

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, May 18, 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
Jan Leshner, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshner, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Flood Control District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

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 and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Flood Control District Budget in the amount of \$18,824,889.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.3335. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION

Staff requests approval of a Riparian Habitat Mitigation In-Lieu Fee Proposal in the amount of \$4,560.00 for placement of a single family residence at 1252 N. Calle Rinconado, located within Regulated Riparian Habitat classified as Important Riparian Area with Underlying Xeroriparian Class C Habitat. (District 4)

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

3. **CONTRACT**

Kipp S. Drake and Glenda A. Drake, to provide for a Sales Agreement and Special Warranty Deed for property located on the south side of Orange Grove Road, east of Oracle Road, a portion of Tax Parcel No. 102-20-001A, in Section 12, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, contract amount \$1,420.00 revenue (CTN-PW-21-116)

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

4. **REGIONAL FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT TECHNICAL POLICIES**

The District recommends adoption of three new Technical Policies and approval of the proposed revisions to the existing Technical Policies.

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

Supervisor Scott asked for a summary of the actions being considered by the Board and asked whether input from stakeholders caused significant changes or revisions to the proposal.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that a change to the State Statute in 2015, required formal approval of substantive policies. He explained that these policies provided clarification and detailed acceptable floodplain standards, for such things as fencing or wall improvements. He indicated that there were three new policies added. He stated that most of the comments received from stakeholders addressed Technical Policy No. 24, which dealt with the disturbance and avoidance of Riparian Habitat. He stated that the Flood Control District reached out to the development and environmental community, circulated drafts and met with organizations or individuals to address questions. He added that the reasons for incorporating or not incorporating changes were provided.

Supervisor Scott asked whether stakeholder input resulted in substantial modifications from what was originally proposed.

Mr. DeBonis responded that the changes made were minor to moderate. He stated that the groups that had commented were satisfied with how input was addressed.

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 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
Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the following County Improvement District Tentative Budgets for Fiscal Year 2021/2022:

<u>IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT</u>	<u>FY 21-22 PROPERTY TAX LEVY</u>
<u>Other Improvement District</u>	
HAYHOOK RANCH	\$ 40,000
<u>Street Lighting Improvement District</u>	
CARDINAL ESTATES	\$ 12,030
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1	\$ 6,947
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3	\$ 1,192
DESERT STEPPES	\$ 4,171
HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES	\$ 3,572
LAKEVIEW NO. 1	\$ 5,560
LITTLETOWN	\$ 15,286
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1	\$ 7,544
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2	\$ 8,733
MAÑANA GRANDE B	\$ 5,955
MAÑANA GRANDE C	\$ 9,727
MIDVALE PARK	\$ 12,359
MORTIMORE ADDITION	\$ 26,832
OAKTREE NO. 1	\$ 20,739
OAKTREE NO. 2	\$ 16,286
OAKTREE NO. 3	\$ 28,453
ORANGE GROVE VALLEY	\$ 6,148
PEACH VALLEY	\$ 3,250
PEPPERTREE	\$ 9,055
ROLLING HILLS	\$ 15,637
SALIDA DEL SOL	\$ 13,242

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 and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to close the public hearing and adopt the Improvement District Tentative Budgets as presented. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 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, May 18, 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
Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Library District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

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 and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Library District Budget in the amount of \$45,031,490.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.5353. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **AWARD**

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-16-338, Amendment No. 7, Baker & Taylor, L.L.C., to provide for library materials and related services. This amendment extends the termination date to 6/30/22 and adds the annual award amount of \$3,000,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$17,543,024.00. Funding Source: Library District Fund. Administering Department: Library District.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 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
Jan Leshner, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshner, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

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 and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Rocking K South Community Facilities District Budget in the amount of \$1,531,155.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CLERK

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 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
Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING

Review and adoption of the Library District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

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 and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative Stadium District Budget in the amount of \$8,566,944.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met remotely in regular session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 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
Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator
Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney
Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board
Charles Lopiccolo, Sergeant at Arms

*Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, left the meeting at 10:22 a.m. Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, represented the office in his absence.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

3. Presentation of a proclamation to John Spiker, Storm Water Utility Division Manager, Town of Oro Valley; Daniel Burke, Deputy Chief - Operations C-shift, Tucson Fire Department; Mike Sagara, Public Information Officer, American Red Cross-Southern Arizona Chapter; Ken Drozd, Warning Coordination Meteorologist, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Matthew McGlone, Community Outreach Coordinator, Pima County Office of Emergency Management; Greg Saxe, Environmental Planning Manager, and Joe Cuffari, Public Information Officer, Pima County Regional Flood Control District, proclaiming the week of June 13 through 19, 2021 to be: "MONSOON SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK"

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

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Patricia Maisch, proclaiming the first Friday of June 2021 to be: "NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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. Supervisor Scott read the proclamation.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that the County Attorney's Office provide the Board with an updated opinion on gun shows held on County leased properties.

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Gracie Soto, granddaughter, proclaiming the day of Saturday, May 29, 2021 to be: "GRACE SOTO DAY"

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

6. Presentation of a Certificate of Appreciation to recognize and thank the Pima County Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers of Green Valley for the support and service given to the Green Valley community, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. (District 4)

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

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments for the record.

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 9:44 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 10:00 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a request by Bosse Rollman, P.C., to waive a conflict of interest to allow it to represent Green Valley Recreation, Inc. ("GVR") in a matter involving a potential lease between GVR and Pima County of a parking lot next to the Canoa Hills Golf Course.

Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that conflict waivers were at the Board's discretion.

It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to waive the conflict of interest.

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in DHS Property Investments Limited Partnership v. Pima County, Arizona Tax Court Case No. TX2021-000082.

Lesley Lukach, Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the County Attorney's Office recommended denial of the proposed settlement.

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

12. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak were submitted regarding the Tentative Budgets for FY 2021/2022. None had been received.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

13. Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022 in the amount of \$2,115,600,207.00 at an effective tax rate of \$5.1952. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

14. Review and adoption of the Debt Service Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.

It was moved by Chair Bronson and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Services Tentative Budget in the amount of \$109,492,831.00 at an effective tax rate of \$0.4500. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

Supervisor Grijalva asked for confirmation of the budget total.

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, responded \$2,115,600,207.00, with a combined property tax rate of \$5.1952.

15. **Dementia-Friendly Community**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 23, of the Board of Supervisors, declaring the County's intent to become a Dementia-Friendly Community and entering into a formal partnership with Pima Council on Aging to work toward that goal. (District 5)

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

Maddy Bynes, Director of Public Policy & Special Projects, Pima Council of Aging, indicated that 20,442 individuals living in Pima County had Alzheimer or other related dementias. She stated that a coordinated system would help organizations address the needs of caregivers and those with related dementia.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

16. **Naming of New Public Defense Services Building**

Staff recommends approval of naming the new Public Defense Services Building on the Juvenile Justice Complex after Mr. Fredric Kay.

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

17. **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.)

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

18. **Fiscal Year 2022 Expenditure Limitation Report**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 24, of the Board of Supervisors, designating the Chief Fiscal Officer for official submission of the Fiscal Year 2022 Expenditure Limitation Report to the Arizona Auditor General.

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

JUVENILE COURT

19. **Juvenile Court Center Family Counseling Program**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 25, of the Board of Supervisors, electing participation by Pima County in the Juvenile Justice Services Family Counseling Programs and providing \$15,245.00 in matching funds.

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

Supervisor Grijalva requested that a presentation be made to the Board after implementation of the program.

REAL PROPERTY

20. Abandonment by Vacation

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 26, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of a portion of "Old" State Route 83, a public roadway, as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0054 within Section 1, T18S, R16E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 4)

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

21. Contract

Drexel Heights Fire District, to provide for an Acquisition Agreement - Acq-1044 and Special Warranty Deed, for the Eagle's Nest premises located at 6950 S. Beehive Avenue in Section 18, T15S, R13E, G&SRM, Tax Parcel No. 138-33-280B, Wireless Integrated Network Fund, contract amount \$5,000.00 for closing costs (CT-PW-21-415)

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

22. Contract

Drexel Heights Fire District, to provide for a communications site lease at Eagle's Nest Tower located at 6950 S. Beehive Avenue, no cost/10 year term (CTN-PW-21-124)

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

23. Sale of Real Property - Lot 7

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 27, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0035, Tax Parcel No. 301-65-4690. (District 3)

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

24. Sale of Real Property - Lot 8

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 28, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0035, Tax Parcel No. 301-65-4700. (District 3)

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

25. Sale of Real Property - Lot 9

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 29, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0035, Tax Parcel No. 301-65-4710. (District 3)

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

26. Sale of Real Property - Lot 10

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 30, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing sale of land held by State under a Treasurer's Deed as Pima County Tax Sale No. TS-0035, Tax Parcel No. 301-65-4720. (District 3)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

27. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Russell Doty, Sabino High School, 5000 N. Bowes Road, Tucson, May 27, 2021 at 9:00 p.m.

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 Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

28. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 145902, Kim Kenneth Kwiatkowski, Circle K Store No. 2741657, 4685 E. Valencia Road, Tucson, Series 9, Liquor Store, Location Transfer.

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 Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

29. A. Hearing - Rezoning Closure

Co9-88-80 LANDON - ORACLE ROAD REZONING

Proposal to close Co9-88-80, on an approximately 3.2-acre rezoning from the GR-1 (GZ) (Rural Residential - Gateway Overlay) to the CB-2 (GZ) (General Business - Gateway Overlay) zone, located on the west side of N. Oracle Road approximately 650 feet north of N. Lupine Place, addressed as 15801 and 15803 N. Oracle Road. This rezoning was conditionally approved on February 7, 1989 and expired on February 7, 1997. Staff recommends AGAINST CLOSURE. (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 Supervisor Scott, seconded by Chair Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve staff's recommendation against closure of Co9-88-80.

B. Hearing - Rezoning Time Extension

Co9-88-80 LANDON - ORACLE ROAD REZONING

Newberry Investments Profit Sharing, et al., represented by Perry Engineering, requests five (5), five-year time extensions for the above referenced rezoning from the GR-1 (GZ) (Rural Residential - Gateway Overlay) to the CB-2 (GZ) (General Business - Gateway Overlay) zone. The subject site was rezoned in February 1989 and approved for rezoning time extension in August 1993. The site is approximately 3.2 acres located on the west side of N. Oracle Road approximately 650 feet north of N. Lupine Place, addressed as 15801 and 15803 N. Oracle Road. Staff recommends APPROVAL OF FIVE (5) FIVE-YEAR TIME EXTENSIONS SUBJECT TO ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

- ~~1. Submittal of a complete hydraulic and hydrologic drainage report as determined necessary by the Department of Transportation and Flood Control.~~
- ~~2. Submittal of a development plan if determined necessary by the appropriate County agencies.~~
- ~~3. Dedication of necessary right-of-way for roads and drainage by separate instrument if the property is not to be subdivided.~~
- ~~4. Recording an acceptable plat which will provide for dedication of necessary right-of-way for roads and drainage if the property is to be subdivided.~~
- ~~5. Recording a covenant holding Pima County harmless in the event of flooding.~~
6. Conformance with County paving policies as determined appropriate by the

Department of Transportation and Flood Control.

- ~~7. Conformance with Chapter 18.81 (GRADING) of the Pima County Zoning Code.~~
- ~~8. Recording the necessary development related covenants as determined appropriate by the various County agencies.~~
- ~~9. Provision of development related assurances as required by the appropriate agencies.~~
- ~~402. Recording a covenant to the effect that~~ There will shall be no further subdividing or lot splitting without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
- ~~443. Regional Wastewater Reclamation Management Condition:~~

~~A. Connection to the public sewer system at the location and specified by Wastewater Management at the time of review of the tentative plat or development plan.~~

~~B. The property owner or his agent must construct the on-site sewers in a manner that will provide flow-through for tributary areas at points and with capacities as specified by Wastewater Management at the time of review of the tentative plat or development plan. The public flow-through sewer must be designed and constructed in conformance with the applicable Pima County standards, and must be completed, inspected, and released for service prior to the issuance of any building permits.~~

A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.

B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and / or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.

C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.

D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.

E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

~~424. Transportation conditions:~~

~~A. Proposed access to the subject property shall need the approval of the Subdivision Engineer, Pima County Department of Transportation, prior to~~

~~the submittal of a development plan or subdivision plat for any portion of the subject property.~~

- ~~BA.~~ Access to the subject property from Tucson-Florence Highway shall need written approval by Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) prior to issuance of a Certificate of Compliance development plan approval. Proof of coordination with ADOT shall be submitted to Development Services Department.
- ~~CB.~~ ~~A w~~Written certification from the Arizona Department of Transportation stating satisfactory compliance with all of its requirements shall need to be submitted to the ~~Department of Transportation prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance~~ Development Services Department prior to development plan approval.
- ~~DC.~~ Owner shall covenant to provide and establish joint use access easement with adjacent properties to the north and to the south if deemed necessary by ~~Pima County~~ in order to allow for a continuous common (two-way) access lane across the property and running parallel to Tucson-Florence Highway. The location and design of said joint access easement shall be determined during the development plan permitting process.
- D. The property owner(s) shall accept responsibility for the maintenance, control, safety and liability of privately owned roads, drives, physical barriers, drainageways and drainage easements.

13. Flood Control conditions:

- ~~A.~~ ~~The property owner must dedicate all rights of way and/or grant flowage easements for drainage purposes to Pima County, as determined necessary by the Flood Control District during the plan review process.~~
- ~~B.~~ ~~The property owner must submit all required drainage reports and plans, and receive approval by the Flood Control District prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance. In developing the reports and plans, the requirements and regulations incorporated in the following reports must be satisfied.~~
 - ~~1. Floodplain Management Ordinance~~
 - ~~2. Drainage and Channel Design Standards~~
 - ~~3. Flood Control Policies~~
 - ~~4. Detention/Retention Manual~~
- ~~C.~~ ~~On-site retention of the difference between the existing and the five (5) year event will be required because of the requested land use and density.~~

5. Cultural Resources condition: A caution must be noted concerning human burials. In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.

6. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove invasive non-native species from the property, including those below. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.

Invasive Non-Native Plant Species Subject to Control

<u><i>Ailanthus altissima</i></u>	<u>Tree of Heaven</u>
<u><i>Alhagi pseudalhagi</i></u>	<u>Camelthorn</u>
<u><i>Arundo donax</i></u>	<u>Giant reed</u>
<u><i>Brassica tournefortii</i></u>	<u>Sahara mustard</u>

<u>Bromus rubens</u>	Red brome
<u>Bromus tectorum</u>	Cheatgrass
<u>Centaurea melitensis</u>	Malta starthistle
<u>Centaurea solstitialis</u>	Yellow starthistle
<u>Cortaderia spp.</u>	Pampas grass
<u>Cynodon dactylon</u>	Bermuda grass (excluding sod hybrid)
<u>Digitaria spp.</u>	Crabgrass
<u>Elaeagnus angustifolia</u>	Russian olive
<u>Eragrostis spp.</u>	Lovegrass (excluding <i>E. intermedia</i> , plains lovegrass)
<u>Melinis repens</u>	Natal grass
<u>Mesembryanthemum spp.</u>	Iceplant
<u>Oncosiphon piluliferum</u>	Stinknet
<u>Peganum harmala</u>	African rue
<u>Pennisetum ciliare</u>	Buffelgrass
<u>Pennisetum setaceum</u>	Fountain grass
<u>Rhus lancea</u>	African sumac
<u>Salsola spp.</u>	Russian thistle
<u>Schinus spp.</u>	Pepper tree
<u>Schismus arabicus</u>	Arabian grass
<u>Schismus barbatus</u>	Mediterranean grass
<u>Sorghum halepense</u>	Johnson grass
<u>Tamarix spp.</u>	Tamarisk

447. Landscaping to consist of low water use and low pollen producing vegetation.
458. ~~Tentative plat or development plan when filed per Chapter 18.69 must adhere~~
Adherence to the preliminary development plan as presented approved at public hearing.
469. No more than one (1) parcel.
4710. Heights shall be limited to two stories or 24 feet in height.
11. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
12. The property owner shall execute and record the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights. "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, Chapter 8, Article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

The Chair inquired whether any comments or requests to speak on this item were submitted. None had been received. It was moved by Chair Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve Co9-88-80, subject to original and modified standard and special conditions.

30. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2021 - 14, P20RZ00010, Camfe, L.L.C. - W. Oklahoma Street Rezoning. Owners: Camfe, L.L.C. (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 Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

31. FY22 Funding for Home Sharing Pilot

Discussion/Action regarding a measure directing the County Administrator and County staff to include \$200,000.00 in the Final FY22 Pima County Budget to fund the Year 1 pilot of a Home Sharing Program in Pima County, administered by Pima Council on Aging (PCOA). Such funding would be separate and apart from PCOA's current outside agency funding from Pima County, which leverages millions in federal matching dollars for programs and services for Pima County's elderly communities. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz indicated that this funding request was for the establishment of a Home Sharing Pilot Program in cooperation with PCOA. He stated that this would address the County's affordable housing crisis, especially for elderly citizens. He indicated that this one-time \$200,000.00 allocation would allow PCOA to implement the pilot program.

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

Chair Bronson indicated that due to the lack of accountability, she could not support the item. She stated that this motion was also procedurally problematic because the Board had adopted the ceiling level for the Fiscal Year 2021/22 budget, and this \$200,000.00 was not included. She asked whether a business plan had been provided and whether community outreach had been conducted.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether additional information could be provided by PCOA on the community's level of interest and whether this item could be brought back to the Board. She also expressed concern that this was presented after budget adoption.

Jan Leshner, Chief Deputy County Administrator, indicated that the Board had set the ceiling cap; however, there was \$43 million in contingency funding that could be allocated as the Board saw fit.

Supervisor Grijalva recommended that PCOA utilize American Rescue Act funding to begin the preliminary ground work for the project and that information be presented to the Board.

Ms. Leshar indicated that staff would work with PCOA on funding options for presentation to the Board.

Chair Bronson commented that the American Rescue Act was a one-time funding source and this program appeared to be an ongoing program. She indicated that there were unmet needs in the community and affordable housing was one. She indicated that there was no transparency, accountability, or public outreach on how this program would work.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether housing and eviction prevention funding could be utilized. She expressed support, and indicated that other revenue sources should be considered before considering contingency funding.

Ms. Leshar indicated that staff would provide a full report on available funding sources.

Supervisor Scott commented about meeting with PCOA where PCOA conveyed the City's commitment and PCOA's work towards providing logistics to get the program running. He indicated that he had seconded the motion to allow PCOA the opportunity to continuing working on the details needed.

Chair Bronson commented about the disparity in funding: City of Tucson \$50,000.00; Pima County \$200,000.00.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether Supervisor Heinz was agreeable to having this item reconsidered in October or November. She conveyed support, but felt that additional information was needed in order to address the Board's concerns.

Supervisor Heinz pointed out that a feasibility study was contained in the request. He indicated that PCOA was unable to utilize Federal funding which was why PCOA made the request to Pima County. He stated that his motion had not included a funding source because, as stated, funding could be designated from available sources.

Maddy Bynes, Director of Public Policy & Special Projects, PCOA, indicated that Federal funding was received from the Older Americans Act passed in 1965. She stated that funding was allocated to such programs as: home care, Meals on Wheels, congregate meals, evidence based public health programming, caregiver, supportive services, and Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program. She indicated that the Older Americans Act was not able to support this program. She stated that the County had provided outside agency funding which was used to match draw-downs from the Federal Older Americans Act.

Supervisor Scott asked why the City allocation request differed from the County's.

Ms. Bynes responded that the allocation received from the City of Tucson was outside agencies funding that did not have flexible spending capabilities. She indicated that this request was for one-time funding to be used towards building the infrastructure of the program. She added that PCOA was looking for other funding sources. She indicated that the American Rescue Plan Act was a one-time allocation and PCOA had been working on an infrastructure and sustainability plan.

Chair Bronson commented on the City of Tucson receiving American Rescue Plan funding that could be used and reiterated her concerns with equity. She expressed concern that this would benefit urban areas and not rural communities. She stated that those concerns needed to be addressed and funding sources needed to be identified. She added that information was not in the feasibility report.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that Districts 2 and 5 represented a majority of the urban areas. She stated that there were other equity issues, such as: roads in unincorporated and incorporated areas. She commented about Districts 2 and 5 being located within the City and the expectation that the City would cover infrastructure requests. She indicated the need for this program since older community members did not have a support network and housing was needed. She expressed concern that a majority of the Board was not willing to proceed and suggested that more information be provided and that the item be brought back to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz commented about the overwhelming positive and encouraging feedback received in support of this program. He stated that this was the cheapest and faster way to solve the affordable housing crisis without incurring expenses.

Supervisor Scott inquired how the Board's delay in taking action would affect PCOA's Plans.

Ms. Bynes responded that PCOA did not have sufficient funding for an entire year. She indicated that the housing aspect of the program included case management to ensure compatible matches and needs. She added that PCOA was agreeable to continuing the item.

Supervisor Scott withdrew his second to the motion due to the concerns expressed by Board members. He asked that PCOA provide the additional information requested by the Board.

Chair Bronson commented that she was not opposed to the program, but additional information needed to be provided.

Supervisor Grijalva encouraged Board members to submit their concerns and directed staff to work with PCOA on a robust plan.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the Board needed to move forward with this approval.

Supervisor Scott stated he withdrew his motion based on the responses provided by Ms. Bynes. He stated that PCOA had an opportunity to work with County Administration in providing detailed information.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the next Board meeting.

Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board, responded that the next Board meeting would be held on June 22, 2021.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that this item be continued to the next meeting and that the information requested be provided.

Chair Bronson inquired whether that was by way of direction.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that due to the lack of a consensus, it was a request that it be brought back at the next meeting.

Supervisor Heinz asked that Board members provide their concerns in writing, so that those concerns could be addressed by PCOA.

Chair Bronson indicated that this item would be continued to June 22nd.

Supervisor Scott suggested that Ms. Bynes work with County Administration on addressing the Board's concerns, especially concerns related to a business plan

At the request of Supervisor Grijalva and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 22, 2021.

OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY AND CONSERVATION

32. Santa Cruz River Heritage Project

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 32, of the Board of Supervisors, for City of Tucson Heritage Project.

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

Supervisor Christy recommended continuing this item to the next meeting. He stated that there were serious water issues that needed to be addressed, such as: reduced City of Tucson Water credits based on the County's participation, the City/County 2014 implementation agreement: what were the City and County advantages, what were the gains; and what was the impact to the County.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Chair Bronson to continue the item to June 22, 2021. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that this was the Sonoran Conservation Plan that called for the restoration of the Santa Cruz River. She stated that this was a user agreement for effluent water in a conservation pool. She indicated that she did not have the same concerns and recommended Board approval.

Chair Bronson inquired whether there were concerns with continuing the item.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that the application and the Board's approval were not time dependent and there would be no impact if the item was continued. He indicated that the County Administrator had provided information outlining the general aspects of the conservation effluent pool and the City's application for the Heritage Project. He added that the County had received approval for a similar Riparian Habitat restoration project in the Santa Cruz River.

Chair Bronson agreed that this was an excellent project. She stated, however, that concerns by Board members should be addressed.

Supervisor Christy also concurred that this was a great project, but he was concerned with the implications and ramifications if the County was to give up water credits. He stated that detailed information on the contents of the agreement between the City and the County was needed.

Supervisor Grijalva asked that a project summary be provided and asked whether Board approval was needed for the allocation to the City.

Mr. DeBonis responded that the project was for the City of Tucson's Heritage Project. He indicated that the City was discharging effluent into the Santa Cruz River, approximately 110-acre feet per year. He stated that this project was a collaboration with the Regional Flood Control District. He indicated that a previous project included sedimentation removal from the Santa Cruz River which enhanced the flood carrying capacity and was coordinated between the Regional Flood Control District, the City of Tucson, and Tucson Water. He stated that the series of agreements dated back to 2000. He indicated that there was an agreement between the City and the County that established the conservation effluent pool allocated to Riparian Habitat restoration projects. He stated that this allowed the jurisdictions to rely upon reserved allocation for riparian restoration rather than using other allocations for either the County or City projects. He added that this allowed the City and the County to be eligible for submitting applications for use of up to 10,000-acre feet per year. He stated that non approval would not hinder the project, but it would require the use of other allocations made to the City and the County.

Supervisor Grijalva recommended that the item be approved.

Chair Bronson asked whether that was a substitute motion.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked whether Supervisor Christy's concerns/questions could be addressed by staff at this time.

Supervisor Christy indicated that his concerns could not be addressed at this time. He stated that the Resolution's reference to a 2014 implementation agreement needed further review and understanding prior to approval. He added that there were additional water concerns that might be affected and were dependent upon how the City would proceed.

Upon roll call vote, the substitute motion failed 2-3, Chair Bronson and Supervisors Christy and Scott voted "Nay."

Chair Bronson indicated that the Board was back to the original motion to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 22, 2021. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott inquired whether continuing this item had an impact on the City's ability to move forward.

Mr. DeBonis responded that the City's project was underway and it would continue.

Supervisor Grijalva commented about the cooperation needed between the entities in order to ensure that the Heritage River Project continued.

Julie Castañeda, Clerk of the Board, asked for clarification on whether the Board was voting on the second substitute motion to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 22, 2021.

Chair Bronson responded in the affirmative.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

33. Metropolitan Tucson Convention and Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$200,000.00 (CT-ED-20-388)

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

Supervisor Christy questioned the timing of the amended request and indicated that it was difficult to believe that hotel and motel stays increased during the pandemic.

Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, stated that the County funded Visit Tucson based on State legislation. She explained that hotels and motels in unincorporated Pima County were billed a \$6 bed tax, and 50% of that bed tax went directly to Visit Tucson. She stated that due to the pandemic, the budgeted amount was underestimated and the additional revenues were passed through to Visit Tucson because it exceeded the current contract.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the increase was due to tourism.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was a combination of increased tourism and underestimating actuals. She added that this allowed the County to pass the bed tax to Visit Tucson for their work in increasing tourism dollars during the pandemic.

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

BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

34. Community Bridges, Inc., to provide for the Inmate Navigation Enrollment Support and Treatment Program, General (\$1,160,188.88) and USDOJ Second Chance Act (\$615,130.00) Funds, contract amount \$1,775,318.88/2 year term (CT-BH-21-378)

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

35. Pima Community College, Amendment No. 2, to provide for workforce development education services, extend contract term to 6/30/22, amend contractual language and scope of services, USDOL, ADES and General (\$10,720.00) Funds, contract amount \$958,596.00 (CT-CR-20-393)

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

36. City of Tucson, to provide for the Pima County Early Education Program, contract amount \$1,000,000.00 revenue (CTN-CR-21-126)

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

37. Town of Marana, to provide for the Pima County Early Education Program, contract amount \$132,000.00 revenue (CTN-CR-21-128)

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

38. State of Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, d.b.a. First Things First, to provide for the Pima County Early Education Program, General Fund, contract amount \$3,811,600.00 (CT-CR-21-407)

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

39. To provide for the Pima County Early Education Program, General Fund, 2 year term, for the following:

Vendor Name/Contract Amount/Contract No.

Flowing Wells Unified School District No. 8, d.b.a. Flowing Wells School/\$264,000.00/CT-CR-21-410
Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a. Amphitheater Public Schools/\$792,000.00/CT-CR-21-416
Sahuarita School District/\$264,000.00/CT-CR-21-428
Tucson Unified School District/\$2,112,000.00/CT-CR-21-429
Baboquivari District Office/\$264,000.00/CT-CR-21-427
Sunnyside Unified School District 12, d.b.a. Sunnyside Unified School District/\$528,000.00/
CT-CR-21-431

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

40. Racy Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for federal legislative representation services and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$75,000.00 (CT-CA-18-203)

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

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

41. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Voluntary Vehicle Repair Program, extend contract term to 12/31/21 and amend contractual language, no cost (CTN-DE-20-3)

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

PIMA COUNTY WIRELESS INTEGRATED NETWORK

42. Town of Sahuarita, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$96,744.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-21-102)

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

43. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for the Pima County Home Repair Weatherization Assistance Program - Southwest Gas Corporation, \$23,083.00 (GTAW 21-132)

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

44. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

City of Tucson, to provide for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care Program - Supportive Services-Coordinated Entry Project, \$44,100.00/\$11,025.00 General Fund Match (GTAW 21-139)

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

45. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 33, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Continuum of Care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2021 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), \$421,492.00/\$105,373.00 General Fund Match (GTAW 21-146)

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

46. **Acceptance - Grants Management and Innovation**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management System, Emergency Food and Shelter Program National Board, to provide for the American Rescue Plan Act FY21 EFSP Supplemental Humanitarian Relief, \$2,126,370.72/4 year term (GTAW 21-145)

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

Supervisor Christy questioned the City's involvement and asked what the City received.

Jan Leshar, Chief Deputy County Administrator, responded that the City had committed to assisting with non-congregate housing during overflows at Casas Alitas. She indicated that hotel and motel stays were provided by the City.

Supervisor Christy asked what was the City's allocation and inquired about the funding source.

Ms. Leshar responded that this was a subcontract with the City for non-congregate housing. She indicated that additional information would be provided.

Supervisor Christy restated his question on whether funding would be provided from Pima County.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy referenced the 4-year term and asked whether this was a yearly allocation or a four-year allocation.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was for a four-year term.

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

47. **Acceptance - Health**

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the REACH Pima Partnership Project, \$606,334.00 (GTAM 21-88)

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

48. **Acceptance - Health**

Early Childhood Development and Health Board (First Things First), Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Child Care Health Consultation Program and extend grant term to 6/30/22, \$470,400.00 (GTAM 21-93)

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

49. **Acceptance - Health**

Early Childhood Development and Health Board (First Things First), Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Child Care Health Consultation Technical Assistance and Professional Development Program and extend grant term to 6/30/22, \$55,545.00 (GTAM 21-94)

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

50. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**

GreaterGood.org, to provide for personal protective equipment, \$2,500.00 (GTAW 21-150)

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

51. **Workforce Investment Board**

Appointment of Jennifer Preston, representing Business, to replace Dorothy Kret. Term expiration: 9/30/24. (Staff recommendation)

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

52. **Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission**

Appointment of Amanda Maass, to fill a vacancy created by Stephanie M. Scull. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 2)

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

53. **State Board of Equalization**

Appointment of Susan Scherrer, to replace William Brown. Term expiration: 12/31/24. (District 2)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

54. Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 10 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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.

Supervisor Christy moved to withdraw his second to the motion in order to add Consent Item Nos. 13 and 14 to his request for separate discussion and action.

Chair Bronson made a motion for reconsideration, it was seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to accept the reconsideration.

Chair Bronson then withdrew her original motion and made a substitute motion to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar, excluding Item Nos. 1, 2, 4, 10, 13 and 14. It was seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote.

Chair Bronson stated for the record that the budget adopted by the Board was referenced on page 3 of the Tentative Budget Adoption Fiscal Year 2021/22 Memorandum provided by the County Administrator, dated May 18, 2021.

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Behavioral Health

1. Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center, Amendment No. 1, to provide for forensic medical examination and evidence collection for juvenile abuse, extend contract term to 6/30/22 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$375,000.00 (CT-BH-20-426)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired why funding was being provided from the General Fund and not the Health Department Fund.

Jan Leshar, Chief Civil Deputy County Administrator, responded that a variety of Behavioral Health contracts were funded by the General Fund. She indicated that this contract was for forensic medical evaluations required by the County Attorney's Office, and included forensic interviews related to sexual assault and dangerous crimes.

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

2. Tucson Centers for Women and Children, Inc., d.b.a. Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Arizona Intimate Partner Risk Assessment Instrument System, extend contract term to 6/30/22 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT-BH-20-2)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired why funding was being provided from the General Fund.

Jan Leshar, Chief Civil Deputy County Administrator, responded that this was funding for the Arizona Superior Courts project for domestic violence assessments. She indicated that research and assessments related to domestic violence were provided and the use of General Funds was appropriated.

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

Facilities Management

4. Bruce Wayne, L.L.C., Amendment No. 4, to provide for a Fourth Amendment to 3550 N. 1st Avenue Lease, extend contract term to 6/30/23 and amend contractual language, Health Fund, contract amount \$270,349.68 (CT-FM-19-323)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the contract extension hindered the availability of the old bowling alley.

Jan Leshar, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the contract extension allowed the Health Department to continue services at that north clinic. She added that it was one of the services scheduled to move to the Northwest Service Center once that facility was completed. She stated that there was a tiered schedule for relocations in order to avoid loss of continuity of healthcare services.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether the property renovations would be completed by June 30th.

Ms. Leshar responded that completion was anticipated before the end of the two-year cycle and all departments would be relocated. She added that the Health Department would be the last department moved.

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

Procurement

10. Award

Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-17-143, Amendment No. 11, BlackPoint IT Services, Inc., to provide for ShoreTel VoIP phone system maintenance, support and equipment. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$37,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$2,023,000.00. This increase is required to cover additional licensing costs needed for COVID support services, as well as a re-architecture of the phone system to meet growing demand. Funding Source: Teledata Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.

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

Supervisor Christy commented about the increased licensing costs for COVID support. He inquired why funding was being provided by Teledata and not the CARES Act or other COVID funding sources.

Jan Leshar, Chief Civil Deputy County Administrator, responded that COVID related expenses, initially paid by departments, would be reimbursed with COVID dollars once guidance from the Federal Government was received.

Supervisor Christy asked whether there was confidence that the County would be reimbursed in a timely manner.

Ms. Leshar responded that based on the guidance received, County dollars used for COVID would be reimbursed.

Supervisor Christy asked whether departments would be reimbursed from COVID funding for any up-front payments provided.

Jan Leshar responded in the affirmative.

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

13. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Northwest County Service Center (XNWHLC), amend contractual language and scope of work, FM Capital Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$333,740.30 (CT-FM-20-205) 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 asked that the Board take action on Item Nos. 13 and 14 simultaneously.

Chair Bronson withdrew her original motion and made a substitute motion to move Item Nos. 13 and 14 for approval. It was seconded by Supervisor Christy. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott requested that an explanation be provided as to the purposes of these items.

Jan Leshner, Chief Civil Deputy County Administrator, explained that these were amendments were for the renovation and remodeling of the Northwest Service Center. She indicated that the center would provide a variety of services, such as Pretrial, Health Department and Community and Workforce Development services. She added that it eliminated leases, provided one stop shopping and better served constituents.

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

14. Line and Space, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for architectural and engineering design services: Northwest County Service Center (XNWHLC), amend contractual language and scope of services, FM Capital Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$4,252,423.81 (CT-FM-20-111) Facilities Management

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 13 for discussion and vote regarding this item.)

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Behavioral Health

1. Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

2. Tucson Centers for Women and Children, Inc., d.b.a. Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse, Amendment No. 3, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Community and Workforce Development

3. City of South Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the John A. Valenzuela Youth Center, extend contract term to 6/30/22 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$113,000.00 (CT-CR-20-454)

Facilities Management

4. Bruce Wayne, L.L.C., Amendment No. 4, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Pima County Wireless Integrated Network

5. Arizona Board of Regents on behalf of the University of Arizona and its Risk Management Department, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$791.80 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-21-105)
6. Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona on behalf of its Associated Students of the University of Arizona Emergency Medical Services, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$8,352.00 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-21-104)
7. Arizona Board of Regents on behalf of the University of Arizona Police Department, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$34,641.25 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-21-103)
8. Drexel Heights Fire District, to provide for subscriber services, contract amount \$46,204.35 revenue/5 year term (CTN-WIN-21-92)

Procurement

9. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-16-401, Amendment No. 1, Runbeck Election Services, Inc., to provide for election printing services and materials. This amendment extends the termination date to 6/30/22. No additional funds required at this time. Cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount remains at \$15,000,000.00. Administering Department: Elections and Recorder's Office.
10. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Master Agreement No. MA-PO-17-143, Amendment No. 11, BlackPoint IT Services, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

11. Professional Pipe Services, Inc., to provide for conveyance system closed circuit television inspection services, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount \$1,558,350.00 (CT-WW-21-396) Regional Wastewater Reclamation
12. Line and Space, L.L.C., to provide for architectural and engineering design services: Richard Elías Mission Library Expansion and Renovation (XREMLB), FM Capital Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$575,716.81/3 year term (CT-FM-21-406) Facilities Management
13. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 2, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
14. Line and Space, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

15. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/22 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$441,000.00 (CT-WW-20-306)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

16. **Acceptance - Health**
First Things First, Pima North and South Regional Partnership Councils, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the First Smiles Matter Oral Health Program and extend grant term to 6/30/22, \$760,766.00 (GTAM 21-91)
17. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
RESOLUTION NO. 2021 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Continuum of Care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2021 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), \$209,127.00/\$52,281.75 General Fund Match (GTAW 21-128)
18. **Acceptance - Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, \$16,530.56 decrease (GTAM 21-92)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

19. **Planning and Zoning Commission**
Appointments of Mark Hanna and Dr. Jan Truitt, to replace Brad Johns and Jodi Bain. Term expirations: 6/19/25. (District 1)

ELECTIONS

20. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY

Matt Kopec-038-DEM; Shasta M. McManus-038-DEM; Patricia M. Overall-056-DEM; Michael C. Orme-149-DEM; Bill Beard-030-REP; William Moore-049-REP; Richard Kampa-228-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Matt Kopec-057-DEM; Elizabeth A. Camus-088-DEM; Shasta M. McManus-225-DEM; Brenda L. Cotter-006-REP; James W. Cotter-006-REP; Katherine J. Weasel-020-REP; Gabriel R. Morales-053-REP; Alan Paul Harwell, Jr.-067-REP; Michelle Whitehead-075-REP; Judith D. Koziana-091-REP; Robert Gonzalez-163-REP; Patricia K. DeZor-174-REP; Dominique A. Phillips-199-REP; Christine E. Collins-216-REP; Chad E. McBroom-227-REP; Sherry L. McBroom-227-REP; Kamryn K. Padilla-241-REP; Kayla M. Van Soest-249-LBT

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

21. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Community Food Bank, Inc. \$25,000.49; Juan C. Alvarez \$20.00; Long Juan Wang \$650.00; Earhart Equipment Corporation \$1,332.68; Chrisinda D. Ballew \$225.00; Tenex Software Solutions, Inc. \$15,000.00; Southwest Human Development, Inc. \$81.25; Jacob Creel \$105.50.

JUSTICE COURT

22. Judge Pro Tempore Appointments

Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore of the Consolidated Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022:

John Davis; Carmen Dolny; Maria Felix; Theodore M. Forgach; Charles Harrington; Paul Julien; Cecilia Monroe; Ronald J. Newman; Linda Penn and Brick P. Storts, III.

RECORDER

23. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the months of December, 2020, January, February and March 2021.

TREASURER

24. Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$41,550.95.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

25. Minutes: April 6, 2021

* * *

55. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

17. Updates and Action on COVID-19

Verbatim

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

SB: Item 24, COVID, Updates and Action. Ms. Leshner.

JL: Chair Bronson, we did not provide a memo at this time. We are looking for discussion from the Board because of, most of the action we have taken related to the lifting of the mask mandate that occurred in your exec, in the Special Board Meeting on Friday. Since that time, we have let employees know how we are moving forward with the implementation of revisions to the mask mandate and as it relates to our, all of our public facilities, County facilities, and County employees. Dr. Garcia has joined us as well. So while we do not have anything specific to present, we are happy to answer any questions.

SB: Any...

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to ask some questions to Dr. Garcia, if I could? First off Dr. Garcia, are you there?

FG: I certainly am.

SC: Good morning, Dr. Garcia. I think you will be happy to know, I just received my second Moderna vaccination yesterday, I am feeling fine, and it was a relatively painless process. I, at this point, would like to ask your expert, for clarification purposes, in light of what happened with the Board action on Friday. What is the mandatory protocol for someone, using me as an example, what is the mandatory protocol now for someone in my status of completed vaccinations? And the time frame involved?

- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, there is no mandatory protocol. What I think you are alluding to is, what is the recommendations that the CDC might have as to when you can expect to be fully protected? That typically occurs at two weeks after the 2nd shot and at that point, you reach kind of your highest antibody production levels. At that point, you are considered completely protected, and per the Centers for Disease Control, at that point, you would not need to wear a mask or be physically distanced from someone else, unless, of course, you fall into one of special categories of folks who may not be eligible to do so.
- SC: Madam Chair, Dr. Garcia, thank you for that. Just to reiterate though, your first statement was, there is no mandatory protocol for me to have to follow?
- FG: Supervisor, Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, you are correct.
- SC: Thank you, Madam Chair, one more question, if I may? Dr. Garcia, I have noticed that we are not using the same line of generating information on the COVID's data and numbers as we have been. It went from Pima County to the Arizona Department of Health, to the CDC. Now it appears we are just bypassing those two entities and getting our information directly from the Centers for Disease Control. Is that the correct lineage as to how we are deriving our information and data now?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, that would be an incorrect representation of how we use the information. So, to be very, very clear, yes, we continue to collect information here locally, which is transmitted up to the State, which the State then shares back with us. We continue to use the State's dashboard, our own data analysis, as well as the Centers for Disease Control data tracker. All three of those elements are looked at for consistency with each other, and to verify that in general the trends are consistent with each other. There will always be a little bit of variation from one source to another. However, I am happy to report that the degree of consistency is very high and that we feel really confident about the data upon which we are making our assessments. We thought it was because of the notoriety of the CDC data tracker, because the CDC data tracker has been identified by this administration as their barometer for progress on the issue of vaccinations. We thought it was important to not add an additional element of confusion and so just use those data directly from the Centers for Disease Control. But I am happy to report that they are very consistent with what both what the centers, with what the State Department of Health is saying, as well as what our own analysis of those data are.
- SC: Madam Chair, Dr. Garcia, it would be incumbent upon the community then to rely pretty much, as you point out, on the CDC reports?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, I am not sure for the purposes of, for individuals who are interested in delving into the particular details, there are an abundant number of resources, as you previously pointed out, that sometimes have inconsistencies. The consumers choose where they shop for their data and the CDC is a very reliable data source as is ADHS, as is the Pima County Health Department.

SC: Thank you Dr. Garcia. Thank you Madam Chair.

AG: Chair Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: So, thank you Dr. Garcia for being here. I know that we started offering Pfizer vaccines to 12 to 17-year-olds on the, I am sorry, 12 to 15-year-olds on the 13th of May; is that right? So do you have any numbers on how many young people have been vaccinated? Oh, you are muted.

FG: Sorry about that. Supervisor Grijalva, so, you know this is we just started this last week. It is very much a moving target, but I can tell you that, again, triangulating across all these different data sources, I can tell you that there have been several thousand young folks vaccinated between the ages of 12 and 18. That number continues to grow. That number we anticipate will be our largest demographic. When you look at the Centers for Disease Control data tracker for today, they note approximately 6,000 roughly just under 6,000 folks in that age group that is less than 18, but greater than 12 years of age, as being vaccinated. So we believe that this is the group that we need to concentrate on at this point and are redoubling our efforts in partnership with the school districts, with the charters and privates in order to be able to achieve that.

AG: We have so many more students that are coming on campus, and because we are going to have graduation, I am wondering what we can do to coordinate those efforts. It was great when FEMA was able to, and they are still providing through the 21st, but able to provide all of the different vaccines that are available, because I think that they are meeting the need that is really important. I appreciate that. The site has a lot of information and maybe we might want to just have one button that says, if you are the parent of a 12 to 17-year-old, this is where you can get Pfizer. We tried to do it in District 5, but obviously the Health Department has more of a reach than we do. I think that that is great. If you can provide when you have those numbers, I just from my impression, so many of my children's friends that are able to, are eager to get the vaccine or have already received it. Our young people are showing a lot of leadership in our community as to what to do to keep people safe. Because as we know, they are in the demographic that may not be as sick statistically, but are able to transmit to other people. I

appreciate the leadership and wanted to, just wanted to highlight how great our young people are in our community.

SC: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

SC: That prompted me, Supervisor Grijalva's comments prompted me. Dr. Garcia, does the County Health Department maintain or gather information on vaccination numbers for the most at-risk of our population, based on what we already determined over the last year? So, what populations are at most risk, the underlying factors, the health issues, the age? Do we have any kind of a compilation of data that tells us how our vaccinations of that particular segment is proceeding?

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, the greatest risk factor in terms of the outcomes of both COVID infection in terms of hospitalization and mortality, is age. We have very explicit, detailed information on vaccine penetration in our different age groups. I can tell you, for instance, that 94% of 70 to 79 year-olds in Pima County have been, have received a vaccination. I can tell you, for instance, that for 60 to 69-year-olds, that number is 78% and the number starts to get lower and lower as you proceed to younger and younger age demographics. Age is the most important predictor of mortality and hospitalization. We do have some information about co-occurring comorbidities, however, that information is not systemically recorded at the time of vaccination. When you went to get vaccinated, I believe it was unlikely that you were asked about whether you had any pre-existing medical conditions, immune issues, et cetera, et cetera. So those data are not typically collected at the time of vaccination.

SC: I think, Madam Chair, Dr. Garcia, they asked me, you know, do you have any allergic reaction to this. But you are right, I was not questioned on that, but those numbers and those percentages that you just shared with us, I think are very helpful and encouraging and I thank you for doing so. Thank you.

RS: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Madam Chair, I have a request for direction to the administration, so I am going to be directing this to both Ms. Leshner and Dr. Garcia. As they know, there were three coronavirus relief bills passed by the United States Congress. The first one being the CARES Act, signed by President Trump in the Spring of 2020. The second one being the Consolidated Appropriations Act, signed by President Trump in December of 2020 and then the American Rescue Plan, that was passed in the Spring and signed by President Biden. The CARES Act and the American Rescue Plan, provided direct payments to

the counties, but the Consolidated Appropriations Act provided \$300 million for COVID testing and over \$60 million for vaccines to the State of Arizona, to be distributed for those purposes. As I said that the Consolidated Appropriations Act was passed in December, the State of Arizona received its funds on January 14th. We were informed through an email that was sent to Dr. Cullen by a gentleman with the Arizona Department of Health Services that they were going to submit a budget to the Federal government about how to expend, how they intended to expend those funds and distribute them to the counties by mid-March. We requested a copy of that budget. What I would like to know, in writing, please at some future date when this information can be compiled, is how many funds, what is the total amount of funds that Pima County has received up until now directly from the Consolidated Appropriations Act? Have we ever received the budget that the Arizona Department of Health Services submitted to the Federal government? And most importantly, what further action is possible in terms of determining when those funds will be distributed by the State of Arizona to Pima County and the other 14 counties? It is almost inexcusable and incredible that we have been waiting for this long to get answers from our State Department of Health Services and the Governor that oversees that department as to when these funds are going to be distributed to counties. I realize this may seem like an inside baseball question to the public, but for me it is a, and I am sure for the other members of the Board, it is a matter of accountability and I would like some information from the administration as to how we are going to get answers from State administration and whether or not that involves asking our congressional representatives in the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate to intervene on our behalf. I know as our representative to the County Supervisors Association, that this is a concern that is shared by our colleagues in the other 14 counties.

JL: Thank you Chair Bronson, Supervisor Scott, we have noted the three questions and we will be back with you with a response.

SB: Thank you.

AG: Chair Bronson?

SB: Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: Supervisor Scott, they have been asking too. So, I think if we contribute to the additional request for information, it cannot hurt but quite honestly, there is very little transparency at the State level on what those funds were spent on. While we are on this item of COVID and it is related in the way that, I know that we are pushing to have less remote work and or telecommuting and people coming in. I want to just highlight the that many of the summer programs that historically serve our young people, are either not going to, they are not recruiting young people this summer or they are at a minimal capacity. A lot of the summer programs, we were trying to put a list together

for District 5 as a resource, and many of those programs have already, they are already filled, all of the spots are filled. We will have many people working in the County and in our community that will not be able to go to work because they have young people at home. I just want to continue to push the fact that we really do, this is the new normal and what it looks like, is that we are going to be doing telecommuting periodically throughout different departments, more people than others. So, while we still have young people that are in our schools, some of our schools are not offering summer programs, others are. Most of them are half day programs which means we still have a lot of childcare issues for our parents out there. As I am trying to arrange summer for my own family, I am like, this is an issue I would like to bring up for every other parents that are going through the same thing. So, thanks.

SB: Alright.

MH: Madam Chair?

SB: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. I have actually received quite a bit of feedback, personally from, after our meeting on Friday and after the CDC's new recommendation of folks that are, still would like to wear their masks or still feel more comfortable social distancing. I want to be clear that that is fine. That is absolutely perfectly acceptable. You can continue to wear your mask inside of a grocery store, even if that grocery store is saying you do not have to if you are vaccinated, Because I know that we have been doing this for 15 months or something, so you know, people feel almost uncomfortable or naked without it. That is fine. It is totally okay to wear your mask, but the CDC, the recommendations and then which we acted on as a Board, just reflect the overwhelming data that it is very safe for vaccinated people to, you know to, to leave their masks off and decrease that social distancing in most situations other than in hospitals or traveling. The other thing I wanted to ask about is to see if we are aligned with FEMA? I know that the FEMA mobile vaccination units do not require or request any type of identification. That is incredibly important because we are in the business of getting everybody vaccinated in the community. It does not matter where they are from or if they have legal status or not. And I think, I know that FEMA (inaudible) of that and I want to make sure that the County PODs are aligning with that and also not requesting identification because I believe, at least at some of the ones I visited there, there had been some of that. So, if I could hear from maybe Dr. Garcia on that, that would be great.

FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Heinz, effectively what we have said in this county, both in the testing arena as well as in the vaccination arena. Is that our priority is it to serve the community, to serve those who live here and those would work here in our community. Because that is what makes sense,

because that is what will advance the health of all of Pima County. Having said that, we do not require that individuals present any particular type of identification. We do need to know who you are. We do need to know your name, we do need to have date of birth, we need to have something that reconciles your identity so that, so that we know that you are coming in for your second dose, not for your first dose, so you do not end up getting a fourth dose. Those are the reasons why we collect that information. That information is treated confidentially, and appropriately. The barriers that we create for that are very minimal. In fact, in the history of medicine, the barriers for identity attestation have never been so low as they currently are for these kinds of services. I believe that we are meeting that. We continuously remind our contractors that is the County policy, and that is the County posture. We continuously remind our partners, and our friends at FEMA have been actually really good about it and it has really been, that component has been of particular success. I actually took my kid into Walgreens this weekend to get his vaccination. He is 14-15, and I forgot my driver's license. I said, I forgot my driver's license, I need to get Diego his vaccine and we were able to do it and it was not a big deal. Even at a place like Walgreens, even at a place like CVS. At every single one of our locations, you will see that tact being taken. Sometimes people hear something differently, but operationally, on the ground, I can tell you that this is moving forward and yes, your guidance and your concern about decreasing barriers, is of the utmost importance.

MH: Great. Thank you for that and also just because we cannot say enough, this is free. Like there is no charge, there is no cost involved. We all know that here and we therefore sometimes do not say it enough. There is no cost to the public. So, one other thing I wanted to ask, actually, Dr. Garcia, if we could get and maybe all Board members already have this, but we are tracking the vaccine, the vaccine I guess uptake, by even down to the census tract level. I do not think I knew that before. So you can actually see that, not like precincts but like little subsections of precincts, right? So that is pretty cool. You can actually see the census tract you live in and how, what percentage of County residents within that census tract have been vaccinated and there are some that are well over 75%, I figure like about a dozen already in the County that are at that level. So that is actually kind of a really neat tool that I would love to have shared with all of the Board and the public as well. It probably is somewhere on our website I just have not; I did not know of it. So if could you share that with everyone, that would be great.

SB: Thank you, Supervisor. Any further?

SC: Madam Chair? Just one quick follow-up?

SB: Supervisor Christy.

- SC: Yes, Dr. Garcia, I used myself as an example about the mandatory protocols, having received both vaccinations. What are the mandatory protocols for those who have not been vaccinated? Just for clarification.
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, again, I hesitate to say mandatory anything. So, the recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control, is that individuals who are unvaccinated should not be in public areas, in areas without a face covering, should maintain 6 feet of physical distance from others, should stay home as we all should when we are sick, and should get vaccinated as quickly as possible. There are no mandatory requirements for unvaccinated individuals other than the common sense issue of, being aware of the fact that you are unvaccinated and that you are at increased risk for becoming ill.
- SC: Madam Chair, Dr. Garcia, just to underscore that though, there are no mandatory protocols for unvaccinated individuals?
- FG: Chair Bronson, Supervisor Christy, you are correct.
- SC: Thank you.
- AG: Chair Bronson?
- SB: Supervisor Grijalva.
- AG: I just want to clarify though, that we are requiring in certain locations where the public is coming in, masks are required to come in, regardless of your vaccination status because we are not asking for vaccination status and most people are not carrying that card around. So in our libraries, in our (inaudible) where (inaudible) is coming in, masks are still required and I believe the City (inaudible). So I just want to be clear that when we are in crowds, the recommendation is to wear masks and, for example, at high school graduations, most schools, we are not asking vaccination status. So we have to assume that people are not vaccinated and so they will need to wear masks. In our public meetings when we do get to the point where we have public coming in, until our numbers are low enough, as we talked about I think it was 10 of 100,000 is moderate, where we can start looking at some of those mitigation strategies being reduced, until then, my assumption is that we will continue to assume that we are in rooms with people that are not vaccinated and have masks. So I just want to be clear that there is no mandate to do that but there are requirements depending on where you are going, what businesses you are visiting, and patronizing and what buildings we are going into. So I just want to make sure that people hear that repeatedly and that all of us are continuing to let our constituents know that when you go into our public libraries, masks are required and we can ask you not to come back if masks, if you are not willing to wear it. I just think it is important that we repeat that and we also have a large number of our

population that cannot be vaccinated, either they have their adults that have health issues, that their doctors are advising them not to get the vaccine for whatever reason, or anyone under the age of 12. I will continue to wear my mask because I have a 10-year-old who cannot get vaccinated and the rest of our family when we are out, we will do the same because it is a good example for him and let him know that he is not the only one that does not have to wear, you know that has to wear a mask. We do it because it is a community and family thing. So I just wanted to make that point because I think it that it cannot be explained enough. Thanks.

SB: Thank you. Any further questions? Alright, then let us move on to Item 24, excuse me, Item 25.