

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' AND CITY OF TUCSON MAYOR AND COUNCIL'S SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors and the City of Tucson Mayor and Council met in a special session through technological means at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, February 19, 2021. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Board of Supervisors: Sharon Bronson, Chair Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member	Mayor and Council: Regina Romero, Mayor Nikki Lee, Vice Mayor Lane Santa Cruz, Member Paul Cunningham, Member Paul Durham, Member Richard G. Fimbres, Member Steve Kozachik, 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	Michael J. Ortega, City Manager Michael Rankin, City Attorney Roger W. Randolph, City Clerk

1. INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Ana Marrufo.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Submitted public statements were added to the record.

4. COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESPONSE ISSUES

- a. Vaccine Rollout
- b. Testing
- c. Mask Usage
- d. Curfew
- e. Evictions
- f. Business Restrictions
- g. Federal Funds Appropriated to the State of Arizona and Local Jurisdictions

(Clerk's Note: See attached verbatim for Minute Item No. 4, for discussion and action on this item. Verbatim was necessary due to the nature and evolving circumstance related to COVID-19.)

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:09 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

3. COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESPONSE ISSUES

- a. Vaccine Rollout
- b. Testing
- c. Mask Usage
- d. Curfew
- e. Evictions
- f. Business Restrictions
- g. Federal Funds Appropriated to the State of Arizona and Local Jurisdictions

(Clerk's Note: Due to technical difficulties, not all comments were fully audible.)

Verbatim

SB: Chair Bronson
RR: Mayor Romero
CH: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator
MO: Michael J. Ortega, City Manager
PD: Council Member Durham
SC: Supervisor Christy
RF: Council Member Fimbres
SK: Council Member Kozachik
FG: Dr. Francisco Garcia, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer for Health and Community Services
PC: Council Member Cunningham
NL: Council Member Lee
AF: Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
MR: Michael Rankin, City Attorney
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
MH: Supervisor Heinz
RS: Supervisor Scott

CH: Chair Bronson and Members of the Board and Mayor Romero and Members of the Council, let me start off by the discussion about the vaccine roll out. We developed an accelerated vaccination plan and sent it to the State on January the 12th. That plan has been amended and supplemented with a Disadvantaged Community Plan that also is accelerated and included in that plan. It consists of approximately, today, about ninety outlets that are qualified and registered to distribute vaccine. We have concentrated on three general categories. One is what we called regional centers and those regional centers, one of which is the Tucson Convention Center. We have five and typically those regional centers were capable of vaccinating about 1,000 to 1,500 individuals per day. We also had a group of what we call community health centers that were also qualified and who also had panels, meaning that they had patients who met the qualifications. They were also empowered. We have also developed what we call a Mobile Vaccination Plan to reach the

disadvantaged communities. It has had one event and it will have many more, we hope, as vaccine supply increases. Just to give you an idea, we produce every, twice a week, something called the vaccination report and the latest one dated yesterday, February the 18th. We have inoculated 203,000 individuals. That is about 16% of the population. If you look at first and second shots, 153,000 of those are first shots and 50,000 are the second dose, so we have 50,000 individuals completely vaccinated. One of the strategies that we advanced and, as you recall was, it was plus 75 first, then it went to plus 70 and then it went to plus 65 as of yesterday. To show you that we are actually making progress in that area, our vaccination report says of the individuals 70 and over in the community, they represent 14% of the regional population. The number that have been vaccinated, to date, is 43% of those individuals. So that targeted vaccination plan is working. I would like to pay special attention and give a lot of credit to the Tucson Convention Center. They have done more than we could ever ask them to do and the City staff has been outstanding, who is doing that work. They actually, I think, responded well to some chaotic supply issues associated with the vaccine. In addition to that, I think they stood up what we call our first walk up registration and that first walk up registration is for people who, for whatever reason, could not navigate the current system to get registered. That has been very, very helpful. We are hopeful that that will continue and we know that as we are able to schedule more people into the system and add to the walk up registration, that facility alone could probably vaccinate 2,500 individuals a day. We do not have a real vaccine capacity problem. We have a vaccine supply problem. With that, let me see if there are any questions or if City Manager Ortega has something to add, but again, I think the Tucson Convention Center has been extraordinarily successful. All of our other four sites, Tucson Medical Center, Banner North, Banner South, the U of A, have all been running about 1,000 vaccinations a day. The production, I think, just yesterday was a little under 6,000 vaccinations given in those sites.

RR: Mr. Ortega.

MO: Sure, Mayor and Members of the Council, thank you for the opportunity. Chair Bronson and Members of the Board, thank you for the opportunity. I had put together just a couple quick numbers for you on the TCC and I am not sure if the County Clerk got that. We sent that kind of late, but if they could put that up, that would be great. It does have some information that coincides with what Mr. Huckelberry outlined. First and foremost, Mayor and City Council, you had given me authority to stand up and provide whatever support to Pima County was necessary on the vaccine. The TCC was, in fact, that...that effort, if you will. You can see the numbers there. Actually, I think that is the testing. We have another slide which is the vaccine. There we go, awesome. As you can see, we have administered about 20,000, a combination of both first and second doses. We have about 70 employees on site every day. That is a true partnership, not only with our internal departments, but also Pima County, TMC, etc. We are very proud of that and I think, as Mr. Huckelberry mentioned, our ability to pivot, quite frankly on the dime, to make sure that we are able to

get the vaccines administered, has been amazing. As Mr. Huckelberry mentioned, we do have a capacity. We think it is about 1,800, he can push us to about 2,500, but at this point, we are really averaging only about 1,000. The issue is not the capacity that we have there, it is really the availability of vaccines, as was previously mentioned. With that, I will just mention, we are spending about \$15,000.00 a day, every time that we are open. I know that that is a lot of money, but we are happy to partner and participate. We are tracking our costs. We know that there is an effort ultimately to seek reimbursement from the State or the Feds and so we are working closely with Mr. Huckelberry and his staff. Mayor and Members of Council, as well as the Board, happy to answer questions on any of that information, if, as needed. You can take the slide down now.

PD: What...

SB: Is somebody trying to speak?

PD: Yes.

SB: Could you identify yourself?

PD: Paul Durham. How are the City of Tucson and Pima County to expand mobile vaccination clinics to meet our most vulnerable communities?

MO: Mayor, what I would suggest, is that maybe we pass that over to Mr. Huckelberry. I know that we have partnered on mobile testing and we have had some conversations internally about the availability of resources once those mobile testing, I know there has been some mobile testing that has occurred. But I guess I would pass that on to Pima County for some guidance on how best we might be able to help.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson and Council Member Durham, what we have done and what we will continue to do, is identify disadvantaged community locations based on census tract information related to age, related to ethnicity and related to income. As well as then coupling those data sets with the number of infections occurring in those particular census tracts, hospitalizations and deaths. That data will then combine to give us the best idea about where we probably ought to be going. We will want to be scheduling, and our goal with vaccine supply, is to schedule two to three of these mobile clinics per day, not per day, per week, excuse me. And that each one would probably dispense about 500 vaccines. That was our experience with the first pilot, which occurred at, I think, St. John's Church. We will also, and I think the data sets that we are developing, we want to cross coordinate those with the City staff, particularly the housing staff, as you deal with issues of the same things we deal with to make sure we are not missing anyone or missing any community that might be in this disadvantaged category. I think, we are putting together those

programs. We had hoped to get them off the ground actually a week ago. We had to postpone that because vaccine shortage. We had three scheduled for this weekend. They were postponed to next week because of vaccine shortage. We are anxious to get out and get into the community because what the data shows us to date is that the large P.O.D.s, and we can talk about first the State 24/7 P.O.D., it is not getting to the disadvantaged communities. The data is very clear that it is not reaching those individuals. Our regional facilities do a better job at reaching those disadvantaged because they are more disbursed and easier to get to. If we really want to get to disadvantaged communities, we have got to go mobile. In the first mobile experiment that we did as a pilot, just to see how it worked, just to see if we were going to be overwhelmed, if the community would respond, worked very well. It was an outstanding, what we call event. It vaccinated 511 people, all of them, most of them, all of them over the age of 70. 72% were Hispanic and it was clear we were reaching who we intended to reach. We intend to do more of those and with the help of the City, making sure that we do not miss anyone, we will continue that.

SC: Madam Chair? Supervisor Christy.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Would this be an appropriate time in the meeting to ask the County Administrator some questions about reimbursement funding from the State?

SB: I think we will probably, I will let Mr. Huckelberry respond, but I think we will get to that later. I just had some, I have some information I want to share with Mr. Huckelberry quickly and that is that Senator Kelly is meeting with the Governor this afternoon, I think. So if you were not already aware of that, Mr. Huckelberry, it is my understanding at this point. To Supervisor Christy's point, do you want to deal with some of the costs now or what would you, what would be your preference?

CH: Madam Chair, I think that falls under Item g.

SB: It does.

RR: Chair Bronson?

SC: I will go ahead and wait with my questions for Item g.

SB: Okay. Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Mayor.

RR: Just to continue the conversation on the vaccine and disadvantaged populations, I did read the memo that Mr. Huckelberry sent to the Board of Supervisors and has since shared with the community and with the Mayor and Council. I do see that the intent of the mobile vaccination clinics were very targeted and accessible to disadvantaged communities and underrepresented

communities. I do understand the access and availability of vaccines is going to, if not has already started to, impact the amount of vaccines that are being distributed at the different P.O.D.s. One of the concepts that we should at least talk about in terms of fair and equitable vaccine distribution is the location of vaccination sites. We understand that at the Tucson Convention Center, we, our staff at the City of Tucson, our fire department, EMTs, paramedics and everyone in the City that has contributed to the effort, has been very successful. At the same time, as the U of A P.O.D. 24/7 site designated by the State starts ramping up, I would suggest, since the TCC is so close to the University of Arizona, that we consider, and I am more than happy to put out there to my colleagues on the Tucson City Council and in partnership with Pima County, that we consider El Pueblo Activity Center as a possible vaccine site as opposed to the TCC. I am just thinking of distribution, equitable distribution, or geographic distribution in terms of delivery of vaccines. Even though we have been very successful with the TCC, we could always pick up that site and the effort that we have put at the TCC and move it to El Pueblo Activity Center, in order to reach more disadvantaged communities. Frankly, in the area where El Pueblo is located, those zip codes, 06 and 14, 85706 and 85714, have seen a huge amount of COVID-19 cases. I put it out there because I know that the first mobile vaccine distribution event happened at St. John's the Evangelist on Ajo and 12th Avenue and that is something to consider. We do not have to make a decision or a call right now, but because of the, because of the concern about getting the vaccines in the arms of working families and those that have been devastated by COVID-19, we could consider El Pueblo Activity Center as a possible site that the City of Tucson can help set up.

RF: Madam Chair, I have, Madam Mayor, I have a couple of questions for Mr. Huckelberry.

RR: Go ahead, Council Member Fimbres.

RF: Thank you.

SB: Does Mr. Huckelberry want to respond to Mayor Romero first and then we will go to Council Member Fimbres' questions?

CH: Yes, Madam Chair, very simply, yes. We will consider that as a site that probably we will revisit several times in the mobile facility. I think everybody needs to remember, we have administered 200,000 vaccines to date. To get through the population that will probably accept the vaccination, we need to administer 1.6 million. That means probably we still want to keep the TCC operational but we certainly would actually go to all of these other locations, assuming we have vaccine supply.

RR: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Go ahead Council Member Fimbres.

RF: Thank you, Madam Chairs. One of the things, Mr. Huckelberry, can you explain what, when you say “doing a temporary mobile site,” what does that entail and how do we notify the citizens of the community that we are having this event, at that event? I know St. John’s, they do a great job with Matis Trevizo there and Father Robert Gonzalez, reaching out and they have the trust of the people. I know that Pastor Scott, Pastor Otis Brown and Pastor Amos Lewis also have the trust of the people and they are willing to open up the sites for themselves, too. Another site suggestion would be the rodeo grounds. We have done some sites there. People can stay in their vehicles and do a drive thru and it has helped, been successful. Again, also with El Pueblo, we had 8,500 masks given out and all people stayed in their vehicles. That was another site that was present. Another suggestion since the University is a site, 24 hour. I would like to see if we can extend that over to the Tech Park at The Bridges and at the, what is it called, the Bridges and Marketplace. That could be easy because people could drive in right there where the University is and also get their shots. That might be another suggestion for you. I am interested to know what kind of, beforehand, when we are going to choose a site and how was that alerted and how the people had known. We had 511 there. That was a good turn-out. What was the success of that, that made it happen?

CH: Chair Bronson and Council Member Fimbres, it was exactly as you said. We contacted the church leaders and then they contacted their congregation. That is how that worked, through word of mouth and notification. We will do the same thing. We had scheduled one at Christ Community Church and again that was working through black pastors to get that population there. That is the key, is where, as we go into these sites, is to go into the communities and go in to the individuals who know those communities to notify the individuals and get them in for vaccinations.

RF: Thank you Mr. Huckelberry.

SK: I have a couple of questions about vaccines while we are on this item, if it is the appropriate time.

RR: Go ahead Council Member Kozachik.

SK: I want to pivot to the supply question. In the memo that County Administrator put out, it indicates that Dr. Garcia has concerns about our vaccination sites nearing or getting down to zero supply by next week. We have requested, you have requested, nearly 40,000 doses. Have we had any response from the ADOH on that request yet?

CH: Council Member Kozachik, not much, other than a decreased allocation again this week. Our allocations went from 17,300 or 17,800 to 16,300, to this week, I think, is 12,500. We are seeing decreased supplies. Of the decrease this week, we do not know if it is weather related. All we know is that our Moderna allocation went down about 5,000 doses. We have asked the State, and we did make a call over to the University to see if they were over there and they

are not. They are zero. We asked the State to tell us where the 5,000 doses went and obviously do not have an answer yet.

SK: Do we know what the impact of the State run P.O.D. on the mall is with respect to our own supply? Is it a net negative or is it no impact?

CH: Council Member Kozachik, at this point, timing of opening it is not great because our supplies are going down. I do not think we can directly correlate our decrease to their increase. They are using the Pfizer product. The State has basically nationalized all the Pfizer, so they are controlling all the Pfizer allocations. We do know that the State and the University has about 14,000 doses of Pfizer. We are encouraging them to get them out and it sounds like they are trying to ramp up to get to, sounds like, 1,300 doses today. We will see where it goes. I am not sure how many they did yesterday. I think the problem is, is that, of course we needed an initial capacity. Once we have a supply, but we did not need it right now. So that is the difficulty.

SK: In your memo though, you mentioned Pfizer, that Pima County is receiving 10% of the State's supply and Maricopa County is getting 90%. Have we had any adjustment to our allocation with that ratio?

CH: Council Member Kozachik, no we have not. Like I said, we only were able to discern that over the reports on the State's website. Since Pfizer was only being used in Maricopa and Pima County, that means that 90% of the Pfizer went to Maricopa County. Previously, in our P.O.D.s, the only ones that were using Pfizer were the hospital base. So that is TMC and Banner North. Banner South always used Moderna. The issue, and we do know that the Pfizer allocation to TMC and to Banner North has decreased.

SK: So it seems to me that the timing of the U of A opening up this mall has not been helpful with respect to our regional effort to stand up mobile sites and catch some of the most vulnerable populations. Question, perhaps for one of the medical people on the call. You have suggested going to a tiered allocation process and Tier 3 now are second dose vaccines. Would you recommend that people who have had a first dose, not go and get their second dose so we can at least get as many first doses in people's arms as possible or should we stay on track with respect to everyone going with numbers 1 and 2? Dr. Garcia?

FG: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero, Members of the Council, Councilman Kozachik, that recommendation currently continues to be that we provide folks their second dose. We do think that eventually the vaccine supply will loosen up. We know that we are having some stress in the system right now, precisely because we have been very efficient utilizers of our first doses. There is not a lot of reserve in the system. But at this time, we are not recommending that people purposefully defer their second vaccination. Please understand that there is a window. People do not have to get it exactly at three or four weeks. The window actually goes out to six weeks, so that we

have a little bit of latitude. At this time, our recommendation for that has not changed.

SK: Okay. Thank you. That is all the questions that I had. Thanks, Mayor.

RR: Thank you Council Member.

PC: Your Honor?

RR: Council Member Cunningham.

PC: Good morning. I want to thank the Board of Supervisors and the, and my colleagues on the Council. This is one of our better, this is one of the better exercises that we do and it should be a little bit more regular. It should be a twice-a-year, standing meeting. It always should have been and it is something that we ought to consider, long term. I want to give a, I definitely want to give a kudos to the Pima County Health Department. First of all, for those of you who are listening, and watching online, a few things. I always like to compare us with Maricopa County because I love bragging about how much better we are than them. In this case, 21% of our total population, well our ratio in total jabs, that is the total number of inoculations, now some of that is second doses but when you consider every inoculation we have done, we have a 21% ratio of the total inoculations versus the number of people in Pima County. In Maricopa County, even though they have the extra state count, they are only at 19%, so we are winning. Two, 37% of our jabs have gone to people over the age of 65. In Maricopa County it is only 33%. We are winning there, too. The other thing is, is that the, and probably, this is probably a little bit more nuanced, but what is interesting to me, is if you do not consider the State POD, Maricopa County has not done the same effort that Pima County Health Department has done in just ramping up all the different avenues for sites. I also want to thank them for standing up, helping us stand up the TCC site right away. I think it is one of our biggest successes that allowed us some flexibility within the system. It allowed us to get more jabs into arms so I am really proud of that. A couple things to go over this morning, really quick. One is, I am seeing that there is some faulty in the supply. I wanted to know and answer at the end. Are we at the direct mercy of the State Health Department on whether or not our allotment changes? Can we go to the federal government? Can we go directly to Moderna or Pfizer? I do not know. I do not want to get us in trouble, but at the same time, being at the State's mercy has never worked out for Pima County. I just wonder what other activities. I also wanted to thank everyone on the dashboard accuracy. Our dashboard accuracy is terrific, however I do want to point out to Dr. Garcia, not that it is a big deal, I know it was a holiday Monday, but this week's Thursday update has not posted yet. I just wanted to, you know, mention that.

SB: Council Member Cunningham, I am going to interrupt you in the interest of time. We have got a number of items to cover.

- PC: I have got a few more things. One is, I want to talk about rides and transport to sites. I want to talk about admin fees at Walgreens and CVS and understand if Walgreens' and CVS' jabs at critical care facilities are counted in our data dashboard. I want to talk about the \$100 million in testing reimbursement to see if that is going to help us so we can continue testing. Finally, I want to talk about the second part of the vaccine roll-out. So those are all of the things that I wanted to cover. Thank you.
- SB: Thank you.
- RR: Thank you, Council Member and in the interest of time, I agree with Chair Bronson. Maybe we could have either Dr. Garcia or Chuck answer your questions and then we can move to Testing.
- SB: Or we could have the Council Members submit the questions and get some written responses.
- RR: Okay. Absolutely.
- CH: Chair Bronson, let me just give you a quick, quick answer. Yes, we are at the mercy of the State. It varies week to week and I think we ought to keep talking because Dr. Garcia just notified me that we got an additional allocation of 4,000 doses, so we are back up to 17,000 doses for next week.
- RR: That is great news.
- SB: It may be the only good news we get today. I do not know.
- RR: Hopefully, they keep. Hopefully, the good news keeps coming. Chair Bronson, if you would like, we can move on to Testing on the agenda.
- SB: Yes, let us move on. Now would that be Mr. Huckelberry or Dr. Garcia? Who wants to? Or Dr. Cullen? Mr. Huckelberry.
- CH: Let me briefly go through it and again we also appreciate the City of Tucson because you have, I think, pledged \$4 million of your CARES Act relief money for testing. Testing has been a big issue. The County has spent, probably, as of this date, about \$45 to \$50 million on testing of our CARES Act allocation of \$87.1 million. As a public health agency, we did what we thought was appropriate and that is to fund testing in a fairly wide span of time and location. There has been a discussion recently with regard to testing. We have had a number of sites set up throughout the County. During the peak period of January when the infection rate was about the highest, we were averaging 3,000 tests per day. We are down now, probably to about 1,500 tests per day and over a week period that amounts to a cost of about \$2 million. That gives you a scope concept about how much has been spent. Since January 1st, we have provided 56,000 tests to residents of Pima County, up until a couple of days ago. The State has been providing ASU saliva testing and they also took

over the testing that we set up at the airport on January 1st. At that site, they have tested 5,500 individuals. Our expenses since January 1 are \$10.7 million. By now it is probably \$11.5 million. As you can see, if we spend \$2 million a week, it adds up fairly quickly. One of the items that I asked the Board to consider is whether or not we are going to be receiving any of the \$416 million the State received. It was appropriated by Congress in late December. The money was sent to the State on January 14th. I think that the Mayors and the Chair sent a letter to the Governor asking about the dispersal of those funds two or three weeks ago. The Chair just sent another letter recently asking for those funds in both vaccinations, as well as testing. We received a response two days ago from the State that said that we might get \$1 million, but it had to go through their contractor, who happens to be our contractor, ironically. We are faced with a dilemma of: Do we continue testing? Do we finance vaccinations? What do we do? The answer was, we would finance vaccination over testing or we could run the County budget into the red. That was the dilemma we faced. We finally heard yesterday at a, what we call a LOA call, which is where all the State Health Directors around the counties are on a call with the State health officials, that they might be allocating \$100 million of that fund for the purpose of testing. Every county would get a base \$100,000 and then they would distribute the rest on the basis on population. Pima County would get about \$14 million, a little bit more. Our reaction to that is that the State has no idea who is doing what on the ground. Simply because of all the counties doing COVID-19 PCR testing, Pima County is doing the most. If you were to add up all the other counties doing COVID-19 PCR testing, we are probably doing 90%. Our expenses, if we continue on through August are going to run into the \$41 million range. You can see that \$14.3 million does not go very far when your continuing expenses are running into the \$41 million range. We would hope that the State would actually get some on the ground experience as to what is occurring, because if they did, they would know that we are doing most of the testing in Arizona, as a county. We are hopeful that they can figure that out. The action that the Board, I had asked them to do, based on the press release, that is the only notice we have gotten from the State. Is that we obviously can continue testing until March the 2nd, which is the next Board meeting, to try and find out if, in fact, the State is going to allocate more money or our option would be to have the State take over all of our contracts as of that date and then they can worry about paying the contractors. That is all on testing.

SB: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. I was going to ask the question. So we basically, have enough money to get us through March 2nd. Is that what you are saying? For testing.

CH: Yes. Yes we do.

SC: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

SB: Yes.

- SC: I was under the impression this kind of discussion was going to be saved on the Agenda Item under g, but it was brought up at this point. Would you still prefer that we hold off questions on that until we get to g or can I ask?
- SB: Well, if this is specific to testing, ask your question for Mr. Huckelberry.
- SC: I will hold the cost element that Mr. Huckelberry was referring to, to Item g. But I just want to ask Mr. Huckelberry and Dr. Garcia about a recent study by the John Hopkins School of Medicine and the Bloomberg School of Public Health that announced that their investigation showed that COVID cases have officially fallen 77% over the last six weeks and the John Hopkins School of Medicine, that did this study, suggests that herd immunity is responsible for the drastic drop and I quote, "Natural immunity from prior infections is far more common than can be measured by testing. Testing has been capturing only from 10 to 25% of infections." That would mean about, based on when they, the infections were first received or first indicated, that 55% of Americans have natural immunity and they go on to say that at the current trajectory, COVID will be mostly gone by April, hopefully allowing a return to some sense of normalcy. I am just wondering, this report reflects that, obviously that testing is not that effective, yet we have been doing it for a number of months now, at a great expense. Dr. Garcia, what would your comments be about this study from John Hopkins School of Medicine?
- CH: Madam Chair, let me start and I will let Dr. Garcia finish.
- SB: Yeah, and again, in the interest of time, I think we need to get to some facts and I do not know that this is relevant to making sure everybody has the facts, but if we could, again, we have very limited time so if we can, you can answer quickly. We still have to do Mask Usage, Curfew, Evictions, Business Restrictions, Federal Funds. That is Item g, I think the one that interests Supervisor Christy. Again, I just caution my colleagues. We want to get through all of these items and we have a very short time to do it.
- RR: Thank you and after Mr. Huckelberry answers, Chair, if we could have Mr. Ortega present on the City of Tucson's efforts in testing and then we can move to the next item.
- CH: Madam Chair, very quickly. I think I will let, the issue of testing is vital. It is important. It is the only way we are able to isolate infected individuals and keep them from spreading COVID-19 to others. It continues to be extraordinarily important. If you take the data with regard to the number of infections we have to date in Pima County. Yet we have maybe 10% who might have some immunity, but I would caution that immunity is questionable as to how long it exists. If you then take, we vaccinated 50,000 who have the second dose. That is 5% of our population. So maybe we are at 15% herd immunity and we need to get to 85%.

SK: May I make a quick comment on that also. I will make it real brief. You have to remember, we have to remember that any reduction in the infection rate is coming from an extremely high level. The levels that we are seeing right now exceed the peak last summer, so any percentage that Supervisor Christy is throwing out, that has to be taken into consideration. Remember the context. In addition to that, the testing was extremely important when we were identifying, testing surges in congregate settings, in particular the towers around the U of A mall. It helped us, not only for isolation but for contact tracing and if you recall, back after the U of A opened last September, they had an R0 value of over two in that area. That was the highest one in the region and that was extremely helpful for that. Finally, with respect to this disappearing by April, it was about April last year that we had a President saying it was going to disappear in the summer, so I think we have heard that, we have sung that tune before.

RR: Thank you, Council Member Kozachik. Mr. Ortega.

MO: Sure. Thank you, Mayor. I do have a quick slide, just again to show some numbers, if the Clerk can put them up, that would be great. I will not go through that. I will let you all read those. We too are looking pretty tough on some dollars in terms of expenses. The \$9 million will be through the end of February. As Mr. Huckelberry mentioned, the Council had initially allocated about \$4 million, but we have been burning up money as well and that is on both fronts. As far as helping with the testing that occurs at Udall, as well as El Rio Health, El Pueblo, as well as some of our popup testing. I think what will be important is, depending on direction from the County, ultimately I may need to come back to the Council and say, "If we are not going to have the County as partner in that testing effort because of their finances or because of their decisions on a policy level, then we will need to make something similar." No decisions necessary right this minute. As you heard, we do have enough to get us through the end of the month, but that may be something coming, Mayor and Members of City Council. Very happy to answer some questions. In the interest of time, I will not spend too much time on this. You can take the slide down now.

RR: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Ortega. Chair Bronson and Mr. Huckelberry, I believe the cost for testing, to this date, have been anywhere from \$1.3 to \$1.8 million. We do want to be partners in the planning efforts of how we continue as a community with vital testing to know where the, where COVID-19 is hitting our community the greatest. I agree that testing has to continue for the benefit of the health of Tucsonans and Pima County residents. The City of Tucson, its Mayor and Council, was very, very clear that with the \$9 million that we chose to contribute to the testing puzzle here in the City of Tucson and Pima County. It was very important, but as Mr. Ortega just mentioned, those CARES funds are going to end at the end of February so we, on the Mayor and Council side, want to support your efforts in Pima County. Understand that you have the public health experts to be able to guide us and give Mayor and Council and the community input as to what the Plan B for testing if there is no support by

the State of Arizona. Maybe what we have to do is find a less expensive way and then, as you said Mr. Huckelberry, leave it up to the State to pick up the testing sites that we currently have and then maybe, possibly find a less expensive, they can, the State could find a less expensive way to do the necessary testing, according to the facts, according to what public health experts deem necessary for testing in Pima County. I wanted to open up for any additional questions or Chair Bronson, I do not know how you wanted to proceed with this particular item.

SB: I think we, unless Mr. Huckelberry or Mr. Ortega have anything else to add. I think we pretty much hit where we need to be with testing, so I think, let's move on to Mask Usage. If that is okay with you, Mayor?

RR: That is absolutely good.

SB: So, Mr. Huckelberry, Mask Usage. Comments?

CH: Yes, Chair Bronson, Members of the Board and Mayor Romero. I will be very brief and then turn it over to City Manager Ortega. We have a mask ordinance. We have a mask requirement. It remains in place. It is probably one of the cheapest, most effective public health measures that we can employ to keep the spread of COVID-19 down, along with all the other standard things about keep your distance, wash your hands, do all the other things that do not, are not difficult. I do not think you will see, at least a recommendation from me any time soon, about modifying or rescinding our mask requirements in the County. They are county wide, as a public health agency. We will continue those.

SB: Thank you.

MO: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Bronson and Mr. Huckelberry. Members of the City Council, as you know, our ordinance is still in place. It pretty much tracks with the County's ordinance. I do not see any time soon making a recommendation to rescind that. We will continue to monitor the numbers and watch, but we will certainly be in cooperation with our county health department partners. Mayor and Chair Bronson, one thing that I know we are running short on time. Mr. Huckelberry and I did discuss providing a written report, to both the Council and the Board of Supervisors addressing some of the questions, so we are trying to keep notes on the questions that you all are asking. Then we will provide you with a written response after this meeting, that we can both sign, to give you the information that we may not get to today to answer. That is all Chair Bronson and Mayor.

SB: Thank you.

SC: Chair Bronson?

SB: Who is that?

SC: Supervisor Christy.

SB: I think Council Member Lee had her hand raised.

NL: Thank you, Chair Bronson. That was from a previous item and I am good to take my questions offline, but thank you.

SB: Alright. You are welcome.

RR: Thank you.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Mr. Huckelberry answered the same question at the last Board Meeting. I would like to ask Mr. Ortega. In the mask ordinance, in the City of Tucson, how many complaints have resulted in any kind of fines or imposition of penalties by law enforcement, since it has gone into effect in the City?

MO: Mayor, Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I will have to get back to you with the specific number. I know that we have issued many warnings and many opportunities for folks to comply. Most of the time when an enforcement action is to be taken, people come into compliance. We just bring it to their attention. But happy to provide that information to you in writing after the meeting.

RR: Mr. Ortega, just to be able to respond to Supervisor Christy. When Mayor and Council decided to institute our mask mandate back on June 17th, a few days before the Governor untied the hands of Mayors across Arizona, as well as counties such as Pima County. We were very deliberate at Mayor and Council level that even though we instituted a fine for no mask wearing, that it was going to be an effort, an educational effort. That educational effort was much more worth and helpful for the community to understand how important wearing a mask, and how cheap frankly it is, to help prevent the spread of COVID-19. We, at Mayor and Council, felt very strongly that the time and effort of our police officers was not going to be spent standing on corners giving tickets to people because they were not wearing masks. As a matter of fact, many of our police officers carried masks and brought it to the attention of many individuals. Which, by the way, Tucsonans were absolutely happy to comply with, most of them. We felt that such a simple health measure was necessary and according to the numbers and the public health experts and the science behind it, it really is something that helps prevent the spread. We are not going to have our police officers stand on corners giving tickets because people are not wearing masks.

SC: Thank you, Your Honor, for that. I will still look forward to Mr. Ortega's numbers of non-compliant use in the City of Tucson. Mr. Huckelberry reported to us, that same question at the last meeting, that there were no issuances of any kind of penalties that he knew of in the County, in the unincorporated area of Pima County, regarding noncompliance. It would be interesting to see the

comparison of the two. I think for another time and another place we could probably discuss the efficacy of mask wearing and what it does to the community, at least what I am getting from my constituents. I appreciate the explanation, Your Honor, and I look forward to Mr. Ortega's numbers. Thank you.

RR: Thank you. Chair Bronson, would you like to move forward or are there any Council colleagues or Board Members that would like to contribute to this item?

SK: If masks were so worthless, then the healthcare community would not be suggesting double masking to control the variant strains.

SB: Well said.

PC: Your Honor, I just had a couple questions. I wanted to know whether or not we can institute, I know it is a little late in the game for this, but if we, the supply chain for of KN95 and 95 masks was significantly challenged early on (inaudible) this, but it seems with the new strains and variants that if we can locate K95 level masks and help distribute them, I think that would definitely make a dent in the spread of the virus. For me, I would be willing to go in on a joint effort, depending on whether or not we can allocate dollars from this \$100 million or whether or not we cut back, I am not. It looks like we are going, our testing capacity can be reduced a little bit. Our public testing capacity can be reduced and we reapply those dollars into KN95 distribution. I think that would be a much better opportunity for us. That is kind of my two cents on that but other than that I want to move on, in the interest of time.

SB: Thank you. So let us then move on to Curfew. Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero, Members of the Council, this will be a very short update. We lost, in the Superior Court, our public health authority to impose a curfew and it is now been appealed to the Arizona Court of Appeals. We will await its scheduling and will argue our public health authority that has already been upheld by previous Supreme Court cases.

MO: Mayor and Chair Bronson, as you might recall, the City of Tucson did have an ordinance. We allowed that to expire on December 23rd, I believe was the date, given that Pima County had their ordinance. So we do not have one in effect today, other than the County's, which is county-wide, including the City of Tucson. That is all I have.

SB: Thank you. Any comments from Board Members, Council Members?

SC: Madam Chair, just to be clear on both Mr. Ortega's and Mr. Huckelberry's statements, as of right now there is no curfew ordinance in effect. Is that a correct statement? In both the City and the County?

CH: Chair Bronson, the order has been nullified by the Superior Court, but it is on appeal to the Court of Appeals. So, it is not in effect today.

SC: Thank you.

MO: We do not have, Supervisor Christy, we do not have an ordinance currently in the City of Tucson.

SC: Thank you for that clarity. I appreciate it. Thank you.

RR: Chair Bronson?

SB: Supervisor, Mayor. Sorry, I thought it was, I thought I saw Steve, Supervisor Christy raise his hand again. Mayor.

RR: I would put on the table for consideration from my colleagues on the Mayor and Council and if it is needed or necessary, an amicus from the City of Tucson on that appeal. I do not know if, I am not an attorney. I do not suppose I know the procedural steps necessary, but the City of Tucson would consider an amicus if that is still a possibility and necessary for the case from Pima County.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, would you like to comment? Or Mr. Flagg? I think he, our County Attorney, is with us.

CH: Chair Bronson, I will turn it over to Andy, but we could use all the help we could get.

SB: Mr. Flagg, did you want to comment?

AF: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero and Members of the Council, I think the County would welcome amicus support. There will be a briefing schedule put in place and I can certainly be in touch with the City Attorney to discuss that.

SB: Are you going to contact Mr. Rankin or?

AF: Madam Chair, yes, I can do that.

SB: Thank you.

RR: I do see, Madam Chair, Mr., our City Attorney, Mr. Rankin is with us.

SB: Yes, I think he raised his hand.

MR: Thank you, Madam Chair, Mayor. I have had some preliminary discussions with Mr. Flagg, as well, at the County Attorney's Office. We are happy to help out, as we can, with the preparation of an amicus brief. Thank you.

SB: Thank you.

SK: Do we need a motion from the Mayor and Council to give you direction or do you have what you need?

MR: I would appreciate that, yes, so that the authority to do so is clear.

SK: I move that we give the City Attorney the authority to join with the County in an amicus brief with respect to this item.

PC: That motion is seconded.

RR: So on the Council side, we have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, signify by saying, "Aye."

[Chorus of Ayes]

RR: It sounds like we have a unanimous vote to support Pima County with an amicus on their case regarding curfew.

AG: Thank you.

RR: Thank you, Counsel. Chair, if we could move on to Evictions.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, did you want to comment on that?

CH: Very briefly and then I will turn it over to City Manager Ortega. I think he probably has more than I do. The County and the City have been working together very well with regard to eviction prevention and the distribution of funding that has been received from the various federal agencies to reduce eviction. Our issue is one that I think I communicated with the Board this morning on and that is the degree of transparency that we need in our Justice Court system that we do not have today. We will hopefully push forward and attain that information and the issue of evictions that are anecdotal could either be confirmed by fact or not. That is what our report is, but I do appreciate the City's assistance in the area of housing, as I believe you have more to do with housing than the County does. Thank you.

MO: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Mayor, Members of the Council and Chair Bronson and Board Members, there are a few things going on with regard to this topic. First and foremost, we appreciate very much the County's participation and assistance through the Constables' Offices, also through your Housing Department, as we partner to address this important topic. Today Constables have resources available to them, mostly through our Housing Department. What ends up happening is, as a Constable finds themselves serving the writ for eviction, the opportunity then to either negotiate with the landlord or provide a list of services through the Housing Department or through our housing function, then comes into play. A couple of pieces of that,

first and foremost, the Constables do not have money, if you will, by which to negotiate with the landlord. It is basically just them trying to talk on behalf of the renter. As you are aware, we did receive about \$16.2 million in rental assistance. The thought is to include that into the mix to give the Constables an opportunity to at least identify a source of funding for some of these discussions. On a bigger scale though, with our partnership with Pima County, the Community Investment Corp., has partnered with us to assist us in distributing those dollars, those monies that have been allocated to the City. There is criteria for that. Those that have lost their job and meet 50% of AMI and that is a Fed requirement, federal requirement. If the applicant meets those criteria, then they can actually see their arrears paid for as well as up to three months going forward of both rent and utility assistance. We are working very closely to put that together with CIC. We have established a relationship with them and expanded what we had been doing in the past. We know that there are a lot of folks in the community that are struggling and dealing with this. Mayor and City Council, I know you have been very much interested in us pushing hard to not only allocate the dollars that were in the previous CRF allocations, you previously allocated in excess of \$6 million for that effort, which has been very efficient, effective through our partners within the community to address this. I guess what I am suggesting is, we have still got a lot of need. We do have some game plans in play. We are working closely with our partners at Pima County to make sure that those dollars get out very, very quickly, as quickly as possible. Mayor and Chair Bronson, happy to answer questions.

SB: Any questions from Board Members or Council Members?

SC: Madam Chair, Supervisor Christy here.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: I would like to request maybe that very quickly you give the Mayor and Council a brief update on the actions of the Board of Supervisors regarding the reconsideration element on this subject that we voted on and passed at the last Board Meeting.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, did you want to comment? I think what we did, we, as you know there has been an action taken by the state legislature, several state legislators, who referred our action, when it came to extending the evictions, referred it to the AG to see if we were in violation of state law. We have not had, well, I will let Mr. Huckelberry. Have we had a response, or we were supposed to respond, I think, by yesterday, was it not, to those allegations?

CH: Madam Chair, that is correct. I think Andy can probably fill in the details. The action of the Board on Tuesday at least mooted the complaint filed against the County by two legislators. We have forwarded, I think, that fact to the Attorney General and we will see what comes from that discussion. In the meantime, I believe the matter is back on the Board's discussion. I believe for the March

2nd meeting, of which we are trying to do a great deal of fact finding right now and to provide a more comprehensive report to the Board, so that the Board can consider whether to reinstate that action or take other actions.

SB: Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair, just to piggyback what Mr. Huckelberry stated, also in that discussion, at the Board Meeting, it was noted very strongly that all stakeholders on all sides of this issue would be brought to the table for discussion and input so that some resolution could be made comprehensively and collaboratively and fairly among all those that are affected by any kind of eviction situation. I think that was a very important step we took and I am hoping that Mayor and Council consider all elements of this issue, all people involved, be they landlords or renters. That this whole process affects both greatly and does need to have community wide input and discussion. Thank you for that update, Madam Chair.

SB: You are welcome and I believe Mr. Flagg had his hand raised. Did you have any comments, Mr. Flagg?

AF: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero, Members of the Council, I can just confirm what Mr. Huckelberry said. We did respond to the Attorney General that the moratorium had, for the time being, been rescinded and therefore, the investigation should be mooted out. I have not heard a response from the Attorney General, but I assume they will dismiss it.

SB: Thank you.

RR: And thank you for the update. Just to add to the rent and utility assistance and mortgage assistance that the City of Tucson, in its strategic plan for our CARES funds, we have used more than \$10 million, in terms of rent and utility assistance and mortgage assistance. That has helped more than 3,000 individuals and families in the City of Tucson and in all of our actions for the usage of CARES funds, the Mayor and Council decided to be inclusive of the City of South Tucson. All of our programs, including rent and utility assistance and mortgage assistance and all of the other programs that we created to help our community, the residents of the City of South Tucson were included in being able to use these programs. Mayor and Council also took steps to create a moratorium on our own City of Tucson owned housing and we have extended that moratorium to the end of March, for City of Tucson owned properties. Just wanted to add to that. It is unfortunate that Representative Leach really attacked the County for creating a humane policy to not see people leaving or being evicted from their homes and I am hoping that this coming \$1.9 trillion relief package introduced by President Biden can continue helping the City of Tucson, cities and counties throughout the United States and receive direct funding to continue helping families and individuals to keep shelter over their heads. Anyone on the Council that would like to contribute to this discussion?

MH: Madam Chair? Supervisor Heinz.

SB: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you and it is really good to be here. I hope we do these, not often, but regularly. On the topic of evictions, I think something that has come forward in the discussions that we have had during the last couple of Board Meetings and just as we have all been doing our own fact finding, is that in a substantial majority of these cases, the defendant, or the tenant, is not represented. When you have a judge or a court that is faced with a Plaintiff and no defense, or a Plaintiff and the Plaintiff's attorney, in this case a landowner or landlord and their attorneys or just their attorneys, and nobody on the side of the tenant, the result is pretty much a foregone conclusion. That, we, I believe, really need to fix, because a lot of this would stop or slow if those tenants were to have some mechanism to have some kind of legal defense or legal counsel to represent them in these proceedings, which is not currently required, of course. I think that is something we need to look at going forward. I appreciate that opportunity to do.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Mr. Huckelberry, do you have any comments?

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, the material I sent this morning said that that is one of the flaws in that there are some Justices of the Peace who spend some time with an individual in the eviction process and others that spend two minutes. So that needs some consistency. We will and have been contacting Legal Aid for some type of contractual assistance, as well as contact the U of A law school for intern law students providing some similar assistance. We are working on that because we do know it is one of the problems.

SB: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Any other comments by Board Members? Council Members? Mayor, do you want to move on to Business Restrictions?

RR: Yes, Chair Bronson.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, do you have any comments?

CH: I will be as brief as I can be. Things are getting better and when things get better, what that means is six weeks ago, and we distribute these dot maps, I think once a week to, I believe everyone. Six weeks ago, the weekly infection was 5,000. This last, most recent map, it is down to 1,060. That is an improvement. The trajectory is in the right direction and appears to be accelerating in the right direction. It is still above some of the thresholds that we set for talking about reopening and looking at reopening certain things. We are looking at that. We are monitoring that very, very carefully. Both Dr. Cullen and Dr. Garcia are doing that. We are cautiously optimistic that if things continue the way they are, we will begin to open up and lift some of the restrictions. Most of those will start with parks, reopening park facilities and

talking about organized sporting events and things of that nature. They will still have requirements. There will still be distance requirements. There will still be mask requirements, but we will talk about opening those things up, if the trend continues. That is very, very important to understand, the trend continuing. The daily infections have fluctuated widely. At this point, they are staying mostly in the 100 to 200 range per day whereas before they were ranging in 800 to 900 a day. I think our biggest concern is that the trend is real and that the variants, if they begin to appear, do not reverse that trend. That is all I have. I will let City Manager Ortega.

SB: Somebody was trying to talk.

AG: That is okay. I just wanted to know what the threshold would be for reopening. You mentioned 5,000 infections this week we are down about to 1,000. When might we start considering? Just because I have, I anticipate that will be a question.

SB: And I think the other thing we have not addressed, in terms of business, this was business restrictions, but as you mentioned already, Mr. Huckelberry, we are looking at our parks. I think that the other piece that we hear very often at Board Meetings from the public are schools and what is the County's role as we, if this trend is in the right direction, does the County have a role when it comes to prescribing what, when in-person learning can occur?

CH: Chair Bronson, and let me answer Supervisor Grijalva's question first. Either Dr. Cullen or Dr. Garcia can interrupt me if I am wrong, but I think it is the typical two week rolling average of infections dropping below 100 per 100,000. I think we are still over 200, at this point in time. Again, we recalculate that every day and roll the seven day average into it. When we start getting below 100, we get back into that green zone that we were talking about some time ago. We have got a ways to go but the trajectory, in other words, what we call the acceleration of how things are improving, is very good. But that does not mean it cannot be reversed fairly quickly. With regard to schools, what we have said is that it is frankly the school district's decision. We will continue to provide the best public health advice we can to the district, but it is really up to the individual school district board to make that decision. That is all we can say about it. The only thing that is a little concerning is that our more recent infections in schools have been with the high school activities that are athletic. Basketball.

AG: Supervisor Bronson, just to add to that, TUSD teachers are returning to school on the 22nd of March, is the current plan, and then, depending on the grade, students are starting either the 24th or 25th. 6 through 12 are hybrid and elementary K through 5 will be in person, full-time. Other school districts have already opened or are planning on it. Near future, Sunnyside and our neighboring districts in Pima County. Really the only restrictions that we have had thus far are in using County facilities for sport tournaments, that kind of stuff. That stuff has still been on hold. I agree with Mr. Huckelberry that the

concern is really our contact sports that are going on and that is where the infection is happening.

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you. We talked about schools and we talked about parks. We left out one very vulnerable community at risk and that is our business community that has been dealing with the series of restrictions on their operations since last year. As we all know, many are shuttered. Many people that work for these businesses are out of work. They are faced daily with trying to put food on their tables. I have had this discussion with my colleagues on the Board of Supervisors many times, so they are familiar with my feelings on this. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Mayor and the Council, particularly Her Honor, who has made it very clear that Tucson, the City of Tucson, is going to be a welcoming community to undocumented persons. That all are welcome and that every effort is going to be made to accommodate those folks who want to come here from other countries and that Tucson will be available to assist them and to accommodate them. My question is, given the amount of letters and emails and phone calls that I am getting from constituents, who are literally in tears and ridden with anxiety over the future of their investment, of their businesses, what do you folks. How do you respond [inaudible] they are dealing with all of these issues? On one side they are trying to comply with all of these restrictions that are crippling their business and then on the other side being a welcoming community to people who do not live here. I would just like to hear some direction on how I can respond when I am asked those kinds of questions.

MR: Madam Chair and Mayor, this is City Attorney Mike Rankin. I am not sure how this is a topic that is on the agenda for discussion.

SB: I was just headed in that direction. Thank you.

RR: On the business restriction side, the City of Tucson, in our strategic plan to use our CARES funds, small businesses are the ones that, really amongst many others, individuals. We have all gone through a very, very difficult time, but our small businesses, our small restaurants have really been devastated by the pandemic. In order to address the item on the agenda, which is business restrictions and business in general, the Mayor and Council allocated more than \$5 million in small business assistance grants. Again, small businesses throughout the City of Tucson received and were recipients of small business assistance grants for their survival. We understand that restrictions to small businesses really devastated our community businesses and so we have to continue advocating. I understand that the new \$1.9 trillion Biden Administration rescue package will have, again, funds directly through PPP for small businesses. They will have funding for grants and we are hoping that they also have, that the federal government has, direct funding for counties

and cities, just like the CRS package did. Because of those types of packages, we can allocate, as a city, as a county, direct assistance to our small businesses. My question is, Mr. Huckelberry, is, what are the current restrictions still in place for small businesses, specifically restaurants, in Pima County?

CH: Chair Bronson and Mayor Romero, those are all still in place. They were put in place by governor's executive order. They were not put in place by the County or the City and they remain in effect, as far as I know. They are limiting occupancy to 50% and with a series of other restrictions. All of the governor's executive orders remain in place.

RR: Okay. Chair Bronson or any of my colleagues on the Council have any questions or comments?

PC: Yes, Your Honor. I just want to make a point that, on multiple levels, the bottom line here is that we, everyone in here knows that the restaurants and people who work in the restaurant industry were probably the most significantly hit. We talked about this a month ago. We have been really active in the City, in trying to provide that relief and hopefully, long term, be able to either restart or re-kick in some of those businesses so they can be rejuvenated after we come out of this. The reality stands clear that, again, from what I remember, we had a briefing back in June, or it could have been in August, in which we were seeing that was where the at-risk, that was where the majority of the at-risk was that late night (inaudible) I think we have done our best in trying to be coordinated. I do not know what the other piece of discussion has anything to do with this discussion. Again, what I just want to tell you is that we were anticipating a 15 to 20% drop in business activity through the pandemic. Tucson in-city limit sales tax revenues are only down 4%. The hit, from a business activity standpoint, while significant, has not been what we anticipated. As we move forward and we see those numbers go down, which, I am an optimist too. I think that we will see the numbers we need to open parks and open schools and open everything else over the next three to six months, but we have to be cautious in doing it. We do not want to be, we do not want that backlash. I think everybody on this, on both boards are on the same page on that one. Again, rather than try to pinpoint some philosophical positions that have nothing to do with the discussion, I just ask everyone that we focus on what is at hand and not as how we open, what our long term COVID planning pre- and post-pandemic is.

MH: Madam Chair? Supervisor Heinz.

SB: Supervisor Heinz. Proceed.

MH: Thank you. I have two things. Really quickly, if Mr. Huckelberry could just let everybody know the estimated number of teachers we are working toward vaccinating at this point. I know they started, obviously, a bit more recently but the, how many teachers, approximately, we have been able to vaccinate, at

least with one dose, at this point. I think that would be just a helpful piece of information for the public. Then I had one other comment specific to business restrictions.

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, did you have a comment? Do you have that information at the moment or want to provide it later?

CH: Chair Bronson, we will provide it later, but let me give you what we think we know and that is 25,000 teachers, plus. Probably a majority of them have had one dose. We do not know how many have had two doses. We can try and sort that information out. I think the other point is on business restrictions. The business industry that has been hit the hardest, has been the tourism industry.

SB: Right, and I do not know if Mr. Ortega wants to comment, but with the lack of the gem and mineral show, I am sure there has been some impact on city funds, sales taxes, etc.

MO: Thank you. Chair Bronson and Members of the Council and the Board, absolutely. We are very concerned about that. There is a movement to have a scaled back version of the gem show later in the calendar year. We are hopeful that we will see some recovery of that. As Council Member Cunningham mentioned, we are seeing a reduction in our overall sales tax. It has not been quite as much as we had originally projected, but it still is a decrease. Mayor, if you do not mind, I just also wanted to cover one piece that is, I think, important for the Council and the Board to know with regard to our parks. We are working closely with our partners at the County to make sure we will lock step on that. Initially, I know Vice Mayor Lee had some concerns about, maybe, the differences between a county park and a city park. We are working very closely to make sure that the opportunities for residents, whether they are unincorporated Pima County or in the incorporated areas are similar or the same with regard to our parks, including activities which are the sporting events that have already been mentioned, as well as just how we organize these larger opportunities going forward. That is all, Madam Chair and Madam Mayor.

SB: Thank you, Mr. Ortega. Supervisor Heinz, did you have another question?

MH: Yes, thank you very much. I was just going to say that. With regard to business restrictions, in meeting with, multiple members actually, of the Tucson Metro Chamber and a variety of individual and business groups in the past several weeks, something that I have learned with regards to, we are all in this together. We are all in the same community. I know that these business owners understand the public health predicament and want to be helpful. I think some of the things that I have heard from the community is that communication has to be, communication is essential so that (inaudible) they have the information about (inaudible) what is going on, what exactly the restrictions are and why. Fairness and equity in any mitigation efforts. Obviously, if one place is being required to have masks and another is not,

that would make no sense and not be fair. Something that I thought was, that initially I found was really surprising, but makes quite a bit of sense to me now. If we need to have additional mitigation efforts, stricter ones such as looking at stay at home orders or that kind of thing, if we see, or when we see, the UK variant, for example, spread to Pima County. It already is in Arizona. Implement any such further mitigation efforts in a way that these businesses can take advantage of available federal funding. Meaning, do not decrease capacities allowed to be inside of a restaurant or apply a curfew, for example, but shut it down. Because then, they can apply for considerable number of federal dollars to continue to keep their folks on payroll, whereas the other way you are kind of just basically forcing them to bleed money out week after week after week. I thought that was a really interesting perspective that I certainly had been, heard their point of view on that.

SB: Thank you. Any other questions, because we are running short on time.

SK: I will be real brief. I will be real brief.

SB: Council Member Kozachik.

SK: To Supervisor Heinz' point, that is why a state-wide mandate on the masks would be helpful. The consistency issue that you bring up. I will remind, piggybacking on what Administrator Huckelberry said with respect to that we are under the executive order of the Governor. That executive order was implemented when the numbers were substantially lower than what they are now. So again, back to context. As far as the City of Tucson's actions are concerned, we also implemented extension of premises options for restaurants, so if you go into the downtown core right now you will see a lot of outdoor seating and they are very appreciative of that. I would like to, at this point, thank Jan Leshner and the County for helping out with downtown businesses and also the 4th Avenue businesses. Through your efforts nearly a million dollars of CARES money has been allocated to small local businesses, just in that region, that have really kept doors open. I am very grateful for your help on those, that effort.

SB: Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair? One quick statement.

SB: Real quickly, because we have got to move on to the next item.

SC: I understand and I also understand that part of my question was ruled out of order, so I will omit that. I am very pleased to hear that the Council and the Mayor are working for businesses and trying to aid them, but I have to point out that, in this meeting, the Mayor and Council just passed a resolution to join in an amicus with the County on reinstating curfews. Hardly a business friendly gesture. Also, the City and Mayor have been very forceful in the use of masks. Making employees be mask police to their businesses. Hardly a business

friendly gesture. I needed to point those out and I thank you for allowing me to do so. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Thank you and we are going to move on now to the final item and that is Federal Funds Appropriated to the State of Arizona and Local Jurisdictions. I will turn it over to Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero and Members of Council, I will be brief. This continues to be a struggle. We expended fully our \$87.1 million of CARES Act money as of December 31st. All of our activities associated with either vaccination or testing has been borne completely by the County without any real assurances of reimbursement. We have made some efforts at trying to get the State to release the vaccination money. It was \$66 million to the State provided by the consolidated budget act. We have been told that we will receive \$7.1 million. We have not seen it yet. Our accelerated vaccination plan that we provided to the State, which we then updated with the disadvantaged component, costs in implementation about \$14 million to as much as \$21 million, depending upon how long you have to go in the vaccination process. Primarily, how long you have to go in the vaccination process depends entirely on vaccine supply. As you can see, we are facing a deficit in the area of vaccinations, something we are prepared to, I believe, bear if necessary. In the area of testing, we have already talked about that. How much has been spent. What the obligations are. We know there is a little bit of relief coming from the State, but the way in which it is distributed amplifies the fact the State does not know what is occurring on the ground in each county. I think we have also made some pleas to our congressional delegation to get involved and to actually help allocate some of those funds or get them broken loose. Whatever happens in a third relief bill, is that cities and counties need a direct appropriation very similar to the first Coronavirus relief act and those should be made directly to any county or city that has a population of over 500,000. In particular, for counties that provide solely for the public health benefit of the entire county, again for populations over 500,000. That model would fit throughout the country and we are hopeful that that gets accomplished. Let me turn it back over to City Manager Ortega for a brief update and then we can answer questions if you have any.

MO: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Mayor and Council and Members of the Board of Supervisors and Chair Bronson, much like you all, we had \$95 million in Coronavirus relief moneys, most of which was expended by the end of the calendar year. We did hold back a small amount, as I mentioned earlier, for testing to get us through the end of this month. Those dollars were used for business assistance, for rental assistance and all of the items that have been mentioned previously. In addition, as I mentioned earlier under the eviction item, we did receive just over \$16 million in rental assistance and it is rent and utility assistance. We are working with our partner at the Community Investment Corp. to get those dollars out again, the idea is to provide money for folks that are in arrears on their rent and/or utilities and provide them three months of rent and utility assistance going forward. One thing that I know

Administrator Huckelberry and I have been very frustrated over is the lack of reimbursement from FEMA. That has been very, very difficult for both of us. I think that if there were messaging it would be great for the Feds to understand when there is an announcement made about FEMA funding, it is great and wonderful, but when it comes to actually receiving reimbursement, it has been non-existent. The bureaucracy that is assigned to that at the either state or federal level has made it very, very difficult. We have yet to see dollars come back to us that were submitted last year. I think it is a shame when you hear a lot of public conversation about it. Unfortunately, those dollars do not come back to our community. With that, Madam Chair and Madam Mayor, happy to answer questions.

RR: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry and Mr. Ortega. If you provide me a moment, Madam Chair, I just wanted to thank our federal partners, our congressional delegation. The senators, both Senator Sinema and Senator Kelly, have been helping the City of Tucson and I am pretty sure Pima County, navigate the conversation on the previous packages, relief packages, and then the one that is currently on the table brought by President Biden. I did want to thank our Southern Arizona congressional delegation, Congressman Grijalva, Congressman Kirkpatrick, for their assistance, their help and their listening to me as the Mayor of the City of Tucson in advocating for direct funding with the first package. And then with the second package, I know that the State of Arizona received direct federal funds specifically for vaccination and testing and that in order for the residents of Pima County, who are also City of Tucson residents, we need to make sure that we continue working with our state legislature, our delegation from Southern Arizona to the state legislature. I know I have made some calls myself to be able to advocate for those testing and vaccination funds that came to the State specifically for testing and vaccination that they get here to Pima County and the City of Tucson. Chuck shared a letter that was signed back on January 29th on behalf of Mayors here in Pima County and Chair Bronson requesting from the Governor our fair share of the \$460 million received by the State, from the federal government, for COVID-19 testing and vaccination. I wanted to reiterate to Pima County, because we, the City of Tucson, and its residents, we are also putting money on the table to help with vaccination and testing, that we continue advocating to the Governor that Pima County and the City of Tucson receive those funds. I just wanted to open up with that, with our partnership with the federal government. I also wanted to mention that President Robbins sent a letter to the Council and the Board of Supervisors just thanking us and congratulating for the historic meeting that we are having. That they want to make sure that the University of Arizona is part of the effort and that the three jurisdictions work in partnership to make sure that vaccinations are fairly and equitably distributed to all residents of Tucson and Pima County. So I just, we will forward that letter to the Board of Supervisors.

SB: We have received it and I have asked the Clerk to add it to the public record for today's meeting.

RR: Thank you, Madam Chair.

RF: Madam Mayor and Madam Bronson, Chairman Bronson, I have one question, Madam.

RR: Go ahead Council Member.

RF: Through a new federal effort, Walgreens and CVS will be offered, will be offering COVID-19 shots. The question raised by the community was over administrative fees. Can we explain how Walgreens and CVS would administer the shots and people would not be charged for the shot or charged an administrative fee either?

SB: Can someone answer?

CH: Francisco, go ahead.

FG: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, Mayor Romero, Members of the Council, Councilman Fimbres. The, to be clear, when you go get a vaccine, when you get any of these COVID vaccines, you are frequently asked for your insurance information and the, whoever provided that vaccine, whether it is Banner, TMC or in this case, the pharmacy, retail pharmacies, will absolutely take the opportunity to send a bill out to your insurer. Please be assured that individuals should not be getting individual bills at that time of service or any time thereafter. That is, that has been the case since the whole process started. It is important for those, for the pharmacy, for Banner, for the clinic, to recover some of the costs for actually putting the shot in your arm, but that is invisible to the patient. That will be visible to the patient's insurance. So that is the clarification I believe you wanted.

RF: And for the uninsured people, Dr. Garcia?

FG: The federal government eats the cost.

SB: Does that answer your question, Council Member?

RF: Yes, but if I could get something to relay to the groups that have been bringing this up, the neighborhood associations and several of the diversity groups that have brought this question to us, because they have seen it on TV and they say, "We are getting a free product and then they are going to make money and people that are on social security making \$750.00 or less a month, they cannot afford this."

SB: I think we can have our Health Department prepare some, an information sheet that you would be able to find helpful when your constituents contact you.

RF: Thank you, Chair.

MH: Chair Bronson?

SB: Alright. Well, we are, we have got two minutes left. Any comments from anyone? You want to make some closing remarks, Mayor or, what is your pleasure?

RR: Chair, I think I heard Dr. or Supervisor or should I call him Dr. Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. Just a couple, and this might be for Mr. Huckelberry or possibly for Andy Flagg. With regard to the federal funds approved in the second aid package for local governments for testing, the \$416 million that has been at the State for possibly as long as five weeks now, are, has the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services been notified, the CDC specifically? These funds were sent to the State to be distributed to the local health authority doing the testing. I would think that if the Congress earmarks things in that way that it would be a problem if the State does not actually deliver on it and not in a year and a half, but when it is actually needed, right now. So, I guess, what, have we discussed that, A? Other legal options? Complaints to the District Attorney, I do not know. Then two other very quick things. We heard that the governor talked about a \$600 million tax cut in the State of the State. The \$300 million that does not seem to be going to the Counties, they cannot just use that, right? For the, I hope. I would think not. Just please reaffirm that for me. Lastly, I know this is about the federal funds, but if Mr. Huckelberry, the County, the City, if we can all advocate and do our best to get direct delivery of not only dollars, but doses. I want the County to receive funds for vaccine distribution and for testing and also the vaccines to distribute so we can cut through all this garbage and get this job done for everyone.

SB: Thank you. It is noon now. Mr. Huckelberry or Mr. Ortega, do you have any quick comments before we adjourn this meeting?

CH: Chair Bronson, I believe the, myself and the City Manager have taken that as general direction to draft a letter to the Secretary of HHS explaining the dilemma we are under with regard to lack of funding being disbursed through federal agencies to the State and not receiving the front line folks who are actually doing the work. We will draft the letter essentially for that on behalf of the Board and the Council.

SB: Thank you.

SK: Chair, may I make a real quick point? Based on, piggybacking on what Matt just said, what are the terms of the federal funds going to the State? There must be terms and conditions that the State receiving them has to distribute them through. We are coming as a suppliant. They were given a gift, essentially. A gift that is supposed to be distributed to the people who are doing the work on the ground, which is the people on this call. We should not have to come hat in hand to Governor Ducey saying, "Hey, you got \$416 million. We need a piece of that." What were the terms and conditions from those dollars

arrived in Phoenix? Again, with respect to Matt's question, what legal options do we have immediately to say, "Send us the check?"

RR: Council Member Kozachik, I understand that those funds sent by the federal government were sent to the State and they were assigned for testing and vaccinations. Yet the Governor has chosen to either keep those funds and not use them and not distributing to counties, towns and cities that are spending money for testing and vaccinations. What we could do, we have already sent a letter on behalf of town mayors and myself and the Chair to request those funds. We can continue working with our congressional delegation as Chair Bronson said. Senator Kelly is going to hopefully advocate for Pima County and the City of Tucson to receive those funds so that we can continue providing the services for the benefit and the health of our community. I agree with Supervisor Heinz that we need to make a note to our congressional delegation of being able to receive direct funds, both city and county, and not just funds, but the amount of vaccines that is fair for us to distribute in our community. I just want to make sure that we are fair in terms of keeping you on time and...

SB: Quickly, it looks like Mr. Rankin has his hand up, if you are not aware of that, Mayor.

RR: (inaudible) Go ahead, Mr. Rankin.

PC: You are muted.

MR: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Madam Chair. I am confident that the letter the County Administrator just referenced will, in fact, cite those terms and conditions for the appropriations of the federal funds to the State. And to the extent the County Administrator and City Manager need help with citation to those terms and conditions, I am confident Mr. Flagg and I will be able to assist in that. Thank you.

AG: Supervisor Bronson? Really quickly.

SB: Yes.

AG: ADHS they just sent out a press release that they are making \$100 million immediately available for testing. So Pima County's share would be \$14.36 million. What I would. what I just. It just came up so I thought I would share that. I did want to make sure that while we have all of us at the table, that we create some sort of very easy flyer for our non-profit organizations and others to download and have a printout of all of the services that are available related to COVID-19 for everybody. Where the testing sites are going to be and then we periodically update that and have it on both of our websites. Put both of our logos out there so everybody knows. Because I did not know that we were still, that the City of Tucson was still sponsoring testing at El Pueblo Neighborhood Center. I did not know that. I just think that it is, and I am reading this

information and I do think that we have to partner in a better way to make sure that our communities know where everything is located. That it is all really easy. Front and back little flyer for rental assistance, utility, food boxes, any services that are related to COVID, the pandemic and the recovery. Thank you very much, all of you, for being here it really, I think, was a really good meeting.

SB: I concur and I think our staff now have direction to put such an information packet together. It is now 12:06 p.m. and I again want to thank everybody who joined us today, and especially our Health Department and the City of Tucson for what they are doing on evictions and housing. Mayor, if you have a few more words, please proceed and then we can adjourn the meeting.

RR: Thank you, Chair Bronson. I really appreciate my colleagues on the Council, my colleagues on the Board of Supervisors and Administrator Huckelberry and our City Manager, Mr. Ortega, for helping us coordinate the logistics and information sharing for this meeting. Chair, appreciate you, being able to coordinate with you. I will be pitching to my colleagues on the Council as well as the Board of Supervisors that we start thinking about the next meeting, next joint meeting. I think it is very beneficial. Hopefully by the end of the year we can have another one to touch base and even though we are not meeting publically jointly, I want to make sure that the community knows that, on my behalf, and I know my colleagues on the Council, that we are at the ready and willing to further the relationship, the partnership, with Pima County government and its elected officials. Right now, we, now more than ever, we have to make sure that we are joining forces as much as we possibly can to fight our common enemy, which is COVID-19. Thank you, Chair. I really appreciate your time and I am looking forward to the fruits of the labor of this meeting, pretty quickly, especially with that letter, by, that work by Mr. Ortega and Mr. Huckelberry. Thank you all so much and have a wonderful weekend.

SB: Alright. Supervisor Scott, did you wish to say something? You are on the screen now.

RS: Madam Chair, I just wanted to ask, are the Members of the Board supposed to stay on the call after the adjournment of the joint meeting to talk about the possible suspension of COVID testing that we got a memorandum on yesterday?

SB: Mr. Huckelberry, did you want to respond to Supervisor Scott's question? I do not think we need to stay on at this point, but I will defer to Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, we are going to take the State's press release at its face value that we will receive at least \$14.3 million and that will fund us for testing up to and through March the 2nd, so we will revisit this matter at the Board meeting of March the 2nd.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry.

SB: Does that answer your question?

RS: It does. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Okay. If there are no further questions, then without objections, this meeting stands adjourned. Mayor, you join me in adjourning, is that correct, just for the record?

RR: Yes, for the record, this joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and Council is adjourned.

SB: Thank you all.

RR: Thank you all.

TCC: Tucson Convention Center
TMC: Tucson Medical Center
POD: Point of Distribution
UofA: University of Arizona
ASU: Arizona State University
CIC: Community Investment Corp
CRF: Coronavirus Relief Fund
AMI: Area Median Income
AG: Attorney General
PPP: Paycheck Protection Program
HHS: Health and Human Services
ADHS: Arizona Department of Health Services