

## STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 3, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair  
Rex Scott, Vice Chair  
\*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member  
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member  
Steve Christy, Member

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

\*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:06 a.m.

### 1. **CONTRACT**

Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson and Arizona Soccer Holdings, Inc., d.b.a. FC Tucson, to provide a Hospitality and Promotional Agreement to host a preseason training camp over the course of the next three seasons, KSC-2024FD (\$120,000.00) and Attractions and Tourism Special Revenue (\$120,000.00) Funds, total contract amount \$240,000.00/2 years, 3 months term (not-to-exceed \$80,000.00 annually) (PO2400013748)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the funding sources, in particular the Special Revenue Fund. He stated that Item G in the agreement listed a term date of January 17, 2017 to March 31, 2019 and asked what had been done from March 2019 to present. He asked how the revenue fund interacted with the car rental tax and wanted an explanation regarding how this item was funded.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the car rental tax, \$3.50 per car, was set by Statute dedicated to the Stadium District for sports and tourism and was part of an overall funding structure.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that there were other components related to tourism, but for this particular agreement the revenue source would be the hotel bed tax. He stated that in regards to the Special Revenue Fund within the Stadium District, dollars came in and resided within a fund that contained hotel bed tax. He stated that in terms of prior agreements from 2013 to

2019, those agreements were in place and were funded at various amounts over those years, the agreement ceased around the time prior to the COVID pandemic, and in 2019 there were discussions about a new agreement, but that had not gotten finalized prior to the pandemic. He stated that as FC Tucson attracted Major League Soccer teams and other professional teams to come to Tucson, if they stayed at hotels in the unincorporated area, which generated bed tax they would use up to \$80,000.00 under this contract to offset those costs for those traveling teams.

Supervisor Christy asked if the idea was for those revenue funds that were designed to be somewhat operational of the sports complex would cover the expenses or help offset the expenses of soccer teams that came and participated in tournaments.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that all of the funds of the Stadium district went towards the operations of the district and the capital investment in the facility itself. He stated that there was a marketing and promotions budget that was part of the Stadium District and as they worked to attract organizations host their events at Kino Sports Center, there was a component of that. He stated the \$80,000.00 was made up of two components, up to \$40,000.00 of Kino Sports Complex dedicated bed tax and Attractions and Tourism contributed up to \$40,000.00. He stated that the Stadium District funds would be used first if there were qualifying bed night stays in hotels in unincorporated Pima County and then if there were stays in hotels, it would generate additional revenue in subsequent years to the organization.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the car rental tax.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the fund source for this agreement was solely bed tax.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated the public benefit and national exposure of Pima County and the Kino Sports Complex with the promotion of being a host site for major soccer events but questioned why the first \$40,000.00 that would be used was from the Stadium District and not the Attractions and Tourism Special Revenue Fund.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that in addition to the bed tax generated by their hotel stays, as teams came and played at the facility, they would be paying facility fees to the Stadium District, so there was additional revenue generated to the Kino Stadium District as a result of these stays. He stated that in regards to marketing, through the relationship the County had with FC Tucson and the work of Jon Pearlman, the County had been identified by FIFA as a potential site for a team training camp for the 2026 World Cup. He stated that was the type of exposure the County was able to get, not only on a regional and national basis, but potentially on an international basis, and was the hallmark of the Kino Stadium District and Attractions and Tourism. He stated that they had a much broader reach since sports tourism was one of the components and those were the reasons the Stadium District funds were identified first.

Supervisor Scott asked if FC Tucson would provide a list of hotels that were in unincorporated Pima County to traveling teams so that they were encouraged to book at those hotels, since reimbursements would only be provided for hotel costs associated with room nights at those hotels.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative. He stated that FC Tucson, Attractions and Tourism and Visit Tucson were working to help identify the locations within unincorporated Pima County that would then be eligible for the reimbursement and Visit Tucson would track those stays. He stated that a report would be provided to the County that included the teams that stayed and the amount of nights they stayed at those locations.

Supervisor Scott asked how the contract amount was determined and if that was something that may be adjusted in the future depending on the success of the program.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the County had a history of this type of agreement with FC Tucson and Visit Tucson. He explained that in 2013, it was at its highest at \$190,000.00 and had tapered over time, between 2017 through 2019, it ranged from \$111,000.00 down to \$51,000.00. He indicated that in 2017, it was \$80,000.00 and staff felt that was a good starting point to resume the agreement between the parties. He explained that the agreement would be evaluated over the three year time period and if warranted and successful, it could be brought back for adjustments.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be possible to get a flow chart that showed the special revenue funds and how many there were and the revenue sources and the amounts. He stated that it might bring clarity as to how the whole structure was devised, particularly when picking different revenues from time to time, depending on the situation. He stated that it could be difficult to decipher the actual source of these revenues and a flow chart would bring clarity.

Supervisor Christy requested a flow chart that included the number of special revenue funds, the revenue sources and the amounts. He stated that a flow chart would provide clarity.

Ms. Leshar requested clarification if the flow chart would only be related to this contract.

Supervisor Christy responded yes.

Chair Grijalva stated that the County had done this before and it had been paid out of Contingency Funds. She stated that in 2013 it was \$190,000.00, so the amount of this item was less than what the County had invested in previous years.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., concurred.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 3, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair  
Rex Scott, Vice Chair  
\*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member  
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member  
Steve Christy, Member

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

\*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:06 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 Jeff Sawyer, Program Coordinator, Arcadia Region, Palo Verde Family Resource Center, Tucson Unified School District.

### 3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

### 4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Chair Grijalva acknowledged the passing of Mayor Ed Honea and observed a moment of silence in his honor. She expressed her condolences to his family, friends and Marana community.

Supervisor Lee stated that Mayor Honea had completed his Associate's degree at Pima Community College and he had told her that he had fun doing so because he was the old guy surrounded by 20 year olds and he was very proud of this accomplishment.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had worked with Mayor Honea on the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Board. He explained that they were the only Republicans and he appreciated Mr. Honea's honesty and dedication to the community. He stated that Mr. Honea would be greatly missed in the community.

Supervisor Scott stated that he met Mayor Honea through the RTA and appreciated his candor, wisdom and experience. He shared a fond memory of sharing his desserts with Mr. Honea when they attended RTA conferences. He stated that he would miss his friend and looked forward to honoring him at his funeral services.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, commented that Mayor Ed Honea's funeral services would be held on Saturday, December 21, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. at the Marana Civic Center.

## **PRESENTATION**

5. Presentation of the 2024 Small Business Commission Awards to:
  - Arivaca Mercantile, Small Business Rural Award
  - Forbes Meat Company, Small Business Urban Award
  - SARSEF, Small Business Nonprofit Award

Janay Arenas, Chair, Small Business Commission, presented the awards. No Board action was taken.

6. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding an increase in fentanyl deaths in Pima County, funds and resources given to illegal immigrants, and her concerns with Proposition 139.

Shirley Requard spoke on behalf of Gisela Aaron regarding her concerns with election results, ballot numbers, and fluctuating tabulation numbers on Election Day. She asked that the Elections Director provide clarification on these issues.

Ann Rose spoke about the remaining funds within the American Rescue Plan and specific line items for the Health Department, and expressed her concerns about the Covid vaccine.

Dave Smith acknowledged the passing of Mayor Honea and spoke about his dedication to the Marana community. He also expressed concern over the Sheriff's election results and border issues.

Robert Reus discussed the end of the line for two-party institutional party powers and expressed his concerns regarding President-Elect Trump taking office in 2025.

\* \* \*

Supervisor Christy asked that the issues Ms. Requard spoke about on Ms. Aaron's behalf, be sent to the Elections Director for analysis and response.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, clarified that the Director Hargrove had responded to Ms. Aaron's concerns from two meetings ago.

Supervisor Christy recalled that Ms. Aaron's comments were responded to, but was unsure if they addressed the specific issues that were raised on this day.

Ms. Leshar stated that she would confirm if any additional information needed to be provided in response to Ms. Aaron's comments.

\* \* \*

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

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

Jenifer Darland, Director, Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions (OHOHS), provided a slideshow presentation regarding an update and high-level overview of the activities that had rounded out the first year since the establishment of the OHOHS. She explained that as they closed out the year, their attention had been spent on Priority No. 4, which was the development of a strategic and continuous improvement plan for ensuring that County programming was responsive, sustainable and equitably distributed. She stated that as a result, it involved a deeper evaluation of responses to reports of complaints of homeless encampments, which meant participating in "walking the work" with Pima County's Public Works and homeless services teams during the carrying out of the duties aligned with the County administrative procedure, and it included an evaluation of the various pathways by which a report could be made since currently there were multiple ways homeless encampments could be reported, such as by email, telephone call, constituent feedback forms maintained by the Public Works departments, drainage complaint forms maintained by the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) or regional reports that the County received from the City of Tucson (COT) through their regional dashboard. She stated that these multiple pathways for submitting a report made it a very complicated process to establish baseline data and to monitor the incoming demand for homeless encampment activities in real time, as well as homeless response and needs, and tracking the progress of their own efforts, therefore, they had engaged in conversations with Pima County's Information Technology Department on the development of an internal data system. She stated it would allow them to monitor real time data reports and the status for the efforts in response to those reports, such as whether it was reviewed, if a department had conducted a site visit, the progress on engagement, and a timeline for site remediation or cleanup. She stated that the additional goal for the data system was for it to seamlessly liaise with the COT's regional dashboard and establish baseline data on where these activities took place for the purpose of monitoring areas within the County that were prone to homeless activity and resettlement after the Public Works teams had responded to a report and to

proactively get ahead of the challenges rather than react to reports. She added that improved visibility would help them evaluate the coordinated response and delivery of services meant to interrupt homelessness. She stated that Administrative Procedure 50-2, Homeless Protocol, would be updated as the protocol used to direct County staff on how to respond to homeless encampment reports. She explained that updates would include clarification in the steps and the processes for more specificity to ensure that it could be a responsive document, and it was a balance between adding specificity and almost too much detail that ran the risk of not being evergreen, which meant it would need to be updated on an annual basis because the dynamics of homelessness was fluid. She added that it would include enough detail that ensured the fidelity of the protocol was being followed, that it continued to lead with humanitarian efforts in advance of posting and engagement with law enforcement as necessary and continued to be something that could be responsive to constituents and their concerns for public safety and access to public resources. She explained that those two components of Priority No. 4 would consist of more granular detail in the forthcoming year-end report and anticipated delivery to the County Administrator by the end of the year. She stated that Priority No. 4's establishment was foundational to starting the work on Priority No. 5 and it was challenging for them to establish a thoughtful, comprehensive and regional strategy. She stated the County's processes needed to be cleaned up and made routine so that they had the ability to be a faithful and reliable partner. She explained that one of the upcoming attractions for community efforts and regional collaboration was a visit from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Central Command Technical Assistance (TA) was anticipated to be on site the current month for the purpose of discussions around the housing central command efforts, which had been a laborious exercise and worked with Streets-to-Stabilization that had been underway for more than a year. She added that they also expected to release the University of Arizona Southwest Institute for Research on Women's (SIROW) 2024 Gaps analysis, a housing portfolio that was part of the continuum of care, which was HUD-funded housing in the community. She stated that an early review of the draft suggested it would include the portfolio that went with the continuum of care homeless response portion of resources and the demands on the system, which meant the number of people identifying themselves as homeless and needed a response would be a very informative data point. She stated this would help them determine how to decrease the number of reported unsheltered or homeless individuals. She added that her team would be conducting a point in time unsheltered count on January 29th, which involved field work to complete a survey of individuals experiencing homelessness in unsheltered settings and would provide staff with an opportunity to hear about the challenges and ensured that their efforts continued to move forward and provide responses to those experiencing homelessness. She indicated that a summit on older adult homelessness was forecasted for the year ahead, which was a collaborative event by the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness (TPCH) and the Pima Council on Aging, and that the focus would be on the vulnerabilities and experiences of older people that had a very difficult time tapping into the homeless response system. She added that they were underrepresented and were largely unsheltered because they were tucked in the shadows of the homeless community. She added that the purpose would be to identify the pathways to connect individuals to those resources, as well



as to work with homeless service providers and identify the support systems that the older homeless population needed in order to age with as much dignity as possible.

Supervisor Scott stated that he understood that with the central system for reporting homeless encampments, they were trying to internally address which department would be responding to a report of an encampment. He stated that he was aware of issues with departments bouncing things back and forth between each other and had heard in his office that constituents were being bounced from one jurisdiction to another. He asked if the central system could also address the fact that so many of the County's constituents reported sincere frustration with being bounced between jurisdictions.

Ms. Darland responded that the goal was to ensure they were able to be responsive, irrespective of jurisdictional ownership as easily as possible, although, they needed to consider those assets that were held by Federal and State agencies for which the County had no authority to enter a property and could complicate the County's responsiveness. She recognized Marco Diaz and the RFCD and stated they set the gold standard for the ability to be creative, flexible and industrious in identifying strategies to complete the work quickly and efficiently. She explained that the update to the procedure was meant to memorialize what Mr. Diaz had set out as a good practice and being able to refine the way to contact Federal and State partners seamlessly, which could be challenging and posed delays. She indicated their efforts would ensure that those points of contact would be easily identified so that they could be as responsive to this concern, as well as the County and other jurisdictional partners.

Chair Grijalva commented that some of the issues were with funding, so if it was a COT project versus unincorporated Pima County, there were different resources depending on the area. She added that there were a lot of moving parts to the problems and appreciated Ms. Darland's explanation of the different systems and their collaboration. She stated that some things were out of their control, such as with the courts, and they needed to be able to have willing partners to do their part, but that was not always the case.

Supervisor Scott asked if a draft of the changes in the protocol and procedure document could be shared with each district office, because his office dealt with that protocol a lot in terms of responding to constituent concerns, and staff in the various district offices might be able to offer some valuable input into the language for that document.

Ms. Darland responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Scott expressed his enthusiasm regarding HUD's Housing Central Command structure, but stated that it had dampened with some realism about that structure. He asked whether HUD could help the County with what was working and not working with that structure, since they helped with its establishment, and asked if it could also lead into a discussion of what had been long known and what the

County's partners had long known, were that changes needed to occur within the structure of TPCH.

Ms. Darland explained that after HUD's visit, they would present a summary report that would likely include what had been done and the progress to date. She stated that challenges with the incoming Federal Administration could mean changes to HUD which could mean a pause until it was known what those federal changes meant for local continuums of care. She added that these programs were funded by HUD and facilitated in accordance with current continuum of care guidelines, for example, Housing First practices, and irrespective of any challenges, including income or sobriety, had largely been the priority and the regulation. She stated they were waiting to see how that would evolve and the timing of the visit from the TA's and their report, as well as the report coming from SIROW Gaps Analysis, would be very helpful. She stated that in conversations with her team and staff from the COT, they were trying to emphasize reviewing those metrics so they could determine how to improve the overall collective responses. She believed there would be some key pieces of information that should provide some indication of improvements needed, but overall, housing stability was very complicated, and it was not quite clear how much more complicated it could possibly be with any forthcoming changes at the federal level.

Supervisor Scott asked for clarification if the County could also request what they wanted seen in the reports based on what staff and its partners had seen as needs for change or strengthening in the structures of both housing central command and TPCH.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the County could request changes, but it was not a County report and what was finalized was not up to the County. She added that she had even less optimism about this visit than with the others, which had been minimal. She explained it was a final report of the current administration that was coming in December of the current year, and it was unknown how it would be transmitted to a new administration. She stated it was unknown whether anything that came out of this report might influence or impact changes in the funding or the operations in the new administration. She stated they had begun to receive information from the new administration that there would be no more funding for low barrier housing, and they would try to influence the current administration as they closed the door at the end of their work for the last several years as they finalized their report, but it was unknown how they would finalize the report or the actions that would be taken in response to the report.

Supervisor Scott requested more information and details regarding the January 29th Point in Time Count so that he and his staff could participate in it.

Chair Grijalva concurred and stated it was a very challenging time for the community with the upcoming holidays and change in the weather which created additional layers of challenges.

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

**8. Revised American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (CSLFRF) Budget**

Staff recommends approval of the revised ARPA CSLFRF project budgets and authorization of any necessary operating transfers.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained this item was the final modifications or transfers proposed with ARPA funds, and the County had received over \$203 million in ARPA funds and in 2021, started a plan with the Board on the initial spending, but modifications were made along the way to ensure they were appropriately spending those dollars. She added that this was the final allocation or request to transfer about \$1.3 million to ensure the funds were expended and had to purpose the funds by the end of this year and spend soon thereafter. She commended staff for monitoring the funds and making the requests to formally and fully allocate the remaining funds.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, reiterated that this request was for the end of the County's spending obligation period, which was December 2024 to ensure they were obligating funds with no other changes afterwards. He stated that they would not be able to come back to the Board again, so they did their best to review those spend-down plans and where they could be spent down. He went over the timeline recap and stated it was critical because some of the concerns had been why December 2024 was the County's end of the spending obligation period when the actual spend-down period ended in 2026. He stated they needed to obligate dollars prior to that, and more importantly, June 30, 2025 would be the last time they could utilize the funds for staffing. He added that their interpretation of the obligation was particularly the budget that was set for the current year for staffing as the obligation requirements they felt met the federal requirements for spend-downs for staffing. He stated that other projects would go beyond that timeline, but any internal staffing associated with this spending down plan would end on June 30, 2025. He stated that given the amount of funding of the \$1.3 million, there were small buckets of areas by which they felt were not going to be spent down and then some overages where they wanted to re-obligate dollars. He stated a memorandum had been provided that included the individual items and recommended approval of this final modification.

Chair Grijalva congratulated Project Design & Construction on their cost saving efforts seen with the Northwest Services Center and the Curley School Gymnasium Projects, and both projects were on track.

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

Supervisor Lee stated that the Ajo Community was very excited about the Curley School Project and had previously mentioned that when the electricity went out in Ajo, it could be a respite area that would be air conditioned and have a generator. She stated that she knew the County did not purchase the generator and it would

be very costly because of the size of the building. She asked for a status update on that purchase, since the cost savings would not cover a generator.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that he was confident in his assurance to Supervisor Lee that a generator would be installed at that location and the team was working on it. He stated that he did not have a recent update from them on the process, but knew that funds were available within the project, and the plan was to size that appropriately to serve the needs of the community in instances of power outages. He stated they would provide additional details to the Board.

Supervisor Lee thanked everyone for their efforts on the work in the Ajo courts to ensure that the generator was implemented.

Supervisor Scott thanked Mr. Holmes for his presentation and Ms. Leshner for the memorandum that had been provided to the Board. He referred to the County Administrator's Memorandum dated November 25, 2024, regarding the information on Table II for the Drexel property. He requested a report regarding the potential long-term options for use of the Drexel property.

Supervisor Christy stated that the funds had to be spent by December 31, 2026, but a new administration would come in on January 20, 2025. He asked how the funds could be obligated to that extent with almost a year past the beginning of a new administration.

Ms. Leshner responded that all of those dollars and the timelines were part of a federal law. She explained that in order to make modifications it required additional legislation that could be passed and approved by the President. She stated that it was possible for the dollars to be clawed back and that was being monitored, but at this current point it was executive branch action and legislation that had been passed by both the House and Senate and approved by the President.

Supervisor Christy stated it was imperative to note that the required legislative action could very well happen within that year. He stated that it was his understanding there was interest in rushing to spend the money to ensure it was spent before anything happened to it and was concerned with the new administration coming in. He stated that he was also astounded by the fact that these were COVID dollars that went towards things that could be questioned on what they had to do with COVID, which seemed to be the overriding issue. He stated that COVID was over and asked why money was being spent for nothing that had to do with it, and he also heard that it had to be spent because staff needed to be paid. He stated that the smartest thing to do was for the unspent money to be sent back.

Chair Grijalva stated that these projects were not only happening in Pima County, but across the nation, it would be complicated to shift and pivot funds that had already been expended and the County was told they could be used through 2026.

Ms. Lesher explained that while these were ARPA dollars, it meant they were not only responding to the public health needs during a pandemic, but assisted with the recovery happening in communities. She stated that as a result, some dollars were expended for economic development efforts or things that might be part of recovery in the community. She recalled that before ARPA funds, they had the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act funds that initially came at the onset of the pandemic which was from the previous Trump administration, and they were optimistic that they would be able to align those dollars into the new administration.

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

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **9. Justice of the Peace - Judicial Productivity Credits**

In accordance with A.R.S. §22-125, the Supreme Court has provided the Judicial Productivity Credits for Fiscal Year 2024. Staff recommends approval of the salary adjustments for the Justices of the Peace, effective January 1, 2025.

Chair Grijalva stated that her understanding was the credits were assigned by the Supreme Court, and the Board did not have any discretion regarding modifications or suggestions.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, concurred.

Chair Grijalva stated that when the former County Administrator sent out updates on productivity with some of the judges it included some disturbing information and she pointed out that the Board did not really have any oversight over the judges.

Ms. Lesher stated that the productivity credits were established and defined in statute and there were eight elements that were used to provide the productivity credits for each of the Justices of the Peace (JP). She stated there was a website under the Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, which provided transparency, tracked the productivity of every JP in the state and showed the total number of monthly cases heard by each JP which was averaged into the overall productivity credits.

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

Supervisor Lee expressed concern with Ajo's case numbers. She knew it was a much smaller community, but she needed a better understanding of those numbers and requested a breakdown of the productivity credits for Ajo.

Ms. Lesher stated that a report would be provided to the Board.

Chair Grijalva stated that Ajo's numbers stayed the same and everyone else had increased.

Ms. Leshar clarified that Ajo's productivity credits decreased.

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

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Community and Workforce Development**

10. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for emergency eviction legal services - emergency housing for occupancy and operation of low-barrier shelter at Knights Inn, extend contract term to 12/31/25 and amend contractual language, Arizona Department of Housing - S.B. 1720 Homeless Shelter & Services Fund, contract amount \$948,913.04 (PO2400003500)

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

Supervisor Christy asked if this was a COVID-era policy or if it was initiated as a result of COVID.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, responded that in 2021, the County began to fund emergency eviction assistance that was funded through COVID CARES Act dollars. He stated that one of the things that was recognized fairly early on was that there were a group of individuals who were acutely losing their housing stability because of their inability to pay their rent and they often ended up in the streets. He indicated that they were largely families with children. He stated that the County set up a program at that time specifically to address the needs of that group of people, as well as older, vulnerable adults.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the year.

Dr. Garcia responded it started in 2021 and was originally funded with emergency eviction ERAP funds that were provided through the COVID pandemic. He stated that subsequently the County identified a variety of different sources, including American Rescue Plan Act funding, and state and federal Department of Housing funding for the operation and purchase of this particular property.

Supervisor Scott stated that on Page 2 of the County Administrator's memorandum that referenced this item, it referred to the primary performance metrics for the shelter. He commented on the extraordinary success rate of the County and the program had consistently maintained a rate of 80% to 85% since its opening in January 2022. He indicated that at the Craycroft location the County dealt with a much more stable element of housing the homeless community than others and asked how they were building on the successes at Craycroft, in other areas of outreach to the homeless community that presented greater challenges. He stated Dr. Garcia had referenced that the County had grant funding through the Arizona

Department of Housing, and given the success of the Craycroft location and the needs it fulfilled in the community, he asked if the department was looking at their options in terms of keeping that facility up and running after June 30, 2026, which was the deadline date for spending those funds.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded yes.

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

### **Detainee and Crisis Systems (formerly Behavioral Health)**

11. NaphCare, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for correctional health services, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$2,016,148.31 (PO2400003903)

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

### **Kino Sports Complex**

12. Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, d.b.a. Visit Tucson and Arizona Soccer Holdings, Inc., d.b.a. FC Tucson, to provide a Hospitality and Promotional Agreement to host a preseason training camp over the course of the next three seasons, KSC-2024FD (\$120,000.00) and Attractions and Tourism Special Revenue (\$120,000.00) Funds, total contract amount \$240,000.00/2 years, 3 months term (not-to-exceed \$80,000.00 annually) (PO2400013748)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the funding sources, in particular the Special Revenue Fund. He stated that Item G in the agreement listed a term date of January 17, 2017 to March 31, 2019 and asked what had been done from March 2019 to present. He asked how the revenue fund interacted with the car rental tax and wanted an explanation regarding how this item was funded.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the car rental tax, \$3.50 per car, was set by Statute dedicated to the Stadium District for sports and tourism and was part of an overall funding structure.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that there were other components related to tourism, but for this particular agreement the revenue source would be the hotel bed tax. He stated that in regards to the Special Revenue Fund within the Stadium District, dollars came in and resided within a fund that contained hotel bed tax. He stated that in terms of prior agreements from 2013 to 2019, those agreements were in place and were funded at various amounts over those years, the agreement ceased around the time prior to the COVID pandemic, and in 2019 there were discussions about a new agreement, but that had not gotten

finalized prior to the pandemic. He stated that as FC Tucson attracted Major League Soccer teams and other professional teams to come to Tucson, if they stayed at hotels in the unincorporated area, which generated bed tax they would use up to \$80,000.00 under this contract to offset those costs for those traveling teams.

Supervisor Christy asked if the idea was for those revenue funds that were designed to be somewhat operational of the sports complex would cover the expenses or help offset the expenses of soccer teams that came and participated in tournaments.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that all of the funds of the Stadium district went towards the operations of the district and the capital investment in the facility itself. He stated that there was a marketing and promotions budget that was part of the Stadium District and as they worked to attract organizations host their events at Kino Sports Center, there was a component of that. He stated the \$80,000.00 was made up of two components, up to \$40,000.00 of Kino Sports Complex dedicated bed tax and Attractions and Tourism contributed up to \$40,000.00. He stated that the Stadium District funds would be used first if there were qualifying bed night stays in hotels in unincorporated Pima County and then if there were stays in hotels, it would generate additional revenue in subsequent years to the organization.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the car rental tax.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the fund source for this agreement was solely bed tax.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated the public benefit and national exposure of Pima County and the Kino Sports Complex with the promotion of being a host site for major soccer events but questioned why the first \$40,000.00 that would be used was from the Stadium District and not the Attractions and Tourism Special Revenue Fund.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that in addition to the bed tax generated by their hotel stays, as teams came and played at the facility, they would be paying facility fees to the Stadium District, so there was additional revenue generated to the Kino Stadium District as a result of these stays. He stated that in regards to marketing, through the relationship the County had with FC Tucson and the work of Jon Pearlman, the County had been identified by FIFA as a potential site for a team training camp for the 2026 World Cup. He stated that was the type of exposure the County was able to get, not only on a regional and national basis, but potentially on an international basis, and was the hallmark of the Kino Stadium District and Attractions and Tourism. He stated that they had a much broader reach since sports tourism was one of the components and those were the reasons the Stadium District funds were identified first.



Supervisor Scott asked if FC Tucson would provide a list of hotels that were in unincorporated Pima County to traveling teams so that they were encouraged to book at those hotels, since reimbursements would only be provided for hotel costs associated with room nights at those hotels.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative. He stated that FC Tucson, Attractions and Tourism and Visit Tucson were working to help identify the locations within unincorporated Pima County that would then be eligible for the reimbursement and Visit Tucson would track those stays. He stated that a report would be provided to the County that included the teams that stayed and the amount of nights they stayed at those locations.

Supervisor Scott asked how the contract amount was determined and if that was something that may be adjusted in the future depending on the success of the program.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the County had a history of this type of agreement with FC Tucson and Visit Tucson. He explained that in 2013, it was at its highest at \$190,000.00 and had tapered over time, between 2017 through 2019, it ranged from \$111,000.00 down to \$51,000.00. He indicated that in 2017, it was \$80,000.00 and staff felt that was a good starting point to resume the agreement between the parties. He explained that the agreement would be evaluated over the three year time period and if warranted and successful, it could be brought back for adjustments.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be possible to get a flow chart that showed the special revenue funds and how many there were and the revenue sources and the amounts. He stated that it might bring clarity as to how the whole structure was devised, particularly when picking different revenues from time to time, depending on the situation. He stated that it could be difficult to decipher the actual source of these revenues and a flow chart would bring clarity.

Supervisor Christy requested a flow chart that included the number of special revenue funds, the revenue sources and the amounts. He stated that a flow chart would provide clarity.

Ms. Leshar requested clarification if the flow chart would only be related to this contract.

Supervisor Christy responded yes.

Chair Grijalva stated that the County had done this before and it had been paid out of Contingency Funds. She stated that in 2013 it was \$190,000.00, so the amount of this item was less than what the County had invested in previous years.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., concurred.

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

## Procurement

13. Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001726, Amendment No. 5, Carahsoft Technology Corp., to provide for computer software and related items. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$365,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$2,365,000.00, and adds the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention and Safety Plan language to the contract, pursuant to Pima County Procurement Code 11.40.030. Funding Source: General (50%) and Enterprise Funds. Administering Department: Information Technology.

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

14. Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002328, AssetWorks, Inc. (Headquarters: Wayne, PA), to provide for AssetWorks fleet, fuel and GPS Management System. This supplier contract is for an initial term effective 12/3/24 to 8/31/26, in the initial award amount of ~~\$800,000.00~~ **\$890,000.00** (including sales tax) and includes one (1) five-year renewal option in the subsequent award amount of \$2,640,000.00. Funding Source: Fleet Services Operations and Fleet Services Capital Projects Funds. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

15. Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002367, Insight Public Sector, Inc. (Headquarters: Chandler, AZ), to provide for Apple computer hardware and software. This supplier contract is effective 12/3/24 to 4/30/26, with an initial award amount of \$450,000.00 (including sales tax). The contract also includes one (1) two-year renewal option with an additional award amount of \$600,000.00 (including sales tax). Funding Source: Internal Service and General (25%) Funds. Administering Department: Information Technology

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

## Real Property

16. American Battery Factory, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide a lease-purchase agreement for property located at the Aerospace Research Campus for developing a battery manufacturing facility and amend contractual language, contract amount \$10,000.00 revenue (CTN-RPS-23-81)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this was the second time they were extending the original contract and asked whether \$10,000.00 was all that was required to extend the contract. He stated that the entire project was first conceived in 2022 and American Battery Factory (ABF) has yet to break ground on it. He expressed concern whether the company had cash flow problems and asked if the suppliers were being paid, if this particular deal was contingent on federal government spending on the project, and what had ABF contributed towards the project. He stated that in the original contract, during the first year of the contract, ABF was to pay in the purchase lease agreement \$455,000.00 for year one, \$466,000.00 for year two, \$478,000.00 for year three, and \$490,000.00 for year four. He asked if the contract payments had been made and he heard that the equipment was not due until the first half of 2026. He stated that consequently, he was told that there was no construction of the facility until they had the equipment and it seemed they would want to have the facility ready for the equipment when it came in, but that had not been accomplished. He asked whether the payments were only due if there was a groundbreaking and expressed his concern that for two years this had been on hiatus. He asked about ABF's financial commitment to the whole process over those years and if it would cause missed opportunities in the County's economic development since this very valuable property stood dormant when it could be marketed around the world to other entities that might be interested in it. He stated that it raised a lot of red flags and he had concerns in 2022, and had questioned the then Chief Executive Officer, who was no longer with the firm, so he was very concerned and skeptical about the prognosis of this project. He added that he was concerned about the stability of ABF and their commitment and asked if they were utilizing elements of the contract to delay payments and financial commitments to the building and to the project itself.

John Kem, President, ABF, thanked the Board for their decision two years ago on the original contract and access to the land. He explained that they had been paying the monthly lease rental agreement, which was a lease to buy and this had been ongoing for quite a length of time. He stated that they missed one payment for three days due to staffing. He stated that he had been with ABF for 16 months after his retirement from the Army and had a long history of working on complicated projects as part of the Army Corps of Engineers and had a background in how to work through these types of problems. He stated that this had been challenging for them and the reason their timeline was delayed was not because of any funding problems, but it was related to trying to ensure the machining of what needed to be in there was done right and other companies around the world had also struggled, like at Northvolt in Europe, and they did not want to be someone that did it wrong. He stated that they needed about \$120 million for the main manufacturing line, which was 1,500 feet long of very complicated equipment with some being 150 feet long. He stated that they spent a much longer time than anticipated from two years ago to get that right, because they had seen in Asia, Europe, essentially almost none of that main equipment line was made anywhere but in China and having to figure out exactly what to get and where to get it. He added that they wanted to ensure they had the right cyber controls needed for bringing the Chinese equipment and that it would operate effectively. He stated it took much longer than anticipated and the lead part for the delay and the reason the building construction on those

things had not kicked off. He stated they did not want to build a building and have it empty and the funding up front until it was timed right with the machine. He stated that in terms of the quantity of equipment, there was another \$50 million in U.S. equipment related to HVAC and other systems and controls that would go in that building. He stated that the sense of the scope was about 450 containers worth of equipment that needed to be internationally shipped which was why timing was critical in terms of the funding. He stated that they did not have a major issue, but had both a debt and an equity that would happen within the next 60 to 90 days and they had funds on hand to accomplish a lot of this work, but they did not want to kick off until the machining and the apparatus were exactly right, because the worst thing was to get started and then get stuck and they did not want that to happen. He explained that they had completed environmental review and hired Rick's Engineering to do the development site concept permit, which would be planned for the end of January and they were track to complete this.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that ABF paid their rent, which totaled \$915,000.00 since the initiation of the lease. He stated they paid a \$50,000.00 security deposit to the County and a purchase option deposit of \$50,000.00. He stated that the \$10,000.00 included in this amendment was an additional amount on top of the \$50,000.00 purchase option amount, for the extension of time. He added that it was not without value to ABF and Pima County, and since the onset of the lease through November, they paid \$1,020,000.00 and were current with all terms of the lease.

Supervisor Christy asked if the future of the entire funding project was based on any federal grants or federal involvement.

Mr. Kem responded no and they were not currently tied to the federal grant program but were working the Department of Defense Security Cooperation Agency to find out if there was interest, but it did not depend on that. He stated that there had been some interest in the last 90 days by the Federal government on making battery cells a critical material of sorts, but they were still working through that process. He stated that they had not applied for anything, but knew it would be an interesting way to try to do things.

Supervisor Christy asked about the timeline was for the second extension and the estimated time of arrival for the equipment that would precipitate the groundbreaking of the building.

Mr. Kem stated that things would begin in late winter, early spring in the coming year and that the construction window on the building would be done in two parts because it was a 1,500-foot-long building. He stated that machining would arrive in the back half of the building as the first half was still being completed and that the timelines provided to staff was that they planned to do work in the back half of the building towards the end of 2026. He stated that they decided to decouple and explained the way battery cell manufacturing worked, the chemistry part was the front end, and the electrolyte and other things at the back end. He stated that they saw companies in other parts of the world that struggled with hiring and then the

front half would not work right. He stated that the chemistry took a little longer to commission and get straight including the need for fire code and all those other things, and then the others would stand around with nothing to work on, so they separated those two and would complete the back half first where they could bring in some materials to start working on things and training staff. He stated that if this delayed commissioning for the full factory, they could still operate and was the reason there was a split process.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was concerned with two basic areas, ABF being current with all the lease purchase payments according to the contract, and secondly, the reason for the extensions and the delays was that they were waiting for the equipment to arrive so they could configure it in the building. He asked if this was correct.

Mr. Kem clarified that they were not waiting for the equipment, they had not scheduled delivery of all of the equipment and manufacturing, and some of it needed to be manufactured for delivery. He stated they were timing it to be brought together at the right time and that was why they had timing from 2018 to 2026 before all of it would be mostly done.

Supervisor Scott stated that another reason for the delay mentioned in the memorandum provided by Ms. Leshner and also in the letter to Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, which dealt with the Tucson Electric Power (TEP) site that was dependent on some of the internal work of the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC). He read from the second to last paragraph and asked that given the fact that ABF stated they would be using the TEP facility as their wider development efforts, how the County would have input into those negotiations with TEP to ensure that the wider development efforts were addressed in those negotiations.

Mr. Kem explained that the first factory had a 46kv transformer and power that TEP provided in the bottom right corner of the complex. He stated that when they expand from 4gw up to 20gw, they would need more power and the original plan from TEP was there would be 138kv, a much larger complex in that same area, which was the two parts that had to be done. He stated that about 9 to 10 months ago, TEP informed them that some of the 138kv would not be exclusively for ABF, but they did not need that much. He added they told them by Derrick rules, it changed some of the dynamics of how things had to be done, so as part of that, they tried to ask for permission to let them work directly with TEP to figure out what was the right location for them and TEP's viewpoint on the best way to access that site and keep it in that bottom right corner. He stated that in the end, ABF needed to work with the County for final approval, due to them only being a lease holder, and the land was owned by the County. He added that it would make it less complex and allow staff to work on its integration.

Supervisor Scott asked about the wider development efforts that were referred to in the letter.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., explained that TEP was a wonderful development partner to Pima County and so every economic development project in the region that was within TEP's service area, the jurisdictions were involved. He stated that County staff met routinely with TEP staff, at the technical and leadership level and were engaged in discussions. He added that the Economic Development director had been working with Matt Miller at TEP until his recent departure from the company. He stated that the Aerospace Research Campus had other available acreage there and in addition, the entire corridor along Aerospace Parkway had land assets owned by others, for example, Tucson International Airport, and there was State land in the area that could be made available for employment generating economic development uses which would then benefit from the power infrastructure. He stated that from the onset of the concept of the Aerospace Parkway and its relocation to the south, to provide a sufficient buffer to Raytheon, the idea of a utility corridor along aerospace Parkway had been central to the success of the development there, and the County's ability to meet the power demand needs, as well as other utility needs in the area. He stated that Tucson Water had a water station infrastructure servicing that area, so it was a coordinated effort across the region by multiple entities, including Pima County, the City of Tucson, Tucson Airport Authority, TEP, Tucson Water and others.

Supervisor Scott referred to the memorandum regarding a special contract between ABF and TEP being processed by the ACC and asked about its time frame.

Mr. Kem responded that he was unsure, but the engineering work on exactly how to locate this would drive that and hopefully by late spring it would be going to them.

Chair Grijalva commented that staff and ABF always made themselves available to receive updates and ask questions. She stated it was important to have public conversations, but if Board members needed specific clarification, she encouraged them to meet with staff because Mr. Vescovi-Choiridi had visited her office to provide specifics.

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

### **Transportation**

17. Federal Highway Administration, Amendment No. 2, to provide for AZ FLAP PIM FR510(1) Sabino Canyon Park Road; Carter Canyon Road to USFS Gate Project (4SCPRD), extend contract term to 12/31/27 and amend contractual language, County HURF Fund, contract amount \$185,000.00 (CT-21-196)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this was a very important project for his district and would mitigate congestion and improve safety on Sabino Canyon Park Road with the much needed additional parking. He stated that the goal of the project was to improve access to Forest Service lands by rehabilitating and paving about half a

mile of Sabino Canyon Road in the Mt. Lemmon, Summerhaven District, constructing a new 75 stall parking lot and 21 street parking stalls, plus a shared use pathway and public restroom. He commented that these were much needed for the very congested and popular destination and commended the Summerhaven community, Forest Service, federal government and the County for all of their hard work on this project.

Chair Grijalva concurred and that it was good for everyone who liked to visit.

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

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

### **18. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

RESOLUTION NO. 2024 - 72, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the continuum of care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2024 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for HUD Continuum of Care Program - La Casita, \$231,303.00/\$57,825.75 General Fund Match (G-CWD-70932)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this grant dealt with young adults, basically teens who were homeless and were trying to address their situation. He asked if this grant posed a potential conflict with groups that were already centered on these efforts, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) like Youth on Their Own and Job Path. He asked if there were related programs that this item fell under that were already funded by COVID dollars. He commented that the County had a number of entities that were working on the same project and if this would create more work than what was needed.

Chair Grijalva stated that based on the conversations she had with the nonprofit organizations who were working on this, the problem was significant and the need was greater for 18 to 24 year olds. She commented that there was never enough organizations providing services.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the coordination between organizations.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that a report would be provided to the Board which included who the County communicated with, how they shared resources and the conversations with the groups in the similar space.

Supervisor Christy asked if this grant was being threatened by any kind of reduction due to a timeframe on when the money could be spent or with the incoming new administration.

Ms. Leshar responded that it was a retroactive grant because HUD had not gotten it back to the County in time.

Dr. Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator and Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services, stated that the period of performance for this grant ended in June 2025, and it was for a 12-month performance period. He stated that the dollars had been obligated and encumbered and upon the Board's action the County would be billing for these. He clarified that these dollars were directed specifically for this particular contractor, who was one of the partners in the continuum of care.

Supervisor Christy questioned whether the funding would expire in a year.

Dr. Garcia responded yes.

Supervisor Christy stated that it behooved the NGOs to get more involved in this since its expiration was nearing.

Ms. Leshar responded that NGOs were very involved in this and the information she would provide to the Board would include who was doing what in the space.

Chair Grijalva stated that this grant specifically provided transitional housing and education, and that was the piece that a lot of the other NGOs could not always offer.

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

19. **Acceptance - Health**

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the PimaREACH Coalition: restoring cultures of health among Native American and Hispanic/Latinx communities in Pima County, AZ and amend grant language, \$680,038.00 (GA-HD-70325-1)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.

20. **Acceptance - Health**

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the PimaREACH Coalition: restoring cultures of health among Native American and Hispanic/Latinx communities in Pima County, AZ, extend grant term to 9/29/28 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-70325-2)

It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the item.



## **FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

### **21. Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, December 12, 2024 at 8:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

### **22. Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Brandy White, Loews Ventana Canyon Resort, 7000 N. Resort Drive, Tucson, December 12, 2024 at 8:00 p.m.

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

Supervisor Scott stated that several meetings ago the Board denied the fireworks permits for the Westin La Paloma that were purely for commercial purposes and now there were similar fireworks permit requests from Loews Ventana Canyon on December 12 and 18, 2024. He stated that just like Westin La Paloma, Loews Ventana Canyon was in an area surrounded by residences and his district office frequently heard from residents about the disturbances that fireworks shows caused them and their pets. He clarified that he did not have any issues with fireworks shows that took place at area resorts that were surrounded by residential areas on holidays, such as New Year's Eve and 4th of July. He stated that Supervisor Christy mentioned the fireworks shows frequently requested by Caterpillar in Green Valley did not affect any residents because they were held in an area that was away from residences. He stated that was not the case with resorts, such as Westin La Paloma or Loews Ventana Canyon, and saw their requests differently than the request from Skyline Country Club, which was also in his district, because that request was for New Year's Eve. He stated that in the interest of consistency and to protect the concerns raised by residents, he encouraged his colleagues to oppose the fireworks permits requested by Loews Ventana Canyon.

Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 1-4, Chair Grijalva and Supervisors Heinz, Lee and Scott voted "Nay."

Supervisor Scott asked that given the action taken by the Board on these shows, if it would be appropriate if there was something that the Clerk's Office could communicate to applicants in the future, so that they knew what the likely outcome was going to be. He stated that he did not want people to go through the process of submitting an application with the Clerk's Office if the likelihood of approval was low.

Chair Grijalva stated her concern with making that statement was there would be a new Board member in 2025 and she did not know what her position would be regarding fireworks. She indicated that if a statement was needed from the Board or if there would be a policy change, it could be discussed after January 2025.

Supervisor Scott stated that was a fair point.

Chair Grijalva stated that it was not illegal to hold fireworks shows and they could continue to hold shows.

**23. Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Naomi Reilly, Loews Ventana Canyon Resort, 7000 N. Resort Drive, Tucson, December 18, 2024 at 9:30 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 22, for discussion and action on this item.)

**24. Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Maddison Angelone, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. St. Andrews Drive, Tucson, December 31, 2024 at 10:00 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

**25. Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, January 23, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

**26. Hearing - Bingo License**

24-06-8050, Jennifer Kenney, San Xavier Moose Lodge No. 1964, 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, Class B - Medium Game.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Revenue.

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

### 27. Hearing - Rezoning

#### P24RZ00008, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY TUCSON, INC. - W. MARS STREET REZONING

Habitat for Humanity Tucson, L.L.C., represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., request a rezoning of approximately 4.46 acres (Parcel Codes 225-36-0520, 0530, 0540, 0550, 0560, 0570, 0580, 0590, 0600, 0610, 0620, 0630, 0640, 0650, 0660 and 0670) from the CR-3@ (Single Residence - Restricted) to the CR-4 (Mixed-Dwelling Type) zone, located on the north side of W. Mars Street, approximately 600 feet east of N. Camino de Oeste. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Medium Intensity Urban. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Maese was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

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

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Transportation conditions:
  - A. Existing public easements and right-of-way shall be abandoned or vacated prior to tentative plat approval.
  - B. Sidewalks shall be constructed to Pima County standards along the property frontage on Mars Street.
  - C. The design of on-site circulation, access lanes and parking areas shall meet the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Street Standard or as determined at time of tentative plat.
  - D. Prior to Tentative Plat approval, written proof of coordination with the Town of Marana is required regarding any traffic impacts to their roadway system.
3. Regional Flood Control District conditions:
  - A. Drainage design shall not increase existing conditions water surface elevations and flow velocities at all property boundaries.
  - B. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development practices distributed throughout the site.
  - C. Curb cuts in appropriate locations along roads shall be utilized to optimize Low Impact Development Practices in appropriate locations throughout the internal road system and parking areas.
  - D. Drainage infrastructure shall be maintained by the Homeowners' Association.
  - E. At the time of development, the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.
4. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
  - A. The owner(s) shall not construe any action by Pima County as a commitment to provide sewer service to any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.
  - B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the

owner shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.

- C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
  - D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
  - E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.
  - F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.
5. Environmental Planning condition: Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s)/developer(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*) from the property. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site; and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.
6. Cultural Resources condition: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
7. Adherence to the preliminary development plan approved at public hearing.
8. No landscape bufferyards (including screen walls) shall be required along the east and west property boundaries. An open fence will be installed along the northern property line in-lieu of a landscape bufferyard. Where feasible in light of the design of the project's proposed drainage facilities, the open fence shall connect to the northeast and northwest corners of the existing adjacent properties' fencing or walls, and vegetative screening shall be provided within basin areas adjacent to said fence connections.
9. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
10. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Lee and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24RZ00008, subject to standard and special conditions.

28. **Hearing - Rezoning**

P24RZ00009, 1455 RIVER RD, L.L.C. - W. RIVER ROAD REZONING

1455 River Rd, L.L.C., represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., request a rezoning of approximately 3.12 acres (Parcel Code 104-01-049B) from the CB-1® (Local Business - Restricted) to the CB-2 (General Business) zone, located on the south side of W. River Road, approximately 600 feet west of the intersection of W. River Road and N. La Cañada Drive, addressed as 1455 W. River Road. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property as Neighborhood Activity Center. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Maese was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

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

1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Regional Flood Control District conditions:
  - A. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development practices distributed throughout the site proposed for development.
  - B. Curb cuts in appropriate locations within the parking area to be redeveloped shall be utilized to optimize LID Practices.
  - C. At the time of development, the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.
3. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
  - A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.
  - B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) stating that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
  - C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
  - D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the

PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.

- E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.
  - F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.
- 4. Adherence to the preliminary development plan approved at public hearing.
  - 5. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
  - 6. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Lee and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24RZ00009, subject to standard and special conditions.

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

### **29. 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-80840)

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

## **SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICT**

### **30. Cortaro-Marana Irrigation District**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-642(B), presentation of the certified copy of the official canvass for the November 12, 2024 election conducted by the Cortaro-Marana Irrigation District.

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

31. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

\* \* \*

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

1. **Special Event**

- Craig Stephen Ivanyi, Arizona - Sonora Desert Museum, 2021 N. Kinney Road, Tucson, March 22, 2025.
- Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church Parish - Tucson, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, December 14, 2024.
- Lance P. Laber, DeGrazia Foundation, 6300 N. Swan Road, Tucson, December 7 through 16, 2024
- Aaron Michael Cooper, International Sonoran Desert Alliance, 10 W. Pajaro Street, Ajo, December 14, 2024.

**ELECTIONS**

2. **Precinct Committeemen**

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

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Jamie Sullivan-073-DEM, Donna Sandberg-128-DEM, Cuong Tran-040-REP, Nancy Alix-141-REP, Kathleen Cusumano-145-REP, Mitchell Limmer-184-REP, Everardo Mercado-184-REP, Susan Sandoval-192-REP, Larry Shoemaker-194-REP, Ann Lobreglio-207-REP, Christopher Senftleben-243-REP, Nicole Senftleben-243-REP

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

3. Warrants: November, 2024

\* \* \*

32. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

DRAFT