details.

Supervisor Heinz agreed that there was a lack of details but it was important to get the process started.

Chair Bronson requested that Ms. Bazata work with County Administration to gain more details and recommendations for the Joint Task Force.

Supervisor Christy stated that poverty was a regional problem and reminded that the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) conducted informative analysis on poverty. He stated his concerns with working directly with the City of Tucson and suggested the County first explore a comprehensive and regional approach with PAG.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, reiterated the direction from the Board was to get more information on what the Joint Task Force would look like and for the issue of poverty in Pima County to be looked at from a more regional perspective with PAG.

Supervisor Scott elaborated on the need for more information from the County and other jurisdictions on the issues of housing, utilities, food, child care, health care, transportation and cell phone coverage.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if the City of Tucson had goals and objectives for the Joint Task Force.

Ms. Bazata stated there had not been specificity in the proposal by the City of Tucson. She explained that the proposal was a way to look at how the City and County could better utilize their joint resources.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that funding was similar between the City and County to address the same issue of poverty.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he did not feel confident in the leadership at PAG and would prefer that the County retain control over poverty in the area and that the Joint Task Force remain between the City of Tucson and Pima County.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed the need for more information from County Administration and staff before a decision could be made. She withdrew her second to Supervisor Heinz's motion.

The motion died for lack of a second.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. County Administrator's Update

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, provided the following updates:

- She commended the 19 individuals who recently received their G.E.D. at Pima Vocational High School and the 7 individuals who received their G.E.D. in May through the Las Artes Program.
- She recognized Dan Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, and his team for their work with the program and the program had recently celebrated their one year anniversary.
- She indicated that the Ina Road landfill would be covered with soil, revegetated and solar panels would be installed for use by the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department.
- She recognized Fleet Services for their partnership with JTED and indicated that they would have their first intern through the JTED Automotive Program.
- She indicated that Pima County's Collaborative One-Stop Program had received an allocation of \$2.7 million, which would allow for their expansion at Pima Community College Downtown Campus.
- She explained that the County had received the Arizona Auditor General's Report that had been completed on 8 major county programs and it had come back with no findings.
- She provided an update on the Pima County Strategic Planning Task Force for Countywide access for broadband.

12. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy C 2.1, Workplace Ethics, Conduct and Compliance.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the proposed revisions to the policy were distributed to the Board for their input and none were received. She requested direction from the Board and asked if they had any recommendations to expand or enhance the policy. She confirmed that if there were no recommendations provided, the current policy would stay in place.

Chair Bronson stated she was fine with the current policy and, since no other board member had provided input that seemed to be the consensus of the Board.

No Board action was taken.

13. **Pima County Employee Cost of Living Adjustments**

Direction/Action regarding the preferred salary increase scenarios.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the tentative budget included salary adjustments/wage increases proposed at rates of 5%, 3% and 1%. She indicated that additional proposals were made by several District offices and requested Board direction regarding which proposal should be included in the final budget which was scheduled for adoption on June 21, 2022.

Chair Bronson stated that the additional proposals from each District office needed to be analyzed to fit the upcoming budget.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed her support for the proposal that highlighted salary increases based on the current salary of the employee and a higher increase to lower salaried employees due to the rise in inflation. She shared concerns about where the money for the increases would come from and if there would be cuts in other areas, in the future, to accommodate the increases.

Ms. Leshner explained that staff was working to find a way to make sure that the funds used for the increases would come from a place that would be able to be sustained in the future. She spoke about the elimination of vacant Position Control Numbers (PCNs) in order to cover costs of increases.

Supervisor Heinz showed his support for the proposal submitted by Supervisor Scott's office. He mentioned that his team reached out to department heads to survey the response to the increases. He recommended that partial funds for the increases should come from General Fund expected surplus.

Chair Bronson clarified that the next Board meeting included the final budget adoption and stated that the Board could give staff direction for any budgetary requests regarding increases. She expressed her concerns for the fund balance for the final budget and how it would affect the County's bond ratings which could eliminate their ability to do Certificates of Participation.

Supervisor Heinz asked for clarification regarding the direction that County Administration was asking from the Board.

Ms. Leshner stated that County Administration wanted the Board to give direction on which proposal should be included in the final budget adoption, if the Board wanted to keep the final budget adoption on schedule.

Supervisor Scott stated that he would not be comfortable voting on an option without proper data to show the effects on County funds. He expressed his concerns with any outcomes which would create a low General Fund balance.

Supervisor Christy expressed his opposition with the Board approving salary increase for all County staff and stated he supported merit-based raises. He indicated that his office staff opted out of previous salary increases that had been approved by the Board, but received merit-based salary increases. He shared his concerns with the use of inflation rates instead of cost of living rates when determining increases to salaries. He stated that it would not be beneficial to the County to give increases at this time.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson to include direction to County Administration to use vacancy savings and to eliminate vacant PCNs in order to cover the costs of the increases in whichever proposal was adopted. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva commented on how the vacancy savings had a cap of \$5 million and how that amount would not be available every year. She stated that there needed to be a funding source that was reliable and would continually be available every year. She stated that she did not feel comfortable moving forward on a proposal without more details on the possible outcomes. She expressed the need for an increase to workers who made less than \$35,000 due to rising cost of living.

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

Supervisor Scott requested written guidance be provided to the Board on how vacancy savings would be used to address this issue and other issues that arose in the future.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if the Board would need to have a special meeting in order to review options for increases before the next Board meeting.

Michelle Campagne, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that the Board would need to narrow down potential options in order for a final budget to be created to include the salary increases. She clarified that at the Board of Supervisors meeting on June 21, 2022, the Board would have to vote on State schedules which would not be able to be created without knowing what the cost of salary increases would be.

Supervisor Heinz commented that in the first scenario he presented, there were exact numbers on the effect it would have on the budget.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated her concerns with the scenario presented by Supervisor Heinz were due to the large difference in costs between the options. She supported bringing the item back to the Board of Supervisors Meeting of June 21, 2022 and asked if there would be issues if the Board continued the final budget adoption to the July 5, 2022 Board of Supervisors Meeting.

Ms. Leshar responded that there would be no issues with continuing the final budget adoption to the July 5, 2022 Board of Supervisors Meeting,

14. **Option to Fund Open Space and Affordable Housing**

If the Board wishes to fund \$2.0 million for Open Space and \$5.0 million for future Affordable Housing Task Force Recommendations, staff recommends the following:

- Create a \$2.0 million PAYGO project within the Capital Projects Fund for the purpose of purchasing Open Space. Delay the \$1.25 million Kino South Beach Volleyball PAYGO project and reduce the Canoa Ranch Campground Development PAYGO Project by \$0.75 **million**.
- Create a \$5.0 million reserve for Future Affordable Housing Recommendations within the General Fund.
- Eliminate the \$3.0 million from the Contingency - Inflation, Fuel and Security reserve.
- Eliminate the \$2.0 million operating transfer out to the Facilities Management Renewal Fund Project and the corresponding operating transfer in.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, introduced the item and stated that the \$5 million would become restricted funds going into future budgets for use by the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that the funding for this project would be similar to the funding that was used for the Pima Early Education Program, where the funding needed to be allocated to the proper source. She expressed the need for a spending plan for all funds. She stated that this would allow for land to be acquired in protected areas.

Supervisor Christy asked if affordable housing would be created on the open space and would share funding. He expressed his concerns with the County's involvement with affordable housing, the lack of task force recommendations and the funding that would be taken away from the Canoa Ranch Campground Development PAYGO Project. He asked what open space was available and if it was Pima County property. He added that he was not in favor of any of the staff recommendations, the \$5.0 million for future Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations or the \$2 million for Open Space

Supervisor Grijalva stated that they did receive a list of County properties and that any expenditure out of these line items would come to Board for review. She stated this was to establish a budget line item in finance to make sure the funds were accessible. She clarified that Open Space and Affordable Housing were two separate line items.

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

Supervisor Scott commented that during a discussion with Mr. Rossi, Pima County lobbyist in Phoenix, he indicated that approval of this item could help the County receive State and Federal funding.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board had received a list of County properties.

Ms. Leshar stated that the full request was for buildings, properties and available land.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that a list of land inventory was being compiled, but a preliminary building list could have been circulated amongst the Board. He clarified that a final list that included both land and building inventory would be sent to the Board.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

15. Annual Action Plan

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 28, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve submission of the Pima County 2022-2023 Annual Action Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

FY2022/2023 Pima County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

Location/Applicant/Program/Activity/District/Request/Recommendation

Ajo Center for Sustainable Agriculture/Seeds of Future/ps/3/\$28,000/\$28,000
Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Builds/hsg/3/\$50,000/\$50,000
Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Works/ps/3/\$20,000/\$20,000
Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Butcher to Brewer/pf/3/\$76,650/\$55,000
Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Teen Project/ps/3/\$30,000/\$30,000
Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Youth Center/pf/3/\$75,000/\$75,000
Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resources/Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resources Facility Improvements/pf/3/\$46,200/\$50,000
Avra Water Co-op, Inc./Aging Meter Replacement Program/MXU Install Program/pf/3/\$40,000/\$30,000
Avra Water Co-op, Inc./Line and Road Erosion Repair/pf/3/\$30,000/\$0
Drexel Heights Fire District/Family Safety Program/ps/3,5/\$15,000/\$15,000
Drexel Heights Fire District/Thermal Imaging Cameras/pf/3,5/\$23,000/\$0
Flowing Wells School District/Flowing Wells Family Resource Center/ps/1,3/\$37,000/\$37,000
Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/SHiM Safety and Health in Motion Fall Prevention/ps/2,3,4/\$20,000/\$10,000
Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Infrastructure Improvement: Enclosing Porch for Office use/pf/2,3,4/\$44,600/\$45,000
Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Stairs/Upstairs Renovation for Occupancy/pf/2,3,4/\$108,000/\$0
Sahuarita Food Bank/Sahuarita Food Bank Facility Improvement Project/pf/2,3,4/\$300,000/\$0
Town of Marana/Administration/admin/1,3/\$20,000/\$13,000
Town of Marana/Colonia-Neighborhood Cleanup/ps/1,3/\$20,000/\$10,000
Town of Marana/Emergency Home Repair/hsg/1,3/\$85,000/\$18,500
Town of Marana/Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation/hsg/1,3/\$85,000/\$18,500
City of South Tucson/Administration/admin/2/\$30,000/\$30,000
City of South Tucson/Code Enforcement Program/ps/2/\$25,000/\$10,000
City of South Tucson/Community Cleanup & Green Program/ps/2/\$10,000/\$5,000
City of South Tucson/Crime Prevention and Education Program/ps/2/\$25,000/\$20,000

City of South Tucson/Fire and Rescue Safety Equipment/pf/2/\$15,000/\$10,000
 City of South Tucson/Youth Programs/ps/2/\$120,000/\$100,000
 Living Streets Alliance/South Tucson Bicycle Pedestrian Program/ps/2/\$30,000/\$20,000
 Pima County CWD/Administration/admin/All/\$500,000/\$475,000
 Pima County CWD/Indirect Cost Recovery Policy/All/\$250,000/\$182,990
 Pima County CWD/Brownfields/bf/All/\$30,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Commercial Facade/pf/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Project Delivery/pf/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Emergency Demolition/demo/All/\$65,000/\$45,000
 Pima County CWD/Emergency Septic/hsg/All/\$100,000/\$50,000
 Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program Lead/hsg/All/\$ -/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program Lead Relocation/hsg/All/\$30,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$1,000,000/\$454,905
 Pima County CWD/Safe, Healthy Green/shg/All/\$100,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Safe, Healthy Green-Capacity Building/shg/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Rural Food Pantry Improvement Program/pf/All/\$40,000/\$0
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair
 Program/hsg/All/\$225,000/\$200,000
 DIRECT Center for Independence/Home Access Program/hsg/All/\$50,000/\$50,000
 Habitat for Humanity Tucson/Habitat Home Repair Owner-Occupied Housing
 Rehabilitation/hsg/All/\$150,000/\$50,000
 Interfaith Community Services/ICS Drive Through Food Bank/pf/All/\$100,000/\$70,000
 Jewish Family & Childrens Services of Southern Arizona/Financial Wellness and Emergency
 Financial Assistance/ps/All/\$70,000/\$35,000
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./Pump up the Volume: Growing Mobile Meals Healthy Food
 Delivery for Rural Pima County Residents/ps/All/\$50,000/\$20,000
 Our Family Services, Inc./Reunion House/shg/All/\$15,000/\$20,000
 Primavera Foundation, Inc./Catalina House/shg/All/\$100,000/\$0
 SER Jobs for Progress/SER Facility Improvements/pf/2,All/\$64,000/\$64,000
 Southwest Fair Housing Council/Fair Housing Enforcement, Education, and
 Outreach/admin/5,All/\$35,000/\$25,000
 TMM Family Services, Inc./TMM-Whole Home Rehabilitation/hsg/All/\$65,000/\$50,000
 Tucson Clean & Beautiful, Inc./South Tucson Via Verde Greenway
 Enhancements/pf/All/\$60,500/\$45,000
 Watershed Management Group/Enhancing Site Sustainability of Local
 Shelters/shg/All/\$50,000/\$50,000
 Watershed Management Group/Green Stormwater Infrastructure for Neighborhood
 Cleanup/pf/All/\$90,000/\$70,000
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/ps/All/\$30,000/\$15,000
 YWCA of Southern Arizona Womens Economic Advancement Center-YWorks/ps/2,All/\$50,000/\$0
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/YWCA of Southern Arizona Community Facility Rehab at House of
 Neighborly Services/pf/2,All/\$130,210/\$70,000
TOTAL REQUESTED \$5,008,160/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$2,746,895

HUD Eligible Activity Abbreviations: admin = Administration; ps = Public Service; pf = Public Facility
 Improvement; SHG = Safe Healthy Green Shelter Set Aside; infra = Infrastructure Improvement; hsg
 = Housing Rehabilitation; ed = Economic Development; land = Land Acquisition; demo = Demolition;
 bf = Brownfields and Clearance.

FY2022/2023 Pima County Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program
ESG Component/Agency/Program/Activity Focus/District/Request /Recommendation

Street Outreach/Our Family Services/Street Outreach/Families, Individuals/All/\$51,035/\$-
 Emergency Shelter/Emerge!/Emergency Shelter for Victims of Domestic
 Violence/DV Families/All/\$60,000/\$40,000
 Emergency Shelter/Our Family Services/Emergency Shelter/Families, Individuals/All/\$32,168/\$-
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Casa Paloma/Single Women/All/\$30,000/\$30,000

Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Family Pathways/Families,
 Individuals/All/\$30,000/\$30,000
 Emergency Shelter/Sister Jose Women's Center/Safety, Stability, Success Program/Single
 Women/2/\$60,000/\$40,000
 Homeless Prevention/Green Valley Assistance Svs/Valley Assistance Family MAP (Map a
 Plan)/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$45,000/\$45,000
 Homeless Prevention/Interfaith Community Svs/Homeless Prevention/Families,
 Individuals/1,4/\$30,000/\$-
 Homeless Prevention/Our Family Services/Homeless Prevention/Families,
 Individuals/All/\$30,635/\$32,520
 Rapid Rehousing/Green Valley Assistance Svs/Rapid Rehousing/Families,
 Individuals/2,4/\$15,000/\$-
 Rapid Rehousing/Our Family Services/Rapid Rehousing/Families, Individuals/All/\$51,035/\$-
 Administration/Pima County/Administration/All/\$19,007/\$17,891
 Administration/Pima County/Indirect/Administration/All/\$16,789/\$16,789
TOTAL REQUESTED \$470,780/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$252,200

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

16. The Board of Supervisors on May 17, 2022, continued the following:

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.

Supervisor Grijalva stated her issue with the process for these funds not being an open public process, there not being equitable access to the funds and that anonymous reporters would receive the funds for 88-CRIME.

Chair Bronson shared her objection to the funds for University High School Gradation Night due to concerns with the equitability of the funds being provided.

Supervisor Scott commented that schools used the Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds for their graduation night, which was equitable. He explained that Grad Night at High Schools were started because the senior students were not making good choices after commencement ceremonies. He stated that most school administrations were aware of the availability of these funds.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that the application process had recently become unclear which had caused issues. She questioned the use of the funds since students attending had already paid for Grad Night.

Supervisor Scott stated that University High School Graduation Night had already happened and the schools relied on the funds for the current school year and upcoming school year activities.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to approve the use of Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds for University High School Graduation Night. Upon the vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Bronson and Supervisors Grijalva and Heinz voted "Nay."

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the use of Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds for 88-CRIME rewards.

HUMAN RESOURCES

17. Revisions to Personnel Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Personnel Policy No. 8-105, Annual Leave.

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

18. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 23.6, Employee Essential Training.

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

19. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 2.3, Employee Compliance.

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

20. La Posada at Pusch Ridge Project

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 29, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the proceedings of the Industrial Development Authority of the County of Pima regarding the issuance of its not-to-exceed \$225,000,000.00 senior living revenue bonds (La Posada at Pusch Ridge Project, 10930 N. 1st Avenue, 7930 N. Oracle

Road and 9740 N. Oracle Road, Suite 102, Oro Valley, Arizona), Series 2022 and declaring an emergency.

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

REAL PROPERTY

21. Abandonment by Vacation

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 30, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of a portion of Ina Road and Campbell Avenue, a public roadway, as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0065, within Section 5, T13S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 1)

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

22. Sale of Real Property - Lot 5

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0057, Tax Parcel No.113-09-2450. (District 3)

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

23. Surplus Property

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 7,884 square feet of undeveloped vacant residential lot located at 199 W. Florine Drive, Lot 133 Sycamore Vista No. 10N, Tax Parcel No. 305-37-1330, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 4)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

24. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 195897, Michelle Ivy Valenzuela, Dollar General Store No. 22864, 6450 S. Sandario Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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

25. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Anne Connell, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. Saint Andrews Drive, Tucson, June 17, 2022 at 9:15 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 Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

26. Hearing - Specific Plan Rezoning

P21SP00002, BRATTON, ET AL. - N. RESERVATION ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN

Christopher Bratton, et al., represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., request a specific plan rezoning for approximately 5.07 acres (Parcel Codes 208-45-004A and 208-45-005B) from the RH (Rural Homestead) zone to the SP (Specific Plan) zone, located on the west side of N. Reservation Road, approximately one and one-half miles north of the T-intersection of N. Reservation Road and W. Mile Wide Road. The proposed specific plan rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Low Intensity Rural. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Hook and Gungle were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

IF THE DECISION IS MADE TO APPROVE THE SPECIFIC PLAN, THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE MADE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MAY RESIDE WITHIN THE SPECIFIC PLAN DOCUMENT:

1. Not more than 60 days after the Board of Supervisors approves the specific plan, the owner(s) shall submit to the Planning Director the specific plan document, including the following conditions and any necessary revisions of the specific plan document reflecting the final actions of the Board of Supervisors, and the specific plan text and exhibits in an electronic and written format acceptable to the Planning Division.
2. In the event of a conflict between two or more requirements in this specific plan, or conflicts between the requirements of this specific plan and the Pima County Zoning Code, the specific plan shall apply.
3. This specific plan shall adhere to all applicable Pima County regulations that are not explicitly addressed within this specific plan. The specific plan's development regulations shall be interpreted to implement the specific plan or relevant Pima County regulations.
4. Transportation conditions:

- A. Paving will be required for all handicap accessible spaces and aisles, and paving for the on-site regular parking areas and access lanes shall be required in accordance with the Subdivision and Development Street Standards requirements if the site is opened to the public for product sales.
 - B. Legal, paved, all-weather access to the nearest public paved roadway shall be provided by the owner if the site is opened to the public for product sales.
 - C. Dust control mitigation for Reservation Road shall be provided by the owner(s) on a routine schedule as identified during the permitting process.
 - D. Proof of coordination with City of Tucson shall be provided to Development Services prior to the issuance of a development plan.
5. Flood Control District conditions:
 - A. Demonstrate prior to issuance of a Site Construction Permit and/or a Floodplain Use Permit the existing structures and any infrastructure that will remain onsite for this project are compliant with the Floodplain Management Ordinance. Noncompliant structures shall be modified to be compliant or removed prior to the issuance of any permits for new improvements.
 - B. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development practices distributed throughout the site.
 - C. At the time of development, the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.
6. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
7. Cultural Resources condition: Prior to ground modifying activities, an on-the-ground archaeological and historic sites survey shall be conducted on the subject property. A cultural resources mitigation plan for any identified archaeological and historic sites on the subject property shall be submitted at the time of, or prior to, the submittal of any tentative plan or development plan. All work shall be conducted by an archaeologist permitted by the Arizona State Museum, or a registered architect, as appropriate. Following rezoning approval, any subsequent development requiring a grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with Pima County's cultural resources requirements under Chapter 18.81 of the Pima County Zoning Code.
8. Adherence to the specific plan document as approved at the Board of Supervisor's public hearing.
9. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
10. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P21SP00002, subject to standard and special conditions.

27. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 12, P21RZ00011, Dixon Family Revoc TR. - N. Oracle Road Rezoning. Owner: Dixon Family Revoc TR. (District 1)

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

28. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 13, P21RZ00014, Biklen - N. Sunrock Lane No. 2 Rezoning. Owner: John Biklen. (District 5)

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

29. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 14, P21RZ00016, Markland Investments, L.L.C., et al. - N. La Cholla Boulevard Rezoning. Owner: Markland Investments, L.L.C., et al. (District 1)

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

30. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - 15, P21RZ00017, Thalma, L.L.C. - W. Ina Road Rezoning. Owner: Thalma, L.L.C. (District 1)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

31. Opposition to the Proposed Copper World Project Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2022 - 32, of the Board of Supervisors, opposing the proposed Copper World Project. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva provided background on the Copper World Project and stated that if the resolution passed it would be shared with Congressional Representatives and the Senate.

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

Supervisor Scott stated that Hudbay did not need to apply for Federal permits, but they needed to apply for State permits. He asked if the State would also receive the results of the vote.

Supervisor Grijalva verified that the resolution stated that Federal, State and local authorities would be informed of the County's opposition to the permits.

Supervisor Scott asked if there had been any communication between Hudbay and the Flood Control District.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that there had been ongoing interactions and staff would provide a memorandum to the Board.

Supervisor Christy expressed his objection and stated that resolutions on this matter that had previously been approved by this Board, had not prevented Hudbay from their work. He commented that Copper World was on private property, so the Board did not have the ability to stop Hudbay, ultimately that decision would need to come from Washington D.C.

Chair Bronson called the question. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

32. **COVID-19 Premium Pay**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the actions taken by the former and current County Administrators in determining the recipients of and the amounts of COVID-19 Premium Pay paid to Pima County employees during FY19/20, FY20/21, and FY21/22. Discussion to include the criteria used to determine when such payment required a vote of the Board of Supervisors. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated the COVID-19 premium pay had been distributed to some employees and asked why the Board had not voted on the COVID-19 premium payments. He inquired if there were other COVID-19 premium payments that had not come before the Board for approval.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the Board approved Board of Supervisors (BOS) Policy No. C 2.9 on April 9, 2020, which included a process that did not require Board approval to issue COVID-19 premium payments. She explained that the policy was brought back to the Board for amendments and extensions multiple times since the adoption and had been continually approved by the Board. She indicated that the COVID-19 premium payments were distributed to staff as allowed by the process the Board approved.

Supervisor Christy asked which policies required Board approval.

Ms. Leshar responded that the BOS policy designated the County Administrator to approve the payments.

Chair Bronson stated, therefore, it did not need to come back to the Board for approval.

Supervisor Christy asked when the BOS would be brought into the process for approval of COVID-19 premium payments. He stated that the \$2 per hour hazard pay, the employee vaccination incentive and a \$50 stipend for vaccinated poll workers had been brought before the BOS for consideration/approval, but the COVID-19 premium pay had not.

Ms. Leshar encouraged the Board to review BOS Policy C 2.9 and provide any recommendations, clarifications or amendments to the policy. She explained that the \$2 per hour hazard pay, employee vaccination incentive and the \$50 stipend for vaccinated poll workers were deemed separate from COVID-19 premium pay.

Supervisor Christy stated his concerns of the classification of items that were brought to the Board and others that were not. He inquired about the list of approximately 2,500 employees who received the COVID-19 premium payments and how they were determined.

Ms. Leshar responded that the BOS allowed the County Administrator to approve funding for the COVID-19 premium payments. She stated that a list of employees who received the payments would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked if the decisions were made by the previous County Administrator in April of 2020.

Chair Bronson stated that the decisions were made by the Board.

Ms. Leshar clarified that the BOS made the decision with the County Administrator to provide additional pay to encourage employees to get vaccinated. She stated BOS Policy C 2.9 was created in April 2020, and had been brought back to the Board multiple times for updates to the policy.

Supervisor Scott reiterated the adoption date and revision dates of BOS Policy C 2.9, which had been approved by the previous and current BOS.

Supervisor Heinz stated that Supervisor Christy voted in favor of BOS Policy C 2.9 and if there were any further questions on the topic, they should be addressed to Administration and not brought to the BOS.

Supervisor Christy responded that the information he had recently received did not fit with what he remembered at the time the policy was introduced and revised.

Chair Bronson advised the BOS to review past minutes of the meeting dates that included the policy adoption and revisions.

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

33. Small Business Commission, COVID-19 Pandemic Response Task Force

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Small Business Commission recommendation to the Board of Supervisors which outlines the formation of a task force to conduct an after-action analysis of the impacts of the actions taken by the Board during the COVID-19 pandemic, both positive and negative, on the Pima County small business community.

The Chair and members of the commission are invited to present during the discussion and respond to any questions that arise. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated the need for a task force to analyze the effects of COVID-19 on the small business community with the use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds,

Kent Blumenthal, Commissioner, Small Business Commission, explained that the task force would analyze the economic impact of the pandemic on small businesses. He expressed his appreciation to the Board and County Administration for their work in the small business community. He stated the need for a review on the effects of the pandemic to find out what went right, what went wrong and what could be improved upon in the future. He stated that the proposal of a task force would be beneficial because it would allow for mid-course corrections on how to approach the health and wellness of the county, help identify best practices and would allow preparation for the future. He explained that the task force would be broadly represented since the Small Business Commission was represented in every aspect of the County and community. He stated that the proposal was the same as a review that any major corporation would do or any other government.

Joshua Jacobsen, At-Large Commissioner, Small Business Commission, stated that the commission had been tracking where Pima County was in relation to economic recovery compared to the rest of the State. He added that the County was at 83% for job recovery and the rest of the State was at 109%. He added that the difference in recovery was in regards to the difference in jobs offered in Pima County compared to the rest of the State. He explained that the proposal would allow for preparation if another pandemic arose. He indicated the task force would address issues related to health, fentanyl, comorbidities, housing, education and why Pima County was 19% below the national level for incomes.

Chair Bronson asked if ARPA funds would be available for the Small Business Commission Task Force.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the Board outlined a spending plan for the ARPA funds and could bring forward plans on how to reallocate funds, if needed, for the task force.

Supervisor Grijalva asked how the price of the task force had been determined.

Mr. Blumenthal explained that the Small Business Commission had discussed the proposed task force before the proposal was brought to the Board. He identified the personnel that would be needed for the task force and made sure that the task force was apolitical and independent. He explained that a consultant would be hired to address various variables or data points within the proposal. He stated that it would be hard for the commission to capture every element that would need to be reviewed, which was the reason a task force would be required. He indicated that the pricing was determined by the members of the commission given the corpus of the proposal as it was envisioned. He explained that as the business of the County continued, a Request for Proposal (RFP) would be put together that was overseen by the task force to assign specific dollar amounts for potential consulting firms to bid on. He added that in the proposal, the cost was estimated and would be the maximum required and the amount could be less than estimated.

Mr. Jacobsen stated that the funds were not definite. He added that the \$775,000 used for the task force would benefit everyone in the County.

Supervisor Christy commended the work of the Small Business Commission on the task force.

Mr. Blumenthal indicated that the plan for the task force was started in October 2020.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Scott to approve the formation of a COVID-19 Pandemic Response Task Force, as presented by the Small Business Commission with the funding mechanisms to be determined by the County Administrator and that they were allowed to move forward with their commission. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Small Business Commission raised concerns that should be discussed and the importance of reflection on decisions made by the Board. He indicated that the Small Business Commission already had the ability to get analysis without the task force. He stated his concern with the cost that would be required for the task force and encouraged the commission to work with Mr. Cavanaugh and County staff to collect necessary data. He requested background information on the Small Business Commission, why it was formed and what its original mission and focus was and the assignment of County staff to assist Mr. Cavanaugh to work with the Small Business Commission on defining their mission, vision and focus.

Ms. Leshar stated that a review of practices that the County took during the pandemic would be welcomed. She suggested that the Small Business Commission work with Pima County staff on what the issues that needed to be addressed were and to continually work together to analyze and gather data that would meet all needs of the community.

Supervisor Scott agreed with Ms. Leshar's suggestion.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Small Business Commission preferred to be independent from the County and that it would be important for an unbiased view in the task force. He recommended that the Small Business Commission stay separate from the County.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if there had been an evaluation of the Small Business Commission by the County that showed the need for the commission and if not, there was a need for one. She indicated that there would be benefits of an analysis of the actions taken by the Board regarding the pandemic and there were lessons that could be learned, but there appeared to be a disconnect between the Small Business Commission and Pima County.

Mr. Blumenthal stated that the objectives of the Small Business Commission were to advise the Board and communicate with small businesses. He stated that the commission could not ask for money for their own work which would not allow for the commission to do any analysis by themselves. He stated the commission was independent from the County.

Mr. Jacobsen stated that the task force included a scope of work that could not be handled by the Small Business Commission.

Supervisor Christy stated his support of the use of ARPA funds for the task force.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Heinz to direct the County Administrator and staff to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the County's pandemic response which would include health and economic outcomes using outside consultants, if necessary. The motion died for lack of a second.

(Clerk's Note: Supervisor Heinz left the meeting prior to roll call vote of the original motion.)

Upon roll call vote of the original motion, it failed 1-3, Chair Bronson and Supervisors Grijalva and Scott voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

34. Recommendations for Election Workers and the COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate

Staff recommends lifting the mandate concerning the COVID-19 vaccine for the narrowly defined group of Election Workers and that the following mitigating requirements and benefits be followed for all Election Workers:

- Election Workers are not permitted to work if experiencing any symptoms of COVID-19 within 48 hours of their scheduled start time;
 - Cough
 - Sore Throat
 - Runny/Stuffy Nose
 - Muscle Aches
 - Headaches
 - Chills
 - Fatigue
 - Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea
 - Fever
 - Loss of Taste/Smell
- Between 36 and 24 hours prior to the scheduled start time, Election Workers shall provide proof of a negative test for COVID-19.
- Mask wearing is recommended while working.
- Election Workers shall maintain social distancing where possible.
- All work surfaces and areas will be routinely wiped down with approved cleaning products.
- A \$50.00 stipend will be offered to vaccinated Election Workers for whom the County can validate vaccination status.

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

Supervisor Scott expressed his support for the requirements with the exception of the requirement that election workers provide a negative COVID-19 test 36 to 24 hours prior to their scheduled start time. He explained that if an election worker had symptoms they should not report to work and that COVID-19 tests could produce false negatives. He stated he could not support the item if that component was included and requested it be removed.

Supervisor Christy reiterated that if any symptoms were present for election workers, they should not be reporting to work. He stated his objection and asked to remove the \$50.00 stipend offered to vaccinated election workers for whom the County could validate vaccination status. He stated that it would not be a good use of taxpayer dollars and would not provide a fair and equitable balance between poll workers.

Supervisor Scott amended his motion to include the removal of the requirement that election workers provide proof of a negative COVID-19 test between 36 to 24 hours prior to their scheduled start time, and to remove the \$50.00 stipend that would be offered to vaccinated election workers for whom the County could validate vaccination status. Supervisor Christy seconded the amended motion.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that it was important to have accessible voting centers with representation of all parties. She expressed her support of the \$50.00 stipend since it would help to ensure the safety of election workers and voters.

Upon roll call vote, the amended motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Grijalva voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

35. Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds

Staff recommends approval to utilize Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds in the amount of \$5,000.00 for the Barbea Williams Performing Company, Inc., pursuant to A.R.S. §13-2314.03 and by Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 6.3.

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

Supervisor Grijalva expressed her objection since the application of the Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds was not accessible to the community.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Grijalva voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

36. Public Announcement

Pursuant to A.R.S. §49-391(C), a public comment period of 30 days must occur before any Pretreatment Consent Decree or Negotiated Settlement Agreement is made final. The Public Information Enforcement File for the following case will be made available for public review or copies may be obtained for \$.35 per page at the Public Works Building, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department's reception desk, 201 North Stone Avenue, 3rd Floor, Tucson, Arizona, 85701. Comments will be taken for the next thirty days and written comments may be sent to Industrial Wastewater Control, 2955 W. Calle Agua Nueva, Tucson, Arizona 85745-9750. If sufficient interest is expressed, a public hearing may be held by the Board of Supervisors. After the comment period, the Board of Supervisors will vote on acceptance of the following Settlement Agreement:

Busy "D" Pumping. The proposed settlement in which Busy "D" Pumping, located at 3255 E. District Street, will complete a Supplemental Environment Project (SEP) in lieu of a monetary penalty as allowed by Section 2.4(C) of Pima County's Enforcement Response Plan. The proposed SEP will require additional sampling and monitoring requirements at the Busy "D" Pumping facility and require Busy "D" to modify either its permit or operations at the facility.

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.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

37. PROCUREMENT

CBIZ Benefit & Insurance Services, Inc., d.b.a. CBIZ Talent and Compensation Solutions, to provide for a Classification and Compensation Study, General Fund, contract amount \$383,000.00 (MA-PO-22-187) Human Resources

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

Supervisor Christy questioned if the Human Resources (HR) Department was capable of providing the resources for this study.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the County was previously unable to find a consultant to provide the resources necessary for the study. She stated that the HR was capable of providing individual classifications, but not the entire scope of work for the Classification and Compensation Study. She stated that it would be more efficient to use an outside consultant.

Supervisor Christy asked why the County was unable to find a consultant for the study and if it was for an independent consultant.

Ms. Leshar stated that it was difficult with the past Request for Proposal (RFP) to communicate and allow for travel, but a new RFP had been issued that allowed for the recommendation to continue the study. She confirmed that it was for an independent consultant.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

38. Housing Commission

Appointment of JoAnn di Filippo, Ph.D., to fill a vacancy created by Ray Clarke. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 4)

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

Supervisor Grijalva commented that a draft report by the Pima County Affordable Housing Task Force suggested the formation of a new Housing Commission to replace the current commission, and indicated that the report would be issued in June. She stated that the current Housing Commission had not met in years.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

CONSENT CALENDAR

39. Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 21, 22 and 27 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Scott 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

Community and Workforce Development

2. Marana Public School District, d.b.a. Marana Unified School District, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, U.S. Department of Treasury, American Rescue Plan Act - Coronavirus State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, contract amount \$345,656.00/2 year term (CT-CR-22-359)

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

Supervisor Christy asked Chair Bronson if she would amend her motion to include Consent Calendar Item Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Chair Bronson amended her motion to include the approval of Consent Calendar Item Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6. Supervisor Grijalva seconded the amended motion.

Supervisor Christy expressed his objection to the contracts. He felt that it was not the responsibility of all Pima County taxpayers to pay for a pre-kindergarten program that only a select few would attend.

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

3. Marana Public School District, d.b.a. Marana Unified School District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program and amend contractual language, Town of Marana Grant Fund, contract amount \$10,345.00 (CT-CR-21-489)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Calendar Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

4. Tucson Unified School District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 5/31/24 and amend contractual language, City of Tucson Grant Fund, contract amount \$1,021,528.00 (CT-CR-21-429)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Calendar Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

5. State of Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, d.b.a. First Things First, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-CR-21-407)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Calendar Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

6. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a Amphitheater Public Schools, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program and amend contractual language, City of Tucson Grant Fund, contract amount \$633,600.00 decrease (CT-CR-21-416)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Calendar Item No. 2, for discussion and action on this item.)

9. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental cooperative agreement for the Consortium of the Federal Home Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2023 - 2025, no cost/3 year term (CTN-CR-22-146)

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 Consent Calendar Item No. 21 was related to this item.

Chair Bronson amended her motion to include the approval of Consent Calendar Item No. 21. Supervisor Grijalva seconded the amended motion.

Supervisor Christy stated there had been an intergovernmental cooperative agreement between Pima County and the City of Tucson to establish U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Home Investment partnerships and a partnership consortium since 1992. He stated that recently there had been an increased interest in affordable housing by Pima County. He requested a report on all completed units that the County had been involved with in regards to affordable housing and an evaluation by staff regarding the extent of the County's involvement. He expressed his concerns with the lack of information provided for the program goals and predicted outcomes. He commented that the Board did not have the metrics, but the background materials showed the number of completed units identified in the current city HUD five-year consolidated plan and in the consolidated performance and evaluation report. He questioned if the County should be involved in affordable housing and asked for data on the goals of affordable housing in Pima County. He asked that this item to be continued until the requested information was provided.

Chair Bronson expressed her support for the item and asked staff to provide the reports requested by Supervisor Christy.

Supervisor Scott elaborated on the partnership between the City of Tucson and Pima County and the purpose of the consortium.

Supervisor Christy asked how many affordable housing units had been completed with the consortium since 1992.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

21. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, to provide for the HOME Investment Partnership Subrecipient Agreement between City of Tucson and Pima County, \$3,750,000.00/3 year term (GTAW 22-127)

(Clerk's Note: See Consent Calendar Item No. 9, for discussion and action on this item.)

22. Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation

Emergency Food and Shelter Program - Phase ARPA-R, to provide for the Humanitarian relief for individuals at imminent risk of homelessness, \$580,632.00 (GTAW 22-116)

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

Supervisor Christy questioned who would be covered by the program and what accommodations would be provided for those covered, who was considered at imminent risk and what was the difference between the eviction program listed in the grant and the existing eviction program. He asked why the program was being implemented if there were multiple homeless programs that were currently available and felt there was not a clear difference between imminent homelessness and homelessness.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that the County had been leasing hotel facilities with federal funds for those facing evictions and that this grant would be a continuation of those programs.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, explained that there were many categories of homelessness and that imminent risk was defined as being within 15 days of homelessness. He stated that individuals who were placed in hotels through the programs offered by the Community and Workforce Development Department were considered at imminent risk since they were in a shelter.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the difference between migrants and the homeless that the County was sheltering and if there were programs already in place for these individuals. He asked about the shelter location of this program and if there would be a difference in treatment for individuals who were COVID-19 positive. He asked about the use of the funds and how funds were differentiated between programs.

Mr. Sullivan responded that if individuals were referred by the Office of Emergency Eviction Legal Services, they were there to ensure they had a pathway into permanent housing. He stated that those individuals that were referred by Border Patrol, were asylum seekers. He stated that individuals in the community who were at imminent risk of homelessness and faced eviction would receive the grant funding to prevent them from living on the streets. He confirmed that the location for this specific program would be at the Comfort Suites, but other programs were housed at the Comfort Suites and Red Roof Inn. He indicated that there was no difference in placement between individuals with or without COVID-19. He stated that the Grants Management and Innovation Department tracked the use of housing with a data system and could determine which funding was used for each person based on the categories established by the Housing and Urban Development Department.

Supervisor Christy indicated that the Board received a running tally on some of the program's expenses which included amounts of \$580,000 and \$290,000 that should be included in the \$12 million of previous funding provided for homeless programs. He questioned if the expenses would equate to around \$13 million.

Mr. Sullivan confirmed that the estimated expenses would be approximately \$13 million for all of the homeless programs. He stated that the programs had received federal stimulus funding to help prevent individuals from becoming homeless or living in a shelter.

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

27. Acceptance - Justice Services

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance via the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the Arizona Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program, \$91,030.00/3 year term (GTAW 22-111)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that he had initially pulled the item for separate action, but it was not necessary.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

1. Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing, and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$600,000.00 (CT-ED-21-510)

Community and Workforce Development

2. Marana Public School District, d.b.a. Marana Unified School District) (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
3. Marana Public School District, d.b.a. Marana Unified School District, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
4. Tucson Unified School District, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
5. State of Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, d.b.a. First Things First, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

6. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a Amphitheater Public Schools, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
7. Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., to provide for workforce development services (adults), USDOL/ADES WIOA Fund, contract amount \$252,098.04 (CT-CR-22-298)
8. Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., to provide for workforce development services (dislocated workers), USDOL/ADES WIOA Fund, contract amount \$143,637.62 (CT-CR-22-299)
9. City of Tucson, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Health

10. The Tohono O'odham Nation, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for COVID-19 Health Disparities grant funds, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention via ADHS Fund, contract amount \$199,998.00 (CT-HD-22-123)

Office of Sustainability and Conservation

11. National Park Service, Amendment No. 1, to provide a cooperative agreement to collaborate on conservation, extend contract term to 6/19/27 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-SUS-17-209)

Procurement

12. **Award**
Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-22-168, Sierra Vista Glass, d.b.a. Vista Glass (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide for as-needed and emergency glass repair. This master agreement is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$380,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.
13. Arizona Communication Experts, Inc., Solutions i3, L.L.C., and Sturgeon Electric Company, Inc., to provide a job order master agreement for structured cabling services, Various Funds, contract amount \$2,000,000.00 (MA-PO-22-179) Facilities Management
14. Motorola Solutions, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for Spillman software, professional services, maintenance and support, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$180,000.00 (MA-PO-18-330) Information Technology and Sheriff

Real Property

15. Conterra Ultra Broadband, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for a Nonexclusive Right-of-Way Use License for a communications system (Lic-0269), extend contract term to 3/6/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$1,980.00 revenue (CTN-IT-17-161)
16. Global Water - Rincon Water Company Inc., to provide for a Nonexclusive Right-of-Way Use License for public utility facilities (Lic-0337), no cost/25 year term (CTN-RPS-22-154)
17. Sprint Spectrum Realty Company, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide a master agreement for wireless communications facilities and site-specific supplemental agreements for specified locations, extend contract term to 6/5/30 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$242,724.99 revenue (CTN-RPS-22-73)

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

18. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, Amendment No. 2, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/23 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$478,800.00 (CT-WW-20-306)
19. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 1, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/23 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$435,600.00 (CT-WW-21-367)

Sheriff

20. Town of Oro Valley, to provide for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount \$5,000.00 revenue (CTN-SD-22-134)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

21. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
22. **Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation**
Emergency Food and Shelter Program - Phase ARPA-R, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
23. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the Pima County HIV Surveillance Program, \$60,682.00/~~4-year term~~ **5 year term** (GTAW 22-123)

24. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the Well Woman Health Check Program, \$518,100.00 (GTAW 22-124)
25. **Acceptance - Health**
Exact Sciences Corporation, to provide for the Unrestricted Grant Agreement for colorectal cancer prevention, screening and care coordination, \$124,850.00 (GTAW 22-115)
26. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Health Start Program and extend grant term to 7/5/23, \$201,860.00 (GTAM 22-90)
27. **Acceptance - Justice Services**
U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance via the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
28. **Acceptance - Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation**
Arizona Game and Fish Commission, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the shooting range development grant and extend grant term to 6/1/23, no cost (GTAM 22-84)
29. **Acceptance - Pima County Attorney's Office**
U.S. Department of Justice, OJP, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Pima County Attorney's Office Mitigation of Coronavirus Exposure, \$36,665.04 (GTAM 22-94)
30. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**
Friends of Pima Animal Care, Amendment No. 3, to provide a funding agreement extension for Vet Care at PACC and extend grant term to 6/30/23, \$250,000.00 (GTAM 22-93)
31. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, Amendment No. 9, to provide for the Title IV-E Federal Foster Care Matching Funds, \$442,596.94 (GTAM 22-87)
32. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Arizona Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding Program and extend grant term to 1/31/23, \$51,850.00 (GTAM 22-82)

33. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, to provide for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$1,060,923.00 (GTAW 22-125)
34. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the Governor's Office of Highway Safety Prop 207 BERLA iVe Toolkit, \$9,635.00 (GTAW 22-118)
35. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Phoenix Police Department, Arizona ICAC Task Force Lead Agency, to provide for the Arizona internet crimes against children, no cost/5 year term (GTAW 22-117)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

36. **Election Integrity Commission**
Reappointment of Arthur Kerschen. Term expiration: 2/5/24. (Libertarian Party recommendation)
37. **Workforce Investment Board**
A. Appointments of Victor Gonzalez, representing GECD; Philanthropic Organization, to replace Dr. Margaret Higgins and Magdalena Verdugo, representing Workforce; CBO, to replace Michele Bettini. Term expirations: 9/30/24. (Commission recommendations)
B. Staff recommends approval of amendments to the Workforce Investment Board By-Laws.

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

38. **Special Event**
 - Robert Shevlin, Rotary Club of Green Valley, Santa Cruz Valley Regional Hospital, 4455 I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, May 26, 2022.
 - Kelly Wild, Tucson Rebels Fastpitch, Brandi Fenton Park, 3482 E. River Road, Tucson, June 4, 2022.
39. **Temporary Extension**
 - 06100203, Jeffrey Craig Miller, Hot Rods Old Vail, 10500 E. Old Vail Road, Tucson, May 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, June 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, July 1, 2, 3 and 4, 2022.
 - 07100326, Thomas Robert Aguilera, Tucson Hop Shop, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, Tucson, May 22, 2022.
 - 12104529, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Wild Garlic Grill, 2870 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, June 1, 2022 through January 1, 2023.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

40. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Dana Dent \$150.00; Dana Dent \$150.00; National Archives and Records Administration \$50.00; IDentisource, L.L.C. \$746.37; West Publishing Corporation \$730.79; HSL La Reserve Properties, L.L.C. \$7,825.42; Sonia Nieto \$4,200.00; Melissa Rogers \$45.00; Salvation Army \$1,461.02; GRI River Center, L.L.C. \$2,216.78; Banner-University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C. \$42,134.84.

JUSTICE COURT

41. Judge Pro Tempore Appointments

Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated, Green Valley and Ajo Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023:

John Davis; Carmen Dolny; Maria Felix; Charles Harrington; Paul Julien; Frederick S. Klein; Ronald J. Newman; Sarah R. Simmons and Brick P. Storts, III.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

42. Warrants: May, 2022

* * *

40. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:51 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK