

## **FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES**

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 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 at 9:04 a.m.

### **1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE**

United States Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service, to provide for the Emergency Watershed Protection Project - Pima Wash installation of a berm and riprap chute, \$53,718.75/\$17,906.25 Flood Control Tax Levy Fund match (GTAW 21-88)

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

Supervisor Scott commented that this request was a result of the Bighorn Fire and inquired whether similar protections were being applied to other waterways.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that because of the light rains damages to other waterways were minimal.

Supervisor Scott remarked that the preponderance of Buffelgrass had fueled the fire and requested that a future presentation be made to the Board on the efforts being made to manage Buffelgrass by local, state and federal jurisdictions.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 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 at 9:04 a.m.

### 1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Institute of Museum and Library Services, to provide for the Writers in Residence in Libraries Program, \$4,800.00 (GTAW 21-103)

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Bronson 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 1:20 p.m.

---

CHAIR

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, February 16, 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 at 9:04 a.m.

### **1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Chair Bronson recognized Mary Jo Furphy, Procurement Director, for her award winning leadership and her 16 years of service to Pima County. She congratulated her on her retirement.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, also expressed his appreciation to Ms. Furphy and remarked on her many achievements.

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The Clerk of the Board read a submitted public comment and the statement was added to the record.

### **4. CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 9:07 a.m.

### **5. RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 9:34 a.m. All members were present.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

6. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding settlement of a property tax appeal concerning centrally assessed property in Southwest Gas Corporation v. Arizona Department of Revenue, et al., Arizona Tax Court Case No. TX2020-001122.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that under the terms of the proposed settlement the difference between the noticed value and the settlement value would result in an estimated reduction of \$465,569.51 in Pima County primary property taxes. He indicated that the County Attorney's Office recommended approval.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to accept the County Attorney's recommendation and approve the settlement.

7. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a complaint under A.R.S. §41-194.01 submitted to the Arizona Attorney General February 9, 2021, regarding Pima County's eviction moratorium adopted February 2, 2021.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the County Attorney's Office sought direction on whether to provide a written response.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to defer Board direction to the County Attorney until after reconsideration of Minute Item No. 26.

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

8. **Early Childhood Program Scholarships**

Discussion/Action. A measure directing the County Administrator and County staff to include \$10 million in the Pima County budget for Fiscal Year 2021-22 to fund scholarships to wholly or partly cover the cost incurred by parents who wish to enroll their three- or four-year-old child in a high-quality early childhood program. Eligible children will come from families whose income is under 200% of the federal poverty level. These scholarships would be payable only to high-quality early childhood education programs such as those run by public school districts, childcare centers and family home care providers. (District 1)

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

Chair Bronson expressed concern indicating that there was no denying that Early Childhood Education was needed in our State. She stated that the State's failure to address educational needs was even greater in our own community due to our workforce distribution. She indicated that there was a void which was entirely the responsibility of the State and not the responsibility of local jurisdictions. She stated that there was a need for committed leadership in our State, otherwise jurisdictions were left to fix the problems. She indicated that she understood that the County was willing and committed to playing a role in early childhood education, but partners were needed in this effort. She reiterated that education and education support was not the responsibility of the County. She added that this was not a preexisting administrative infrastructure within the County, nor did the County have the expertise to address this matter. She indicated that she supported this endeavor if there was support from local jurisdictions, and the private sector, to collectively play a proportionate role, financially and politically, to make this an effective and constructive endeavor. She stated that if the County was to involve itself in Early Childhood Education, then they must not engage in ill-conceived cap measures. She added that a full commitment from everyone in the community was needed. She stated that without a full commitment from other municipalities and the private sector, it was too early to act on this commitment. She indicated that the County had to actively engage all members of the community in this conversation, and until then she was not willing to approve \$10 million, especially with a decreased fund balance. She stated that this was another example of costs being shifted from the State to County. She indicated that the County's mandated responsibilities, listed in the State constitution, did not include education. She indicated that the County should be moving forward with an emphasis on mandated responsibilities which included restoring the economy, commitment to public infrastructure and to justice and law enforcement. She stated that the County was recovering from COVID, which had impacted the fund balance, and the County's budgetary priorities should be placed on dealing with infrastructure, and the economy.

Supervisor Scott read the following prepared statement:

"Back in June of 2019, the Editorial Page Editor of the Arizona Daily Star, Sarah Garrecht Gassen, said that 'The more 3- and 4-year-olds who can attend high-quality preschool, the better, more stable and more prosperous their future and their communities' futures will be.' That same year, Nicole Fyffe, who is an Executive Assistant to our County Administrator, wrote in a report to the Board that, quote, 'Research shows that children who attend preschool are better prepared for kindergarten, and with continued supportive education these benefits may result in positive longer term outcomes for those children, their parents, employers and taxpayers. This is particularly the case for economically disadvantaged, minority and dual language children attending high quality preschool.' That same year, 2019, there was a guest opinion in the Arizona Daily Star written by Dr. John Petticone who has been the Superintendent of both Flowing Wells and the Tucson Unified School Districts. Dr. Petticone said, quote, 'We have an obligation to make our voices heard. Standing on the sidelines makes us

complicit. We must demand that those we elect to office focus on meeting challenges with a plan to solve the critical problems that confront our community, not make excuses for why they cannot. We must demand that they have the courage to demonstrate their regard for the long-term welfare of the citizens they are entrusted to represent. Anything less is unacceptable.' Two years ago, we began a conversation in Pima County about the need for all our children, regardless of family income, to enjoy the benefits of quality early childhood education. Then, as now, the facts are clear as to how our children and our community will benefit if we do what is needed to make this precious opportunity available to each one of our children. Ample research on brain development, kindergarten readiness and academic success and later grades attest to the importance of every child being able to take advantage of this foundational experience. We also know that our entire community will enjoy a myriad of benefits if every child who wants to can enroll in preschool. Low-income families often struggle with the costs of early learning, which can exceed \$800 a month per child. Business leaders know that investment in a robust educational system that begins with quality early childhood education will result in a better-trained workforce and a more attractive economic climate. Any teacher in our primary grades will tell you that they can see the differences between the students who have enjoyed these benefits and those who have not. The key difference between now and two years ago is that now we are immersed in the worst global health crisis of our times. Those in our community who work hard to address their basic needs, even in better times, have been affected the most. Their challenges will continue as we emerge from this pandemic and recover from it. We have a solemn duty and an exciting opportunity to make their lives and those of their children more hopeful and promising by taking bold action. This measure represents a vital first step, but there will be so much more important work to do moving forward. The funds we will authorize for next year's budget will only be able to help approximately 1,000 kids. There are over 25,000, 3 and 4-year-old children in Pima County and only 20% of them are currently enrolled in quality early childhood education. If we want to meet the necessary goal of all children having access to this benefit, we will need to commit many more resources to this cause and we must include more than Pima County government. Pima County, however, must take the first step because every one of these children is one of our citizens, but we cannot be the only ones on this journey. Cities, towns and school districts must be steadfast and contributing partners. Business groups as well as those in the charitable and service sectors must also commit to join us in every way they can. All people who can speak to the evidence of the benefits of quality early childhood education must rebut critics and reach out to the skeptics. The key lesson from other cities and counties around our country that have cultivated this opportunity for their children is that the efforts to do so must be collaborative and multifaceted. The measure we consider today merely directs that money for quality early childhood education scholarships be included in the budget for the next fiscal year, which begins in July. There

are still decisions that will need to be made about how to get these funds to the children who need them the most. Working with County staff, the early learning centers and the many people in our community who have long advocated for this need, those logistical details will be discussed and addressed. We will also work together to determine how to achieve the goal of enrolling every child in a quality early childhood education program if that is what their families want for them. There has been a great deal of well-meaning dialogue in our community about quality early childhood education in recent years, but it is now time to act, to walk our talk. When something is so obviously needed and can do so much good, how can we fail to take necessary action? We cannot wait for others to lead. It is our time. It is our task to bring our children, to bring our community together on behalf of all our children. As Dr. Petticone said two years ago, anything less is unacceptable.”

Chair Bronson commented that her sentiments were aligned with Supervisor Scott’s statement; however, she was looking at this from a fiscal perspective.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she supported any initiative that would direct funds to the most vulnerable. She proposed the following: that the age limit be changed from 3- to 4-years olds to 3- to 5-year olds. She indicated that she agreed that this was the State’s responsibility, but Pima County should have a role. She emphasized that the County had roles in law enforcement, economic development, safety and health, and that preschool affected not only the child in those programs, but entire families. She stated that education was a gateway that opened up opportunities out of poverty. She stated that this was an opportunity for the County to make fundamental changes and to provide support that the State had negated. She indicated that several school districts were responsible for paying some portion of the costs since the State failed to pay. She stated that this failure left the County with problems that they were trying to solve, but it was not their responsibility, but could arguably be their responsibility. She indicated that the County had some mechanisms available to provide support, like outside agencies that were already set up through nonprofit organizations. She stated that providing scholarships should be explored and they should include a fixed amount or full tuition and take into consideration working families that required 7 am to 7 pm accessibility. She indicated that this request would be for the Board to direct the County Administrator to set aside \$10 million, within the Budget, for the development of a detailed and robust program in partnership with other municipalities, and nonprofits. She added that there was a community need and the County was well-positioned to take that lead. She indicated that she would like to see funds directed to unified systems that had the capacity, but she was not opposed to other child care centers and family home providers, provided that they could show that they were quality preschool programs. She added that she was supportive of the initiative because it tied directly into the County’s responsibilities, which included economic development, safety, and crime prevention.



Chair Bronson reiterated that the responsibility was with the school districts and not the County. She indicated that one of the challenges, previously discussed, was that the Early Childhood Education centers benefiting from these programs would ultimately make the determination of who would be accepted into the program, which could be a direct conflict of interest. She stated that another challenge was that these programs were not located in areas with the greatest needs and rural areas were left out of the equation. She indicated that as she understood the motion, it would be to include this as part of the budget and she asked whether a majority of the Board would support attaching a fiscal note that would address how the County would pay for this allocation. She commented that the County did not have the infrastructure, transparency or accountability spelled out in the language provided, and whether this would require additional property taxes. She stated that a fiscal note was necessary so that taxpayers were aware of the impact.

Supervisor Christy agreed that pre-kindergarten childhood education was not a function within Pima County's responsibilities. He indicated that the County was not in a position to properly administer this problem and that \$10 million was too high a price to experiment on whether the County could administer this program. He indicated that he had concern about the money being dispersed properly for the manner it was prescribed. He added that the funding should be provided from the State, as it was the State of Arizona's responsibility. He questioned the nebulous statement "high quality" contained in the agenda item and asked who would determine what was high quality, what high quality was and what was the cost of high quality. He stated that these were significant questions that needed to be answered before allocating \$10 million. He indicated that there were new concerns to be considered, such as a pandemic economy, a \$50 million budget shortfall and a general fund shortage. He asked how the Board could justify allocating \$10 million toward pre-k education when businesses were closing, employees were being laid off, roads were deteriorating, Sheriff deputies' raises were being impacted and individuals were facing hardships. He stated that \$10 million could help relieve some of those issues. He referenced an April 23, 2019, memorandum from the County Administrator, which estimated that an annual investment of over \$100 million was required to ensure low-income 3 and 4-year-olds received early childhood education. He questioned whether \$10 million would be adequate to start such a program, and expressed doubt that it would cover curriculum costs. He stated that the memo also referred to an initiative attempted by the City of Tucson to earmark sales taxes, however that initiative failed by a vote of 65% to 35%. He referenced an additional option stated in the memo that alluded to the entire program being funded through the County's primary property tax rate. He asked again, how could the Board justify this when constituents are on fixed incomes and scrambling to pay their property taxes. He stated that the County Administrator had concluded his memo by stating that the execution of the funding concepts was flawed, and was a shared responsibility by the State, school districts, the County and others, which meant that it was not a function of Pima County. He asked the County Administrator what changes had occurred between the April 23, 2019 estimations, and the present agenda item.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that earlier discussions, by advocates, were to cover all 3-, 4- and 5-year-olds in Pima County, not just those below the 200% poverty level. He stated that this was a dramatic scaled difference. He indicated that staff's position was to take policy direction from the Board and determine how to implement or provide the Board with options regarding implementation. He stated that the basic goal of this agenda item, was for the Board to provide directions and then for staff to come back with recommendations to the Board on how to proceed. He indicated that it would ultimately be up to the Board to further refine that work and come up with a policy position. He stated that the County's budget position would not be known until adoption of the tentative budget and until tax rates were set. He added that there was time for staff to provide all of the alternatives. He indicated that staff would handle this as a Board policy objective and include it with other Board policy initiatives, such as responses to the pandemic. He stated that funding discussion would depend on the amount of reimbursement received from the federal or state government as it related to pandemic relief. He added that if the Board's direction was to pursue this policy, staff would begin looking at options and talking to partners. He added that these discussions would be key in making a decision on how to proceed.

Supervisor Christy indicated that the County Administrator's recommendation in April of 2019, was to not recommend funding. He asked what had changed since that recommendation.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that his recommendation was based on a specific set of facts that occurred in April of 2019. He added that those facts had changed and the Board's policy had changed. He stated that staff would examine alternatives.

Supervisor Christy indicated that he would not be supporting this item and he encouraged Board members to review staff reports before approving this item. He inquired of Supervisor Grijalva, whether she felt there was a potential conflict of interest based on her position as the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) Board Chair and her current leadership role on the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Grijalva responded that she was not the Chair of the TUSD Board. She asked that the County Attorney provide a response to whether there was a conflict.

Andrew Flagg, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that conflict of interest statutes' focus on financial conflicts; and there was no financial interest in Supervisor Grijalva's position on the TUSD Board.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether conflicts were segregated to financial conflicts only. He asked whether there were policy or directional conflicts?

Mr. Flagg responded that there was no reference in the conflict of interest statutes that applied.

Supervisor Heinz commented that this request was in line with other County antipoverty programs. He stated that investing in Early Childhood Education was an investment into the local economy and an important economic priority. He indicated that the County could not do this alone, but it was important for the County to step up and lead. He indicated that the possibilities of funding this annually was not likely, but experiences through the pandemic had presented the County with possibilities, an example being reduction in jail populations. He stated that reducing the jail populations addressed a public health crisis and reduced the budget. He added that private partners could be encouraged to participate.

Supervisor Scott accepted Supervisor Grijalva's friendly amendment to extend the age limit to 3-, 4- and 5-year-olds.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that she concurred with the County Administrator's recommendation that this item be considered direction from the Board and that Administration be tasked with providing a proposal to the Board. She asked for clarification on whether Supervisor Scott's motion was to direct Administration to budget \$10 million for Early Childhood Education and provide the Board with an implementation plan.

Mr. Huckelberry indicated that his understanding was that this would be direction from the Board for staff to develop the framework on how to implement the policy objectives of the Board. He indicated that there were uncertainties related to the budget due to COVID relief and COVID relief funding but staff could incorporate the Board's direction into the budget.

Supervisor Scott recognized that education was fundamentally the responsibility of the State, but indicated that there were cities and counties who had taken on the responsibility of preschool education. He added that the County was not setting an outlandish precedent. He indicated that the County had waited decades for the State of Arizona to take responsibility and the County could not wait for them to fund pre-k education. He recognized that the County was dealing with a significant financial challenge, with regard to the pandemic, but he reminded the Board that this commitment would not be undertaken until next fiscal year. He stated that based on information from Washington, the next COVID relief bill should provide relief to state and local governments before the next fiscal year.

Chair Bronson stated that her understanding was that this was policy direction only and was not a guarantee that it would be adopted at the time of final budget adoption, but would be included as part of the budget submitted by the County Administrator for the Board's consideration.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the Board was directing the County Administrator and his staff to include this funding within the budget for next fiscal year for the purposes that were described in the measure. He reiterated that the logistical details about how funds would be made available still needed to be determined.

Chair Bronson inquired whether this was to be part of the budget adopted in May.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the measure stated “a measure directing the County Administrator and County staff to include \$10 million in the Pima County budget for fiscal year 2021-2022.”

Chair Bronson inquired whether today’s vote was a recommendation that this allocation be included in the budget for discussion and approval by the Board in May.

Supervisor Scott responded that final approval would be determined when the Board adopted the budget allocating funding, but at this point the Administrator was being directed to include the allocation within the budget for the purpose presented.

Supervisor Christy asked that the motion be clarified. He inquired whether \$10 million would be dedicated to pre-k in the upcoming budget.

Supervisor Scott indicated that the Board was directing the County Administrator to include that allocation in next year’s fiscal budget for that purpose.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether General funds would be allocated and dedicated to pre-k.

Supervisor Scott responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Heinz asked what the total reduction was in financial obligations as it related to decreased jail population.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that the Sheriff’s Department would have a surplus of \$1 to \$2 million. He stated that the biggest reduction would be in overtime, because there would be less of a demand on Correction Offices. He indicated that ultimately the Board would have the final decision on how monies would be allocated at the time of final budget adoption.

Supervisor Heinz commented that it made sense to invest in our children now, instead of investing in their incarceration later.

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

9. **Pima Association of Governments Transportation Improvement Plan**

Discussion/Action regarding the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) 2022-2026 Transportation Improvement Plan regarding allocation of unprogrammed regional transportation funding. Propose that the Board considers and approve one of two options in the form of letters to send to the PAG Executive Director. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott provided staff direction that the Board be provided a comprehensive update on the Regional Transportation Authority's (RTA) projects.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that a comprehensive update would be provided.

Supervisor Scott commented that as the representative for the Board on the PAG Regional Council and the RTA Board, his intentions were to be the collective voice of the County. He presented two letters that he had prepared: one addressed concerns regarding the Transportation Improvement Program and the other addressed funding issues that plagued County transportation projects. He solicited input from Board members on which of the letters should be submitted to PAG's Executive Director.

Chair Bronson questioned the reasoning for the two letters. She commented that unincorporated Pima County received less HURF funding than other incorporated areas within Pima County.

Supervisor Scott clarified that the initial letter was drafted by the Transportation Department. He stated that the second, process-driven letter, was a byproduct of conversations he had with the Transportation Department.

Supervisor Heinz expressed his appreciation to having these items brought forward and proposed that the PAG and RTA Boards meet monthly.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the RTA should proceed with their projects despite the gaps in funding and asked how the gaps would be closed.

Mr. Huckelberry provided a historical synopsis of RTA funded projects and assured the Board that the County would continue to fund projects. He indicated that all of the original projects would be completed as promised.

Supervisor Heinz preferred that the process-focused letter be sent. He suggested that the committee meet monthly and requested that meeting minutes be conveyed to all jurisdictional representatives on the PAG and RTA Boards.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to send the process-focused letter to the Executive Director.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **10. 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**

### **11. 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 Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **12. Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 2, of the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona authorizing the lease and lease-purchase back of certain real property, including buildings and structures, in order to finance all or a portion of the County's unfunded liabilities with respect to the Arizona Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and the Correctional Officers Retirement Plan or, to the extent not so used, to finance other projects or to pay other expenses of the County approved by the Board and to pay costs of delivery; authorizing notice to the public of the lease and lease-purchase of the property and providing for the award thereof to the highest responsible bidder; authorizing the execution and delivery of a ground lease, a lease-purchase agreement and a trust agreement and other necessary agreements, instruments and documents; approving the execution and delivery of pledged revenue obligations to provide the necessary financing therefor, with lease payments by the County to be made solely from certain pledged revenues imposed or received by the County; and authorizing other actions and matters in connection therewith.

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

Supervisor Christy commented that he historically supported utilizing Certificates of Participation for infrastructure projects and for spending that benefited the community. He expressed concerns with borrowing money for unfunded employee pension retirement systems. He asked that the Board reconsider because it was irresponsible and set a precedent.

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

### **13. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 22.11, Public Safety Personnel Retirement System (PSPRS) Pension Funding, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-863.01.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

## **HEALTH**

### **14. Contract - Ratification**

Banner-University Medical Group, to provide for COVID-19 Vaccination Services, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$5,000,000.00 (CT-HD-21-301)

Supervisor Christy questioned why \$5,000,000.00 in funding was being allocated for additional vaccination sites when there was a lack of vaccine supplies.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that this was for reimbursement and for ongoing vaccination efforts by Banner.

Supervisor Christy asked for a definition of the Health Special Revenue Fund.

Mr. Huckelberry responded that the fund was used to segregate grants, receipts and special funds used to operate public health programs, including the pandemic.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether this was one of those items in which he would want to "draw a line in the sand."

Mr. Huckelberry clarified that vaccination spending would always take precedence over testing.

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

## **FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

### **15. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 130021, Jacobo Valdez, Taco Giro Mexican Grill, 13160 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, 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**

### **16. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 3, Co9-08-22, Reay, et al. - Sandario Road Rezoning. Owners: Gordon and Lois Reay. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Resolution.

### **17. Hearing - Rezoning Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 4, Co9-09-06, Reay, et al. - Trico Road Rezoning. Owners: Gordon and Lois Reay. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Resolution.

### **18. Hearing - Concurrent Plan Amendment and Rezoning Resolution and Ordinance**

P20CR00001, Cummings, et al. - E. Rex Molly Road Plan Amendment and Rezoning. Owners: Susan E. and George W. Cummings. (District 4)

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 and adopt the Resolution and Ordinance.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **19. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 4, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating traffic at the intersection of Twilight Echo Road and Echo Crossing Road in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.



**20. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 5, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; establishing reasonable and prudent speed limits for motor vehicles on Pima Mine Road in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.

**21. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 6, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating traffic at the intersection of Irvington Road and Joseph Avenue in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.

**22. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 7, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating parking on portions of public highways in the High Plains Ranch subdivision in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 4)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.

**23. Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 8, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating traffic at the intersection of Desert Scroll Place and Echo Crossing Road in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.

24. **Hearing - Traffic Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 9, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to traffic and highways; regulating parking on Crown King Drive in Pima County, Arizona. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 1)

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 and adopt the Ordinance.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

25. **Pima County Road Improvement Acceleration Plan**

Discussion/Action. A measure directing the County Administrator and staff, working within the parameters outlined in Board Policy D22.12 (General Fund Capital Improvement Fund Pay-As-You-Go Program), to prepare options for the Board to consider that would result in all roads in unincorporated Pima County attaining an average Pavement Condition Index of 80 sooner than the original goal of that standard being achieved by 2030. Multiple options should be prepared based on this goal being achieved in either 2026, 2027, or 2028. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott indicated that he had received confirmation from the County Administrator that the County had the capacity to reach program goals prior to 2030.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to provide options for attaining an average Pavement Condition Index of 80 by 2026, 2027, or 2028.

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

On February 2, 2021, the Board of Supervisors took the following action:

A. **Eviction Prevention**

Discussion/Action regarding codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to adopt as a public health regulation through March 31, 2021, applicable throughout Pima County a moratorium on all evictions in Pima County, except those for material falsification or for material and irreparable breaches as provided in A.R.S. §33-1368(A) and to direct the Pima County Health Department to develop a form/declaration eligible tenants can sign to show their eligibility for the

protections of this moratorium consistent with the terms of this moratorium and otherwise with the Centers for Disease Control Eviction Moratorium and to make such form easily accessible to the public.

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

**Eviction Prevention**

Discussion/Action regarding codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County. (District 2)

- C. In conjunction with or in addition to reconsideration as noted above, discussion/action regarding community/stakeholder input on codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County.

(Clerk's Note: See attached verbatim for Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on this item.)

27. **Progress Update on Resolution No. 2020-92**

Discussion/Direction/Action. Directing Administrator Huckelberry and the Department of Health to provide an update at the March 2, 2021 Board of Supervisors meeting on progress with the Be it Resolved Items 1 through 6 of the December 1, 2020 Board of Supervisors Resolution 2020-92: Declaring Racial and Ethnic Health Inequities and Income Inequality in Pima County to be a Public Health Crisis. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva asked for an update on the Resolution's progress and asked how progress would be determined and measured.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the six components of the Resolution could be broken down into various programs within the Health Department. He added that an area of focus was to take public health components and make them equally available to all. He indicated that he would provide a response to each of the items detailing where within the Health Department those areas were being addressed and through what programs.

Supervisor Grijalva asked that updates be incorporated into the monthly COVID-19 updates.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern that vulnerable elderly populations were not included in this Resolution. He suggested that the Board revisit the Resolution to include the elderly population.

Chair Bronson recommended placing an amended Resolution on a future Board agenda for consideration.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that individuals over 70-75 were prioritized and included as part of the data. She stated that her reason for an update was because it dealt with racial and ethnic health inequities.

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

**28. Board, Commission, and Committee Appointments**

Discussion/Action. With numerous boards, commissions and committees and three new Board of Supervisor members, we need to discuss how appointments to them are decided. While in many cases the appointments and terms are clear, in many other cases it is not at all clear. It seems especially problematic when an appointee to one of these bodies is to be one of the five members of the Board of Supervisors, as these appointment processes appear to vary and have not always been discussed with all board members.

Information requested for this item:

- 1) Complete list of Board Committees where a member of the Board of Supervisors is appointed;
- 2) Complete list of Committees approved by the BOS;
- 3) Complete list of Committees with an appointed member from each Supervisorial District and;
- 4) Complete list of all of the memberships/associations that Pima County is a part of and to which dues are paid annually (if applicable). (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva explained that she placed this on the agenda to determine whether membership, participation and terms were up-to-date. She also had concerns with BCC's being inactive. She indicated that the only information she requested and did not receive was the costs associated with participation.

Chair Bronson provided staff direction that cost and status updates on the various BCC's be provided along with a list of decommissioned BCC's.

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

**29. COVID-19 Vaccination Demographics**

Discussion/Direction/Action. Directing Administrator Huckelberry and the Health Department to assemble and disseminate demographic information (age, gender, race, ethnicity, residence, etc.) as it applies to the COVID-19 vaccination effort. Also, please provide information on the demographics, numbers served, and the efficacy of the vaccination pop-up sites. (District 5)

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim for Minute Item No. 10 for discussion related to this item.)

## **CLERK OF THE BOARD**

### **30. 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 Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

31. United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Employees Care About Pima County 2021 Campaign, extend contract term to 12/31/21, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$42,336.60 (CT-CED-19-401)

Supervisor Christy indicated that he objected to this item.

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

### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

32. Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District, Tucson Group Holdings, L.L.C. and LordCap Green Trust, to provide a Consent and Acknowledgement of Ground Lessor for property located at 75 E. Broadway Boulevard, no cost/4 year term (CTN-CA-21-71)

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether there were other means in which the County would receive funds to make up for the property tax breaks included in the contract.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, explained that there was an in-lieu sales tax that was required on the property lease which was offered by Rio Nuevo. He indicated that there was no waiver for the first eight years and it extended to the life of the project. He stated that a government property lease excise tax was fairly equivalent to that of a property tax. He explained that the monies received were paid to the County Treasurer and disbursed proportionately to each property taxing entity. He added that previous legislation had resulted in dramatically different property tax amounts, but that the numbers were fairly equivalent at this current time.

Supervisor Grijalva directed staff to provide a written breakdown of the information for easy accessibility.

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

## **HEALTH**

33. Pima County Community College District, to provide for an Affiliation Agreement, no cost/5 year term (CTN-HD-21-65)

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

34. Golder Ranch Fire District, to provide for administration of COVID-19 immunizations and testing, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (CT-HD-21-309)

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

35. Rincon Valley Fire District, to provide for administration of COVID-19 immunizations and testing, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$25,000.00 (CT-HD-21-304)

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

36. Three Points Fire District, to provide for administration of COVID-19 immunizations and testing, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$25,000.00 (CT-HD-21-310)

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

37. Green Valley Fire District, to provide for administration of COVID-19 immunizations and testing, Health Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (CT-HD-21-306)

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

## **PROCUREMENT**

38. **Award**  
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-20-154, Amendment No. 1, Barker Contracting, Inc., Chasse Building Team, Inc., Core Construction, Inc., Durazo Construction Corporation, Kapp-Con Incorporated, Kittle Design and Construction, L.L.C., Lloyd Construction Company, Inc. and SD Crane Builders, Inc., to provide a Job Order Master Agreement for remodel and construction services.

This Amendment increases the annual shared award amount by \$1,000,000.00 from \$2,500,000.00 to \$3,500,000.00 to accommodate several upcoming projects. Three projects totaling \$920,000.00 will be going under construction before the April renewal date and six projects totaling \$2,000,000.00, will be going under construction shortly after the April renewal date. The remaining funds will be needed to accommodate any unplanned projects received throughout the contract term. Funding Source: Various Funds. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

Supervisor Scott requested additional information regarding the services covered under this agreement and asked for the meaning of 'accommodating unplanned or upcoming projects'.

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

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that he would provide additional information to the Board.

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

39. Accu Reference Medical Lab, Amendment No. 3, to provide for laboratory services for COVID-19 and amend contractual language, CARES and Various Funds, contract amount \$2,500,000.00 (MA-PO-20-186) Health

Supervisor Scott inquired whether the funds were for reimbursement or related to reducing or stopping COVID-19 testing.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that the funds would be used for reimbursement.

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

## **REAL PROPERTY**

40. Territorial Sign Co., Amendment No. 4, to provide for right-of-way encroachment for subdivision directional sign installations and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-PW-20-18)

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**

### **41. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Continuum of Care - Homeless Management Information System, extend grant term to 6/30/21 and amend grant language, no cost (GTAM 21-68)

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

### **42. Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Family Health Partnership, to provide for Chlamydia and Syphilis screening services, \$27,000.00 (GTAW 21-115)

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**

### **43. Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Appointment of Terry Majewski, to replace Jill Lavon Jenkins. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 1)

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

### **44. Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council**

Appointment of Rhonda Pina, Republican, to replace John L. Fink. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 1)

Supervisor Scott thanked Mr. Fink for his service and explained the organizational requirements for selecting his appointee.

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

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **45. Approval of the Consent Calendar**

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 2 and 3 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.



Supervisor Grijalva inquired, with regards to Consent Calendar Item No. 9, whether an alternate could be appointed to the Board of Health.

Chair Bronson responded that an alternate had not been previously appointed. She indicated that she would seek clarification from the Clerk and the County Attorney on whether an alternate was appropriate.

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

\* \* \*

### **PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY**

#### **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

##### **Procurement**

2. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 8, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Historic Courthouse Final Stage Construction (XOCH03), extend contract term to 12/31/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-FM-19-416) Facilities Management

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

Supervisor Christy inquired whether this was a contract extension of the existing contract for the courthouse. He also inquired whether the contracted amount would be applied to the January 8th memorial or the courthouse renovations.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, explained that the contract was a no-cost time extension. He indicated that this would allow the contractor to remain on site during the completion of the University of Arizona Mineral Museum and for the final amendment for completion of the renovation to the courthouse. He added that funding for the January 8th memorial was paid by the January 8th Foundation.

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

3. Aztec Flooring, L.L.C., Continental Flooring Company and Flooring Systems of Arizona, Inc., to provide a Job Order Master Agreement for flooring services, Various Funds, contract amount \$500,000.00 (MA-PO-21-121) Facilities Management

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

Supervisor Christy inquired what flooring services would be provided.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded that there would be various scenarios and applicable flooring services provided.

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

\* \* \*

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation**

1. Friends of Agua Caliente, Amendment No. 2, to provide a park agreement for Friends of Agua Caliente Park, extend contract term to 3/1/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-PR-16-114)

### **Procurement**

2. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 8, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
3. Aztec Flooring, L.L.C., Continental Flooring Company and Flooring Systems of Arizona, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

4. **Acceptance - Health**  
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Well Woman Health Check Program, extend grant term to 1/28/22, amend scope of work and grant language, \$518,100.00 (GTAM 21-73)
5. **Acceptance - Health**  
Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research Centers, extend grant term to 9/29/21 and amend grant language, \$39,575.02 (GTAM 21-74)
6. **Acceptance - Health**  
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 4, to provide for immunization services, amend grant language and scope of work \$322,600.00 (GTAM 21-77)

7. **Acceptance - Sheriff**  
U.S. Department of Agriculture - U.S. Forest Service, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreement FY2021 Annual Operating and Financial Plan and amend grant language, \$38,000.00 (GTAM 21-72)
8. **Acceptance - Sheriff**  
Arizona Department of Education/Arizona State Board of Education, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the National School Lunch Program, extend grant term to 9/30/24 and amend grant language, estimated \$350,000.00 (GTAM 21-78)

#### **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

9. **Board of Health**  
Appointment of Dr. Matt Heinz, to replace Betty Villegas. No term expiration. (Chair recommendation)
10. **Fair Horse Racing Commission**  
Reappointment of Ronnie Reyna. Term expiration: 1/16/23. (District 2)
11. **Housing Commission**
  - Reappointment of Tim Escobedo. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 3)
  - Appointment of Dana Petty, to fill a vacancy created by Henry Boice. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 3)
12. **Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council**  
Reappointment of David Freund. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 3)
13. **Metropolitan Education Commission**  
Appointment of Wendy Effing, representing School Board Member (Arizona School Boards Association), to replace Buck Crouch. Term expiration: 2/14/23. (Commission recommendation)
14. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**  
Appointment of Alison Jones, Citizens Water Advisory Committee, to fill a vacancy created by Jean McLain. Term expiration: 3/1/22. (Organizational recommendation)
15. **State Board of Equalization**  
Reappointment of Shaun McClusky. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 4)
16. **Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**  
Appointment of Margo Susco, to replace Mikki Niemi. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 4)

## ELECTIONS

### 17. Precinct Committeemen

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-821B, approval of Precinct Committeemen resignations and appointments:

#### RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Patti J. Bersbach-180-DEM; Marion Pickens-183-DEM; Alex Dely-121-REP; Michael Hicks-182-REP

#### APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Ricky R. Sage-009-DEM; Alexis K. Walker-069-DEM; Wynona P. Larson-076-DEM; Manisha G. Bewtra-080-DEM; Margaret H. Lacy-107-DEM; Michael F. Angelo-108-DEM; Emily R. Godlove-108-DEM; Barbara J. Galligher-118-DEM; Karen C. McWhirter-130-DEM; Alexis K. Dudoit-133-DEM; Christian Maldonado-Echevarria-174-DEM; Brian S. Templet-174-DEM; Kathy A. Simolaris-180-DEM; Rita V. Flattley-190-DEM; Diane J. Wootton-192-DEM; Anthony E. Camilli-210-DEM; Theresa A. Jackson-005-REP; Kerry K. Tomlinson-010-REP; Nelly G. Holst-012-REP; Laurie A. Moore-012-REP; Jon M. Sharp-012-REP; Patricia H. Sharp-012-REP; Vera Shury-012-REP; Kathy Sue Lorensen-013-REP; Richard D. Peters-024-REP; Jose L. Medina-025-REP; Grady L. Rhodes-030-REP; Bryan R. Platt-039-REP; Valerie R. Platt-039-REP; Anne "Michelle" Pedersen-046-REP; Jane C. Hubbard-077-REP; Darren L. Venters-084-REP; Barbara L. Ware-084-REP; Stephen F. Ware-084-REP; Philip E. Kortesis-092-REP; Jo Anne F. Sabbagh-094-REP; Alan M. Nichols-112-REP; Helen "Lee" Nichols-112-REP; William B. Martin-118-REP; Caroline M. Straub-118-REP; Gini D. Crawford-127-REP; Thomas M. Crawford-127-REP; Kathleen R. Webster-127-REP; Ryan D. Pierce-164-REP; Richard W. Anderson-169-REP; Kathryn H. Anderson-169-REP; Valerie S. Solomon-169-REP; Bernie R. Stannus-169-REP; Elbridge G. Wilkinson-171-REP; Abbey M. Schlesinger-172-REP; Robert E. Dohse-174-REP; Thomas A. Gillies-175-REP; Steven J. Spain-184-REP; Kyveli Graziano-188-REP; Robert L. Graziano-188-REP; Trisha J. Panka-188-REP; Jorge A. Rivas-188-REP; Babis S. Jeffery-194-REP; Lyn S. Reedy-197-REP; Diane Devincentis-200-REP; Vincenza Schweda-205-REP; Joan A. Woods-205-REP; Sharon L. Fickes-207-REP; Iris K. Sapovitz-209-REP; Dana L. Deo-221-REP; Colleen A. Jiran-227-REP; Eric D. Jiran-227-REP; Dustin J. Hoeflinger-227-REP; Silvania F. Pereira-Smith-238-REP

## FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

### 18. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

CCG Systems, Inc. \$42,643.94; Catalina, L.L.C. \$560.00; Grecia Ramirez \$79.00; Megan Conte \$11,234.53; Carmen Borquez \$73.42; Cathy E. Kocis \$6,135.11.

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

19. Minutes: January 5, 2021

\* \* \*

46. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 10. 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  
NG: Nico Grischkowsky, IT Technology Support Analyst

---

SB: So then let us proceed with Item 9, Mr. Huckelberry.

CH: Chair Bronson, Members of the Board, we sent you a fairly long memo last Friday and it had some accompanying materials with it, just so that we can transmit all of those available information we have to the Board. Let me get a few of the highlights very quickly. Then I want to call on Dr. Garcia to talk about some of the proactive measures the Board has taken and how it is actually resulted in decreased infection rates. Infection rates are dropping. We are seeing some fairly significant drops. Hospital medical capacity is improving, and so that is positive. We have adopted an accelerated vaccination plan. We have put up five regional pods that provide vaccines and vaccination, up to 5,000 to 7,000 people per day. We have also distributed to a lot of community clinics, and we just started, a week ago, with the disadvantaged population effort and that was the St. John's Church. It turned out to be a very successful event and vaccinated a lot of individuals who might have been omitted or had the inability to become vaccinated because of access to computers, internets or transportation. As you can see, we have talked about considering some form of policy issues discussed with rationing, and those really deal with the most disadvantaged populations first and the preservation of our ability to provide a second shot vaccination. The State has made a decision to open a State-run pod, 24/7, at the University of Arizona. It is competing with our vaccine supply. Our notice last week, late, was that we would receive, I think, 16,300 doses. We were initially told that that would be reduced by 2,000 doses that would be transferred to the State pod. The State also made some decisions with regard to the Pfizer in providing more Pfizer to the State pod at the university. Our actual reduction was 1,000 doses. We are asking for that back so we can continue our access to disadvantaged populations in the next few days, actually, if we can. And that is accessing disadvantaged populations in South Tucson, Steele Elementary, two Black churches, likely Littleton and other locations, as well

as some rural locations. We have requested there be some fiscal transparency with the State with regard to where some of the Coronavirus Relief Act funds were spent. There was a piece of legislation that was introduced to require that. We were in support of it, provided that it also required the State to disclose where they spent their Coronavirus relief funds. It is likely that legislation will die and never see the light of day. Our call center has successfully been able to provide registration for 1,500 individuals who had no internet access and ability to register and that way I have talked about our fiscal position which started out with a fund balance of about \$111 million, we are anticipating that will drop to 53 if we do not continue to receive reimbursements for some of our COVID expenses. Then that will drop to zero plan for the next fiscal year which is not acceptable. So we are hoping that will improve and that we will receive a significant share of the money that has already been appropriated to the State in the second CARES Act or CARES pandemic relief. We know there is a third wave that could be coming and that is what congress is talking about now, and so our budget position is pretty fluid and we continue to pursue those things. I would like to, before we start taking questions, have Dr. Garcia talk about the improvements in a couple of areas where the Board has taken action either from a health advisory or a regulatory perspective that has, you know, significantly reduced infection rates. Dr. Garcia.

SB: Dr. Garcia, we cannot hear you. I do not know what that noise was. It sounded like something on, there is obviously a problem here.

FG: [inaudible]

SB: Can anybody hear me? Because I cannot hear anybody.

NG: You are loud and clear.

AG: I can hear you.

SB: Okay. Good.

SC: I can hear you, Chairman Bronson.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Nico, I could not hear Dr. Garcia at all.

NG: It looks like his connection may have had some trouble. I think he disconnected and reconnected.

SB: Okay. Dr. Garcia, I see that you are there but you are still muted.

FG: Can you hear me now?

CH: Yes.

SB: Now you are fine.

FG: Okay. Sorry about that. Inevitably, I seem to have challenges here. Nico, it would be helpful if I could share my screen because I think there is some stuff that the Board would be interested in seeing. The Board and Public Health has taken a lot of actions throughout this pandemic that have really served to mitigate and manage our risk and I think that we are starting to see some of the fruit of those actions that have been taken. I am just going to share with you really briefly, just the quick overview of how we have gotten to where we have gotten. For the last five, four weeks, we have experienced a very significant decline in the number of cases. I think this trend is real. And I think this trend is at least in part, although not entirely, explained by some of the actions that have been taken by the Public Health Authority. As you will recall back on November 23rd, Dr. Terry Cullen issued a public health advisory at which time we asked people to adhere to a voluntary curfew to limit their participation in gatherings of more than 10 people at a time, and to really curtail their travel. We now have really good information based on the, we now have really good information based on the [No audio]. We now have very good information based on the actions that have been taken that suggest that these measures, indeed, especially the Board of Supervisors' action on December 4th, which included the mandatory masking resolution, as well as reinforcing all the other elements in the, all the other elements that we had included in the public health advisory are really having a positive impact. What you are seeing on your screen is the, what you should be seeing on your screen is the impact of the, in terms of the reported participation in attending bar or restaurants in the last 14 days, reported by people who have been, who have ended up being cases. So I think that this is, this is all trending in a very positive direction since the date of the public health advisory. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly and more dramatically, is in terms of the percent of cases, in terms of the percent of cases reporting having or having attended an event in the past 14 days, that has really dropped dramatically since the public health advisory and since the Board action. And now we are seeing that that is down to approximately 9%. I will refresh the memory of the Board that back on 11/23, when you took your action, shortly after we did a quick look at the data and at that time, more than 15% of people reported participating in such large congregations. The last thing that I will point out to you is the impact on travel. So one of the things that we have really seen, that we really tried to message, is the idea that people need to stay home, and so this is travel as reported by folks who are interviewed as part of their case investigation and you can see that the subsequence through the 23rd there has really been a curtailment of that. So, I think this is, in every sense of the word, a positive thing and I believe that we will continue to see the benefits of these kinds of actions, that the Board has taken. With that, I will conclude my remarks and make myself available for your questions.



SC: Madam Chair? This is Supervisor Christy.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: How are you, Dr. Garcia?

FG: Doing great.

SC: Last week or so, there has been a media statement circulating around the community that a higher up Pima County Health Department official made an address to the Amphi School Board and basically his message was the Health Department was backing off on its position of advising school boards on opening and closing of schools. In other words, they had been in an advisory position, advising school boards whether or not they should allow students to resume in-class education and other education factors. But according to what this Health Department official stated to the Amphi School Board, the Health Department is backing off from that position and not taking any chance or making any kind of a statement or a commitment one way or the other regarding in-class education or the opening or closure of schools. Can you tell me what data was used to prompt that backing off of the Health Department's position?

FG: So Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, to be clear, I believe that that is a misrepresentation of the message that we were communicating.

SC: Okay. Was that message made?

FG: I do not believe that message was given, no.

SC: Okay.

FG: The message that we were communicating was that ultimately the decision to enter into whatever mode of instruction is appropriately made by school districts. That we would support every single school district, every single charter and every single private in whatever decision they wanted to make. We have been working with the superintendents for the public school districts particularly closely, trying to help them understand what they could anticipate was coming down the pipe. One of the things that we gave them a preview of was the fact that the Centers for Disease Control was about to issue a new set of guidance that would impact the way that they operated their school. And essentially what that guidance says, and it was issued on Friday or on Thursday, what that guidance says, is that you can operate schools if you take certain mitigation measures and it lays out some mitigation strategies. So, we were wanting to make sure that we were clear in terms of our ability to provide support and technical assistance to the school districts, but to help them, you know, apply and adhere to and understand the guidance that is coming down from the federal government about this issue.

SC: Okay. But it made the appearance of this statement to the Amphi School Board was that the Health Department really was not in a strong position to make recommendations one way or the other as to how school boards should function as far as opening and closing schools. That they were backing off from taking a position. Going along with that same kind of thinking, how can the Health Department justify its decisions on such things as curfews and masks and other advisory edicts and to individuals when, at the same time, on one side the Health Department is making a statement that it is not in a position to make recommendations to schools? I see a disconnect there. If you cannot do it with schools, how can you do it with other entities like businesses and individuals and gatherings and sports functions and other gatherings of the public?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, again, I believe that that is a mischaracterization of what our message was. The basis for our messaging in terms of the actions that were taken by the Board of Supervisors on December 5th, I have shared with you the data that underpins the fact that those, actually, have been effective actions that the Board has taken and that those actions are actually changing risk behavior in our community and, therefore, changing the amount of disease burden that we are experiencing. I believe that those data are very clear and compelling. Can we always draw a bright causal line between an action and outcome? Not always. In terms of where we are with schools, for instance, we continue to have significant outbreaks associated especially with our school sports. Basketball most recently about five or six different school districts have been impacted by cases of COVID associated with their teams. We continue to provide support for those school districts. We continue to try to be helpful for them, but it has always been the position of the County that only the school boards have the legal authority to make decisions about instructional model and closure and non-closure, as well as the executive.

SC: Well, Madam Chair and Dr. Garcia, just to be clear, what was it that the representative from the Health Department conveyed to the Amphi School District Board?

FG: I believe, and I will find out exactly, I believe that what we were telegraphing was the fact that new guidance was coming from the Centers for Disease Control that really was a lot more permissive and a lot more broadly permissive instruction regardless of the amount of disease in a particular community. That was new guidance. That was, like I said, just issued on Thursday, and so I believe that we were telegraphing that guidance was to be forthcoming.

- SC: And was that guidance that was conveyed to the School Board by the Health Department official under the direction of you or Dr. Cullen to convey that message or did he act on his own or are you familiar with what was said at that meeting?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I am not familiar with that particular instance. Like I said, I will make sure that I investigate that and report back. But, again, being familiar with all the messaging that we have done that I have personally been involved with, that our school team has been involved with, that our Health Department has been involved with, I feel a relatively high degree of confidence that what we were trying to convey is the fact that there is abundant flexibility that schools have that has to do with their own physical plans, their own resources, the community and the students that they serve, and that is how those final decisions about instruction get made or not.
- SC: Well, I look forward to see what you find when you investigate that statement made to the Amphi School Board. That will be interesting. One other question, Dr. Garcia, can you tell us what the seven-day rolling average of cases per 100,000, where are we on that?
- FG: Sure. I can tell you that, let me just quickly take a peek, that we are at about 200 or so in Pima County. So, if you look at the State's website, which I am doing right now, and if you go to the business dashboard, specifically, what the Governor has recommended is that we use the seven-day average, but for the previous two weeks. But we are starting to get to a good place and, like I had mentioned before, for the last five weeks we have had a decrement in the number of cases and I believe that we are in the process of getting much better and much faster.
- SC: Madam Chair, Dr. Garcia, what is the release point or the lifting of the curfew protocol? What is the case per 100,000 where the curfew is lifted?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, what was discussed at the Board meeting was 100 per 100,000 cases. At this point, like I said, we are at about 200 and change. So we are pretty close to within striking distance of no longer needing a voluntary curfew. We are not there yet, but if we continue on the current trend, we are in really pretty good shape. All of our indicators in general are actually moving in the right direction, including COVID-like illness reports from the hospital. The percent positivity is dropping significantly. All of our indicators are moving in the right direction. I anticipate continuing to see that movement this week and next.
- SC: Okay. Chair Bronson, I have another question for Mr. Huckelberry. Shall I wait until other of my colleagues are done questioning Dr. Garcia?
- SB: Just proceed, Supervisor Christy.

SC: I am sorry?

SB: Just proceed.

SC: Okay.

SB: Ask your question.

SC: All right, thank you. Dr. Garcia, thank you very much for answering those questions. I will be interested to see what you find on the Amphi School District presentation by the Health Department official. Thank you for answering my questions. Mr. Huckelberry, give us, if you could, an update on the Casa Alitas, the asylum seekers, what the numbers are looking like, the increase of folks seeking asylum. Also their COVID infection rate and are they receiving vaccines? What is the status of that entire asylum-seeking process through the Casa Alitas?

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Christy, not much has happened. I think it is all anticipation of a significant increase. But at this point, there has been a slight uptick in just a handful of additional individuals. There is a protocol in place, I believe, by the Department of Homeland Security that deals with those individuals who may be eligible under what has been called the MPP Program. They will be COVID tested first and if they turn negative they will be allowed to proceed with their asylum claim. If they are positive, they go into quarantine, I believe.

SC: Is that at Casa Alitas?

CH: No. No. In Mexico. So it is likely that, and their using, and I would assume they are using the Binax rapid test which we know is effective when people are contagious, but it may not be as foolproof as the nasal swab. So, I think they are doing what they can to ensure that those individuals who are arriving at Casa Alitas are negative. At this point we have not seen a significant increase. We do anticipate that it might occur. I think our position has been that we ought to have the Department of Homeland Security, its components, which is Customs and Border Protection, that division of the department should be talking to the Federal Emergency Management Agency of that department and work out an appropriate arrangement for emergency housing, should the group that comes and released by Customs and Border Protection be greater than that can be housed at Casa Alitas. That process at this point is one that we have asked and I do believe that a congressional delegation is asking the same questions of those agencies and trying to get them to actually work together so that they can come up with an emergency housing program.

- SC: Okay. Thank you. So that adds to the question about the uptick. It does not appear like it is occurring at this very moment, but there might be some in the very near future. My next question is, regarding the face mask requirements and the curfews, how many business and individuals in Pima County have been cited for violations regarding these two protocols that the Board has imposed on the community?
- CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Christy, the Court has invalidated the curfew requirement. So therefore, it is not in place. Prior to that, I do not believe there were any enforcement actions. With regard to face masks, I do not believe there has been any significant enforcement actions. There appears to be a fairly uniform compliance. We will occasionally get a complaint but, for the most part, most are complying with it. It becomes and has become, I think, almost second nature to those individuals who are out in the community.
- SC: Okay. My final question, Madam Chair, is the last Board meeting, I requested the possibility of receiving a vaccine flow chart..
- FG: Yes.
- SC: ...from the federal government to the State, to the County where all the contracts are and what the criteria for those to receive vaccines from certain entities are. I have not seen it yet. I know it is very complex, but I think when I am dealing, and maybe my colleagues could agree, with the concerns of our constituents who are struggling to try to get vaccinated. If we had some idea of the flow chart, as to what programs are in place, who is administering them, who are the recipients of them, how many are available, just a basic plan or model that will help us to identify how vaccines are distributed in Pima County. I am hoping we can get that sooner rather than later.
- CH: Yes, Chair Bronson and Supervisor Christy. I have seen a draft document from Dr. Garcia. We will provide it to the Board. I think that flow chart is process-oriented and it needs to be added to the eligibility criteria and the eligibility criteria varies over time depending upon the degree of vaccination of the vulnerable population. As of now, today, we will be releasing and moving from, as you recall, we were plus 75, then we were plus 70. On Thursday, we will be going to plus 65.
- SC: Great. Very good. I look forward to seeing that flow chart when you can compile it. Thank you, Mr. Huckelberry. Thank you, Madam Chair.
- AG: Supervisor Bronson?
- SB: Adelita.

AG: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify because I know that we have had some people, oh, there is an echo. We have had some people from the Pima County Health Department present to TUSD Governing Board meetings and I just asked the superintendent at Amphi and basically it was what you indicated, Dr. Garcia, in regards to the Pima County Health Department not making recommendations to individual districts because the information that we are using as criteria does not tell the full story. So, if we use percent positive, that next day it could vary significantly. So, for us to ask the Pima County Health Department to give us a definitive—hey, do we go hybrid? Do we stay remote? Do we go fully in person? Is a lot on you and that is why it defaults back to the elected people on the governing board to make the decision. The other issue is throughout this process, where we have this roadmap to reopening schools, the criteria has continued to change from the State. The Pima County Health Department took the position with Tucson Unified, and I am assuming with the rest of the districts, in that we will provide you whatever support, mitigation strategies, whatever you decide to do in your own elected position, with your own school districts for what you are going to do and then we will provide whatever support you need in order to make it happen. But, we are not going to say 'be under this percentage', because if you look at the percentage to open up traditionally, whatever that looks like for every school district, it is under 10 cases per 100,000. Moderate is hybrid is 10 per 100,000. So it just depends on if a school district decides they are going to go in-person. We have had schools that have been completely in-person when the criteria shows we should be shutting everything down. So again, it cannot be the responsibility of the Health Department. It has be to the people that are elected. I appreciate that, because in times when different districts were not opening like TUSD and others were, we still had the support from the Health Department in order to help us target individual areas where there is potential spread, individual departments, that kind of thing. I do want to say how much I appreciate the pop-up site at St. John's. I heard from many, many of my friends, parents and grandparents that found out about it, got in line, would not have done so otherwise, because of how difficult they perceived the process to register for on every other site. And so I do think based on the data that came out of that, that for that neighborhood, it was completely our target audience. I think that if you look at the criteria from the state-sponsored hub and pods versus what Pima County is doing, who we are vaccinating better represents the community that we serve. I have some concern about State pods and how if you look at how disproportionate the number of, even if you look at age or ethnicity, or race, it is very disproportionate to the population that is the most impacted. So, I do think that Pima County is doing a better job in targeting those neighborhoods that really have the highest spread. So, I want to say how much I appreciate that effort and I hope that we get more vaccines so we can target other areas where there is a high spread and really look at the number of Native American, African American people that are not represented in our vaccine plan right now. But if we were to target some of those churches that are predominantly African American, some of the other areas that Mr.

Huckelberry mentioned near the reservation. I do think that our numbers would greatly represent the communities that we serve or better represent the communities that we serve. So, I want to say how much I appreciate that effort and I want to encourage us to do as much of that as we can. Thank you.

SB: Adelita, I believe on the Addendum Agenda, Item 7, you have some, and we are considering all the COVID action items under this discussion. But I believe you wanted to get some demographics on vaccination demographics and you wanted to have that information disseminated. Am I correct?

AG: Yes, and actually when I put that item in we did not have any demographic information. So it was, like, a miracle it just showed up, like, almost the next day. I was like oh really. So that, I know, but I do appreciate that and I think accessibility to that information is very helpful. Because when we did not have, when we had information from the State sites but not from our local and how we were doing. Once we were able to put those two things together, it really did highlight how these targeted efforts are making a really big difference and I want to continue to have that information accessible, have it updated. So, then we can be on our end better advocates and show both the State and the federal system, like, this is the way you are supposed to be targeting these communities that might not be able to be reached in any other way.

SB: [inaudible] Now I am getting an echo too.

AG: Just go ahead and go down the order and then I will just pull it.

SB: I want to make sure that we address all of those concerns.

[Overlapping speakers]

AG: I believe that we have, but I will double check it as we get to it.

SC: Madam Chair, I was going to suggest maybe we combine Supervisor Grijalva's items for discussion?

SB: I believe Supervisor Grijalva has indicated, and the way I am reading the Item 7 on the Addendum Agenda, we have essentially addressed that and our staff has addressed it.

AG: Yes.

SC: How about five?

AG: No. That is a separate item.

SB: Yeah, that is separate.

AG: But I would like to say if we are going to go ahead and, because a lot of my concerns have been addressed in Item 7, if we can also look to how we identify the census track, and identify those populations in the census track, because it is pretty clear in that data, as well, that some of our neighborhoods and communities are disproportionately affected. So, I do not know if there is a way for us to incorporate that into some of the other presentations but that would be helpful as well.

SB: Thank you.

AG: Thank you.

SB: Any other?

MH: Madam Chair?

SB: Yeah, okay. Is that Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

SB: Proceed.

MH: Thank you. Actually, first for Dr. Garcia, just a quick, I guess, maybe a little bit of a recap or the school reopening issue and regarding supporting the school boards and the schools, I think makes sense for the Health Department to, you know, support them in whatever way that they can. But the underpinning data, I think is important to remember, you know, for elementary-aged children, at least initial data, early data, does make it pretty clear that there is a much lower risk of viral transmission and which is, you know, a lot of the underpinning we received behind the CDC recommendations which I know that the ADHS recommendations are based on, to inform the local school boards in making a decision. So, I just wanted to give you just a brief moment to respond on that.

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Heinz, you are absolutely correct. One of the nice things, and because we have been having these really great discussions with our school superintendents. A lot of our schools already started to incorporate some of these modifications even before the CDC came out with them, and so you see some school districts, Sahuarita, Flowing Wells, really trying to get their little, they call them the low littles, K through 4, K through 5, in sooner rather than later for in-person instruction because the data is pretty compelling that those children A) do not represent a risk to each other if there is appropriate mitigation in place, B) do not represent a risk to the teachers and staff. Again, if there is appropriate mitigation in place and because they are a lot less likely to be involved in some of these extracurricular kinds of



things that really is where risk happens. The CDC guidelines do sort of stair step that up, right, with kids in high school being the last ones to kind of come into the fold, as, you know, disease burden continues to drop. I really think that the trend line is looking very nice and is moving very steeply. I do think that we continue to make a lot of progress and our school districts have been remarkably resourceful. Part of the reason we have deferred to them is because they know those communities better than any of us do and they are better able to adapt on the fly. So, I just cannot say enough good stuff about our public schools.

MH: Thank you. Dr. Garcia, this might be a question for you but it also could be potentially for Mr. Huckelberry. I think, and I know a lot of this is in the memo. I think it is really important because of what is going on for us to do, like kind of a recap of where exactly we are up to, like, now or when we have data from, as to the rollout of the vaccine and kind of vaccination progress. I think there was a pretty good summary of that in the memo but I would love to hear that just briefly. I mean, we see 171,661 out of 100 [inaudible] thousand doses have been given, at least as of several days ago. That is over 90% of the doses physically in Pima County have been put into people's arms. That is incredibly important to point that out because I think earlier on there was some misinformation that, like, we were hoarding vaccine. You know, no. That is clearly not what is going on. It is getting into people very quickly and I would just like to hear you recap maybe the raw number and the percentage of the estimated population in terms of where we are at in terms of our vaccination progress, at least one dose for our healthcare providers, the healthcare workers, teachers, protective services and the 70-year-old population and up, if you could real quickly.

CH: Yes, Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, those numbers move on a daily basis since we are vaccinating anywhere from 5,000 to 7,000 individuals every day. At one point, before the new allocation was added to this week's total, we were at about 98% utilization of the vaccine. So, there is a real myth that anything sitting on the shelf anywhere is going into people's arms as fast as we can get it. If you look at the data this morning, we have vaccinated 196,000 people and we have 223,650 vaccines either ordered and then that is now distributed between the State pod and us. So, if you look at the delta there, it is about 20, 28,000, yeah, 27,000 of which we were allocated 16,300. And then we were required to send or allow 1,000 of our Moderna to go to the State pod. The balance of that is more than likely all Pfizer that is going to the new State pod, as well as, perhaps, some to, and we are still tracking this down, we have Dr. Cullen out on a vaccine hunt this morning. Trying to basically find out where this delta in the vaccine has gone to, Pfizer and to which of the three entities that are using Pfizer, and that is TMC and Banner as well as now the U of A pod. So we are trying to hunt that up right now. So again, I think the point is that you get us vaccine, we will use it. And the point is, that we are making this week, is that we want that vaccine to basically go into our mobile units, to the disadvantaged populations and to

answer Supervisor Grijalva's question, we will report the demographics and the number of shots given on every mobile vaccination pod we stand up so it is very clear that we are targeting specific demographics and we are reaching them.

MH: Great. So I think that brings up my next point. We, in looking at the demographic data that is now (inaudible) potentially looking at the State pods, Glendale and the Phoenix stadium. I share Supervisor Grijalva's concern because this is distressing. Overall, Pima County, and we need to do much better because we have 38% less doses here. Of course, we are at about 14% of the Latinos in terms of the vaccinations we have given out, according to the data I am looking at. The State pods in Maricopa County, the two stadium pods, those seem to be at 3.7% Latinos. I am sure there is a chunk of unknown and maybe some of those, maybe that number goes up a little bit, but that is very concerning and the reason that I certainly am worried, representing District 2. I know that Supervisor Grijalva, as well, in District 5, that populations in our districts are going to not benefit from the stated pandemic policies and priorities of Pima County which is to make sure that those who are at risk are actually getting a vaccine as early as possible. I do not know that that is going to necessarily dovetail very well with what the experience has been so far of the State pods up in Maricopa County. I think that is a very important point we need to drive home to Dr. Christ when, I understand Dr. Christ will be here in Pima County on Thursday. So probably, hopefully that I am sure the County will be involved in some kind of media availability and looking forward to hopefully talking with Dr. Christ myself. I look forward to making sure that Dr. Garcia and Dr. Cullen are able to do that as well so we can maybe, you know, make that point. Maybe she will come down with a truck of Moderna or Pfizer in tow. That would be great. And if not, we can reiterate that we would really appreciate it because it sounds like by what you just said, we are deviating from Pima County's plan, which clearly has been able to get to more lower income areas, more areas that, you know, that have a higher population of African American and Latinos, than the State seems to be able to successfully do from their pods. So I think that it is really important to keep making those points to the State, which I know that you will.

CH: Yes. Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, we set up the regional pods and they are working well, and so we do not have to give them much attention. They are kind of on their own at this point and working well, typically on average 1,000 shots a day, and that is four of them. The one has been now transferred, the U of A pod, has been transferred to the State so our four pods are continuing kind of on autopilot, providing we have vaccine supply. They can be ramped up if we get more supply. Our entire focus now is on those mobile applications, to get to the disadvantaged populations. So we are entering that phase that says our goals right now is to reach those disadvantaged populations in the rural areas of Pima County, as well as any urban area that has a high percentage of that population. As we have defined

that, it deals with the demographics of the census track itself and it deals with the infection rate of COVID-19 in that census track, as well as the hospitalizations and deaths in that census track. Those numbers all combine to direct us to where we ought to be concentrating our efforts.

MH: Perfect. Two more things and I will suspend here. I think it is important to point out that the, and I was at the mobile vaccination site at 12th and Ajo which I was planning on just stopping by on my way home from a night shift. I ended up staying four or five hours because it was really, really, and frankly it was an amazing experience to see how well things were working and to see literally vaccines going into the population that is most in need based on the fact that in that area, of course, as you mentioned, there was a hotspot with regard to the transmission and cases. We were going to do another one of those, as I understand it, this past Saturday which had to be delayed due to vaccine. (inaudible) I think it is important for folks that are encouraging us to do more of this in the communities we are working to do that, but because of, I would say an inequitable distribution coming from the State and overall low supply coming from the (inaudible) for whatever reason, that rollout is not happening maybe as much as we want. I applaud the fact that we will be looking to do in the next few days, that I believe we will be doing at least two or three in South Tucson, Littleton and the eastern part of my district. I believe Steele Elementary and some others. I think that is excellent. Last thing I wanted to say is that, just like a recap, since we last talked about the funds approved for the second CARES Act, or whatever it is called, the second federal aid package with regard to supporting counties and jurisdictions for testing and tracing and, of course, vaccine infrastructure. We talked two weeks ago and I believe the state of Arizona had received \$416 million of which we are owed \$63 or \$4 or \$5 million or something to that effect. And also there was another smaller bucket of money that I think we were estimating we were owed \$10 to \$14 million. Can you give us an update as to what, if anything, we have received from the State. Does the State have the money? When can we expect the money? Maybe Dr. Christ will drive down with, you know, \$65 million in 10s and 20s. That is fine. We accept cash here in Pima County. Actually, I do not know about that. Andy, I am sorry. Mr. Flagg, you can correct me. But, you know, whatever we can do.

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, it was a consolidated act. It was an intermediate piece and \$416 million for testing and \$66 million for vaccination. We have written at least, I went back and looked, there is a letter signed by the Chair and all of the mayors dated in January, that was sent to the Governor requesting that those allocations be made for the expenses being incurred primarily by the public health agency. We looked at the data from January 1 on to where we are today and the County, and most other counties are not doing this and so we are a little unique, where we are doing a vast, significant amount of the COVID-19 testing, PCR testing.

MH: Right.

CH: We are doing about 65% of all testing in Pima County and we know the State picked up testing out at the airport both inside the security perimeter and outside of it. Since January 1, we have provided 56,000 PCR tests to people in Pima County. The State has provided about 5,000 tests at the airport. So it gives you kind of an order of magnitude of what is occurring in knowing that each one of those tests is about \$120. It tells you how fast we are spending money in the testing arena. We hope that we can break that discussion loose. It sounds like from talking to Dr. Garcia this morning, somebody is at least acknowledging that we are spending that money, and hopefully we will get it broken loose pretty quickly. And the area of vaccination, we had five regional pods that we stood up, and each one of those was costing about \$12,000 a day to operate, and so, if you do the math, five times 12, that is \$60,000 a day that we have been incurring in operating those regional vaccination centers since January 15th. So, again, \$60,000 a day. Now, one of them has been transferred to the State, which is the U of A one, but that is still, we are at \$50,000 a day in vaccination expenses. We have been told that we will see our, quote, share of that, of the \$66 million is \$7.1 million, even though we know our expenses will run more than that. Probably 10 to 14, but we will take anything we can get. We still have not seen any of that money either. So we are, and that is why I put in my report that, so we are eagerly awaiting some confirmation that we will see that money come to Pima County and offset our expenses in the pandemic, but so far, it has been crickets.

MH: (inaudible) That brings up one other thing I wanted to point out in your memo. Very distressing, because I believe that the viral surveillance that we are doing, this testing regimen has actually been able to help and I think Dr. Garcia and Cullen will echo this. Is what is allowing us to find the hotspots, send the mobile units for example. This is how we do this. All this viral testing is incredibly important and it looks like if we do not get that \$3 or \$4 million of the \$416 million that the State has right now, we could be faced with potentially stopping the testing program that we have put into place on March 2nd, if I am reading your memo correctly. Is that what you said?

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Heinz, that is correct. We just cannot go on indefinitely, spending that kind of money at that rate, without some assurances we are going to be repaid. So we have to somehow draw a line in the sand. I was not going to do it. I was going to put it on the Board's agenda for the 2nd, because obviously, that is a policy decision and a pretty tough one.

MH: Understood. Thank you for that.

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. I had a couple of questions and I do not know if they both go to Mr. Huckelberry or, perhaps, to Dr. Garcia, but Mr. Huckelberry, I will let you decide that. Could we get an update, it was not one of the topics covered in your memo, on the assisted living facilities, skilled nursing facilities, all of those senior citizen facilities that were not part of the CDC program with Walgreens and CVS that are now the responsibility of Pima County. Where do we stand in terms of the service to those facilities?

CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Scott, let me make an initial comment and then I will defer to Dr. Garcia. If you looked at our tiers of priorities, which we established if there is a shortage of vaccines. Tier one was those orphaned assisted living facilities that had not been covered by the federal program. So they were, frankly, on the top of our list as a priority. I will let Dr. Garcia address where we are in that.

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, you know, one of the greatest vulnerability and the greatest mortality that we had in this community early on was due to outbreaks that occurred in long-term care facilities. To date, I can tell you that approximately 12,000, 13,000 vaccines have been administered in those facilities through the federal partnership. I can also tell you that we have been identifying all of those facilities that are not already enrolled in that process and have started the process of vaccinating those individuals that reside in them. At this point, I can tell you that it is, I cannot give you an exact number, because quite honestly it escapes me at the moment but we are well into that work. We have allocated modest but substantial numbers of vaccines on a weekly basis that are taken to those facilities by our public health nurses and administered on site. So, I believe that at this point we are in the 200 range, but I cannot swear to that so I will have to get back to you with the exact amount.

RS: I appreciate that. And then I just had one other question and, Mr. Huckelberry, you referenced in your memo the Wall Street Journal article that indicated that President Biden is going to ask for close to 30% increase in the national allotment of vaccine. Knowing that fact, also knowing that the State has decided to do its 24/7 facility at the University of Arizona, do we foresee in the future any plans for the site that we had originally proposed for the State pod and that being Rillito Park. Do we see that as a pod for us in the future?

CH: Yes, Chair Bronson and Supervisor Scott, it is. We are continuing to do planning because as we get through the 1b population, we are going to be going into the 1c population which is even larger. So we know that if a significant amount of vaccine becomes available, we will increase our capacities not only in our four remaining regional pods, but establish Rillito as well, because there is a potential that if the Johnson & Johnson vaccine

becomes available there will be, you know, a lot of it and so we need to have a plan to get that again distributed as rapidly as possible. So yes, Rillito is still on the list.

RS: Thank you very much. And Madam Chair, those were the only questions I had.

SB: All right. Are there any further questions? So we are, is that, did somebody just start to say something? No. okay. So then, we have concluded Item 9.

DRAFT

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### 26. Request for Reconsideration - District 3

On February 2, 2021, the Board of Supervisors took the following action:

A. **Eviction Prevention**

Discussion/Action regarding codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to adopt as a public health regulation through March 31, 2021, applicable throughout Pima County a moratorium on all evictions in Pima County, except those for material falsification or for material and irreparable breaches as provided in A.R.S. §33-1368(A) and to direct the Pima County Health Department to develop a form/declaration eligible tenants can sign to show their eligibility for the protections of this moratorium consistent with the terms of this moratorium and otherwise with the Centers for Disease Control Eviction Moratorium and to make such form easily accessible to the public.

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

**Eviction Prevention**

Discussion/Action regarding codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County. (District 2)

C. In conjunction with or in addition to reconsideration as noted above, discussion/action regarding community/stakeholder input on codifying, extending, and/or expanding a moratorium on evictions in Pima County.

#### 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  
JC: Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board  
NG: Nico Grischkowsky, IT Technology Support Analyst

---

SB: Let us move on to Item 4. I placed this on the agenda. It is the reconsideration of the eviction prevention. I did so because of actions that have been taken at the State level and because of information we received after we acted on this that suggests we might want to revise what we did. And then in addition, I was and remain concerned about how we did this. There was essentially, and especially in the time of COVID, there was no real opportunity for public discussion. We were not able, the public was not able to even see what we were doing until Supervisor Heinz made the motion and at least I had not even seen anything regarding that motion until Supervisor Heinz made the motion. So that is why I am asking for a reconsideration. I am going to make the motion to reconsider and then if the motion is approved, if I get a second, and if the motion to reconsider is approved, then we can proceed with some discussion and determination as to whether or not we want to leave the eviction prevention motion as it stands or amend it.

SC: I will second your motion. Supervisor Christy.

SB: Okay. Supervisor Christy seconds it. I made the motion. Again, we are not discussing, we are just doing, do we want a reconsideration, so let us do a roll call vote.

JC: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

JC: Supervisor Grijalva?

AG: No.

JC: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: No.

JC: Supervisor Scott?

RS: Yes.

JC: Chair Bronson?

SB: Yes. Motion for reconsideration passes 3-2. So then, let us now move on to discussion and action regarding the eviction prevention. I would like to make the following motion for purposes of discussion, that we rescind our eviction prevention action at our last Board meeting and that, instead, we would perhaps consider at our March 2nd meeting after ample input from stakeholders in determining what action to take, since we have some action before the Attorney General. Determining whether the eviction prevention



motion that passed at our last Board meeting is something we want to pursue or amend.

SC: I will second your motion. Supervisor Christy.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Okay. So my motion is, to just clarify, is that we rescind the eviction prevention action that we took at last Board meeting and we extend a public comment, allow the public to comment and then at our March 2nd meeting, depending on the action of the Attorney General, that we amend, if appropriate, the eviction prevention action we took at our last Board meeting. So is there somebody who wants to talk? Who is that?

SC: Supervisor Christy.

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, what you are basically saying is there will be public discussion to come up with a new process that has the collaboration of all those involved in the process for consideration before the Board on March 2nd. Is that right?

SB: That is the intent of my motion, yes, and that if, again, go ahead, I am sorry. I interrupted.

SC: Well, my question is, the public stakeholders, I want to be clear on this. At first blush there is two sides, the property and landlord owners and then the renters, and it is easy to determine which side will be represented on the property owners' and landlords' side. Who is going to be the stakeholders and the people speaking on behalf of the stakeholders on the other side?

SB: I think we just allow the individuals who would like to weigh in on this to weigh in and we advertise that we are reconsidering and we see who wants to weigh in. I think the other piece of this, I think that the motion as it was made is confusing and it is going to be confusing to the courts because they have to specifically enact it and that language is, I do not think, sufficient to give them guidance. So I am concerned about that. I am also, as you have seen, we do have that action before the Attorney General. So, I think it is important that we rescind this and continue the item so we can get the appropriate information. I would also hope that, you know, there was a rock, as we said, in some types of eviction but that was a percentage that was provided, not detailed specificity. I would hope that we would get some information from staff as to the exact, and you had already asked this question Supervisor Christy, to the exact information on if there is a problem with those evictions that occurred or if they were, the increase in evictions, or if they were warranted. Because I think some of the information I am getting is that the action we took is actually going to put public health at risk. So. I am very concerned about that. There simply was not efficient discussion.

- SC: Madam Chair, I agree with all of your statements and concerns and I shared many of them with you at the last Board meeting. I just want to make sure that there is ample input from all of those concerned so, together, those generating that input can craft an item that we can all agree upon. I do have a question. Is March 2nd too soon to be able to compile all the input from the stakeholders?
- SB: Mr. Huckelberry, do you want to respond? And yeah, we have to advertise it. They have to know it is reconsidered and we may want to do it at our second meeting in March. Mr. Huckelberry, do you have any comments?
- CH: Chair Bronson and Supervisor Christy, I believe if it is the Board's direction we could meet the March 2nd date.
- SB: Alright, thank you. Supervisor Christy, does that answer your question?
- SC: Yeah it does, Madam Chair. Thank you, and also thank you for voting and moving to reconsider this item. I find a lot of the issues that were brought up at the last meeting will be given an ample opportunity to be publicly and transparently aired in a new forum and a new setting with new information, particularly the anecdotal information to be verified at this particular point, and we can act as a Board much more educated in something that is really affecting not just the business community, but an industry within the business community that really needs consideration. So thank you for moving to reconsider it and allowing me to second it, and I am hopeful and positive that we can put together something by March 2nd.
- SB: Thank you. Any other comments?
- AG: Supervisor Bronson?
- SB: Yes, Adelita.
- AG: Yeah, so I think that we have an opportunity later if the County Attorney should make a decision that is against the extension of this eviction moratorium. We have an opportunity at that point to reconsider. I do think it is important for us to get input from other stakeholders, which is why I met with two different groups of landlords, realtors, and property owners and property management to try to understand what some of the nuances of their issues were. But I do think that it is important for us to create a partnership because all of the stakeholder groups have to be at the table. I do think clarification to the courts is important, but I do not think that that is something that we cannot accomplish by continuing to ensure that people stay in their homes if they cannot afford the rent. Considering that we are expecting, or we have already received some of the funding that should be of some assistance to renters, if we have an opportunity right now to ensure that people stay in their

homes, I do think that that is one of the other mitigation factors that has been really critical in Pima County, reducing the spread. So I am not in favor of rescinding it. I do think that having more clarification is important, but it is something that has to go hand in hand with rescinding the moratorium. Thank you.

SB: Any other comments?

MH: Yes, Supervisor Bronson.

SB: Supervisor, is that Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

SB: Okay. Again, for whatever reason, it sounds like you are a little far away from the mic.

MH: Oh, I am sorry about that. So I think that it is important..

SB: That is better.

MH: ...to clarify what the Board did and what my motion, which was made in an open meeting publicly, accomplished. That was simply to direct that there be a forum generated to, based on our public health authority under Title 36, that we essentially echo the CDC's moratorium, not extend it. This is not making it go past March 31st. I would remind everyone, March 31st is when the motion that I made and was passed by the this Board 4-1 would, I guess, sunset or expire. But, to clarify and to resolve the issue brought to, I think, multiple members of this Board by the Constables and multiple members of the community. That these evictions, these certain subset of evictions, these frivolously, I think, be brought forth. It would give the Constables the added ability to have a forum so that they could potentially attest to this like what they do right now with the CDC. So, I do not know why that is confusing. I certainly do not know why that endangers public health because, as a physician caring for people in the hospital on a regular basis with COVID, I can tell you that forcing people out of their homes, forcing people into shelters or other congregate living arrangements or forcing them into having more people in one home, like with a family member that maybe has a home that they can share. Forcing more people into close proximity during a viral pandemic is extremely, extremely bad health policy and it is totally inappropriate for us to rescind this right now because we will be endangering dozens of people in the meantime. While we, you know, I do not mind giving additional information and input and revising something in the future, but there is no reason whatsoever we should stop providing the Constables with this tool to help keep people in their homes during this pandemic.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Any other comments?

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Well, I will defer to Supervisor Christy. Go ahead, Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz, I am very respectful of your profession and you are doing such wonderful work on the frontlines and dealing with things far more important than most business people. However, I would not in the least bit advise you as to how to treat a patient or operate on a patient in your capacity as I have no medical background or experience. The same, I think, applies in this situation. You are doing God's work in the hospitals. Again, a much more higher level of importance. However, I do not think it is incumbent upon you to direct how an industry and a business where, in many cases are mom and pop real estate owners that are utilizing property investments for their own income, for you to unilaterally decide how the direction of the businesses should conduct themselves. I would not do that to you, and I do not think it is fair for you to impose that upon a community that has employees, that has investments, that has payments to lending institutions. There are many, many items involved in being a landlord and a commercial real estate broker and a property owner that go beyond and above just collecting rent. And there are many rippling effects that are actually affected by this particular item that you have been forwarding and I think it certainly is an element of fairness that if you are going to make one side of this equation benefit, or have an upper position, that it is just as important to bring the other side into the equation as well because there are many, many different stories than just what we are hearing on the side you are presenting. So from a transparency, from an understanding, from a fairness and from an industry standpoint, it is important that we rescind what we did at the last meeting and that we move forward and get a consensus of all those involved in this. Stakeholders, regardless of their position or their standing in this issue, need a chance to air their position, air their grievances and air what they are putting forth in this, without just unilaterally deciding that only one side should prevail. So it is important and incumbent upon this Board to allow for a meeting of the minds and a new method to try to get everybody involved so it is a fair and equitable resolution to a very difficult problem. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank Supervisor Heinz for bringing this matter to the agenda two weeks ago. I am sure that I gave all of you a little bit of both confusion and, perhaps, bemusement when I seconded his motion to approve the item and then seconded Supervisor Christy's motion to extend it to March 2nd. I thank Supervisor Heinz, because I believe that the measure that we discussed then, that we are discussing again today, brought up

issues that all of us were hearing in the community that needed to be considered. But, I thank Supervisor Christy for asking that we extend the matter to March 2nd, because we needed to have a comprehensive discussion, community wide, with everybody who deserves input into this issue. Quite frankly, this matter has taught me some lessons as a new supervisor about not only how to post items on the agenda. And I have already shared my thoughts about that with Supervisor Heinz. But also the need for us to engage in outreach. To not just put items on the agenda, but to ask everybody who might have a need to have input into that agenda, to invite them to offer input and so that is why I joined Supervisors Bronson and Christy in the move for reconsideration today.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Scott. Is there any further discussion?

AG: Supervisor Bronson?

SB: Yes, Adelita.

AG: I think it is important that we all do our homework and so I feel like I did. I talked to a lot of different people about the issue, been a part of many different forums and groups that meet every Monday talking about eviction prevention and the health concerns and that is how it impacts us. Respectfully, you know, the item passed 4-1 and so it was not, you know, each of us have our own opportunity to do what we need to do in order to make an informed decision. I appreciate that there has been some pushback from different, a couple different people regarding how we got to this point but, you know, Supervisor Heinz had as much of an obligation to bring this item forward as each of you respectfully making the decision. So, a majority, just as a reminder, a majority of us voted for this moratorium.

SB: Is there any further discussion?

MH: Supervisor Bronson, one other thing here. It is Supervisor Heinz.

SB: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Yeah, I think it is also really important to point out that in the majority, a considerable majority of these cases I am informed, the folks that are being subjected to these, in many cases, frivolous or loophole evictions during the CDC moratorium that has been enforced for now, months. That in these cases before these judges, there is very regularly no tenant. There is no defense. There is no defendant. So they are faced with a situation where you have a landlord, and I am not saying that they do not deserve to be compensated or that they are in some way not owed this money. Because, as Supervisor Christy points out, that is quite an issue and, as Supervisor Grijalva points out, the funds are now here to be distributed to folks through tenants to make sure that some of those funds can be paid back. But, when

in most of the cases you have people getting thrown out of their homes without being represented in the court. So these judges are faced with this very untenable situation where you have a lawyer and a landlord or property owner on one side and nothing on the other side and that is not really fair to do to them. That is why I think it is also really, and certainly not equitable justice, equal justice for all. So, I think that is another reason why rescinding this makes no sense and those, you know, if we do that, if that is what is done, then, you know, I think that we are jeopardizing more people than we are helping in this case and I am, you know, again, we should not have to even legislate or regulate human decency. But I believe that what we did two weeks ago was necessary based on what the Constables are telling us and I think that we need to continue to do that.

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I am very much looking forward to seeing the data that staff is going to present to us by March 2nd, because everything that we talked about two weeks ago and everything that we have talked about so far today has been anecdotal. So I am looking forward to seeing the data that Mr. Huckelberry says staff can produce by March 2nd. Secondly, and again I communicated this to Supervisor Heinz privately, I feel that the motion he made last week, the motion that he crafted in partnership with Mr. Flagg, is the item that should have been on the agenda. I think if that motion had been on the agenda instead of the more general language that was, it would have attracted more attention from everybody in the community that deserves input into this issue. That is why I said that I feel like I have learned some lessons from this situation about agendizing items so that the public can be informed in advance about what the Board is actually going to consider.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor Scott. I concur, and especially during times of COVID, when we do not have in-person meetings and there was no advance, there was little advanced notice of this. So there was not an opportunity for real comment and I do not think that is how you make real policy. I think you need to have, everybody needs to have the ability to weigh in and we have to ascertain the facts and I do not think we have done either in this instance. So with that, if there is no further discussion, roll call.

JC: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

JC: Supervisor Grijalva?

AG: No.

JC: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: No.

JC: Supervisor Scott?

RS: Yes.

JC: Chair Bronson?

SB: Yes. Motion carries, 3-2.

DRAFT