

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 15, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair
Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair
Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
*Andrés Cano, Member

Absent: Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Cano was sworn in and joined the Board on the dais at 10:15 a.m.

1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

U.S. Department of Agriculture, to provide for the Brawley Wash Watershed Plan, (GA-FC-66009). The amendments shown below were not submitted to the Board for approval due to oversight associated with both District and Grants, Management & Innovation personnel changes. The purpose of this item is to rectify this oversight, for the following:

- Amendment No. 2, is a no cost extension for one year with a new term date of 6/30/23 to 6/30/24.
- Amendment No. 3, per email correspondence, was canceled by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).
- Amendment No. 4, awarded additional funds in the amount of \$230,957.91. This was approved by USDA via Notice of Amended Grant Award Agreement.
- Amendment No. 5, is a no cost extension for one year with a new term date of 6/30/24 to 6/30/25.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

2. RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION PLANS

Pursuant to Pima County Code, Section 16.30.050(B), quarterly report of District approved Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 15, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair
Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair
Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
*Andrés Cano, Member

Absent: Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Cano was sworn in and joined the Board on the dais at 10:15 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Elizabeth Ladriere, Office Manager, Davis Bilingual Elementary Magnet School.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Cano acknowledged the passing of Pascual Erunez, who was survived by his wife of 65 years and his five children. He stated that Mr. Erunez was born on May 17, 1939, in Sonora, Mexico and passed away peacefully on April 4, 2025, surrounded by his family. He observed a moment of silence in his memory and honor.

Supervisor Cano also expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to serve on this Board. He praised the transparent and inclusive appointment process and thanked the other applicants. He reflected on his journey from a 14-year-old County intern to public servant and credited the late Supervisor Richard Elias for inspiring his commitment to service. He thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her leadership, and the

current and former District 5 staff for their humble and urgent service. He acknowledged his family's support, especially his mother, brother, and late grandmother, whose words continued to guide him. He reflected on his time as a State Representative and House Minority Leader, where he helped pass a bipartisan budget with historic investments in housing, healthcare, and education. He stated that after pursuing a Masters of Public Administration degree, he returned to serve as Director of Federal and State Relations for the City of Tucson and thanked his colleagues at the City. He recognized the County's challenges such as federal cuts, housing instability, and climate change, and expressed confidence in the community's ability to overcome them. He expressed his commitment to lead with collaboration, accountability, and care, and was ready to get to work in District 5.

PRESENTATION

5. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Lorie Zambos, Library Associate, Pima County Public Library, for 25 years of service.

Amber Mathewson, Director, Pima County Public Library, acknowledged Lorie Zambos for nearly 26 years of dedicated service to the County. She expressed her appreciation and thanked Ms. Zambos for her exceptional customer service, kindness, generosity, and leadership, as well as her cooking and holiday decorating skills.

No Board action was taken.

6. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Joseph Doranski, Laboratory Supervisor, Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, for 26 years of service.

Jackson Jenkins, Director, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, recognized Joseph Doranski for his 26 years of service. He stated that Mr. Doranski started as a laboratory assistant and over the years, progressed into a supervisory role, where he became a significant leader. He expressed his gratitude and thanked Mr. Doranski for his dedication and leadership.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Jamie Maslyn Larson, President and CEO, Tohono Chul and Koren Manning, Chair, Tohono Chul Board of Directors, proclaiming the day of Saturday, April 19, 2025 to be: "TOHONO CHUL DAY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item. Chair Scott made the presentation.

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Genie Joseph, PhD, The Human-Animal Connection, proclaiming the day of Wednesday, April 30, 2025 to be: "NATIONAL THERAPY ANIMAL DAY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item. Supervisor Allen made the presentation.

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Cytllali Gonzalez, Public Health Program Manager I, Yulisa Garcia, Public Health Educator II, Brian Dennis and Nicholas Matthews, Public Health Program Coordinators, REACH; Lee Itule-Klasen, Senior Manager, Office of Non-Communicable Disease Prevention; and Christina Flores, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Public Health Program Coordinator, Pima County Health Department; Arisia Lee, Community Engagement Coordinator, and Hope Barton, Intern, Pima County Department of Environmental Quality, proclaiming the month of April 2025 to be: "BIKE MONTH IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item. Supervisor Heinz made the presentation.

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. Julian Ackerley, Director, and Kelly Burkholder, Board President, Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus, proclaiming the day of Saturday, May 3, 2025 to be: "DR. JULIAN ACKERLEY AND TUCSON ARIZONA BOYS CHORUS DAY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item. Chair Scott made the presentation.

PROCLAMATION

11. Proclaiming the week of May 1 through May 7, 2025 to be: "YOUTH WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

12. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Dana Kormash addressed the Board regarding District 5 applicant, Andrés Cano. She stated that she had known Mr. Cano for nine years and involved her in helping the less fortunate.

Laurie Moore spoke about reinstating City bus fares and bus rides that became free during COVID led to a decline in clientele by workers and students, which were replaced by homeless individuals and drug addicts. She emphasized the need to address mental illness and addiction.

Dave Smith addressed the Board regarding the District 5 appointment, urging them to prioritize the collective good of Pima County. He emphasized the importance of managing shared resources, addressing issues like property taxes and misuse of public services, and called for a representative who served the entire community rather than a narrow scope.

Roger D. Score expressed his concerns over recent vandalism of private property, including his Tesla, and blamed local leadership for allowing lawlessness in the community. He stated that the Board had not condemned the violence or destruction, and spoke about potential consequences.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

13. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to convene to Executive Session at 11:56 a.m.

14. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:44 p.m. Supervisor Christy was absent and Supervisor Cano was not present when the Board reconvened from Executive Session. He rejoined the meeting at 1:46 p.m. All other members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

15. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding federal lawsuits.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote and Supervisor Christy was absent, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

16. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(4), for legal advice and discussion regarding the possible purchase of downtown properties.

This item was for discussion and consultation. No Board action was taken.

17. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding the Estate of Mary Hutchinson, et al. v. Naphcare, Inc., et al.

This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

18. Board of Supervisors, District 5

Discussion/Action regarding the appointment of a new District 5 Board of Supervisor.

Supervisor Allen acknowledged the incredibly qualified and capable individuals who had applied for the District 5 Supervisor position, and each of the significant contributions they made to the community in various ways. She emphasized the need for someone who could immediately hit the ground running with experience around the Board of Supervisors, complexities of budgets, and navigating difficult times.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to appoint Andrés Cano to fill the position of District 5 Supervisor. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen stated that Mr. Cano's experience as a sixth-generation Arizonan, his early start in public service, his work in District 5 and the Legislature, and his Harvard degree, made him highly qualified for the position.

Supervisor Heinz expressed his appreciation to the applicants who took the time to meet with him, noting that the community consistently impressed him with the quality of individuals that stepped forward for such roles. He acknowledged the challenges ahead and stated that, if he was a District 5 resident, he could see himself voting for nearly every applicant he met. He emphasized the need for someone who was ready at this moment with as much knowledge to step into the role and he expressed his support for Mr. Cano.

Chair Scott expressed his support for the nomination of Andrés Cano. He reflected on Mr. Cano's upbringing and how it reminded him of many exceptional students he had encountered in his career as an educator, and noted that Mr. Cano's challenging personal circumstances motivated him to thrive and serve his community. He emphasized that, like his colleagues, he had the opportunity to meet with the applicants for the District 5 Supervisor position, and even though each candidate had compelling reasons to be considered, when he spoke to Mr. Cano it felt as though he was conversing with someone who had already held the position of Supervisor due to his depth of knowledge and clear preparation. He stated that numerous people had praised his intellect, political skills, and personal character, noting that he was fully present in conversations and was a model of servant leadership. He highlighted Mr. Cano's public service career and his advanced

degree from Harvard, and that he came home to continue his work on behalf of the residents of Pima County. He expressed confidence that District 5 would be well-served by him as Supervisor.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

OATH OF OFFICE

19. Oath of Office to be administered by the Honorable Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, for the newly appointed Board of Supervisor, District 5.

The Honorable Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, administered the Oath of Office to Andrés Cano, the newly appointed District 5 Board of Supervisor. No Board action was taken.

20. **Board of Supervisors Procedural Organization Selection of Vice Chair.**

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Chair Scott to select Supervisor Allen as Vice Chair. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

21. **Appointment of Board Members to Boards, Committees and Commissions**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the nomination of members of the Board of Supervisors to serve as the appointee to the following:

- Pima Association of Governments/Regional Transportation Authority
- Visit Tucson

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to nominate Supervisor Heinz to serve as Board representative on the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA). No vote was taken at this time.

A substitute motion was made by Chair Scott to nominate himself to serve as Board representative on PAG and the RTA. It died for lack of a second.

Upon roll call vote, the original motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Chair Scott to nominate Supervisor Cano to serve as Board representative on Visit Tucson. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

22. Board of Supervisors Representative Updates on Boards, Committees and Commissions and Any Other Municipalities

Supervisor Allen stated that she had met with the Arizona Border Counties Coalition for their first meeting, aimed at bringing the group back together. She stated that they were introduced to the new Deputy Director of the Economic Development Department and heard from colleagues on the Cochise County Board of Supervisors regarding the importance of developments around the port of entry in the Douglas area. She expressed her continued commitment to working with the committee to promote strong economic development and ensure that the ports of entry foster the relationship between Arizona and their partners in Sonora. She stated that the Board of Health met on a monthly basis and provided highlights from the most recent meeting, which included recommending the legal age for purchasing tobacco and vape products be increased from 18 to 21, following the lead of the City of Tucson, and expressed support for a bill currently moving through the Arizona Legislature. She stated that the Health Department continued to monitor the recent resurgence of measles cases, and the Board discussed the outbreak rates and the actions being taken by the Pima County Health Department. She stated that they had also addressed the growing issue of misinformation being spread concerning vaccines and the challenges in keeping communities safe. She stated that they had also received a report on the health costs of gun violence, highlighting how gun-related deaths and injuries had domino effects throughout the County, both on the health system and the economy.

Chair Scott stated that he served as the Board representative to the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) for the County Supervisors Association and that due to a lack of action in the Legislature, the LPC had not met for the last two weeks. He stated that he was also the County's representative to the Sun Corridor Board and the merger between Sun Corridor and the Tucson Metro Chamber had been finalized. He stated that the County would have a seat on the Board of the new Chamber of Southern Arizona and their first meeting would be held on April 25th. He stated that the kickoff luncheon for the new Chamber of Southern Arizona was scheduled on May 2nd, and all Board members had received invitations for that event.

This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

23. Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of July 2025, to add a Special Virtual Meeting on Monday, July 28, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., for the canvass of the July 15, 2025 Special Primary Election. This special meeting will be held virtually.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

24. Update on Federal and State Executive, Legislative and Judicial Actions that affect Pima County

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administrator's Office, provided a slideshow presentation of activities that had occurred over the past two weeks including the State impact on the Medicaid system, the federal Medicaid implications, federal funding, holds determinations, stop work or any other budgetary implications, the reduction in the federal workforce, and a high-level update on elections and tariffs. She explained that there were 112 executive orders issued by the Executive Office, which increased to 124, 12 were signed on April 8 through April 9 and recently posted the prior day and on this day. She stated that these were tied to elections, deregulation and regulatory policy as discussed at the Board's prior meeting and that she would provide an update in her next update. She stated that any impact to the local order of business at the County was 178 legal actions increased to 192 and that four of those legislative actions had closed. She stated that most could be tied to the content of the executive orders and the policy decisions at the executive level, or full funding stops, the County was monitoring its own grant budget and legality. She stated that the third component was workforce component and the State legislative update. She stated they had seen a bit of a lag on bill review, but current committee sessions had concluded, with the exception to the budget hearings and the ongoing special appropriations discussions. She stated that 51 bills were signed, 4 were vetoed on the Governor's desk, a consideration of bills introduced late, and this was important because they would be discussing the budget shortfall of \$122 million at the State level which was tied to developmental disability budgets and associated Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) enrollment and that the Board would be updated as those bills passed through. She stated that many County initiatives had progressed and they anticipated additional vetoed bills as they went through review and the Board would also be updated in the upcoming weeks at the conclusion of those outcomes. She mentioned that the County Administrator had provided a memorandum to the Board regarding review of the State activity and Medicaid discussions which affected both State and Federal levels and risks to AHCCCS, Arizona's State Medicaid. She stated that cuts to address the budget shortfall would impact over 60,000 Arizonans, with an estimated 10,000 in Pima County. She stated this was being discussed at the State level and the program was set to run out of funds by the end of the month, unless they came up with a budget adjustment, which the Board would be updated on either in the next update or via memorandum as it concluded. She stated that it was important to revisit what Medicaid enrollment looked like in Pima County, and what State and Federal budget cuts would look like to Pima County residents. She stated that the Federal government had already proposed over \$880 billion in Medicaid cuts over ten years with this Governor's budget and State level budget impacts coming in from the other side. She stated that roughly 25% to 30% of the

County's population was covered by AHCCCS within four groups, with traditional enrollment being the largest group at 66%, which represented normal Medicaid enrollees, healthcare for kids and safety net programming. She stated that two expansion groups were brought forward into different time frames, during Prop. 204, which was passed in 2000, removed the responsibility of indigent care from Counties to the State Medicaid system. She explained that the expansion group represented 100% individuals fell within 100% of the federal poverty limit, and discussions around the childless adults population. She stated that this further expanded during the Affordable Care Act expansion in 2014, to include folks that fell in from the 100% of the federal poverty limit to 133%, further expanding an additional 4% of County residents. She stated that Arizona Long Term Care Services (ALTCS) represented 4%, but this was the group that had some of the most significant health and care needs, including disabilities, and intellectual and developmental disorders, 35% of those were children under 18. She stated that it was a smaller group across the traditional enrollment buckets but it was critical. She stated that cuts to AHCCCS would affect the accessibility of care for critical services across these residents groups and would be harmful to the provider network, hospitals, families, and overall economic impacts across the County. She highlighted that 37% of all AHCCCS enrollees were children, ages 0 to 18, compared to the traditional Medicaid population which was 66%. She stated that many of these expansion populations represented individuals with co-occurring medical or acute behavioral health substance use needs. She stated that it was a very comprehensive care network for some of the more vulnerable populations and more than a third of those had claims data tied to multiple of those care needs at one time. She stated that reducing Medicaid enrollment would leave thousands of residents without health care coverage and there was additional narrative being drafted on this at the Federal and State levels.

Chair Scott stated that data from the Children's Action Alliance indicated that 42% of children in Pima County were enrolled in public health insurance and asked whether there were other public health insurance programs beyond AHCCCS.

Ms. Davis responded that there was traditional AHCCCS, but there was also different timing on when they looked at enrollment numbers and it was not always consistent month to month. She stated that depending on where their data was sourced, there was KidsCare through AHCCCS and ALTCS program that served more children with high needs. She stated that depending on the data source, enrollment for these was between 250,000 to over 300,000 Pima County residents. She stated that there had been a lot published recently but she would report back to the Board on any data discrepancies. She stated there was not much to report about the status of Federal funding across the County's grant programming and they only received some notices in and around non-award or additional review from their Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) partners and also some programming tied to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), but it was by way of the shifts in staffing with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), which was substantial. She stated she would keep the Board updated on any other grant holds as they were known. She explained that

workforce was new data and they had been trying to follow this as closely as possible because this was cascading and incredibly important as they looked at economic indicators and the effects of the Federal workforce reductions and the grant reductions and other Federal cuts. She stated that this included nonprofit agencies, the County's contracted partners, and the workforce everywhere. She stated that they had preliminary numbers from the Department of Labor (DOL) for Federal workers and U.S. based employers announced over 275,000 job cuts in March of 2025 alone, a 205% increase compared to the same month the previous year. She stated this was overall employment and 80% of those job cuts were tied to Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) actions, which were substantial. She stated that recently, a federal judge ordered six Federal agencies to rehire the probationary group and the Supreme Court ruling blocked it. She stated that DOL data suggested that claims for unemployment were as high as they were in November of 2021, although, they were starting to see a reduction in first time claims. She stated they had seen an increase in the unemployment rate from 4% to roughly 4.2%, increasing slightly every month. She added that the Supreme Court ruling was notable for any court action, which were kind of like three legs of a stool, policy actions within the executive orders, funding and workforce. She stated that this also related to funding, because in the absence of court injunctions around the County's funding, there were directives to have increased scrutiny on reimbursements, which was mostly reimbursement portfolio. She stated that with increased scrutiny, it was known that DOGE had a hold of Grants.gov, which was the County's largest grant funding portal, previously administered by HHS and they would continue to monitor this and also monitor the local impact. She explained that with elections and tariffs, they had an executive order on election integrity with the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act that had passed the House and was awaiting Senate review. She stated that these put forth significant additional documentation for elections that would be required at the time of voting and some restrictions on early voting. She stated that they would update the Board as more information was known about how that would affect Pima County tariffs. She stated that the data shown on the slide was incorrect since there had been a series of movement on reciprocal tariffs with certain Countries on the previous day. She stated that China was at 125%, but there might be exemptions and they would monitor the effects on tariffs on Pima County projects or business if they heard from small businesses or any businesses across the County.

This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

25. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Overall Budget Development

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the FY 2025/26 overall budget development.

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Chair Scott to direct staff to include up to \$1.5 million within the as yet not finalized capital improvement budget to contribute toward the abatement and rejuvenation of the burned out, hazardous

Spanish Trail property in the City of South Tucson, to mitigate that public health hazard, and while doing so, work closely with their staff and potentially not for profit entities possibly interested in this property and leverage any federal grant dollars for mitigation efforts if those should be available. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

It was then moved by Supervisor Heinz to direct staff to include the Health Department's \$485,000.00 supplemental request in the budget, and emphasized the importance to support the Office of Non-Communicable Diseases. The motion died for lack of a second.

26. **Pima County Climate Action Update**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update of Pima County's Climate Action Plan, as requested by the Board of Supervisors.

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

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

27. **Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan.

At the request of Supervisor Christy and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 6, 2025.

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

28. **Attractions and Tourism One-Time-Only Outside Agency Funding Requests**

Agency/Program/Fiscal Year/Amount

La Frontera Mariachi Conference, Inc./La Frontera Tucson Mariachi Conference/FY24-25/\$7,900.00
Tucson Kitchen Musicians Association/Tucson Folk Festival/FY24-25/\$7,900.00

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

29. **Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §12-284.01, staff requests approval to expend \$16,400.00 (tax included) from the Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund, to purchase scanning equipment.

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

James Giacomino, Clerk of the Superior Court, stated that the request was for an additional scanner for the department's scanning operations of old and new documents, and that expanding this capability would help to better serve the public in that role.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

30. Revised Outside Agency Committee Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2024/2025

Youth, Young Adult, and Family Support Category

Agency/Program/Contract/Current Award/Revised Recommendation

Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern AZ, Inc./Project Safe Place (PSP)/
PO2400012213/\$32,174.00/\$15,593.73

Youth On Their Own/YOTO Program (Stipends)/PO2400013340/\$103,666.00/
\$120,246.27

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

31. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 7, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve submission of the City of Tucson and Pima County Consortium FY 2025-2029 HUD Consolidated Plan and the Pima County 2025-2026 Annual Action Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

FY 2025/2026 Pima County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

Location/Applicant/Program/Activity/District/Request/Recommendation

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Builds/hsg/3/\$50,000/\$50,000

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Works/ps/3/\$25,000/\$20,000

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Curley School Affordable Housing Life Safety Improvements/pf/3/\$65,000/\$0

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Expanding Community Food Hub Capacity/pf/3/\$50,000/\$0

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Teen Project/ps/3/\$40,000/\$35,000

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Youth Center/pf/3/\$30,000/\$25,000

Avra Water Co-op, Inc./Aging Meter/MXU Install Program/pf/3/\$35,000/\$35,000

Drexel Heights Fire District/Family Safety Program/ps/3,5/\$48,000/\$15,000

Flowing Wells School District/Flowing Wells Family Resource Center/ps/1,3/\$45,000/\$50,000

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Intergenerational Rural Workforce Development/ps/2,3,4/\$40,000/\$0

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/SHiM, Safety and Health in Motion Program/ps/2,3,4/\$45,000/\$15,000

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/VAS Food Distribution/Nutrition Education Center/pf/2,3,4/\$39,500/\$0

Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center/A Community Building for Summit/pf/2,3,4/\$60,000/\$60,000

Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center/Increasing Warehouse Capacity for Food Distribution/pf/2,3,4/\$104,040/\$100,000
 City of South Tucson/Administration/admin/2/\$30,000/\$30,000
 City of South Tucson/Code Enforcement Program/ps/2/\$20,000/\$10,000
 City of South Tucson/Community Cleanup & Green Program/ps/2/\$28,260/\$5,000
 City of South Tucson/Crime Prevention and Education Program/ps/2/\$50,000/\$20,000
 City of South Tucson/Fire and Rescue Safety Equipment/pf/2/\$25,000/\$25,000
 City of South Tucson/JVYC Facility Improvement 25-26/pf/2/\$113,952/\$100,000
 City of South Tucson/Youth Programs/ps/2/\$200,000/\$100,000
 Pima County CWD/Administration/admin/All/\$458,594/\$458,594
 Pima County CWD/Project Delivery/pf/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Emergency Demolition/demo/All/\$65,000/\$0
 Pima County CWD/Emergency Septic/hsg/All/\$100,000/\$50,000
 Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$1,000,000/\$697,039
 Pima County CWD/Neighborhood Greenup/ngu/All/\$100,000/\$0
 Catholic Community Services, d.b.a. Pio Decimo Center/Childcare Services-Pio Decimo/JVYC/ps/2,All/\$100,000/\$0
 Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc./Nahui Ollin Wellness Program (NOWP)/ps/All/\$50,000/\$20,000
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$275,000/\$275,000
 DIRECT Center for Independence/Home Access Program/hsg/All/\$75,000/\$50,000
 Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Community-Based Services Clinician Support for Survivors of Domestic Violence/ps/All/\$73,498/\$0
 Family Housing Resources/Housing Counseling/ps/All/\$30,000/\$20,000
 Habitat for Humanity Tucson/CHUCK Center Facility Improvements/pf/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Habitat for Humanity Tucson/Habitat Home Repair Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation/hsg/All/\$170,000/\$80,000
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./Medically Tailored Meals for Low-Income Seniors/ps/All/\$60,000/\$30,000
 Our Family Services, Inc./Homeless Youth Parent Education Program/ps/All/\$28,750/\$0
 Our Family Services, Inc./Reunion House Facility Improvements/pf/All/\$25,000/\$25,000
 Our Family Services, Inc./Safety Gate/pf/All/\$25,000/\$0
 SER Jobs for Progress/SER Facility Improvements/pf/2,All/\$64,000/\$0
 Sister Jose Women's Center/Sister Jose Women's Center Gateway Shelter Program/ps/All/\$50,000/\$0
 Southwest Fair Housing Council/Fair Housing Enforcement, Education, and Outreach/admin/All/\$35,000/\$25,000
 Tucson Clean & Beautiful, Inc./Power in Place/pf/All/\$35,000/\$0
 Watershed Management Group/Building Resilient Communities Through Green Stormwater Infrastructure/pf/All/\$100,000/\$0
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/HNS Facility Improvements/pf/2,All/\$97,335/\$97,335
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/ps/All/\$47,000/\$45,000
TOTAL REQUESTED \$4,307,929/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$2,567,968

HUD Eligible Activity Abbreviations: admin = Administration; ps = Public Service; pf = Public Facility Improvement; ngu = Neighborhood Green-Up; infra = Infrastructure Improvement; hsg = Housing Rehabilitation; ed = Economic Development; land = Land Acquisition; demo = Demolition; bf = Brownfields and Clearance.

FY 2025/2026 Pima County Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

ESG Component/Agency/Program/Activity Focus/District/Request/Recommendation

Street Outreach/Our Family Services/Street Outreach/Street Outreach/All/\$32,250/\$0
 Emergency Shelter/Emerge!/Emergency Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence/DV Families/All/\$50,000/\$45,000
 Emergency Shelter/Green Valley Assistance Services/MAP-ES Emergency Shelter/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$30,000/\$15,000
 Emergency Shelter/Our Family Services/Emergency Shelter/Families, Individuals/All/\$34,531/\$0

Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Casa Paloma/Single Women/All/\$45,000/\$35,000
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Family Pathways/Families, Individuals/All/\$45,000/\$35,000
 Homeless Prevention/Family Housing Resources/Housing Stability-Homeless Prevention/Families, Individuals/All/\$30,000/\$23,342
 Homeless Prevention/Green Valley Assistance Services/Valley Assistance Family MAP (Map a Plan)/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$55,000/\$23,342
 Homeless Prevention/Pima County/Homeless Prevention/Families, Individuals/All/\$40,000/\$40,024
 Rapid Rehousing/Our Family Services/Rapid Rehousing/Families, Individuals/All/\$38,700/\$0
 Administration/Pima County/-/Administration/All/\$17,570/\$17,570
TOTAL REQUESTED \$418,051/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$234,278

Dan Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development (CWD), explained that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Annual Action Plan was part of a five-year plan and that he had discussed it with Board offices. He stated that a State expert was participating remotely and would provide the presentation on the five-year plan.

Martina Kuehl, Consultant, Kuehl Enterprises, L.L.C., provided a slideshow presentation on the overview of the five-year HUD Consolidated Plan and the program year 2025 Annual Action Plan process goals and planned use of funds. She explained that the five-year Consolidated Plan served as a framework for approximately \$13 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and \$1.2 million in Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds the County expected to receive over the next five years. She stated that the plan was developed through a HOME Program consortium with the City of Tucson (COT), the lead agency, which shared about \$4.2 million, or 1/3, with Pima County. She stated that it was important to understand that the Consolidated Plan was implemented through the Annual Action Plan that addressed a priority, and that to establish those priorities, Pima County and the COT held five joint forums, a public meeting, and independently conducted surveys. She stated that each of the jurisdictions conducted separate annual funding outreach, and 85 participants attended the 11 technical assistance meetings held by County staff. She went over a summary of the HUD housing data used in the plan and highlighted that 16,500 households outside of the COT paid 50% more of their household income for housing costs and were considered severely cost burdened. She added they were most at risk of homelessness if renting, or foreclosure and improper maintenance if they were owners. She went over the five funding priorities under the five-year Consolidated Plan which included community facilities and improvements such as infrastructure, public services, decent affordable housing, homelessness, and program administration. She stated that the County also identified eight community development target areas that were at least 51% of households that were low- to moderate-income and they automatically qualified for CDBG funding when activities benefited the entire area. She stated that goals for CDBG funds over the next five years included public facilities and infrastructure improvements that would benefit 40,000 people, and it included the demolition of buildings to facilitate project development. She stated that public services would benefit 100,000 residents, and housing rehabilitation would assist 1,000 homeowners, which included emergency septic repairs. She explained that the five-year goal for ESG was for homeless services, which were for all

activities eligible under the ESG, such as support for emergency shelters, homelessness prevention, rapid rehousing, and rental assistance that would benefit 40 households. She explained that the County focused their HOME funds on homeownership opportunities and hoped to assist with the development of 59 new homeownership units and 61 households with home purchase assistance. She explained that the first year Annual Action Plan was part of the five-year Consolidated Plan submission to HUD and for future years it would be a standalone document and discussion. She stated that this plan focused on funding specific activities and program-specific regulatory requirements and other actions requiring discussions under the Consolidated Plan regulations. She stated that the chart displayed on the slide showed Program Year 2025 resources with assumed level funding allocations from Program Year 2024 that would need to be adjusted once the actual allocations were known, which were expected in early- to mid-May. She stated that the projects and programs that were to take place in the six community development target areas included Ajo, Arivaca, Arivaca Junction, City of South Tucson, Flowing Wells, and Picture Rocks. She added that after the official allocations were announced, the documents would be finalized to incorporate public comments, although none had been received at the public meeting or in writing during the comment period. She stated that adjustments would also be made due to regulatory changes that had occurred since the draft release and after the documents were revised to reflect the final allocations and regulatory changes, they would be submitted to HUD, and program and grant agreements were expected in the fall, following HUD's 45-day review period, noting that revisions could still occur after that time.

Supervisor Allen thanked Ms. Kuehl for her presentation and asked whether there was any concern about loss of funding.

Ms. Kuehl responded that they shared the same concern over speculation of all federal funding and what would happen with the HUD funding, and they were anxiously awaiting answers.

Supervisor Allen inquired about the criteria that was used for selection of the community development target areas.

Ms. Kuehl explained that a community development target area had at least 51% of the population at low and moderate income. She stated they had an income less than 80% of the Area Median Income, a CDBG requirement for conducting activities that had a benefit to an area, and if not met, a special survey would be needed, which was expensive and time consuming.

Supervisor Allen asked if this could be framed in the context of the Prosperity Initiative and how the work, the priorities, the activities, the target populations were aligned in helping to achieve some of those 13 policy areas within the Prosperity Initiative itself.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he wanted to ensure a distinction between the two and as they went through this with their partners at the COT, the Prosperity Initiative was an overarching theme that was considered and the granularity taken when selecting the projects. He stated that moving forward, it would be part of the selection process of how recommendations were brought to the Board and clarified that this was just the beginning of the Prosperity Initiative and their annual action plan on a five-year plan being joined together. He stated that it would continue to become as one, that the Prosperity Initiative was the overarching goal and guiding document, and policy for everything they did at CWD.

Supervisor Heinz stated that both the current presentation and previous presentation had underscored the need for affordable housing, an item he intended to address later in the meeting. He referenced the ECONorthwest Study, which showed over 36,000 more affordable housing units were needed over ten years and \$2.5 million was for one year, which was still just a drop in the bucket of the identified needs from that study.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to adopt the Resolution.

DETAINEE AND CRISIS SYSTEMS

32. Inmate Navigation, Enrollment, Stabilization and Treatment (INVEST) Independent Final Evaluation

Presentation of the key findings of the Independent Final Evaluation of the INVEST Program.

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

33. Monthly Financial Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a monthly financial update on the County's financial performance.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slideshow presentation on the monthly financial forecast through February. He reported that the revenue variance had increased to \$11.5 million, reflecting a \$2.5 million increase from the Period 7 forecast. He stated that it was primarily attributed to an increase in state-shared sales tax collections and a \$1 million increase in pooled interest, which had not been expected due to earlier forecasts predicting a decline in interest rates, but the feds had held the rates stable. He stated that on the expenditure side they had seen a positive trend up to \$4.8 million and departments

continued to manage their budgets effectively. He stated that two departments remained over budget by at least \$500,000.00 and Public Defense Services held steady at \$2.6 million, and the Sheriff's Department at \$3.9 million, primarily due to overtime, inflation-related increases in fuel and utility costs. He stated that on a positive note, the Sheriff's Department projection was \$939,000.00 less than in the previous year, which would bring them back in alignment with their budget from the Period 7 forecast to the Period 8 forecast.

Chair Scott stated that he wanted to ask a follow-up question related to earlier comments by Supervisor Heinz and he recounted a prior discussion with the Sheriff following one of the monthly financial forecasts. He stated that the Sheriff expressed interest in providing the Board with more details about the overall financial picture of the department, which included information on historical financial trends since his election and projections for the current year. He stated that the Sheriff had also made some specific references to how he defined "Initial Appearance Pay", as opposed to how it was defined as he understood it in these reports. He asked if the Board was expected to receive a more detailed report from the Sheriff, which reflected what he had previously described.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that each month the Sheriff's deficit had been decreasing and that he usually did a good job of reducing that line by the end of the year. She stated that the difference about initial appearance was really tied to overtime, that they had been looking at regular overtime, not as a one-time review, but they were searching for trends. She stated that she would get that information and provide it to the Board.

Mr. Cuaron referred to the slides and stated that there were positive trends with the revenues and expenditures which contributed to a \$14.4 million excess reserve, an increase of \$4.2 million, that would help reduce the initial FY26 budget deficit introduced in January. He stated there was an affordable housing commitment contingency of \$1.4 million and General Fund Contingency of \$1.8 million. He stated that was a difference between the \$4.1 million and the \$2.2 million that the Board authorized for use of Contingency at the last meeting, which led to an available Fund Balance of \$11.2 million. He stated that as they built the recommended budget, these figures would be incorporated into the recommended budget to help offset the deficit. He stated that the previous day a memorandum was provided to the Board that included the quarterly Economic Indicators report, a 15-page report based upon actual data from the Eller College's economic forecast by Dr. Hammond and noted them at a high level on the slide. He explained there were five stages of economic triggers and highlighted a couple of indicators, one that was specifically requested by the Board, consumer confidence. He stated that consumer confidence measured the consumer's optimism about the current and future state of the economy and the baseline was at 100. He stated that the reason it was currently a stage zero, but trending unfavorably was that for the last four months a contraction of this number was below 100 and in March it was 92.9 and anything below 100 was a waning consumer confidence number. He stated that it was largely due to the volatility in the stock market and the unknown. He stated it

was unknown how the tariffs were going to impact the national economy and the County's economy, as well as how it was going to impact consumers. He also highlighted the federal funds rate and stated there was good news on the rate, it was at a Stage 4 during the last quarter but had moved to Stage 3. He stated that it buoyed by a quarter percent rate decrease from the federal funds at their last meeting. He stated that they discussed having a potential 1 or 2 other cuts this year. He stated that they would await for that approach and would monitor the federal funds rate moving forward. He stated that it would have an impact on consumer confidence, because if the feds decreased rates, it meant lower interest rates on credit cards, lower interest rates on loans and mortgages. He stated that there was a far reaching impact on consumer confidence and inflation.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had mentioned this before and asked why this was such a negative situation in Pima County, and that despite the federal funds rate being better, it was still trending unfavorable, which he did not like, and it did not make sense to him. He asked for clarification of the nomenclature of favorable, unfavorable, and stable, and what were the other options for trending.

Ms. Leshar explained there was favorable, unfavorable and stable positions, the current stage and trending differed in that while Stage 3 was good, the trend moved from a 4 to 3, which continued in an unfavorable path.

Supervisor Heinz asked whether Stage 4 was better than Stage 3.

Mr. Cuaron clarified that Stage 3 was better and the lower the number went the better it was. He stated that Stages 0 to 4 represented actual data that occurred over the last quarter, and the current stage was representative of the actual economic data that had been seen. He explained that trending was based upon what the economists were projecting what was going to happen in the future, but there was no data to represent what might happen. He stated that in the case of the federal funds rate, and the reason it was trending unfavorably could change if the national economic policy changed. He reiterated that they wanted to ensure they were distinguishing between actual data, of the current stage measured versus what the economists were saying was trending out into future months.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he still did not understand why the trend for the federal funds rate would not at least indicate stable since going from 4 to 3 was better.

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

HEALTH

34. Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions

Staff recommends approval of the use of \$8,000,000.00 in opioid settlement funding for the procurement of services and Pima County Health Department staff positions to provide substance use prevention and response interventions in Pima County.

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the plan as described by staff.

HUMAN RESOURCES

35. Classification/Compensation

The Human Resources Department requests approval to create the following new classifications, associated costs will be borne by the user department from within its current budget:

Class Code/ Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

6099/ Radio Frequency Network Engineer/ 16 (\$73,189-\$102,465)/ 2/ E**

2100/ Human Resources Information Systems Manager/ 18 (\$88,881-\$133,321)/ 2/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

36. Department of Veteran's Affairs, Amendment No. 3, to provide a Memorandum of Understanding for co-location of services at Kino Veterans' Workforce Center, extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2500000020)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

37. Friends of the Arivaca Schoolhouse & Historic Townsite, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Arivaca Schoolhouse facility improvements, extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-23-152)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

38. YWCA of Southern Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Facility Rehab at House of Neighborly Services Project, extend contract term to 2/28/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-24-189)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

39. Watershed Management Group, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Green Stormwater Infrastructure for Neighborhood Cleanup, extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-23-344)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

Elections

40. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services in 2025, contract amount \$1,526,225.00 revenue (CT-24-67)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

Human Resources

41. United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide for the Employees Care about Pima County (ECAP) 2025 Campaign, General Fund, contract amount \$47,737.00 (CT-24-435)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

Procurement

42. Pueblo Mechanical Controls, L.L.C. and Sun Mechanical Contracting, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide a job order contract: HVAC contracting services and amend contractual language, Various Funds, contract amount \$750,000.00 (SC2400001448) Administering Department: Facilities Management

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

43. Line and Space, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for architectural and engineering design services: Richard Elías Mission Library Expansion and Renovation (XREMLB), extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, Non-Bond Projects Funds (Capital Project Funds), contract amount \$48,742.00 (PO2500007246) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

Real Property

44. Francisco Lopez and Josefina Lopez, Amendment No. 1, to provide for a ranch management agreement for J Six Ranch, extend contract term to 4/14/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$2,064.00 revenue (CT2500000014)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

Transportation

45. City of Tucson, to provide a lease agreement for 1313 S. Mission Road, Building 11 Laboratory for asphalt and material testing, contract amount \$38,194.00 revenue (CT2400000038)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 8, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS grant amendment for Fiscal Year 2023-2026 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, no cost (GA-CWD-65910)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote and Supervisor Christy was absent, to adopt the Resolution.

47. **Acceptance - Conservation Lands and Resources**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 9, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the submission of a grant application to Arizona State Parks for acquisition of Kelly Ranch, and authorizing the Conservation Lands and Resources Director or Designee to enter into grant agreement with the State of Arizona upon federal approval of the Kelly Ranch Project, \$1,500,000.00/\$1,500,000.00 General Fund match (G-CLR-78322)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote and Supervisor Christy was absent, to adopt the Resolution.

48. Acceptance – Health

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for Arizona's Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention Program, extend grant term to 9/29/25 and amend grant language, \$401,024.90 (GA-HD-70319)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote and Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

49. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, May 21, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to close the public hearing and approve the permit. No vote was taken at the time.

Chair Scott pointed out that Caterpillar, Inc., had requested numerous fireworks permits in the past, they were located in a nonresidential area and the permits had been approved each time they came before the Board.

Supervisor Allen stated that she anxiously awaited the revisions to the fireworks ordinance and in the meantime, would continue to vote against fireworks permits due to her concerns for air quality, noise that affected animals and wildlife, and fire danger.

Chair Scott stated that he had made similar remarks concerning commercial fireworks shows at resorts.

Upon the vote, the motion tied 2-2, Supervisors Allen and Heinz voted "Nay," and Supervisor Christy was absent.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that a tie vote resulted in postponement of consideration of this item until the next regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors' Meeting on May 6, 2025.

50. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Lisa Perez, Walden Grove High School, 15510 S. Sahuarita Park Road, Sahuarita, May 22, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

Kristen Miller, Principal, Walden Grove High School, addressed the Board and requested their approval of the fireworks permit for the high school's upcoming graduation ceremony. She indicated that with the exception of 2020, every previous graduating class had celebrated the milestone with a brief fireworks show and the display had become a beloved tradition for the students, families and staff. She stated that the fireworks would be launched from the school's practice field, which was the same location used for previous displays, and despite the region's typical dryness, there had been no issues with fire or safety concerns in past years. She stated that the Santa Rita Fire Department had been contacted and received all the required permit information. She stated that no homes required notification since there were none within 1,000 feet of the display area. She highlighted that the senior class went above and beyond for this fireworks show because they raised the funds to cover the cost themselves.

Chair Scott acknowledged that County Administrator Leshar was continuing to look into the overall regulation of fireworks, consistent with the Board's prior direction. He noted that the Board had historically approved fireworks permits in conjunction with high school graduation ceremonies.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Allen voted "Nay," and Supervisor Christy was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

51. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Sonia Martins, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. Saint Andrews Drive, Tucson, May 3, 2025 at 9:15 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Allen voted "Nay," and Supervisor Christy was absent, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

52. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Kevin Amidan, Sabino High School, 5000 N. Bowes Road, Tucson, May 21, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

At the request of the applicant and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda, due to the cancellation of the fireworks display.

53. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 330162, Stephen Chung Sze, Lee Lee Oriental Supermart, 1990 W. Orange Grove Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

54. Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6

- A. Acceptance of the resignation of the Honorable Alexander Ball, effective May 1, 2025.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to accept the resignation of the Honorable Alexander Ball, effective May 1, 2025.

Chair Scott thanked Judge Ball and expressed gratitude for his dedicated service to the people of Pima County and to the Justice Court.

- B. Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a selection process to fill the vacancy of Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6.

Chair Scott provided an outline of the draft selection process to fill the vacancy of Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6 as follows:

1. Applicants for the position must meet the following statutory requirements:
 - 18 years of age or older at the time of appointment
 - Resident of the state
 - An elector of the county or precinct in which the duties of the office are to be exercised
 - Literate in English
 - Same political party as the person vacating the office (Democrat)
2. Interested parties are required to file the following documents with the Clerk of the Board:
 - Letter of Interest
 - Resume
 - Financial Disclosure Statement
 - Conflict of Interest Forms
3. Pima County will conduct a background check on all qualified candidates.
4. The Clerk of the Board will begin accepting the required documents on April 16, 2025.
5. The submission deadline will be on Friday, April 25, 2025, at 5:00 p.m.
6. The selection process information will be posted on the Pima County Homepage. Information regarding how to submit public comments will be included. A press release will be issued by the Pima County Communications Department.

7. If requested by the Board of Supervisors, a virtual public forum for the eligible candidates will be scheduled and conducted by the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson (LWVGT), during the week of April 28 through May 2, 2025.
8. The Board of Supervisors are encouraged to conduct individual candidate interviews if they choose.
9. The Board of Supervisors will make the appointment of the Pima County Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6, at their meeting on Tuesday, May 6, 2025.
10. The individual appointed by the Board of Supervisors will serve through December 31, 2026.
11. A Primary and General Election will be held in 2026 and the candidate elected by the voters of Precinct 6 will serve the remainder of the term until December 31, 2028.

Chair Scott stated that if there were no concerns from other Board members regarding the selection process he presented, then they would move forward with that process. He directed the Clerk to schedule a virtual public forum with the LWVGT.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the selection process.

55. Differential Water Rates

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 10, of the Board of Supervisors, reaffirming support of jurisdictional rate parity for Tucson Water customers. (District 1)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 6, 2025.

56. Economic Development Initiatives

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the Administrator to create a plan to (a) strengthen partnerships and opportunities for direct foreign investment from Mexican-based companies in Pima County, and (b) leverage partnerships with Southern Arizona business accelerators and other partners to help facilitate relocation to Pima County of Mexican companies and professionals to address critical workforce shortages in healthcare, engineering, and other critical sectors. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that this item was related to some activities he had engaged in on behalf of the County, in conjunction with the Director of the Pima County Economic Development Department. He stated that this included a recent trip to Mexico City for a trade conference, and another trip to meet with the Governor of the State of Aguascalientes. He stated that he was very impressed and that it was important for individual jurisdictions, whether at the municipal, county and

even State level, to have engagement with their trading partners. He stated that Mexico was the County's largest trading partner in Southern Arizona and there was no support from the Federal level to help foster these relationships with regard to tariffs and other trade policy issues. He stated that he was very pleased to find out firsthand at the Select U.S.A. Conference in Mexico City that three times the number of Mexican business people signed up, something like 700 plus, despite the new Administration's rather antagonistic view on threats of tariffs and the bashing of the County's friends and neighbors. He added that the Texans, Californians, and North Carolinians were there trying to compete to get them to move to their States or to their various jurisdictions. He stated that the Arizona Commerce Authority also had some representation, but what he saw was a tremendous desire for engagement. He stated they were looking for place to go and Pima County had an amazing cultural confluence that many of the other places did not have due to the proximity to the border. He stated that all of those observations were reinforced when he visited Aguascalientes and spoke to their Governor and extended an invitation for her to meet Arizona's Governor, because there was a tremendous need. He asked if the Southern Arizona Chamber's name had changed yet.

Chair Scott stated that it was called the Chamber of Southern Arizona, but Pima County continued to have a contract with Sun Corridor, Inc.

Supervisor Heinz stated that it was in transition but they had been facilitating discussions locally about the professional workforce deficit, which was worsening and had a negative effect on the hospital systems. He added that the hospital systems were fiercely competitive for market share for patients and under the leadership of Judy Rich, a former Chair of Sun Corridor, Tucson Medical Center (TMC), Banner, Carondelet and Northwest Hospital, all of their Chief Executive Officers agreed that there needed to be a County-wide effort that was a funded, targeted effort to fix this desperate situation with regard to professional workforce in healthcare. He added that at Raytheon they were always several hundred engineers short and also needed engineering students. He stated that Aguascalientes did not have a U.S. consulate, but they had 4 or 5 medical schools, nursing schools, and three schools of engineering and Mexico City had way more than that. He stated that there was an interest to come to Pima County, work as medical students, and continue their residences at TMC and Banner system, which had graduate medical education. He stated that with healthcare training, someone could not practice without completing a residency of three plus years at 90% of the time. He stated that this was where that professional would stay because of the relationships they would form. He stated that he came to Pima County from Michigan for his residency at the University of Arizona, and he was still in Pima County. He stated the point being there were hospital systems working together to encourage an effort for the County to attract the talent needed so that the healthcare system did not fall apart in about ten years. He stated that it was in the purview of the County to move forward with this within the County's Economic Development Department. He stated that this was a major secondary priority with the main priority, helping to facilitate businesses coming to Pima County and assist with registering them with the Corporation Commission. He stated that the best way

to develop a plan for this was to rely on the expertise of the Economic Development Department, to put together a plan for Mexico and for it to be brought back to the Board within 90 days. He stated it would also show where their offices would be, how it could be rolled out, and what made the most sense. He stated that this was in line within the statute, and economic development was part of what was supposed to be done. He stated that it may require adding at least double of economic development staff in order to have deployable assets within Mexico to take advantage of the ample interest and need for navigators to direct businesses and medical and other professionals into Southern Arizona.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Chair Scott to direct staff to develop a plan and bring it back to the Board for review within 90 days. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Scott stated that there also needed to be discussion within the parameters of the County's contract with Sun Corridor, because it seemed that they could play a role in this discussion.

Supervisor Allen requested that the plan contemplate a scaling up, starting small and then growing as the need developed and evolved. She added they also needed to ensure that they were thinking about appropriate places in Mexico to fulfill the need in Pima County.

Supervisor Heinz stated that this would contemplate a multi-year pilot for the data.

Chair Scott asked if there was a time frame.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had not provided a time frame, but should have indicated multi-year. He stated that the pilot needed to be a legitimate effort.

Chair Scott stated that this was to create a plan and everything else after that was sufficient direction.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

57. **Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 - General Fund, Three Cents for Affordable Housing**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposing adoption of a new Board of Supervisors Policy, D 22.17 - General Fund, Three Cents for Affordable Housing, to raise \$207,000,000.00 over the next decade for the construction and preservation of affordable housing in Pima County, as well as potentially the expansion of initiatives and programs that reduce homelessness and keep people housed.

The initial findings from ECONorthwest point to the need for an additional 38,584 housing units in Pima County over the next decade that are affordable to families earning 60% or below of the Area Median Income (\$48,720.00 for a family of four, 2023). This policy, if enacted as proposed, would allow us to expand our Affordable

Housing Gap Funding program and other programs that preserve affordable housing units and keep people housed, in a meaningful way over the next decade. Additionally, it would give us a head start as we further develop and implement a Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan, as per the County Administrator's memo to the Board dated March 20, 2025. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that this subject was something he contemplated for a while, and the Board had heard and seen a lot about the need for affordable housing. He stated that the County could not do it alone and it was a heavy load for any single jurisdiction. He explained that this would be a ten-year plan for \$0.03 per year over the next ten years that would bring in about \$207 million to direct over the next ten years to address the housing shortfall, especially on the affordable side. He stated that during his time on the Board, he had supported borrowing money to help accelerate road projects as it was also an important priority, but at the same time, as a hospital physician, he knew people were struggling. He stated that his patients were struggling with housing and that at times, he and his colleagues in the Emergency Room had to discharge people to the street, so roads was not the only thing that could be done. He stated that the study showed a need for 116,000 housing units over the next two decades, and over the next ten years about 36,000 of those would be classified as affordable housing. He stated that this would be on top of the \$5 million that had already been built into the budget, and would bring in over that ten years a sufficient amount of money to build approximately 12,000 affordable housing units. He stated that this was a big policy discussion, and decision, but was incredibly important and it was something like PAYGO and other policies. He stated that this Board or future Boards could determine the amounts, whether to stop it altogether, double it, or extend it, so this would give authority to the Board to modify this going forward. He stated that the Board had impaneled a commission for affordable housing, and they had begged the Board multiple times and motions had been passed asking the Board for ways to get additional funding and the Board put that off because they were waiting for a study. He stated there were results from that study, at least top line results that this was based on.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz to adopt a \$0.03 per year property tax increase dedicated to affordable housing for the next ten years.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Allen to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 6, 2025. She stated that she supported the \$0.03 for affordable housing but wanted to have a conversation about the overall property tax rate and what it could look like if there was going to be any other increases to the property tax. She stated that she wanted information on how the County's tax rate compared to other counties across the State and what it was that the County could actually utilize because the property tax levy was already divvied amongst other jurisdictions and districts. She stated that having the context of the broader property tax revenue would be helpful, and then she would be comfortable voting for it and ensuring it was there. She thanked Supervisor Heinz for giving this traction because it was something the Board needed to be specific about and intentional to tackle the needs for affordable housing within the County.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, clarified that Supervisor Heinz had a motion on the floor for approval of a new Board Policy D 22.17, and asked if there was a second to that motion.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew his original motion and seconded Supervisor Allen's substitute motion.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Heinz for bringing this proposal together and he supported the spirit and intent and looked forward to continuing this conversation to ensure that it was also in alignment with budget adoption.

Chair Scott stated that he would reserve his comments until the next meeting, to be aligned with the guidance received by the Board's parliamentarian earlier that day.

Upon the vote, the substitute motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

58. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00009, Verano, Section 10, Block 1 Parcel G/H, I, J, & K, Block 2A, Block 2B, Block 3, Block 4A, Block 4B, Block 5A, Block 5B, Common Area 'A' (Open Space), and Block 6. (District 2)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

59. South Wilmot Land Investors, L.L.C., to provide for First Amendment to Amended Swan Southlands Specific Plan Development Agreement, no cost/25 year term (SC2500000136)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

60. SBH Verano, L.P., to provide for Verano Section 10 Development Agreement (a portion of Swan Southlands Amended Specific Plan), no cost/25 year term (SC2500000134)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

61. SBH Verano, L.P., to provide a Master Wastewater Service Agreement for Construction of Improvements to the Public Sewage Conveyance System and Provision of Wastewater Service for Verano Section 10, no cost/20 year term (SC2500000135)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

PROCUREMENT

62. Durazo Construction Corporation, Amendment No. 9, to provide for the Curley Gymnasium Historic Renovation (XCGAJO) Project and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400012356) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the item.

PROCUREMENT

63. **Hearing - Solicitation No. IFB-2400006782, El Vado Road Storm Drain (5ELVSS)**

Appeal of Procurement Director's Decision

Pursuant to Pima County Code 11.20.010(H), Falcone Brothers & Associates, Inc., appeals the decision of the Procurement Director regarding Solicitation No. IFB-2400006782, El Vado Road Storm Drain (5ELVSS).

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, introduced Bruce Collins, the new Procurement Director, and stated that he would address the item.

Bruce Collins, Director, Procurement, explained that this item was based on the company's appeal of an upcoming bid award scheduled for May 6th. He stated that the company protested that the submitted bid was unbalanced, and that the crowd control element of the bid was low and could not be substantially completed as proposed. He explained that when the appeal was initially received, it was reviewed in accordance with Pima County's established processes and procedures. He stated that elements of the appeal were reviewed by the legal team, the project management team, and the department. He stated that the concern addressed was whether the bid in question was unbalanced. He stated that after an analysis, staff determined that there was no evidence of unbalanced bidding and confirmed that all bids were submitted through a competitive process. He stated that the Davis-Bacon wage rates in the solicitation were higher than those in previous ones, but it was determined that this was not a material issue. He stated that since the wage rates were included in the original solicitation, all bidders acknowledged them and included them into their bids. He indicated that staff met with the lowest bidder,

whose cost was below the engineer's estimate, and confirmed that they were willing to complete the work in accordance to their submitted bid. He stated that staff recommended that the appeal be denied based on their analysis of the facts that were presented.

Supervisor Heinz asked whether the appeal was made simply because the entity was not selected during the process.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Tom Falcone, President, Falcone Brothers and Associates, Inc., stated that his company had been doing business in Pima County for over 35 years and always competed against firms like KE&G, B&F, and Granite in the bidding process. He emphasized that this particular bid stood out to them because normally their bids tended to align closely with the engineering estimate, and on this project the contractor who submitted the lowest bid came in 35% lower than all other bidders, including the engineering estimate. He stated that an unbalanced bid was if a line item was more than 154%, it was considered by the State and County, to be unbalanced which meant it was lower than everyone else's bids. He explained that a line item more than 200% was a safety concern for traffic control. He stated for instance the engineering estimate for that item was \$90,000.00, the contractor only allocated \$35,000.00. He stated that there were doubts about how the contractor could complete the work, especially considering that the wage decision for this project was nearly double that of similar past jobs and they were based in Utah and would have to travel to Tucson to do the work on this project at almost \$650,000.00 less than any other local contractor.

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification from staff if they were comfortable that the contractor who submitted the lowest bid would be able to complete the work satisfactorily and on time.

Mr. Collins confirmed that staff had reviewed the bids and acknowledged that the lowest bidder came in below both the engineer's estimate and the other bids. He stated that for the mobilization item, three of the four bids were also lower than the engineer's estimate, which indicated an extremely competitive process. He stated that despite some line items being lower, staff was comfortable in their procurement analysis and awarding the contract to the lowest bidder. He reassured the Board that the project would have payment and performance bonds in place, which was additional assurance that the contract and work would be completed.

Chair Scott asked the Clerk about the motions that the Board could consider with this item.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated that the Board could deny the appeal or approve the appeal.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and deny the appeal. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz indicated that staff mentioned that there would be an ongoing process to monitor the progress of the project to ensure that the project moved ahead the way it was supposed to before they received full payment. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Collins responded in the affirmative.

Chair Scott requested that updates on the project's progress be provided to the Board.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was absent.

CONSENT CALENDAR

64. Approval of the Consent Calendar

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy was absent, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Election Integrity Commission

- Appointment of Karima Wicks, to replace Matt Smith. Term expiration: 4/14/27. (Green Party recommendation)
- Reappointment of Brian Bickel. Term expiration: 5/7/27. (Democratic Party recommendation)

2. Animal Care Advisory Committee

Appointment of Steve Kozachik, Ex-Officio, to replace Monica Dangler. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (County Administrator recommendation)

3. Small Business Commission

Appointment of Crispin Jeffrey-Franco, to fill a vacancy created by Shelby Collier. No term expiration. (District 1)

4. Environmental Quality Advisory Council

Appointment of Mike Dawson, representing Transportation Planning, to fill a vacancy created by Kylie Walzak. Term expiration: 4/14/28. (Staff recommendation)

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

Appointment of Lauren Burson, to fill a vacancy created by Amanda Maass.
Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 2)

**SPECIAL EVENT LIQUOR LICENSE/TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PREMISES/
PATIO PERMIT/WINE FAIR/WINE FESTIVAL/JOINT PREMISES PERMIT
APPROVED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION NO. 2019-68**

6. **Special Event**

- Norman Scheopner, Society of St. Vincent de Tucson Diocesan Council, St. Rita in the Desert Catholic Church, 13260 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, April 26, 2025.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Rec Hall, 38 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, April 5, 2025.
- Julie Wolfe Beadle, Literacy Connects, The Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, April 26, 2025.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, April 12, 2025.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

7. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Hill Brothers Chemical Co. \$2,287.59; Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation \$15,597.15; Administration of Resources & Choices \$3,004.35; Administration of Resources & Choices \$2,249.07; Administration of Resources & Choices \$1,585.22; Jim Click Ford, Inc. \$678.78; Michelle Dent \$316.39; The Quails Apartments \$2,745.15; Pillars & Bridges \$12,000.00; Oscar Furet \$49.58; Xochitl Martinez \$301.00; Manuel Martinez \$2,620.00; Nabil Nasruddin Bhimani \$700.00; Dagostino Private Investigations \$3,000.50; Waxies Enterprises, Inc. \$3,169.87; Verizon Wireless \$876.18; Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc. \$102.00; FKH SFR Propco H, L.P. \$4,410.98; TransPerfect Holdings, L.L.C. \$52.50; Dermatology for Animals Tucson \$309.76; Graffiti Protective Coatings, Inc. \$10,267.60; Tucson Electric Power Co. \$610,900.72; City of Tucson \$83,137.76; GLHN Architects & Engineers, Inc. \$38,294.00; The 5H's, L.L.C. \$480.00; Vet-Sec Protection Agency \$5,176.80; Vet-Sec Protection Agency \$6,475.56; El Dorado Place \$4,042.35; Tucson Botanical Gardens, Inc. \$4,737.00; Pillars & Bridges \$12,000.00; Cox Media \$150.00; Merck Animal Health \$7,031.11; McKinstry \$395.00; PSOMAS \$62,168.15; Language Line Services, Inc. \$183.32; Pillars & Bridges \$7,000.00.

TREASURER

8. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Silver Horse Holdings, L.L.C. \$784.23; Title Security Agency \$148.67.

9. **Request to Waive Interest**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$135.14.

10. **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 \$63,283.45

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

11. Minutes: January 21, 2025

* * *

65. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

25. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Overall Budget Development

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the FY 2025/26 overall budget development.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
AC: Supervisor Cano
JA: Supervisor Allen
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator

RS: We will now move Item No. 22, which is Fiscal Year 2025/2026 Overall budget development, Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott, and we do not have an update at this point. I think we have shared with the Board information regarding the preparation of the budget, but we are wanting to make sure we had an opportunity to hear from the Board any thoughts they might have, making sure, any questions about the process or where we were in the development. We will be transmitting the tentative budget to the Board on the 25th of this month, on a Friday and you are scheduled for tentative budget adoption in May.

RS: Any questions from my colleagues? I had a question, Ms. Leshar with regard to the General Fund Reserve. When Mr. Cuaron did his presentation, there was discussion about having a one-time change from 17% of expenditures to 15%, and then I requested if we could get a report on the long-term ramifications of doing that consistently moving forward. Well, first question is, will that one-time shift be part of the recommended budget or is that still under discussion?

JL: Chair Scott, that one-time shift will be part of this budget and if I can anticipate your second question, you will have that memo by the end of the day.

RS: Alright. Thank you, Ms. Leshar and then second question I had is will there be any recommendation from Administration as to the allocation for the PAYGO program, or are you looking for, because I know that has an impact on the overall tax rate. If we go from 60/60 to any other allocation and I just wondered if that will be if there will be a recommendation for any change in that allocation or if the recommendation will be to stay at the current allocation?

JL: Mr. Chairman, we are working on the budget daily, but as of today, we do not. We are not going to be looking at a change for this year in the PAYGO formula.

RS: Okay. Alright. Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, three things. One, and we have talked about this a little bit before, but in terms of the Sheriff's Department's budget, it is really big. It is like 27% of the amount of dollars that we can manipulate at all. I would really like to see unless it is impacting public safety and if that staff tells us that right now, then I might change this but I really want to see us kind of not increase that department budget, but and work to improve retention, other efficiencies. I do not think we need to add 20 more positions at this time, certainly not ten of those at least, but I mean, the base budget is \$189 million, which is again massive and there are 1,500 employees, PCN's, under the Sheriff's Department and they will be benefiting from raises like everyone else. And over 90%, it's 91% of the Sheriff's Department is general fund based. Just the 9% or less is grant based and I do not believe that grants are under threat for public safety. I mean, that we know of, at least not yet so, I mean, again, I want to hear staff's thoughts on this, but I would just prefer that we kind of hold the line on the Sheriff's budget and not increase it and encourage greater efficiencies and retention with the current budget, which is again massive and the largest portion of our discretionary funds at Pima County and I guess I would like Administrator Leshner to talk more about the public safety side of things.

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz, at this point, when we have been looking at the supplemental packages that have been coming from the Sheriff's Department, the one that we are remaining we are reviewing at the current time is in a supplemental request for ten positions that are currently under grants that are targeted to be eliminated, and they are for correctional officers so we are getting back with your staff, who had some very specific questions about the purpose for those ten individuals. What we have been reviewing will come back when we look at the full budget presentation to the Board, is the exact number of individuals within both the jail and the men and women on the street as the deputies and what we have been looking at is making sure that we are evaluating the data on overtime usage, where we are with the budget. The full impact when we cut 2% across the Board in the Sheriff's Department last year and what that might impact but as you indicate, the concern is public safety. What we look at is making sure, like you, that the men and women who are in the jail, those by choice, those not by choice, have a safe environment and that we have adequate coverage of our deputies in unincorporated Pima County to ensure safety so we will make sure that when we bring the tentative back for you, for the Board, that we have an in-depth analysis of what is being recommended in the Sheriff's budget.

MH: Okay, thank you. Next, this is something in District 2 that I think everybody has seen, the burned-out husk of the of the Spanish Trail right next to the freeway, not the greatest first impression for this community so this is like I mean, we do not have Visit Tucson here, but holy crap, it looks terrible. It is in my district still. I have been at this for over four years and in working closely with Mayor and Council and the City of South Tucson, they have obviously much more limited resources but this is an imperative. It is a public health and safety risk. It was just on fire the other day,

right. It was just again like, so I am not trying to make light of it. It is really bad for that community in particular. That area can be developed in other ways. It has asbestos in it. Political subdivisions, governments and also not for profits can ask the EPA if we still have one, we can, for mitigation funds, an individual private landowner is not eligible to do that so for just one time within our capital improvement budget, I am asking my colleagues to join with me, to direct staff to figure out a plan, a mitigation effort, something for up to \$1.5 million. Again, one time only to get this area mitigated, rejuvenated and remove this hazardous burnt out husk of the Spanish Trail property and then allow our colleagues at the City of South Tucson to help to develop that into whatever needs to be there but it really must be remediated and I would like to make that in a form of a motion if I could get some support.

RS: I will second it for discussion purposes only, because I would like to know if that was something that we passed, how it would be paid for. If that is something that you and your staff has already talked about, or if you have had discussions with the County Administrator along those lines.

MH: Our initial move was to get a plan kind of basically direct the staff to help bring forward a plan, frankly. And it may not be \$1.5 million. It might be much, much less than that, especially if federal funds are available. If the property is purchased, for example, by a not for profit like La Frontera is looking at it. And they can also apply for those funds, but not there is not a specific pay for at this point. I am just trying to get staff to develop a plan that they could bring back to us, so we could then approve it.

RS: And then I, thank you, Supervisor Heinz and then I had a question, two questions for Ms. Leshner. Number one, if you could respond to what Supervisor Heinz is requesting and number two, I wonder if there would be any jurisdictional considerations that we would have to take into account, because my understanding is that that hotel is within the boundaries of the City of South Tucson.

JL: Thank you. Chair Scott. Staff, in addition to members of the Board, have been talking with folks in South Tucson for several years now and we have a variety of appraisals that have been have taken place on that site. We have looked at it from the public health side. Is it a public health nuisance? How can we identify the problems with that project? I think what would be very helpful is, is the plan in that I think has been noted, it is from an economic development perspective it is a key entry point, I think, into parts of our community and not the best looking at this. What we would like to do as part of the plan is to look at whether there is capital dollars available, whether we can look at mitigation grants, what might be funding sources for this, and continue very closely in collaboration with the staff and the Mayor and Council of South Tucson, to see how we might proceed with their with their approval and knowledge on this property. I think what we have talked about is in previous meetings with the folks from South Tucson is how do we take some of the lands that are currently idle and helping them becoming economic engines, if you will. How can we find opportunities for mixed use development that might

produce sales tax and revenue for the community, in addition to providing an elimination of that blight. The part that is the hotel which is in question is only 3.6 acres so it is a fairly small footprint, but it could, I think, lead to other opportunities with adjacent properties.

RS: So just to continue with that point of inquiry, it sounds like everything that staff has already been talking about, both with the District 2 office and the City of South Tucson, are incorporated in Supervisor Heinz's motion.

JL: Chair Scott, I believe that to be true. Yes.

RS: Okay. Any other questions or comments from Board members? Alright. I am sorry, Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yeah. I just wanted to share some of the things that as we move through the budget that are priorities for our office. I think we have shared some of them before, but

RS: I apologize for interrupting. I just wanted to move to a vote on Supervisor Heinz's motion. And then I will recognize you. Go ahead. Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Would you be willing to second it for action as well?

RS: Yes, I absolutely will. Yes. Alright, so, Supervisor Heinz, just for because I know that the Clerk's always happy when we do this. If you could repeat your motion. See, I am learning. Alright and so that we have a better sense of how we are moving forward.

MH: Sure. I move that we direct staff to include up to \$1.5 million for within the as yet not finalized capital improvement budget to contribute toward the abatement and rejuvenation of the burned out, hazardous Spanish Trail property in the City of South Tucson. To mitigate that public health hazard, and while doing so, work closely with their staff and potentially not for profit entities possibly interested in this property and leverage any federal grant dollars for mitigation efforts if those should be available.

RS: Do you have all that, Ms. Manriquez? Alright and I will second it. Any further discussion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? That motion passes 4-0 and before I call on Supervisor Allen, I think you had said Supervisor Heinz, there were three things you wanted to bring up, and that was your second. Right?

MH: That is right. Thank you for calling. This is the last thing and I mean, you know, I am a hospital physician, so public health is a thing for me. The vast majority of people who are dying in our community are dying from cancer, heart disease, complications from diabetes, all that kind of stuff. We have a health department that relies about approximately half of the Health Department's budget is grant funding. It is under siege and under attack. I that lawsuit that there is a lawsuit multiple ongoing and there are three grant funded positions that I believe we should direct our staff as they develop a budget to include in the general fund that that very likely could be taken away and that is the specifically the \$485,000.00 for, that is one of the supplemental requests, for the Health Department to have the office continue to have these three PCN's in the office of non-communicable diseases. I understand tuberculosis, hepatitis C, STIs, all this other stuff, infectious type stuff is really a lot of what our health department does, but it is so much more and should be more because our public health is not just infection, our public health, as I mentioned at the beginning, has a lot more to do with folks that do not know they have hypertension or do not know that have diabetes or need to be, you know, there is a lot of things we can do from a public health perspective to help mitigate those major causes of mortality in this community and so I would move that we direct our staff to include that supplemental going forward and in addition to that, and we can split this up if people do not like both of these just because we are watching the department get attacked again and again and again, so that Dr. Cullen does not have to keep issuing pink slips to people, because if we lose that talent, they may not come back. Right? I think we are still looking for the people to handle our nuclear materials. So it is we need to keep these people from being in fear of their job to the best of our ability so I would like with when as we develop our budget, \$1 million of contingency just for the Health Department because we know they are going to get attacked so I just I think that would be a great thing to do as well, but I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts, and I am happy to split those do one and not the other. If my colleagues prefer it.

RS: Supervisor Heinz, thank you and I wanted to direct a question to the County Administrator along the lines of what you are speaking to. I believe in one of our weekly discussions, Ms. Leshar, you indicated that you had asked all department directors, including the Health Department director, to prioritize their supplementals and I wonder if in response to what some of the points Supervisor Heinz is raising, if what he is raising is aligned with any of the discussions you or your team have had with Dr. Cullen and their team.

JL: Chair Scott, I, as you seen where we are with the status of the recommended supplementals and not in. Yes, the Health Department and many County departments had a variety of supplementals our recommendations at this point, as we are drafting the budget, do not include funding for that last \$485,000.00 supplemental, as we have been looking at others. I would also just note in response to the other comment that what we, as you know, we always look at what is the contingency bucket for a contingency fund for the entire budget? We have been chatting about what we may be looking to do is to develop a special contingency

fund simply to offset and to mitigate against the what the impact of the federal cuts that would be separate what that would.

RS: That would not be specific to the Health Department?

JL: No, it would simply be in response to the federal cuts or state cuts, which would then allow some capacity for the Board to fill any of those holes. What we have been hearing at this point is obviously a lot directed towards the Health Department. We have also seen in Community Workforce Development, and we are seeing it in Department of Environmental Quality. We just do not know where all the cuts are going to be at this time, even though there are a variety at the front. I believe that at this point, we will have at least \$1 million in a fund to offset the impacts of the federal government but at this point, we have not been, as staff recommending it to be solely towards the Health Department, but to have the capacity for flexibility.

RS: Thank you, Administrator Leshner and Supervisor Heinz?

MH: In light of that. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am fine with dropping the \$1 million dedicated to public health, because if that is going to be one, two, whatever million for any departments affected by the federal cuts, I am fine with that but I would like to see that \$485,000.00 supplemental funded, because we need to augment the non-communicable diseases, because again, those are the things that are killing our people, which I guess I am making in the form of a motion. Maybe? No? Okay.

RS: Okay. That motion dies for lack of a second and I am going to state just for myself that I am waiting to hear recommendations for all supplementals as part of the recommended budget from the County Administrator before we start talking about individual supplementals, I really think that the staff needs to go through that comprehensive process and so, speaking just as one Supervisor, I did not want to weigh in on individual supplementals at this point, but would like to see what we get in the recommended budget. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RS: And you know what, I apologize. I had told Supervisor Allen I was going to.

AC: Yes, that is correct.

RS: My apologies.

AC: Of course.

RS: Sorry, I am losing track of things. Go ahead Supervisor.

JL: Was that part of?

RS: Is it part of, was it related to what Supervisor Heinz had brought up, or was it a new point?

AC: It was a to that point, Mr. Chairman, so I would respectfully defer to Supervisor Allen.

RS: Very kind of you. Thank you. Go ahead, Supervisor Allen.

JA: You know, working out some kinks.

RS: Yeah. The budget gives us a lot of opportunities to do that.

JA: Yeah, yeah. You know, so I was leaning in to maybe second like I do think it is an enormous priority to protect our Health Department. Given that I think where we are at right now in terms of the attacks on our funding, which is an attack on the health, the safety, the well-being of our community and our economy. And I think public health is so critical in that so I do, I wanted to just kind of run through a few of the priorities, generally, not ascribing dollar values to them, but just that these are things that I think we are prioritizing a very important at this moment so one is the Health Department and ensuring that our health department is well resourced to be able to respond to this moment in spite of the attacks and the yanking away of essential funding. Housing, we are deeply concerned of falling back into another foreclosure moment in our community, given both inflation and the likelihood of recessionary indications. Workforce Development, as we see from the reports of increasing unemployment, we need to be able to help folks get their jobs, land on their feet, develop new skills and get employed again. Similarly, around housing, also thinking about the important work we do around eviction prevention, this work and this program has been lauded across the across the region for protecting people, supporting people in some of the most difficult moments and really keeping them in their homes. Our work around the Transition Center and INVEST, I think, are so important to help prevent sending people into jail and transitioning people out of jail so they land on their feet and we cut our recidivism rate. And then the last bucket is around air quality and enforcement, air quality enforcement, pollution enforcement, as we see in executive orders that are attempting to open up lands for mining and opening up federal lands. I think our ability to enforce the, the quality of our air and ensuring that polluters do not have free reign on the areas that we have worked so hard to protect is going to be really important. To that end, the transition of the creation of the Conservation and Land Resources Department, I think is very important as we make that shift and ensuring that that department can stand fully on its own two legs as a new department, and is sufficiently staffed to make sure that the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and the Multi-Species Habitat Plan are able to continue to infiltrate across our community and our departments, and is integrated into everything that we do. And then the last piece is around the work that we have done around weatherization and home repair. As temperatures continue to rise, as unemployment rises, costs that people are boring out, or costs that people are absorbing through utilities is on the rise so whatever we can do to help increase our energy efficiency in our homes, keep people in their homes, keep their costs

down, I think is incredibly important at this moment in time. So those are some of the priorities, I think, from our vantage point to the budget. Thank you.

RS: Thank you. Anything you wanted to say in response to any of that? Alright. Thank you, Ms. Leshner. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Administrator Leshner, I look forward to an in-depth budget briefing, and I look forward to your recommendations in the coming weeks as well. I am paying close attention to employee classification and compensation, and will be curious to get your proposal and your budget recommendations. I would also like to prioritize housing, as my colleagues have also mentioned here today. Neighborhood infrastructure is very important to me as well and looking for ways to support some of our inner-city neighborhoods, especially with the resources that they need. And I do not know if I mentioned open space, but I do think that that needs to continue being a priority as well. I am not prepared today to offer any specific amounts, but those certainly will navigate where I am at moving forward and last, but not least, I am going to be paying close attention to your recommendations on the Board contingency fund as well. I believe that we can make a fiscally responsible decision to perhaps modify that amount but we also, I believe that is a perfect opportunity for us to invest in some of these cuts that are going to be coming our way as we started this discussion. Right, that is what a contingency is for and so I am curious how all of that will be crafted in a way that allows us to provide to our community. Thank you.

RS: Thank you. Any other questions or comments on Item No. 22 for Board members? Ms. Leshner, I had one. Oh, I am sorry, did I miss one? Alright, Administrator Leshner, I did have one request. This Board enacted a vacancy policy which took effect at the beginning of this fiscal year. I would appreciate hearing in the cover memo to the recommended budget, how the implementation of that policy in year one affected any staffing requests for any particular departments. And then if there is any, I know that this is not just a topic related to the recommended budget, but is one that we are exploring in a number of different areas. But anything related to the long term viability of the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships I know that we have a recent memo that indicated that there are sufficient funds for the next two fiscal cycles, but anything that we can project beyond that as part of the discussion of the recommended budget would be appreciated. Alright. Anything else under that? Okay.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

26. Pima County Climate Action Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update of Pima County's Climate Action Plan, as requested by the Board of Supervisors.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration

RS: We will move then to Item No. 23 also under the County Administrator, Pima County Climate Action Update. Administrator Leshar.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and also under Supervisor, I am sorry, Senior Advisor, not Supervisor, Davis will walk us through the updated plan. Thank you.

RS: Ms. Davis, you might get more intrinsic enjoyment from this presentation than your last one.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, County Administrator, I am thrilled to be here today to talk to you about our Climate Action Plan for County operations and a lot of our regional partnerships and development that we have been working on over the past year and a half. I feel like I should get a new jacket and like, pop in from the side but yeah, same me new presentation. Next slide please, so every two months we debrief the Board on our Climate Action Plan activities, our priorities, our continued development of action. In September of 2023, we set forth with our Climate Action Executive team, which was Interdisciplinary directors, which started out as nine department directors, now has expanded to over 24 departments covering all spectrums of the County to help us frame and set forth our climate action priorities and associated plans for mitigation, adaptation and community resilience. So today we will give you an update on that plan. The status update on each of the planning priorities, the climate outlook for 2025 through 2030, and then the timeline of what you can see from now up until the release of our Climate Action Plan for County operations in September. So next slide please, so previously, the County has produced its Sustainable Action Plan for County operations, which the directive was to direct action around five critical priority areas and strategies by which we address our carbon mitigation, our water conservation, supply and demand, our critical landscapes and conservation spaces, materials and waste and how do we bolster our workforce to be an all encompassing, climate informed County workforce. So, you will see those priorities maintained in our Climate Action

Plan for County Operations 2025 to 2030, but you will see them within some larger bucket areas, as identified in Board of Supervisors Resolution 2022-25 to expand our SAPCO effort into a climate action plan and include adaptation measures for our climate related risks such as, but not limited to heat, extreme weather and wildfires so you will see all of those priorities folded into mitigation, adaptation and community resilience is really going to be woven through all of it. We will continue to create comprehensive measures to reduce our impact through our carbon reduction strategies. You will see our adaptation looks very specifically in and around our drought measurements and associated water recommendations, strategies and measurements, and our wildfire mitigation endanger planning and coupled with that, our invasive species strategies. The community resilience component will be woven through all of these climate priorities. We have a commitment to disproportionately affected communities. How do we bolster workforce and how do we ensure that we are meeting to the best of our abilities the public health needs of the community, tied to some of our climate risks? Next slide please, so this is a very, very busy slide but you can really look at this in a couple of different ways either vertically or horizontally. We know the science based targets have told us that our carbon emissions directly affect our region's climate risk so as identified from the Drachman Institute in our Pima Prosper's climate policy document, the biggest climate risk to this region are extreme heat and extreme weather, drought, wildfire and flooding so we have set forth on a Climate Action Plan that addresses all of those adaptation measures and the reason this is a two year process is because each of these priorities has a regional component. We have a County operations commitment, but we are also committed to the community around us and our area partners that make this work happen so that we can best serve the community around us and so, what you see are plans starting to develop that have a regional component and one example is our Pima Climate Action Now carbon reduction strategy, which includes multiple jurisdictions, tribal partners, nonprofit agencies and community agencies to help us prioritize and set forth our mitigation goals. The column next to that is what you will see parceled off to our County operations so where are we going to make the measurements within our County operations priorities? What you have seen us do before is look at our County facilities and our wastewater treatment plant and our fleet. One thing we are adding to our Climate Action Plan so you will see our carbon reduction strategy slightly shift. In addition to our baseline is we are going to start integrating data around commuter emissions and informing our broader transportation planning effort. You saw last summer and starting in 2023, and the amazing work that the Health Department led under the state's direction, to have it be public health centered but regionally facing, especially with our jurisdictional partners, is our heat adaptation plan and one thing that the Health Department released last year was their three year heat plan and the County portion of it really is to convene the stakeholders together, create a comprehensive cooling center network, and do our core public health work in epidemiological surveillance, work with our Medical Examiner, understand where we have disproportionately affected community members such as our housing vulnerable, and create comprehensive heat strategies that best meet those public health needs for drought and flooding. We have our water working group, led by our Regional Flood Control District representative of 11 County departments that are working together, but with a

regional facing component where we look at water supply demand, high utilizers and opportunities for alternate water use or innovative comprehensive land use planning and what you will see coming forth in May 6th, what you have already seen is our strategy for invasive species but our Wildfire Danger and Mitigation plan, which has outreach components, fuel reduction components and critical emergency response infrastructure and you will hear about that on May 6th. Next slide please.

RS: Excuse me, Ms. Davis, can I ask before we go off of that slide on the old SAPCO plan, there was a measure that spoke to the County's intent to convert when possible, some of its gas-powered vehicles to electric vehicles. I do not know if that was something that was mentioned in that part of the presentation, or if that is still part of the CAPCO plan.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, fleet is represented in our carbon emissions and our fleet strategies, and our conversion path forward will continue to exist within that chapter and so we have converted a substantial amount of our vehicles to electric vehicles, with some of the rebates available and the ability to do so. We are also looking at hybrid, and we are also looking at bigger swaths of County fleet capacity to transition, but we have done a really monumental job in our SAPCO effort 2018 through 2024, but it will still exist, and we will set forth our measurements and goals to continue to convert where we can.

RS: Can the Board also get information, not only on vehicles where it is likely desirable for us to move towards conversion, but also, I think we need to know the flip side of vehicles where their duties just do not make it plausible to go in that direction.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, absolutely.

RS: Thank you.

SD: Next slide please, so climate resilience will be folded into all of these so our landscapes, our conservation land planning, our multi use planning and our green infrastructure. You will probably see a lot of that throughout all of the Climate Action Plan, but we will bring special attention to it as we continue to grow that footprint. Materials and waste, we have measured it in our Sustainable Action Plan for County operations, will continue to do that and I really want to highlight the climate responses that have been developed over the past few years, and you will start to see this come to fruition as we gather our measurements, is the multi-sector and shared priority approach so we are looking at things that tie to workforce, for example and I want to call out workforce specifically because we have been really working towards not just working with our community workforce development program to look at workforce training opportunities in green sectors, but also our green stewards that we have grown across the County. There, we have done monthly events with our green stewards in and around all of the County's climate action priorities to help continue engagement and participation in our Climate Action Plan. Those you can see in eScoop, and we get special guest speakers all the time

to talk about our climate priorities so we will keep the Board engaged as we do more of that public facing work to bolster our own County workforce but again, we do put everything with a lens of our disproportionately affected communities. We are working with our CWD partners also to look at energy efficiency in our low-income energy LIHEAP group of funding, and how we get those resources out to households, especially during heat season. How do we bolster our heat season response and our air quality leads with our DEQ department? Next slide please.

RS: I am sorry, before we move off of that slide, looking at the climate responses bar and consistent with one of the cross policy strategies in the Prosperity Initiative, if the Board could get some information on particular communities or geographic areas where we are focused on dealing with climate resilience and the effects of climate change, I think that would demonstrate not only how this policy is affecting those impacted communities, but also how we are taking into account the Prosperity Initiative.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board. Absolutely.

RS: Thank you.

SD: Next slide please.

RS: And I and I apologize. I am interrupting from time to time to ask questions. If any of my colleagues want to feel free.

SD: No, it is actually great that you, Chair Scott, it is great that you said that because one strategy tied to the Prosperity Initiative that we are looking at in conjunction with our partners is the housing inventory. And so how do we look at the housing inventory through the lens of older houses that need that weatherization and repair to bring them up to a standard so that they are not at risk during heat season, but also people can stay in their homes and so looking at that in terms of cross policy opportunities with the Prosperity Initiative and our Climate Action Plan, we are also doing this across our infrastructure plan and our own County facilities, and looking at the energy use and what makes good return on investment cost savings to the County to reduce our energy use so all of that will be also represented in our data measurements, which I will be back in June to tell you all about so without further ado, I am going to bring this slide back to the Board. I was here in October for my first presentation, and we were in a stretch of 14 days of 100 plus degree weather, and we could not close our SAPCO because we were still doing the climate outlook and could not close out our 100 degree day count. That finally closed at 112 days. 2024 was the hottest year on record, and every year we continue to say that so data and this data has been validated by our National Weather Service over the 2019 through 2024 years, we saw an average compared to 1901 to 2000 of an extra 35 days of 100 plus degree weather. That represents a 75% increase. That also is the equivalent of one extra month of summer. As you can see, April and October are becoming hot months. In addition, between 2019 and 2024 alone, every year we had an extra week of 100 degree days so I say this because Heat Awareness Week

is coming in May and so the Board will see that, and we will do a lot of public health communications on that but it is really important to bring it to light now, because October through December is the fastest warming quadrant of the year. We see that in the national data. It was the driest winter we have had to date so we have seen a lot of heat risk and wildfire risk over the past few days. Over the past week and April and October are when we are recreating so we are going to do some additional public health communications in and around heat preparedness, especially as we see these 50 degree shifts between morning and midday for safety. If folks are outside on the bike, out hiking, and we will be prepared to set forth our entire regional heat action network in May for heat awareness. So next slide please, so just a quick timeline April through June we are finalizing our work plans so the Board will see those in form of a memo as they get finalized. They have a regional component. We will be pulling out the County operations component. May is Heat Awareness Week. In addition to wildfire awareness and heat and wildfire season, will have response efforts going on concurrently to all of this. June and July, we will be setting forth with this County specific measurements. We have been approached by the University of Arizona to help us review our County Climate Action Plan and evaluate it with our client, climate researchers and August, we will finalize the report and solicit it to the Board for their input and also, we hope to gather some public input. Our DEQ department is doing their public input sessions right now, which will also inform our Climate Action Plan with a kickoff in September of 2025. Any questions?

RS: Any questions from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and Ms. Davis. I also look forward to a briefing to learn more about your work. I am particularly curious about the heat mitigation strategy, and really just want to hear about some of the initial planning that is already taking place as we get closer and closer to those triple digit temperatures. That outreach is, of course, critical and I am specifically, specifically curious about our cooling centers in the region. I know that there is strong cross jurisdictional commitment to that, and all of these can be discussed at a later time. They do not have to be today, but I wrote my notes. As part of the Climate Plan I am also very curious how the County is going to be playing a leading role in advanced water purification, working with our wastewater team and seeing how, as the state rolls out its program to conserve our water supply, how we, as a regional entity that treats water, is participating in those discussions and my colleague from District 3 earlier mentioned weatherization and repairs, as did you, Ms. Davis and so I am very curious how, you know, I would hope that what the County is doing in these critical early weeks, as we get closer and closer to the summer, is doing that outreach now with our community partners so that we can have a statement of need, right. And do that work proactively rather than reactively and we can follow up with another conversation, Ms. Leshner or however you suggest that happens. But those were my inputs and thank you for your incredible work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano, very much, Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you so much for the update, but also the work that has been going into creating such a robust plan, along with the community meetings that are happening. We are trying to get to a few of them and get some input and hear the input from folks within our district. There is a few things that kind of jump out to me that I just want to highlight and make sure kind of lifted up as we move along the planning process so one and I think in many ways I am echoing perhaps what Supervisor Scott had said is the centering of our people so the ways in which we are supporting our workers, who are facing the impacts of increased heat on the job, the ways in which we are supporting the cooling centers and places where people can go in this extreme heat, but also particularly out in some of our rural areas, there is grid instability so the power goes out during these summer months, people need somewhere to go where that is hospitable. Thinking about home repair and weatherization. Also, the utility assistance and then also just the challenge of mobile home parks, over a quarter, close to a third of residents of District 3 live in mobile home parks, which presents a really unique challenge and then layer on top of that the challenge of being in some of them are in the urban areas, but some are mobile homes that are out in rural areas and somewhat isolated and separated from one another, but still deal with the needs for home repairs, weatherization and utility impacts and so how can we ensure that our plan is thoughtful enough to reach those who we do not normally hear from and are often invisible within some of our County operations or planning processes. Yeah, I think those are a few of the things that I think are critical. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Vice Chair Allen. Anything else from my colleagues? Alright, Ms. Davis, thank you very much.

DETAINEE AND CRISIS SYSTEMS

32. Inmate Navigation, Enrollment, Stabilization and Treatment (INVEST) Independent Final Evaluation

Presentation of the key findings of the Independent Final Evaluation of the INVEST Program.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
PP: Paula Perrera, Director, Detainee and Crisis Systems
MP: Matt Pate, Deputy Director, Detainee and Crisis Systems
ZS: Zach Stout, Social Worker Supervisor, Detainee and Crisis Systems

RS: Now it is my long overdue privilege to call on Ms. Leshar to introduce our colleagues who are going to talk with us about the INVEST program.

JL: It was not the time for a practical joke. Thank you, Chair Scott and members of the Board, we are very excited to introduce Paula Perrera and all the team who are from the Detainee and Crisis Services Unit to talk a little bit and share with the public information about the INVEST program. It is extraordinarily exciting and successful, and they are here to give you all the information you want about the program. Thank you.

RS: And I neglected to say before I called on Ms. Leshar that this is Item No. 29 on the regular agenda.

PP: Good afternoon, Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, members of the Board, my name is Paula Perrera. I am the Director of Detainee and Crisis System, and we are here today to provide you with an overview and report on our program that is called INVEST. It was a randomized controlled trial. We and it was independently evaluated by Lacroix, Milligan. And I am going to turn it over to Matt Pate and Zach Stout, who were instrumental in this program and in the audience, I would be remiss if I did not mention Manny Mejias and Rudy. They call him the rooster. So anyway, with that, I will turn it over to Matt.

MP: Thank you. Paula. Chair Scott, members of the Board, my name is Matt, as Paula mentioned, and with my colleague Zach, we are going to give you a high-level overview of the INVEST independent final evaluation. Next slide please, so what is INVEST? Initially we were a proof-of-concept program. Essentially we wanted to prove that we could do better than the status quo at reentry planning out of the Pima County Jail and specifically what we wanted to do was to see if we could identify, engage, and address the health care needs of individuals and see if that would have an impact, a measurable impact on their well-being and subsequent

involvement in the justice system. At this point, it is important to note that INVEST is a treatment reform program, not a justice reform program. What I mean there is that we work with those who are justice involved, but we do not ask any of our justice partner entities to really alter their operations. Instead, we are looking to augment how individuals access care and take ownership of their own recovery. One thing that we do is we operate with a fundamental assumption that the treatment system, as currently constructed, does not necessarily work for this population. We like to say that we cannot refer our way out of this, and so we have had to come up with some novel ways to administer some reentry programming, combining three factors. The first being forensic peer support, which is the use of people with lived experience who have gone through our jail or others prison and the treatment system to act as mentors and navigators of a complex system of resources to increase the likelihood that individuals will be able to exit successfully. We also use the Freedom Management curriculum, which was developed by our colleague Manny Mejias. This is a cognitive behavioral reconstruction curriculum where we help people to better understand why they feel the way they feel, why they think, the way they think, and why they do what they do and we work with people through this curriculum in a guided way towards more pro-social behavior. And we tell people pretty bluntly it is on them to manage their freedom and if they do not, the County, the state or the feds will do it for them. Many of our people have been to prison, so they know what that means. We also operate utilizing a critical time intervention. This is an evidence-based model to change behavior, and it really operates off of capitalizing on sentinel events and in this case, a jail booking. It is an experience that we know heightens somebody's readiness for change and so, we work with individuals while they are in custody, and 6 to 9 months after they are released in the community. INVEST is also a research program. As Paula mentioned, we have designed a community reentry study that randomly assigns study participants to either a control or treatment condition. That is the presentation we are giving you today, but based on the initial success of INVEST, we have already begun our second randomized control trial, which we began in July of 2024. Next slide please. So importantly, why did we need to create INVEST? Well, the first real reason is that jail in-reach is insufficient to meet the demands of the in-custody population and I will give you an example. In March of 2025 1,055 individuals were booked into the County jail for more than 24 hours. 67% of those individuals are on Medicaid, have an access health plan, and are associated with some sort of community health. As a requirement, those people should be seen and have a reentry plan built for them and I would be surprised if 20% of those individuals are met by community entities and have a reentry plan made. Coordination around meaningful jail discharges into treatment is complex. We have certainly figured that out with INVEST through forensic peer support, but using that same example, those 1,055 individuals at the jail have 14 different insurance designations and so, as we all know how community healthcare works, that means 14 different potential paths into treatment, which is pretty complicated on top of their complex health needs, the community treatment system is not designed to treat complex traumatic stress disorders. Most of the individuals we work with have experienced trauma throughout life, but especially early in life, and we work with our individuals to better understand that we can explain some behavior through trauma, but we cannot excuse it and so through the

Freedom Management curriculum, again, we are trying to get people to have a greater ownership of their own recovery and treatment. Good help is hard to find. What I mean here is we rely not just INVEST, but in the community behavioral health system on the use of peers. Again, those with lived experience who have found a way towards recovery, and I can tell you that we really have not figured out how to properly compensate those individuals for that experience. Again, we are paying them for that experience and mentorship, but they often are paid entry level wages. We figured this out with INVEST to an extent, and I can tell you, anybody coming to work for us from the community system sees a significant pay bump coming to the County, which should speak to some of how that system pays its employees, because the other side is recruiting. We cannot understate this point. We are dealing with an unprecedented drug use epidemic. More people have died in the last 25 years from overdose than in all American wars combined. We cannot minimize this fact and so what we see is that fentanyl has fundamentally upended our treatment modalities, our housing approaches. We even see it in the informal economy; it is disrupted drug dealing economics. We see collateral consequences in prostitution and human trafficking and ultimately we see desperation as our enemy. We know that people change when they are in states of desperation, and so we are trying to prevent people from being in those states. We have kind of dueling sayings in INVEST. One is that INVEST can be a driver of creativity. We certainly see people come up with unique solutions, but that is certainly not always the case. With that, I will pass it over to my colleague.

ZS: Thank you Matt. Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Leshner, thank you for having us today and as Matt was saying, desperation is the enemy. So he has a saying desperation is the driver of creativity. Our colleague Manny Mejias counters that with desperation as the rival of morality and as somebody who has lived that life, experienced time in prison, I can absolutely concur with that sentiment. Next slide please, so overview. What is INVEST? It is a study as Matt was alluding to earlier. The goals of INVEST to identify and engage individuals that are jail that have a co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorder, as well as moderate to maximum criminogenic risk. The goal, obviously, was to reduce recidivism. One of the primary goals, we set a target of 20%. We actually achieved that target, and we exceeded that target by about 55%. We also are wanting to increase adherence to treatment in the community and then self-sustainability so we are talking housing, income, employment, education, etc. Next slide please. Results, so the chart is very small I apologize and there is a lot of data within this study. We have a final evaluation report that I encourage everyone to read and review. I will just be going over some high-level results so treatment versus the control treatment is obviously the INVEST program. What we found is that it works. INVEST participants spent more time in the community. They spent less time in jail and they were rebooked less as well. Next slide please. The key insights, however, are when we examine the within group comparison so successful INVEST participants versus unsuccessful INVEST participants. One stat that is not on this slide that is was huge for the program is we found that 83% of successful INVEST participants attended at least 20 Freedom management classes or more. We take that as a proxy for engagement, but we also take that as the curriculum works and

so successful INVEST participants, they experience 20 fewer days in jail, two fewer rebookings and greater stability in the community. Next slide please. Potential savings, so this is more of a kind of a door to open up that we could pursue in the future. I highly recommend doing a cost study, Matt will talk about that later. But the potential savings for INVEST we have a saying that successful INVEST participants are expensive to us, unsuccessful participants are expensive to the community. So just to elaborate on that, a successful INVEST participant costs us about \$8,000.00 to \$10,000.00. Compare the six months that they spend with us to a six-month period in the Pima County Jail, where it is \$495.00 for a booking fee and then \$125.00 per jail day so we are looking at \$22,000.00 to \$23,000.00 in jail costs alone. That has nothing to do and does not account for court costs, patrol costs, treatment, etc. Next slide please. Finally, beyond INVEST, so we do not want to just focus on our own participants. We have had many requests to join INVEST, and we have kind of pledged to ourselves and our team that we will do what we can to elevate others within the community who need help as well, whether that is through referral in custody engagement or freedom management. What you see on this slide is the number of Freedom management classes and attendance that we have had since 2020. Now you can see that there is around 360 from November of 2020 to September 2024. All of a sudden, though, they start to increase not only in frequency but in attendance. The reason why is because the facilities where we were conducting these courses at were recommending and requesting us to do more classes. They were wanting more freedom management, not only residential treatment facilities, but the jail as well. We were reported, it was reported to us that detainees taking those classes actually had better behavior and were more ready for release, at least anecdotally but so if you look from October to March, just in that six-month period, we essentially ran 156 classes so almost half of that four-year period that we did, and classes are in high demand. We are planning on expanding to other areas as well. Next slide please.

MP: Okay and in our report, there were several recommendations made that we wanted to highlight and then give you some insight into where we are heading with those recommendations so the first was to highlight areas of success, notably freedom management. What I would like to say here is that we are currently working with our third-party evaluator to develop a journal submission to academic publications. The combination of us designing a program, having results that exceeded what we had set out for, and doing it under the most rigorous evaluation framework, are really important to get out there. This is an area where there is not a lot of research, and so the ability for us to show innovation here, especially doing this in a very unique way, is something we are very excited about in this publication we expect to happen towards the end of this year. We were asked to consider expansion of freedom management within the jail and the community. As Zack highlighted, we have already done that. We are currently doing ten of these classes a week. Between the jail community treatment centers and the Abrams Public Health Building. The third was areas with non-significant findings are opportunities for refinement of the program, as Zack mentioned, we are a very data rich program. We had a lot of other areas with potential findings, and within our second randomized controlled

trial, we are certainly drilling down into those more and so there will be more to come on that next slide, please.

RS: Can you go back to the previous slide for a second?

MP: Sure.

RS: Where it says consider expansion of FM within jail and community and then also going to the cover memo from Ms. Leshner to your report. Given the program's measurable success, the independent evaluation recommends scaling the INVEST program to reach more individuals within the Pima County Adult Detention Center and expand services post-release. Do you have any sense yet of how wide you want that expansion to be, or is that something that is still being discussed with Administration with regard to your budget for the coming fiscal year?

MP: Yeah, it is a great question. Chair Scott, members of the Board, so when we have done eligibility screening for this program, right. We are looking at mental health, substance use status and criminogenic risk. We have done these eligibility screenings for five years now. And we can tell you with relative confidence, about half of the jail has co-occurring conditions so a mental health and substance use diagnosis presence, about half of those individuals also meet that moderate to maximum criminogenic criteria so about a quarter of the jail at any point in time would be within our target population and so what I would like to say, though, about scaling or expansion is I would think of it more as an evolution. This work is really challenging and so what I will say there is it is not as expensive as we thought it would be. It is time consuming to build those relationships with individuals, but it is also emotionally taxing, and I want to kind of make that point here is that we all do time. Some of us are just being paid for it. These are incredibly traumatic environments, and I can tell you that corrections officers are often forgotten first responders. They have some of the highest suicide rates of anyone in law enforcement, health care professionals in corrections have some of the highest suicide rates within the healthcare profession and so these environments are, again, traumatic to everybody and so as we look to scale our operation, which we have begun with INVEST, the second randomized controlled trial essentially allowed us to double our staffing capacity. And what that has allowed us to do is our first study targeted 300 individuals. We are now targeting eight for the study. Now, this freedom management curriculum and offerings are bigger than INVEST, and we can offer those classes to more people than are just in INVEST. And I can tell you, since January, we have been seeing between 400 and 500 people a month at the jail to do these classes and so we are really trying to do this in a way that is sustainable. I can tell you that this certainly wears on staff and I, you know, personal point of disclosure, I have had people very close to me say, I miss the person you were before you started doing this work. Not all the changes are positive, but it is certainly worthwhile work, and we endeavor to continue in it so I think we just have to be smart when we scale this, it is not like we can just pick somebody up off the street and do it. It is really intentional work.

RS: Thank you very much.

MP: Back to recommendations, so the one of the recommendations was to monitor the sustainability of the positive changes over a longer period of time, including recidivism rates and community reintegration metrics so this is a really important point. We were asked initially to do a six-month recidivism look at the current randomized control trial, they want us to look at 30 days, which, I mean, there is really no standardization here. But what I would encourage us to do is look beyond recidivism. Recidivism is an indicator typically that something is not working, right. They are coming back to the jail for whatever reason and so what we have found is that and you will see this in the report, we try to measure days in community as a probably a more important indicator than recidivism. The challenge is it is really easy to measure when things are going wrong. Right. People are in jail. When people are doing well, they are out in the community, they are working, they are paying their bills. They are managing their recovery. We do not get to see that often and it is a lot harder to capture and so we need to start thinking about better ways of how do we show the positive improvements that we want to see and measure those and so we are thinking about that in INVEST and certainly would welcome any feedback if you guys have any of those indicators in mind. Another recommendation was to employ strategies to engage more study participants on follow-up, especially in the control group. I can say in this new study, we were able to hire more jail-based release planners, and one of their job areas is to get some of that feedback and try to understand why people are coming back. We have recently funded a reentry manager position within our department to, again, start figuring out more like when we work with individuals, set up community reentry plans, and they come back to jail, we should be having a conversation. What worked? What did not work? How can we how can we do better here? And so that is another area that we are intentionally moving forward with. Consider conducting a cost benefit analysis to assess the economic impact of the program, as Zack mentioned, we see potential cost savings just looking at a jail cost savings metric but a further and more comprehensive analysis would certainly be valuable. We would welcome something akin to a revisit of the Rose report. For those of you who are not familiar, this Board asked for a comprehensive overview of the criminal justice system. 25 years ago, 22 recommendations were made, and some of those recommendations are kind of they are the reason why our department is here. That report led to the development of the office that would become our department. However, when you look at some of those recommendations, those items are still very much issues today that we struggle with and so there may be value in revisiting how we have done on those 22 recommendations and I am certain that there are more that will come up in the 25 years since that report was authored. Our last recommendation was to continue gather participant narrative to provide context for the quantitative outcomes and inform program adjustments. We are really big at getting our participant voices included in this. We have kind of four distinct time frames that we try to elicit that information so for non-INVEST participants when they are doing those classes in the jail the community or in a community residential setting, we are getting follow up surveys for them trying to figure out some of that impact. INVEST participants, we get their narrative information at exit. We also with our third-party evaluator, they do

a six month follow up after they are out of the program to see kind of how those things have stuck and then lastly, we do focus groups with our participants, as well to try to again elicit feedback on how we can kind of get better and so, with that, that concludes our presentation, but we are sure happy to hang around for questions. Thank you.

RS: Thank you. Any questions or comments from Board members? I would really appreciate getting an update on whatever scaling up happens in the Adult Detention Center. That would be of great interest to the Board not connected with your program, but seeing a way of maybe some cross-pollination. I wonder if there would not be value. Ms. Leshner, if we could have Ms. Darland talk with Ms. Perrera and her team about the Freedom Management curriculum, and if there is any possibility of seeing how some of the components of that curriculum might be able to offer some insights into following up with people who consistently refuse services and shelter in our unhoused community. Obviously, it is not a direct correlation, but I could not stop thinking about it when you were making your presentation and the fact that it honors lived experience, the freedom management curriculum, and that it confronts desperation, which I think is obviously something that people in the unhoused community are dealing with. I wonder if there is not some opportunity for these two offices to have some dialog.

MP: Yeah, we are certainly willing to work with Ms. Darland. We communicate regularly on issues of homelessness but we certainly to your point, I mean, we have a saying in INVEST and I mean, you know, you cannot..

RS: You have more than a few sayings.

MP: Yeah, we have a lot of sayings. We are conversational and relational bunch. You know, you get a bunch of social workers together. That happens and we know like old adage, right, you can take the horse to water. You cannot force it to drink. What we say with our facilitators and our staff. It is our job to make them thirsty. It is our job to really get them to buy into that new and different life and again, that only happens at that individual level when you know them, when they know you and there is trust established and so I certainly see your point and I come from the homeless services world and that certainly informs our work.

RS: Alright. Thank you very much and thank you all for waiting as well.

HEALTH

34. Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions

Staff recommends approval of the use of \$8,000,000.00 in opioid settlement funding for the procurement of services and Pima County Health Department staff positions to provide substance use prevention and response interventions in Pima County.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
AC: Supervisor Cano
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator
TC: Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director, Pima County Health Department

RS: Before I turn it over to Dr. Cullen. Ms. Leshner, any introductory comments? Alright, Dr. Cullen, thank you for your patience as well. The final presentation today. I apologize for that.

TC: No worries, Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Leshner, I am going to talk about the Regional Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee. You also have a BOSAIR that is included in your agenda. I would say that I think that this is a very pertinent presentation, following on the two other presentations that you heard today. While we know that the opioid crisis continues, we also know that homelessness and behavioral health are parts of what we are seeing out there so what I hopefully will present you is something that will leave you with some hope about some interventions that we can hopefully promulgate, evaluate and mitigate some of the harms that we are seeing in our community. Next slide. This is the, we always do the land acknowledgment. We already did this so I am going to skip over it so if we could thank you very much, we are going to do the history our process and activities. I think the most important part of this is our recommendations and next steps so I am going to go a little quick so I can spend more time on that. So background, I do want to share with you however some very disconcerting data. You may be aware that from a federal perspective, we have been seeing a decrease in overdose deaths and this is I apologize, this is not on the slides. However, we did just issue an alert because our overdoses in January were the highest they had been since August of '23. That is very concerning because the numbers had been going down. In addition, we saw our heroin overdoses jump to the highest they have been in multiple years. Now it is still a relatively small absolute number, but it is hard to know what this is reflecting. What we know is that as the border gets more difficult for drugs to come across, it is very possible that what we are seeing is people reverting to black tar and you may be aware, black tar heroin for a very long time in the city was the major drug, more than fentanyl, with heroin overdoses accompanying that so I think that we will have a better sense of

this as we go through the next 4 to 6 months, but you may recall that while many of us have said we are very pleased that we are seeing a decrease in overdose deaths, we had nothing to that we could ascribe causality to. We believed some of it was having Narcan out there. Some of it was our other interventions. I am just placing the contextual discussion about what I am going to talk about here within that context so we continue to be worried about fentanyl overdoses, behavioral health, and obviously the unhoused and the intersection between those three. You are aware the opioid settlement funds in Arizona were divided among the counties. Just as a reminder four jurisdictions are part of our aggregated data that we have available to make a spend plan on. They include the City of South Tucson, Marana, the City of Tucson and Pima County and for those of you who were on the Board, you may recall that we had a delay in getting to an IGA, an agreement with the City of Tucson, which we wanted that delay because we thought it was critical for us to have the blending of these funds. This is proven to be a really positive thing, in my opinion. But when people ask us why, if your first fund happens in '22 and now it is '25, a lot of that was our working out how we would work together as a geographic area to address this issue. As a reminder, Oro Valley and Sahuarita both took their funds. We do track that, their funds and we track just through reporting of what they have done with that so the next slide now goes through this other history. Great. Thank you so much. You will recall that initially we had a Substance Misuse Advisory Committee that was comprised of Board of Health members, established in October '22 when the money first started coming in, that group solicited input and did a ton of the foundational work that is now informing what we are doing from community experts, a series of community forums, and a survey. That information was ensured that the voice of the community, the voice of those who had been, had suffered because of engagement with drugs and or substance use and/or other family members had a voice. In '24, this Board allowed us to spend \$180,000.00 on Narcan. I just want to call out that that was a time when we were really accelerating our distribution of Narcan. We have not come back with another request for Narcan, because the Attorney General at the state has graciously given us Narcan, and we have had other venues to get the Narcan if and when that distribution cycle changes, we will come back with a request to spend Narcan. We also spent two different contracts. We awarded two contracts, one was \$100,000.00 to increase the capacity for the provision of care to women who were pregnant and suffering from substance use disorder and then the second one, and you are going to see this later, this evaluation of how do we get increased MOUD or medicated assisted treatment out to the rural areas using a mobile distribution model. That is because the vast majority of that MOUD that is available in the County is available, makes total sense, in the urban areas. We actually have looked at this data by looking at the prescription data monitoring base and we know where individuals are able to access MOUD and remember, MOUD can either be in most cases it is either Suboxone or Methadone. Methadone is highly regulated in that individual's need to show up six times out of seven times, so 6 days out of 7 days of the week and so there are outpatient treatment programs that prescribe Methadone. When we are talking about what, for instance, is happening in the jails or most of the community work we are doing, we are not talking about Methadone. Methadone remains an incredible opportunity and incredible medication for substance use disorder but

most of the other work that is being done is being done with Suboxone. There are long acting medications now available that are like Suboxone. However, they are heavily require prior authorization from AHCCCS. We have been working with AHCCCS to try to modify that. Okay, so the next slide, this talks about the committee which we call Rossak for short. This is the new committee. Once the City of Tucson signed on to an agreement to blend our money together, you can see it is comprised of six members, the two members that are from Pima County, two from the City of Tucson, one from South Tucson, and one from the Town of Marana. I want to call out these individuals that are participating first, because this is a real labor of love. The incentive is to help figure out what to do but the other thing is, everyone that is participating has made this a non-parochial issue. They have said I am from Marana, I do not need money to go to Marana. I need money to address this issue. City of Tucson, I need money to address where this issue is happening. If it is in the rural areas, we need to make sure we are getting to the rural areas. I think this is a real tribute to the process that has happened here and the engagement that we have had, so let us go now there is three slides in a row that are going to talk about how we ended up with what we are doing for this process. Next slide, so we are scoring alternatives and I am going to go through how this was developed and then take you to where we ended up. So remember x amount of dollars. What do you spend them on? How do you evaluate what you have spent them on and are you making a difference? At the end of this slide deck you are going to see the recommendations, which is what we are bringing to you today but I want you to be aware that these were the criteria that were developed by the committee, informed by the survey and the community members that we discussed with and what you will see here is going all over, including what are jurisdictional priorities but really, does it reflect the community? Does it make sense? Is there evidence base for it? Which is why as a shout out to Paula and the work they are doing, it is so critical to get an academic journal to publish stuff because at some point you really want to know that you are doing evidence-based practice and can it be sustainable? Remember, this is 18 years of funding. It is not going to renew and at the end of the day, we want to make sure whatever we are doing has the ability to be sustained and have long-term impact. Next slide, so let me talk to you about where we are right now. We have met 11 times, and Steve has indicated that we are accelerating what we are doing. We have put some timelines on us because we believe that at some point we just need to act so you can see what we focused on current misuse efforts, identifying priorities, analysis of the local opioid data points, so I also want to echo that this is a data informed decision-making process. We are pulling in every data set that we have available. You guys I know are aware that we track where the data, where the overdose is happening, where the hospitalizations are happening, where the EMS calls are happening, and what medications, what substances are affecting them, as well as study guides and this has been called out, I will give amazing credit to Brian and his team. Big City Health Coalition has said this is a model for how to do decision making about the opioid funds, because what we have done is put together study guides. At the bottom there you see the funding opportunities in areas. We have a study guide, which is an extensive amount of information, including peer reviewed literature on every one of these areas. Well, you might not recall, but I will remind you with the opioid settlement, the One

Arizona settlement, there are 12 areas that you can spend money on. This committee itself went through a long process of prioritization and came up with the areas that are at the bottom of this slide as the priorities and if we go to the next slide, which is a process slide, you can see that this is kind of a culmination of what I have just described to you. I am not going to go through this, but suffice it to say, those 11 meetings that we had this time were about how to prioritize, what matters, Once you prioritize, what did the data show, What were the opportunities available, and then how can we make the decisions about what to recommend to you as the Board of Supervisors? Next slide, so this is kind of the critical slide. Step back a second. There was a time when we had asked for \$5 million for this coming fiscal year. That has been increased to \$8 million. At the current time we have collected \$24 million. The goal if nobody else declares bankruptcy, we will probably be between \$80 and \$90 million. Initially, we thought we would collect \$100 million. Mallinckrodt has gone bankrupt. We anticipate that some of the other people that have been incriminated in this opioid settlement may also go bankrupt, but at the current time, we have \$24 million. The discussion with the committee was and to quote Dr. Soltani, who is amazing, "we have a crisis, why would we put this off? Let us spend it." So we came to Steve and asked, I came to Steve and asked if we could go from \$5 to \$8 million, with the belief that we do not want to do single year funding. In most cases, what we know is we probably need 3 to 5 years' funding. If we divide \$24 million by three, we get \$8 million a year. So very complicated math I did to come to \$8 million but that is where we got it. At the last meeting, remember, the committee has gone through all of these. These are the suggested amounts. Now, what the next plan is and it is on the last slide but I am just going to discuss it right here, is that our plan is to go out with an RFP to go out in by June so in the next six weeks hopefully put an RFP on the street that says these are the areas and this is a target amount, not for an individual application, but a target amount for to develop contracts from primarily community based organizations or all CBOs to address these different areas. So let us talk youth prevention. What does youth prevention mean? The RFP is going to be written broad, it will have under youth prevention. It will say well maybe you could do schools-based thing, maybe you can do education to prevent adverse childhood events. Maybe you can work with an organization like Boys and Girls Club. I am making up stuff here that wants to do an extension of work that they have done. Those applications will come in they will be scored with the suggested goal of \$1.5 million overall, a suggested goal of \$800,000.00. I do need to be clear that PCHD staffing is three individuals, 3 to 4 people, and it is at about \$330,000.00 so youth prevention peer navigation aligns 100% with what Paula recently presented about what is happening in the jails. We know peer navigation works. We actually have are using some of our overdose to action money to have peer navigators within the Health Department. Kodak, Hope, La Frontera, Tucson Indian Center. This is a proven, proven interventions. What we know is there is not enough peer navigators, they are not in the hospitals, they are not in the health care systems. There are multiple places where there is the potential to really make a difference. Transitional wraparound support services. We hear this all the time. I may be in an intensive outpatient program, but nobody is there to help me get food, to help me get clothing, to help me ensure that I stay in the program and that was discussed earlier today. People need to stay in programs;

the data is pretty clear. Probably three months, six months, sometimes nine months so this is designed to ensure that that could happen. Law enforcement Co-response this is happening already at the City of Tucson. There MIST program people go out with law enforcement so at the sharp end of the interventions, there is somebody other than law enforcement to interact with people that have substance use disorder, mobile mat services, I talked about that, we have previously funded that. We have left it in here; however, we are waiting for their evaluation to see whether we want to continue that or not. The one thing that is critical to all of these is to have within a contract that after a year, if there is not, if there is no positive impact based on what the evaluation schedule has been determined, what there will be a redetermination of whether we continue that. Innovation is in here and I just want to this is a push from me. It is a push from the City of Tucson. When I query ChatGPT or DeepSeek or whichever one I want to query and I say, what should I do? They tell me what to do I am already doing it. Then I go, what should I do next? Okay, I am already doing it. We are already doing all of this. We are not doing it as extensively as we need to, but there have to be. We have to be willing to take some funds and say, what do you think will work? Because the only way we are going to get out of this is to do something new, in addition to doing all these other things and then finally, this sobering center implementation plan you have you may have heard me talk about this. Multnomah County in Portland has done this. This is really work that has been discussed with Kate Vesley, as well as other people to try to figure out maybe it is not enough that diversion or deflection puts you in a facility for three hours. You get started on MOUD and you go out, maybe you really need three days in a place like that. Maybe you need a place like that that keeps you safe for that three-day period, maybe you are lots of stories for women maybe we need to give you a safe place so this is a really it is a small amount of money to evaluate what we are seeing is happening in Portland. There are a few other sites like this, but this gives us the opportunity to really extensively look at a model like that that may really help those individuals that are unhoused, that have MOUD and even though we initiate them, have substance use, and even though we initiate them on medication assisted treatment, they still have nowhere to go and this may give us an opportunity to give them a place to go as we stabilize to get housing. So next steps, I have kind of gone over most of these. The one thing and this would be the next slide, I am sorry and then we could go back to this slide. The next slide really that I think what is important to note and you have heard these challenges, there are policy challenges, there are Medicaid cuts. If they happen, they will significantly hurt the population that right now is suffering from substance use disorder. The coordination of care between data systems. Some of this we are funding with our overdose to action funding, working closely with the city, with EMS and with other data sets that we believe will help us figure out how to address specific people and then this ongoing evaluation, I do want to and then we could go back to that slide we were just on with the numbers. Thank you very much. Sorry, so one back. The one thing I do want to remind you is that the County is already putting almost over \$3 million a year into this, all from grant funding. Our overdose to action is one and a half years into a five-year grant. Despite the concerns about CDC, we believe that money will stay. We have no indication that it will not stay so in addition to this is all this other work that we are doing that the City of Tucson is doing, Marana is doing

and so this is not a loan, but this is to really reflect what we believe is a way forward right now so the BOSAIR and I am going to turn it over to Steve. In some ways the BOSAIR talks about \$8 million and it is in a supplemental. It is really not a supplemental. It is the opioid money.

SH: Chair Scott, Mr. Leshner and members of the Board, so the ask today is to approve \$8 million just as a, it is part of our supplemental request but it is not General Fund just that we access \$8 million of the opioid dollars to begin this RFP process and approve the general categories that we are looking at for purposes of releasing those RFPs.

RS: Questions from Board members? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I would just like to move that we approve this plan. But if we are not ready yet, I can wait.

RS: I have some questions as well. Supervisor Allen?

JA: So, I am curious about the project areas that are going to reach rural areas. I think the mobile map is one. I understand it has the smallest allocation pot so are there other are there other project areas that are also have rural community outreach embedded within it?

TC: Yeah. Supervisor Allen, members of the Board, all of these will have traditional RFP scoring accompanying it and you do not see that but one of those is to make sure that there is appropriate geographic distribution of the whatever the proposals are. So, for instance, we would hope and assume that many of the organizations that are providing care in the more rural areas or the unincorporated jurisdictions would submit proposals. Part of our responsibility will be to ensure that we do enough information sharing in throughout the County to do this. I believe I am comfortable with us doing that because of the work we have done in the past three years related to programs like SaludArte, where we were in every district but we will be making sure that one of our criteria is to average, to make sure that there is nobody left out. There is a dependency on organizations applying to this. Now, the way this is going to happen in terms of the RFP review is that we do we may have the opportunity to say, you know, this is great, but we really need you to extend into the more rural areas. That is actually what happened with the mobile van. The mobile van came to us and said, we are going to go into these three areas, and we said, "No, you need to go into these six rural areas and so I am not concerned about that." It is definitely something that we are paying attention to.

JA: And then my other question is how are we defining and measuring success and including is there because it is a lot of money and there is you know, it as always sort of the tension between spreading it out thin or going narrow, but going deep and so I guess you know this to me it looks like we are spreading thin. We are spreading out, I should say, not necessarily thin so I do I wonder, I worry about the degree to which we are that we have some clear metrics of what success looks like

and that there is funding and an eye towards the evaluation and capturing and tracking of those metrics as we move along through the implementation of the funds.

TC: Yeah. Supervisor Allen, members of the Board, I am so glad you highlighted that. That has been a source of tension, actually, in the committee itself. Do we set aside funds specifically for evaluation so that we can make sure we have that? What we do know is that the RFP, which is currently in a very, very draft form, has evaluation within it, including metrics that are different for each of these. But remember, these topics are not only not deep, they are broad like you mentioned so the evaluation will need to be reflective of whatever the submission is if it is chosen for that. Remember the decision making we had about can it be sustained? Is it long acting? Does it reflect jurisdictional priorities? Is it a public health proven intervention in the past? Those will be some of the scoring criteria that are used in the RFP itself. And from that, the evaluation criteria will need to be specific for each of the interventions so for instance, our mobile van metrics right now is number of people impacted, number of people that have education. These are very quantitative number of people initiated on MOUD, but then a longer term number of people that are on MOUD, 30, 60, 90 days out. Very similar to what you heard from Paula and the reason why you are hearing those is that beyond that, it is difficult to evaluate. We could throw in something like, are you employed? Have you had a decrease in interface with the justice system? This is an area that is really open. I think depending upon what happens The one here that is actually the most difficult to evaluate in some ways is the youth prevention. This is an area that we hear repeatedly that people want us to go in. They want us to do something with the youth. but what my hope is that I am not going to see a youth that is then involved with the judicial system if they are nine years old. Right? So, the issue is, are they staying in school? Is the family seem more together? Is there a way that we can measure that? So, the question is 100% appropriate. I am really into evaluation and data so I can give you my word that we will be looking closely at that, but it may not. I do not think that at the end I am going to be able to roll eight different things up into one number that shows that. The requirement for, we also did just get approval to work with another grant called ARPA-H out of Washington, DC. Their metric is are the numbers of overdoses that result in 911 calls decreased. That is their one metric for a federal grant. And so there probably will be some overlying metric like that, especially as we work with the City of Tucson and EMS there but that in and of itself, while that would be reflective, especially right now as our numbers are going up again, it is probably insufficient to do an appropriate evaluation of these.

JA: Is it possible, feasible, conceivable to come up with like three metrics, four metrics that they do? I can understand that one that bundles them all up in a nice bow is not realistic, but is there 3 or 4 that that we could be driving towards that are a unifying metric that are woven into, that is woven into the RFPs for the different areas, so that there is some yardstick to know whether we are moving the needle, acknowledging that, you know, it is different needles.

TC: Yeah. Supervisor. All members of the Board. Yes, I think that is. It may be five, but I do think that we need to follow why the feds did the decision they did, which was basically said there is 2 or 3 things that are quantitative that you can measure a lot of. That is why youth prevention is so not nebulous, but more difficult because it is really qualitative measurement you are trying to get there. Now we do have some standard interventions that we use for the non-intervention standard evaluation tools that we use for the County. The YRBS, the Youth Behavioral Health Survey, which is conducted by CDC that we pay to get additional surveys done on that. Those are numbers that we track to see, are we improving the number of kids that are using drugs? We also this year engaged with a police initiative to work with one of the large school districts to get some baseline data about violence, exposure, things that are constitute the adverse childhood experiences, so that we do have some additional ways that we can measure what is happening in the County, because I think some of this is what is the real goal of this? It is really to improve the health status of the County, regardless of who you are, regardless of race, ethnic, age, gender, sexual orientation. Let us make sure that we decrease these numbers as we go along.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman . And hi, Director Cullen, it is good to see you.

TC: Hi. It is good to see you.

AC: A couple of questions. Does the City of Tucson have its own bucket of money or is this the regional allocation?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, yes this is an integrated model of funding the city in the appropriation has its own budget, own appropriation but the IGA combines the money along with the City of South Tucson and Marana. I do want to give a shout out to that. We are the only large city, which is defined as over 500,000 and County in the United States that have combined their money. Every other County-City, the money has stayed segregated.

AC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Director Cullen, can you expand upon what youth prevention means and some of the like, what would a three bullet points be under that?

TC: Yeah, it is a really good question and what I can, Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, what I can do is share with you guys the data sets that we have put together with best practices so that you have a sense of this. So under this would be things like curriculum building for k-12 interventions, working with team sports and giving youngsters and the way youth is defined in this is nine and over, access to mentoring. Looking specifically at reaching out to families to ensure that families are stable, so have access to resources for families. Some of this builds on work we have done with our schools program, where we have been highly successful with a program called You Are Not Alone. Where we have trained kids, we have trained

children to take a course that was really developed by Lady Gaga and has proven to be highly successful. It is a two-hour course about how to be a best friend to somebody, how to recognize if somebody is in a crisis situation and to report to them, so our hope is that this youth prevention will also build on other work we have done in the schools that is been funded by public health. In addition, the City of Tucson, because they are very close partner, has work that has been done in this youth area. I will say that the law enforcement, the chief and the sheriff have both indicated that this is a high priority for them.

AC: Mr. Chairman, Director Cullen, the applications for this \$8 million would be nonprofits only. So tribal entities, if jurisdictions have a program that works right now, the proposal in front of us is just community-based nonprofits, right?

TS: It is community, Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, it is community based. My hesitation with that is that some of the goal of peer navigation is to get those into health care settings. I am not clear all health care settings are nonprofit that are in Tucson. So my hesitation is around that one, because what we know is independent of if you are a nonprofit or a for profit hospital, all the health care systems are being, have individuals come into them that have either been are diagnosed with substance use disorder or who have suffered an overdose because it is the closest hospital they go to.

AC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just some comments, please and really probably directed toward the County Administrator. I want to support this, I have more questions specifically really related to timing. How are we ensuring cross jurisdictional partnerships, including with our tribal partners and just really like if there was an opportunity for each one of these project areas to have like three deliverables behind it, which is probably going to happen in the RFP anyway, I feel like that would give me more clarity. Right now this proposal is well-intentioned, but feels very vague to me as a newcomer, and I will commit to the briefing with you, Dr. Cullen, and the County Administrator's office as well, so that I am ensuring that, you know, my assumptions are supported. And I guess really, you know, to my colleague from District 3, I do not know if this is the same concern that you had earlier or what you were trying to share. but what I would hope this, these opioid dollars that are going to our region really promote is creativity, direct impact on direct ability to fund key programs and do it in a way that is responsive to community need and I do believe that we have that but this feels a little bureaucratic to me from a County as the safeguard of these funds. Right, I am trying to figure out how to support staff recommendations while also seeing if we can do something to support some collaboration in a meaningful way. So those are my thoughts for now, appreciate it.

RS: Thank you Supervisor Cano for those comments.

TC: Can I respond please?

RS: Yes, Dr. Cullen.

- TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, we have a tribal member on the committee, and we have been working closely with Tohono O'odham, Pascua Yaqui and Tucson Indian Center. We already fund Tucson Indian Center. Pascua Yaqui, and TO, Tohono O'odham, have gotten their own opioid settlement dollars so these dollars are not designed to support what is going on reservation. However, we work very closely with all three tribal organizations in the County, and we are transparent with them about what we are doing. I do want to call out that American Indians, Alaska Natives have the highest rate of overdose in the County, and we are cognizant of that. Just last week, actually, we arranged for Narcan to be delivered to one of the tribes that needed to have that so I am pretty comfortable with that. The tribal engagement with this, because it has been very intentional. The other concerns you have, I would love to discuss with you. Thanks.
- RS: Anything else? Supervisor?
- AC: No. I am good.
- RS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Supervisor Heinz?
- MH: Now, can I move the item?
- RS: Well, I had not gotten asked my questions yet, so I am sorry and I am delighted that my questions came after Supervisor Allen's and Supervisor Cano's, because I think they are going to follow along the same lines in the BOSAIR, it says that "to ensure that opioid settlement funds are invested in evidence based, evidence informed, and culturally appropriate strategies that address current and emerging issues and work to prevent future negative impacts, PCHD will be seeking proposals from suppliers through a request for proposals procurement process." Then it lists the seven initiatives using different wording by the way, in the BOSAIR than is used in the slide, but I get it. Recognizing that somebody could address more than one of these seven initiative areas. I am assuming that our RFP that we do not have an RFP for each initiative area. That we are trying to craft a more broadly drawn RFP.
- TC: Chair Scott, members of the Board, yes, we actually have gotten three RFPs from other counties that have let them, and that does seem to be the best practice. There is one RFP with the different areas included under that RFP so individuals could, for instance, apply for one, three and five. I am making that up and then give us specific interventions and plans for each of those different areas. And to go back to what Supervisor Allen and Supervisor Cano talked about, make sure that there are metrics associated with each of those. So yes, there are not multiple RFPs. There is one overarching RFP that is planned.
- RS: And recognizing that and understanding, I would gather that when the committee was coming up with amounts in each one of these seven initiative areas, those amounts could change based on the type of responses we get to the RFP and what respondents are able to address.

- TC: Chair Scott, members of the Board, yes, you can see some of them have like a range but at the end of the day, the most important thing is we add up to spend \$8 million and not go over that \$8 million but yes, I would anticipate that that will happen. I think it is also important to note that this is where we are starting during the RFP process itself. I imagine there will be lots of evaluation. We do not anticipate having only people from the Health Department on the review committee. We anticipate that there will be an external person as well as someone from Community Workforce Development to help evaluate the RFP. It is a little difficult in that there are people on the committee themselves that may be representing an organization that may want to apply for one of these funding sources so once the decision is made that this is what we are going to move forward, it will become an internal County developed RFP. We are very cognizant of the need to ensure that that is protected in a way so that there is not any concerns about that.
- RS: And thank you very much and one other question, and I have asked this before with regard to opioid settlement funds that the County gets. I know that a certain portion of the opioid settlement goes to the state, and I am always wondering if, especially with something this extensive, if we are looking for opportunities to partner with either DHS or the Attorney General's office so that we can combine our efforts and perhaps impact even more people?
- TC: Chair Scott, members of the Board, we do have discussions with the Attorney General. It is actually how we have gotten Narcan in the past. We also have discussions with Poison Control Center because they are on the radar for the Attorney General to be a distributor for Narcan and also medication assisted treatment, especially in southern Arizona. You know, the Poison Control Center for non-Maricopa County is based at the University of Arizona. However, you probably are aware that last year, the opioid settlement dollars were taken for the prison population.
- RS: Yes.
- TC: So, our discussions with the Attorney General and our interfaces there are really based on what are they doing for the other counties? We are part of the local health department, Arizona committee, and Chris Mayes and other people have presented to us. Their concern is really to make sure that there is equitable distribution. If they are going to send out to the counties that they are sending it out equitably. Now, we have been the benefit of their largesse in that we have a way to distribute, for instance, Narcan that is more efficient and effective than the other counties, so we have gotten a much greater percentage of the Narcan that is been distributed. As far as homeland security, you know, we are a high narcotic trafficking area. You are probably aware probably 60% of the fentanyl. It is hard to say what is going on right now, but 60% of the fentanyl historically has come in through the U.S. We work very closely with CBP and Homeland Security and actually their the ways we get insights into what the supply is that is coming in and the amount of fentanyl that is included, for instance, in a fentanyl pill or another distribution method that they are using so those have been there. They have not included an ask, can you give us additional

funding? What they have included is do you have resources that you are focusing on that we can ensure come into Pima County? I am pretty comfortable with that right now. I think we are going to have to wait and see what happens in the next few months.

RS: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. Supervisor Dr. Heinz, if you would like to make your motion.

MH: I would move that we approve the plan as described by Dr. Cullen.

RS: I will second. Any further discussion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Opposed? Item passes 4 to 0. Alright, Dr. Cullen, thank you, appreciate your patience, but the presentation was very informative and I think, led to some good dialog with the Board.