



MEMORANDUM

Date: January 12, 2015

To: The Honorable Ally Miller, Member
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: **January 13, 2015 Agenda Item 8 – Board of Supervisors Policy regarding Budget Development Transparency and Transfer to Community Nonprofit Organizations for Public Services**

This memorandum is in response to your January 11, 2015 inquiry regarding Board of Supervisors Policy D29.4, Pima County Contracts Policy, and proposed new Policy E36.2, Small Public Purpose Grants. The County Attorney approval requirement referenced in Policy D29.4, Section V.I., Item A, is "approval as to form" of a contract. Proposed Policy E36.2, Section C.3, requires County Attorney "confirmation the planned use of the funds is within the County's legal authority." The language in these two policies does not conflict, since two separate County Attorney actions are described.

You also inquired as to whether it is more appropriate to end the use of Contingency Funds for small public purpose grants to nonprofit organizations or political subdivisions. Whether to do so is a policy decision to be made by the Board of Supervisors. Historically, the Board has used Contingency Funds for this purpose; and if the Board elects to continue this practice, I would recommend Policy E36.2 be applied to such grants.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors

Maura Kwiatkowski

From: Ally Miller
Sent: Sunday, January 11, 2015 11:40 PM
To: Chuck Huckelberry
Cc: Chris Straub; Amelia Cramer
Subject: Clarification regarding language for discretionary spending

Mr. Huckelberry,

On page 3 of 11 of Policy D29.4 Item VI

A. This clause states contracts under \$5000 may be executed without attorney approval.

This is in conflict with your new Policy governing the small contributions in Attachment 3e 36.2 Under C Policy Item 3 which are limited to \$2500.

If a board member wishes to fund a small public service grant within district budget adopted, the board member must submit the information required...documentation you outline in Item 2.

Together with the board member signed recommendation by county attorney office for confirmation of the planned use of the funds is within county's legal authority.

Policy D 29.4 conflicts with two of the possible choices because they are required to be a maximum of \$2500.

Also you state board should try to avoid contingency fund. Is it not more appropriate to end use of contingency fund allocations of this type altogether as this is not the intended use of this fund.

Thank You for your assistance in clarifying.

Ally

Ally Miller, Supervisor

District 1

Pima County Board Of Supervisors

130 W. Congress

11th Floor

Tucson, AZ 85701

(520) 724-2738

Sent from my iPad