



Minutes of MAYOR AND COUNCIL Meeting

Approved by Mayor and Council
on April 6, 2021.

Date of Meeting: December 18, 2020

MEETING NOTE: Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which prompted declarations of a public health emergency at the local, state, and federal levels, this meeting was conducted using measures to protect public health. This meeting was held remotely through technological means, as permitted under Arizona law.

The Mayor and Council of the City of Tucson met in regular session remotely through Zoom at 11:17 a.m., on Friday, December 18, 2020, all members having been notified of the time and place thereof.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Romero and upon roll call, those present and absent were:

Present:

Lane Santa Cruz
Paul Cunningham
Paul Durham
Nikki Lee
Richard G. Fimbres
Steve Kozachik
Regina Romero

Council Member Ward 1
Vice Mayor, Council Member Ward 2
Council Member Ward 3
Council Member Ward 4
Council Member Ward 5
Council Member Ward 6
Mayor

Absent/Excused:

None

Staff Members Present:

Michael J. Ortega
Michael Rankin
Roger W. Randolph

City Manager
City Attorney
City Clerk

1. **Report and Update on the Continuing COVID-19 Emergency: City Response and Emergency Management; Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF) Mayor and Council Strategic Plan and Expenditures, Federal Funding for Coronavirus Relief; and Curfew Orders in the City and in Pima County (City Wide) SS/DEC18-20-277**

Introductory comments were made by Mayor Romero regarding the number of COVID cases, especially in Tucson and Pima County, increased testing, mobile testing, etc. She said the City Manager would go over the Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF) expenditures and requests to spend the remaining balance and the City Attorney would report on the curfew orders within the City limits and Pima County as a whole.

Information and presentation were given by Michael J. Ortega, City Manager, regarding testing sites, and the balance of CRF funding expenditures (\$1.5 million). He gave an update on the expenditures thus far and asked for approval to expend the remaining funds as follows:

Pima Council on Aging	\$50,000
Rescue trucks (Station 10 and Station 8)	\$200,000
WIFI Infrastructure	\$400,000
Testing (balance of funds, between)	\$800,000 to \$900,000

Mayor Romero stated she agreed with Mr. Ortega's recommendation, ensuring that any remaining funds be used for COVID testing. She thanked the Council for their interest in ensuring that the community could receive COVID testing. She stated that during the past two weeks, the medical community had reached out to Governor Ducey's office asking him to act upon this due to the urgency of the numbers rising and the lack of hospital space. They were specifically asking Governor Ducey to close bars and night clubs, limit restaurants to outdoor dining and take out only. limit public gatherings to no more than 25 people (except for essential services) and to implement a statewide and enforceable face covering mandate, that focused on businesses compliance rather than individual compliance. She stated it was imperative to continue to follow the social distancing guidelines.

It was moved by Council Member Fimbres, duly seconded, to approve the recommendation to expend the balance of the CRF funds as presented by the City Manager.

Council Member Lee asked about the status/clarification of funding for small businesses.

Joyce Garland, Chief Financial Officer/Assistant City Manager, said there were current lists available and there might not have been additional applications because the need for these funds was so great, they wanted to make sure they took care of businesses that had previously applied.

John Iurino, City Manager's Office, Zoning Examiner, clarified that there was the Workers and Families program being administered by the Woman's Foundation. He said he believed Council Member Lee's questions was with regards to the small business continuity grants being administered by the YWCA. He said for the Workers/Families grant and the Woman's Foundation had over 11,000 applications and when the additional funding was allocated, their judgement was that they should continue to process the overwhelming number of applications they already had on hand.

Mr. Iurino said with respect to the small business continuity grants and the small business rent and utility grants, the YWCA has continued to accept applications and pursuant to the Mayor and Council's direction after the last meeting, they prioritized small businesses that had been impacted by the curfew put into place in December. He said there was still money flowing from the YWCA to small businesses, they had a sizeable number of applications on hand, and were continuing to accept applications until they set a cut-off date.

Mr. Iurino said all of the agencies had done a great job, but to recap, there was still funds available for small businesses, applications on hand were being processed, and they were continuing to accept applications, but eventually they had to set a cut-off date (December 22nd) in order to expend all of the funds by the end of December 2020.

Mr. Fimbres asked who would notify small businesses of these resources available.

Mr. Iurino replied the YWCA had expanded their website information to include information regarding the curfew piece. He stated that from the beginning of the Small Business Continuity Grant Program and all programs, any COVID-related impacts, including the shut-down experienced earlier in the year, all of those had always been items that qualified small businesses/workers and families or other eligible to apply could apply for these grants based on that criteria.

Council Member Fimbres asked what assurance the Mayor and Council had that this information was being made available to the community. He stated he had received calls from constituents stating that there were no more funds available.

Mr. Iurino responded he would follow up with Magdalena Verdugo, Executive Director, YWCA. He stated that he understood that there was a lot of misinformation regarding the grants. He offered to speak to any constituents seeking this type of relief and asked for any feedback or ideas that might help their cause.

Mr. Ortega also stated that this information was made available through the Economic Initiatives Weekly Update. He stated this was sent to the business community through Barbara Coffey, Economic Initiatives Director and her team.

Council Member Kozachik asked that by the number of applications received, if Mr. Ortega and Mr. Iurino felt that there would be enough funding available to accommodate all applicants.

Mr. Ortega replied it was his belief that there would be more applicants requesting these funds, than funds available.

Mayor Romero added that the YWCA's website was very clear. It was easy to navigate through and provided clear instructions for the services being requested. She also stated their website was updated regularly. She mentioned that Congress (both the Senate and the House) were working on a potential relief package. She said she had been in communication with Andrew Greenhill and Tracy Tucker, and they had kept the Mayor and Council updated on the Federal Relief Package.

Vice Mayor Cunningham stated he wanted like to see some flexibility on the fifty-employee limit. He stated Mayor and Council needed to ensure that these were fifty full-time employees. He also asked for clarification regarding the CARES Act Bill. He said he there were three separate versions of the bill and wanted to make sure he understood what was on the table.

Mayor Romero responded it was her understanding that this was a proposed \$900 billion bill. She stated that direct assistance for cities and states had been removed from the bill and the proposed bill included an additional round of PPP (forgivable loans to small businesses). This would also have additional funds for testing and direct assistance to families. She said the bill also included an additional \$300 per week in unemployment benefits.

The motion to approve the City Manager's recommendation to expend the balance of the CRF funds as presented was CARRIED by a voice vote of 7 to 0..

Vice Mayor Cunningham asked about the criteria for small businesses regarding the number of employees being 50 FTE. He asked for guidance from the City Attorney.

Mike Rankin, City Attorney, confirmed what the current criteria was. He said it looked like it was just defined in the number of employees (50), which included part-time workers and not full time equivalent (FTE) employees. He said if it was the Mayor and Council's desire that that be expanded so that it referenced 50 FTEs instead of 50 total employees, he felt a motion would be appropriate. He said recognizing what had already been explained, which was that there were a few applications in the "queue", he did not know how much of an impact this had in the next fourteen days.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Rankin said the Pima County Board of Supervisors had converted their voluntary curfew to a mandatory curfew. He said the County's order, as approved, applied county-wide, which meant it applied both within the City limits and outside the City limits in

unincorporated Pima County. He stated that since the Mayor and Council acted, going back to December 1st with their own ordinance, with the related Proclamation by Mayor Romero, some questions had arisen on which controls over the other and was there conflict, etc.

Mr. Rankin stated both orders co-exist, and that Pima County's did not change the responsibilities of individual persons within the City limits that were already put in place by the Mayor and Council and through the Mayor's Proclamation. He said the County's curfew did in fact reinforce the requirements of the Mayor and Council. He said, essentially, all persons were prohibited from traveling or being present on any public street/place during the defined curfew hours, unless they were engaged in essential functions and essential activities. He said those functions/activities were defined the same way in the County order as they were in the City's order, and in fact, were defined in the same way State-wide under the Governor's prior Executive Order.

Mr. Rankin said the curfew hours in the two orders were the same, 10:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. He said the County's curfew went into effect December 15th and will continue to run until the metric that measures significant community spread, changes. In other words, the metric that defines significant community spread is anything above 100 confirmed cases per 100,000 of population. In the City's instance there was an end date of December 23rd.

Mr. Rankin stated, the way the County's Order was written, it would stay in place for some time, especially with the upcoming holidays and people gathering. The curfew also imposed new obligations on business establishments themselves because the County had authority through its Health Department and under the statutes that define the powers of county health departments, with respect to the operating permits issued by the County, food permits, etc., (restaurants, bars, etc., were subject to those operating permits issued by Pima County). He said within its curfew order, Pima County included provisions that establishments that allow persons to violate the curfew order were subject to the suspension or revocation of the operating permits issued, which was an additional element that went beyond what the Mayor and Council's ordinance provided and was enforced through the Pima County Health Department.

Mr. Rankin commented that the County's Order also provided for a general provision that the County could enforce the curfew requirements through any other available legal action. He said what that meant was that the County could enforce it through its health code through civil citation for both businesses and individual persons who violate the curfew. He said there was no conflict between the two Orders, the significant difference was the end date, and the net effect, in his opinion, was that there sort of was two options: 1) the Mayor and Council could just choose to allow the City's curfew order to expire as provided in the Ordinance and Proclamation on December 23rd and in that instance the County Order would remain in place until such time as that significant community spread number comes below the 100/100,000 or 2) the City could extend its Order because it did not conflict with the County's Order and it could be extended using the same metric that of the County's resolution.

Mayor Romero asked if the City let its curfew expire and followed with the County's existing curfew, who would oversee enforcement.

Mr. Rankin replied that the City order focused on individual compliance with curfew. TPD enforcement was built into the proclamation, focusing on education, providing notice and an opportunity to comply. When the City's order expired, the City would fall under the County's enforcement policy. Pima County's policy focused more on business establishments and not the individual. Moving forward enforcement would be handled by Pima County.

It was the consensus of the Mayor and Council to let the City's Curfew Order expire and go with Pima County's Curfew Order.

2. Mayor and Council Priorities as Identified at the January 28, 2020 Mayor and Council Retreat – Year End Review (City Wide) SS/DEC18-20-278

Introductory comments were made by Mayor Romero. She recapped what had been done since the budget planning retreat held on 1/28/2020. She said the Mayor and Council filled out a questionnaire on their priorities and she shared the priorities and challenges identified at that time: Climate Action, Recycling, and Sustainability, Parks & Trees, Housing, History, & Homelessness, Children & Youth, Economic Development & Training, Poverty, Crime, Safety & Public Safety, Equity, IT & Cybersecurity, and Green Transportation, Green Infrastructure & Green Mobility and Roads. She said the budgeting process included these areas up until the COVID pandemic hit, at which time, their focus changed. She said they spent a lot of time on the Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF) allotted to the City to ensure they were distributing funds where there was the most need.

Mayor Romero stated that along with work on the pandemic and distributing the CRF Funds, a lot of the priorities identified were brought to the forefront in the budgeting process such as the green water infrastructure, creation of an urban forestry program manager position, kick off of the million trees initiative, allocated funds for a social workers, started work on the Community Safety Pilot Program, worked on solving homelessness and not just managing homelessness, committed to allocating funds to hire a Housing First Program director, held discussions on a Chief Equity Officer and funds for Equity analysis, and allocated funds for a climate action and adaption plan. She thanked her colleagues for their immense work and working together to accomplish these goals, as well as the City Manager, City Attorney, Finance Team, and others.

Mayor Romero said she wanted to kick off the budget planning conversation with an initial focus conversation on long-term transportation planning. She said it was only the beginning for budget conversations, but there were some things she wanted to discuss to initiate the planning conversations. She said Congress had started talking about an infrastructure and transportation bill that they want to have ready by September. She said there was also an Executive Summary shared with everyone regarding Move Tucson. She

said the Mayor and Council should start deliberations regarding Proposition 101, which was the roads and public safety proposition. She mentioned that conversations had begun regarding the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA).

Mayor Romero stated both her and the City Manager felt they could kick off the budget discussions with the focused conversations on long term transportation planning. She said that did not mean there were no other priorities such as community safety, public safety, parks and recreation, housing community development, all of which were important, but to start, they felt long term transportation planning would go first in this particular kickoff. She stated that in the materials, there was a timeline that outlined the on-going discussions for budget issues.

Mayor Romero commented that the week of January 25th, there would be another focus conversation regarding the budget and ensuring public input from the community was sought. She asked the City Manager for his comments regarding this issue.

Michael J. Ortega, City Manager, reiterated the context of the discussions. He said he had reviewed the timeline graph provided to the Mayor and Council. He said it also outlined the spirit and intent of the 2021 budget with regards to participation and needed to continue moving forward. He said with regards to the transportation piece, it was probably the number one issue the City faced on a regular basis in terms of potholes, paving, mobility, transit services, etc. He said with talks about the re-authorization of the transportation bill, the federal government would be looking at all aspects of transportation, not just roads, but infrastructure around transportation and mobility, transit, broadband and a variety of other pieces. He also touched on the status of the RTA and Proposition 101.

Discussion ensued. Comments were made by Council Members Lee, Fimbres, Kozachik, Santa Cruz and Vice Mayor Cunningham. Some of the items discussed were the Smart City Initiative, challenges with IT and cyber security, million trees project, transportation issues, recruitment of employees to replace those retiring, core responsibilities, relief package from the federal government, KIDCO, youth support and employment, state shared revenues/unincorporated areas, return to back to basic philosophy for Ward offices to decide on roads and parks, enterprise funds vs general fund, participatory budgeting, root causes of societal issues, and general fund budgeting for streets and roads.

Council Member Lee stated that in going through the Smart City Initiative process, she realized the value that this would add to the City in terms of getting traffic moving through the City more efficiently and the safety aspects of it. She stated she continues to track where the Mayor and Council wants to be at the beginning of 2021.

Council Member Fimbres stated he wanted to focus on the many issue's IT was facing with Cyber Security. He stated that the virtual platform was the norm and wanted to make sure this issue was addressed. He also stated that he wanted to look at transportation issues and was pleased that the million-tree initiative had been kicked off. He also stated that recruitment of employees needed to happen, to replace those who were retirement

eligible. He said e wanted to make sure this issue was discussed, as it was becoming a new challenge for the City.

Council Member Kozachik stated he wished to continue with the CARES II Act for financial assistance. He also stated that the Mayor and Council's core responsibilities were an important item for him; in continuing to provide the same services, according to the Charter, despite the current monumental challenge.

Council Member Santa Cruz stated that she had an idea of what some of the 2021 priorities looked like. She said she wanted to continue building the participatory budgeting process. She stated that the community was looking for a little more involvement in things that impacted their daily lives. She stated she wanted to see more participatory budgeting and wanted to identify what systems the City must put into place, so that the community could be more engaged in the process, enabling them to have a place to voice their opinions and their needs. She also said she wanted there to be a little more creative space for addressing cultural landmarks within the City and giving attention to those as well.

Vice Mayor Cunningham stated that youth programs were necessary due to the current social interaction time. He stated he was willing to invest in this endeavor. He wanted to begin a process and try and work with school districts to offer a model in which universal aftercare was available to all families in Tucson, and that employers and employees could buy into the City's insurance plan for their children. He said he wanted to eliminate the need for people to turn down earning extra money because they did not want to lose their kids care benefit. He suggested going to the State and asking for a change in the distribution of state shared revenues in unincorporated areas. He stated this was an issue the City had dealt with for many years and felt it was time they did something about it.

Council Member Cunningham said he wanted like to see the City return to a back-to-basics philosophy, where funds were set aside for roads and parks, and the respective ward office would decide how that money was spent. He also said he wanted to see a customer service-oriented policy involving public safety, water, etc. and involve the community more. He commented about finding a way where all city financial transactions could be done in one place. He thanked Mayor Romero for her leadership, and the Council for taking an awful situation and making it livable.

Mayor Romero commented that in addition to the items discussed, the Mayor and Council had been talking about climate action and adaptation. She said Council Member Lee shared with her, a report that talked about livability in Arizona within the next ten years. She stated they were alarmed that within the next 10-20 years, there were four or five counties that would be considered unlivable. She said the Mayor and Council had been very clear about acting on climate livability, sustainability, and adaptation. She stated they needed to continue down that path.

Information and presentation on the budget process were given by Michael J. Ortega, City Manager and Joyce Garland, Chief Financial Officer/ Assistant City Manager, who fielded and answered questions.

Mr. Ortega said their goal was to have the budget process wrapped up by the first week in May, which was the normal budget schedule. Ms. Garland spoke about the participatory tool for the budget process, how it worked the previous year and how she saw it working for FY 2021/2022.

Mr. Ortega outlined the budget process. He stated that the next three meetings were important. He said there would be ample time and opportunity to discuss everyone's goals as time went on. He stated that there were three steps to the budget. The conversations with Mayor and Council, the conversations with the public and the implementation piece, generating the documents themselves. He reiterated that the goal was to have the budget completed by the first week in May.

Ms. Garland stated that the memorandum provided explained what was went on during the last budget process. She said there was a lot going on, not only in the community. She talked about the social injustices, the pandemic and other significant events, like national politics. She stated that there were lessons learned in all this. She commented that this year provided the opportunity to focus on specific topics. She stated that there must be a different type of outreach approach, to accommodate those who were not technologically able to participate. She said many groups responded because of what was going on nationally and locally. She said she believes that some of the results obtained may have been skewed because of this.

Council Member Santa Cruz thanked Ms. Garland and her team for putting together the budget proposal so quickly. She stated it was misleading to include the enterprise funds and general funds together, to make it appear as if there was a large amount of funding going to a specific department. She said it was important to clarify what purpose each fund had and how it operated.

Ms. Garland stated she agreed with Council Member Santa Cruz's opinion regarding the general fund. She explained that the purpose was to provide the public with information on the size of the budget and how it worked. She stated she believed it would not be an issue to place the focus on the general fund. She stated that the last budget did not provide enough time to get it into play and staff would do a better job this time round.

Council Member Santa Cruz referred to a previous comment made by Ms. Garland regarding the skewed results because of what was happening nationally. She stated that she wanted to make sure these voices and these national and local events were not dismissed. She stated that Mayor and Council were being challenged to see how the root cause of these issues was addressed and that the community was asking that these issues be better addressed moving forward.

No formal action taken.

**3. Financial Review: City of Tucson General Fund Budget Overview (City Wide)
SS/DEC18-20-280**

Information and presentation were provided by Joyce Garland, Chief Financial Officer/ Assistant City Manager, who fielded and answered questions on the City's Unrestricted FY 2019/2020 Preliminary Financial Results, FY 2020/2021 Working Projections, the 5-Year Projections for FY 2021/22 – 2025/26 and Unrestricted General Fund.

Discussion was held regarding raising the minimum wage for City employees to \$15/hour and making the related decompression adjustments. Discussion was also held regarding what the best increase would be for decompression adjustments, raising employee wages to \$15/hour or giving them the recommended 1% increase, whichever was greater and the possibility of giving other employees a 1% COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment).

Ms. Garland stated this was also an update to where the City ended in FY2020. She stated there was a minor change from their last discussion regarding the budget. It was a difference of about \$100,000. She said this change resulted from transfers from other funds. She wanted the Mayor and Council to remember was how much the CARES Act funding helped at the end of the last fiscal year. She pointed out a few items in the working projections for the fiscal year. Proposition 207 Marijuana Legalization passed. She stated that the City stood to receive city sales tax revenues and state shared tax revenues. She said she was projecting \$1.6 million for this year from city sales tax and an additional \$400,000 from state shared tax revenue. She stated these were estimates only, as Proposition 207 had not fully gone into effect.

Ms. Garland stated that expenditures were another item to point out. She said that at the November 17th meeting, the Mayor and Council asked staff to return with a plan for employee compensation. This was to ensure the City's minimum wage was raised to \$15.00 per hour plus any related adjustments. She indicated they had calculated a city wide 1% increase, for all those employees not impacted by the \$15.00 per hour minimum wage increase. They were trying to determine which scenario best benefited the employees, the adjustments made based on the \$15.00 minimum wage increase or the 1% raise. She stated that the five-year forecast was a projected working model. She indicated this was a long-term view of what the City's financials could look like, given whatever changes might occur.

Discussion continued regarding projecting revenues (marijuana legislation and state shared revenues) and expenditures, bond issuance for public safety, parks and recreation equipment, maintenance, technology services, debt services, etc.

Mayor Romero asked about the last market increase that was conducted. She said there was a group of employees who did not receive that increase. She asked if what was presented to them covered that area.

Ms. Garland said it did.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Cunningham, duly seconded, and CARRIED by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to move forward with the plan to raise the minimum wage to \$15/hour for City workers and make related decompression adjustments, either the \$15/hour or 1% increase, whichever was greater, to take effect as soon as possible, but no later than February 2021.

No other formal action was taken.

4. Looking Forward – Initial Focused Goals: i. Transportation Long-Term Planning; ii. Employee Recruitment and Retention (City Wide) SS/DEC18-20-279

Introductory comments were made by Michael J. Ortega, City Manager.

Information and presentation were given by Diana Alarcon, Department of Transportation and Mobility Director, who fielded and answered questions on Move Tucson, and long-term planning for transportation. She said Tucsonans wanted the City to have an increased travel choice, focus on improving safety, and invest in current infrastructure. Some other areas of focus were improving the paving quality, sidewalks, bus stop improvements, mobility, connectivity, efficiency (modernizing what the City currently had today), high quality travel options, comfort, connection, and accessibility.

Ms. Alarcon stated that Move Tucson would be the framework of the next RTA. She stated she wanted to highlight some of the things that came from the community through Move Tucson. She said what was learned from the survey was that the community wanted an increased travel choice and focus on improving safety and investments in the infrastructure currently in place. She stated the community really wanted the City to focus on making city streets safe for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists alike. She commented that maintenance was another major issue. The community wanted more attention paid to the City's aging infrastructure, improving pavement quality, sidewalks, and bus stops. She stated that modernizing what services were already in place was another issue. She said the community wanted comfort and accessibility and also asked for efficiency.

Mayor Romero asked if Move Tucson was the direct input from Tucsonans.

Ms. Alarcon stated it was.

Mayor Romero said Move Tucson was the direct input of Tucsonans and these priorities should inform discussions with the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA). She asked what the next steps were with the RTA.

Discussion ensued regarding a letter from the City Manager to the RTA, reinforcing what he had heard from the Mayor and Council, letting them know there was a public process, then a conversation with the Mayor and Council to transmit to the RTA.

Ms. Alarcon stated DTM had prepared a letter to the RTA, that highlighted the main focal points, and asked for another conversation with them, because of the City's strong community driven investment. She also stated they were getting ready to launch a virtual open house to provide information back to the community regarding what had been collected thus far and to gather additional feedback. She said they would then prioritize a project list to present to the Mayor and Council in February, receive direction to create an Action Plan by April or May that could be submitted to the RTA.

Discussion continued. Additional comments were made by Council Members Kozachik, Fimbres, Santa Cruz, Lee, Durham, and Vice Mayor Kozachik regarding equity within the RTA since the City was 62% of RTA's tax base.

Mayor Romero stated that there was not enough time to have a discussion regarding Proposition 101. She suggested bringing the item back to the Mayor and Council on January 5, 2021.

Mr. Ortega briefly spoke about retention/recruitment. He said to give this issue justice, he suggested that the item also come back to the Mayor and Council for further discussion at their January 5, 2021 meeting. This item not only addressed retention/recruitment but was also about having conversations regarding performance-based adjustments, which was a three percent adjustment that was built into the budget. He said without having a sustained funding philosophy it was a one and done deal and he was suggesting that it become part of the budget moving forward. He said he was looking at performance-based standards and would be presenting that to the Mayor and Council soon. He asked for feedback from the Mayor and Council prior to the next meeting that he could address and comeback with options to answer any questions they might have.

Mayor Romero asked if it made sense to make decision on a COLA based on inflation rather than a blanket 1% or 1.5%. She also asked if staff was looking at performance-based adjustments as opposed to a COLA.

Mr. Ortega responded it made absolute sense, but he would not recommend that because there was no way of knowing what the inflation rate might be and had to have discussions annually to ensure the City could afford it. He said it was the goal to have performance-based adjustments.

Mayor Romero reiterated that Proposition 101 and retention/recruitment conversations be continued to the January 5, 2021 Mayor and Council meeting.

5. **ADJOURNMENT:** 2:19 p.m.

*AUDIO RECORDING FOR THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE ON-LINE AT
<https://www.tucsonaz.gov/gov/meeting-schedules-and-agendas> FOR TEN YEARS FROM THE
DATE OF THIS MEETING*

Mayor Romero announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Mayor and Council would be held on Tuesday, December 22, 2020, at 5:30 p.m.



MAYOR

ATTEST:



CITY CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICITY

I, the undersigned, have read the foregoing transcript of the meeting of the Mayor and Council of the City of Tucson, Arizona, held on the 18th day of December 2020, and do hereby certify that it is an accurate transcription.



DEPUTY CITY CLERK

RWR:jc:bb