

## STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium 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, July 1, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair  
Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair  
\*Steve Christy, Member  
\*\*Andrés Cano, Member

Absent: Dr. Matt Heinz, 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 Christy joined the meeting at 9:17 a.m. He participated remotely.

\*\*Supervisor Cano participated remotely.

### 1. AWARD

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002378, Amendment No. 2, A-Team Security Event Services, Inc., to provide for event security at Kino Sports Complex. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$150,000.00 from \$170,227.00 to \$320,227.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$320,227.00. This increase is necessary to adequately cover the additional security expenses resulting from KSC's recent use agreement with a professional Mexican baseball team for their scheduled events at the complex. This adjustment is essential to ensure safety and maintain compliance with operational standards. Funding Source: Kino Sports Complex Fund. Administering Department: Stadium District - Kino Sports Complex.

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

Supervisor Christy asked if there was any anticipated revenue that would offset the increase of the security costs.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative. She stated that staff would provide an additional breakdown of how much revenue would come from the contract and the projected revenues from audience attendants.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:23 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, July 1, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair  
Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair  
\*Steve Christy, Member  
\*\*Andrés Cano, Member

Absent: Dr. Matt Heinz, 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 Christy joined the meeting at 9:17 a.m. He participated remotely.

\*\*Supervisor Cano participated remotely.

### **1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Alisha Vasquez, Co-Director, Mexican American Heritage and History Museum and District 5 Representative, Public Art and Community Design Committee.

### **3. PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

### **4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Chair Scott acknowledged the passing of William O. Wills, Sr., a dedicated community member who had an extraordinary career. He stated that Mr. Wills, Sr., retired as a Master Sergeant from the Air Force after 20 years of service, retired from Pima County as an Assistant Public Health Director for Administrative Services after 22 years of service and had served on numerous Boards and Committees. A moment of silence was observed in his honor.

## 5. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Vivek Bharathan addressed the Board regarding Project Blue, indicated the process failed to consider environmental impacts or provide a comprehensive economic assessment. He expressed disappointment in those Board members who voted in favor and urged local government to protect their residents.

Kirk Astroh, Volunteer, Humane Borders, spoke about desert deaths and urged the Board to continue to support water stations because that saved lives and reduced the Medical Examiner's workload.

Robert Reus spoke about the upcoming 249th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and read Thomas Jefferson's Second Annual Report to Congress, dated December 15, 1802.

Reverend Jessica Braxton expressed support for the County's continued support of Humane Borders and emphasized that their work did not make the desert safe, but made it less deadly. She explained that the water stations were visible symbols of compassion, honored lost lives and affirmed the value of every person, and called on Pima County to remain a leader in having a seat at the table.

J.P. Salvatierra addressed the Board regarding the data center land sale and that it was approved without full disclosure of key liabilities. He stated that the foreign interests had unduly influenced the Board through misinformation and disingenuous proffering.

Reverend Steve Keplinger, Grace Saint Paul's Episcopal Church, shared emotional accounts of migrants he had met over the last 15 years, many of whom risked their lives crossing the Sonoran Desert. He emphasized the desperation that drove people, especially women and children, to make repeated dangerous journeys, and urged support for Humane Borders to prevent further deaths from dehydration.

Laurie Cantillo, Board Chair, Humane Borders, described the deadly reality migrants faced in the Sonoran Desert, where extreme heat and isolation claimed lives every few days. She stated that the organization's volunteer-driven mission was to prevent these deaths through water stations, called on continued support amid worsening conditions and rising fatalities.

David Smith voiced his concern over the lack of accountability and decision-making processes. He urged the Board to implement clear goals, feedback mechanisms, and data-driven evaluations to ensure taxpayer money was used for the welfare of the community.

Dr. Ana Greif thanked the Board for their support, that county funding helped serve 500 students and achieved a 90% graduation rate. She noted the program's strong return on investment and growing impact through expanded partnerships.

Christine Mokhtarian expressed opposition to selective ICE operations and racial profiling, stressed the fear it caused even among U.S. citizens and warned of potential social and economic harm to the community if such practices continued.

Isabel Garcia addressed the Board regarding protecting immigrant communities amid increasing fear and abuse. She urged local leaders to protect residents' rights and reject policies rooted in discrimination.

\* \* \*

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Chair Scott requested that the County Administrator provide an update to the Board on the County's broader support for Humane Borders, beyond the current agenda item, and suggested a conversation with its leadership team. He also requested an update on County policy regarding the current status with federal immigration authorities, given recent concerns about increased enforcement and interagency cooperation.

\* \* \*

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **6. Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule**

Approval of the Board of Supervisors Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of October 2025 to add a Special Virtual Meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., for the canvass of the September 23, 2025 Special General 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 Heinz was absent, to approve the item.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **7. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety**

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

## **COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

### **8. Outside Agency Committee Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2025/2026**

#### **Community Services Category**

#### **Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Amistad y Salud, d.b.a. Clinica Amistad/Community Health & Wellness/\$45,500/\$31,445

Catholic Community Services of SO AZ, Inc., d.b.a. Community Outreach Program for the Deaf/Reengaging and connecting Deaf, Deafblind and Elderly Deaf Individuals with resources through supportive partnerships/\$65,000/\$47,148  
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona, Inc./Roof Repair and Replacement Program/\$40,000/\$30,416  
 International Rescue Committee/Job Readiness Training/\$20,000/\$19,097  
 International Rescue Committee/Medical Case Management/\$20,000/\$19,097  
 Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern AZ, Inc./Financial Wellness Program/\$70,000/\$23,223  
 Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern AZ, Inc./HoME/\$50,000/\$35,209  
 Southern AZ Legal Aid, Inc./Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc. Homeowner and Tenant Protection Program/\$89,944/\$85,036  
 The Center for Community Mediation and Facilitation, Inc./Community Services - Conflict Resolution/\$15,000/\$15,000  
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Women's Counseling Network (WCN)/\$30,000/\$25,331  
**Category Subtotal: \$445,444/\$331,002**

### **Emergency Food & Clothing Category**

#### **Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group, Inc., d.b.a. Arivaca Human Resource/AHR Food & Clothing/\$95,308/\$59,568  
 Arizona Diaper Bank/Diapers for Infants, Children, Disabled, and Seniors/\$42,357/\$31,684  
 Community Food Bank, Inc., d.b.a. Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona/Caridad Community Kitchen/\$50,000/\$34,962  
 Community Food Bank, Inc., d.b.a. Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona/Child Nutrition Program/\$40,000/\$30,126  
 Community Food Bank, Inc., d.b.a. Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona/Emergency Food Assistance Program/\$375,000/\$327,660  
 Community Food Bank, Inc., d.b.a. Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona/Rural Resource Centers and Mobile Distributions/\$80,000/\$76,159  
 IMPACT of Southern Arizona/IMPACT Clothing Bank/\$38,000/\$34,250  
 IMPACT of Southern Arizona/IMPACT Food Bank/\$40,000/\$38,086  
 Sahuarita Food Bank, d.b.a. Marana Food Bank & Community Resource Center/Emergency Food for Sahuarita and Unincorporated Pima County/\$100,000/\$42,305  
 Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/SAAF Food for Life/\$115,000/\$92,941  
**Category Subtotal: \$975,665/\$767,741**

### **Senior Support Category**

#### **Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Administration of Resources & Choices/Elder Shelter Coordination & Placement Program/\$55,179/\$41,863  
 Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group, Inc., d.b.a. Arivaca Human Resource/Senior Support/\$50,000/\$25,176  
 Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Older Adult Resource Program Specialist/\$22,500/\$15,000  
 Interfaith Community Services/ICS Mobile Meals/\$50,000/\$34,190  
 Interfaith Community Services/Transportation Services for At-Risk Seniors/\$50,000/\$33,806  
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona Meal Delivery Program/\$50,000/\$31,793  
 Southern AZ Assoc. for the Visually Impaired, d.b.a. Saavi Services for the Blind/Health and Wellness Program for Blind Seniors/\$20,000/\$23,065  
 St Luke's in the Desert, Inc., d.b.a. St Luke's Home/The Stronger, Longer Senior Dietary Program/\$29,010/\$27,669  
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Las Comadritas/\$40,000/\$29,394  
**Category Subtotal: \$366,689/\$261,956**

**Support Services, Shelter, and Domestic Violence Services Category****Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Catholic Community Services of Southern AZ, Inc., d.b.a. Pio Decimo Center/Case Management for Homeless Families/\$58,110/\$46,589

Interfaith Community Services/Eastside Emergency Financial Assistance/\$50,000/\$28,208

Our Family Services, Inc./Emergency Shelter-HFS/\$43,285/\$40,675

Our Family Services, Inc./HYS-Common Unity Program/\$27,315/\$27,569

Salvation Army/Emergency Shelter-Motel/\$30,000/\$15,000

Sister Jose Women's Center/Sister Jose Women's Center Gateway to Housing Programs/\$65,000/\$15,000

Soldier's Best Friend/Soldiers Best Friend's Service/Therapeutic Companion Dog Training Program/\$15,000/\$15,000

Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/SAAF AVP (Anti-Violence Project)/\$30,000/\$23,223

The Primavera Foundation, Inc./Casa Paloma Drop-In Center/\$45,000/\$30,126

The Primavera Foundation, Inc./Resource Center: Homelessness Intervention and Prevention Program (HIP)/ \$40,000/\$34,122

The Primavera Foundation, Inc./Supportive Housing Program - Resource Specialist Supportive Services/\$45,000/\$36,649

Tucson Centers for Women & Childrens, d.b.a. EMERGE! Center Against Domestic Abuse/Comprehensive Domestic Abuse Support Services/\$125,000/\$115,798

**Category Subtotal: \$573,710/\$427,959**

**Youth, Young Adults and Family Support Category****Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

3rd Decade, Inc./3rd Decade Financial Education & Mentoring/\$50,000/\$15,000

Arivaca Action Center Incorporated/Arivaca Early Learning Center/\$22,500/\$21,015

Arizona Diaper Bank /Potty Training and Cloth Diapers for Infants, Children and Families/\$26,240/\$15,000

Arizona's Children Association/Las Familias Program Support/\$40,000/\$32,763

Boys to Men Tucson, Inc./Healthy Masculinity Site Based Mentorship Program for Marginalized and Rural Communities/\$175,281/\$15,000

Chicanos por la Causa/CPLC Nahui Ollin Wellness Program/\$20,000/\$15,000

Child & Family Resources/Pima County Healthy Families/\$45,564/\$39,834

Girl Scouts of Southern Arizona/GSSOAZ EmpowHERment for All Girls/\$40,000/\$29,167

Greater Tucson Leadership/Tucson Youth Leadership Academy/\$50,000/\$15,000

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Family and Youth Resource Program/\$27,500/\$16,031

Higher Ground a Resource Center/Judo in Schools Programming/\$29,982/\$29,982

International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Ajo Las Artes: ABE, GED & Jobs Program/\$48,000/\$47,292

Literacy Connects/Literacy Connects Youth Programs/\$62,340/\$48,587

Make Way for Books/The Story Project/\$35,000/\$25,427

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Food Project/\$18,000/\$18,058

Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/SAAF ALLY (Arizona Life Links for Youth)/\$43,070/\$39,424

Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/SAAF EON Youth Lounge/\$39,575/\$29,162

The Center for Community Mediation and Facilitation, Inc./Youth, Young Adults & Family - Conflict & Communication Training/\$15,000/\$15,000

Tu Nidito Children and Family Services/Children to Children Grief Support Program/\$25,000/\$27,824

Tu Nidito Children and Family Services/Pathways for Seriously Ill Children and Their Families/\$15,000/\$19,097

Youth On Their Own/YOTO Program (Stipends)/\$110,250/\$121,912

YWCA of Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/\$50,000/\$42,881

**Category Subtotal: \$988,302/\$678,456**

**General Services Category****Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Arizona Sonora Desert Museum/Bufelgrass Education and Coordination/\$48,043/\$44,528

El Rio Santa Cruz Neighborhood Health Center, Inc./Patient Centered Medical Home/\$50,000/\$45,108  
 El Rio Santa Cruz Neighborhood Health Center, Inc./Trichloroethylene (TCE) Program/\$165,000/\$161,178  
 Friends Of Robles Ranch, Inc./Robles Food Pantry/My Friends Closet/\$53,137/\$47,978  
 Pima Council on Aging/Family Caregiver Support Program/\$22,000/\$17,578  
 Pima Council on Aging/Home Delivered Meals/\$50,000/\$17,658  
 Pima Council on Aging/Neighbors Care Alliance/\$70,000/\$55,978  
 Pima Council on Aging/Rights & Benefits, Older Adults/\$150,000/\$130,278  
 Pima County Community Land Trust, d.b.a. PCCLT/Housing Counseling/\$74,588/\$60,978  
 Sahuarita Food Bank, d.b.a. Marana Food Bank & Community Resource Center/Emergency Food for Marana and Unincorporated Pima County/\$200,000/\$200,000  
 Southern Arizona Childrens Advocacy Center/Services for Child Victims/\$77,713/\$70,538  
 United Way of Tucson and Southern AZ/Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program/\$44,563/\$26,000  
**Category Subtotal: \$1,005,044/\$877,800**

**CWD OUTSIDE AGENCY SERVICE CATEGORIES TOTAL: \$4,354,854/\$3,344,914**

**County Departments Managing OA Programs with Other Sources**  
**Agency/Program Name/Amount Requested/FY25/26 Recommendation**

Desert Survivors, Inc./Desert Survivors, Inc./\$67,760/\$67,760  
 Pima Associations of Governments/Pima Association of Governments Overall Work Program/\$298,000/\$298,000  
**Category Subtotal: \$365,760/\$365,760**

**OUTSIDE AGENCY PROGRAM TOTAL: \$4,720,614/\$3,710,674**

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to approve the item, with an amendment to remove the recommendation to the International Sonoran Desert Alliance (ISDA) in the amount of \$47,292.00 listed under the Youth, Young Adults and Family Support Category. No vote was taken at this time.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that ISDA in Ajo had a long standing partnership with the County, and there had been a recent budget reallocation of about \$47,000.00, which consolidated ISDA's funding into a direct allocation to simplify reporting and administration for the small organization and that the reallocation did not reduce the total amount ISDA received, but shifted the funding to a different contractual obligation under the County's Workforce and Community Development Department.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, explained that this was a two year continuation of the Outside Agency Program and in the second year they took the total amount that agencies requested in the first year, reviewed and adjusted them based on their actual spending rates, and that the Outside Agency Committee made their recommendations after that process was done. He added that the outside agency process was being moved to align with the Prosperity Initiative.

Supervisor Cano thanked staff and the Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee for their important work in reviewing applications amid limited resources. He emphasized the County's key role in their continued support of nonprofit agencies that partnered with the community.



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

## **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

### **9. Final Plat With Assurances**

P24FP00009, Blue Slate Acres, Lots 1-23, and Common Areas "A". (District 4)

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

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **10. Fiscal Year 2026 Expenditure Limitation Report**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 23, of the Board of Supervisors, designating the Chief Fiscal Officer for officially submitting the Fiscal Year 2026 Expenditure Limitation Reports to the Arizona Auditor General.

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

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Attractions and Tourism**

### **11. Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and professional, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing, General Fund, contract amount \$5,600,000.00 (PO2500015062)**

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

Supervisor Cano thanked the Board for his appointment as the representative on Visit Tucson, and the County Administrator for her recommendations to allocate more resources from the General Fund to Visit Tucson. He noted that the funding for that line item came from bed taxes and he praised Visit Tucson for their economic development priorities, their commitment to local priorities, local entrepreneurs, and businesses. He added that it was refreshing to see Visit Tucson's work grow and he supported this item.

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

12. Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing, and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$200,000.00 (PO\_24-454)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 11, for discussion related to this item.)

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

### **Community and Workforce Development**

13. Arizona Diaper Bank, to provide for the facility improvement project for warehouse upgrades, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$35,000.00 (PO2400012791)

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

14. Flowing Wells Neighborhood Association and Community Coalition, Amendment No. 1, to provide for operating funds and technical assistance, extend contract term to 4/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT\_24-419)

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

15. Job Path, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for workforce development services and job training assistance, extend contract term to 6/30/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$600,000.00 (CT\_23-459)

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

Supervisor Christy referenced the background materials, particularly Exhibit C, which presented performance metrics in percentages, such as employment in the second and fourth quarters after exit, and measurable skill gains. He stated that the majority of the index indicators were of a percentage nature, while Job Path claimed that approximately 250 individuals were involved in and benefitted from the program. He asked where the 250 individuals were in the performance measured and highlighted that the data showed percentages like 68.5% employed in the second quarter after exit and questioned what that percentage was based from. He stated that while the background materials referred to 250 individuals being involved in the program, the performance metrics did not use that number to show how many people were actually being measured. He stated that the background materials had not indicated how many people completed the program even though it had stated that 250 individuals were involved over the one year contract. He expressed

concern with the use of percentages since it was unclear what those percentages truly represented in terms of individuals who went through the program.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, explained that the contract aimed to align as closely as possible with the performance measures used in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act grants, which was why the data presented included percentages of those individuals who had completed a training program or who were employed in the second and fourth quarters after exit. He stated that the performance measures applied specifically to the 250 individuals covered under the contract.

Supervisor Christy asked if the 68.5% of those employed in the second quarter after exit referred to the 250 individuals.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy suggested reviewing the performance measures more closely for clarity on that level.

Supervisor Cano thanked Job Path for their incredible work in the community and he called the question.

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

16. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 9/1/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$320,000.00 revenue (CTN-CR-21-126)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the City of Tucson's (COT) initial contribution to the program. He recalled that the COT had originally contributed \$1 million, which was then reduced to \$750,000.00, followed by a further reduction to \$320,000.00, and eventually decreased to zero.

Chair Scott stated that Supervisor Christy's recollection was correct except the \$320,000.00 was the amount going into the program for the upcoming academic year. He indicated that there was a recommendation from the COT Manager for zero support and that the COT Mayor and Council acted to provide the \$320,000.00 that was reflected on the agenda. He asked the County Administrator if that was correct.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy indicated that was what he had in his notes as well, however, stated he recalled previous discussions that the funding would eventually be

reduced to zero. He asked what the County's plans were to make up the lost revenue and if that plan included an increase in the Library District tax rate again.

Ms. Leshar stated that staff would provide some granularity of exactly what they were doing and how they would move the funds. She indicated that initially, when the COT considered going to zero, there had been plans to eliminate a few classes in the Sunnyside and Amphitheater areas. She stated that with the \$320,000.00, they were working with the PEEP's program to adjust class sizes and make modifications to ensure those classes could continue.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that there were 46 less scholarships available that would be reallocated to help make up the difference. He stated that reallocation of individual scholarships to the school districts was the strategy in place at this time and that discussions about how to fund the remaining amount were still ongoing and expected to continue over the next year.

Ms. Leshar stated that the decreased funding from the COT was not going to be filled from the County. She stated that the County's commitment remained at \$10 million and the current approach involved reallocating scholarships up to \$320,000.00.

Supervisor Christy asked if an increase to the Library District tax rate was on the table.

Ms. Leshar responded no.

Supervisor Cano stated that this was his second or third time requesting, in writing, from the Administrator's Office, a more holistic plan for PEEP's. He expressed concern that the Board had yet to be provided with a plan that would protect children from the impact of the \$400,000.00 difference from the COT. He emphasized the importance of investing in children's futures, hopes, and potential, he urged the Administration to explore any available one-time grant contingency funds to avoid disproportionately harming kids and families in District 5. He noted that adjustments often meant cuts and he believed many of those cuts affected District 5. He requested more clarity from the Administration on how children would be protected and asked for a memorandum within the next two weeks.

Chair Scott indicated that Ms. Leshar was making a note of the request.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-0, Supervisor Allen was not present for the vote and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

17. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Cooperative Agreement, extend contract term to 6/30/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000634)

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

18. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Cooperative Agreement, extend contract term to 6/30/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000635)

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

19. City of South Tucson, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Cooperative Agreement, extend contract term to 6/30/29 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000636)

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

#### **County Administrator**

20. Humane Borders, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for water distribution services in the remote areas of Pima County, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$30,000.00 (CT\_23-378)

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

Supervisor Allen expressed her support for this item and stated that Pima County was a border county who shared approximately 130 miles with Mexico, which was one of the largest stretches of shared border with their largest trading partner. She emphasized the importance of recognizing the deep interconnectedness between the two regions and the shared responsibilities of the communities. She stated that the border crisis had persisted for centuries, and more recently since 1994 with the launch of Operation Gatekeeper. She stated that deterrence strategies aimed at making border crossings more difficult had proven to be a failed strategy and that the crisis had continued each year with the loss of countless lives. She stated that each loss served as a constant reminder of the need to stand up, protect life, and denounce failed policies that impacted everyone in numerous ways. She emphasized that the relationship with Mexico affected families, the economy, and communities in deep and countless ways that could be prevented. She acknowledged the well-understood causes of migration, including violence and brutality, which compelled people to leave behind their homes, families, and languages. She stated that the idea that water stations, such as those provided by Humane Borders, were drawing people to the border was a fallacy. She voiced strong support for their efforts and was appreciative of the volunteers across District 3, from Ajo to Tucson, who fueled life-saving efforts. She thanked them for their leadership, vigilance, and commitment to preserving human life.

Chair Scott indicated that his office recently received an email from the County Administrator inviting them to presentations by Dr. Hess, the Pima County Medical Examiner, on deaths in the desert. He stated that due to the nature and location of his work, Dr. Hess was an expert on desert-related deaths and could share many harrowing accounts, as could some of the other individuals who spoke at Call to the Public. He expressed support for the item, as he had consistently done each year since he joined this Board, noting that the funding amount had remained the same and was appreciative that Ms. Leshner would be informing the Board about additional ways the County was or could be supporting Humane Borders. He thanked his colleague from District 3 for her long-standing commitment to ensure that people in the borderlands were treated with dignity and respect.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

21. Racy Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for state legislative representation services, extend contract term to 9/4/27 and amend contractual language, General Fund, total contract amount \$400,000.00 (\$200,000.00 per year) (CT\_24-59)

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

22. Racy Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for federal legislative representation services, extend contract term to 9/4/27 and amend contractual language, General Fund, total contract amount \$400,000.00 (\$200,000.00 per year) (CT\_24-58)

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

### **County Attorney**

23. Audilett Law, P.C., Amendment No. 7, to provide for legal representation of the Pima County Sheriff's Department, Sheriff Chris Nanos, Sergeant Mosely, and Deputy Caudillo pertaining to the Bradley Lewis Matter, extend contract term to 7/12/26 and amend contractual language, Risk Management Tort Fund, contract amount \$100,000.00 (CT\_22-61)

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

24. Southern AZ Children's Advocacy Center, Inc., to provide for evidence collection services for children - evidentiary consultations, Anti-Racketeering Fund, contract amount \$15,570.30 (PO2500015170)

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

### **Development Services**

25. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 3, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for street naming and addressing services, extend contract term to 7/7/30 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000110)

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

26. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 3, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for street naming and addressing services, extend contract term to 7/7/30 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000111)

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

### **Economic Development**

27. Ajo District Chamber of Commerce, Amendment No. 4, to provide for Ajo Visitor Center: Gateway to the Sonoran Desert, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$48,000.00 (CT\_24-47)

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

28. DM50, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Davis Monthan Air Force Base Advocate; Economic Development Activities, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$50,000.00 (PO2400000026)

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

Supervisor Christy commended DM50 for their consistent and long term work which cultivated one of Pima County's biggest assets and encouraged economic development activities through their mission. He shared that he had attended a number of their events and meetings and appreciated their community engagement especially for their work with Davis-Monthan Air Force Base residents and enlisted personnel. He stated that the DM50 organization was passionate, effective and played a vital role in nurturing one of the County's key economic development assets and expressed his support for continued funding.

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

## **Facilities Management**

29. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the termination of the lease agreement for the TPD office within the Children's Advocacy Center of Southern Arizona located at 2329 E. Ajo Way, no cost (CTN-FM-CMS141464-2)

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

Supervisor Christy indicated that the 25 year lease started in 2008, he inquired about the cause of the termination and whether the City of Tucson (COT) was current on its lease payments.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, clarified that the item was not a termination of the lease. He explained that it involved a specific space within the Children's Advocacy Center that the Tucson Police Department (TPD) had previously used on a case-by-case basis and they no longer needed that particular space, but would continue to support the Children's Advocacy Center. He stated that the space could be reallocated, and there were no implications on the full lease that continued to be part of the agreement.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that the item specifically stated it was for the termination of the lease agreement for the TPD office, but Mr. Holmes had indicated that it was not for the termination. He requested clarification on whether it was for the termination of the lease.

Mr. Holmes clarified that it would terminate the lease agreement with TPD and that they did not pay any revenue under the agreement. He stated that they had only used the space and this agreement repurposed that space which had been part of the original agreement with them.

Chair Scott stated that TPD still maintained a relationship with the Children's Advocacy Center, as did the Pima County Sheriff's Department. He indicated that they were no longer using the space that they had been leasing.

Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy stated that in the background materials it indicated the lease would generate \$189,000.00 over 25 years, so there was a dollar amount associated with the lease. He indicated that while TPD may not have been using the space, the lease was through the COT, which included TPD. He asked whether the County was still entitled to receive the \$189,000.00 upon termination of the lease.

Mr. Holmes referenced page 2 on the document and noted that the lease remained at \$189,000.00 and removed TPD from the use of the premises.

Supervisor Christy asked if the COT was still going to lease it.



Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative. He stated that the \$189,000.00 continued to be part of the lease agreement and the only change was that particular space would be occupied by different tenants in the future.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be a different tenant then what was in the lease terms or if it would still be with the COT.

Mr. Holmes responded that in the program goals of the agreement, the recovered space could be reallocated to another agency or organization within the Children's Advocacy Center.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that it was a lease with TPD that covered 500 square feet on the second floor of the building. She stated that the lease remained in place and there would be continued collaboration with the Children's Advocacy Center of Southern Arizona across the entire facility. She stated that the space was a small office suite that had been used by TPD. She stated the more robust relationship between the Children's Advocacy Center and the COT would continue, just without that specific space for TPD.

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

#### **Forensic Science Center**

30. Graham County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for medical examiner services, contract amount \$500,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT2500000036)

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

#### **Information Technology**

31. Drexel Heights Fire District on behalf of Valley Emergency Communication Center, Amendment No. 5, to provide for data center racks and GIS services, extend contract term to 6/30/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, contract amount \$18,000.00 revenue (CTN-IT-20-89)

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

#### **Parks and Recreation**

32. Arivaca Community Center, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Arivaca Recreational Programming, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$60,000.00 (CT\_22-373)

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

### **Pima Animal Care Center**

33. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, Amendment No. 3, to provide a master cooperative agreement for philanthropic support, extend contract term to 6/5/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002321)

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

### **Procurement**

34. Cardinal Health, Inc., d.b.a. Cardinal Health 110, L.L.C., to provide for pharmaceuticals, Health Department Operations Fund, contract amount \$9,500,000.00 (SC2500000124) Administering Department: Health

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

Supervisor Christy requested a description of the pharmaceuticals.

Chair Scott indicated that Supervisor Christy's request was noted by the County Administrator.

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

35. Durazo Construction Corporation, to provide for Arthur Pack Park Reclaimed Water Irrigation System Improvements, Parks and Recreation Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$2,106,321.00 (PO2500016805) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

36. Anew RNG, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Renewable Natural Gas Management Services, extend contract term to 6/22/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount ~~\$1,500,000.00~~ **\$4,000,000.00** estimated revenue (SC2500000100) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

## **Recorder**

37. City of South Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the 2025 City of South Tucson Recall Election, contract amount \$12,000.00 revenue (CT2500000037)

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

## **Sheriff**

38. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for law enforcement dispatch services and the management of associated records, contract amount \$358,025.00 revenue (CT2500000029)

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

39. Saguaro National Park Arizona, Amendment No. 2, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for law enforcement dispatch services and the management of associated records, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$26,385.00 revenue (CTN-SD-23-107)

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

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

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

Arizona Community Action Association, d.b.a. Wildfire, to provide for the 2025-26 Utility Assistance Programs, \$483,217.88 (G-CWD-82495)

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

41. **Acceptance – Health**

Early Childhood Development and Health Board / First Things First, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the child care health consultation, extend grant term to 6/30/26 and amend grant language, \$865,125.00 (GA-HD-70298)

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

42. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Women, Infants, and Children and Breastfeeding Peer Counseling Programs and amend grant language, \$170,496.00 (GA-HD-78965)

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

43. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Family Health Partnership, d.b.a. Affirm Sexual and Reproductive Health, to provide for reproductive health services, \$24,673.00 (G-HD-82078)

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

44. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Medical Reserve Corps State, Territory and Tribal Nations, Representative Organizations for Next Generation, extend grant term to 5/31/26 and amend grant language, no cost (G-HD-70287)

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

45. **Acceptance – Sheriff**

Executive Office of the President/Office of National Drug Control Policy, to provide for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program, \$787,078.00 (G-SD-87144)

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

**FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

46. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 347145, Brandon Michael Ray, Dollar General No. 30375, 16500 W. Arva Valley 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 Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

**47. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 346683, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Casa Vera, 7265 N. La Cholla Boulevard, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

**48. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 347585, David James Cuoco, The Outlaw Bar & Grill, 1302 W. Roger Road, Tucson, Series 6, Bar, Person Transfer.

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

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**49. Hearing - Concurrent Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning**

**P24CR00001, 1722 INA, L.L.C. - N. SAN ANNA DRIVE PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING**

1722 Ina, L.L.C., represented by Bruce Woodruff, requests a concurrent plan amendment and rezoning to amend the Comprehensive Plan from Low Intensity Urban 1.2 (LIU-1.2) to Medium Intensity Urban (MIU) and to rezone from CR-1 (Single Residence) to TR (Transitional) zone on approximately .88 acres. The site is located on the northeast corner of the T-intersection of W. Ina Road and N. San Anna Drive addressed as 7200 N. San Anna Drive, in Section 34, T12S, R13E, in the Catalina Foothills Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted [5-3 Commissioners Gungle, Maese and Tronsdal voted NAY and Commissioners Lane and Cook were absent] to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

Completion of the following requirements within five years from the date the rezoning request is approved by the Board of Supervisors:

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
  - A. Traffic Statement shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Transportation within six months of rezoning approval. The traffic statement shall

- provide an analysis of the Ina Road/San Anna Drive. Offsite improvements determined necessary shall be provided by the property owner.
- B. The two existing access points on San Anna Drive shall remain, and direct access onto Ina Road is not permitted.
  - C. Access gate(s) are required to remain open during business operations.
  - D. All parking shall be provided on-site, and parking in the right-of-way is not permitted.
  - E. On-site access lanes and parking areas can be gravel, but the ADA parking space is required to be paved or concrete. ADA accessibility shall be provided through an accessible route from the parking space to the office.
- 3. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
  - 4. Cultural Resources condition: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State Laws ARS 41-865 and/or ARS 41-844 require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for the repatriation and reburial of the remains by cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
  - 5. Adherence to the sketch plan as approved at public hearing.
  - 6. The use of the property is limited to professional or semi-professional offices.
  - 7. Less restrictive rezoning applications may not be submitted under the approved comprehensive plan designation. A separate comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning are required for less restrictive zoning.
  - 8. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
  - 9. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."
  - 10. No residential uses are allowed.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing and approve P24CR00001, subject to standard and special conditions.

## 50. **Hearing - Rezoning Time Extension**

### P19RZ00008, UNISOURCE ENERGY CORP. - N. LA CHOLLA BOULEVARD REZONING

Plaza de Luna, L.L.C., represented by Jeffrey Stanley, requests a five-year time extension for an approximate 1.74-acre rezoning from the SH (Suburban

Homestead) to the CB-2 (General Business) zone, located approximately 270 feet south of W. River Road on the west side of N. La Cholla Boulevard, addressed as 5341 N. La Cholla Boulevard. The subject site was rezoned in 2020 and expired April 7, 2025. Staff recommends APPROVAL OF THE FIVE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION SUBJECT TO ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
  - A. In accordance with the 2016 Subdivision and Development Street Standards, a traffic memorandum is required at the permitting process. The memorandum should focus on determining if a right-turn lane is required for the site and the impact to existing bus stop location, queuing analysis for the proposed driveway and impacts to the driveway to the north. Coordination with Sun Tran is required to determine if relocation or improvement to the existing bus stop is necessary.
  - B. The property shall be limited to one (1) access point as depicted on the preliminary development plan (Exhibit B).
  - C. The design of the driveway shall be made to restrict vehicles from turning into existing southbound left-turn lane directly across from the proposed entrance.
  - D. Relocation/Removal of the existing guardrail shall be as determined by the Department of Transportation during the permitting process.
3. Regional Flood Control District conditions:
  - A. Fifty feet from the top of bank shall be dedicated, in fee, to the Pima County Regional Flood Control District.
  - B. At the time of development the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table A or B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.
4. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
  - A. The owner shall not construe any action by Pima County as a commitment to provide sewer service to any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner to that effect.
  - B. The owner shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
  - C. The owner shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
  - D. The owner shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
  - E. The owner shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

- F. The owner shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.
5. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s)/developer(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove invasive non-native species from the property, including those below. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the current property owner.
- Invasive Non-Native Plant Species Subject to Control:
- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Ailanthus altissima           | Tree of Heaven  |
| Alhagi pseudalhagi            | Camelthorn  |
| Arundo donax                  | Giant reed  |
| Brassica tournefortii         | Sahara mustard  |
| Bromus rubens                 | Red brome   |
| Bromus tectorum               | Cheatgrass  |
| Centaurea melitensis          | Malta starthistle                                     |
| Centaurea solstitialis        | Yellow starthistle                                    |
| Cortaderia spp.               | Pampas grass  |
| Cynodon dactylon              | Bermuda grass (excluding sod hybrid)                  |
| Digitaria spp.                | Crabgrass   |
| Elaeagnus angustifolia        | Russian olive   |
| Eragrostis spp.               | Lovegrass (excluding E. intermedia, plains lovegrass) |
| Melinis repens                | Natal grass   |
| Mesembryanthemum spp.         | Iceplant  |
| <u>Oncosiphon piluliferum</u> | <u>Stinknet</u>                                       |
| Peganum harmala               | African rue   |
| Pennisetum ciliare            | Buffelgrass   |
| Pennisetum setaceum           | Fountain grass  |
| Rhus lancea                   | African sumac   |
| Salsola spp.                  | Russian thistle                                       |
| Schismus arabicus             | Arabian grass   |
| Schismus barbatus             | Mediterranean grass                                   |
| Sorghum halepense             | Johnson grass   |
| Tamarix spp.                  | Tamarisk  |
6. Cultural Resources conditions: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
7. Adherence to the preliminary development plan (Exhibit B) as approved at public hearing.
8. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
9. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding ~~Proposition 207 rights~~ Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of



rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

Michael Baird, Owner, explained that they purchased the property just before the COVID-19 pandemic with plans to develop a commercial restaurant strip center with seating along the Loop, however the pandemic and rising interest rates disrupted those plans. He stated that they reconsidered their approach and decided to pursue a multifamily development on the property.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing and approve P19RZ00008, five-year time extension, subject to original and modified standard and special condition.

#### 51. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

##### P25CU00005, NOBLE-WOLFF ENTERPRISES, L.L.C. - S. SONOITA HIGHWAY

Noble-Wolff Enterprises, L.L.C., requests a Type II Conditional Use Permit for a winery tasting room in accordance with Section 18.13.030.B.40 of the Pima County Zoning Code, in the RH (Rural Homestead) zone located east of the S. Sonoita Highway approximately 3,500 feet southeast of the intersection of S. Sonoita Highway and S. Old Sonoita Highway, addressed as 18585, 18651, and 18655 S. Sonoita Highway. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

##### Standard Conditions & Requirements pre the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A winery tasting room is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.40.

##### Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

1. Size and location of the new tasting room is approved as shown in applicant materials.
2. Special events are limited to no more than ten (10) per year, with a maximum of no more than sixty-five (65) guests at an individual event.
3. The dirt road shall be maintained, including dust control, in advance of special events.
4. Surface treatment, such as gravel or decomposed granite so as to ensure dust control, is required for customer and employee parking areas.
5. Handicap parking space(s) shall be paved in concrete, and an ADA accessible route to the buildings on-site shall be provided from the parking space(s). Handicap parking spaces shall comply with Pima County Standards.
6. Customer parking is limited to 15 parking spaces.

Colton Noble, Noble-Wolff Enterprises, L.L.C., thanked Supervisor Christy for facilitating a meeting with Development Services Department (DSD) staff, noted that the permit process had taken about a year and it demonstrated effective government by working with the people. He acknowledged DSD, specifically Mr. Drzazgowski, for his support throughout the process.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing and approve P25CU00005, subject to standard and special conditions

**52 Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

P25CU00006, DAY, ET AL. - E. SAHUARITA ROAD

Darrell Rodney Day, et al., represented by James McMurtrie, requests a Type II Conditional Use Permit for a contractor's yard in accordance with Section 18.13.030.B.22 of the Pima County Zoning Code, in the RH (Rural Homestead) zone, located north of E. Sahuarita Road approximately 3,700 feet east of the intersection of E. Sahuarita Road and S. Wilmot Road, addressed as 6901 E. Sahuarita Road. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

Standard Conditions & Requirements pre the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A contractor's yard is allowed in the RH zone as a conditional use per Section 18.13.030.B.22.

Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

1. The proposed use is subject to approval of a site construction permit (SCP).
2. Regional Flood Control District review and approval is required at the time of the permitting.
3. Encroachment into the Lee Moore Wash West Flow Corridor is prohibited.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing and approve P25CU00006, subject to standard and special conditions.

**53. Hearing - Building Code Text Amendment**

P25TA00001, Building and Construction Update

An Ordinance of Pima County, Arizona; relating to building and construction; adopting by reference the 2024 International Building Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Residential Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2023 National Electrical Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Mechanical Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Plumbing Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Fuel Gas Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Property Maintenance Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Wildland-Urban Interface Code with local amendments (applicable only to areas designated rural forest village under the Pima County Comprehensive Plan and areas encircled thereby); adopting by reference the 2024 International Existing Building Code with local amendments; adopting by reference the 2024 International Swimming Pool And Spa Code with local amendments amending Chapters 15.04, 15.08, 15.12, 15.14, 15.16, 15.18 and 15.20 of the Pima County Code to reflect the amendments adopted by this ordinance along with previously adopted Board of Supervisors Resolutions. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (All Districts)

If approved, pass and adopt: ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 15.

Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA), expressed appreciation for stakeholder inclusion and commended staff member Dan Ice for his professionalism. He stated that SAHBA also supported delaying and forgoing the adoption of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) and that it would add \$3,000.00 per home in construction costs. He stated that there were two items that remained a concern and recommended the Board not adopt amendments to Sections E3901.4 and E4002.11 because they were unnecessary, an inconvenience to homeowners and that they should remain optional. He stated they also recommended that the Board direct staff to continue to work with stakeholders to mitigate further cost impacts.

Supervisor Christy sought clarification on whether SAHBA was requesting full rejection of the amendment or removal of specific items.

Mr. Lyons clarified removal of those two items specifically, and if there was an opportunity to address future added concerns over costs, that be considered as well.

Chair Scott stated the Board received a written request from SAHBA regarding this request and asked for a response from County Administration.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the request dealt with the receptacles, which the Code previously allowed the receptacles to be on the side of countertops and islands, but now it would be at the top. She stated that the amendments being considered were consistent with those adopted by the City of Tucson. She added that for years the concern had been the accessibility to children and that they sought of a unanimous recommendation of the group so that it was consistent with the national codes and the City of Tucson.

Camie DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that the current provisions on outlet placement were recommended by the Code Committee and were adopted by the City of Tucson. He stated staff's recommendation was to remain consistent across jurisdictions and incorporate it and they had accommodated SAHBA's request to not include adoption of the IECC.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Chair Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification whether the motion was to accept the entire code text amendment, as presented, including the items that SAHBA requested not be adopted with this amendment.

Chair Scott responded yes.

Supervisor Cano stated that he wanted to reiterate that uniformity was key and the fact that the City of Tucson had already adopted the same code and specific codes that the homebuilders had in question, it would not be prudent for the County to have a different set of rules, and he would not be able to support SAHBA's request.

Supervisor Christy stated that SABHA had been around for decades and were quite experienced in all of the iterations of the amendment over the years. He stated that they probably had valid reasons for not supporting the adoption of something and it was not a justifiable reason to follow the City of Tucson. He stated that he could not support the item as presented unless the amendments to those two sections were removed, as requested by SAHBA.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., clarified that there were two parts to the request by SAHBA, one was not to adopt the IECC, which was not recommended by staff and was consistent with what was adopted by the City of Tucson. He stated that the second request was with the provisions related to outlet placement and staff recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt it. He stated it was consistent with the joint City/County Building Code Committee which had deliberated and debated, and the City of Tucson adopted the recommendation from the Code Committee.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, to reopen the public hearing so that Mr. Lyons could address Mr. DeBonis, Jr.'s comments.

Mr. Lyons stated that Mr. DeBonis, Jr. was correct and that the request to forego the IECC code at this time as recommended was accurate as well as foregoing it in the future altogether. He stated that the additional two items remained, and upon deliberation and consultation with the National Association of Home Builders, believed that the two additional receptacles should be removed and be optional, but that was the Board's prerogative.

J.P. Salvatierra, Constituent, addressed the Board and requested that clarification be made in regards to whether these changes addressed the Americans with Disabilities Act and possibly aside from the precaution for children, that this might be a mobility issue that some adults with disabilities needed to have access to those receptacles.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Chair Scott to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance. No vote was taken at this time.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of August 5, 2025, for further discussion and clarification on these items, to provide an opportunity for collaboration between staff and SAHBA to come to a resolution. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Scott stated that the Board was back to the original motion.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay,” and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

Supervisor Allen requested to explain her vote. She stated that SAHBA had a seat on the Joint Code Committee, and they had recommended this amendment. She stated that they had a venue in which it was discussed and she felt confident with the recommendation that came forward from staff and the committee. She stated that she did not feel more time was needed for discussion or to probe it more for the Board to understand it.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **54. Hearing - Code Text Amendment Impact Fee Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 16, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Capital Improvements Funding and Development Impact Fees; amending Appendix A of Chapter 19.03 (administrative provisions) of the Pima County Code; amending Ordinance No. 2020-27.

Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA), thanked staff for their professionalism and responsiveness throughout this process. He stated they recognized the importance of planning for infrastructure needs that came with growth and supported the County's efforts to ensure a strong, resilient foundation for the future. He stated that at the same time, they knew that housing affordability remained a key concern for many in the region. He urged the Board to consider a five-year phase-in of the proposed development impact fee increases. He stated that a gradual approach would support a smoother transition, provide predictability for the housing market, and help balance infrastructure goals with a shared priority of keeping housing accessible for working families. He stated that SAHBA valued the partnership built with the County and looked forward to continued collaboration on solutions that advanced the region's housing needs.

Supervisor Christy asked Mr. Lyons if he was in support of this code text amendment on impact fees.

Mr. Lyons responded in the affirmative.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that the recommendation included a five-year phase-in fee that they had working on with SAHBA and appreciated their input. She stated that all of the new fees would take effect in October and it was a five-year phase-in, as requested.

Kathryn Skinner, Director, Department of Transportation, explained that their slide presentation was largely similar to what the Board had seen in her prior visits. She stated that slide five and six showed the five-year phase-in which was the department recommendation.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **55. Environmental Impact Reviews (EIRs) Policy**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to present to the Board of Supervisors by the September 2, 2025 Meeting of the Board, a policy to require the completion of Environmental Impact Reviews that provide policy makers and the public with a robust analysis of the environmental and environmental justice impacts of proposed economic development projects in Pima County. The EIRs should include, but not be limited to, immediate and cumulative impacts to the quality and quantity of all relevant water sources; energy demand and generation requirements; and the compatibility with Pima County Climate Action Plan, the Conservation Lands System, the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, and Multi-Species Habitat Plan. The EIRs should be made available to the public along with economic analysis of the projects' impacts. The proposed policy should define triggers for the completion of an EIR as well as who conducts the analysis. (District 3)

Supervisor Allen stated that after conversations around Project Blue and the decisions, one of the difficulties or challenges was that the Board received economic analysis from the number of jobs created directly and indirect wage investment numbers, but did not receive an analysis of the environmental impacts. She referenced earlier comments about concerns from the community with water and air, and the land was so critical to economic development. She stated that if the Board had an understanding when given the opportunity to consider economic development projects that they should also receive some analysis of what the impact would be on water, energy, air and land. She stated that this item was a proposal for Administration and staff to create a policy that would integrate and define exactly how this would work, and an environmental impact analysis or review that would correspond with and be combined with the economic analysis of proposed economic development projects.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy that taking any action on both or either of these measures at this time could be seen as an attempt to influence or prejudice the deliberations of the City of Tucson Mayor and Council on a matter coming before them and would be tantamount to exposing the Board of Supervisors and Pima County to potential litigation and to table the items until the second meeting in September. The motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Scott stated that the last sentence of Supervisor Allen's item read, "The proposed policy should define triggers for the completion of an Environmental

Impact Review (EIR) as well as who conducts the analysis.” He asked what “triggers” meant.

Supervisor Allen stated that not all projects would require an environmental impact analysis and the question would be defined in the policy of whether or not a scope and scale at which an environmental impact analysis would be necessary.

Chair Scott asked when did departments that dealt with environmental concerns on development projects typically weigh in and how would this item change or enhance their work.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that this would define a very clear policy and a process and that while they worked with the other departments and asked for feedback, they would provide a very specific roadmap so that all the departments saw when and if they could and how they could ensure that their comments were reflected and it would provide a more formalized process.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that when economic development projects came through and the economic development team worked on it, there was continual engagement with County staff, as well as other agency partners and jurisdictional partners. He stated that in each instance, the economic development team would work with departments, regulatory departments, permitting departments, infrastructure departments so there was an ongoing dialog that happened back and forth. He stated it formalized a process that stated there would be an economic analysis and there would be an environmental review. He stated that it was not that those conversations were not happening with County agencies currently but it would bring that forward. He stated that he would envision a structure similar to what they did for reviewing environmental aspects of private rezoning properties. He stated that there could potentially be a questionnaire developed that was provided to business prospects that would be internally reviewed by the departments for formal agency responses, and that a lot of the interaction that currently happened was via verbal dialog and email correspondence and what he heard was that there should be a formalized document presented and brought back to the Board.

Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Economic Development, explained that they engaged with every one of these regulatory departments from day one and that sometimes these projects came to them at various stages. He stated that one of the things that he could attest to, through the Department of Environmental Quality, was that the earlier they connected with them, the better. He stated that went for all departments, because there was a little bit of a time perspective they went through with these different information gathering and regulatory processes that existed to obtain these different permits, public hearings, all the things that were required through established policies and procedures currently in place. He stated that if what he had heard was correct, a formalized policy or presentation of that policy, and what that process looked like was something they could iron out and could

discuss the specific components of what an economic environmental impact review might look like and be developed along the way as directed by the Board.

Chair Scott stated the item also said, "The EIRs should be made available to the public along with economic analysis of the projects' impacts." He asked who completed the economic benefit analysis for Project Blue, and inquired about the involvement of County staff.

Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi responded that the actual analysis was completed by Sarah Murley of Applied Economics, and the inputs were provided by the Chamber of Southern Arizona, in conjunction with Beale Infrastructure. He stated there was a model developed and used by Applied Economics for specific types of projects, whether it was manufacturing, technology, or campuses which were then put into that model and the model came out with that economic impact analysis.

Chair Scott stated that with the recommendations that came to the Board in September, the environmental impact reviews were to be done by staff, there would still be the ability for outside entities like Applied Economics to weigh in on the economic benefits analysis but there could be staff input.

Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi responded in the affirmative and stated that if there was a level of analysis that County departments could complete on the environmental side and in conjunction with the City of Tucson and utility providers, they would. He stated that it would not take away the opportunity for them to work with a third-party entity on an economic impact analysis as well. He stated that whatever that alignment looked like, they could figure out exactly how to communicate that. He pointed out that not all of it could be made public and it touched on the non-disclosure agreement component and those would end up having to be developed contemporaneously if they were to achieve the goals put forward by the Board.

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

Supervisor Cano thanked his colleague from District 3 for bringing this item forward. He stated that the process was definitely one that was needed to ensure that public trust was upheld in future discussions related to economic development projects. He stated that the only thing he would ask was for staff to be mindful of trying to figure out how they would work with private partners like the Chamber, in making this happen. He stated that the unusual situation that had happened in the last couple of weeks was that the data was not controlled and it was a private entity, so that ambiguity was going to be really important for them to look at. He stated that he looked forward to supporting the policy and reviewing the County Administrator's report on September 2nd.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was absent.



**56. Use of Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) in Economic Development Projects Policy**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator, in collaboration with the Pima County Attorney's Office, to present to the Board of Supervisors by the September 2, 2025 Meeting of the Board, a policy regarding the use of NDAs in economic development projects. The proposed policy should include, but not be limited to, how the use of NDAs reflects Pima County's commitment to government transparency and provides sufficient and timely information that enables sound policy making decisions as well as robust public input. (District 3)

Supervisor Allen stated that this was for the use of NDAs in economic development projects policy. She stated that the proposal was to direct the County Administrator to work with the Pima County Attorney's Office to present to the Board, at the September 2nd meeting, a policy regarding the use of NDAs in economic development projects. She stated that the proposed policy should include, but not be limited to, how the use of NDAs reflect the County's commitment to government transparency and provide sufficient and timely information that enabled sound policy making decisions, as well as robust public input. She stated that this was an item in reflection to the process around Project Blue and the use of NDAs. She stated that she had repeated an analogy that this was being a wrecking ball as opposed to a scalpel, and what she hoped that they could get to was that the use of NDAs were precise in determining the type of information that made it a make-or-break deal, but no more than that. She stated that even in that, they had a clear analysis that the impact of that was not one at the detriment of the overall good or detriment to their ability as a Board to make effective decisions for the County and for constituents.

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

Chair Scott stated that he had voted differently than Supervisor Allen on Project Blue, but they agreed they would have benefitted from having more information to weigh and so that was why he would support the item. He stated that the Board was aware that before and after the Project Blue items, that the County Attorney's Office played a significant role in preparing NDAs when requested. He asked, generally, how NDAs were drafted, who was involved and to provide as much that could be shared about the process as it currently existed and how this item might change things.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, explained they worked with County Administration and the contracting parties or the development parties. He stated there was template used by their Business Transactions Unit under Supervisor Bobby Yu. He stated that for consistency, they promoted use of their template which was reviewed and updated. He stated that it had been reviewed over the past few weeks and if there was a conflict, as with any contract negotiations, details were worked out so the end product was not always the same, but they tried starting with their template every time.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that the vast majority of their use of the nondisclosure ran through the Procurement Department that dealt with contracts. She stated that when they dealt with Microsoft or other computer companies, on occasion the Board received a confidential packet of information because there was a variety of information that was proprietary to that organization. She stated that some of the cost structure and some of the health care, pharmaceuticals and things like that were considered and were usually run through the Procurement Department in coordination with the specific agency or department making the purchase. She stated that what she heard from Supervisor Allen was the need to look closely at the difference between the magnitude of a problem or a concern, like an economic development organization to bring a company in and evaluate the impact on the community and the need for public information related to that versus what the internal pricing structure might be within an organization with which they contracted to buy office supplies. She stated that was the way they were currently used but it could be differentiated and would figure out a different way to find an analysis that allowed them to provide for confidentiality in a public environment.

Chair Scott stated that would still allow the County to be competitive with other jurisdictions because one of the things he was hopeful to hear from staff, he agreed with the intent of the item to provide more transparency to both the Board and the public, but realized that might also be a fine line in terms of putting Pima County in a position to lose out on opportunities due to asking for things that perhaps other jurisdictions did not.

Ms. Leshar responded that they would look at how to implement this and there would be another discussion for when the policy was brought back to the Board. She recognized the need to consider the confidential information and stated that Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi was checking with other jurisdictions. She stated that any government entity that dealt with economic development opportunities like this had reviewed and scrubbed any number of ways in which to deal with that information. She added whether it was brought into an executive session was also a concern, because that remained private, but how the process was developed allowed for public involvement in public processes like this was something they had been looking at. She stated that Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi was the incoming President of the Arizona Economic Development Association and they were working with partners around the State and around the Country to look at best practices and what they could craft for the Board.

Supervisor Cano echoed some of the concerns made by Chair Scott. He stated that he did not want this policy to hurt Pima County's economic advantage and that sometimes could end up happening in these kinds of really targeted recruitments. He stated that the Administrator needed to explore all options and perhaps not to even come up with a recommendation of which lane to enter. He stated that the Board wanted a robust input and best practices from throughout Arizona and certainly throughout the nation, and determine where the County could do a better job at this. He stated that this was where his concerns had come from. He stated that this Board and all of the regionally elected jurisdictions that had jurisdiction over

these issues needed to have some level of engagement. He stated that they could not leave it to private entities to make decisions that ultimately taxpayers were on the hook for and that was where he thought the spirit of the motion was from District 3. He expressed support for the policy, contingent on it not hindering economic development efforts, and stated that he looked forward to Administrator Leshner's findings.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

### **57. Request to Waive Liability Insurance Requirement for Ajo/Gibson Volunteer Fire Department's Fireworks Display**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Requesting a waiver for the requirement of the \$10 million liability insurance condition for Ajo/Gibson Volunteer Fire Department's approved Fireworks Display on July 4, 2025.

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

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

### **58. Meet and Confer Memorandum of Understanding**

Staff recommends approval to extend the Memorandum of Understanding with American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Arizona Local 449 through September 30, 2025.

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

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that members of the Meet and Confer Committee had been identified, they would meet and provide an amended agreement to the Board for consideration, but they wanted to ensure that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) remained in place until it was completed within the next 90 days.

Supervisor Christy asked why it had been extended for three months.

Ms. Leshner responded that the Committee had recently convened with representatives of both the County and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSME), and they would be discussing an amended MOU that would be brought back to the Board. She stated that both sides requested 90 days to continue those conversations and she recommended the current MOU be extended so that it remained in place prior to the approval of the new agreement.

Supervisor Christy asked if it correct to assume they had not come to any agreement and needed more time to work through certain items in order to continue with this MOU that was the cause for the three-month extension.

Ms. Leshar responded no, and reiterated they had recently received all the names of the individuals participating in the Committee and did not believe an initial meeting had occurred. She stated that there were no concerns or that there would be any disagreements, they simply needed to convene and meet over the next 90 days.

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

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

59. The Chamber of Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide economic development support services for Pima County and Southern Arizona, General Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (PO2500018868)

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

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

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to reduce the contract amount to \$300,000.00 and shift the balance of \$250,000.00 to the Pima County Economic Development Department.

Upon roll call vote, the substitute motion tied 2-2, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

Chair Scott stated that the Board was back to his original motion.

Upon roll call vote, the original motion tied 2-2, Supervisors Allen and Cano voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was absent.

Chair Scott clarified that based on the Board's Rules, a tie vote resulted in postponement of consideration of the item until the next regular scheduled meeting.

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

60. **Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission**

Appointment of Jane Kroesen, to replace German Quiroga. Term expiration: 6/30/31. (District 2)

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

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **61. Approval of the Consent Calendar**

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 3 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was absent, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

\* \* \*

## **PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY**

### **RECORDER**

3. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993 200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the entire Fiscal Year 2024 and July through May Fiscal Year 2025.

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

Supervisor Christy expressed concern regarding this item since it went back to July of 2023 and the Recorder's Office had not submitted their reports since that time, which resulted in nearly two full fiscal years without the reporting of income. He stated that that item should not have been placed on the consent agenda, but instead on the regular agenda. He stated that the fund balances showed a decrease by over \$1 million, after the Recorder waived roughly \$500,000.00 in potential revenue, and two years of declining revenue with no explanation other than being impacted by high volume election cycles. He indicated that in 1993, the Board passed a resolution that required regular reporting by the Recorder and pointed out that previous County Recorders had also managed high-volume election periods. He stated that the background materials referenced inconsistent housing market trends and questioned what that had to do with balancing the equivalent of a checkbook for two full years. He questioned why the declining fund balance had not been addressed sooner and whether there would be any ramifications with the Auditor General.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that she had met with the Recorder and confirmed that the required reports would now be submitted

regularly to ensure transparency and to understand any fluctuations. She assured the Board that the current report had been fully reviewed, audited, and verified for accuracy through May and for the last two years. She stated that the Recorder understood the importance of submitted regular and ongoing reporting moving forward.

Supervisor Christy asked whether the situation could be characterized as sound financial reporting.

Ms. Leshar stated that while the funds had likely continued to be audited and reviewed internally, the issue was the lack of reporting to the Board. She stated that everyone wanted regular reports moving forward, in line with proper audit and accounting principles, to ensure checks and balances.

Supervisor Christy expressed disappointment that the reports had not been submitted to the Board over the past two years and there was an absence of any explanation for the prolonged delay and incomplete reporting. He pointed out a \$1 million decrease in revenue since the fund's inception and questioned why the Recorder had waited so long to report and whether this delay could lead to trouble with the Auditor General.

Supervisor Cano called the question.

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

\* \* \*

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

1. **Temporary Extension**  
12104129, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Union Public House, 4340 N. Campbell Avenue, Nos. 101, 102, 103 and 104, Tucson, August 16, 2025.

**ELECTIONS**

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Donna Corbin-215-DEM, Samuel Kalter-215-DEM, Michael Aaron-176-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Jose Malvido-001-DEM, Alison Erdmann-062-DEM, Cynthia Gardiner-085-DEM, Hector Tamayo-086-DEM, Holly Ives-093-DEM, Blake

Walker-105-DEM, Lila Dessen-107-DEM, Bryan Hanks-149-DEM, Robert Holloway-179-DEM, Rachel Shoop-215-DEM, Joe Bridges III-224-DEM, Summer Miller-234-DEM, James Behra-239-DEM, Gilbert Rice-241-REP

## **RECORDER**

3. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the entire Fiscal Year 2024 and July through May Fiscal Year 2025. (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

## **RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

4. Minutes: March 18, 2025  
Warrants: June, 2025

\* \* \*

## **62. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:23 p.m.

---

CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK

## CONTRACT AND AWARD

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

59. The Chamber of Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide economic development support services for Pima County and Southern Arizona, General Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (PO2500018868)

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott  
JA: Supervisor Allen  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AC: Supervisor Cano  
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator  
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator  
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board  
JS: Joe Snell, President and CEO, The Chamber of Southern Arizona  
FM: Fletcher McCusker, Treasurer, The Chamber of Southern Arizona  
JR: Judy Rich, Immediate Past Chair, The Chamber of Southern Arizona

---

RS: We are now going to move to our time certain item. This is Addendum Item No. 5, the Chamber of Southern Arizona Incorporated, to provide economic development support services for Pima County and Southern Arizona, General Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00. I want to point out that not only is staff available to answer questions, we have Ms. Leshar and Mr. DeBonis, but we also have Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. I just wanted Supervisors Cano and Christy to know which staff members were here and we also have from the Chamber of Southern Arizona, Mr. Snell, Ms. Rich and Mr. McCusker, who can answer questions from Board members. Ms. Leshar, any initial comments or presentation from staff on the recommendation?

JL: Mr. Chair and members of the Board. What you have before you today is just a continuation with slightly adjusted scope of work to enhance the specifics required over the upcoming year. Those have all been noted. Whatever has been updated has been noted in a memorandum of the 27th explaining how we continue to work with Sun Corridor, and it is recommended the continued level of funding for the next fiscal year, but as you note, staff is happy to answer any specific questions.

RS: Alright.

JL: Thank you.

RS: Thank you very much. Let us go to comments/questions from Board members and they can be directed at staff. They can also be directed at our guests from the Chamber of Southern Arizona.



SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yeah, thank you. I am excited about this merger of the two entities at this particular time, and I am supportive of their request. One question I must ask, because it has been posed to me by several chambers that are in Pima County, two of which are in my district. Will this, do you think, invite the other chambers to ask the County for financial support? And I think that maybe Ms. Leshner could address that.

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Christy, we do support the Ajo Chamber at this point in time, so I know that it is, any chambers may come forward and ask for consideration, and that will be up to the policy direction of the Board, but given the unique nature of the Ajo Chamber they have come to the Board and received funding. That is the only chamber that has approached us directly. My hope is with the consolidated organization, that there is a recognition that we continue to support the economic development opportunity that is really the lead of the Chamber of Southern Arizona, and not the advocacy portion that is the chamber.

SC: Thank you.

RS: Any other questions, Supervisor Christy?

SC: No thank you.

RS: Alright, thank you. Supervisor Cano, you have your hand up?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. My question is for Administrator Leshner. Administrator Leshner can you give us an overview on how this amount was decided? \$550,000.00. Can you also tell us what other jurisdictions are paying into the Chamber of Southern Arizona? It is my understanding that the City of Tucson has an annual contribution that is much less than the \$550,000.00 that we are providing.

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. I will look to others to help me with this number and particularly the second quarter. I believe that the City of Tucson is \$50,000.00. Board dues at \$50,000.00, which again, I think the distinction that was just made, if you could not hear it, Supervisor Cano from Mr. Snell, from the Chamber, is that the City of Tucson pays board dues, as do, I believe, other jurisdictions. The County has been unique in a slightly different partner from the get go as the regional partner, and we have seen ourselves in. If you look at the amended scope going into this, all the communication from the Chamber of Southern Arizona goes not only to Pima County, but for us to work with the region.

We came in at a larger level from day one because of what we believe to be the regional responsibility we have as the County. We work with the economic development officers of all the jurisdictions and other partners as well, so it is that historic participation negotiated up to ten years ago with the County that has led for the difference. We do not just pay the board dues. We have a regional responsibility. Mr. DeBonis, Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, is there any additional comments you would like to make? No? You are good. Thank you. Supervisor Cano, did that answer your question, sir?

AC: Thank you, it does, and I have one more if Chair Scott will permit it?

RS: Please go ahead.

AC: I want to thank Administrator Leshner for the additional information that you sent our way yesterday in response to some questions. I am concerned that with this \$550,000.00 contract that was approved by the Board last year, that in quarters one, two and three, the Chamber submitted to the County only 23 jobs created for that \$550,000.00. Members of the public are ought to hold Pima County to the same high standards that we hold both the public and the private sector to, and I am pleased, Administrator Leshner, that there has been some number crunching in the quarter four report to indicate that the Chamber is, in fact, creating more than 23 jobs in one year but I do have to say, it is unsettling that received two memos with zero activity on the job front, Administrator Leshner, and so I am curious what additional guardrails we would like to continue having with the Chamber as they merge into this new and empowering entity that I know has lots of potential.

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. I think we have looked at a variety of ways in which we communicate with the Chamber and report to the Board in additional scope of work and amendments in the upcoming contract. I can tell you that our economic development staff and Deputy County Administrator DeBonis met regularly with representatives of the Chamber, and I think the most significant relationship we have comes through Chair Scott, who serves not only on the Board but on the executive committee for the Chamber. I think that day-to-day participation in the operations will allow us to continue to monitor and to tweak whatever might need be in terms of how we receive the reports and the updates on progress from the organization. I can tell you sometimes the amount of work and the energy that goes into the hopes to bring a new company into the community, it can take a while to see the return on that initial investment and I think that is what we have seen historically. It can be several quarters, if not a year, before we see the actual numbers come in that report on those jobs. The rest of the time, I think what you see is the ongoing relationship that exists between our staffs working together on behalf of the region. But there are others in the room who are the experts and can easily speak to that, in terms of why. I was less concerned about the zero for some quarters, as long as I know that there are things that remain in the pipeline, and that there is ongoing work that occurs every day to make sure that we are continuing to

look at what I believe is the critical mission, which is to increase the per capita income of every individual who resides in Pima County.

RS: Any follow up Supervisor?

AC: No, thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Any of our guests, would you like to respond to the question, provide some additional information for the Board?

JS: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board, Administrative Leshner. Thank you for allowing me to be here. My name is Joe Snell, and I am the President of the Chamber of Southern Arizona. Real briefly, we have some key players with me here today. I have Fletcher McCusker, who is the Treasurer of our organization, and Judy Rich, who is the immediate past Chair of the organization. I will just say from initial comments, really do appreciate this partnership that that goes back a long time, 20 years. The County was a founding member of this organization, one of the few groups that helped found it and we have done some significant things over the last 20 years. Over 200 companies brought in to this market, 60,000 jobs created, which a lot of times those numbers get lost. What does that mean? Well, that means people going to work and that is really important. I would stress a couple things. Our efforts are additive to the County's economic development efforts. We do not compete, we do not have duplicate services. Not one industry sector could do everything and we represent a very large, diverse group of leaders across multiple industries, whether that be government, industry, business, small business, large business, academic sectors, both the U of A, Pima community College and we do that all under one roof, so we are very much of a convener of those drivers. And about 90% of all employment is represented in the halls of this organization and we think that is very important that we have that kind of diversity as we try to solve our biggest problems. Anyway, I will not go on, I would say that, yes, to Supervisor Cano's question, the jobs do not line up linear all the time and we have a very strong fourth quarter with several companies. I will be honest, it has just taken longer this year. We forecasted some announcements earlier, but in a presidential election year, things tend to get a little wonky where companies hold back and then I will be frank, some of the policies coming out from the federal government with tariffs have really stalled some things. I think we are on a better pace looking forward to next year and we were thrilled by it. I am going to shut up and ask Fletcher McCusker to say a couple words as our Treasurer. Thank you.

FM: Good afternoon.

RS: Gentlemen, when you are done, please stay up here because I know Supervisor Allen also has some questions.

FM: Sure.

RS: Mr. McCusker?

FM: Chairman Scott, members of the Board. I think you know me. I am new as the Treasurer of The Chamber. I like to call it kind of like The Ohio State. You referred to it as the Chamber of Southern Arizona, but I am honored to be an officer. I think I bring something to this Board as it merges that concern you and frankly, I have a very strong history as both a public company CEO and the Chairman of Rio Nuevo around transparency and conversations about government funds. A couple of things that address Supervisor Cano and Christy's question. The money we receive from you does not go to salaries or travel or our regular operational expenses. It is used almost exclusively for marketing. Who do we market to? Well, we market to site selectors. If you are not familiar with the site selector world, it is a very competitive environment. Companies like Caterpillar and others that we have been a participant in select consultants to identify targeted cities, and we compete for their attention, so your \$550,000.00 almost goes exclusively to marketing and hosting those kind of people. I think we can do a better job showing you where that money goes and we are certainly not opposed to a quarterly report that can identify, to the dollar, what kind of expenditures we are making on behalf of the region. To Steve's point and to Jan's point, you are the only government partner that we have. You are the only government partner we choose to have, because the City jurisdictions tend to be very parochial if they want to contract within their own geography. You represent the region. We represent the region. Our goals, we believe, are therefore aligned and we do more with you than just give you a board seat. We tend to work together to identify and recruit companies that matter. The other thing that we provide that I know is a challenge for you, and it is an agenda item today. We do it confidentially. We do it without disclosing the company, they choose to work with cities anonymously. It is in fact demanded of us, Caterpillar's a great example. Caterpillar was codenamed, they did not want their employees to know that they were moving their company. Each company has a different reason for why they do not want it to disclose. The most recent project, a lot of things that identify them, they did not want to disclose to their competitors. We can operate under an NDA on your behalf, and we are approached weekly, daily with companies that are inbound that will not come to a government jurisdiction for fear that their identity cannot be protected. \$550,000.00 is one seventh of our new budget. I have only been at the Chamber for a few weeks, but I can tell you that we have integrated both the budget of the former Chamber and the budget of Sun Corridor. Now, this \$550,000.00, which is our only outside government contract, represents one seventh of our budget. The seven X times your budget all comes from the private sector. It comes from the attraction side, which is the former Sun Corridor. Those are executives of companies who want to be passionate about how we recruit. Not only do we pay a significant amount of dues, but we participate hours and hours of our time to recruit, entertain, visit with tour, inbound executives who only go through other CEO's. You have to remember our network is this community's 70 best CEO board members. By combining with the chamber, we now represent over a thousand small businesses that are going to be equally attractive we believe in the supply chain. Our budget is balanced for this year. It is a break-even budget. Every dollar that comes in to this organization is going up. There is no room for reserve. We have had a combined two organizations, two offices. Again, all of your money goes to marketing, any

reductions in that, the only thing that is going to hurt is our ability to market the region. And I think it is incumbent on all of us, particularly post Project Blue. When the identity of that company gets announced, Tucson is going to be on everybody's radar in the world. We do not want it at this time and place, diminish our ability to respond to them. We have an unbelievable pipeline. I think it was shared with you in the most recent report. We can share it with you every quarter if you want but what they are facing is this unbelievable activity. To Supervisor Cano's point, our jobs come in spurts. Over the 20 years that we have been involved, we have created 60,000 new jobs, 60,000 jobs but they come in spurts. There will be quarters where there is zero, there could be 2 or 3, or maybe a year where there is zero. It does not mean we are not working behind the scenes to attract those companies, so we urge you to continue this at the current level for staff's recommendation. If there is anything we can do to be more accountable to you, to be more transparent to you, to share with you on a regular basis where this money is going. Right now, we talk about where it is not going. It would be very easy for me to provide a report to you that shows you to the penny where this money has gone, and we are available for questions. I think Judy wanted to close.

RS: Thank you, Mr. McCusker.

JR: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board and staff, thank you for the opportunity to be here today to speak about an organization that I think very highly of. As a person who had the privilege to be the Chair of this organization for three years and work with the people who are still there, because we do not have a lot of turnover, and now with this great opportunity with the Chamber, I believe that this organization has integrity. I have heard a lot of numbers, I am not going to repeat one of them, but to tell you that the integrity and the transparency of this organization is something I believe in, and I have seen the effectiveness, so I just add my voice to those of Joe and Fletcher to say that we appreciate the opportunity to be here and appreciate your support.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Rich and I know that Supervisor Allen had some questions, perhaps for you, but perhaps also for staff. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you for being here. I am looking at the Prosperity Initiative, which is just a cornerstone of our vision for Pima County and how we build prosperity across the region and so there are four goals within the Prosperity Initiative that relate to economic development and raising all ships in our community. If you will bear with me, I will read through them. One, is "Prioritizing workforce development for low-income job seekers," and I will not read you the detail of it. Second, is "Improving job quality for workers, which is improving...expanding employment capacity of employers already offering quality jobs, with quality jobs defined as those that provide competitive, equitable and self-sustaining wages, family friendly benefits and practices, and consistent scheduling." The third, is "Improving financial capability, improve the financial capability of low-income families, small businesses to increase their access to fair Credit, and to gain and protect income and wealth building assets." And then the fourth, is "Increasing small or micro business

ownership and expansion opportunities, so increasing ownership expansion opportunities, prioritizing entrepreneurs of color, women-owned businesses and businesses operating in high poverty neighborhoods.” I read through the contract, spent some time on the Thrive in Tucson website and I am interested in learning more about how our goals align those four goals within the Prosperity Initiative and there is other goals, obviously, but how those align and how we would work together to accomplish those.

FM: Thank you for that. The merger will enable that substantially more than the Sun Corridor as a standalone agency. Our business historically has been attractive. We react to people that are interested in coming here. They are typically very large companies, they are competitive with Caterpillar, we competed with Denver, so that focus is on the fortune 50 for the fortune 100. Generally, we have had very little to do with small business, small business empowerment, small business diversity, small business microlending. That has been the Chamber's job almost entirely merged now. We have a new interest in both sides of that coin and again, your funding is primarily on the attraction side. But with your private sector partners and now with 1,500 or so small businesses, we can indeed focus more on improving the lives of small businesses. It is not lost on us that these big companies coming to town are going to need local supply chain vendors, construction companies, plumbers, electricians, drywallers, suppliers, retail, housing, rental housing, so now for the first time, as an executive staff, we get to focus on both sides of it. We have never really been in a position to do it.

JS: Okay, maybe I can add that...very great answer. Supervisor Scott, members of the Board. We needed to evolve from just pure recruiting and at the end of the day, issues like childcare, the barriers of childcare become much more important to our economic health so a group like ours now is looking at this diversity of issues that feed into the prosperity initiative and I am going to have Judy talk about it. One of the issues that we identified before the merger, was we had a critical, absolutely alarming shortage of physicians in this community. The old Sun Corridor could not have addressed that. The new chamber is, and I am going to let Judy talk about that, because it is something that keeps me up at night, and I am glad we are addressing it.

JR: Supervisor Allen, when I hear you go through that quality-of-life list and listening to all the goals of Pima County, I am very challenged to understand how we take on such a huge challenge in this community for quality of life, for higher wages, better housing. My subcommittee right now, is working on how do we get more doctors here and every time we have to recruit anyone to our County, to our region, it is always about jobs, trailing spouses, education and health care. So to Joe's point and Fletcher's point, I think we have a really good muscle now with our merged organization to not leave any unanswered questions on the table and to really dig in. We have a whole army of people we did not have before, before we were merged.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Allen?

JA: We have a long history, and it is an acclaimed history of land preservation, conservation and now staff are involved in developing a comprehensive Climate Action Plan and thinking about the land conservation piece, the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, nationally awarded and recognized. These are some of our land, our water, our air, are some of the things that define us from our national parks that border the valley and then extend beyond through other national monuments, etcetera. How do those values of conservation and protection of these important places including preserving our water for generations to come? How do those infuse into the attraction of industry and business here?

JS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. It is a great question. We are cautious. We do not want the assets that got us here to disappear but we do respond to the market. The market will tell us what they are looking for, which industries, we do not actually get to go cherry pick industries. There are industries that are a good fit for us and based on our skill set of our employees. I would just say this. It is very important that we have discussions, and we work so closely with Jan and the team is we have a pretty good sense of which industries are off limits. An industry might come and find us and say, we would like to set up shop, but if they if they are not a good fit, we might hit it off the path. I will give you a great example that maybe is not so much on the environmental side. We actually manage the foreign trade zone for Pima County, and it is a federal program. It is all about tariff relief that companies can apply to reduce certain tariffs, very important now with what is going on in Washington. Well, we sat down with the County very early and said, "What do we need to do?" Because part of the foreign trade zone can be a reclassification of property tax. And what we found very early is the County said, "Here is the deal, we are not going to let the school districts take any hits on property tax." We will be very honest, as the administrator of that foreign trade zone, to say it is off the table, do not even ask, so we have some latitude with that. The other thing is, we are not in the business of fighting the environmental plan. We have a blueprint that was designed that had input from over 6,000 people. We had Carolyn Campbell be a part of that. We had the environmental groups. It does take an entire community, and we have got to balance our values as a community. We are not the ones to say what is good or bad necessarily, but I think we have a pretty good sense of what does not land here and what does. Ultimately, that is your decision though, to decide if it is a good fit. We are going to bring opportunities, but we try not to bring opportunities that we feel are going to fail immediately based on the values of this community. I hope that answers it.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JS: You want to offer?

FM: I would just mention and direct you to the current pipeline report that is in the most recent quarterly report. You look at those, you will see sustainable manufacturing, sustainable energy. We understand the region. We understand the resources. Project Blue is water positive. It is the only time any of us have seen a data center

that can actually replenish water. They chose to come to Tucson because of how we view the environment. They could go to Phoenix and not have to be water positive. They could go to a lot of places and not even worry about building a pipeline from one end of this County to another, just to attract reclaimed life. I think we can deliberately strategize with you on things that create sustainable use of our resources. At this level you participate. Your Chairman participates with us in what we call the Chairman's circle, so Chairman Scott has a seat at the same table that I do. He sees deals very early, and all he has got to do is say, we are not going to support this. I think it is important to understand you have a very different voice with us, than any other jurisdiction in the region.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano, give me just a second, because Supervisor Allen had some follow up questions, and then I will call on you next, sir.

JL: How do we handle, because Chairman Scott is one vote among several on the Chairman's circle, so how do we handle conflicts? As I spent some time reading through the Thrive in Tucson website, there is a significant emphasis on mining. We just passed a resolution a couple of weeks ago calling on the protection of Ironwood National Monument, which is now under threat from shrinkage due to interest in expanding mining operations into some of those lands. How do those conflicts, which are bound to happen, around our priorities versus some of those that I have seen touted on the web page?

FM: I cannot imagine we would ever bring a mine to this board. However, Caterpillar is based here, Hexagon mining is based here, Axiscades, which is an engineering firm that relocated here from Calcutta. There is a lot of intellectual property in this community building new mining technology. Caterpillar here is 100% focused on autonomous vehicles, creating sustainable mining. The University of Arizona just identified the four top priorities under the new leadership of President Garimella. Mining is among them, Space and Defense, AI, Healthcare, and Fusion another possibly very controversial topic. I think there is a way all of us coalesce around things that make mining appealing, but do not necessarily need to build a mine. We recognize that in this Board for 20 years, so you are not going to see us bringing a mine to you. I think there is a lot of mining tech, however, that is interesting to us and Caterpillar has been the base for that. Most people were shocked that they were located in a County that is so anti-mining, but it is because of the resources that are available to them and the fact that they have a training facility a few miles south of us to demonstrate this new technology. I think that is another reason it is important for you to have a voice. We do not vote in that meeting. There is no majority sends something. If any of us believe something is unaligned, we can stop it. I think Joe is right, we know, intimately, what you are looking for, what the region is looking for, and we have got plenty to choose from. Phoenix has 110 data



centers. We will never want to be, but can we support 2 or 3 or 4 with sustainable energy and sustainable water crop.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Last question.

RS: You are fine.

JA: It is about the use of NDAs and it has risen to the surface. I was aware of the commonplaceness of them within economic development, and it hinders, or they can. And depending upon the scope of the NDA, can hinder me as a Supervisor, to be able to make good decisions that reflect the interests and the constituents who I am sworn to represent in the interests of Pima County, as in the complexity of the needs and realities of the County. There was some language within the contract about information being shared with us as it could be, given the use of NDAs, if you all sign an NDA. I am just wondering how do we negotiate that, of the transparency of information such that we get the information that we need in order to be responsible and transparent and accountable to our constituents?

RS: Let me interject before you answer Ms. Rich, because I think that is a question from Supervisor Allen that I would also like to have staff respond to because my understanding is that there is dialog between the Chamber of Southern Arizona, and staff, any time an NDA is proposed. I am going to ask staff to also respond to your question if that is okay. Ms. Rich?

JR: Well, I might want to wait until after staff answers this, but I am going to tell you this, Supervisor Allen, when I became involved with Sun Corridor, coming from healthcare, where we have HIPAA laws about strict confidentiality about ever sharing anything. I was extremely impressed with how effective the confidentiality is in the process through the use of NDAs and Joe taught me very early that nothing can leak because we can give you story after story about something that went bad because it leaked. I recognize and respect the need for NDAs but I also believe that there is never a reason why we would not under the strictest confidentiality, make sure that the right people here were in the loop.

RS: Thank you. Ms. Leshner, could you respond to that or anyone you may choose to designate?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott. I am going to ask Mr. DeBonis or Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. Carmine, you want to give it a shot?

CD: Chair Scott. Joe, if you can step aside so I can see both Supervisors, sorry about that. The County enters into to Non-Disclosure Agreements and I know that has caused a lot of discussion and led to some agenda items that we are going to hear from the Board on today and understand that there is opportunity to go ahead and refine our process and improve our process. I will say that entering into a non-

disclosure agreement does not prevent us from talking to other partner agencies and jurisdictions. In the case of Project Blue, others have entered into non-disclosure agreements with that entity and so we talk with the Chamber of Southern Arizona. We work closely with them. We work with the City of Tucson and their economic initiatives office. They also entered into a non-disclosure agreement, so it does not preclude us talking to other agencies and jurisdictions that also have entered into those agreements. We work with Pima Community College, we work with the University of Arizona. In this instance, we work with Tucson Water, which is a municipally operated utility but we also worked with Tucson Electric Power and so I think that the presence of a non-disclosure agreement in the case of this recent project has led people to believe that information was not provided from which the County or others could make decisions. I understand that certain details were not disclosed and I will indicate to you that in some of our past initiatives, as we approached bringing actions for Board consideration with the client, with the business prospect, the decision was made to release information so that those details were available to the Board. In this particular instance, working with this client, they uniquely had indicated that they were concerned that it would disclose proprietary operations that would lead to the ultimate identification of the user on the site. I understand that we need to do better in this area but as has been said, the use of non-disclosure agreements in the economic development world are common. It does not mean that we necessarily need to conform. If folks know up front what our expectations are and how we are going to seek to have information provided and distributed, they can come into that eyes wide open. I think this is an important topic for us to refine. I think everyone here has a common goal, and as you mentioned, Supervisor Allen tied directly to the Prosperity Initiative, to increase economic stability and wealth in this community and investment in this community, job creation. We are all on the same page with that. It is that we need to smooth out some of the process in order for us to be able to do that comfortably and for you all to be able to respond to questions that you are receiving, so I hope that adds some context to the County's role in that and how we work with others in this area of economic development.

RS: Thank you, Mr. DeBonis. Supervisor Cano, you had some other questions you wanted to ask?

[Supervisor Cano shakes head, 'no']

RS: No?

[Supervisor Cano gestures with a 'thumbs up']

RS: Okay, alright.

FM: Chairman Scott, Supervisor Allen?

RS: Mr. McCusker?

FM: The NDA issue is our client's wish, and it is not so much information as it is the identity of their target. They are in a very competitive environment. They move very stealthily, particularly in large data tech worlds. They do not want their name in the public domain. Makes it really hard for a government entity to approve something on a nameless basis. However, they have made it crystal clear to us that if our name gets out there, we are done, we walk, so it is an all or nothing proposition with someone of that scale that says to us, do not let this get leaked and we can provide you the information, the scale, the scope, the jobs, the location. There was some things about this particular project that were so proprietary that they could be used to identify the end user, the amount of water, the months that they do not cool, other size and scope, energy consumption. They were concerned that that would allow a competitor to identify who it is. They want to be the first mover in this space, and they have made it crystal clear to us, and you have it on the agenda today. I think, you know, with legal's help. I just do not know how we cross that bridge without losing the client.

RS: Thank you, Mr. McCusker. I am going to go ahead and make a motion. I am going to recommend approval of the contract with the Chamber of Southern Arizona for the period of July 2025 to June 30, 2026, in the amount of \$550,000.00, as recommended by the County Administrator.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. I have some comments that I want to share with my colleagues. The County really is the region's leader in economic development. We have demonstrated that throughout our long standing support of Sun Corridor International since its inception. I want to commend our staff, especially Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, for the revisions to our Economic Development Strategic Plan, which was put together with a regional focus and is, by the way, attached to this contract that we are voting on. Because it was vetted by the Federal Economic Development Administration it is going to have benefits not just to the County, but also to the cities, the towns, the tribes. I watched during the time that I represented the County on the RTA Board, I watched County staff, especially Ms. Leshner and Mr. DeBonis, lead this region to compromise, including giving up County projects so that we could move forward this most significant infrastructure decision for the entire region. The new contract and its emphasis on regional support, making sure that the cities, the towns, their chambers, their economic development officers have a seat at the table and that their voices are heard through ours. The merger of Sun Corridor International and the Tucson Metro Chamber strengthens our regional voice, and I feel that we need to stand by them at this critical stage. This merger has just happened. It was encouraged not only by people within our region, but by our partners at both the State and Federal level. I also want to reassure my colleagues, as someone who has a seat on both the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee of that Board of Directors, that I am always going to protect our interests as the County, and that I am also going to ensure that what is stated in this contract, in terms of other regional voices being heard, is always

respected. I appreciate that the motion was moved and seconded. Any comments or further discussion on the motion? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I would like to offer a substitute motion to reduce the contract amount to \$300,000.00 and to shift the balance of \$250,000.00 to Pima County's Economic Development Department. I suggest this for a number of reasons. I believe strongly that our greatest economic development assets, it is our community, and it is our lands, it is our air, it is our water. These are the things that define who we are and their preservation intact over the long-term of generations will continue to be our asset that plays out with ripple effects. I want to ensure, I want to invest, in the County's Economic Development Department that is more tightly linked to the complexity of values of the County. I value the role of formerly Sun Corridor, now Southern Arizona Chamber, and especially the fostering of growth and development of small businesses and that leadership. But I also want to make sure that, and especially at these moments, that our economic development efforts are strong and robust and can help drive forward the complexity of visions and value of Pima County. My substitute motion is to move forward with the contract but at the reduced rate of \$300,000.00.

RS: And your motion also directs that the additional \$250,000.00 go to the County's Economic Development Department?

JA: Yes, correct.

RS: Is there a second to that motion?

AC: Yes, I seconded it already Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Motion is moved and seconded. I am not going to be able to support it. I want to draw my colleague's attention to the comments by the County Administrator when she made the recommendation. I am happy to talk about reductions in our level of support to the Chamber of Southern Arizona when we take up another contract at this point next year. But I think at this late stage in the game, given not just the recommendation from the County Administrator, but also the discussions that she and staff have been having leading into that recommendation with the Chamber and its representatives, I think we are going to be demonstrating ourselves as good partners, especially at this crucial stage in the new organization's development if we stick with the original recommendation. I am not able to support the motion. Unless there is further discussion, let us do a roll call vote on Supervisor Allen's motion.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No.

RS: Alright, so we will go back then to...

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes.

MM: Actually, it is a tie vote and due to the tie vote, it results in postponement of consideration of this item until the next regularly scheduled meeting, which will be July 15.

RS: Okay, so that also has the same effect, Ms. Manriquez, on my original motion?

MM: Chair Scott. I believe so, but we can ask Legal Counsel.

RS: Okay, Mr. Brown?

SB: Chair Scott, can you repeat the sequence of events? I was having a hard time following.

RS: That is okay. I made a motion to approve the contract at the level recommended by the County Administrator. Supervisor Allen made a substitute motion to reduce that amount to \$300,000.00 and to send the balance to the Economic Development Department. That motion resulted in a tie vote, so our question to you is, is the whole item moved forward to the 15th, or do we also do a vote on my motion which has not been voted upon?

SB: I believe we revert to your motion, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Brown. We have a motion on the table to recommend approval of the contract with The Chamber of Southern Arizona, for the period of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026, in the amount of \$550,000.00. We will also do a roll call vote on that motion. Ms. Manriquez?

MM: This is a roll call on the original motion for approval. Supervisor Allen?

JA: No.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: No.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. According to the Rules of the Board, because there is a tie vote, this item moves forward to our next scheduled meeting, which is July 15th. Thank you all very much for being here and thank you to staff as well.

DRAFT