

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 18, 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 9:36 a.m.

1. CONTRACT

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., to provide for post design services for Elvado Road Storm Drain Project, Flood Control District Capital Project Fund, contract amount \$31,276.90 (PO2500020427) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 18, 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 9:36 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Pima County, Rocking K South Community Facilities District and Rocking K Development Co., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Development and Intergovernmental Agreement for Rocking K South Community Facilities District, extend contract term to 7/11/67 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_17-447)

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 18, 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 9:36 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Marcos Ysmael, Housing Program Manager, Pima County Community and Workforce Development.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

4. Presentation of a proclamation to J.J. Lamb, President & CEO, Vail Preservation Society, proclaiming the day of Saturday, August 23, 2025 to be: "PIMA COUNTY TUCSON 250+ CELEBRATION"

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

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Lorena Verdugo, certified Community Health Worker, Pima County Community Health Worker Coalition, proclaiming the week of August 25 through August 29, 2025 to be: "COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKER AWARENESS WEEK"

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. Supervisor Cano made the presentation.

6. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Monica Molinares addressed the Board and expressed her strong support for the PEEPS Program. She stated that the program allowed her son to gain confidence in himself and attend kindergarten without fear.

Tiffany Bucharely–Fay, Director, Early Childhood Education, Amphitheater School District, thanked the Board for their support and commitment to funding early childhood education and their investment in the PEEPS program. She stated that the program prepared children for higher learning and was a great imitative within the community.

Zach Yentzer, Vice President of Business Advocacy, Chamber of Southern Arizona, expressed support for PEEPS and highlighted the economic impact of inadequate access to childcare, citing a study which found an estimated \$350 million of tax revenue was lost annually in the state due to challenges of access and affordability in these programs. He stated that the Chamber supported using the Library District's fund balance for the program and encouraged alignment with existing business coalition efforts rather than creating new ones.

Randy Rist addressed the Board regarding his neighbor's trash encroaching on his property and the constant barking and aggression of their dogs. He stated that his neighbor had been cited once by the County, but the piles of trash and clutter continued and were not cleaned up.

Reed Spurling thanked Supervisor Allen for her careful investigation of the guardrails urgently needed to ensure continuing economic development while protecting the shared resources from the massive risks of hyper scale data centers. He emphasized the importance of protecting water for future generations and future economic development. He asked that some Board meetings be held later in the day to increase public participation.

Kelly Griffith, Executive Director, Center of Economic Integrity, thanked Supervisor Cano for bringing the issue of supplement funding for PEEPS before the Board and shared testimonials from parents and early childhood educators whose daily lives were positively impacted by the program.

Yadel Liese thanked the Board for their support of PEEPS and spoke about how it enabled families to access early childhood education and helped students with their social and emotional growth.

Meghan Heddings, Executive Director, Family Housing Resources (FHR), addressed the Board regarding the IDA Resolution that involved bonds that were originally approved for their local multifamily housing development project, but due to a number of setbacks that made it unfeasible to pursue, FHR wanted to transfer those bonds to a multifamily housing project in Goodyear, Arizona, before they expired in December.

Gerald Montag expressed his opposition to the Pima County Sheriff's Department's (PCSD) current fiscal year budget and the second consecutive year they had gone over budget. He spoke about an ACLU lawsuit that sought communication between PCSD and immigration officials and urged the Board to support better transparency.

Penelope Jacks expressed her support for PEEPS and the positive impact the program had on providing families with access to high quality, early childhood education. She believed that every child who received a scholarship represented the Board's commitment to the future of the community.

Melanie Lenart spoke in support of the zoning regulations for data centers. She urged the Board to consider the effect that data centers would have on water, land, and energy usage in the future.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Chair Scott asked the County Administrator to designate Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr., to engage with Mr. Rist regarding the issues he spoke about concerning his neighbor.

7. **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 12:02 p.m.

8. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 12:45 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

9. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion relating to the waiver and distribution of Attorney-Client privileged memoranda.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Heinz shared that the RTA, mostly their TMC Board, had been meeting frequently, working hard to place their item on the March ballot. He stated that because of the timing it might not be received well by the public, and referenced Prop. 414 which fell short of the expected 70% approval rate. He noted that the RTA's new Counsel Lisa Anne Smith, from DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy, P.C., informed the RTA Board that the significant changes they had at this point triggered the necessity to go to the ballot to tweak things with the original RTA Next Plan. He reported that on the March ballot voters would see a summary of changes to the original RTA Next Plan and its pending projects, the new 20-year RTA Next Plan, and a new half-cent sales tax. He stated that statutorily it had to be on the ballot, but it was the same rate as the previous one that they were currently paying now. He expressed his concern regarding this given the most recent actions of the public and the economic uncertainties. He stated that the RTA voted 6-2 to move forward with a new RTA Next Plan draft, but reiterated his concern over the timing and possible rejection by the public. He stated that while they could secure \$24 million in transit funding by pushing items to the November ballot, they would not recover financially if voters rejected the March ballot. He stated that the Boards would need to have the items finalized by their next meeting on August 25, 2025.

Supervisor Christy asked Supervisor Heinz how he planned to vote on the items at the next RTA meeting.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he was undecided, but would continue voicing his concern over the timing. He noted that he voted against putting the items on the March ballot, but it had passed 6-2. He clarified that he was supportive of the new plan, but reiterated his concern with the timing because it felt rushed and he would continue to have discussions with his colleagues.

Chair Scott asked Legal Counsel if it was okay for the Board to continue this discussion since it had started to go into specifics of the RTA's work.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Heinz for the engagement that he and his district office had on RTA. He believed that the plan the RTA Board endorsed was a consensus driven regional document that needed this Board's support, and he was in favor of an extension of the existing tax structure in order to fund the transit system, create more jobs, and foster cooperation with other jurisdictions. He stated that it had taken a lot of effort and with leadership from RTA Executive Director Mr. Ortega and the plans he had seen, it indicated that the RTA's current path would have the least amount of fiscal impact on the region and transit operations.

Supervisor Heinz noted that his initial concern over the lack of fiscal contingency and being \$1 billion short from the first RTA, was addressed in the plan recently endorsed by the RTA Board. He clarified that this was not anyone's fault, but rather the impact of recessions in the early 2000s and the global pandemic that caused inflation and cost overruns. He stated that to avoid repeating past mistakes, they could be more financially responsible by including a contingency plan and ensuring that they stuck to it. He remarked that during the 19 plus years of the RTA's existence, revenues had never come in at the levels that were expected, they got within \$8 million during the second year. He stated that Mr. Ortega provided the RTA Board with 19 years of revenue data displaying annual shortfalls.

Chair Scott stated that as his predecessor on that same Board, he and his colleagues had requested that data multiple times to no avail, so he was sure the current members who had been on the previous Board appreciated that data.

Supervisor Cano stated he was continually impressed by Visit Tucson's national and international outreach to promote Tucson as a destination of choice. He shared several marketing headlines and highlighted a Visit Tucson ad he heard on Futuro Media Group, which was one of his favorite podcasts. He added that the Visit Tucson Board was meeting that week.

Supervisor Allen stated that while the Board of Health had not met since the summer, the Border Counties Coalition continued to meet. She noted the creation of a new board seat for representation from the Tohono O'odham Nation. She stated that the Coalition had been discussing the importance of and process of developing a much more coherent, cohesive narrative that better reflected the border and highlighted it as the economic powerhouse for the United States and Mexico, and how their communities were inextricably linked, so that the region would not be seen as dangerous, void, or in need of more militarization. She added that they had been provided with a great presentation regarding the current improvements happening at every Arizona Port of Entry, and an \$800 million investment was going towards port of entry infrastructure improvements for Yuma, Nogales, and Douglas.

No Board action was taken.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. Pima County Climate Action Update

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

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration, provided a slideshow presentation on the County's Climate Action Plan that had been built by the commitment of the Board of Supervisors by resolution on May 6th, which recommended an approach on climate and how to strategize the next five-year plan. She stated that the resolution included a 60% reduction in carbon emissions

goals across County operations with a shift in how they looked at climate and sustainability work in conservation, how they would adapt some of the region's biggest climate risks, and build resilience across communities. She added that it included how they would prepare and recover from extreme heat, wildfire risk and other risks like drought. She stated that this was the primer of the five-year plan that the Board would be able to receive and respond to, and consider for approval with data and metrics. She explained that the climate action teams were representative of over 25 County departments, 40 staff members, directors, subject matter experts and key operational folks that would help drive this work. She stated that a working session held on July 31st focused on defining metrics and addressing barriers to federal funding, emphasized the County's commitment to a data-driven approach to sustainability, energy efficiency, and resilience. She stated that they had also embarked on a regional climate action plan which included partners with the City of Tucson, Oro Valley, South Tucson, Tohono O'odham Nation and Pima Association of Governments (PAG), for a full review of regional greenhouse gas emissions inventory. She stated that the biggest carbon emissions footprint was in facilities, wastewater, fleet services and, newly added, commuter emissions. She stated that the regional focus would be on comprehensive efforts in transportation emissions, residential, energy, industrial and commercial wastewater of the 60% reduction by 2030. She stated that public feedback about what people's climate priorities were and what they wanted to see was that government agencies needed to take the first step so this was the County's demonstrated commitment in that space. She stated that the update in October which closed out Fiscal Year '24, had shown they were ahead of schedule for carbon emissions reductions, but it was substantially larger at this time. She stated that the County's emissions goal was to reduce from 53,265 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent to 38,509 metric tons by 2030. She confirmed that the County had sufficient projects and alignment between capital planning and energy goals to meet the target, averaging approximately 6,122 metric tons of reduction per year. She stated that it would not be evenly distributed across five years, but they wanted to know based on the Sustainable Action Plan for County Operations (SAPCO) if performance-based metrics could influence the future. She stated that new data on commuter emissions showed an 8% reduction in 2021, largely due to telecommuting during the pandemic, and a 12% reduction in 2024. She added that a travel reduction survey was scheduled for October to gather more accurate data and would also look at data from the PAG Survey distributed through Department of Environmental Quality. She stated that between 2018 and 2024, through the six-year SAPCO period, there was an average annual reduction of 6,559 metric tons of carbon emission reductions through thoughtful energy efficiency projects, advancement and renewables, standardization across County buildings and capital improvement and investment. She stated that as they reviewed these subcategories, in terms of energy strategies across County buildings, wastewater and fleet, they would look at an inventory and an audit and where they made strategic investments and return on investment and cost savings. She added that most of the County fleet had been electrified and that GIS route planning was being explored to further reduce emissions. She explained that their water conservation efforts included a 16% reduction in water use across County facilities. She stated that the Water Working Group prioritized groundwater replenishment, turf

conversion, and increased use of reclaimed water and green infrastructure. She stated that adaptation, extreme heat and invasive species had their own plans, but it included a County component. She highlighted the County's adoption of a heat protection ordinance, administrative procedures for workforce safety, and that the County continued to support a network of over 20 cooling centers and home weatherization programs. She stated that they would also connect the Wildfire plan to this through advancement in how they treated invasive species and land management. She stated that landscapes would be trimmed because it was already a component of water and landscapes as a component of carbon emissions reduction strategies through carbon sinks. She stated that they would keep these specific targets, which existed in the SAPCO but were also represented in some other chapters, like urban areas. She stated they would continue to commit to tree planting and green infrastructure and their work with Conservation Lands and Resources. She stated they would continue to keep those percent reductions in and around reduction of materials and waste in landfills but also thinking about the types of materials used. She stated for example, the fleet management team was exploring soy-based tires, cool pavement and the types of materials procured that were aligned with their sustainability goals. She underscored that they were continuing to build dialog at the dais and over the summer on the connectivity between the County's economic development work and sustainability by creating those linkages through environmental review and demonstrating their commitment to sustainability and leadership in this role could continue to bring economic vitality to the community, residents, and a cost savings and return on investment. She highlighted workforce preparedness efforts, the Green Stewards Program, and the importance of communicating data in accessible formats to demonstrate return on investment. She stated that their regional partnership was growing the workforce discussion from a Chamber of Commerce perspective and looking at green infrastructure jobs. She added that they would continue to regularly report to the Board on what this data meant.

Supervisor Cano thanked County Administration and department staff for putting together this incredible work. He stated that he believed they were headed towards a path where they could turbocharge this plan and show it as a model example across the region of what the County could do. He indicated that he had questions and the responses could be provided in a memorandum. He questioned how the County used methane capturing as a source of fuel, wanted to review the contract and what the return on investment was for operations at the wastewater facilities. He questioned what kind of inventory was available at County libraries and parks for solar use, and any kind of existing footprint where they could plan out future solar parking structures that were seen in a lot of various facilities throughout the County and to continue that. He stated that he did not understand how the solar capacity gained through some of the County's existing infrastructure fit into the overall portfolio of energy consumption. He asked if this was being sold back to the regional utility and if the County was capturing the battery capacity.

Supervisor Allen stated that she had questions around the data and she could follow up with Ms. Davis directly. She stated that there was a headline article in the

Arizona Daily Star about the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) voting 5-0 to repeal the State's renewable energy standard and it was also articulated that Arizona Public Service (APS) had already said that they intended to renege on their commitment to getting 100% renewable energy generation by a certain time. She stated a massive investment in natural gas facilities and infrastructure had been seen locally and asked how those things affected the County's efforts. She questioned if the degree that the County had set out its goals and targets were enough to communicate with the ACC about what the County expected of them and supporting them as the regulatory body for the utility, whether the County could be doing more.

Chair Scott requested a response from the County Administrator regarding Supervisor Allen's question.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that there had not been any communication with the ACC but would ensure they were responding to and communicating as they looked at State efforts with the rulemaking, how they were evaluated and what the County did. She stated for example, recently exploring to become an intervenor in the Tucson Electric Power (TEP) rate case. She stated they had started some things but had not had a robust experience with that in terms of how it was put together and ensured they were aware of all those other external forces. She asked Ms. Davis if there was a way to indicate how the committee might be evaluating that in the future.

Ms. Davis stated that the ACC decision was substantial, and the APS's response was substantial. She stated that they worked very closely with TEP on the SAPCO effort and the development of the Climate Action Plan for County Operations (CAPCO) and as seen on one of the lines on the graph was TEP's commitment to renewables if the County did nothing and how that would affect overall impact. She stated that to her knowledge, TEP had not made a statement but that she could issue something similar to the Water Working Group memo that was specific to energy efficiency, renewables, and the vast data around it. She stated that because a component of that was indirectly and directly related to the County, they needed to think through some of the regulatory space and how it should be considered as they walked through the next five years, because it was substantial and very similar to some of the federal funding. She stated that it could be provided in a memorandum for the Board.

Supervisor Allen asked whether the goals within the CAPCO could be achieved through internal operational changes, or if the assumption was also that there was going to be Board policy changes that needed to happen in order for these goals to be achieved.

Ms. Davis replied that they could achieve it with the existing capacity that had been built since 2007. She stated they would focus on how they looked at capital asset inventory and how it was being spent thoughtfully. She added that with the inclusion of a fourth budget pillar for climate and sustainability they would be able to measure

costs. She stated that as seen with the extreme heat response policy and procedures, this had been integral to the success of that. She stated that she would continue to update the Board about potential policy updates and emphasized their adherence to Board resolutions and directives in climate action efforts, while remaining open to considering formal policy where appropriate.

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

12. **Wildfire Mitigation Plan**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update on Wildfire Mitigation Plan.

Amaris Vasquez, Senior Advisor, County Administration, provided a slide show presentation and acknowledged the active wildfire season affecting northern Arizona and much of the West Coast. She stated that although the seasonal outlook was slightly better, persistent drought and elevated temperatures continued to pose risks in the region. She explained that the Wildfire Executive Group had adopted a draft Pima County Wildland Urban Interface (PC WUI) map and it delineated areas where the built environment intersected with wildland vegetation and identified housing density levels and watercourses. She stated that the ArcGIS map included layers such as Supervisorial districts, jurisdictional boundaries, and tax-coded County-owned parcels. She added that using this mitigation map would enable data driven decision making across departments and jurisdictions that Pima County was collaborating with on actionable projects and a disclaimer pop-up was added to clarify the map's intended use. She stated that the data parameters were informed by agencies including the U.S. Geological Survey, USDA, National Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and local jurisdictions and the PC WUI map would be used until the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) was completed. She stated they were very thankful to the Department of Forestry and Fire Management for funding the CWPP update, and the Office of Emergency Management (OEM) held the initial meeting on August 6th, with completion anticipated by June 2026. She explained that each task in the Wildfire Mitigation Plan had been dissected into categories, as listed on the slide show, to define deliverables, success metrics, and funding sources. She stated that they worked with the Finance team to develop a funding request workflow using Workday. She added that community considerations were identified to tailor approaches to different landscapes and needs, and identified challenges and risks early to prevent future obstacles. She referenced a sample table included in the Board's materials, showing task progress and timelines and noted that wildfire risk could not be addressed by a single department, and it was essential to have collaboration among County departments and regional stakeholders. She stated that public education was identified as a high-impact, quickly implementable area and they had leveraged existing social media platforms to share educational messaging and public service announcements through fire agencies, County websites, and partners like the U of A Cooperative Extension and the Desert Museum. She explained that the messaging calendar had been adopted by the newly formed Desert Fire and Invasives Collaborative Coalition to ensure coordinated outreach and the group coordinated

messaging on risk reduction topics that would keep all partners aligned and ensured that the community heard a repeated message that was coordinated rather than fragmented outreach. She stated they were also working to get this information incorporated into a County website tied to Pima CAN! She explained that the mitigation tasks aimed to reduce wildfire risks by addressing fuels and conditions before fires started, and that they could do this by reducing highly flammable vegetation and creating defensible space around homes and WUI areas, directly reducing the chance of catastrophic losses. She stated ideas they had for the defensible space mitigation were piloting a program for waived dump fee applications for those in need, up to the budget allocated for disposal of eligible brush vegetation at local landfills and transfer stations and expanding a Brush and Bulky removal initiative, which could support vulnerable populations such as the elderly, individuals with functional limitations and limited financial means by providing direct assistance with vegetation removal, brush trimming and debris disposal. She stated that this initiative could involve scheduled community-wide volunteer events or contractor support, and it could help residents clear hazardous materials and create defensible space around their homes. She stated another idea would be creating a community chipping program, which could offer mulching or chipping services at predesignated community drop off sites around the County for residents, and wildland urban interface or intermix zones. She stated that these efforts aimed to prepare neighborhoods, protect watersheds, and support faster recovery after fires. She highlighted the importance of preparedness, especially for emergency response and that OEM was working with the County's Information Technology Department to create a new evacuation zone map. She added that a tabletop exercise led by TEP was scheduled for the end of the month to simulate a public safety power shutoff during a wildfire. She stated that updating the Pima County Community Wildfire Protection Plan was crucial and encouraged residents to sign up for My Alert notifications and to follow the "Ready, Set, Go" messaging.

Supervisor Christy commended Ms. Vasquez for her coordination and efforts. He shared that he had met with the Green Valley Council's Executive Committee and they were enthusiastic about the plans, especially regarding debris clearing. He noted that his field representative, Doug Kenyon, had been working with Ms. Vasquez and praised her work. He stated that he looked forward to further expansion of the plans and mentioned that Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr., would attend the Green Valley Board of Representatives meeting in September to discuss insurance issues related to the Firewise Program, like the Mt. Lemmon community being the hallmark of the program. He emphasized the importance of County support for mitigation efforts and expressed appreciation for the community cooperation across District 4.

Supervisor Allen stated that what had been heard from a lot of residents in western Pima County, was confusion around which fire restrictions were in place for different types of land, given that in western Pima County and other places around the County there was a mix of County land, State trust land, Bureau of Land Management, Park Service, Fish and Wildlife. She stated that when the County dropped its level from Stage 2 to Stage 1, residents saw that, which then triggered a

whole cascade of other questions around what was happening in the jurisdictions. She stated that it made her wonder if there was more that could be done by the County around education and outreach, specifically to places like the Ajo Copper News or the Fence Post in Three Points. She asked how much education and work was already happening for outreach in those publications for the rural areas and if there was more that the County could do to support that.

Ms. Vasquez responded yes and agreed that outreach to all communities was important. She explained that the County's decision to lower fire restrictions followed the State's lead and that the Desert Fire and Invasives Collaborative Coalition would help coordinate messaging when such changes occurred and she would take the feedback and incorporate that in the plan.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

13. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), General Assembly & Church of The Firstborn has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2020 through 2024, for Tax Parcel Nos. 101-15-3360, 226-01-010A and 226-01-011A.

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

14. Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – 28, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the proceedings of the Industrial Development Authority of the County of Pima regarding the issuance of its Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds (Flats at Ballpark Village) Series 2025 and its Multifamily Housing Revenue Note (Flats at Ballpark Village) Series 2025, in a combined total aggregate principal amount not-to-exceed \$60,000,000.00, and declaring an emergency.

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

Michael Slania, Counsel to the Industrial Development Authority (IDA), stated that the Pima IDA was a statutorily created entity and it did not pledge the obligation of County, the State or the Pima IDA to the bonds, it was project based financing, so from that perspective, it was strictly a borrower coming forward to borrow money by going through the IDA, where a lower interest rate could normally be achieved on those bonds. He stated that they were revenue bonds under the statute, they did

not use any taxpayer monies and the IDA did not receive any support from the County. He stated that the Resolution before the Board was for Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds for an affordable housing development for the benefit of Family Housing Resources. He stated that this was a specific situation where in order to issue bonds of these types, they must obtain what was called private activity volume cap, which was a scarce resource because it was \$900 million for the entire state of Arizona. He stated that if it was not used in any year, they could get carryforward. He indicated that the carryforward, which was the subject matter of this Resolution, was only good for three calendar years, and they had a carryforward for a project authorized by the Pima IDA for Family Housing Resources that would expire at the end of this year if it was not used, which meant it went away and could not be used by any other Authority and could not be used for anything other than Multifamily Housing Development. He stated that state statute allowed them to move from one project to another project if that need occurred, which was the case in this instance. He stated that the Pima IDA authorized issuance of the bonds and a reallocation of that private activity carryforward volume cap from the project that was identified at Campbell and Drexel to the Goodyear project, and that structure was a publicly offered bond issue that at the end of construction would become a single multifamily note held by Citibank as an affordable housing developer. He added that the IDA could issue bonds, not only in Pima County, but throughout the state as all IDAs could for multifamily housing developments with nonprofit partners.

Supervisor Christy asked why they had halted the Campbell and Drexel project.

Meghan Heddings, Executive Director, Family Housing Resources (FHR), responded that the primary issue they faced was the original development plan that had been put forward only had a maximum of 100 units, and with that density they had an \$8 million gap in funding. She stated that even if they assumed the gap funding that they currently expected, the intention was to use the low-income housing tax credit program for that 4%, but found that it would be financially unfeasible to pursue. She said that they were now in the process of redevelopment and because the City of Tucson had passed the Community Corridors Tool, it allowed them to potentially explore additional density at the project which would enhance what they could do. She added that they had a new plan with the City's Planning Department that allowed them to increase the maximum number of units at the project.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the potential costs of the project before realizing they could not move forward with that project.

Ms. Heddings responded that housing development projects were fairly complex. She stated that they had found land that they believed was reasonable and could be explored, but realized that they were unable to pursue it. She commented that she did not believe that project was not completely off the table.

Supervisor Christy asked why the original project could not be pursued.

Ms. Heddings responded that they did not have a feasible financial structure for the project.

Supervisor Christy stated that the money originally intended for that project would be sent to the Goodyear location.

Ms. Heddings explained that FHR was the general partner for the project and would participate in the project with the Lincoln Avenue Group for the Goodyear project. She stated that the Lincoln Avenue Group was a robust national builder who had not come to Pima County yet because it was not economically viable, since the cost of construction had been too high and rental rates too low to financially make it feasible.

Supervisor Christy asked how FHR envisioned getting the finances for the Campbell and Drexel project and the timeframe for starting that project.

Ms. Heddings responded that they were still exploring how to complete the project, whether it be through a 4% or 9% low-income housing tax credit project, but were looking forward to pursuing the housing development in 2026.

Mr. Slania added that the private activity volume cap was a calendar year test and said the state received about \$900 million annually for these types of projects, and a developer could get a reallocation later in the calendar year. He stated that at this point, they would need to wait for next January for the next available volume.

Supervisor Christy asked how the Goodyear project would be affected if FHR had been able to finish the Campbell project.

Mr. Slania responded that if the Board approved the Resolution they would issue the bonds for the Goodyear project and clarified that it was separate from any financing that would be done for the Campbell and Drexel project.

Supervisor Christy noted that the funds initially intended for the Campbell project were now being transferred to the Goodyear project.

Mr. Slania explained that the money was a volume cap allocation, which was an issuance of bonds. He stated that there was no limitation on the amount of bonds that could be issued for project based financing for projects like this under the IDA statute. He stated that the \$60 million used for the Goodyear project could be separate and apart from the \$60 million that could be issued in the future for the Campbell and Drexel project.

Chair Scott asked if the Board opposed the Resolution, if the money would be unavailable for any project.

Mr. Slania replied that the money would expire at the end of the calendar year, in December, with no use.

Supervisor Allen inquired if the expiration of these bonds could be remedied by a temporary extension.

Mr. Slania responded that a time extension did not exist. He stated that it was a Treasury regulation and when the carryforward was obtained in 2022, the Pima IDA filed a request which granted that 3 year period, so there was no time extension available.

Supervisor Allen asked if the IDA's bond rating would be affected by unspent funds or if there were other ramifications for unspent money.

Mr. Slania replied that there were no ramifications for that and as previously indicated, each project was based on its own. He stated if there was a rating on the project, it would be just for this project based on this borrower and separate from any future projects.

Supervisor Allen inquired about the fee that the County collected when the bond was issued for the project.

Mr. Slania responded that under statute the Pima IDA charged an annual administrative fee that was five basis points on the outstanding principal amount of the bonds or at the request of the borrower, it could be an upfront fee charged at the initial point, but that had not yet been determined.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Facilities Management

15. Eleven Cafe, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide a lease agreement for 33 N. Stone, Suite 150, extend contract term to 8/31/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$29,580.07 revenue (CTN-FM-19-18)

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

Finance and Risk Management

16. Pima County, Rocking K South Community Facilities District and Rocking K Development Co., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Development and Intergovernmental Agreement for Rocking K South Community Facilities District, extend contract term to 7/11/67 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_17-447)

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

Procurement

17. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for design-build services for San Xavier Sheriff Substation (XSDSS), extend contract term to 12/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2500021032) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

18. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc., Amendment No. 8, to provide for the ESRI Geographic Information Systems Software ELA Project, extend contract term to 11/29/28 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$3,200,000.00 (SC2400000831) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

19. RDO Construction Equipment Co., to provide for John Deere heavy construction equipment, Fleet Services Ops Fund, contract amount \$900,000.00/1 year, 8 months term (SC2500000482) Administering Department: Fleet Services

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

20. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 11, to provide for computer software and related items, extend contract term to 1/31/26 and amend contractual language, General (50%) and Enterprise Funds, contract amount \$2,900,000.00 (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Recorder

21. Theelios, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for database management, extend contract term to 9/5/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_23-77)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired if this was the same contractor who had been performing the contract duties in his own residence and whether the contractor was willing to work unpaid for another year.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded yes and that the Recorder's Office had worked with the contractor for several years. She stated that no additional funding was needed for the contract.

Supervisor Christy asked if the contractor's work was involved with the City of Tucson's Primary Election.

Chair Scott responded that it was not. He stated that the last time the Board discussed this item, the Information Technology Department (ITD) Director had been in attendance to assure the Board regarding the security of the arrangement with this vendor.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated part of the assurance from Director Baca was that there would be a transition to a new system that allowed for more communication with ITD.

Supervisor Christy requested confirmation that the contractor had not worked on the City of Tucson Primary Election.

Chair Scott responded that from his conversation with the Recorder, the reason for the extension of this item was because it involved several developers in her office and the overlap of both the City of Tucson Election and the South Tucson Special Election, and there was some internal control within the office that needed to be shifted and had not been.

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

22. BP Vail Partners, L.L.C., to provide a wastewater service agreement for construction of a public sewerage system and provision of wastewater service for Public Off-site Sewer to serve Vail Crossings South and Desert Vistas, no cost/10 year term (SC2500000497)

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

Sheriff

23. Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers Green Valley District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for property loss protection - Green Valley SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400006084)

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

24. Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers Green Valley District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for property loss protection - Green Valley SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Self Insurance Trust Fund, contract amount \$6,000.00 revenue (CT2400000033)

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

25. Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers, Amendment No. 1, to provide for property loss protection - SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400006085).

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

26. Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers, Amendment No. 1, to provide for property loss protection - SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Self Insurance Trust Fund, contract amount \$8,462.30 revenue (CT2400000034)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

27. **Acceptance – Community and Workforce Development**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 29, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Continuum of Care La Casita "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2025 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for HUD Continuum of Care Program - La Casita, \$260,495.00/\$65,123.75 General Fund Match (G-CWD-79108)

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

Supervisor Cano commended the County Administrator and Community and Workforce Development team, noting that the grant and its programming aligned with the Board's budget pillars which aimed at improving quality of life and housing stability. He added that this material supported the Board's direction to departments by working in alignment with the Prosperity Initiative.

Supervisor Christy asked if the funds were currently being reviewed by the federal government.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that as staff reviewed the agreements for receipt of these funds, they did so in coordination with the Pima County Attorney's Office (PCAO) to ensure that the language in these agreements was consistent with the rulings that came out of litigation cases, particularly in King County.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, confirmed that they were closely observing court rulings as they engaged in litigation around Continuum of Care and Housing and Urban Development funding. He noted that this funding was being analyzed through the lens of the new guidance.

Supervisor Christy asked if PCAO was unable to determine if this funding was on the chopping block.

Mr. Brown responded that was correct, he could not say definitively.

Supervisor Christy inquired if they were carefully wording the agreements to comply with litigation rulings and asked if this characterization could be done successfully.

Mr. Brown responded that was correct, but PCAO and County Administration was hesitant because the guidance available was clear as mud and PCAO continued to work with its national partners to interpret the guidance and its applicability to various grants.

Supervisor Christy noted that by carefully massaging the wording in the agreements, PCAO and County Administration hoped the agreements would be approved accordingly.

Mr. Brown responded yes, but they were also in court to gain the clarity that was needed.

Supervisor Cano requested that the County Administrator provide a quick follow-up on Minute Item Nos. 27 and 28, to clarify for the Board that the funding for these items was proceeding and the programs were ready to house Pima County residents.

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

28. Acceptance – Community and Workforce Development

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 30, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Continuum of Care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2025 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for Pima County Homeless Management Information System Consolidation, \$448,750.00/\$112,187.50 General Fund Match (G-CWD-79112)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 27, for discussion related to this item.)

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to adopt the Resolution. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

29. **Acceptance – County Attorney**

Arizona Automobile Theft Authority, to provide for the FY26 Vertical Prosecution Grant Agreement, to support Theft Unit Staff, \$311,709.00 (G-PCA-89234)

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

30. **Acceptance – County Attorney**

Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the FY2026 Crime Victim Compensation Program Grant, \$735,809.00 (G-PCA-88028)

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

31. **Acceptance – County Attorney**

Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, to provide for the FY2026 Crime Victim Compensation Program Grant, \$181,734.00 (G-PCA-94040)

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

32. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 6, to provide for the Health Start Program, extend grant term to 9/30/25 and amend grant language, \$55,443.25 (GA-HD-70307)

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

33. **Acceptance – School Superintendent**

United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, to provide for the STEAMAZing Project at Pima County School Superintendent's Office, First Things First Professional Development Strategy, \$44,000.00 (G-SS-93980)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

34. Hearing – Tax Levy Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, for the levy of taxes for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

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

35. Hearing – Tax Collection Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 32, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the delivery of tax statements and the collection of the 2025 taxes.

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 Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano indicated that at the last Board meeting he had asked the County Administrator to return with a plan for more transparency on the County's tax statements, but had not received a response to that inquiry, however, he had been in communication with the Tax Assembly Group and the Assessor's Office, and discovered that some of the information he sought was already included on the tax statements. He stated that the County needed to work with the contractor to design a property tax bill in a manner that taxpayers deserved and in a way that they should be receiving the information, and noted that the guidance he previously provided might be a better fit for next year, given that the current year's tax statements would be delivered soon.

Supervisor Christy asked if Supervisor Cano's adjustments or proposed changes to the tax statement included the mailing of a second notice because his office had received numerous complaints from constituents who were unaware they owed money.

Supervisor Cano responded no and his ask had been more about what could be done and the kind of information that should be included on the property tax statements. He stated that the Assessor could work with the County Administrator and the Treasurer to determine the specifics of Supervisor Christy's inquiry about an additional mailing as they discussed the costs associated with redesigning the property tax statements.

Supervisor Christy expressed his support for exploring the possibility of a second notice being sent to taxpayers for the second half of their payments.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

36. Hearing – Liquor License

Job No. 350934, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Family Food Store, 2100 W. Ruthrauff Road, Tucson, Series 9, Liquor Store, Person Transfer, and Series 9S, Liquor Store Sampling.

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. 349845, Samuel William Webert, Oasis Golf Club and Lounge, 9290 N. Thornydale Road, No. 108, Tucson, Series 7, Beer and Wine Bar, Person Transfer and Location Transfer.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and 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.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

38. Zoning for Data Centers

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing Development Services Department staff to initiate a zoning code text amendment requiring additional review and public processes on CI-2 zoned parcels for data centers and other large-scale users of water and electricity. (District 3)

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

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

39. Sustaining and Strengthening the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships (PEEPS)

Since its launch, PEEPS has served over 3,100 children-including 1,923 in FY24-by expanding access to quality preschool for families who need it most. PEEPS strengthens early learning, supports working parents, and aligns with our Prosperity

Initiative and school readiness goals. Beginning in FY25, PEEPS will be funded solely by the Library District at an annual cost of \$10.9 million.

To protect and expand this vital program, we must act with urgency-through stabilization funding, cross-sector partnerships, and long-term sustainability planning.

Discussion/Direction/Action: Request the Board's consideration and direction on the following items:

1. Authorize a \$600,000.00 allocation from the Library District Contingency Fund to hold PEEPS Scholarships harmless in FY26.
2. Convene a Regional Early Education Roundtable and Jurisdictional Participation Review in partnership and communication with the community led coalition, Preschool Promise Working Group.
3. Establish the PEEPS Workforce & Business Leadership Council in partnership and communication with the community led coalition, Preschool Promise Working Group. (District 5)

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

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

40. Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule for October 2025

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of October 2025, to add a meeting on Tuesday, October 7, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., the first Tuesday of the month, and cancel the meeting on Tuesday, October 14, 2025, the second Tuesday of the month. (District 4)

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

Supervisor Christy requested that the Board amend the current meeting dates for October to follow the standard meeting schedule of the first and third Tuesdays of every month.

Supervisor Heinz asked why there was back to back meeting dates scheduled in October.

Supervisor Allen believed it was because Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) was on fall break during the week of October 6 through 10, 2025.

Chair Scott indicated that Sunnyside Unified School District (SUSD) was also on fall break during that week.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, responded that it was to accommodate fall break for TUSD and SUSD.

Chair Scott added that the previous Chair had proposed back to back meetings in October because of Board members and staff who had children in those school districts and might have family plans during that time.

Ms. Manriquez responded that was correct.

Upon the vote, the motion tied 2-2, Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen voted "Nay," and Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote.

Chair Scott inquired if the item needed to be brought back for consideration at the next regular meeting since it was a tie vote or if they could wait for Supervisor Cano to return to the dais so that he could vote on the item.

Ms. Manriquez responded that the Board Rules and Regulations stated a tie vote resulted in the item being moved to the next regularly scheduled meeting for consideration.

Chair Scott asked Mr. Brown if he concurred as the parliamentarian.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that he concurred, but did not see any issue if the Board decided to pause the vote until Supervisor Cano returned to the dais and concluded the vote at that time.

Chair Scott indicated that he would hold the vote open until Supervisor Cano returned to the dais and could vote on the motion.

Supervisor Cano returned to the dais and voted "Nay" on the motion.

The motion failed 2-3, Chair Scott and Supervisors Allen and Cano voted "Nay."

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

41. 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.

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

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

A substitute motion was made by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Cano and Heinz voted “Nay,” to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors’ Meeting of September 2, 2025.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

42. **United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Section 533 Housing Preservation Grant FY 2025**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 33, of the Board of Supervisors, for the pre-application for United States Department of Agriculture Section 533 Housing Preservation Grant Funds.

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

RECORDER

43. **2025 Congressional District 7 Special General Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 34, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2025 Congressional District 7 Special General Election.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

44. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy, 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**
Appointment of Christina McVie. Term expiration: 8/17/31. (District 1)
2. **Self-Insurance Trust Fund Board**
Appointment of Eric Richard Cunningham, to fill a vacancy created by Miguel Delgado. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (Staff recommendation)

3. **Industrial Development Authority**

Appointment of Jeff Singleton, to replace Stanley Lehman. Term expiration: 9/5/28. (Authority 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**

- Meredith Bode, TMC Health Foundation, The Westin La Paloma Resort & Spa, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, November 15, 2025.
- Michelle Lea Phillips, Greater Green Valley Community Foundation, Historic Canoa Ranch, Pima County Conservation Lands & Resources, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, November 22, 2025.

5. **Temporary Extension**

07100326, Thomas Robert Aguilera, Tucson Hop Shop, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, Tucson, November 15 and December 13, 2025.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

6. **Duplicate Warrants – For Ratification**

The 5H's, L.L.C., \$495.00; The 5H's, L.L.C., \$225.00; Essential Pest Control \$3,865.00; The Quails Apartments \$3,445.75; Summit Ridge \$10,805.34; Intervet, Inc., \$7,031.11; Onyx Asset Service Group, L.L.C., \$59,237.58; Clifton Park LF Solar, L.L.C., \$5,077.01; Coin & Professional Equipment Company \$27,684.49; Empire Southwest, L.L.C., \$1,419.80; Batteries Plus Bulbs \$116.82; Dawami, P.L.L.C., \$5,600.00; City of Tucson \$167,630.49; Bestway Electric Motor Service Co., Inc., \$10,731.01; Bikeep, Inc., \$1,656.00; Velocity Truck Centers \$551.37; O'Reilly Motor Company \$1,526.26; Palomino Crossings Apartments \$1,375.00; City of Tucson \$356,549.05; Velocity Truck Centers \$6.46; Coin & Professional Equipment Company \$27,684.49; Oracle Energy Alliance, L.L.C., \$5,215.00; Anne S. Carrel \$645.00; T3P, L.L.C., \$3,013.02; Merrigan's Arizona Roadrunner \$1,479.39; Ameresco, Inc., \$24,322.05; Kashable, L.L.C., \$53,723.81; Ventura Townhomes \$5,000.00; Nadya Arenas \$1,800.00; Jorge Navarrete \$278.00; Law Office of Robert A. Kerry, P.L.L.C., \$3,551.85; Coronado Villas Apartments \$1,295.00; Onyx Asset Services Group, L.L.C., \$16,577.35; Jeff Niemi \$1,680.00; T3P, L.L.C., \$828.43; Pima Solar Mission III, L.L.C., \$18,682.58; Pima Solar Mission III, L.L.C., \$5,139.65; Onyx Asset Services Group \$31,068.16; Arcadia Park Apartments \$1,130.00.

SUPERIOR COURT

7. Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment

Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of August 19, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Thaddeus Semon

TREASURER

8. Certificate of Removal and Abatement – Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$29,611.49.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

9. Minutes: July 1 and 28, 2025

* * *

45. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

38. Zoning for Data Centers

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing Development Services Department staff to initiate a zoning code text amendment requiring additional review and public processes on CI-2 zoned parcels for data centers and other large-scale users of water and electricity. (District 3)

RS: Chair Scott

MH: Supervisor Heinz

JA: Supervisor Allen

SC: Supervisor Christy

AC: Supervisor Cano

JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator

SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney

TD: Thomas Drzazgowski, Deputy Director, Development Services Department

HVC: Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Economic Development

RS: I have gotten some requests from my colleagues to move up a couple of our items. So we are going to go to Item 3 and Item 4 on the Addendum. We will do them in that order. Alright. So Item 3 is Zoning for Data Centers, directing the Development Services Department staff to initiate a zoning code text amendment requiring additional review and public processes on C1-2. Or is it C-I? Thank you CI-2 zoned parcels for data centers and other large-scale users of water and electricity. This was put on the addendum by Supervisor Allen. Supervisor?

JA: Thank you. So for a little bit of background on this item, we have seen through our region's recent experience with Project Blue and what is happening elsewhere in Arizona, data center developers have their sights on our state, southern Arizona in particular, and we have heard that as many as 30 or more are considering Pima County for siting. Project Blue was somewhat unique in that it involved a County land cell and a rezoning, which gave us, as Supervisors, an opportunity to weigh in, even if we did not have the full picture, but that will rarely be the case under our current zoning code. So under the current code, data centers can be built on some industrially zoned parcels by right, which means that the Board and public have little to no say whatsoever about how these are developed. Their energy, water usage, community engagement, noise or aesthetic considerations. As we have seen, other jurisdictions across Arizona have recently taken on various changes to their zoning code to be better prepared for the increase of data centers, some more proactive than others. So this particular agenda item is introducing the process to get the zoning code text amendment rolling. Right. So what we want to accomplish is ensuring that as proposals come to the County for data centers or high utility users, high water, high electricity users, that there is a much more robust process that it is not approved by right, but instead that it would go through our existing channels that

the Planning and Zoning Commission would consider it, that through that process, that there would be opportunities for public input, that would come to the Board where would we be able to attach conditions. This would establish that these sorts of projects would then go for a conditional use permit, as opposed to the by right zoning. Right. And all of that would then ensure greater transparency, public participation and Board engagement. So this would also mirror what the City of Tucson is doing. It is important, I think, that we, as the County and the City, work in tandem to make some changes to our zoning so that we do not end up with any particular company trying to pursue going to the City, or coming to the County as a means to circumvent good, robust transparency, public engagement and Board decisions. So, this would put us in line with other communities like Tempe, Scottsdale, Mesa, Phoenix, Marana, who have already passed reforms to their zoning such that they get something along the lines of conditional use permits. So that is what is on the table and I would love my colleagues support to get this done.

RS: Would you like to move the item Supervisor?

JA: Indeed I would. I am still a little fuzzy on the language for moving.

RS: Just move the item.

JA: Let us just move the item.

MH: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Other comments, questions from Board members. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am glad Mr. Drzazgowski is here from Development Services and we have Mr. DeBonis too, he can fill in. I have three or four basic questions. First and foremost, how many acres exists in Pima County that are zoned CI-2?

TD: Chair Scott, Board members. While I do not know if we have the exact number we have a patchwork of different CI-2 zoned properties throughout the County. So there are properties that are above 50 acres, that are CI-2 zoned, that are unencumbered without any type of rezoning conditions. Those are the types of scenarios where a data center could be allowed. More recent rezonings..

SC: And how many of those parcels or pieces would you estimate exist?

TD: For me to put a number on it, we definitely have some near mines. Caterpillar Proving Grounds is zoned CI-2. There are other areas close to the Air Force Base, and so it is a combination of the CI-2 and then obviously a size of a property where this type of use would be allowed, so they do exist. More recent rezonings within the last 25 years, those have preliminary development plans, rezoning conditions that

limit uses on the property. So those are, you know, more restricted to what could be allowed on them.

SC: Mr. Chair, Tom D. I will call you D. to make sure. Out of 100% of all the available acres what percentage would you estimate at CI-2?

TD: It is hard for me to give an exact estimate.

SC: Under 10%?

TD: No, I would say it is higher than that. Maybe around a third. And we did create a couple maps of these larger scales. We can share it with the Board just to kind of analyze what is out there. We do have some in close proximity to the town. We also do have a decent amount out at the Caterpillar Proving Grounds, some of the mines. There is a substantial amount out in Ajo outside of the city limits that is CI-2. So it is a little bit of a patchwork across the entire County.

SC: I see. Mr. Chair, we have our Economic Development Administrator here. Can you give us some kind of a feeling and we also have Mr. Yentzer from the Chamber, if he may be allowed to speak, if he so desires, what this kind of rezoning or manipulation of current zoning would do as far as Economic Development and attracting new businesses?

HVC: Chair, Vice Chair, Supervisor Christy, thank you for the question. It would effectively make it a little bit more tactical on our behalf. So one of the things that we would have to do, and it depends on what the final product is. If you are looking at one specific industry, that is a different proposition than as if you are trying to regulate based off of specific utility resource use. Right? So to give a fully fleshed out answer to that, I would have to give it a little bit more thought, but we would have to develop a different type of plan or an updated strategic plan that would allow us to pursue economic development projects that would effectively fit whatever the new profile is of those zoning opportunities.

SC: And, Mr. Chair?

RS: Hold on just one second Supervisor, Ms. Leshar wanted to weigh in on your last question.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, you are asking some questions and my apologies that we do not have the numbers ready for you, but we will be happy to follow up with a memo about how many acres are there and talk about economic development so that we are not giving you any wrong information today.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Leshar.

SC: I appreciate that, Ms. Leshar, and thank you, Mr. Chair. But I do think that maybe there might be more that we can amend to this motion if it should proceed further,

that it could be included, those kinds of reports, before we make any decision. Mr. Yentzer, with your permission, Mr. Chair, did you want to add to that? Okay. Another question is basically the legal realm. Let us say someone has bought 500 acres and it is zoned as CI-2, what is the legal vulnerability or exposure if we, as a County, go back and try to rezone somebody's property that has already been for perhaps years been invested in this zoning and now suddenly Pima County decides to change the zoning. What does that do as far as the investment of the owner and what does that do as far as legal exposure to the County for changing something after it has already been approved for obviously, many years?

JL: You said that was a legal question?

SB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy there is..

SC: Or perhaps Mr. Drzazgowski could address it as well.

SB: There is potential liability. That is something we would be happy to provide a memo on. But there is state law protection for land value in the way that you frame it.

SC: Did you want to add anything to that Mr. Drzazgowski? I think before we go into any kind of manipulation of existing zoning laws, that those items need to be addressed as well in this motion. So I would like to suggest a friendly amendment that in the process of looking at these changes in CI-2, or perhaps a different managing of CI-2 that they include a financial and economic impact from our Economic Development Administrator, as well as the amount of acreage that this would affect and as well as, perhaps Mr. Brown could render a legal opinion about the exposure of going in after something has been established as CI-2 and then arbitrarily changing it in this manner. I would like to offer that as a friendly amendment.

RS: Supervisor Christy, all of the information that you are seeking, I think the entire Board wants to get. I would like to ask a clarification question of Ms. Leshner. My understanding of Supervisor Allen's item is that we are beginning the process of discussing a possible code text amendment, and so that process could take several months from what I am hearing from Supervisor Allen and from staff. Could we get some idea of the sort of information that will be coming to the Board during this process? Ms. Leshner, or somebody that you wanted to designate?

JL: Certainly Chair Scott and I will look to the team for a little more granularity. But as noted in the memo from Supervisor Allen, it is asking that we reach out and work with other economic development organizations, development staff, departments, community organizations, the County Attorney, and others. And so I think that that is, while this is any one of our normal rezoning or a look at our code text amendment, expanding or enhancing the coordination and communication with other organizations as well, as we have heard today, looking at financial, any kind of impact, legal analysis. Gentlemen anything? Okay.

RS: Mr. DeBonis?

RS: Oh, I am sorry, Mr. DeBonis or did you want to be recognized?

JL: We will just include that all as part of the parcel.

RS: So, Supervisor, based on what we heard from Ms. Leshar, I think everything that you have cited is going to be discussed as part of starting this process if this item is approved.

SC: I appreciate that and hopefully it will be noted as a matter of record that it will be included. And my only point is, why go into all of this effort, energy and expenditure of staff, time and potentially waste a lot of staff time if we find out that even doing so is illegal. So I think that if that could be addressed and looked at, it could be, I think, very precise as to the subject matter here.

RS: Let me ask Supervisor Allen. She wanted to respond to that. Go ahead. Supervisor?

JA: Well, we are not doing anything novel. In fact, we are amongst the last to sort of jump into this wading pool. We would be following what is already been initiated by the City of Tucson, by Chandler, by Marana, by Mesa, by Phoenix, by Tempe and other communities who have already implemented changes to making code text amendments to their zoning such that we can allow public participation and Board decisions and conditions as part of the zoning. So, you know, I think that this is not nothing new, nothing bold. Other Bodies such as ours have already approved this.

RS: To that point, I would like to ask staff if the Board can be provided with examples of similar items from other jurisdictions, especially if those items have been in place for a period of time. And it sounds like District 3 has done some research into this. They might have some of those items, but I suspect that your department would as well, and I think that would be enlightening to the Board.

TD: Thank you, Chair Scott. Board members, we will provide that. This is the initiation, so we are going to go through a vigorous public process to create the text amendment. We will use other jurisdictions' codes as a guide. We can update the Board as needed and all of that will be included throughout the public process.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Leshar. Thank you, Mr. Drzazgowski.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy.

SC: One question. You are not going to be generating a new amendment. You are going to be analyzing doing that.

TD: Mr. Chair, Board members, we will create a new text amendment. That is what the Board has initiated, if the Board initiates it. So we will create it. It is the scope and

different options that we will analyze throughout the process and then start the public process and then go through notice, meeting with neighborhood groups, going through the Planning and Zoning Commission, and then ultimately bringing it to the Board of Supervisors for adoption.

AC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much, Chair Scott, I want to thank my colleague from District 3 for bringing a framework that really should have come before us months ago, and this process is going to ensure that we have alignment with our jurisdictional partners across the region and across the state. And I wanted to just have a follow up question for our County Administration to ensure that as this process proceeds, that we are also looking internally to ensure that any economic development recruitment related to data centers or large utility users are put on hold until we are able to have the Board offer the framework for this. Administrator Leshner are you aware of any existing conversations with data centers or large utility users that we need to halt before we set this regulatory framework?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, I know we are not in any discussions with any data centers. My only pause is related to large utility users, defining large. I do not believe we are. Yeah, we are not. It is just that utility piece. No sir, we are not. And we are again, just a reminder we are coming to the Board at September 2nd with new processes for the economic development process to include discussion of the transparency, public participation and awareness, as well as a full environmental review of our projects.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. And I think what is really important to mention in all of this is that what we need in these next several months as this process lays out, is to be able to have a direct conversation with the people of Pima County about what type of economic development initiatives, projects, priorities that we need and that we can all celebrate. The last few weeks, it is an understatement to say have been very difficult for our community and for everyday citizens to figure out where their advocates are in local government. I take that very, very to the heart because I have been on the advocacy side where the message I want to send is that we did listen to a lot of the community conversation, and both the City and the County were unprepared because these guardrails did not exist. And so as we adapt to a new conversation, the message will continue to be that Pima County is open for sustainable growth, for strong economic development, and that we will work with our business community to be able to have those conversations proceed. I do not for one second believe that the actions being considered by the Board today and introduced by my colleague from District 3, are meant to block that progress. They are meant to strengthen our work. They are meant to provide the framework that other municipalities, including, by the way, Republican cities and towns throughout the state that have put guardrails because they recognize that if we are going to have these large industrial users coming into a desert environment, that we have

got to have everything in place to protect our precious natural resources. And so I just needed some confirmation that as we figure this all out internally, that we are also paying attention to the public sentiment of the last few weeks on both sides, because I am understanding of all of it. So thank you, Chair Scott. Appreciate you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Supervisor Christy and then Supervisor Allen.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I too am an advocate for our community, especially our business community and jobs and economic development, and I think by the discussions we have had and by the statements that have been made, that there is an abundance of information that this Board has not yet considered. And the way of this is wording is that it seems like it is a done deal. We are going to initiate a zoning code. Before we initiate anything I think we should continue this to make sure that all of the areas that we have discussed today, be it the acreage, be it the legal exposure, be it the economic development hurdles that might throw up on this whole issue, that we get those responses first before moving on at any great length to, quote, "initiate a zoning code."

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Allen. I had called on after Supervisor Christy, then I will go back.

AC: I just need to that point, if that is okay with Supervisor Christy, I think in parliamentary procedures we are allowed to do that.

RS: That is fine. Let me go then, Supervisor Allen, if you can wait just a second we will let Supervisor Cano respond to that.

AC: Supervisor Christy, I have not heard that any of the items that you have mentioned in your remarks are not to be considered as a part of this item. Is there a disconnect?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: There is no disconnect and it was noted by the individuals who responded to my questions that they did not have the information and that it would be forthcoming and that they would provide it. So there is no disconnect. I just want more information before we initiate anything.

AC: Chair Scott, to that point, just want to emphasize that Supervisor Christy's input is heard in this motion, based on the comments that he has brought to the entire Board and I do believe that we are taking those into consideration. It is now, what I appreciate about this particular item is that it gives opportunity for our County Administrator to get involved in the day-to-day operations, as we task her and her team to be able to put the Board's vision into reality. And this is encompassing of the additional data that we need. And I think that point has been made. I do not want anybody on this Board to leave unsettled feeling as though their input was not

included. And so that is the point, Supervisor Christy, of my comments, to make sure that you know that you are being heard.

RS: Thank you to both our colleagues, Supervisor Allen and then Supervisor Heinz.

JA: So I wanted to underscore that even introducing this initiation of a process for a code text amendment, talked with our attorneys at the County Attorney's Office, also talked to the City Attorney to understand what they have initiated and how they are engaged in that process. And what we are introducing, just to underscore, is something that already exists within existing zoning and in other zoning. So, for example, in GR-1, conditional use permits are already required for specific industries within that zoning, feed stores, grocery stores, neighborhood markets, gas stations, auto shops all require conditional use permit under GR-1 zoning. In CI-1 and CI-3 also have conditional uses. In CI-3 requires conditional use permits for intensive agriculture trade, intensive animal product processing, hazardous materials manufacturing. So we target specific industries within zoning code all the time. So this is nothing that is necessarily kind of above and beyond or introducing something that is new or transformative in our zoning. It is a replication of an existing process that exists for specific industries. And then just the final piece is that this will come back to us. There is a whole process that at best is 3 to 4 months but could extend upwards to 12 months. The City anticipates their process being approximately 6 months, and it will be approved and go before the Planning and Zoning Commission. It will also come to the Board for a final vote, so there is many opportunities for more information and for people to weigh in.

RS: Supervisor Allen, thank you and before I call on Supervisor Heinz, just a point to Mr. Brown, to follow up on Supervisor Allen's points and also Supervisor Christy's. I believe there is information that the Board is seeking from your office, as well as from the County Administrator and her team.

SB: Supervisor Scott and Supervisors. Just to clarify, we have been in touch with Supervisor Allen, with DSD, and with County administration about any legal liability issues. I do want to clarify for the record, doing this effort is not illegal. There may be liability, but I want to clarify that it is not illegal to do it this way, and we have been and will continue to be in touch with County Administration, and we will provide that information to the Board.

RS: Thank you. Ms. Lesh. Were you seeking recognition? Okay, I apologize, alright. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Oh, you know, I think Supervisor Allen just made my point. We are asking to have this sort of looked into by staff, and they will be coming back to us with proposals that the Board will then decide on. This is not actually doing the amendment. And so I think that I am very comfortable moving forward with this direction.

RS: Supervisor Heinz, I appreciate your comments, and I associate myself with them. Back on June 17th, Supervisor Heinz, Supervisor Christy, and I joined together to

approve both the rezoning and the land acquisition item associated with Project Blue. But at the meeting after that, a majority of the Board asked staff to come back to us in September to talk about, not only how we could make perhaps refined use of non-disclosure agreements signed by the County, but also we asked for greater environmental impact analysis. And I find, and Supervisor Allen noted this in her item, I find this item to be connected with that previous motion. I am grateful to my colleague for bringing it forward. Any further questions or comments? Alright. All those in favor of the item indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Opposed?

SC: Opposed.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

39. Sustaining and Strengthening the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships (PEEPS)

Since its launch, PEEPS has served over 3,100 children-including 1,923 in FY24-by expanding access to quality preschool for families who need it most. PEEPS strengthens early learning, supports working parents, and aligns with our Prosperity Initiative and school readiness goals. Beginning in FY25, PEEPS will be funded solely by the Library District at an annual cost of \$10.9 million.

To protect and expand this vital program, we must act with urgency-through stabilization funding, cross-sector partnerships, and long-term sustainability planning.

Discussion/Direction/Action: Request the Board's consideration and direction on the following items:

1. Authorize a \$600,000.00 allocation from the Library District Contingency Fund to hold PEEPS Scholarships harmless in FY26.
2. Convene a Regional Early Education Roundtable and Jurisdictional Participation Review in partnership and communication with the community led coalition, Preschool Promise Working Group.
3. Establish the PEEPS Workforce & Business Leadership Council in partnership and communication with the community led coalition, Preschool Promise Working Group. (District 5)

RS: Chair Scott

MH: Supervisor Heinz

JA: Supervisor Allen

SC: Supervisor Christy

AC: Supervisor Cano

JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator

SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator

RS: Okay. Consistent with what I said earlier, we are doing a couple of addendum items now at the request of my colleagues, we are going to move now to Addendum Item No. 4, Sustaining and Strengthening the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships. This was put on the addendum by Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you. Chair Scott, I want to begin by expressing my deep gratitude for the families, the educators and the community partners who have helped make the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships, otherwise known as PEEPS, such an invaluable resource for parents across our County. I especially want to thank the speakers that came out today in support of this item. Penelope, Kelly, Monica, Yadel, Tiffany, Zack. I have heard directly from parents and from advocates like you

who tell me that without PEEPS, high quality preschool simply would not be an option for their child. This program has already changed thousands of lives, and that deserves our recognition, but gratitude also must come with responsibility. Today, only 1 in 4 children in Pima County have access to early education, and at the same time, families are facing preschool costs ranging from \$5,000.00 to \$10,000.00 a year. The need is great, and we cannot afford to move backward. Last year alone, with the Board's support, nearly 2,000 students benefited from PEEPS scholarships. That is not just a number. It is 2,000 children walking into kindergarten, curious, confident and ready to learn. It is parents with peace of mind, knowing their kids are getting the strong foundation that they deserve. So that is why my proposal does three things: it closes this year's funding gap, looks for ways to expand eligibility so that more middle income families can qualify, and it invites the private sector to keep this work going. I want to thank the City of Tucson for stepping up in the early years of PEEPS. Their commitment helped get us here and now it is on us as a County to lead with vision and ensure this program continues to grow. From the District 5 perspective, the real question is how much more can we do, not how many scholarships should we cut? It is difficult for me to accept the County Administrator's belief that cuts to PEEPS be on the table, and that is why this proposal holds kids and PEEPS scholarships harmless, so that we can reaffirm the Board's commitment to this program. This is not about choosing between libraries and preschool. Both are pillars of learning. Both deserve our investment, the future of our children and the prosperity of our region demands that we do more, not less. And to our librarians, I want you to know that I hear you and I see you. Inner city library branches are hurting. We have got serious staffing concerns to address, and I am committed to figuring that out in the short term, not in 2 or 3 years. Investment in PEEPS is an investment in families, our workforce, our economy and our prosperity initiative. And I believe that the framework before the Board today is putting into motion work that is already happening on the ground. I want to thank Mr. Yentzer for giving us the perspective that I agree with, that we should not be duplicating or reinventing any existing work. This item works in partnership with the existing committees and groups who are committed to expanding the PEEPS program, and I want to thank everybody for recognizing the importance of this item. The District 5 Office was pleased to introduce it, and as your County Supervisor, I will never support cuts to our kids. Instead, I will support bold steps to expand opportunity, strengthen our libraries, and ensure that every child in Pima County gets the strong start they deserve. So I thank my Board members for their consideration of this item.

RS: Any other questions or comments from Board members?

MH: Can I second?

RS: Oh, I do not think he has moved it yet.

AC: And I will move the item.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Any further questions or comments? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes, for our edification, this initially was funded by COVID money. Correct? And since that initial infusion of COVID money and the beginning of the program, how much money has been devoted to this over the last three, four years?

RS: Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you. Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, the initial three years were provided at \$10 million a year out of the COVID dollars and with the help of the legislature and this Board, the program was moved to the Library Department..

SC: So it is \$30 million?

JL: In funding past the end of the COVID dollars. The initial was \$30, we are now looking at the \$10 million plus coming from the Library funding mechanisms.

SC: And thank you, Ms. Leshar. Have we..

RS: Supervisor Christy, just one quick second. Just to clarify, Ms. Leshar, the initial plan was for the ARPA funds to take care of three years, but because we did not expend \$10 million in any of those three years, what was the total number of years that the ARPA funds covered?

JL: I am looking for some help on the exact number...

RS: Mr. Holmes?

SH: Chair Scott..

SC: \$10 million a year?

SH: Can you hear me? Sorry, Chair Scott, we actually went through, we are going actually through four years, coming up in December of '25.

RS: Okay. So initially we thought it might cover \$10 million a year. It did not. So it went beyond those initial three years. I just wanted to clarify that because of Supervisor Christy's question.

JL: Thank you. We are happy to provide the update. We have sent the numbers that show how much we have got every year, but we can provide that update. Thank you.

RS: You got it. Thank you, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Ms. Lesher. Has there been an investigation or a study on what PEEPS is impacting on the Library District operations?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, we have been, I want to be clear, I think that recently there has become what almost feels like a Hobson's choice between libraries and education, which does not have to be that way. As Supervisor Cano has said and others have said, what we are looking at is to ensure that we have the adequate resources within that taxing district to provide both. And so I do not think I cannot come up and say we have not been able to do x or y at the libraries because of PEEPS. There has been funding for both, I think, in the intent of some recent communication with the Board was simply to indicate that in the future it may be possible to look at the tax rate within the district. Do we need another penny or two in order to ensure that both thrive.

SC: So, Mr. Chair, Ms. Lesher specifically, there has been no analysis of the actual impact on the Library District operations. Specifically?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, we have sent multiple memos about the budget within the library district funding. If there is a piece of that...perhaps I am not understanding the question. We have indicated that we can continue. We have for multiple years funded both and that we hope with very, very minor adjustments, both will continue long into the future.

SC: Well, I think we need to be a little bit more specific in the analysis, but we will leave that as it is. I have also noticed that I think one of the local tv stations just released a statement here, and I will show it so everybody can see it states that Tucson Unified School District students to see fewer standardized tests. And I believe the bulk of the recipients of the PEEPS program are fed into the Tucson Unified School District and this obviously raises the question, if there is going to be fewer standardized tests. This sounds like education without metrics and it basically is daycare. What are the metrics going to be if there is going to be fewer standardized tests?

RS: Supervisor Christy, just to clarify, what the Tucson Unified School District announced the other day was the result of negotiations that they had with the Tucson Education Association and the standardized tests that are referred to were internal tests that the District had prepared to get their students ready for state testing, and the input they got from their teachers was that the additional testing was taking away instructional time from teachers. I do not see that there is any necessary connection between your question and the preschool scholarships, because most of those tests that have been discontinued were administered to students in the later grades.

SC: So, Mr. Chair, where are the metrics for this program?

RS: I think the metrics of the program come from the various school districts in terms of what they have reported to us with regard to kindergarten readiness.

SC: And they have actually provided metrics on that level?

RS: I know that we have gotten that from the Amphitheater District, and you heard from Ms. Bucciarelli Fe earlier.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Supervisor Allen?

JA: One of the things that I love about PEEPS is that it indeed is not limited just to TUSD, but it reaches out all across Pima County, including out in communities like Ajo, out in Sells, throughout and around the Arivaca, Amado. There are centers and places where our young children can all participate and have access to scholarships and get quality early education. You know, as a mom, and it feels like yesterday my son was going to preschool over at Desert Spring, it matters. Early childhood education. And there is indeed, so it is not just my word for it, but the research is abundant about the incredible impact that early childhood education has on children's educational excellence thereafter. But then, moreover, even if we do not care about that, the impact on the parent and the parent's ability, especially for women, to be able to go back to work is profound and the research exists that tells that story, and the value of that. So layer upon layer, there is research that demonstrates the absolute value of investing in early childhood education. PEEPS is phenomenal and I think at this moment in time, right, where there is a lot of economic uncertainty, investing in early childhood education makes sense. We are getting lots of requests because of the loss of federal funding across our County that is being experienced by different agencies in different programs. The budget is incredibly tight, so spending more money on things indeed makes me incredibly apprehensive and knowing that we are only eight and a half months into a federal administration that is pulling the rug out from underneath funding programs that are critical in our community. That apprehensiveness I reconciled because PEEPS is so important and that investing in early childhood education is indeed bringing more stability to our community. So I thank Supervisor Cano and Community Partners for really making sure that we keep our eye on the ball. And so thank you and I am excited to support this.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Allen, any other questions or comments from my colleagues? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you. To my colleagues I just want to thank you for the conversations that we have had with your respective offices to prepare this item. I do not believe that this item alone is the end of our work, in fact, it is reinforcing the incredible strength that this program has brought to our region. I am so thankful that this Board, prior to my entrance to it, has set the tone for this strong program and the reality is, we have got 6 out of 10 more children to serve with this. And County taxpayer dollars cannot be the only revenue source in all of this and they are not, right? You have got First Things First, Head Start, state functions. We as a region need to work to ask our legislative partners and our governor to do more to support this program. But more

importantly, I am excited about the ways that we can work with our private sector to bring the eligibility criteria to be expanded. You should not make too little to be a recipient of this program. We should be looking for ways, like both Supervisor Heinz and I have done at the legislature, where we look at very specific programs that allow us to expand the eligibility criteria, like Kids Care, when I was minority leader, to be able to give more access to our families and to our kids. So thank you for your consideration, colleagues. I of course want to thank our incredible community advocates who kept us accountable on this as well.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor and I join with Supervisor Allen in thanking you for bringing the item forward. I am not surprised that not only is Mr. Yentzer here from the Chamber of Southern Arizona, but Dr. Pedicone is here from the Southern Arizona Leadership Council. And I think one reason why the business community has consistently supported the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships is because we are able to say to any business that wants to locate or expand in Pima County, that we have a thriving Pre-k to higher Ed community, and the one area where the County can really have an impact is in preschool. It is the function of the K-12 charter schools and public school districts to work in that realm. It is the function of Pima Community College and the University of Arizona to focus on higher Ed, but where we are able to have an impact is in preschool. And I have said this to Supervisor Cano because he was once on Supervisor Elías's staff, I cannot go into a preschool in this County without thinking of Richard Elías, who really was our pioneer, and at one point was the only person on this dais who was willing to stand up for the County taking a leadership role in breaking down barriers to access to early childhood education. When we, meaning Supervisor Heinz, Supervisor Grijalva, and I became a pro early childhood education majority in 2021, the cost of preschool in Pima County was on average \$800.00 a month per child, and I am sure that cost is either the same or higher since then. The amount of money that Supervisor Heinz has in this item will not only safeguard a certain number of scholarships, but it will also allow a new program to be stood up. Oh Supervisor, my apologies, sorry, I am looking at both of you at the same time. Sorry Supervisor Cano, and there is something else that I wanted to point out, which is that when we were elected in 2021, we talked about that \$10 million a year figure with our friends from Preschool Promise. And I think that figure was directly cited to me for the first time by Steve Lynn, who is part of Preschool Promise and part of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council. But we have never said as a Board, "no more, no less." We have never once said that as a matter of policy and as was pointed out during the discussion, we have never spent the full \$10 million, except, I think, for the first time last year. And so when we are looking at long term planning for this program, I do not want us to feel that that figure is somehow etched in granite. Instead, what I think we should be looking at is how are we moving that thermometer? And by thermometer, I mean the graphic image that is attached to all of those reports that we get. And yes, I read the entire report, not just the anecdotes. And how are we serving more kids? My office has a quarterly meeting with County staff who have led in making sure that this program is vigorous and serves the people that it is supposed to serve every quarter and the director of the program told us in our last meeting that we met our goal of 1,500 kids last year. Well, I think each year we

should be asking ourselves, as a County, what is our goal? How many kids do we want to serve this year? And another principle of this program has been that we will never, ever, ever have the early childhood education program be in conflict with library operations. As Ms. Leshner pointed out, it was a decision of the legislature and the previous governor, Governor Ducey, to give counties the ability to use the secondary property tax that funds the Library District to help fund PEEPS. But we have always said as a Board, we never want library operations and early childhood education to be in conflict. They never have been as Ms. Leshner has pointed out today, and in her numerous memoranda to the Board and they never will be, they never will be. I do think, however, and I have said this to staff, both in that quarterly meeting that I was referring to and in a conversation with Ms. Leshner, I do think that the Board needs more information as to why and this was mentioned in the memo attached to this item, why we need an additional 40 full-time equivalents in the Library District. I know that half of those are associated with the Elias Branch, but the other half are the result of discussions between County Administration, Library Administration and the Library Advisory Board. The Board needs some more information about that, especially since we are just about a month and a half into the new fiscal year. So I really hope that Supervisor Cano's item is the impetus for us to be engaged as a community in long term planning for this program, because I know how it is going to be addressed in the next few years. But I think in terms of long term planning, there still needs to be more community conversations, more Board dialog. But I want to finish up by thanking Ms. Leshner and everybody on her team, because it has taken an extraordinary amount of work by County staff since 2021 to work not just with our partners in Preschool Promise, but also our partners in the preschool community and the K-12 districts. And Ms. Bucharely-Fay, I do not know that there is any district that has done more to break down barriers to early childhood education than Amphi, and I hope that you are sharing some of your trade secrets with the other districts, because I think you are serving right around half a kindergarten cohort, which is extraordinary. Alright.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: To that point and thank you for your very kind words, I agree with everything. There are some technical changes that I want to just briefly mention. In a prior conversation, there was a suggestion that as part of item two in the item that we ensure that school districts are included in that particular first line. So it says direct the County administrator to convene a standing roundtable with representatives from the City of Tucson, Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita, South Tucson, Vail school districts and appropriate community partners. That is the change that I would want to include. And also, the County Administrator's memo correctly pointed out that there is not a library contingency fund. So I wanted to just ensure that County Administration knows where this funding is coming from. It is meant to be from the reserves in the Library District. That was the District 5 scrivener's error. And we just want to ensure that that is made clear as part of the motion. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Heinz is okay with that as your seconder and just to follow up on your point, and it is something I neglected to mention in my remarks, but I mentioned it to Mr. Holmes when he took part in our quarterly meeting. I know there was some discussion, Ms. Leshner, in your memo about the Board being asked to come up with a policy specific to the Library District with regard to a Library District Reserve, and I am wondering if we will also get similar proposals for the Flood Control District and the Stadium District. Yes? Okay. Thank you. Alright. Any other discussion on this item? All those in favor indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: Opposed.

RS: Item passes 4-1 with Supervisor Christy opposed. Thank you all very much

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

41. 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.

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
HVC: Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Economic Development
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Alright, let's go to Item No. 6, which was put on the Addendum by Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Excellent and I will be relying on [inaudible], this was an item that we discussed several months ago, following some of my travel, as well as our Economic Development Office leadership travel to Mexico and looking to explore and invest in our relationship with our largest economic trading partner here. And we directed staff to come back to us with a plan to move forward, to do everything we can to grow this relationship. Obviously, there is some more additional economic insecurity at this time, and I think it is incredibly important that we work to foster these relationships to increase direct foreign investment, facilitate the development and expansion of Mexican-owned companies and businesses right here in southern Arizona, and also as a secondary priority from the health care system perspective, we are in desperate need or will be very soon in much more desperate need of recruiting professionals. And that goes for, frankly, if you talk to anyone at Raytheon that goes for engineers, that goes for nurses, physicians, all sorts of professionals to get them to come to southern Arizona. We are competing with every other jurisdiction in the country, and we have an amazing resource, frankly, just south of the border. So I would like to actually throw this to the Director of our Economic Development Department to explain a little bit more.

RS: Let me see if Ms. Leshar had any comments she wanted to make, and then she can defer to Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. Thank you, Supervisor. Ms. Leshar?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, and thanks to Supervisor Heinz for getting this discussion moving and I think what you have before you today is what we would see as the very first baby steps, if you will, as we begin to expand into an office. We have had conversations with Supervisor Heinz and his office, and there have been a variety of trips already conducted with our Economic Development team, with support and

assistance of Supervisor Heinz. We have had discussions about ultimately opening offices in other communities, a couple of cities in Mexico, having staff there, etcetera. What this does today is bring on, if approved, lets us bring in a couple of consultants or some assistants to work with Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi and others who know this industry well to help us identify exactly where in the identified cities we need to open offices, who we might partner with if that is appropriate, and who are the right staff to be hiring. So this is that first step. Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi if you would like to add to that.

HVC: Administrator Leshar, Chair, Vice Chair, Supervisor Heinz, nothing additional to add. I think we have just laid out effectively a buffet of options and from that County Administration has made a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for your consideration. Whatever the direction of this Board is, the Economic Development Department will implement that appropriately, and I believe we will have our first review, if approved, within the first six months of this happening. So thank you.

MH: Great and with that, I will move the item as outlined.

RS: I will second. Further discussion? Supervisor Cano and then Supervisor Christy.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz for introducing this item. Administrator Leshar, I am looking at your recommendations, which I am supportive of. I am also just curious if you or Mr. DeBonis or our Economic Development Director might be able to share a little bit more about how the County's FTEs in the Economic Development Department align with that of the City of Tucson? How many do we have? How many do they have?

RS: Ms. Leshar?

JL: Chair Scott I will turn to Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. I am sorry, I do not know the exact number of what the city staff is, so maybe you can explain how they line up.

HVC: Yes, ma'am, not a problem at all. County Administrator, Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, so I believe at this moment in time, the City of Tucson's Economic Initiatives Department has 11 total FTEs within it. Within Pima County's Economic Development Department, we have 4 1/2 FTEs at this moment in time. Thank you.

AC: Thank you, Director, I appreciate the response. I have made my position with the County Administration very clear that what I would like to see with our Economic Development team is more FTEs. This proposal, the memo that was sent to the Board on the 15th, does not do that and I would like us to do more. I have made that point consistently clear. When we gave a contract to support our Economic Development Initiatives to an outside entity. Let us do more. Related to our conversation with our southern partner, our trading partner, I fully support Supervisor Heinz's effort to be able to keep this conversation going. It is additional work and so, Supervisor Heinz, I ask for your support to continue advocating for

more personnel in the Economic Development team, because I think that if we are going to be adding more work, we should be adding more people. Those are my comments. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy and then Supervisor Allen?

SC: Administrator, isn't that part of the core mission of your department to engage any opportunities with Mexico to benefit Pima County?

HVC: Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, yes, sir, it is in our 2023-2026 Economic Development Strategic Plan to engage with Mexico, as well as Canada and other various opportunities for attraction to foreign direct investment into Pima County.

SC: And I do want to point out that the County does support the Chamber of Tucson of Southern Arizona. Sorry, I will get it right soon. The Chamber of Southern Arizona. And it seems to me that the Chamber would be very receptive to any kind of overtures from businesses in Mexico to have greater ties and greater communications here. And if that is not the case, which I believe it is the case, we certainly can ask for more involvement with the Chamber of Southern Arizona to explore possibilities within their own core values and core functions. So we have the Pima County Economic Development, we have the Chamber of Southern Arizona, and we have within the newly formed chamber, individuals who serve for many years in economic development through Sun Corridor. So I do not see the necessity of taking money from the Contingency Fund to fund more employees and more expenses to do something that I think we are fully equipped to participate in within our own means here in Pima County. If we are not doing these things outlined, which it obviously appears that we are doing them, we certainly need to have discussions with both entities about upping their involvement and their efforts to create more opportunities for businesses between Mexico and southern Arizona, and particularly Pima County. So I think we have the tools in our toolbox right now. If they are not doing what they need to be doing right now, we can certainly direct them to do so. But to take money from the Contingency Fund to add more employees, to open new offices, when we should be doing all these things on our own anyway, I think is superfluous and basically not needed. We need to make sure our folks, our administration and our investments already made are doing just that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz, for keeping this in the forefront. I think that strengthening our relationships in Mexico at this particular point in time makes a whole lot of sense and ensuring that we are doing what we can to build the relationships and the conduit that can help fill some gaps within our economy, within some of our key industries. I do have a couple of questions, though, that I think are really critical for me to understand what our work could and should look like. So, you know, in talking with Visit Tucson, the City, and hearing about other offices and

investments that are happening in Mexico, I would love a better understanding of kind of who is where and why, right? Which offices are set up, where in Mexico and then why they are there? What was the rationale for different places? So if we are looking to set up a greater exchange with the medical industry, my understanding is that UNAM in Mexico City has the most robust medical school and that then Guadalajara also has really robust medical schools. I am just curious then about why Baja has popped up. My assumption is that Baja has got a tight association with Southern California. So I want to understand a little bit more around why and what unique role or niche we are trying to fill that others are not currently filling, because I do not want to see us duplicating efforts that other municipalities and other entities are doing. I think that it is a big enough country, our need is great and so just making sure that we can hone in exactly in communities, places, and industries that make sense for us and play up our unique need and are a match. The last piece is just, also to help me understand how and maybe the answer is that it does not, but how this investment and uptick in work might align or not align with the Border Counties Coalition. Thinking about the border and both the buildup around ports of entry and facilitating trade through the border seems like it could and should be inextricably linked to an increase investment in foreign direct investment in Mexico.

HVC: Chair, Vice Chair, thank you very much for the question. So I can speak to the alignment on the Arizona Border Counties Coalition. I think first and foremost, at one point, we had discussed the idea of creating a small sub strategy for our engagement with Mexico. We had a few dollars set aside to do that. We have since paused that effort because of this larger discussion about what an investment, you know, in additional due diligence, would look like into Mexico specifically. For the Arizona Border Counties Coalition, we would see that as an advocacy and policy vehicle to move forward. Some of these critical discussions that we are having on the component of there being subnational diplomatic efforts across the border between Pima County and Mexico. Earlier, you briefly mentioned why Baja California, as an example, Baja California, the state government of Baja California is actually looking to diversify their industry outreach. So not just working with California specifically, but looking at other states in Arizona specifically on that radar. Earlier, just this last week, I actually had a meeting with the Undersecretary of the Economy for the state of Baja California. We had a very fruitful discussion about some of the efforts that we can go through government to government. And so those are where some of these conversations are moving towards, is what those larger partnerships look like, government to government. And then obviously, we would be engaging the rest of our regional partners in a lot of these different efforts as well, I think to Supervisor Christy's point as well, there is a specific role for everybody in all of these discussions, and each one of us has a unique skill set that we could bring to the table underneath the umbrella of this overall strategy for development. And please let me know if I missed anything at all.

RS: Supervisor Allen, any other?

- JA: I mean, I guess just to put a finer point on it, I would love a chart. I know I am being very specific, but something that shows very clearly Visit Tucson has offices or staff, where, and are there particular sort of strategies or industries that they are targeting or trying to reach out to. Arizona Commerce Authority, where are they invested in and kind of why, who are they trying to reach? City of Tucson, where are they? City of Phoenix, where are they? And just to get a good understanding of the landscape before we step into it? I would feel better knowing what that landscape looks like and understanding a little bit about why people, other entities, municipalities have made the decisions that they have made to invest in foreign direct investment in Mexico.
- RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Any other questions or comments? No, I was asking Supervisor Allen if she still had more. Oh okay, Alright. Supervisor Christy, then Supervisor Heinz?
- SC: Basically what I am drawing from Supervisor Allen's comments is a concern for being superfluous in our efforts here and overlapping and I think that it needs to be really delineated a lot more specifically as to who is going to be doing what. Secondly, I am concerned about the fact that this is another example of how this Board is so willing to spend taxpayer dollars when we do not even know how much the federal government is going to be demanding us to pay back. So here we are, expanding more costs from the Contingency Fund without knowing what we are going to be incurring from the federal government as far as clawbacks. And third, my final question is how much money is the City of Tucson going to be investing in this program?
- RS: Administrator Leshner, did you want to delegate to Mr. Vescovi-Chiardi?
- JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, this is a program that we have been looking at simply for Pima County. As I have heard from Supervisor Allen and others, they would like us to look at everyone else who is involved in this space. So we will be coming back with the chart and diagram, let you know what the City of Tucson is doing. University of Arizona, Pima College, what all the other partners are doing.
- SC: So, Mr. Chair, Ms. Leshner, what you are expressing is that there are other entities that could potentially benefit from this enterprise, and it would seem to me based on that, it would be realistic to make sure that they participate financially in it, too, if it gets that far. Thank you.
- RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Supervisor Heinz?
- MH: Thank you and look, in talking with our Director of Economic Development, being in Mexico with him a couple of times in two different places in Mexico City as well as Aguascalientes, it is just very clear to me that the jurisdictions that are going to reap the benefits of this kind of relationship need to have boots on the ground. You have to show up and so this is an initial investment. I want to double the budget, frankly, because that would still not get us to what Tucson is doing on economic

development. Tucson has a, I believe, one or two, at least one full time FTE at the direct, I believe pretty high level, who is dedicated only to direct foreign investment. So I am not saying we have to match the City on every single possible thing, but given that the statutes very clearly tell the County Supervisors across the state to do anything and everything possible to frankly, to work toward enhancing the economic conditions for our residents and for this region. This is really important and this is one of our smallest departments. And just to the example that we heard from one of our speakers during Call to the Public, this Sheriff once again has gone over by millions of dollars, and we would not even need all of that \$4 million to double the budget for Economic Development. It is what we should be doing. I want to have another five, six, seven FTEs there. I would love several of them to be in Mexico, to be doing this work on the ground, because, again, having been there several times recently, the people that can shake hands and see you face-to-face and may be speaking a little bit of Spanish too, that is incredibly important and shows how committed we are. And the reason I am very much a fan of this is because we are doing this in a thoughtful way, and we are starting slower than I would like to, but we are starting slow and asking for experts to help us direct. Let us figure out where do those boots on the ground have the best opportunity for success, and where can we reap the most benefit for this relationship. And so yes, I want more full time FTEs as soon as we can possibly do it but I also understand how important it is to plan this kind of an expansion out. There are not a lot of counties, there may not be any counties frankly that have boots on the ground in other countries. And in our situation in this area of the world, this makes a heck of a lot of sense. But I also understand why having a smaller investment, working with experts and consultants to figure this out in conjunction with our staff, I think that is a really important way to approach it, but I will definitely be coming back to ask for your consideration to further expand and fund this effort in the future. But I think this is a great way to go to plan it and to make sure that we know what we are doing and we are not just throwing money away.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair. Scott. I have a question for our County Administrator and/or our Finance Director. Can you give us a quick summary of the Board Contingency Fund, what is in it and what its purpose is meant to be when these kinds of opportunities arise?

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Certainly. I am going to ask Mr. Cuaron to give those specifics.

RS: Mr. Cuaron?

ART: Chair Scott, Board members, the Contingent, I do not have the number right off the top of my head of what our contingency is, so I will have to bring that back to you. But the contingency in the General Fund is intended to be for emergencies, emergency uses, broadly, and that is its intended use. You know, I can think of an

example of, if there was an emergency at one of the County buildings and we needed to use Contingency Fund to repair the building, something of that nature that would be an available use of Contingency Fund balance there. Again, I do not have the total. I apologize for that, but I can get that back to you on what that total number is.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you Chair Scott, has anyone in the room with a laptop figured this number out by chance?

JL: We will get it to you in a moment. I am sorry.

AC: Supervisor Heinz, I am going to, at the expense of perhaps surprising some of my colleagues. I believe that the direction we need to be taking is equipping our Economic Development Team with the resources that they need. The Contingency Fund is available for use by the County to be able to support mid-year operations into our efforts, and coming from the philanthropic sector, I really hesitated anytime I saw a list of priorities with more things to do and not the people power to be able to make it happen. Because this is using the existing Contingency. I want us to make sure that we are doing this in a smart way with assets before what is needed. And so I am asking for a motion to increase this to \$250,000.00.00 from the Contingency Fund, allowing us to have some breathing room for a full time FTE and the related compensation efforts to support the intention of this item, but also to grow the FTEs within that department. I recognize that I have not had the chance to talk with Supervisor Heinz about this, but I think that it puts some substance and meat to what we are trying to do. One of the recommendations in the memo that was received by the Board included a specific line item for this particular effort. And so I just think we have to I think we have to exercise the Board's authority to invest in our departments using the Contingency Fund. So I will offer that as a motion, not knowing where it will head. It is a substitute motion, essentially increasing the allocation to \$250,000.00 instead of the \$100,000.00 with the understanding that the additional allocations outlined the County Administrator's recommendations of the \$100,000.00 baseline, but also for us to create more jobs in our region and support the expansion of our Economic Development team with Contingency Fund dollars. So that is my motion. I do not know if there is a second.

MH: I will second that, but can I second it if the primary motion was mine originally? That is okay. Right?

RS: He can. Correct? Yes.

AC: And for just to keep the conversation going, have we found out how much is in our Contingency?

RS: Mr. Cuaron?

- ART: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Cano, the General Fund Contingency Budget for FY '26 is \$1 million.
- AC: Okay, so I am going to...that would be a huge hit to the General Contingency Fund. So I am going to retract my motion now that we have these numbers. And I still believe that my repeated at least six weeks of requests for us to figure this out need to be heard. So in the spirit of keeping this proposition going, I would like us to come back to the Board in the next 60 days to be able to figure out what vacancy savings we can find to fund an additional FTE position within the Economic Development team, not using the General Fund Contingency given existing resources are so limited. And I recognize that was also a District 5 request for us to be in that position. So thank you, Director Cuaron, for looking at how we can do as much as we can with what we have, but I do think that this is a priority for this Board.
- RS: So just to clarify, Board members and members of the public, we are going back to the original motion, which is to support the Administrator's recommendation as outlined in the memo attached to this item. Supervisor Allen?
- JA: So my understanding is that we were getting an update on the creation of the plan. That is what the agenda item says, and then going back through the memos, it was not clear to me that we were approving the chart, the kind of budget broad strokes in the memo.
- RS: Supervisor Heinz made that motion earlier.
- MH: I guess my motion was to approve the recommendations from staff right now. Was I not clear there?
- RS: That was the items in Ms. Leshner's memo. That was my understanding of your motion. Was that the motion, Ms. Manriquez?
- MM: Chair Scott, Board members, Yes.
- MH: Okay.
- RS: Go ahead, Supervisor Allen.
- JA: I still think that we need more information about what it is that we would be investing in, what it is that staff would be doing. So we think about where to do work in Mexico, given that there is a lot of other entities that have staff there and are doing relationship building. I understand that having people do that work is the critical piece. But where and why?
- RS: So Supervisor Allen, thank you for those remarks and beyond wanting to see the chart that you requested earlier, I also am interested in what would be the components of the substrategy that was noted in Ms. Leshner's memo and that Mr.

Vescovi-Chiordi referred to earlier. So I am going to make a substitute motion to continue this item until our September 2nd meeting so that we can get that information.

JA: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Allen. Discussion on the substitute motion? All those in favor of the substitute motion to continue the item until September 2nd indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

MH: No.

AC: No.

RS: The item passes 3-2. So we will take up this item again on September 2nd with the information requested from Board members.