

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, September 2, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair
Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
**Steve Christy, Member
Andrés Cano, 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 Heinz joined the meeting at 9:57 a.m.

**Supervisor Christy 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 Justine Hernandez, Librarian, Eckstrom-Columbus Library.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passing of Joe Caesar, a community member and native Tucsonan who attended Sunnyside High School and the University of Arizona, and had a career in the real estate business. He indicated that he had been an active church member and would be deeply missed. He requested a moment of silence for Mr. Caesar.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Heinz for his hours of service with the Regional Transportation Authority, because he knew it took a lot of time and effort. He also thanked Administrator Leshar for her leadership on the Technical Management Committee (TMC).

Chair Scott acknowledged Supervisor Heinz, Administrator Leshner and Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr., for their time on the TMC.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. Nic Clement, Ernest McFarland Citizen's Chair in Education, Northern Arizona University, proclaiming the day of Thursday, September 25, 2025 to be: "LEGENDARY TEACHER DAY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Scott made the presentation.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Pima County Office of Emergency Management, Town of Marana, Town of Oro Valley, City of Tucson, American Red Cross, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Tohono O'odham Nation, and Community Organizations Active in Disasters, proclaiming the month of September 2025 to be: "PREPAREDNESS MONTH"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item. Chair Scott made the presentation.

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Luke McKee addressed the Board regarding Detective Fabian Pacheco, who he alleged made a threatening phone call to him in February and despite filing a public records request, he received no response. He also raised concerns about a court case that involved a police corruption informant.

Betsy Wilkening urged the Board to cancel Project Blue and future data centers. She stated that they were a step in the wrong direction and that it was imperative to act on climate change.

Jordan Walker spoke regarding the Board's decision to approve Project Blue despite public opposition and environmental concerns and indicated that the project prioritized developers over the community.

Roma Lamor expressed opposition to Project Blue noting its secrecy, high energy use and lack of community benefit. She urged the Board to reject data centers and stated that the company could not be trusted to care about the community.

Kielly Lewis spoke in opposition to the Project Blue land sale and raised concerns about massive energy and water use, that would pose risks to the power grid and rate payers.

Jon Ralston voiced opposition to Project Blue and that he viewed it as an existential threat to the community.

Julius Schlosburg addressed the Board regarding Project Blue and that it threatened two rare, nearly extinct fireflies unique to Southern Arizona, which relied on fragile ecosystems.

Jeff Wirth spoke on behalf of No Desert Data Center Coalition, and expressed strong opposition to the Project Blue land sale.

June Williams voiced her opposition to Project Blue and that it was a harmful project that did not benefit the community. She warned of rising energy costs, environmental damage and AI driven job loss.

Erica Braymen addressed the Board regarding the Tucson City Council's decision on Project Blue and standing with the community. She asked the Board to honor their voices and not move forward with closing the land sale.

Anna Zappia urged the Board to terminate the Project Blue land acquisition agreement, noting the City of Tucson's unanimous rejection of annexation and called for the end of Project Blue.

Renee Peters addressed the Board and spoke about the deal that was approved on worthless economic projections and how the City of Tucson had rejected the annexation. She indicated that the deal favored Amazon's profits over the community's interests and called for new studies.

Derrick Espadas voiced his opinion on Beale Infrastructure's harmful challenge in scheming behind closed doors. He urged the Board to honor their land acknowledgement statement by protecting the community and future generations.

Jacob Prebler spoke against Project Blue and that approving it during a historic megadrought was obsolete. He emphasized that the affected energy prices would worsen future generations.

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz emphasized that a project of this magnitude must be built on trust, which the developers did not have. He highlighted the developers' own words "no annexation, no closure" and stated that those words were clear to him.

Lee Ziesche expressed opposition to Project Blue and asked the Board not to close on the land sale. She noted the large energy use, water use and impact on public health and called for the creation of a countywide public power utility, which was already being looked at by the City of Tucson.

Russell Lowes addressed the Board and stated that this background was in power plant economics and contract management. He urged the Board to cancel the

Project Blue related land sale and that failing to enforce contract terms could lead to lawsuits.

Rob Tomlinson spoke about the importance of RTA Next to the community. He praised the Board for their efforts.

Colleen McCarty expressed her appreciation to the Board for their support of RTA Next and emphasized the importance of regional planning. She explained how it supported her daily life and questioned how the region would meet the challenges.

Noah Dayton, Arizona Transportation Builders Association, thanked the Board for moving RTA Next to a March vote. He explained that the plan benefited both the community and Southern Arizona's economy.

Glenda Avalos spoke in opposition to Project Blue and thanked Supervisors Allen and Cano for their support. She called for vigilance from the Board.

Logan Phillips addressed the Board in opposition to Project Blue. He indicated that the Board was repeating past mistakes by prioritizing economic development.

Robert Reus expressed his opposition to Project Blue and the RTA Next plan. He proposed an alternative countywide sales tax plan that would give corporate municipalities more control.

Rolande Baker urged the Board to stop Project Blue, highlighting the impact on the desert and water resources. She provided her judgment on Chair Scott's decision to support the project despite constituents' opposition.

Toni Gosinski spoke about the City's unanimous rejection of the land sale for Project Blue, which resulted in her wanting the Board to reject it as well. She stated that Project Blue was biased, had no community benefit and she asked for better communication since that was lacking with this project.

Roberto Jaramillo voiced his opposition on Project Blue and questioned why the Native American community members were not included in the discussions. He praised the City Council's vote against the project and asked that the Board keep future generations in mind.

Tiffany Tocok highlighted the harmful cognitive health effects of the noise pollution from data centers that were close to schools and asked the Board to not close on the land sale.

* * *

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to extend Call to the Public.

J.P. Salvatierra addressed the Board and read a verse from 'A Tale of Flodden Field' by Sir Walter Scott.

John Thompson expressed his frustration with being singled out for a storage container that had been on his property for over 15 years, and offered to have it moved out of view.

Ori Green thanked Supervisors Allen and Cano for their opposition of the land sale to Beale Infrastructure. She criticized their dishonesty and urged the Board to stop the sale and protect the community.

Tom Prezelski, Senior Political Advisor for Rural Arizona Action, dispelled the myth that only Tucson and Pima County opposed the Project. He stated that Phoenix, Mesa and Chandler had passed ordinances to put control on data centers and asked the Board to reconsider their stance.

Raelyn Orozco asked the Board to deny the land sale for Project Blue. She indicated that the City of Tucson Mayor promised the project would not pass and called out Amazon's support of surveillance technology targeting low-income communities.

Joanne Shepherd addressed the Board on public health implications of hyperscale data centers. She highlighted that blackouts caused by grid instability would lead to serious health risks, especially during extreme heat.

Asa Ramsey expressed her concern for Tucson's community and water. She indicated how difficult it had been to participate in the process and urged the Board to join in opposition.

Reed Spurling spoke about the Supervisors' individual priorities and asked for them to stick to them while they considered data center developments. He stated the environmental impacts that would be caused by Project Blue.

Eden Enriquez spoke about the lives lost due to extreme heat and their inability to pay for air conditioning. She asked the Board to have the best interest of every generation and to reject Project Blue.

Marisol Winfrey Herrera expressed her disappointment in the Board's vote and asked them to think about humanity. She spoke on the false claims about water impact and praised Supervisor Allen for her strong support in the community's fight against Project Blue.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Christy requested that staff assist the constituent who had trouble with their storage container on their property and how they could resolve the situation.

Supervisor Allen thanked everyone for doing their research and standing up for their needs and priorities.

Chair Scott thanked everyone for their patience, for listening when others were speaking and reserving their applause until after each speaker was done. He stated that he shared Supervisor Allen's compliments and if anyone felt it was difficult to reach any of Supervisors through their district offices during this process, they could contact the Clerk of the Board's office and any comments would be provided to each district office.

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 10:55 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 2:17 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion related to Non-Disclosure Agreements.

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

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction related to Project Blue.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that direction had been provided and his office would proceed with that direction.

No Board action was taken.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. The Board of Supervisors on August 18, 2025, continued the following:

Plan for Foreign Direct Investment from Mexican-based Companies

Discussion/Direction/Action: Update on the Creation of a Plan for Foreign Direct Investment from Mexican-based companies.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained at the Board's last meeting there was an initial discussion about the plans for initial phasing of a plan to develop foreign direct investment. She stated that at that time, Supervisor Allen had requested an understanding of what organizations currently did and to include in what parts of Mexico, and that memorandum had been provided to the Board.

Chair Scott stated that he was comfortable supporting the recommendation from the County Administrator for the \$100,000.00, as outlined in the August 15th memorandum, but was not comfortable supporting anything beyond that unless and until more was reported to the Board on the components of this strategy. He asked if there was any role for the Chamber of Southern Arizona based on the County's contract with them. He stated that he would also like more detailed information regarding the alignment of the Economic Development Strategic Plan and what it meant in terms of transparency on the effectiveness of the County's overall foreign direct investment efforts and its partnership development. He referred to the memorandum and asked who and what they meant and what were the purposes and goals for foreign direct investment delegation visits in Pima County and in Mexico. He also requested more details on the ramifications of the additional development consideration of a range of methods for business attraction and expansion, including talent attraction.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item, as outlined in the County Administrator's memorandum dated August 15, 2025. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen thanked Director Vescovi-Chiordi and Administration for providing more information. She stated that she was a huge champion of the value that there was for Pima County and its proximity to Mexico and the other relationships they had in the region. She stated that most concerning to her about this proposal was that it would take \$1 million from a contingency fund that was eight months into a four-year administration that had caused unprecedented havoc on the social safety net that would then shift down to the County and local government to have to try to stitch back together. She stated that while she supported this, she would not allocate 10% of the contingency fund. She stated that they had already heard about the impacts, cuts and strains on the Health Department and on critical programs within Community & Workforce Development. She added that nonprofit community organizations were requesting Board assistance to problem solve for shortfalls in funding that impacted meals for seniors, access to food for refugees to other communities within the County. She hoped this could be fleshed out and moved forward in next year's budget round, especially given that it would be drawing from the contingency fund and it was something that required a build-up over time and that the payoff would happen over time. She reiterated her concern with the strain on the contingency fund and the current budgetary state.

Chair Scott asked whether the County Administrator could respond regarding the recommendation to allocate the figure from contingency funds and explain its implications in both short and long terms.

Ms. Leshner explained that they would explore ramping up and allocating these dollars through the year, with \$100,000.00 being funded for the year. She stated that the full amount would not be spent all at once, but monitored throughout the year to be able to identify the consultants. She stated it would take a while to find the partnerships and where offices might be located and so their hope as the year progressed, was to find other opportunities for cost savings that could accommodate some very difficult financial times this year and the next.

Chair Scott added to that point and stated if there was a role that the Chamber of Southern Arizona played along with their contractual obligations to the County, it might be a way of addressing some of the concerns shared by his colleagues.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he understood Supervisor Allen's concerns and in light of what was happening at the federal level, he felt the County should do as much as it could because Mexico was their largest trading partner. He stated it required a ramp up, but the time to start was years' prior and expressed concern over the ongoing uncertainty at the federal level, including tariffs and alienating trading partners like Mexico. He stated that this was something not only the County, but other jurisdictions should also be looking to do to the best of their ability. He expressed his support for this initial modest investment and for more information as they moved forward into the next budget cycle to inform how it could further be fleshed out.

Supervisor Cano stated that he could not support the item as recommended and he was concerned with not providing the Economic Development team the staff power needed to be able to execute its duties. He stated that the background materials showed it was more along the lines of ongoing expenses rather than one time, and so he would rather have a robust conversation about what the County's commitment meant for this really important effort. He shared concerns about using contingency, given the fact that it was limited to \$1 million. He stated that he would support a proposal that increased staff power in the Economic Development team and additional programming to support initiatives like those advanced by the District 2 office and this proposal, but could not endorse the recommendations as presented.

Chair Scott stated that what he understood from Supervisor Cano's comments was that he would rather have this worked into a discussion of next year's budget.

Supervisor Cano clarified that in his opinion the Economic Development's team should have more than three full-time employees currently allocated, which the City of Tucson had outperformed the County on every day. He stated that it had been expressed in numerous ways that this be part of next year's budget, but it was not only with this item.

Chair Scott requested a roll call vote.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, asked Supervisor Scott to restate his motion.

Chair Scott clarified that his motion was to accept the recommendation, as outlined in the County Administrator's memorandum dated August 15, 2025, to expend \$100,000.00 from contingency.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Supervisors Allen, Christy and Cano voted "Nay."

13. Proposed Policy for Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) in Economic Development Projects

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed policy for NDAs in Economic Development Projects.

Chair Scott stated that both this item and the following item had been placed on the agenda by Supervisor Allen on July 1, 2025, and that the Board had received staff recommendations based on that earlier vote.

Supervisor Allen thanked staff for their thoughtful work in developing the proposed policy and was proud of the work that had been done. She stated that it was a reflection of some gaps that emerged within the Board's body of policies throughout the process of Project Blue that prevented them from having some good governance practices, having democratic participatory practices, full public engagement, and ensuring that government bodies had the information needed to make good, effective decisions, when those decisions could land in their laps. She stated that she had reached out to a number of organizations and some experts around NDAs from around the country and other municipalities to find policies in place. She stated that one thing she found was that very few states had contemplated statewide legislation, but in fact, what Pima County was considering was groundbreaking and would ensure there were clear definitions, practices and sunshine periods in place. She stated that something incredibly important within the policy was that it created a 90-day sunshine period, which meant that before any County public body made a decision, be it the Planning and Zoning Commission, or the Board, 90 days prior to that decision, the NDA would conclude and this correlated with the following proposed policy item for the enhanced due diligence and environmental impact review. She stated there would be full disclosure of the project details and what the potential impacts were on land, air, water, climate, health, etcetera. She stated that it also narrowed the scope of what was considered proprietary information, and she had been using the phrase around wanting the precision of a scalpel rather than a wrecking ball when it came to what was covered within NDAs. She added that the policy broke down and defined what key terms would not be included in NDAs and defined who was covered in the NDA, which had been a point of contention and the Board found itself in a position with Project Blue, where they were informed of being signatories or subject to the NDA, but at the same time, were told that they could not get any information because of the

NDA. She reiterated that clarification around who was in and out, what that meant and what information they had access to and did not, based upon whether they were in or out of the NDA. She stated that all those clarifying pieces were incredibly important to good policy making and good public engagement. She suggested a couple of amendments that would provide clarification. She stated that in Section E. it currently stated, "Public disclosure of the project details shall occur no less than 90 days..." etcetera.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen to amend Section E. to read, "Public disclosure of all materials collected per Board Policy 31.4, Enhanced Due Diligence Process for Pima County Economic Development Projects, shall occur..." and then continued with the existing language. She stated that this would ensure it was known what materials would be disclosed to the public, that it was clear and would be a reference back to an existing policy.

Chair Scott inquired about Policy 31.4.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was the following proposed policy that would be considered on the agenda, they were linked to one another and would be contingent upon approval of 31.4. She stated that if it was approved she would like a reference to be included in Section E.

Chair Scott asked Legal Counsel if the Board could consider proposed Board Policy 31.4 before this item.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative and as described by Supervisor Allen, would be contingent on the approval of following item and if the following item failed, then the revision would not be included.

Chair Scott seconded the motion. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano asked for clarification if this was regarding the overall ordinance or on the motion.

Chair Scott stated it was for the motion.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

It was then moved by Supervisor Allen to amend Section H. to read, "All County employees, excluding Boards of Supervisors and their staff, unless specifically named as signatories to the NDA in accordance with applicable laws." She stated that Board members wanted to participate in the NDA since it was a political decision and they should be able to have the option of whether to be part of the NDA or outside of it. She stated that it would provide some clarity for what Board members should or not have access to. She added that ultimately those were political decisions that elected Board of Supervisors should make based on an

understanding of what constituents would expect from them and where they wanted to be.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, requested clarification if the proposal would be to exclude members of the Board of Supervisors and their district staff.

Supervisor Allen responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Cano seconded the motion. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was concerned about the legality of these amendments. He asked if this should be continued for public review, they were not publicly posted, and there was no opportunity to let the public know about these proposed amendments. He added that he was concerned that it might be some sort of violation before the Board could proceed.

Chair Scott asked Mr. Brown to respond to Supervisor Christy's concern as the Board's parliamentarian.

Mr. Brown responded that he was unaware of a public review requirement for a policy change, but would find out that information.

Supervisor Christy clarified that the Board had seen the memorandum and it was posted and it allowed the public to review it, but it was being amended before the Board voted on them. He asked whether it should be publicly posted before any final vote was made.

Mr. Brown responded that decision was up to the Board.

Chair Scott stated that there was a motion and second on the floor and asked that the Clerk read that motion.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, asked Supervisor Allen to restate her motion.

Supervisor Allen stated that the amendment would read, "All County employees, excluding Boards of Supervisors and their district staff, unless specifically named as signatories to the NDA in accordance with applicable laws."

Chair Scott asked Supervisor Cano for confirmation of his second to the motion.

Supervisor Cano confirmed that he seconded the motion.

Chair Scott stated that he anticipated being able to support the item once the Board discussed the amendments. He stated that he could not support this amendment because he thought it would lend an air of uncertainty and confusion to parties that were negotiating with the County in terms of who was allowed to get what

information. He understood the reason why Supervisor Allen made the motion, but he saw it as fraught with uncertainty moving forward and he would not be able to support this particular amendment.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had said publicly, after multiple violations of the NDA for Project Blue that he did not know about it existing. He stated that he did not feel like this was settled law and that elected officials should not be bound by NDAs in any circumstance.

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

Chair Scott asked if the Board was considering the whole proposed policy together, if that meant this item would be brought back on a future agenda.

Supervisor Heinz asked if it was for the amendment only.

Chair Scott confirmed it was for the amendment, which was why he asked because the Board Rules stated that when there was a tie vote, the item moved forward to the next meeting, but he was unsure how it worked with an amendment.

Mr. Brown stated that this was not a motion on the item, rather a motion on the amendment, so the amendment failed.

It was thereupon moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to amend Number II., A., c., which read, "A confidential list of active NDAs for economic development projects will be provided to the Board of Supervisors semiannually" by changing "semiannually" to "quarterly".

It was moved by Chair Scott to amend Number II., C., Extension and Project Report, which read, "Before the expiration of the initial 180-day period or a subsequent extension period, and upon request for an extension of the NDA, the Economic Development Director will prepare, and the County Administrator will provide, a report to the Board of Supervisors about the project scope and user..." by striking "user" and inserting "use."

Supervisor Heinz asked Chair Scott to clarify the reason for the amendment.

Chair Scott clarified that the reason for the amendment was related to when the Board had passed the item on July 1st, for staff to come forth with new procedures for using NDAs so that there was more transparency and information, but not to put themselves in a position where they might lose some kind of edge or advantage with other jurisdictions that might be competing with Pima County. He stated that if the Board knew the use of a project, it was sufficient information, but a username might be concerning to developers that the County was negotiating with.

Supervisor Heinz seconded the motion. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano asked if Chair Scott was open to something about the project scope, its usage and its user, or was the term “user,” something that he wanted defined with greater clarity.

Chair Scott clarified that he wanted to remove “user” and change it to “use.” He stated that would be sufficient for the Board and might provide some reassurance to those the County was negotiating with and not cause the County to lose any kind of advantage with other jurisdictions.

Supervisor Heinz asked if this was based on the rest of the policy, if everything was 90 days ahead of any public meeting where there was a vote for approval that everything would be disclosed.

Chair Scott replied in the affirmative and asked for confirmation from County Administration if it was based on how the policy was drafted.

Ms. Leshar agreed and stated that she believed they had the 90 days correct.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that the information was correct.

Supervisor Allen asked if County Administration and staff were comfortable with this language or if they felt it would impede or inhibit the County’s prospects.

Chair Scott asked Supervisor Allen if she was asking if County Administration was comfortable with the current language or the proposed language.

Supervisor Allen clarified if they were comfortable with the current language with naming the user.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that staff was comfortable with it, based on the information being provided to the Board and Executive Session.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Supervisors Allen, Cano and Christy voted “Nay.”

It was then moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay,” to amend Section F., Authorization, “... An NDA for an economic development project will also be signed by the Economic Development Director,” and remove “Economic Development Director” and insert “County Administrator or designee.”

It was then moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the policy, as amended. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that discussion about the process not having the type of transparency the Board wanted and the amendments the Board just passed were never really put before anyone in the development community, anyone in charge of bringing in businesses and industries into Tucson. He stated that he would have liked their feedback and was the reason why he voted down the amendments, because they had not been given the opportunity to review them. He stated that they were the ones on the front lines that dealt with the competitive nature of bringing industry to the region. He pointed out that the Specific Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendment went through a very long and belabored process that had been in existence in Pima County for decades. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed all of the elements of Project Blue, and they voted unanimously to approve the project. He stated that in that process, there were numerous pertinent County departments and administrations that had very in-depth and intimate dealings with all aspects of Project Blue. He stated that they had expended much time, effort, and energy to review the entire plan and they had much time to decide whether or not this was an appropriate plan for the County. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission voted that it was and several County departments had the opportunity to review and comment on the plan, such as Transportation, Flood Control, Wastewater, Parks and Recreation, City of Tucson water expansion area, Schools, Environmental Quality. He stated that in each category except the schools, which was a non-applicable element, their comments were no objection, and with the City of Tucson upon annexation, the property would be served. He stated that it seemed to him that before the County embarked on another area of trying to send out a very plain and clear message that they were not open for business, there needed to be a robust review of what took place as far as this plan. He stated that another element where those who were on the front lines, the Chamber of Southern Arizona and other entities, private and public, that dealt with bringing in industries, had an opportunity for more comment and more hearings. He stated that it was unfair and unwise that these steps were being taken and some of his colleagues on the Board and some of their friends in the City of Tucson really wanted to usurp this whole process. He stated that what they wanted the end result to be was for this Board and the Mayor and City Council to usurp and throw away this entire process that had served the County so well and basically have the authority, the jurisdiction and the control over any and all industries themselves that came into Pima County and Tucson. He stated they wanted to be able to say yes or no and they did not want to have to deal with the findings of an extensive planning and zoning review. He stated that it further made that there was some sort of a mindset, that there was this long line of industries just waiting to come into the region knocking on the County's door. He stated that with the way Project Blue was handled from beginning to end, particularly the end, it was not going to work that way anymore. He added there were not that many industries out there that would even consider coming into Pima County and by placing more hurdles, as the item that was just voted on stipulated, if they placed more hurdles in front of companies that wanted to relocate to Pima County, it was just going to make it that much more difficult for the County to obtain them.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Allen for introducing this item and stated that she had worked in partnership with the County Administrator, who also used a stakeholder process to be able to ensure that the policy the Board voted on was not only one of being ahead of the times, but ensuring the County was not behind the times. He stated that the fact was that most jurisdictions in the State of Arizona had a similar policy, and so for there to be any suggestion that Pima County was not open for business or that they were trying to reverse course, was simply not factual. He stated that what they ought to be doing was figuring out how they could have economic development conversations with the region that put the people first. He stated that he believed that the sunlight was the greatest disinfectant, and was the reason why he supported the item.

Supervisor Heinz stated that to Supervisor Christy's point, his commissioners had reflected to him that they were told this could be one of 2 or 3 uses and were not told for sure this was going to be a data center. He stated that he might be misremembering, but he did not think they had complete total clarity as to the specific use that this parcel was going to be used for at the time that they were reviewing it. He stated that they did vote unanimously, but he wanted to hear from staff since they had been very involved in developing this entire NDA policy. He asked if staff believed this would diminish the County's ability to attract site selectors going forward. He stated that the process that happened at the City of Tucson would diminish the County's chances of having anyone come to Southern Arizona because of how people were treated.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that staff heard the discussion on the heels of Project Blue and there clearly were opportunities for enhancement and for clarity in terms of how the County used NDAs. He stated that staff attempted to outline an approach in this draft to balance the ability to continue to do economic development, attraction and expansion work with the need for greater transparency and public input in the process, and believed that they fashioned an approach that enabled the Board of Supervisors to receive information on an ongoing and regular basis earlier in the process. He stated that he did not believe that would negatively impact the County's ability to pursue those economic development opportunities, although they would learn along the way since it had not been done previously. He stated that this would allow them to come back and make amendments if needed.

Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Economic Development, stated that he agreed with Mr. DeBonis' assessment and that they could work with the tools available to them in order to perform retention, expansion and attraction. He stated that as this evolved and grew, so would the way they put this process forward. He stated that he felt good about this specific policy and knew it could be utilized in an appropriate way that enabled the Board to have additional information at a cadence that was beneficial to them.

Chair Scott asked if Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi could expand on the stakeholder process they went through as they were drafting this policy for consideration by the Board.

Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi explained they started developing the policy based off of what already existed within the County. He stated that they looked at the existing template and made updates to that, specifically worked directly with the Pima County Attorney's Office, to ensure that all of the legal information was correct as much as possible before it was brought to the Board for their review and approval. He stated that stakeholder involvement was with the County Administrator, Pima County Attorney's Office, as well as their own research outside of the County, specifically with other jurisdictions across the state as well as into others. He stated they formulated a policy they were comfortable and confident with providing a recommendation to the Board.

Chair Scott asked if that stakeholder process also included discussions, and consultation with members of the business community in Pima County.

Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi replied that they did not have robust conversations directly with the business community, but had a brief interaction with the Chamber of Southern Arizona. He stated that they had not had the time to reach out to the business community at large.

Supervisor Christy asked if Joe Snell, Fletcher McCusker or Keri Silvyn could address the Board on this issue. He stated that everyone they talked to was in the public sector and worked for the County Administrator and that they would not argue about the plan as presented. He stated that it was the private sector that would deal with it and bring the businesses to the community and they were not even being consulted on this, as heard from the Economic Director, which was why it was such a farce to bring up without including the real people that were involved at the front lines.

Supervisor Cano stated that he wanted to ensure that he corrected the record of what was said by his colleague from District 4. He stated that if there were people that needed to opine on this policy, they had over one week to be able to provide input into this document and for the Board to haphazardly state that there had not been consultation, he would not entertain that from the dais, and would not accept that kind of treatment of staff. He asked how this policy aligned with what other jurisdictions did and if it should not be a standard that should be paid attention to. He stated that if it was good in Maricopa County, in Goodyear, in Tempe, why was it bad for Pima County to suggest that it should not be done.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that he spoke directly with representatives at the Chamber of Southern Arizona and they asked him whether staff felt that the draft, as it was crafted, was workable. He stated that they did not have concerns, but there was a bit of an unknown but felt as though they struck a good balance and it would enable them to function. He stated that as they looked at the policy and how it related to other jurisdictions, those they reached out to had a mix of strategies, approaches or policies. He stated that the thing to keep in mind was that nothing that was in this policy was significantly different from what was done previously, other than they brought it to the Board earlier in a process where they were

interacting with a prospective economic development client and informing the Board in a way that kept them able to know the details as they progressed through that process. He stated that it also included the public disclosure process, the 90-day period ahead of an action being taken by a public body, that he believed would only help to engage the community in a way that left them feeling that they were part of the process, rather than coming in as an afterthought. He stated that they had heard the criticisms of secrecy in the case of Project Blue and stated that staff had worked through this economic development prospect project, like they did with countless others that had gone through and had come to the Board for some action. He stated that was largely reflected in documenting what Pima County did with a few additions to increase the flow of information to the Board and then eventually to the public, and that jurisdictions were attempting to complete what the County sought in this instance, in their economic development pursuits. He stated that he felt very comfortable that where the County was going to also be consistent, but also help to define for others, balancing of the flow of information and the pursuit of those economic development prospects.

Chair Scott asked Mr. DeBonis, Jr. if he would have brought forward an item to the Board if he did not think it was not in alignment with their shared goal of recruiting and attracting major or small employers to the region.

Mr. DeBonis Jr., responded that staff would not have brought the Board something that they were not comfortable with.

Supervisor Cano stated that Mr. Snell, Mr. McCusker, and Ms. Silvyn all had some affiliation with the Chamber of Southern Arizona. He asked for confirmation of this information and if the County had received any opposition from those three individuals or from the Chamber as a whole on this particular item.

Ms. Leshar responded they received no opposition and there had been communication with representatives of the Chamber, but did not know about those three individuals.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

14. Proposed Policy for Environmental Impact Reviews (EIRs) of Economic Development Projects

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed policy for EIRs of Economic Development Projects.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to amend Section 5, Pima County Department Review and add Pima County Health Department as a consulting department under that section. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano offered a friendly amendment that the verbiage related to the amendment about the Health Department functions be in uniformity with the other outlined items.

The maker of the motion and the seconder accepted the friendly amendment.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Chair Scott to amend Section 8, Additional Review and Reporting and add an additional bullet with the following, "A review of past performance of the user or applicant that is relevant to any aspect of the proposed project." Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item, as amended. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

15. **Consideration of Regional Transportation Authority Resolution to Conduct an Election**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of a Resolution from the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County to conduct an election on March 10, 2026, to ask voters to consider a proposed 20-year regional transportation plan as developed by the Regional Transportation Authority, the levy of a transaction privilege (sales) tax in the amount of one-half cent for a period of 20 years to provide funding for the transportation projects contained in the regional transportation plan, a revision to the 2006 regional transportation plan, and to establish the conduct of the election.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that this item was a ministerial action to place on the ballot, in March, a Resolution unanimously adopted by the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) for the continuation of the RTA plan and tax levy.

Supervisor Heinz thanked staff at Pima Association of Governments (PAG)/RTA, County Administrator Leshner, Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr., and County staff who made this possible and stated that months or weeks ago many of them were not certain that they would get to this point. He stated that he was thrilled to have Mike Ortega, the new Executive Director for PAG/RTA and under his leadership, they were able to get to this position, and that he had voted for it once and would vote for it again.

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

Joe Winfield, Oro Valley Mayor and Chair, Regional Transportation Authority, stated that on behalf of the RTA Board, he wished to extend their sincere appreciation to County Administrator Leshner for her outstanding services as Chair of the RTA Technical Management Committee. He stated that under her leadership, the committee provided the technical expertise, thoughtful analysis and regional perspective necessary to shape a balanced and forward looking plan for RTA Next. He stated that the strength of this work reflected not only Ms. Leshner's commitment to collaboration, but also the collective effort of the jurisdictions and stakeholders represented on the committee. He added that because of this foundation, the RTA Board was confident in moving forward and believed that a March 2026 election would provide the public with the best opportunity to consider and act upon this important regional initiative. He thanked the Board for their continued partnership and commitment to advancing transportation solutions that served all of Pima County.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

16. Fiscal Year (FY) 25/26 Affordable Housing Fund Allocation

Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission and staff recommend approval of the FY25/26 Affordable Housing Fund allocation as follows: \$5 million for "Build More" category, \$3.5 million for "Keeping People Housed" category, and the plan for these funds.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, thanked the Board for allowing this adjustment on the agenda, because it allowed them to provide the platform to really understand how they looked at allocating these funds. She stated that Director Sullivan would provide an overview on how they were proposing to allocate the \$5 million for Build More, in addition to the \$3.5 million to keep people housed, and they could look at both GAP housing, rental housing, and then everything needed for rent, mortgage, utility, rapid rehousing, and all of it built on the kind of work that Director Darland had brought before the Board.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development (CWD), stated that while Director Darland had spoken he thought of the old days together in the Homeless Services Division, serving folks, and how a proposal like this was a dream of theirs, to have funds from the local level that, as Supervisor Cano said, could be innovative, did things differently, not the way that HUD and Rapid Rehousing had been doing since the '80s, but actually try new things and do more for folks. He stated that with an opportunity of \$8.5 million they had this year, it was brought to the Housing Commission and they were asked to put it into two buckets. He explained that those two buckets were Build More at \$5 million and Keep People Housed. He stated that the real differentiation in the Build More category was the addition of bridge housing and transitional housing. He stated that it was not to pay the services for bridge or transitional housing, but to build or maintain more bridge

or transitional housing. He stated that the Keep People Housed category was kept in three buckets: Preservation, Weatherization and Home Repair, which as federal programs went, were some of the most burdensome programs they had, but they looked to target those living in mobile homes and those living on tribal nations. He stated that with rent and utility assistance, it was where he saw them being the most innovative. He stated that they had a very proven track record of more than 40 years of providing rent and utility assistance, especially during the pandemic when more than \$85 million was given. He stated that with the flexibility of these funds they would be able to innovate and pair their programs with other programs that they had within CWD, most notably the workforce program. He stated that in the past where we had just paid a month's rent or moved someone into a shelter situation, they would be able to provide complete wraparound services so that situation did not repeat itself and really built out a model that if the affordability was something they could not overcome, then they had a safety net of the Craycroft Hotel, or they had the ability through employment or receipt of benefits that made it so that people could afford their housing moving forward. He stated that the last category, Rapid Rehousing, was a proven model for those that were at the lower acuity, they would primarily be the population they had seen at Craycroft that was currently underutilized. He stated that in the last year and a half Continuum of Care had lost about \$1 million so they had families that were unable to achieve permanent housing through rapid rehousing, but the ability through this funding would ensure that they could continue that pipeline moving forward.

Supervisor Cano expressed his appreciation for the recommendations. He asked if jurisdictions would be able to apply for this funding.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative and stated that in the past jurisdictions had applied for and had been awarded funding.

Supervisor Cano commended Director Sullivan and his team for putting into motion the Board's vision of increased dollars. He stated that he was very pleased that they had done what was instrumental to the priorities of this Board, which was to engage the Housing Commission in a lot of these discussions and he knew that this was just step one in that process. He stated that technically, they were in step two and the next time the Board heard from him on this framework, was excited to have it be with an award right next to it, to all of the entities in the County's jurisdiction that were working diligently to decrease the affordability gap and housing gap in the region.

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

Supervisor Cano asked if the \$8.5 million was a historic investment.

Ms. Leshar responded yes, it was a historic commitment to ensuring that there was an extraordinary impact into the community that dealt with this issue of housing, housing affordability and addressing homelessness.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay.”

17. Authorizing the County Administrator or Designee to Execute Documents

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 35, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the County Administrator or designee to execute documents, including, but not limited to, Subordination Agreements and/or Deeds of Release and Reconveyance, related to restrictive covenants on affordable housing and community development transactions financed by or through Pima County.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

18. Final Plat Without Assurances

P25FP00007, River and Hansen, Lots 1-60 and Common Areas “A, B, C, and D”. (District 1)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

ELECTIONS

19. Election Board Worker Appointments

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-531(A), appointment of election board workers recruited and on file in the Elections Department for the September 23, 2025 Special General Election.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

20. Vote Center Replacement Location for Congressional District 7 - Special General Election

Staff recommends approval of the 99 Cents Store (Arizona Highway 86 and Mile Marker 112.3, Sells, AZ) to serve as a vote center for the Congressional District 7 - Special General Election on September 23, 2025, pursuant to A.R.S. §16-411(B)(4).

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

21. Sewer System Revenue Obligations

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 36, of the Board of Supervisors, providing for the execution, delivery and sale of (a) sewer system revenue obligations in an aggregate principal amount sufficient to provide up to \$55,000,000 to purchase property constituting additions and improvements to the sewer system of the county, plus an amount to fund a debt service reserve account and plus an amount to pay costs of delivery, and (b) sewer system revenue refunding obligations in an aggregate principal amount sufficient to accomplish the refinancing of outstanding sewer revenue obligations being refunded thereby, to fund a debt service account and to pay costs of delivery; authorizing the execution and delivery of one or more obligation indentures in connection therewith and the execution and delivery of one or more purchase agreements providing for installment payments by the county for the purchase or refinancing of said property to be made from revenues of the sewer system of the county; and authorizing the completion, execution and delivery of all necessary or appropriate agreements or documents and the taking of all actions and matters in connection therewith.

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

Chair Scott pointed out that in a memorandum provided to the Board from Administrator Leshner, it made reference to expenditure limitations that caused local governments to often use short term debt to fund long term capital obligations, and that those were expenditure limitations that were within the Arizona Constitution and applied to all local governments. He added that something that had been brought to the Board before when they had these types of issuances, was that the County paid off its short term debt much more quickly than other jurisdictions in the State and in the Country, some of which took up to 40 years to pay off similar issuances.

Supervisor Cano stated that for the two items it could be complicated when getting into the details. He thanked the County Administrator, the Finance Director and his team, for their responses to the inquiries his district office had on the items. He stated that he looked forward to the day when they could pay down the debt so that they could invest more in the people of Pima County.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

22. Certificates of Participation

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 37, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the lease and lease-purchase back of certain real property, including buildings and structures, in order to finance and refinance projects for the county; authorizing the execution and delivery of amendments and supplements to a lease-purchase agreement and a trust agreement and other necessary agreements, instruments and documents;

approving the execution and delivery of certificates of participation and refunding certificates of participation to provide the necessary financing and refinancing therefor; and authorizing other actions and matters in connection therewith.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 21, for discussion related to this item.)

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to adopt the Resolution. Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

23. Colossal Cave, L.L.C., to provide an Amended and Restated Operating Agreement for the Show Cave and other facilities within Colossal Cave Mountain Park, contract amount \$262,793.30 revenue/10 year term (CT2500000045)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

County Attorney

24. Bosse Rollman, P.C., Amendment No. 9, to provide for Pima County Sheriff's Department employee disciplinary matters, extend contract term to 9/19/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_21-197)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Parks and Recreation

25. Brandi Michelle Fenton Foundation, Amendment No. 3, to provide for contributions and alterations to Brandi Fenton Memorial Park, extend contract term to 9/19/30 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000394)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Pima Animal Care Center

26. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for animal care and enforcement services, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2500000098)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Procurement

27. Award

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000479, Arizona Material Services, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide for landscaping materials. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$455,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Parks and Recreation.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

28. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000127, Amendment No. 6, NEFCO Construction Supply, L.L.C., to provide for power hand tools and accessories. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$90,000.00 for a cumulative no-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,335,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Parks and Recreation.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

29. Award

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001867, Amendment No. 2, Western Environmental Equipment Co., to provide for ISCO flowmeters, parts, and service. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$225,000.00 from \$248,000.00 to \$473,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$721,000.00 (including sales tax). This increase is needed to address anticipated annual replacement requirements of outdated/damaged units, and the associated increases in flow meter coverage. Funding Source: WW Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

30. Home Depot USA, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for building materials and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$187,000.00 (SC2400002397) Administering Department: Facilities Management

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

31. Aurigo Software Technologies, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Aurigo Masterworks Cloud and amend contractual language, Internal Service Fund, contract amount \$73,609.80 (DO-IT-23-20283) Administering Department: Information Technology

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

State of Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Department of Health and Human Services, Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program, extend grant term to 9/30/25, amend grant language, scope of work and decrease funding from \$566,252.00 to \$76,349.00 (GA-CWD-81168)

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

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the decreased funding.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the reduction to the program funding was provided by the federal government through the State.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, concurred and stated that the Department of Housing did not often seek their approval or input before moving money around, however, they had received a substantial million dollar, one time allocation, so they would be able to serve the same amount of people they planned on serving this year.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

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

State of Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the U.S. Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, extend grant term to 9/30/25, amend grant language, scope of work and decrease funding from \$168,620.00 to \$50,280.00 (GA-CWD-81408)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

34. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, to provide for the State Electronic Data Collection Program/materials and supplies (printers, scanners, power/data cords and accessories), \$125,617.96 (G-SD-93587)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

35. **Acceptance - Transportation**

U.S. Department of Transportation, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Safe Streets for All: Creating a Culture of Safety for Our Community, extend grant term to 6/30/27 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-TR-69957)

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

Supervisor Christy asked if the grant had been reviewed by the federal government and if there was a possibility it might be clawed back.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that they did not believe so at this time.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

36. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 349209, Robert William Webb, Old Pueblo Distilling Company, L.L.C., 3810 E. 44th Street, No. 307, Tucson, Series 18, Craft Distiller, 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 unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

37. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 353518, Sergio Angel, Toro Bravo, 13005 E. Benson Highway, Vail, 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 unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

38. Hearing - Conditional Use Permit

P25CU00008, RINCON VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT - S. CAMINO LOMA ALTA

Rincon Valley Fire District, represented by State 48 Consulting, requests a Type III Conditional Use Permit for a wireless communication facility in accordance with Section 18.07.030.H of the Pima County Zoning Code in the CR-1 (Single Residence) zone, located west of S. Camino Loma Alta, approximately 2,000 feet south of the intersection of S. Camino Loma Alta and E. Old Spanish Trail, addressed as 8850 S. Camino Loma Alta. 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. Obtaining an approved Development Plan.
2. Adherence to all requirements of Section 18.07.030.H (General Regulations and Exceptions) of the Pima County Zoning Code.

Special Conditions

1. The lattice tower shall be limited to its requested height of one hundred twenty-five feet (125')
2. The color of the new tower shall substantially match the color of the existing galvanized metal lattice tower on the same property.
3. The on-the-ground equipment compound shall be secured with an 8' tall masonry wall as shown on the submitted preliminary Development Plan. The masonry wall and gates shall be a color that substantially matches the other masonry on the site.
4. The property owner shall achieve compliance with the Maveen Marie Behan Conservation Land System (CLS) Guidelines by limiting their onsite disturbance to the amount, location, and configuration shown on the submitted site plan.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P25CU00008, subject to standard and special conditions.

39. Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 20, P24SP00006, Manzanita Investment Group, L.L.C. - W. Valencia Road Specific Plan. Owner: Manzanita Investment Group, L.L.C. (District 5)

Supervisor Cano inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

40. Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 21 of the Board of Supervisors, relating to the wastewater sewer outreach subsidy program; amending the Pima County Code, Title 13, Chapter 24 (Sanitary Sewer User Fees) Sections 13.24.200 (Account Management) and 13.24.600 (Table of Service Fees, Rates, and Administrative Fees).

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

Supervisor Cano stated that he looked forward to supporting the item and commended the Regional Wastewater Reclamation team for ensuring they had a robust Sewer Outreach Subsidy Program that supported the most vulnerable in Pima County. He asked Administration for additional information on how their systems were talking to one another, clarifying that if someone was getting support through the SOS Program how was staff doing their due diligence to ensure that these individuals also got the resources they needed on any other related services that the County could provide to reduce costs. He acknowledged that it was a complicated item, but he wanted to ensure that the most vulnerable did not have to go through various applications to get the critical support that they needed.

Supervisor Allen indicated that she had similar comments and asked whether there were ways to do a co-enrollment, that if they signed up for one they would automatically get signed up for other utility subsidy programs. She asked if there was collaboration that could happen directly with Tucson Electric Power, Tucson Water, the Ajo Water District or similar entities and asked if staff could look into that. She stated that she wanted to lower the burden and while she appreciated the expanded subsidy program, it seemed like the biggest opportunity was in the space around enrollment and the lack of enrollment. She stated that anything the County could do to help connect the dots and ease the application process would be better and asked what efforts were underway to increase enrollment, and how the County approached outreach to the community.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that staff would provide the details to the Board on how they were coordinating and co-enrolling. He stated that this particular amendment was done in coordination with the City of Tucson and Tucson Water and they had made the same change so that the same updated tier system would apply to Tucson Water customers as well. He indicated that through the Community Action Network, they did a lot of co-screening and co-enrolling. He stated that the Regional Wastewater Department was working with the Pima County Communications Department on campaigns so they could expand outreach, and that one of the biggest things they could do was let people know that those resources existed to assist them. He stated that as they formulated what an expanded campaign looked like, they would give an update to the Board on those

efforts. He stated that it was currently underway, not only to communicate with this particular change, but to figure out how to reach more people who were in need.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

41. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

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

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

42. CONSENT CALENDAR

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Conservation Lands and Resources Advisory Board

Appointments of the following members: Term expirations: 6/30/27. (Staff recommendations)

- Carolyn Campbell, representing Environmental Conservation Expert or Resource Management Organization.
- David Godlewski, representing Local Development Community.
- Meredith Lipscomb, representing Tourism Community.
- Sue Clark, representing Trail User or Trail Advocacy Organization.
- Eric Dhruv, representing K-12 Education Practitioner.

Appointments of the following members: Term expirations: 6/30/29. (Staff recommendations)

- Karl Hoerig, representing Historic Preservation/Cultural Protection Expert or Practitioner.
- Jack Dash, representing Native Plant or Nursery Expert.
- Sarah King, representing Active Rancher or Agricultural Commodity Producer.
- Scott Feldhausen, representing Wildlife Expert or Organization.

2. Board of Adjustment, District 1

Reappointments of Lynn Wildblood and Michael Reuwsaat. Term expirations: 8/19/29.

3. **Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee**

Appointment of Evan Santerior, to replace Joseph Mais. Term expiration: 9/1/27. (Committee recommendation)

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

4. **Special Event**

- Teresa Hani Shami, American Heart Association, The Westin La Paloma Resort & Spa, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, September 18, 2025.
- Jason Khalaf, VFW Post 10254, Terror in the Corn, 13591 W. Avra Valley Road, Marana, October 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 26, 29, 30, 31 and November 1, 2025.
- Judy McDermott, Conquistadores Youth Golf Fund, Terror in the Corn, 13591 W. Avra Valley Road, Marana, October 16, 17, 18 and 19, 2025.
- Vicky Curtis, Angel Charity for Children, Inc., Terror in the Corn, 13591 W. Avra Valley Road, Marana, October 23, 24 and 25, 2025.
- Debra S. Allen, B.P.O.E. No. 1576 Ajo, 350 N. Yermo Street, Ajo, October 25, 2025.
- Mari Nelson, The GVC Foundation, Inc., Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, October 25, 2025.
- Dennis Robbins, Scottsdale Charros, Inc., Sopori Ranch, 11301 W. Arivaca Road, Amado, October 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, 2025.
- Maritza G. Perez, Our Lady of Fatima Parish, 1950 W. Irvington Place, Tucson, September 26 and 27, 2025.

5. **Temporary Extension**

12104529, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Wild Garlic Grill, 2870 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, November 7 and 8, 2025.

ELECTIONS

6. **Precinct Committeemen**

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Doug Ditto-202-DEM, Julie Harrod-184-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

David Bellows-009-DEM, Benjamin Koehler-016-DEM, Robert Young-016-DEM, Brian Dahl-017-DEM, Clifton Mays-036-DEM, Jake Lukasko-067-DEM, Dennis Desmond-084-DEM, Mark Mandel-084-DEM, Linda Chernus-144-DEM, Derrick Espadas-149-DEM, Iman Bah-154-DEM, Lindsay Johnson-158-DEM, Emily Ferket-162-DEM, Georges Chavez-Gehrig-163-DEM, St. Omer Kakou-166-DEM, Judith

Browder-170-DEM, Michael Lance-173-DEM, Seth McKernan-192-DEM, Patricia Kuvik-195-DEM, Nicole Iglar-201-DEM, Joshua Reilly-230-DEM, Susan Markovich-238-DEM, Laura Thielman-206-REP

RECORDER

7. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of July 2025.

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

8. **Public Announcement**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §49-391(C), a public comment period of 30 days must be provided before any Pretreatment Consent Decree or Negotiated Settlement Agreement is made final. The Public Information Enforcement File for the following case will be made available for public review or copies may be obtained for \$.35 per page at the Public Works Building, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department's reception desk, 201 North Stone Avenue, 3rd Floor, Tucson, Arizona, 85701. Comments will be taken for the next thirty days and written comments may be sent to Industrial Wastewater Control, 2955 W. Calle Agua Nueva, Tucson, Arizona 85745-9750. If sufficient interest is expressed, a public hearing may be held by the Board of Supervisors. After the comment period, the Board of Supervisors will vote on acceptance of the following Settlement Agreement:

Busy D Pumping. The proposed settlement in which Busy D Pumping, located at 3255 East District Street, agrees to pay a penalty of \$31,000.00.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

9. Minutes: July 15, 2025
Warrants: August, 2025

* * *

43. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

14. **Proposed Policy for Environmental Impact Reviews (EIRs) of Economic Development Projects**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed policy for EIRs of Economic Development Projects.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Let us move on to Item No. 12, this is proposed policy for environmental impact reviews of economic development projects. This was also introduced by Supervisor Allen, so I will turn to her for any introductory comments.

JA: Sure. Thank you and again thank you to Carmine and Heath for really digging in and giving us a really strong Board policy proposal. This is another one that falls in the category, I think, of lessons learned and ways to, lessons learned from the process around Project Blue. When that proposal landed in our lap, the only specificity that we received was from an economic benefit analysis. Missing, as we have continued to hear, was details especially early on around water usage, energy uses, scope and scale of initial build out and then the potential impacts. What those might mean on air quality, public health and so on. So, during my time working for the traditional government of the Western Shoshone, and when I worked for the Border Action Network, I spent a lot of time reading environmental impact statements for proposed dams and bombing ranges and mine expansions. Those reports were all part of a process that was defined by the National Environmental Policy Act. And while aspects of that process were flawed, it provided communities an essential opportunity to have a voice in projects that might impact them, and for people to get an insight of what was on the table. So, given the scope and scale of projects like data centers or others that are high water or high energy users, transparency and public participation, just having access to really core information is essential. The County could do better to ensure that decision makers, as well as communities in the public, have the full picture of what is on the table and understand the potential impacts, positive or negative, and have a voice in that decision making process. So, that is why I am so excited about this policy. For starters, it will, we are going to have a policy that requires environmental impact reviews and transparency, and ample time for the public and the Board to have the information they need to make good decisions and that significance cannot be

overstated. Beyond that this proposal is comprehensive, it acknowledges and builds on the leadership and expertise of Pima County staff and the departments, and it relies on institutional knowledge and experience of departments countywide, Flood Control, Wastewater, Conservation Lands and Resources, Health Department, and the list goes on and on. This policy also represents an enduring commitment to see our community holistically, meaning that, making it clear that we cannot consider impacts, environmental or otherwise, in isolation. Rather, it also allows us to see the cumulative impacts or the disproportionate impacts or unintended consequences of policy ideas and proposals that land on our table. All of that is vital for transparency and good decision making. So I am proud to have introduced this and had Board support for moving this forward back in July and thankful again that it is before us today. That said, I have two amendments that I would like to propose. So one is that there is a, let us see, so public health is listed in Section 3 as a key project evaluation area and I would like to see the public Health Department listed explicitly as a consulting department under Section 5, Pima County Department Review. So my amendment is that we amend the policy to include by name the Pima County Health Department under Section 5, Pima County Department Review.

MH: I will second that, but has this been moved and seconded already?

JA: Oh.

RS: No, no, it is fine.

MH: Oh, I thought you meant something you had to be, you had to move it. We can do whatever we want, the lawyer left.

RS: We did not, we did not do that with the last item. Yeah.

MH: So, I will second the underlying item if you would like to move it, Supervisor Allen?

JA: So, moved.

MH: And I will also second the amendment proposal.

RS: Okay, just to clarify we did not do that with the last item. We waited till all the amendments..

MH: Oh, sorry.

RS: And then we moved it and then we moved it as amended, but.

MH: I do not know what the rule is.

RS: Are we at, Ms. Manriquez?

MM: So, Chair Scott, Board members so just clarify what is being done right now? Are you guys making a motion to approve the proposed policy for the EIR and then you are going to make amendments, or are you going to do your amendments first?

RS: I think our question is, we can do the amendments first and then move it as amended, is that. That is what we did last time, right?

MM: Okay, that is what we did last time, yes.

RS: Okay, so we are fine. So go ahead. So, you are moving to amend Section 5 to add the Pima County Health Department under Pima County Department Review.

JA: Yes.

RS: And that was seconded by Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Yep.

RS: Discussion? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott, just very in the weeds question. The verbiage related to the amendment about the Health Department functions can be given to staff to come up with that so as long as they are included so that there could be uniformity with the other outlined items, does that question make sense?

RS: It makes sense, yes, because the other departments have specific areas of focus and what Supervisor Allen's amendment is to add the Department of Health, but she did make reference to what was in Section 3 with regard to public health. Under Section 3, it says, "Potential public health effects and mitigation requirements." So.

AC: So, that could be the language or.

RS: Yes.

AC: The other items.

RS: Yes, sir.

AC: That would be my friendly amendment.

RS: Is that acceptable to both the mover and the seconder?

JA: Indeed, it is.

RS: Alright, got all that, Ms. Manriquez? Alright. All those in favor? I am sorry. Further discussion? All those in favor of the amendment indicate by saying "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: (Thumbs down.)

RS: Item passes 4-1 with Supervisor Christy opposed. Supervisor Allen, you said you had a second amendment?

JA: I do, so under Section 8, Additional Review and Reporting. I would like to add an additional bullet that is, includes a review of past performance of the user or applicant that is relevant to any aspect of the proposed project.

RS: In terms of if they had a similar project in other jurisdictions?

JA: Yes.

RS: Okay, alright. I will second that. Discussion? Did you need that repeated back, Ms. Manriquez?

MM: Yes.

RS: I thought you might. Go ahead, Supervisor Allen.

JA: I would add under Section 8, titled Additional Review and Reporting. "A review of past performance of the user or applicant that is relevant to any aspect of the proposed project."

RS: And I am still fine seconding. Discussion on this motion? All those in favor indicate by saying "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: (Thumbs down.)

RS: Item passes 4-1, with Supervisor Christy opposed. Do you have any other amendments to suggest, Supervisor Allen?

JA: I do not.

RS: Any other discussion on the item as amended? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I have a question for the Administration on a term that I have seen used twice here on Page 1 and on Page 3, the term environmental impact review, and then also environmental justice review. Can you please tell us what the difference might be between the two? I see environmental justice used as a term on Item No. 8, Additional Review and Reporting in bullet No. 2. I am just, I have yet to receive information as to how the two differ.

RS: Administrator Lesher, before you answer that, the Clerk requested that we move the item as amended before we have further discussion. You wanted to make that motion Supervisor Allen?

JS: So, moved.

RS: Alright and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Now we will have discussion. And if you could respond to Supervisor Cano's question. Sorry about that, Supervisor.

AC: No, thank you.

JL: Thank you very much. We are familiar with the environmental impact review. I would turn to staff for the additional clarification about the environmental justice piece.

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano, so environmental review could be the entirety of impacts on air, on water, on climate noise, if you will. Environmental justice review may be a specific additional detailed review looking at impacts for maybe historically disadvantaged communities or other populations that might warrant further analysis than just the cursory review of those broader impacts.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. So, Administrator Lesher, Mr. DeBonis, so I am, it would just be additional environmental information? That is not, there is not a different tier of requirements for justice review?

CD: So, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, it could have additional components associated with it. So, it may be more of a term that is utilized in federal grant processes. There is certain criteria or rubric that communities are required to go through that analysis. There are certain instances, for example, with air quality permitting, where we have to demonstrate compliance with federal air quality standards and as part of that, they have a defined set of criteria that they say you must review this project in this permit application against. So, it is an additional level as may be required or triggered from other standards.

AC: Thank you.

RS: Any other questions or comments from Board members? Okay. All those in favor of Item No. 12, as amended indicate by saying "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: (Thumbs down.)

RS: Item passes 4-1, with Supervisor Christy opposed.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

41. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott

SC: Supervisor Christy

AC: Supervisor Cano

JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator

JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

RS: Let us go now to Addendum Item No. 3. We had, if you remember way back to this morning when we had agenda adjustments, Ms. Leshner had requested that we have the presentation from Ms. Darland before we considered regular Agenda Item No. 3. That will also clear out the Addendum for us. So, I will turn it over to Ms. Leshner if she has any introductory comments before we hear from Ms. Darland, who I hope has not had to sit in the room very long during executive session.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and I would simply turn it over to our Director Darland, to review the County initiatives today. Thank you.

JD: Thank you, County Administrator Leshner, Chair Scott, members of the Board. Good afternoon, I will keep this as brief and concise as possible. Next slide please. Again, I always want to start by grounding in the five priorities that establish the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions. Back in December of 2023, briefly, that is again to conduct an inventory of County and partner programming to also, Number 2, to describe and illustrate how services are accessed and delivered to vulnerable populations. Number 3, to develop County and public facing communications on how to access resources and services and priorities. Number 4 and 5, best align broadly speaking to today's presentation. Next slide please. So, if you all recall in August of just last month, I presented to you all an update on the efforts to establish a shelter, feasibility and work plan in response to the May 6th request from Chair Scott. Briefly that covered the evaluation of the existing challenges as well as the opportunities, including the opportunity to develop some models of approach and strategies utilizing available local resources. That presentation also concluded on the need for a regional dialog and various different components that would inform a regional plan, one of which being the development and completion of the Tucson Pima collaboration to end homelessness. Their five-year strategic plan, as well as forthcoming recommendations to the Board from the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission, one of which you will hear later following my presentation this afternoon. For the purpose of today's presentation, I wanted to share with the Board a presentation that was made to your commission on August 19th that informs on the strategy for households exiting homelessness. I am going to pause, just for a moment to remind the Board that in January 2025, you all heard preliminary results from the EcoNorthwest Contracted

Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis, wherein EcoNorthwest identified a future need of 116,000 units of housing that would be affordable for households at or below 80% of the area median income. 21,000 of those units were identified as immediate need, and 8,000 of those were for those individuals who were exiting homelessness. Following the January 25 presentation to the Board, the County Administrator directed staff to begin working with a working group of the Regional Affordable Housing Commission on the development of a draft housing strategy and funding plan. This, of course, did precede the Board's action on the adoption of Board Policy D 22.17 around the ten-year funding plan, however, the staff had begun to use the preliminary results from the EcoNorthwest study to begin to develop some core components that would help to frame and inform a strategy. Staff and the commissioners identified four key elements of that strategy development. Those four key elements were really about establishing a baseline understanding of the current approaches and strategies to developing and preserving housing that is affordable, but also in coordination and conversation with our regional partners, as well as members of our commission who are very diverse and have a high level of experience in this particular field. Staff and commissioners identified four areas; those were GAP funding or the funding mechanisms used to develop affordable housing. Also, the second was preservation of existing affordable housing structures. That was not just the multifamily properties, but that was also looking at what was being done here locally to preserve housing or preserve keeping people housed in housing that they can already afford by way of weatherization and home repair programs. The third strategy under development still currently is that of a market rate strategy. We know that if we all are not also addressing our area market rate housing needs, that we are going to create further pressure, downward pressure on those units of housing that are affordable. So, we have to have a balanced approach to also to address both ends of the housing spectrum. And fourth, and finally, is the strategy for housing for households exiting homelessness. And that is what I will be presenting for you all here today. Next slide please. So much like the Board, your commission also heard from Cat Davis who is a Continuum of Care Program Lead Manager with the City of Tucson. She helped inform the Board on just a baseline understanding of the main portfolio of housing programs for households exiting homelessness. This is a current strategy being employed today. She reviewed with them what the structure of TPOCH is and how the City and the County both support that role, and how the facilitation of approximately \$12 million is utilized to address housing for households exiting homelessness. I followed Ms. Davis by presenting here what you see on this slide before you, which is one that first of all, just the ways in which these programs are traditionally administered. Traditionally, we are talking about three core housing approaches. One is transitional housing that is moving folks out of unsheltered or sheltered settings into housing, getting them back on their feet, back into the world of work and eventually those individuals may move into housing in a lease of their name, or may be reunified with other family members. Rapid rehousing, which is a limited time intervention for individuals who generally have a low acuity of need, meaning that they do not have come into the housing program with a high level of acuity, and they are able to likely gain housing stability pretty quickly. And the third and final is permanent supportive housing programs. That is for individuals

who are both experiencing long periods of chronic homelessness and also have a diagnosed disabling condition that likely is a contributor to their ongoing or returns to homelessness. For these types of programs, there are essentially three sources of funding, there is federal through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Largely, that is going to be coming to communities through your Continuum of Care programming. You also have emergency solution grant funds that are also administered to local jurisdictions through a formula allocation. Additionally, there are state dollars, that is through AHCCCS and through the Arizona Department of Economic Security. And locally here you see both the County and the City appropriating local general fund dollars for supportive services for individuals who are experiencing homelessness or exiting homelessness and here at Pima County is also an outlier because of the significant investment in the Emergency Eviction Legal Services Program, which again, goes a long way to preserving first time and returns to homelessness for individuals at the time that they lose housing. The type of housing program models vary, but essentially they are scattered site, meaning that an individual can select a housing of their choice near a school, near a place of work, or near some of the mainstream resources that they tend to access frequently. Another form is site based or program or project based housing. That means that the housing unit is funded and paid for at a specific site, so the individual will go to a site that is already funded by, whether it is through HUD or through another state or rental assistance program. You have agency owned and developed projects as well, those would be your La Fronteras, your Primavera, those nonprofit organizations that will be developing these units and then later housing folks in them. And the average annual cost per household, and this is a national average, as evaluated in 2024 by the National Alliance to End Homelessness, ranges anywhere between \$8,400.00 per household to a little under \$21,000.00 per household. That is pretty high, we see something a little bit here, a little bit lower here locally, but typically that is about what you would see and the range would reflect really what is a transitional housing or a rapid rehousing cost at the low end, about \$8,400.00 and closer to the high end, about \$21,000.00. That is going to be closely what you are going to be spending on a permanent supportive housing program for an individual who is going to require an ongoing rental subsidy for an indefinite period of time. Next slide please. So really, looking at the context of the current way in which these programs are administered, this is a very busy slide but this also is very indicative of a very bureaucratic process by which we are facilitating resources for individuals exiting homelessness. And in many cases, we are not necessarily doing this urgently. This is not to be confused with emergency housing. This does require a system by which individuals are prioritized, by which people are also deemed as being eligible for certain project types. We have to understand that most of the time HUD recognizes homelessness on two different variables. One is that you are actually literally experiencing street homelessness or living in a place not meant for human habitation. That would be your car or a shelter, as well as maybe fleeing domestic violence. HUD does not recognize anybody who is couch hopping, meaning those individuals who might be economically homeless because they cannot necessarily acquire or rent in their name. HUD does not recognize those individuals' experiencing homelessness. There is also a difference in strategy, where we have permanent supportive housing programs where we can

serve chronically homeless individuals, but that does require that they come into the program with a diagnosed condition, a diagnosed disabling condition. Whereas here locally, we do have a number of people who are seeing an exaggerated length of time homelessness, however, they are not necessarily coming in with a diagnosis. They have been disconnected from a medical or mental health provider and many times these individuals have been out for a moment, but they have not necessarily been diagnosed and will not be diagnosed as having a condition that would be continuing to be a disabling condition. Again, the project requirements do have very specific populations for youth, for veterans, and they do have to be referred through a community process based on priorities set by the local community. And then there is an ongoing conversation at the national level related to Housing First. Housing first means housing for individuals without any preconditions, such as employment or sobriety. We also know here locally that it is never meant to be housing first and housing only. It is meant to be housing first, and additional resources that can help individuals secure and maintain housing stability. However, that is very complicated because we have not necessarily seen federal grants come in with enough funding to actually underwrite the supportive service component to keeping people stably housed, and it has gotten a great deal more complex. And again, we are still sort of awaiting some rulemaking from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development following the July 24, 2025, Executive Order. We are really unclear as to what that may mean as far as how it will impact local programming and the local Housing first strategy. Next slide please. So when the development of recommendations for your Affordable Housing Commission on the strategy for housing for households exiting homelessness, we embarked on having conversations with your local nonprofits in our community, talking with those programs that are themselves developing affordable housing and establishing an understanding of their approach. For programs they will go out and do a capital campaign, reaching out to their nonprofit supporters to help fund the development and construction of units. Those will sometimes yield between 30 and 40 units, which is not a great deal for a lot of the effort the nonprofits are putting into raising those funds. We also had a conversation about the strategies in which they are employing different construction of the actual units to serve these households. So hotel conversions, right, so one of the things that we are finding that, yes, a nonprofit may be able to acquire hotel for a very affordable rate, but what they are finding is that converting that into affordable housing to meet even the federal requirements for housing quality standards, the costs to rehab and bring those back up to, you know, normal code is pretty cost prohibitive. It is sort of one of those things once you pull back the drywall, you start to see the things in the deferred maintenance and it starts, the costs start to add up. You also have local nonprofits that are looking to add tiny home construction. Those can range anywhere between \$30,000.00 and \$50,000.00 per unit. That does not include the sewer and the overall infrastructure improvements that also need to be able to support those units once they are installed, and that also is another cost consideration. It also does not consider the land acquisition costs and containers. Not really sure how this is going to play here in Arizona. There are some zoning issues to still be sort of wrangled out, as well as whether or not they are energy efficient, however, the cost for those are already sort of projected to be somewhere around \$120,000.00. Again, that

does not count or include the sewer tie or any of the land acquisition in which the container would be located. We do see, and even through the Board's approval of previous GAP funding, you have developers like Newport that was built out the Belvedere location and works in partnership with Primavera for the support of services. So those are really great collaborations that ensure support services are provided for those households and based on how they are funded, it may actually be a requirement that you have supportive services available for those households. If you have, say, project based vouchers or anything that would say any number of units over a certain amount, you have to have support services provided for those folks, especially if they are coming in from a homeless setting. And really, at the end of the day, asking your developers to come up with a proforma or a financing structure to help underwrite units that would absolutely be dedicated for households exiting homelessness without a guarantee, such as a federal project-based voucher, is a very difficult thing for them to pencil out. They cannot secure debt against unknown future revenue from rental income. So, this is where the strategy gets a little bit varied from anything from all of the other traditional approaches when we are talking about construction for units for households at or below 80% of the area median income, these folks come in with absolutely no income. We work to get them stable, we you hope that you are bringing them in with a rental support, however, that is not guaranteed. So again, it is very difficult for a developer to be able to actualize that debt for a prospective lender. Next slide please. So again, all of this is predicated on the findings from EcoNorthwest. The preliminary results as mentioned earlier identified 116,000 units needed by 2045, and that includes the 21,000 units right now. If current household need 8,000 of which are for those individuals who would be exiting homeless situations. It is important to note that of those individuals who do get housed, whether it be from a federal program, from a state, or even from local resources and supports, are largely going to be housed in any unit we can find that is available. And that means that we are spending a lot of money on market rate rents. We already know that market rate rent is still higher than most folks can afford and so what we are doing is we are always housing people, and we are crossing our fingers and hoping that they can stay stably housed, especially when we are leasing them up in units that exceed 100% and 120% of the area median income. Next slide please. So, we come back to this. So of all of the considerations I have had the unique opportunity to be looking at this on both sides. Right. So, to be evaluating recommendations around shelter feasibility, knowing that traditionally we have on average about 1,300 individuals who may not be in shelter settings during the point in time count. Also, knowing that we have got to be looking at how our Affordable Housing Commission is making recommendations to you all around a housing strategy over the next ten years to and how that 8,000 number of units is part of that 21,000 of current need. So, balancing that as well. And again, the housing strategy as informed by Board Policy 22.17, GAP funding for housing that will be affordable and could really interrupt homelessness. There is always the balance that you have to strike on any sort of funding recommendation that understands that unit development will take time, and we cannot, in the meantime, ignore what is an ongoing crisis for individuals when housing affordability is still a challenge. So, you have to balance a little bit of both at the same time, you know, it is like walking backwards, chewing bubblegum, you

know, on a tightrope. Next slide please. So, this brings to the recommendation for you that, again this was the recommendation proposed to the Regional Affordable Housing Commission and consideration of their full recommendation for a housing strategy. And that is again aligned, taking into consideration and keeping it in alignment with Board Policy D 22.17, closing the GAP in affordable housing, tackling housing insecurity and preventing an escalation of homelessness. So, the recommendation is threefold, it is to, one, continue to use GAP funding to build more housing that is affordable. Two, it is to do whatever we can to continue to disrupt homelessness at the time housing is lost. So to prevent return or first time homelessness, that is where the Pima County Emergency Eviction Legal Services program is still an outlier nationally in terms of an ongoing program to interrupt homelessness at the time, housing is lost. And the third and final is a rental subsidy to find some manner and way to bridge folks into housing, while at the same time building units that will be affordable for households earning at or below 80% of the area median income and remain affordable for a minimum of 30 years. It is a way of ensuring that you can see this in a very diverse and very strategic approach, so that it does not mean that we are over prioritizing one particular strategy at the expense of future unit development and future unit, because, again, the inventory is always going to be a significant constraint in interrupting homelessness. And to go back briefly to, you know, the evaluation that I conducted in terms of to help frame recommendations for shelter feasibility and work plan, looking at 50 states, affordable housing is the thing that is driving a lot of the challenges in every state across the country. And in terms of interrupting homelessness, not a single example pointed specifically and only to shelter, but it pointed to a very specific strategy in which you are preventing first time homelessness because it is cost saving, right? It is actually a lot less expensive to prevent homelessness than it is to end it. Again, as was evidenced through the cost range between \$8,400.00 and \$20,000.00 a year. But it is also the thing that really makes the difference, right? When you talk to anyone in any lane of advocacy or work in homeless issues, they will always tell you that the first thing to end, to address homelessness is to really stave off homelessness is access to housing. Housing is a significant barrier, and that is all that I have and I can pause here for questions.

SC: Mr. Chair?

(Inaudible due to muted mic.)

RS: Sorry, I did not have my microphone on, Supervisor. Yes, Go ahead, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yeah. I was wondering if Ms. Darland could just very briefly address how the July 24, 2025, Executive Order from the administration will address, she will be addressing this Executive Order. And I am kind of wondering how Section 8, Citizenship Enforcement, will impact this effort.

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, this is still a space of unknown. The soonest that we are going to be able to see how the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has interpreted the President's Executive Order will be when they do,

when they make their annual release of notice of funding opportunity, which is yet to be released, and that way we will probably, will be our first opportunity to see what the department has directed and how they are interpreting that Executive Order. But to date, we have yet to see any official rulemaking from the administration in that space. Now, it could very well be that the City of Tucson, because they are the public housing authority they may see other versions of that Executive Order, however, we are not a public housing authority, and I am not aware of any rulemaking again, or direction to our to the to the County specifically in that space.

SC: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments from Board members? I had one and I had emailed you yesterday, Director Darland and copied Ms. Leshner. In the August 28th memo that you sent to Ms. Leshner and she forwarded to the Board the same day, under the section entitled, Development of a Work Plan, there is a bulleted section entitled, Regional Dialog, and I just wanted to read the last three sentences from that section says, *"The reoccurring theme in multiple conversations during conducting this evaluation,"* and I want to say parenthetically, I appreciate greatly how much dialog you had with our partners in the public and private sectors throughout the region while you were following up on the request that I made, *"The reoccurring theme in multiple conversations during conducting this evaluation was the absence of a regional mission that includes jurisdictional representatives, housing and services providers, faith-based organizations, business representatives, and community stakeholders. The objective would be to establish a clear set of goals, which could create a means of establishing collective accountability and expand participation of community stakeholders in addressing challenges. While there is active interest in convening a regional discussion, no plans have been established to date."* I would appreciate it if you and Ms. Leshner could get back to the Board, at least prior to our next meeting on September 16th, in the form of a memorandum, and just let us know some options that the County could exercise for playing a leadership role in convening that regional discussion that you have found really needs to happen.

JD: Chair Scott, absolutely. One thing I would be remiss if I did not share with you, if I have not said it enough in this in my presentation, I want to just say it one more time. Absolutely, I can get on that memo as well. In the sense that the County has convened a very meaningful conversation around housing affordability, the work with staff at CWD and as well as Development Services and Real Property has also involved their counterparts at the City of Tucson, Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita. This is, you know, so to that extent, I want to assure the Board that absent of an actual convening on homelessness specifically, this is one thing that I do believe that the County has done very, very well as a leader in the regional space, addressing what, again, is a national crisis, it is a national challenge, affordable housing. And this is where the County, through the composition of your Regional Affordable Housing Commission and again, through the working group with your commission members and our regional partners, we have had some extraordinarily meaningful conversations and development related to the recommendation that you will be seeing more comprehensively at the end of this calendar year. So, again,

happy to get on the convening for the homeless conversation, but I just again want to assure you, especially before Director Sullivan presents on his item, is to again say that this is where the County has been a leader.

RS: I absolutely agree, and I am grateful for the fact that the Regional Affordable Housing Commission not only includes appointees from each one of our five offices but also includes jurisdictional representation. I am grateful to Ms. Leshner and her team for making sure to expand that jurisdictional representation to include representation from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and Tohono O'odham Nation. I think all the work that is been done in that space is absolutely laudatory, and I think it is a foundation that we can build on in terms of having that regional discussion about homelessness that you reference in your memo.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much, Chair and Director Darland, thank you for your comprehensive update. As we get ready to hear from Director Sullivan and the Board sets forth all of our funding parameters for some of these additional dollars to go toward housing. You know, I just have to say that so much of what you have shared to the Board is going to require a lot of innovation and creativity, especially in the nonprofit sector. And I guess, I am really just venting at this point after a three-hour executive session and that I am hearing a lot of concern among some Tucsonans about some innovative programs that are going to be addressing homelessness in a creative way. And I am concerned and to understand both sides, I see the public safety side, and I see the need for us to have humanitarian response. What I do not think is really, well, what I am trying to stress from this dais is that innovation will be key in all of this, and it is going to be important for us to be able to try something different and be able to keep people housed. And I just sense a lot of NIMBYism right now happening in our community as it relates to some of these programs. And I do you want some kind of reform or do you not? Right. As kind of the rhetorical question that I am having here at trying to grasp, because I think that I have seen our community provide resources. I have seen where that does not work either and I feel like from at least from this perspective, the County has continued to do our part to try to encourage action and so as we figure out what those new strategies are going to be, I just tell you to go full speed ahead is what I wanted to share Director. You are doing incredible work. Now we have data to be able to put behind all of it and I think that is exactly the type of policy decisions that we ought to be making and really just wanted to say thanks, appreciate you.

RS: Thank you very much, Supervisor. Supervisor Christy, anything else on your end?

SC: (Waved no.)

RS: Alright. Okay. Director Darland, thank you very much. Appreciate your patience.