

ADDENDUM MATERIAL

DATE 8-16-21

ITEM NO. ADD 8

Jessica Kopfmann

From: Allyson Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2021 9:07 AM
To: District1; DIST2; District3; District4; District5; COB_mail
Subject: Addendum Item 8
Attachments: 1487.docx

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Please place the attached comments in the record for addendum item 8
Thank you for your consideration.
Regards,
Ally Miller
Pima County District 1 Resident

21 AUG 13 21 PM 09:06 POC CLK OF HD

To all Supervisors:

Addendum #8

I had sent an earlier email regarding the discussion brought up by Supervisor Grijalva , at the Aug 10, 2021 board meeting, that she had previously voted to impose a mask mandate for TUSD in her role on the TUSD governing board. I found this discussion very troublesome as it became clear that Supervisor Grijalva was concerned that the TUSD school district would be incurring legal liability for violating state law.

The discussion made it clear that the Pima County administrator and the board of supervisors would be in violation of state law if a mask mandate was imposed by Pima County and that the county would be subject to a 1487 referral to the attorney general.

Addendum item 8, on the Aug. 16 board agenda, makes it clear that Mr. Huckelberry and Supervisor Grijalva are knowingly and willfully circumventing state laws that would subject Pima County to a 1487 investigation by the attorney general. By voting for this item, the supervisors will be imposing the costs of TUSD legal liability on ALL residents of Pima County, regardless of whether their school districts are in violation of the state law.

Please vote NO on funding legal advocacy on behalf of TUSD constituents. It is wrong to impose this cost on all taxpayers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ally Miller

District 1 Pima County resident

Jessica Kopfmann

From: alfrankie321 [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2021 7:35 AM
To: COB_mail
Subject: Addendum Item no. 8, August 16 BOS meeting

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Dear Board members,

I am asking the Board to approve Mr. Huckleberry's suggestion "a" regarding an incentive of \$300 for vaccinated employees.

This would be a very nice reward for those employees who have already done their part and gotten the vaccine and a very nice incentive for those who still have not, without it being a punishment for those that will not or cannot get the vaccine.

Please approve the \$300 incentive pay for vaccinated employees.

Thank you.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Aug 13 21 08:34 PM CLKDF ID

Jessica Kopfmann

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2021 8:35 AM
To: COB_mail
Subject: August 16, 2021 BOS Meeting

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Upon reading the County Administrators August 16, 2021 ' COVID-19 Vaccination Incentives and Disincentives' memo to the BOS, several words come to mind: DISCRIMINATORY, BIGOTRY, BIAS, and SEGREGATION.

His anger that the BOS actually stood up to him by not passing a vaccine mandate will be taken out on County employees. WOW! That is quite a display of a temper tantrum equal to that of a 2 year old. Impressive.

Show the County Employees that you value all County Employees. I respectfully ask the BOS vote NO on the discriminatory recommendation (unvaccinated county employees having to pay up to \$1,573.76 more per year in health insurance premiums) brought forth by the county administrator.

Show

AUG 13 21 PM 08:49 PC CLK OF HD

Jessica Kopfmann

From: JoAnn diFilippo [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2021 9:48 AM
To: District1; DIST2; District3; District4; District5; COB_mail
Subject: BOS Meeting 8/16/21: Addendum Item #8

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Clerk of the Board:

I thought I was through responding to agenda items for the board's August 16, 2021 meeting; however, I just checked the Addendum and saw that Mr. Huckelberry included a latent memo to Addendum Item #8. Therefore, please include this comment letter to Addendum Item #8 as follows:

Mr. Huckelberry: After reading your August 16, 2021, memo "**COVID-19 Vaccination Incentives and Disincentives**," I was appalled at your recommendation to the board. How dare you even consider "disincentives" or "incentives" depending on whether an employee chooses to receive/reject the COVID injection (it is not a vaccination)! Have you no shame? Why do you always have to express the last word and try to get your way, no matter the consequences and no matter who you must "crush" to get your way? Remember, I experienced first-hand how you orchestrated the outrageous public records request (PRR) campaign against former District 1 Supervisor Ally Miller. Yet, when she turned the tables on you and directed the same type of public records request of your office, quite frankly, you had a melt-down screaming it would take four employees working one year each to respond to the high volume of PRRs. The lesson learned here is that of "one in exchange for the other" which I'll refer to as the Policy for Institutional Sustainability and Service (PISS).

I want to reiterate, once again, a Pima County employee who elected to receive the Moderna COVID injection on a Monday was reported dead within forty-eight hours of the injection. Whether or not the injection was a direct/indirect cause of her death we will never know; however, what is an undisputed fact is that she willingly accepted the COVID injection, no mandates were imposed on her, and death occurred within forty-eight hours. ***The lesson learned here is that when we make choices, we accept our fate. When we are mandated to submit to an action, we are forced to accept our fate.***

Therefore, I hold that the board must make some type of provision protection for subjecting employees to any type of mandates which can cause bodily harm up to and including death for the employee. And, of course, we taxpayers, would bear the ultimate responsibility for your injurious actions once again.

Board of Supervisors: In consideration of what is being recommended to you by the County Administrator, I have provided you language for a substitute motion. This recommendation is in accordance with the PISS provision described above:

Recommendation

I recommend the Board of Supervisors adopt the following policy to consist of:

- a) A one-time \$300 COVID-19 Health disincentive be deducted from Mr. Huckelberry's salary for each county employee who remains unvaccinated by October 1, 2021. (Example: 2,000 unvaccinated employees x \$300 = \$600,000 which exceeds Mr. Huckelberry's annual salary; however, we can split the amount in two and expense

\$300,000 from October 1, 2021 thru June 30, 2022 and run an accrual for the balance of \$300,000 to be taken from his FY2023 annual pay.)

- b) A financial disincentive to be charged to Mr. Huckelberry's annual pay representing the COVID Incentive pay amounts (I believe it's generally referred to as a "bonus" in the amount of \$1,040 +/- per pay period) distributed to any unclassified, salaried county employee whose annual base pay exceeds \$100,000+ per annum working in the 130 W. Congress building. Until such time as COVID Incentive bonuses can be awarded to all employees in classified positions, there should be no COVID Incentive bonuses paid to any salaried, unclassified county employee whose base pay exceeds \$100,000 per annum regardless of their working location.
- c) Establish the ***Pima County Employee COVID-Related Death & Disability Trust Fund***. A \$100,000 annual incentive charged in perpetuity would be paid to the trust fund from Mr. Huckelberry's and any Supervisor's pay who supported any type of motion to impose incentives/disincentives resulting from the recommendations put forth and adopted by the Supervisors. Any county employee who experiences any type of disability up to including death would be eligible to file a claim against the trust fund for an equitable amount. Should the trust fund not be fully funded to meet the claimant's demand, said claimant can sue the county for the full balance due and outstanding. In the event of death following the COVID injection, the right to file suit against the county and on behalf of the deceased would revert to any named beneficiary.
- d) Any Supervisor who votes in favor of issuing any type of mandate and/or declaration of public health emergency has the option to cost share disincentives/incentives awarded to Mr. Huckelberry. This is in accordance with board policy to incorporate equitable and social justice considerations in all approved board actions, as well as the PISS provision.

* * * *

Supervisors, if it is decided to move forward with any of Mr. Huckelberry's recommendations, I feel it is only proper and just to amend the motion and include the above-referenced substitute "recommendation." In doing so, you would be providing equitable distribution of responsibility.

Do the right thing!

- a) Vote to OPPOSE any mask mandate for county employees.
- b) Vote to OPPOSE any vaccination mandate for any county employee and/or county licensed healthcare workers.
- c) Vote to OPPOSE any declaration or resolution to establish a public health emergency resulting from COVID.

Allow Pima County employees the right to decide their own fate without any recriminations. Thanking you in advance.

JoAnn di Filippo, PhD