

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 19, 2021. 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: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting when the Board was convened in Executive Session.

1. **Canvass**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-707(D), canvass of the election results for the January 12, 2021, Special Election.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 19, 2021. 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: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting when the Board was convened in Executive Session.

1. PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Chair Bronson acknowledged Martin Luther King Day and observed a moment of silence in remembrance of Brian D. Sicknick and those who lost their lives on January 6, 2021, during the domestic terrorism event in Washington, D.C.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments for the record.

4. CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present, to convene to Executive Session at 9:24 a.m.

5. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 12:02 p.m. Chair Bronson and Supervisors Grijalva, Scott and Christy were present. Supervisor Heinz was not present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

6. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a notice of claim and forthcoming lawsuit filed by Viva Coffee House, L.L.C., Andrea and Kelly Walker, and Richard and Cheryl Dunker.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Bronson and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay" and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

7. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding existing and potential County policies restricting political activities of County employees.

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

8. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Kohl's, Inc., et al. v. Pima County, Arizona Tax Court Case No. TX2020-000945.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that under the terms of the proposed settlement, the parcels and Full Cash Values for Tax Year 2021 were set at a total of \$17,450,000.00 and broken down as follows:

Address	Full Cash Values
5850 W. Arizona Pavilions Drive	\$5,800,000.00
199201 N. Pantano Road	\$5,775,000.00
7785, 7825 N. Oracle Road	\$5,875,000.00

He stated that the values for the Arizona Pavilions and Pantano properties would roll over to Tax Year 2022 and the values for the Oracle Crossings property would not roll over to Tax Year 2022. He stated that the Finance and Risk Management Department and the County Attorney's Office recommended approval of the proposed settlement. The County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to proceed with the settlement.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to accept the recommendation and approve the proposed settlement.

9. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Next Level Arcade Tucson, L.L.C., et al. v. Pima County, Pima County Superior Court Case No. C20210057.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay" and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Pima County Board of Supervisors v. Bill Staples, Arizona Tax Court Case No. TX2019-000118, and the processing of petitions for redemption of waiver under A.R.S. §42-11153.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to move forward on transitioning the process back to the Pima County Assessor's Office.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Chair Bronson to transition the process back to the Pima County Assessor's Office. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Bronson inquired whether procedures would need to be changed.

Mr. Flagg affirmed and stated that the County Attorney's Office would work with the Assessor, County Administration and the Clerk of the Board to revise the policy and bring it back to the Board for approval.

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

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding what measures Pima County can take to extend the federal eviction moratorium beyond January 31, 2021 within Pima County.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

12. **Executive Session**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice, and for discussion or consideration of any matter within the scope of A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (1), regarding the proposed County Administrator Employment Contract, 2021-2025. As required by §38-431.03(D), any legal action must be taken in public session. (District 5)

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson, to accept the language contained in the draft contract with the following exceptions: In section 3, replace the proposed salary of \$315,000.00 with a salary of \$292,000.00 and delete the last sentence which states "employee salary shall thereafter be subject to such pay adjustments that may be accorded Pima County employees generally" and replace that language to read "any increase in salary will be based on evaluations as determined by the Board." In section 4, insert a new provision to be labeled provision "H" that indicates "If the employee retires, as allowed by the Arizona State Retirement System, he can return to work as a contractor without any negation of the terms of this contract, including its length." In section 6, replace the following language, "payment equal to 'six months' salary in the event of severance" with "payment equal to three months' salary." No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Bronson indicated that this was new language being inserted into the contract and inquired whether the revisions would require ratification by the Board.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott read the following statement in regards to his support of the renewal of Mr. Huckelberry's contract:

"The decision I have made to renew Mr. Huckelberry's contract is not one that I made quickly or lightly. Dozens of people throughout our community contacted me during the last two weeks to share their opinions on this matter. I read every email and engaged in any conversation to which I was invited, hearing from people who strongly opposed or very much supported Mr. Huckelberry's retention as County Administrator. Along with public input, I also weighed many other factors. A significant reason for this decision on my part is Mr. Huckelberry's record of service and achievement throughout all the years he has worked for Pima County, not just as the Administrator. His extensive knowledge of all aspects of county government and its operations is vast, almost encyclopedic. He also manifests many of the traits of a true servant leader. One of the other attributes of a strong leader is the quality of the team he has built. The Deputy Administrators and Department heads that Mr. Huckelberry has cultivated and framed are an exceptionally skilled and dedicated crew. This has been a point made to me by many people in our community. Most especially those in the business, environmental and human services sectors. The overall financial health of Pima County was another major factor in my decision. Our budgets have gone praised from the government Finance Officers Association. All general obligation debt will be paid off before the end of this decade and overall investment debt has been reduced 40% in the last eight years. The County's credit ratings are at the highest levels and the reports from the rating agencies point to our strong liquidity, reductions in debt, and very conservative budgeting practices. This may be the strongest testament for the decision I am making to support the renewal of Mr. Huckelberry's contract as revised. Especially given the ongoing fiscal uncertainties the local governments

brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. The work Mr. Huckelberry has done to promote conservation and environmental protection is noteworthy, as is the effort he began in recent years to implement necessary reforms in our criminal justice system. He secured unanimous support from the previous Board for a program that will address the 70% of our roads that are in poor or failed condition by 2030 and ensured that program would continue unhindered during the pandemic. Mr. Huckelberry and his team have also worked with care and skill to meet the public health challenges brought about by this pandemic, especially the daunting logistical task of a dancing immunization. [No audio] I am not without concerns. As a new Supervisor, it is very troubling to me that so many of our employees do not see Pima County as a caring, supportive and positive place to work. Many of these employees place much of the blame for their feelings and experiences at the feet of Mr. Huckelberry and his team. Their concerns must and will be addressed. No organization can move forward if its employees do not feel acknowledged, respected and supported. I share the view held by many of them about the inappropriate nature of a raise being considered to the highest paid County employee during this time of challenging crisis, which is why this renewed contract contains no raise but instead reduces his salary from the current base. For our employees and others in the community who do not agree with this, I invite them to hold the Board accountable for the actions of County government, not the County Administrator. Mr. Huckelberry answers to the Board and his charge is to implement our policies and decisions. I said many times during the recent campaign that the Board needs to be the face and voice of County government. My four colleagues have made similar statements. During the next four years, I hope every person in Pima County will demand that this Board defend every decision it makes. We have the solemn obligation to ensure that every service you depend on is provided with the highest levels of equity, constituent service and respect for the public revenues entrusted to us. We will demand that Mr. Huckelberry and every other county employee meet our expectations for public service, but the Board and each individual Supervisor will answer to you, the voters, if we do not meet your expectations. It is with those understandings that I make this decision to support the renewal of Mr. Huckelberry's contract, and urge approval of the motion."

Supervisor Christy asked for a point of order and respectfully requested that Supervisor Scott's proposal be ruled out of order, since he did not participate nor was present during the Executive Session. He indicated that Supervisor Scott's proposal made several references to discussions held during Executive Session, and requested confirmation from the County Attorney on the accuracy of his statement based on the discussion held during Executive Session. He indicated that this was a violation of Executive Session rules, therefore putting his proposal out of order and creating a violation of Executive Session protocol.

Chair Bronson indicated that as the parliamentarian, the request was overruled.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she had also heard from several individuals requesting that Mr. Huckelberry's contract not be renewed. She stated that she also heard from environmental and conservation groups and advocates that were adamant about retaining Mr. Huckelberry because of all the in-roads and improvements in the County. She indicated that the revised contract held the Supervisors accountable and that accountability was important because the Supervisors had been elected to provide this service. She stated that the contract would contain an evaluation tool which would include the implementation of a culture and climate survey which would allow employees the opportunity to express their concerns. She indicated that this could be used as a baseline, and as a metric to improve the culture and climate in the County. She stated that she had also communicated with Mr. Huckelberry regarding diversity in County leadership and that the creation of a formal evaluation would be based on that information. She indicated that she would like to see the creation of an Employee Relations Department, so that County employees would have somewhere to go outside of Human Resources. She stated that the employee relations' position would report, in conjunction with legal, directly to the Board and would help alleviate concerns heard repeatedly about departments within the County. She expressed pride in becoming part of Pima County's efforts to conserve the environment. She added that it was important to be held accountable and this was a joint responsibility that encouraged the Board and Mr. Huckelberry to work together.

Supervisor Heinz commented on his opposition to the contract and the lack of any formal evaluations by previous Boards. He indicated that an evaluation should be structurally required and that he would support a 12 to 24-month renewal in order to implement that requirement. He indicated his acceptance for a reduction in salary, a decreased severance payout and formalizing an evaluation process.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification on whether the proposed contract amendments would be revised and brought back for Board approval.

Chair Bronson indicated that it would be brought back for ratification by the Board.

Supervisor Christy indicated that he had previously opposed and was still opposed to the renewal of the County Administrator's contract. Supervisor Christy read the following statement:

"The reasons for my vote against Mr. Huckelberry's contract renewal are numerous and I feel significant. I will try to synopsise. First and foremost, after closing in about, in almost three decades as Pima County Administrator, that amount of time is and of itself good and justifiable reason for contract discontinuance. It is and has been for many years, time for a change of our County Administrator. So much time in one position leads to many problems and issues many of which are self-expletory and self-evident and as the owner of a business for many years, I can speak from management experience. A fresh new set of

eyes and ideas and different management attributes have been and are needed now in the County Administrator's position. Second, since becoming Supervisor, I have had a number of disagreements of County policy and direction that have been instigated under Mr. Huckelberry's management. To highlight a few, one, \$30 million cost of the Kino Sports Complex and soccer fields, which by the way, have been barred from use by groups and organizations during the COVID pandemic, even though their COVID pandemic protocol guarantees were safeguarding the events. Two, the purchase of the Toole Avenue complex as well as many other properties. The unnecessary purchase and renovation costs to the Golden Pins bowling alley. The use of taxpayer monies to pay for the renovation and accommodation of taxpayer owned facilities at the Juvenile Detention Center for the sole purpose of facilitating Asylum seekers. Taxpayers' money should have never been used for or in the Asylum seeking business. Mr. Huckelberry's non-stop, unyielding opposition of the opening of the Rosemont Copper Mine makes no sense. Pima County desperately needs jobs and Mr. Huckelberry has assisted this Board in spending millions on economic development yet, one of our greatest resources and opportunities has received interference after interference by County staff under Mr. Huckelberry's direction and at taxpayers' expense. Mr. Huckelberry's handling of the COVID pandemic and his assault on businesses and individual choices has not worked and is not working. His policies and utilization of County taxpayers' assets have wreaked havoc on families, athletics and schools for social control instigated again by Mr. Huckelberry. They have not worked and yet more unsuccessful mandates are being added to the mix that is not working, instead of replacing those that have not worked. It is unthinkable that our County employees were recruited to spy on business operators and that availability was created so neighbors spy and snitch on neighbors. This too all comes from Mr. Huckelberry's direction. Finally, the reality should have always been that Mr. Huckelberry as the County Administrator works for the Board of Supervisors. This is not now, nor has it been the case for decades. The policy has been generated by Mr. Huckelberry, put on the agenda and approved by the Board, all in one meeting. No conferring, no advising, no real discussion, no efficient notice or warning. This would have been an ideal opportunity for Mr. Huckelberry to take his farewell as County Administrator. As they say in the theater, 'all good actors know when it is time to leave the stage.' Today should have been that exit."

Chair Bronson expressed her concurrence with remarks made by Supervisors Scott and Grijalva. She stated that she had worked closely with Mr. Huckelberry to develop a strong economy by protecting and enhancing our environment and providing the equity needed for all residents of Pima County.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

13. The Board of Supervisors on December 1, 2020, continued the following:

County Fair Racing Association

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 - 93, of the Board of Supervisors, repealing Resolution No. 1987-227 and designating the Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission as the "County Fair Racing Association" for all purposes set forth in A.R.S. Title 5, Chapter 1, Article 1.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, indicated that he had provided an additional recommendation proposing that the Board formalize the County Fair Racing Association as a subcommittee of the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department. He stated that the Fair Racing Association would be tasked with dealing with various interest groups in association with Rillito Park.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Chair Bronson, for discussion purposes only.

Supervisor Christy indicated that the situation developing at Rillito with regards to horse racing had changed over the past year. He expressed concern with the future of horse racing in Pima County and the placement of the Fair Racing Association under the umbrella of the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation's Advisory Commission. He indicated that to dissolve horse racing in Pima County would be a huge and insufferable loss to our history and to the economy. He indicated that he would be voting against this Resolution.

Supervisor Scott recognized the histories of Rillito Park and the Fair Horse Racing Commission's existence since the 1980s. He inquired about the types of horse racing at Rillito Park, commercial and fair horse racing, and whether either were likely to have a racing season given the pandemic.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that a horse racing season was unlikely unless it was deferred to the Fall. He stated that the time frames for horse racing were January, February, and March and there were 10 to 15 racing days during that period. He indicated that due to the pandemic, it was not possible to gather in large groups until Fall and/or later.

Supervisor Scott commented about consolidating and limiting the Fair Horse Racing Commission's authority under the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee, and asked whether any of the current members of the Fair Horse Racing Commission were consulted about the change.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that he was unaware on whether anyone was consulted. He indicated that this effort was designed to eliminate or minimize conflicts between the various users of the park.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the words cumbersome and confusing were utilized with regards to the current arrangement involving the two advisory bodies. He asked for an explanation as to why this was cumbersome and confusing.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that fair horse racing or horse racing was conducted by the Foundation. He indicated that this was a different group, because the facility was leased to the Foundation for the purpose of horse racing, not the County Fair Horse Racing Commission. He added that in some cases there were conflicting messages and direction from either the Foundation or the County Fair Horse Racing Commission.

Supervisor Scott commented about his communications with commission members and local horsemen who conveyed that a horse racing season was unlikely this year since the Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association does not take into account the needs and concerns of local horsemen. He indicated that he was opposed to this Resolution. He also indicated that should this Resolution be brought back before the Board a collaborative arrangement, with all parties involved, should be provided.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she had also received similar concerns. She stated that her concern was that the composition of this local group did not represent the diversity in Pima County, and merging could cause voices to be isolated. She indicated that she would not be voting in favor of the Resolution and encouraged a better solution be provided. She added that this was not a pressing issue since a racing season was unlikely at this point.

Upon the roll call vote, the Resolution failed 5-0.

14. The Board of Supervisors on January 5, 2021, continued the following:

Contract

County Administrator Employment Contract, 2021 through 2025. Discussion/Action.

(Clerk's Note: Please see Minute Item No. 12 for discussion and action regarding this item.)

15. **Updates and Action on COVID-19**

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item. Verbatim was necessary due to the nature and evolving circumstance related to COVID-19.)

CLERK OF THE BOARD

16. Petitions for Redemption of Property Tax Exemption Waiver

Staff recommends approval of the petitions for redemption of property tax exemption waivers.

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

17. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Iglesia Apostolica de la fe en Cristo Jesus, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of Real Property taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax year 2020, for Parcel No. 131-04-4000.

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

18. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11104(G), Society of Mount Carmel, Inc. - Salpointe Catholic High School, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of Real Property taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax year 2020, for Parcel No. 113-10-001A.

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

19. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 126720, Jorge Manuel Leon Uribe, Ragazzi, 101 S. La Cañada Drive, No. 51, Green Valley, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. 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.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

20. Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

P20CA00004, DE SANTIAGO - W. YEDRA ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT

Tony and Carmen De Santiago, represented by Judith De Santiago, request a Comprehensive Plan Amendment of approximately 4.77 acres from Low Intensity Rural (LIR) to Medium Intensity Rural (MIR) land use designation, located approximately 1200 feet east of the intersection of W. Yedra Road and S. Vahalla Road, and addressed as 7600 W. Yedra Road, in Section 21, T15S, R12E, in the Southwest Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Bain and Hook were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO A REZONING POLICY. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO A REZONING POLICY. (District 3)

Rezoning Policy:

The 4.77-acre comprehensive plan amendment property shall be split into north and south parcels at rezoning to avoid and minimize disturbance to Pima County Regulated Riparian Habitat.

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P20CA00004, subject to a rezoning policy.

21. Hearing - Rezoning

P20RZ00010, CAMFE, L.L.C. - W. OKLAHOMA STREET REZONING

Request of Camfe, L.L.C., represented by Jose Campillo, for a rezoning of approximately 4.05 acres from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to the CR-1 (Single Residence) zone, located at the northwest corner of the intersection of W. Oklahoma Street and S. Sheila Avenue and addressed as 6520 W. Oklahoma Street. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Low Intensity Urban 3.0 (LIU-3.0). On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Bain and Hook were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

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

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Cultural Resources condition: A caution must be noted concerning human burials. In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human

- remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
3. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) 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.
 4. Adherence to the sketch plan as approved at public hearing.
 5. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
 6. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning, or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P20RZ00010, subject to standard and special conditions.

22. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 2, P16RZ00010, 6500 Westover Ave., L.L.C. - S. Westover Avenue Rezoning. Owner: 6500 Westover Ave., L.L.C. (District 5)

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. 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

23. **Appointment of Sergeant at Arms**

Appointment of Sgt. Charles Lopiccolo as the Sergeant at Arms, effective January 10, 2021. (District 3)

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

24. **Open Meeting Law**

Discussion/action. Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Andrew Flagg to provide a review of the Arizona Open Meeting Law as it applies to the Pima County Board of Supervisors and their staff members. (District 5)

Chair Bronson asked that the Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney provide a review of Arizona Open Meeting Laws as they applied to the Board of Supervisors and their staff members.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, provided the following overview of key issues under the Open Meeting Law: The basic concept of the open meeting law was, with some exceptions, public bodies must conduct their business in public with advanced notice, so that members of the public could attend and listen. There was no general right of the public to speak at meetings, but there was a right to attend and listen. Exceptions to the right to speak were matters that statute or code called for a hearing or if the Board elected to have a Call to the Public. The open meeting law applied generally to public bodies and the definition of a public body includes the Board of Supervisors, and it also includes Boards, Commissions and Committees, including advisory committees, established by the Board or by law. A meeting was defined as a gathering of a quorum at which legal action would be taken, proposed or discussed, was held either virtually or in person in real time. It could also include serial communications, including communications by email. The following examples were provided: A one-way email communication from one member of a body to a quorum of the body, constitutes a meeting if it proposes legal action; Email communications, even among individual members, could become a meeting if they were strung along in a way as to involve a quorum; Replying all to emails, or communicating serially to emails with a quorum could constitute a meeting if any legal action is proposed, discussed or taken; This also includes the practice of polling where one member talks to one member and talks to another member and communicates what the other one said, such that a quorum is involved in the discussion. Each of those constitutes a meeting, and must be held with proper notice. The notice required by statute was typically 24 hours, and required a disclosure statement on the website where agendas can be found, and the electronic and physical posting of notices for each meeting, including the agenda for the meeting. The 24-hour period does not include Sundays and holidays, and the exceptions for the 24-hour period include when there was an actual emergency or if there was an item that had been properly noticed and the Board recessed and resumed the meeting later. Those instances do not require an additional 24-hour notice. Agenda items must describe the matter to be discussed or decided and the Board could not discuss items that were not on the agenda, unless there was an actual emergency. In the case of an emergency, the basis for the emergency had to be stated on the record. The Board's policy and practice had been to, almost always, provide a longer period of notice than the statute required and additionally post background material, in addition to the listing of the agenda material, which was not required by statute. This was the Board's practice and it was a good practice. Exceptions to items that must take place in public were those that were allowed in Executive Session. Executive Sessions could only be held for purposes specified by statute. The following summary of those purposes was provided: The Executive Session notice must cite the legal authority for the Executive Session and the language in the notice could be general so that it does not defeat the purpose of the Executive Session; In almost all cases, Executive Session notices were prepared by the County Attorney's Office; The most common reasons for Executive Sessions were for legal advice or for instruction regarding

litigation. These were the two most common reasons for Executive Session. The statute also allowed for Executive Sessions regarding contract negotiations, real estate negotiations, personnel matters, records that were confidential by law and matters related to employee organizations. For personnel matters, those required a 24-hour notice to the person who was the subject of the Executive Session. That individual had the ability to demand that all discussions other than salaries take place in public. Typically, legal action could not take place in Executive Session. Matters could be discussed in Executive Session, but any legal action had to take place in public. Exceptions to that is that the Board could instruct the County Attorney's Office, regarding litigation, contract negotiation, in Executive Session. Typically, with those matters, the public statement after the Executive Session, or the public motion would be to proceed as discussed in Executive Session. Only those whose presence was reasonably necessary to the purpose of the Executive Session were allowed to be in the Executive Session. The Clerk would take minutes of the Executive Session and kept those confidential. He indicated that the Clerk of the Board was responsible for taking minutes of the meeting and preparing agendas and addendums. He stated that Call to the Audience was an option that the Board had, the Call to the Audience can be put on the agenda at the Board's option. If the Board does have Call to the Audience, speakers could address the Board on any matter that was within the jurisdiction of the Board. Only reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions could be imposed. Speakers could not be barred from speaking because of their viewpoint or those sort of things. The Board had imposed a three-minute limit on speakers and in some cases when Call to the Audience had run long, had an overall length requirement, and those were allowed. Call to the Audience does not allow the Board to engage with the speakers. The Board was to simply listen to the speakers. The exception to that was that at the end of Call to the Audience, a member who had been criticized could respond to the criticism. The Chair could respond on behalf of the Board to criticism that was leveled at the Board as a whole or individual members could ask that staff look into a matter or place a matter on a future agenda. All of those things should occur only after Call to the Audience has concluded. He stated that the last issue he would address was the role of parliamentary procedure. The open meeting law does not mandate any particular parliamentary procedure. It had minimum requirements for notice and conduct of meetings. The Board does follow its own rules and when its own rules do not cover a matter it generally followed Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair is the parliamentarian and decided parliamentary questions subject to appeal to the Board as a whole. Matters that come up, sometimes questions, would be addressed and were more appropriately parliamentary, procedure questions, not strictly legal questions under the Open Meeting Law. For those matters, it would be deferred to the Chair.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether Board members and their staff could meet with the County Attorney's Office for personal in-depth discussions of Open Meeting Laws.

Mr. Flagg responded that the County Attorney's Office would provide individual training.

Chair Bronson asked that essential personnel be defined as it related to those allowed to attend Executive Sessions.

Mr. Flagg responded that essential personnel was defined as those whose presence was reasonably necessary. He stated that was not likely to include staff members from individual Board offices. He stated it also included the County Administrator or the County Administrator's designee, if the County Administrator was not available. He indicated that particular matters may include additional members of County staff be involved in the matter. He stated an example, with respect to litigation, would be the Risk Manager.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that her concern involved communications between office staff members that could potentially be discussed with the respective Supervisor and the potential for creating a quorum. She asked for clarification on staff communications, one-on-one communications with individual supervisors and appropriate conduct.

Mr. Flagg responded that Board members and their staff were encouraged to be conservative and careful in their communications, since there was the potential of violating the Open Meeting Law unwittingly and innocently, and there were penalties for those violations. He stated that Board members could individually discuss matters, as long as it did not constitute a quorum. He indicated that Board members needed to be cautious about relaying that discussion to a third member, because even though it was not in real time, that would constitute a quorum. He added that with respect to communications amongst staff members, he would encourage that items not be discussed with other members that would constitute a quorum. He indicated that it was expected for Board members to speak candidly with their staff and for staff to not be put in a position of being unable to reveal something to them, because it could potentially constitute a quorum. He encouraged members to be careful in their discussion that could involve a quorum and that was a good practice for staff members as well.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that it would be helpful for new staff members to review Open Meeting Laws with Counsel because it was important to stay up-to-date.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

25. Consumer Health and Food Safety Fee Schedule

Staff requests authorization to temporarily waive the current (January 1, 2021) increase in the operating permit fees associated with food establishments and allow for a credit to be provided to those that have paid during the current calendar year.

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

26. **COVID-19 Vaccination Agreement**

Discussion/action. COVID-19 Vaccination Agreement between Tucson Medical Center and Pima County.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

PROCUREMENT

27. Paradigm Laboratories, L.L.C., Amendment No. 5, to provide for COVID-19 test kits, processing, and reporting and amend contractual language, Health Department Operations and Federal Grant Funds, contract amount \$16,000,000.00 (MA-PO-20-166) Health

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

28. **Acceptance - County Administrator**

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Safety and Justice Challenge and amend grant language, no cost/3 year term (GTAM 21-65)

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

29. **Acceptance - Health**

National Association of County and City Health Officials, to provide for addressing needs of people with disabilities in COVID-19 local preparedness planning, mitigation and recovery efforts, \$49,778.19 (GTAW 21-99)

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

30. **Acceptance - Recorder**

U.S. Election Assistance Commission, to provide for the 2020 HAVA Election Security Sub-Grant, \$50,000.00/5 year term (GTAW 21-100)

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

31. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY2019 Homeland Security Grant Program Award for a tactical surveillance system, \$6,879.00 (GTAW 21-101)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

32. **Community Action Agency Board**

Reappointment of John Vasquez Bedoy. Term expiration: 12/31/21. (District 5)

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

33. **Fair Horse Racing Commission**

Reappointment of John Ochoa. Term expiration: 1/16/23. (District 4)

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

34. **Housing Commission**

Reappointment of Sharayah Jimenez. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 5)

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

35. **Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council**

Reappointment of Paul Rubin. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 5)

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

36. **State Board of Equalization**

Reappointment of Peter E. Pearman. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 5)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

37. Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

County Attorney

1. Assistance Dogs of the West, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Courthouse Dog Program, amend contractual language and scope of services, Anti-Racketeering Fund, contract amount \$7,500.00 (CT-PCA-19-245)
2. Avertest, L.L.C., d.b.a. Averhealth, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Tucson/Pima County Problem Solving Court Initiative Project, extend contract term to 10/31/21 and amend contractual language, SAMHSA (\$67,689.00) and DOJ BJA (\$12,311.00) Funds, contract amount \$80,000.00 (CT-PCA-20-155)

Facilities Management

3. Downtown Tucson Partnership, Inc., to provide for the Downtown Tucson Partnership Lease Agreement located at 220 N. Stone Avenue, Suite 170, no cost/2 year term (CTN-FM-21-51)

Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

4. Maricopa Trail and Park Foundation, d.b.a. Sun Corridor Trail Alliance, to provide a Memorandum of Understanding to support the development of the Sun Corridor Trail, no cost/5 year term (CTN-PR-21-54)

Procurement

5. MW Morrissey Construction, L.L.C., to provide for the Joel Valdez Main Library - 4th Floor Renovation Project (XLIN21), FM Capital Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$529,365.00 (CT-FM-21-272) Facilities Management

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

6. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Tucson Electric Power Company (TEP), Amendment No. 6, to provide for TEP Low Income Weatherization Program services and amend grant language, \$145,000.00 (GTAM 21-67)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

7. Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission

- Appointment of Joel Ireland, to replace Josephine Hilliard. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 5)
- Reappointment of Rikki Lynn Riojas. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 5)

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

8. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Metro Water District \$400.00; City of South Tucson \$50,629.33; Ernest Lambert Moss \$1,902.80; Nutrien AG Solutions, Inc. \$1,650.00; Rachel Marie Callaway \$3,366.90; Tucson Hispanic Chamber of Commerce \$3,183.62; Sunnyside Unified School District Foundation \$155,913.00; Daniel C. Fulmer \$2,665.00; WSP USA, Inc. \$10,946.50.

* * *

38. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

15. Updates and Action on COVID-19

Verbatim

SB: Chair Bronson
SC: Supervisor Christy
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
MH: Supervisor Heinz
RS: Supervisor Scott
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
FG: Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services
TC: Theresa Cullen, Director, Health Department

SB: Alright, let us go back then to Item 11. Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson and Members of the Board, I am going to be fairly brief. We have both Dr. Garcia and Dr. Cullen, I think on this meeting, and I sent the Board, dated January 13th, an updated memorandum. I will not repeat that. The only thing I would like to point out is that yesterday was the first day that the Kino vaccination site was opened and between the Kino site and the Banner North and TMC, approximately 4,000 vaccinations were given yesterday. They are going to continually bring online and I believe today, the Tucson Convention Center site. Then we will work to develop the Rillito Park site as we bring these others online. Another point is that vaccines allocated by county, Pima County, if you look at the State's latest update, dated 1/18, which is yesterday on their website on vaccine phase. They show that Maricopa County has received 494,000 ordered vaccines allocated. Pima County has 93,372. If you then go to the amount of vaccine actually applied or put in arms, it is 176,541 in Maricopa County, which is 36% of their allocation. In Pima County, it totals 46,661, which is 50% of our allocation has been deployed. With that, let me turn it over to either Dr. Cullen or Dr. Garcia to answer any questions that you might have or offer any information they would like to provide.

SB: Dr. Garcia, is this Dr. Garcia talking now?

FG: Yes, Supervisor Bronson. Can you see me?

SB: Yes.

FG: Supervisor Bronson, the only other piece that I would sort of offer in terms of putting this in context. Almost half a million vaccine doses have been allocated for Maricopa County, and many of that is being distributed through the State's own pods. The State is actually operating those two pods for the most part up in

Glendale and Phoenix Stadium. I think that is good, because it is offering those sites for a lot of individuals. It is challenging, because those allocations sort of come off the top and ultimately have an impact on all the other smaller counties. We are on track to be able to consume all the vaccine that we have on hand in a fairly short period of time and I think that continues to be our greatest concern. How do we encourage people to come into and register for vaccinations when we know that the amount of vaccine stock that we have in hand is limited? I going to turn it over to Terry who can sort of elaborate on that point.

SB: Dr. Cullen.

TC: Hi, thank you. Hopefully you guys can hear me. Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Yep, I can hear you loud and clear.

TC: Okay, thank you. I do want to emphasize a few other things. We did stand up the Kino site. I cannot remember what day that was. I think it was yesterday. The University of Arizona site went live today in a pilot. TCC was tested last week in a pilot. It will go live tomorrow and throughout the week they will all go to production. I think what is important to note is that we have submitted to the State approximately nine days ago now, an accelerated immunization plan. If we were able to follow it, dependent upon vaccine, not dependent upon our infrastructure, we would be able to fully immunize our community by the early summer, by June or July. So, I think it is important to recall for people that in the last 14 days, we have more than doubled our ability to distribute vaccine, and as successfully as Mr. Huckelberry said, given approximately 4,000 vaccines yesterday. We are now passed 1a, which was the healthcare workers. Almost all of those vaccines yesterday at TMC and Banner were to elders, 75 and over. The University of Arizona site will be focusing on educators and child care and the TCC site will be focusing on protective service. Both of those groups have had some people immunized and we anticipate that will be accelerated as we move forward. So overall, I think as a County we have responded appropriately to the challenge that has been given to us. I would remind people of what Mr. Huckelberry as well as Dr. Francisco stated. There does seem to be some, I would use the word "inequity" in terms of vaccine distribution at the State level. We do not have transparency into that, but we have asked multiple times for how these decisions are being made. However, both Dr. Garcia and I talk to the State almost every day, so they are aware that we remain concerned and would like to accelerate distribution. One other thing, I just want to mention, there is a lot of discussion about 65 and over. That is now our 1b/1d group that we will go to that once we have made a significant dent in the first three groups. The State has opened as of today reservations for 65 and over at the stadium, at the two large stadium distribution sites that they will have starting February 1st. I just want to clarify that because there is been lots of discussion about that. Thank you.

SB: I am going to just; I do not know what other Supervisor offices are experiencing. But we are getting a number of calls with people who are eligible in the 1b, 75 and over group, and they are totally confused about where they go to register. Is it the State site? Is it the local site? There seems to be a confusion about the information and

there does not seem to be a centralized, or at least, as they tried, to navigate the process. There does not seem to be a centralized way that they can get the information. You know, I know we have got, Pima County has posted some information on our website, but not everybody has access to that and, of course, they are frustrated because they have to wait. Many of them have waited at least an hour to try to make an appointment. Could somebody address that? Or how we can make it easier for people to register? And understand that we, as Dr. Cullen has said, we do not have, we have the ability, logistical ability to deliver the vaccine. We are just missing the vaccine? So, but how do they register? How do we make it easy for them to register? Because right now there seems to be confusion.

TC: Supervisor Bronson, Members of the Board, we are continually updating our website. So just today, and hopefully it is updated right now, we have added a link to the State registration for these two large stadiums. Hopefully that will clarify. People can also call the phone number. Over the past three days on average, we had 1,200 people call each day. We anticipate we will have a similar number to that today. That call center will be open seven days a week and today starting, we did have a protracted time to get through, but on average, the last two days we were down to about 40 minutes wait for each person. Which I realize is not acceptable and where we need to go, but we are trying to expand that. We are working closely with TMC and UMC Banner, which is running two of the sites to see if there are additional ways that we can expedite registration. As you are aware, Banner, but to clarify, Banner runs a registration site. Everyone else comes through Pima County Health Department. So people that choose to go and get their vaccine at either Banner North or now Kino, Banner South, register through Banner. Everyone else through Pima County. Except, and I will admit, it is confusing, except if you want to go to the State site, and for the State site, you go directly to the link that is now on our website. In terms of access to those who do not have phones, do not have internet, do not have rides, we have found right now there is around 350 of those people. I am sure there is many more that have come in through our phone line. Some of them have borrowed phones, but most people who do have a family member, or someone in their residence that has enabled them to use their phone, those people we are scheduling directly and we are working directly with them, so they do not have to call back and they do not need to establish an internet address.

SB: Thank you and just for a point of clarification. You mentioned the State site and the two large stadiums. Where are the two large stadiums?

TC: One is in Glendale, and I am going forget, Francisco he might remember, and the other one is going to be in Tempe. The Tempe one starts February 1st. The one in Glendale is a 24/7 stadium doing approximately 200 vaccines every hour. So we believe they are doing about 4,800 vaccines a day.

SB: But Pima County residents who are in the 1b group, can register at those sites and they would be getting their vaccinations then in Maricopa County.

TC: Yes, and we have clarified that again today, to make sure. Initially, if you had to live within 100 miles of the facility itself, but now that has been opened to all residents of Arizona.

SB: That was, yes, that was confusing, because it was the 100-mile piece. So it is open to all residents of the State, in the State?

TC: Yes.

FG: Correct.

SB: Thank you.

AG: Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: I have a couple of questions. So, the facilities that we have, what are the hours for those? I thought there was one that was opened up until midnight.

TC: No, none are open until midnight, Supervisor Grijalva. They are on the website and I will have to get those specifics for you. There is now a map, a G.I.S. Map on the website of Tucson, where if you click on it, it tells you what it is, but I can resend you those hours.

AG: Is there a reason why we cannot have a 24-hour facility?

FG: Staffing. Supervisor Grijalva, Chair Bronson, I would say that the main reason why it would not make sense for us to do a 24-hour is two-fold. Number one, vaccine supply, the vaccine supply that Terry has on hand, will take us not too much further into the next couple of weeks and then we are in a world of hurt. The second issue is the staffing, right? So the staffing that we are using for the provision of services, whether it is at TMC or Banner, or U of A, or TCC, it is staffed and it also relies heavily on volunteers for logistics. So it is just kind of the reality of being able to staff that many number of sites. One of the things that we considered early on is whether it should be a single pod to serve the entire community, but one of the things that, to me is clear, that we need to have a lot of different geographic options for where they are coming from. So if the vaccine was unlimited, and it seems to be a little bit more available up in Maricopa County. Yes, it might make sense to do a 24-hour pod, but I do not think it makes sense to do that in Pima County today.

AG: We do not have extended hours? My concern is for working people who, you know, you get off of work at 5:00 and if we have facilities that are not available with extended hours, it makes it more difficult. Logistically, just to sign up, you can go through the process to sign up and a certain time is available, and by the time you go through the three or four minutes to finish the application and that time is not available anymore, it shoots you back through. I understand that there are some concerns. Some of my concerns have to do with, I had an opportunity to talk to Dr.

Christ this weekend and she was talking about the, I was asking for the 24-hour capacity and is that a possibility? They were talking about whether it was resources or staffing and they are working with different organizations and so I know that we have those organizations and people that are ready to volunteer. But my worry is, to make sure that every, that all of us that we are not, she was talking about something about, it looks like some of the people who have vaccines are kind of hoarding them and so it looks like they are not issuing them, it does not sound like that is what is happening in Pima County. But she did say if an organization that is not being able to go through the process and put the vaccines into people's arms, that she would redistribute. I would urge us to go faster and do whatever our capacity is and then look to Maricopa and to FEMA and say look we are the highest rate over here. We have the capacity. I would rather us be in the position where we have expended all of our vaccines and then say we have the capacity to do more versus hold on and sort of parcel it out in time. I just think that it makes more sense for us to do it as soon as possible. Then, the argument for going to something that has extended hours is that then we could reserve those spots in the morning for the people who are uncomfortable driving at night and for those of us who are night owls will be the ones there in the middle of the night to do this thing. I am very concerned that, you know, we are the highest in the world and yet we are struggling to have these vaccines. I know it is not a fault of Pima County, but I do want to position us to be able to do more. I would also ask, if we could go through, if you could tell us what the process looks like from when we receive the vaccine, what the processing looks like, what the appointment time looks like, because one the things that people see, we have 93,000 and we have only done 46,000. Trying to help the community understand what all goes into that process and then when you have it, when the vaccine is thawed, what is the window of time that we have? Because I think that there are a lot of moving parts here and a lot of the community does not really understand that. They are like, well why can we not just do it right now? I think just as a point of verification and so people understand that, because I have had the opportunity to talk to a lot of people because I understood that reaction, like, why do we not get it done right this second? So explain that in trying to do this in an equitable way and letting people that are in different categories apply. So you do not have the people that can get there first and the people that have most access to technology get those vaccines before everybody else. I think that is important. But as we get more vaccines and I think that they are coming. I would really like to see us targeting those communities in Pima County that have the highest threat. Because we really, if we are looking at people who are Amazon drivers and grocery clerks and I do not know that they know they are a high priority and can get access to these and if we have the hours that are available to our working people, people working third shift that they have access to getting in and getting the vaccine. I think that that is really important.

TC: Supervisor Grijalva and Board, I just want to respond to a few of those. We actually have had that ongoing concern about the late shift and what to do with it. Right now TMC has two different sites. They are considered one point of distribution, but the Marshall Auditorium is open until 7:00, the TCC will be open until 6:30, but that is the latest we go. Our Ethics Committee discussed this in the past four days to try to figure out how to do extended hours. I do want to remind people what Dr. Francisco

said, the stadium in Maricopa is a state initiated point of distribution, that is funded by the State as well as large philanthropics, as well as the Blues, Blue Cross Blue Shield. While we do have a Blue Cross Blue Shield presence in Pima County, and we have had some early discussions with them, we have not had an extensive offer of support to stand up a more protracted hours. But we will take that back and figure out how we can get more extended hours for at least one or two of these sites. Thank you for that comment. In terms of letting people understand the process, that is actually a wonderful recommendation and I will take that charge to our department to figure out how to graphically display what does happen, because there is this belief. So for instance, Dr. Christ last week at our press conference said we had 108,000 vaccines coming. We do not have, we never had, we will have 108,000 at some point when our next supply comes in, but we do not have that right now and that is why the statistics that Mr. Huckelberry and Dr. Francisco shared with you in terms of what percentage of our vaccines have we administered is important. I will tell you right now, we have enough vaccines. There is no hoarding of vaccines. We have enough vaccines for 12 to 14 days of immunization at our current rate. That is all we will have and that includes the immunization that is coming this week. We just had a discussion with one of our sites earlier today asking them to make sure that they had opened vaccine appointments for that full 14-day period. They were a little reluctant to do that because they did not know if they would have enough. So given our accelerated rate of the distribution of the vaccines, we will be able to meet the need at the current rate of distribution for the next 12 to 14 days and then we are reliant on additional vaccines coming in.

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Madam Chair, I had a number of questions based on the content of Mr. Huckelberry's last two memoranda to us, but I am ambivalent as to whether it is he or Dr. Cullen or Dr. Garcia who responds to them. I just wanted to say really quickly though that my office has gotten a number of calls from senior citizens within our district about the immunization plan. Some of them in assisted living facilities and I have been so grateful to Dr. Cullen and her staff because my staff and I have not felt equipped to respond to some of those very specific questions that they are asking and we have found Health Department staff to be ready, willing to respond to those concerns and I am very grateful to you, Dr. Cullen and your staff for doing that for us. I also wanted to echo what she said about the concerns with the State and its allotment of vaccines. I was on a zoom call late last week, with supervisors from the other 14 counties and the supervisors from the rural counties are both furious and frightened about vaccine allocations to the rural counties. So the concerns that we are expressing and Pima County in terms of our allotments, they are echoed by our colleagues from counties like Santa Cruz, La Paz, Greenlee, you name it. I wanted to ask, back in the memo from January 12th, Mr. Huckelberry said that up to 20% of the age eligible population will likely decline immunizations. I wanted to ask how that estimate was arrived at, and do we have the, you might have just answered this question, but I hope we have the capacity to adjust if that estimate is too high. Then I have a couple of other questions after that one.

- TC: Supervisor Scott, I will respond to that, because that is my number. It is not, I have been asked this previously, it is not based on any surveys that we have done in Pima County. It is based on national, it is based on a review of national data and national surveys including a recent CMS Survey with elders in terms of acceptance and vaccine hesitancy. But we do not have data specifically for Pima County. Our maximum immunization plan will allow us to deliver 1.8 million vaccines. We do know that the vaccines cannot be given, as of right now, and this may change because there are studies going on with the younger population. So the 16 to 18 year olds, we have also taken out of that number. If we add back in, and assume every adult wants to get an immunization and we were able to meet our maximum immunization, we would be able to cover all of those people.
- RS: Alright, thank you. Next question is, perhaps especially when we get into group 1c, which are the less high risk members of our population, but are also going to be, I imagine the larger group that needs to be immunized. Is there a possibility, and I know this has been done in some other states, is there a possibility that retail pharmacies can be used as vaccination sites at any point during our immunization plan?
- FG: Supervisors, Chairman Bronson, Supervisor Scott, in fact, on the 18th, the State started to roll out their pharmacy partnership and so they have a series of contracts. Well, the feds have a series of contracts with big pharmacy and grocery store chains. They are still in the process of figuring out exactly where those contractors are going to put the vaccine. So, yes, in the future, I anticipate that people will have a lot more places where they can seek to get vaccinated. But in the short term, you know, the infrastructure that we are setting up is pretty much the only game in town with the proviso that long-term care facilities are also part of a separate federal pharmacy partnership contract through CVS and Walgreens. As this progresses, we do believe, like Supervisor Grijalva stated, that the vaccine supply will start to become more available, but the problem is, that strictly from a planning purposes, we are having a hard time anticipating what kind of volume we should expect for the purposes of planning.
- RS: That is very encouraging. I appreciate it and then just another point specific to my district, with regards to immunizations, especially when we get into the 65 and older group. I have had a phone conversation with the Mayor of Oro Valley, and I know that Mayor Winfield also spoke to Mr. Huckelberry. A third or more of the population of Oro Valley is 65 or older. So I would very much like us to consider a vaccination site within Oro Valley, perhaps in one of the large recreation centers in Sun City, because I think that that is going to be an area of greater concern for us. Is that something we can consider moving forward? I know Supervisor Christy has expressed similar concerns about Green Valley, but I think the needs in Oro Valley are only going to be hastened when we move into the 65 and older group.
- TC: Supervisor Scott, yes, we are considering those. I want to reflect the vaccine constraint that we have right now, and to go back to a comment that Supervisor Grijalva made after her discussion with Dr. Christ, it is important right now that we

show efficient, effective and timely delivery of the vaccine because that is critical for us to stay aligned and in sights of the State in terms of distribution. So we have made these decisions to do these. What I would say is, hopefully high-volume, highly efficient points of distribution. Once we get to a point where we have been able to prove that we can deliver, for instance, on average 8, 9, 10,000 vaccines a day, and we have an adequate supply, then we do anticipate that we will extend out into other areas of the County. But for us to do that right now, to invoke what Dr. Garcia shared, we do have staffing and funding limitations and so what we want to ensure is that we are approaching this in the most efficient manner. But yes, I think all of us believe that we need to have a more integrated, much smaller points of distribution in many areas of the County.

RS: You know, you also just with that response, Dr. Cullen, addressed another concern that was raised with me by a member of our legislature, who has heard from representatives of some of our local school districts about wanting to expand vaccination sites and I can tell by you nodding that you are familiar with those requests. So the last question I had is, could you just reiterate what people 65 and older should be doing now? I thought I heard you say earlier, they cannot register yet, but what direction should we be giving them? That will be my last question.

TC: Thank you, Supervisor Scott. So, 65 and over have two options right now. They can register for the State, for the two stadiums in the Phoenix area, and that link is now on our website. Those vaccinations will be available February 1st. Initially, the State had indicated that they were opened to 65-year-olds. I think that that was last week. They got inundated and really wanted to make sure the 75 and overs are immunized and once again, we have not really talked about that, that is based on morbidity and mortality data that the 75 and overs are at much higher risk, whether they are in long-term care assisted living or just living in the community for morbidity and mortality if they get ill. For us, 65 and over is, number and letters gets confusing, and I am sorry, it is 1b and 1d. So, what it means is after we make a significant inroad into the 75 and over, the protective services and the educators and child care, we will open to 65 and over. I did have a discussion earlier today with the Maricopa County Public Health Department. Two of their leadership, they are in a very similar situation to us. They are not opened right now to 65 and over, and we will be really kind of tag teaming with them to learn best practices so we can accelerate it. People are consistently asking us for a timing on this. I am uncomfortable doing that, because it depends on vaccine availability. 150,000 to 160,000 in the group we just opened up. Remember, and just to remind people, we had 1a. 1a had about 58,000 healthcare workers in that. It took us three weeks to get through that, and we are still immunizing some people from 1a. I am hopeful this is not a nine-week process. I am hopeful it is more accelerated than that, assuming we get additional vaccine. We also have major lessons learned and we have opened up significant additional points of distribution.

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

- SC: I have a couple of questions that maybe are not so in depth in content, but I am not sure, I think Dr. Cullen might be more familiar or perhaps Dr. Garcia.
- SB: Supervisor Christy, can you turn up your volume on your speaker, we are having a hard time hearing.
- SC: Yes, how is this? Is this better?
- SB: Yes.
- SC: A couple of questions. I am not sure if it should be Dr. Garcia or Dr. Cullen, but the Santa Cruz Regional Hospital. We know that the State is responsible for the onboarding certification of that hospital to become a pod or at least in the loop for the vaccination to be distributed. Can either of you give an update on how the State has worked with that hospital to try to get that certification or what is the status of that relationship now?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I will tell you that at least as of this morning, Santa Cruz Valley Regional had not yet been approved as a vaccinator. We understand there are a couple of issues. Some of them have to do with equipment, some of them have to do with other issues. Ultimately, it is the State will not ship this federal asset to any facility that has not met its requirements. Notably, you know, all our other hospital partners have been able to do this. It is a challenge, they are special and have some unique challenges, but they have not been able to get that at this time.
- SC: But it is still something that is in the works trying to pursue that?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I believe so. But the ball is entirely in their court and in the State's court. I know that we, I followed up personally with the State on a couple of times and I reached out to their C.E.O. a couple of times to try to get a status update. Like I said, as of this morning, they were still not an approved vaccinator.
- SC: Okay, thank you for that. Going back to Mr. Huckelberry's January 15th memorandum. Under Item 4, Mr. Huckelberry speaks to the Premier Medical Group U.S.A., Vaccinator contract that is going to be utilized in Three Points, Arivaca, Catalina, Green Valley and Vail. What is the scope of the services that Premier Medical is going to be conducting? Are they going to be a facilitator, vaccinators, holding centers, administrators? What can my district that has two of those significant elder population areas, I too have been inundated with concerns and emails from my constituents, what can my community in the Vail and Green Valley area expect as far as services from the Premier Medical Group?
- TC: Supervisor Christy, thank you for that question. Premier Medical Group was awarded through a competitive RFP, a contract that allows them to do many of the things you just talked about. We actually on Friday, they just came on board the end of last week was when we had a kickoff meeting with them. We did ask them on

Friday to work with us to develop a plan for extending vaccination into the semi-urban and rural areas of the County. We have received that plan Monday, no, today, Tuesday and we will be reviewing that. But that is the expectation is that they will function as an arm or extension of our county ability to provide vaccination and perhaps mobile pods that will be designed to meet the needs of the community. Those communities where at the current time we do not have any semi-permanent pods. We do have in addition, our community health centers that we have worked with in some of those areas. But Premier Medical Group was brought on explicitly to be able to extend our ability to provide immunization. The caveat, once again, however, is the access to the vaccine. So as soon as we get accelerated vaccine, we believe we will be able to move into those areas. Though in the meantime, we will be engaging in planning, not only with them, but in planning in conjunction with them in the communities, in which we anticipate providing that service.

SC: Yep, I just want to highlight the communities you are referring to. I know you are familiar with the Vail area as we had the Chamber of Commerce zoom meeting last week, but there is the Southeast Regional Council in the Vail area, and there is the Green Valley Council in obviously Green Valley. Is Premier willing to collaborate with these two organizations to try to make an efficient point of dispensation and working together? Are they aware of these two community groups?

TC: Supervisor Christy, one reason we elected to award to Premier is they have a long standing decade's worth of history of working with local organizations and ensuring that they are augmenting and/or extending the needs and the desires of those local organizations. So yes. I do not want to answer explicitly that they are aware of those two specific groups, but we would anticipate that they will go in and work collaboratively with whatever has historically been the best way to work in these different communities.

SC: And I would just ask and hope that the Department of Health will inform Premier Medical Group of the existence of those two organizations and urge them to collaborate with them. Another couple of quick questions.

SB: Supervisor Christy, before with you ask your, I want to do a follow-up to the information that was just provided as it relates to rural and ex-urban communities. I am sure Dr. Cullen; you are working with United Community Health in Robles Junction. We still have issues with distribution in Avra Valley and much of District 3 is rural. I know you are working with Ajo, but again, it is going to be challenging, because I think there is not enough of the vaccine to go around. I just appreciate if you would keep our office updated and Supervisor Christy, you had a few more questions.

SC: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. That was pretty much in conjunction with what I was asking as well. A couple of quick questions. There was a frequently asked questions sheet, I think, generated by the Health Department through the County. I think I saw it last week. Is that continually being updated and brought up to speed with new developments and what is the status of that fact sheet?

- TC: Supervisor Christy, so we, there is a fact sheet but there is also a FAQ website that is almost updated daily, at least every other day. Those FAQs are designed to reflect the questions we have gotten in from the community if we get more than one, we assume everybody wants to know that. We are in the process of trying to figure out what to do with questions, for instance, specifically for the 75 and over population. Some of those are administrative questions, how do I do this? Some of them are clinical questions, should I get the vaccine? Some of them are safety questions but we do have a team that works specifically on updating the FAQs and that does include a Librarian who makes sure that we are staying abreast of the current clinical and medical information.
- SC: And that is being constantly put out for navigation purposes for folks to find it easily?
- TC: Supervisor Christy, I hope so. I will take that back and make sure that we are paying more attention to that.
- SC: That would be appreciated. Another question is, when people register for inoculations, for the vaccine to be distributed in Phoenix and they come from Pima County, what kind of communication is there between Maricopa County and the Phoenix pods vis-à-vis, the fact that they are residents of Pima County? That seems to be an open invitation to administrative confusion.
- TC: Supervisor Christy, there is limited sharing of data at the current time. We have been working with the State for the state-based stadium. The Maricopa pods are trying to limit their immunizations to residents of Maricopa but it is important to note that we are trying to do that same thing, but I do not know that we have ever refused anyone that showed up if they wanted an immunization and they met the over 75 and for instance they live in Santa Cruz. I am sure we would say to them, it would be better if you got your immunization in your county, but I do not think we are refusing right now.
- SC: And as far as the record keeping and the charts and all of the information, there is some kind of interplay between the State and Pima County residents, when residents go out of the county?
- TC: Yes, Supervisor Christy, that is a great question. There is a statewide system called ASIIS which is an immunization registry for the State and we are able to query that on any patient that presents for care with us and we can see anywhere in the state where they got an immunization.
- SC: Great and thank you for your patience with my questions. I have one last one, and that has to do with the phone help line. This was just recently instituted, I believe the middle of last week, or the end of last week. Would it not have made sense knowing full well that the rollout was anticipated, that there was going to be issues of communication as well as a necessary organization of creating information to the people well in advance of last week, that perhaps this phone line, this phone help line could have been inaugurated weeks ago and all the bugs and kinks worked out of it far in advance of the actual rollout and registration of folks who wanted to get

the inoculation? Was there any thought that maybe this should have been put together and implemented weeks ago?

FG: Madam Chair, Supervisor Christy, yes. We have been thinking about this for a while, but the honest truth is that without having the right information in terms of the amount of vaccine that we are getting, and the ability to put it into people's arms, that has been kind of our limiting factor. What were we going to say to people who were 75 plus saying I want to sign up for my vaccine, when I cannot tell them where to go because we do not know how much vaccine we are getting. So I think it is one of those things where you are between a rock and a hard place. Yes, absolutely, we should have had better capacity to answer those questions. However, part of the reason for being caught not as prepared as we wanted to, is because of the lack of information that we are getting from the State. I mean, folks could have called the State or could have called the CDC for the same kind of generic information and I think folks here in Pima County want to have very specific information about their own situation, and that is what we are trying to provide through the phone line and that is what we will continue to perfect. But this is very much a work in progress, that is really dependent on the vaccine availability and information flow from the feds and from the State.

SC: Well, I appreciate your answer. I just want to reiterate the necessity, which you pointed out is you did not have information to give. So therefore, there was little justification to put a phone line into place, but having been in a service-oriented business for numerous decades, people are willing to hear anything, as long as it is the truth. If we do not have the answers, we tell our people, we do not have the answers, but keep posted and come back and call us. They want to hear something. They want to hear the truth and even if it is not what they want to hear, they do want to hear a response. I do feel that we kind of let our community down by not having something in place even if we could not give them all the information they were looking for. They needed to know that there was some contact that they could make and at least have a tie to what is going on, even if all the information was not available. I am glad to see the phone line has finally been put in place. It certainly has its kinks and I certainly hope that they get worked out as quickly as possible. That is all I have Madam Chair. Thank you.

TC: Madam Chair, Supervisor Christy, I just would like to add one thing to what Dr. Garcia said. We have always had a help line, and it is at the Health Department and until we stood up this line specific for vaccine registration, we were handling the calls internally in our help line. I would agree with you that more forethought to what the need was would have been helpful. We have managed in the last three days, you know, necessity is the mother of invention, to ensure that we do have adequate staffing on that help line. But I do not want to leave the impression that people had nowhere to go because what they did do was call the Health Department line.

SC: Well, I do not think people knew they could do that, but I think have made my point and I accept your response. So thank you very much.

TC: Thank you.

SB: Any further comments?

MH: Yeah, Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. I just want to say that like in many ways I believe Pima County could be excelling. I think in terms of viral surveillance. We are probably one of the top counties in the country in terms of our testing, availability of the testing slots, and the speed with which individuals can receive those results. I think that is remarkable. That is something that the County has been doing really well at. Having been involved in the rollout of the Affordable Care Act, let me tell you, that was not a graceful entry into that particular healthcare insurance market, and I would say that I think we are doing much, much better in terms of standing up infrastructure for the County. The rate limiting stuff here seems to be just really availability of vaccines. I think my main question for Dr. Cullen would be, number one, do we have any clarity whatsoever as to when exactly we will be getting more, how much we will be getting and then going forward into the next administration, any idea how that is going to be evolving?

TC: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz, we have no insight. We, many times are reading the same chatter in social media and in other sources of information that you are reading, that we have not gotten any preview of what will happen. Just this morning, I know Dr. Garcia and I both independently sent some comments to the State saying, hey, what is going on, can you help us here? Especially because of the Dr. Christ press conference last week where we got a lot of press today saying, oh you are getting 108,000 vaccines. No, that is the total of vaccines once our vaccine delivery comes this week that we will have received. Supervisor Heinz, we do not and we have asked along with the other, Supervisor Scott talked about, along with the other public health officers from the other counties for additional guidance, insight and ultimately just transparency, and to the decision making. We do not have it.

MH: And also, if I may, Madam Chair?

SB: Proceed.

MH: Dr. Cullen, in your opinion, based on the increasing numbers of cases, hospitalizations, there has been a dip for the past couple of three days here, but overall Arizona, including Pima County, they are not doing great because of the pandemic numbers. Just by some of the mitigation strategies, we have already put forth, do you believe that any additional mitigation strategies would be warranted at this time? Especially in light of the 1117 variant and other variants that are potentially more contagious that will be hitting us later this year and also looking at some of the advisories, for example, of January 7th where there were a lot of recommendations for businesses, but no requirements from the County for businesses with regards to say capacity of indoor dining or various other things, like

whether or not movie theaters, nail salons, gyms can be opened. Have any of those recommendations without the force of an ordinance, have they been effective to your pain and do we need to do something else?

TC: I think there is multiple questions, Supervisor Heinz, there is multiple questions embedded in that. I do want to reveal that we did send 68 samples for genetic sequencing last week, and we just got the results about an hour ago from Tgen, which indicated that none of the samples had any evidence of the U.K. or the South Africa variant lineages. They are consistent with a lineage called 20C-US which we are seeing as the dominant vaccine right now, as the dominate mutation in the U.S., right now, which is actually good news. We are in the process of working with them regularly to send additional samples for, these are PCR samples for genetic sampling. In terms of additional mitigation factors, we did release a public health advisory and I must admit, I do not have the date in front of me, which recommended to businesses to consider themselves additional interventions that could be done, including limitations on indoor dining, but those were just recommendations and that has been the stand we have taken from the public health perspective right now. We have seen, we track our case investigations and our contacts to determine, through a series of questions, to determine what their risk factors seem to be. We seem to, we do not seem to, we have seen a decrease in the number of people that have reported attending larger gatherings. Remember in that public health advisory, we recommended people have groups of ten or more, obviously we would really recommend that people not do anything inside, but if they did, that they be limited to 10 or more and we do get, this is once again self-reported data, however, Supervisor Heinz as people indicating that they are engaging in what we would consider to be behavior that is not consistent with mitigation.

SB: Supervisor Heinz, do you have additional questions?

MH: So, I guess would any additional mitigation efforts that you believe would make any difference going forward [unintelligible]

TC: Supervisor Heinz, that is a really difficult question, right? There are comparisons today between California and other states of what does make a difference? What we know is if people would limit their social mobility and limit their social interactions, be compliant with masking, be compliant with social distance, that we will see an impact on transmission and you are right to note that transmission is incredibly concerning right now. We are over 21,000 cases reported in January already. We are probably on target to meet 30,000, which means we will surpass the number of cases that we saw in December. To be frank, Supervisor Heinz, I am not sure. I do believe that what we put in the public health advisory, if people chose to follow that, we would see an impact on transmission.

MH: I agree. Thank you.

AG: Supervisor Bronson?

CB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: Yes, I just have a question. I have a lot of calls and emails from people who are not sure what category they are in. They are 1b, but they do not know where or they are 1c, but not sure at all. Are we encouraging people to register, just so we can identify what category they are in and then, you know, give them an idea? I think that would help. For example, if I am in 1b, and I know that and I know that all of these people have to get through the process first. Then we are thinking that I might be going sometime in April, mid-April, at least I have an idea so I have sort of this window of continue to be vigilant, continue to stay safe because I know that in mid-April, this is when I am going to be able to get my vaccine. Versus this sort of, you know, kind of, some of your friends are getting them, some are not. You see people on social media that are showing their cards. They have already had their first dose or second dose and you have no idea when yours is coming. Has there been any thought about encouraging people to register, just so we can get them into a category and then perhaps plan as a County on, you know, how we move forward or what the volume is that we are going to need?

TC: Supervisor Grijalva, we have thought about that, but we are not encouraging that right now. The reason is that, our registration systems, we have put a metering in them. So even if you went in and registered right now. Say you register with Pima County, there are five points of information that we collect. You will not get through that metering unless you answer yes to the questions that put you in 1b.1 right now. The reason for that is because of the volume that is coming through. Do I anticipate we will be in a situation where we will be able to do that? Yes. The constraints right now are really related to the I.T. systems and our needed intervention to de-duplicate people coming into the system. There are many people that register, and I think some of this is because it is the 75 and over group. So we have a lot of people right now that are struggling with technology. We anticipate, we had this discussion this morning, we anticipate that once we get into the essential worker group, that we will have many less problems. At that point, and at some point, we will open this up to everybody and we will give people that kind of feedback. It is an excellent suggestion. I think you should look forward to us being able to do that within a couple of weeks.

SC: Chair Bronson?

AG: Thank you.

SC: Chair Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Yes, Dr. Cullen, in response to Supervisor Heinz's questions just a moment ago, you indicated that if people would just follow the protocols of wearing masks and social distancing and keeping the limits of people in gatherings, that the transmission rate would not be spiking or as high as it is. My question is, what evidence do you have that people are not following those protocols? How do you

determine that people are not in compliance or at least the vast majority of people are not in compliance with those protocols?

TC: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Well, my personal perception is just based on driving and seeing people and seeing gatherings [unintelligible] but Dr. Garcia, do you want to answer?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I would elaborate in this way. So we know that based on what our contact investigations are telling us today, that people are, that to a great extent, that Public Health Advisory and the more forceful actions of the Board have actually had a good effect, have had a salutary effect. We know that people are traveling less. We know that people are gathering in groups of ten or more, less frequently, and we know that people are visiting restaurants and bars less frequently. We know that those things are actually happening, based on really good sample sizes. 3,000 plus confirmed cases that are being asked for this kind of information. We believe that the kinds of action, the very muscular action that the Board has taken and that the public health advisory has encouraged, are actually happening to some extent. That is actually part of the reason why in reaction to Supervisor Heinz, it is hard to say what other tools are in the tool box now because we have exercised. This County has exercised most of the tools in the tool box that we have available to us, within the legal, within the limitations of the law.

SC: Dr. Garcia, I can appreciate what you are saying, I just want to go back to what Dr. Cullen said. She indicated that she was making these determinations by what she happens to be seeing in public, that people are not complying. Well, I am not a health official. I am not a medical doctor. I am not in any way, shape or form, an expert, but I think I can use the same basis for determining things as Dr. Cullen has. I look around and I go to places and businesses and just up and down the street driving to and from my office. It looks like people are taking all of these protocols very seriously, and if we are going to use personal observations as indicators of whether or not we should impose certain restrictions or certain mandates, I think we are heading down a very bad road and I think it is very dangerous to use personal observations and then tell people they have got to wear masks and they have to social distance when that has no basis in fact, other than personal observations.

TC: So, Supervisor Christy, I do want to clarify that I was sharing with you that my personal observations would support what the clinical data shows, which is that adherence to appropriate interventions help mitigate the transmission of this disease.

SB: And I believe Mr. Huckelberry had a comment.

CH: Chair Bronson and Members of the Board, just to put it in perspective, that report that came out of the State said we had 46,000 vaccines as of the 18th. We put 4,000 of those in arms on the 18th. So now we are down to 42. We brought a new facility online today at the University of Arizona. So that is at least 4,000 more. So we are down to 38. We will bring on the additional facility of TCC on Wednesday.

That means that our vaccine capacity is up to about 10,000 a day. So that means we have about three days' supply on hand.

SB: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry.

MH: Madam Chair?

SB: Who was that?

MH: Hi, to Terry.

SB: Okay.

MH: Just to clarify, what I was asking Dr. Cullen and what I believe she was responding to was the some of the specific recommendations and the Public Health Advisory dated January 7th, which goes beyond the meeting size, and the masking, but specifically the recommended limitations on business activity, such as occupancy for dining at 25% or less. The closure of indoor playgrounds and recreational facilities, fitness and dance studios, except where the classes are outside. Hair salons and nail salons, barber shops, movie theaters. Those were the issues that I was looking at, because I do not believe that people or businesses even understand those to be certainly not mandatory, and maybe they should be. We also have not imposed any kind of County-wide stay-at-home order which would be another tool that we could consider as well.

SB: I wish we could do all of those things, but as a weak arm of the state we are limited by Governor Ducey's emergency declaration. Any other comments? Well, I am sorry...

SC: I am sorry I had...

SB: ..Dr. Cullen and Dr. Garcia, we have taken up much of your time and I think you have certainly more challenging issues you have to deal with, connected with COVID. Any other comments from my colleagues or can we move on?

SC: One last comment, Madam Chair, if I may? Supervisor Christy here.

SB: Proceed.

SC: If you go to the Carnegie Mellon website, Carnegie Mellon University website, as of January 17th, according to their records, and their investigations, Pima County equals 95.667 mask compliance. So it appears that there is an overwhelming willingness to comply with these mandates, and I would suggest that we investigate those figures when we make more decisions about how we are going to conduct any kind of transmission reduction in Pima County. Thank you.

SB: Thank you, Dr. Garcia, Dr. Cullen, and with that, we will move on to the remaining agenda.