FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Flood Control District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Flood Control District Tentative Budget in the amount of $19,558,296.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.3407. Upon roll call 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 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement 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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the following County Improvement District Tentative Budgets for Fiscal Year 2026/2027:

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	**FY 26-27 PROPERTY TAX LEVY**
Other Improvement District	
HAYHOOK RANCH	$39,087
Steet Lighting Improvement District	
CARDINAL ESTATES	$17,888
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1	$10,330
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3	$3,487
DESERT STEPPES	$6,029
HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES	$4,779
LAKESIDE NO. 1	$7,276
LITTLETOWN	$30,606
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1	$10,818
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2	$13,031
MAŇANA GRANDE B	$8,716
MAŇANA GRANDE C	$13,002
MIDVALE PARK	$18,693
MORTIMORE ADDITION	$44,021
OAK TREE NO. 1	$30,371
OAK TREE NO. 2	$23,922
OAK TREE NO. 3	$30,247
ORANGE GROVE VALLEY	$7,857
PEACH VALLEY	$4,945
PEPPERTREE RANCH	$12,760
ROLLING HILLS	$14,780
SALIDA DEL SOL	$19,494

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Improvement District Tentative Budgets, as presented. Upon roll call 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 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library 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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Library District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Library District Tentative Budget in the amount of $63,454,352.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.5820. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County 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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget in the amount of $4,930,829.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **FEASIBILITY REPORT RESOLUTION**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - RK1, of the District Board of Rocking K South Community Facilities District authorizing and ratifying the Giving of Notice of Hearing with Respect to a Feasibility Report for Public Infrastructure to be financed by the district; approving such report; authorizing the sale and issuance of not to exceed $2,350,000.00 aggregate principal amount of General Obligation Bonds, Series 2026A, of the district; prescribing certain terms, conditions and provisions for such bonds; approving the execution and delivery of a bond registrar and paying agent agreement; approving the execution and delivery of other documents relating to such bonds; awarding such bonds to the purchaser thereof; appointing a bond registrar and paying agent for the bonds; authorizing the levy of an ad valorem property tax with respect to such bonds; and authorizing the taking of other actions securing the payment of and relating to the bonds.

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

Chair Allen indicated that community facilities districts were an approach, that in theory allowed a developer to build homes more quickly, without having the capital needed upfront, for infrastructure costs. She expressed her concern that the costs would continue to show up on residents' tax bills and it was an example of developers shifting infrastructure costs to homeowners. She expressed her concern regarding transparency and whether homeowners knew their tax bill would continue to increase. She stated that the Rocking K South Community Facilities District (RKSCFD) budget's additional tax on local homeowners was $2.38 per $100 valuation, which meant the homeowner's effective tax rate was almost 50% higher than that of the average Pima County homeowner, and she hoped this was disclosed to home buyers. She stated that since RKSCFD's creation in 2017, this was the fifth time developers had come to the Board with a funding request, and it had caught her attention as that tax rate grew and became a significant portion of residents' tax bills. She added that her office had requested that the Board ask for more from developers when creating community facilities districts and that they look at mixed housing, affordability, more tree plantings, green stormwater infrastructure projects, greywater rainwater harvesting systems, and renewable energy integration as the Board moved forward.

Supervisor Christy stated that home buyers understood the infrastructure costs were part of the purchase contract and part of the process for community facilities districts. He added that there were a number of districts around the state, and it was fully disclosed to home buyers that this was an ongoing process for the improvement of their community.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Stadium District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Stadium District Tentative Budget in the amount of $9,645,670.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

WILDFLOWER COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Wildflower 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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Wildflower Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Wildflower Community Facilities District Tentative Budget in the amount of $0.00. Upon roll call 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 8:29 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 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, Pima County Attorney's Office.

3. **CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Supervisor Scott stated that on May 13, 2026, he participated in the Tucson Values Teachers' Principal for a Day Program, where he spent the morning at the Sunnyside High School campus where he engaged with the principal, staff, and students. He encouraged his Board colleagues to participate in the program when they were provided with the opportunity. He stated that on May 14th, he joined staff from the Community and Workforce Development Department, and they spent time in the Sahuarita Unified School District where they spoke with Sahuarita staff and Santa Cruz County Supervisor John Fanning, about Santa Cruz County's interest in starting a program to provide support for early childhood education, similar to what Pima County had been doing since 2021. He stated that on May 18th, he and Supervisor Heinz were speakers at an event sponsored by the Chamber of Southern Arizona that featured a keynote address by Governor Hobbs, which looked at the future of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement.

Chair Allen stated that the District 3 team was looking forward to a tour of the San Xavier Co-op Farm later in the week. She announced that the Three Points office hours would be on June 3, 2026, from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., at the Hub, and Arivaca office hours on June 6, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at the Farmers' Market.

PRESENTATION

4. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Wade Zelenak, Library Technical Assistant Supervisor, Pima County Public Library, for 47 years of service.

Tess Mayer, Director, Pima County Public Library, acknowledged Wade Zelenak’s contributions to the community over his 47 years of service and with the outreach he provided through the Bookmobile. She congratulated him on his retirement.

No Board action was taken.

5. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Jesus Hernandez, Laboratory Technician, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, for 20 years of service.

Max DiSante, Division Manager, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, congratulated Jesus Hernandez on his retirement. He recognized Mr. Hernandez for his positive demeanor and outstanding dedication to the department over his 20 years of service to Pima County.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Judge Janet Bostwick, Judge Danelle Liwski; Jennifer Richardson, Director, Court Children and Family Services; and Stephanie Chavez, Dispute Resolution Manager, proclaiming the day of Saturday, June 13, 2026 to be: "PIMA COUNTY FAMILY REUNIFICATION DAY"

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

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Trista DiGenova addressed the Board regarding the return of her service dog, Dr. Baker, who was taken during an unlawful raid on her home, the removal of Sheriff Nanos for misconduct and dereliction of duty, and the closure of the Pima County Jail as a human rights crisis. She announced that she was an independent write-in candidate for Pima County Sheriff and the District 5 Board of Supervisor seat.

Ashley Holmes spoke about Voices for Mama, a platform focused on raising awareness around family court trauma, maternal-mental health, domestic violence, and the experiences of self-represented mothers navigating high-conflict custody cases. She stated that many families struggled silently through family court systems that prioritized procedures over safety. She asked that Pima County continue to invest in trauma-informed approaches, survivor resources, and community dialogues surrounding family court reform and family well-being.

J.D. Wallace, Tucson Electric Power (TEP), provided an update on the work done by TEP to prepare for the increased electrical demand of the upcoming summer season. He described new training procedures that allowed TEP crews to make repairs while lines remained energized and the expansion of battery storage capacity at two TEP facilities. He noted that TEP energy rates had been stable for the past three years and encouraged customers to enroll in TEP's budget billing program.

Cory Stephens expressed her support for A.R.S §41-1494 and that it was a necessary step toward restoring unity and equality under the law. She stated that it was a law designed to ensure that no taxpayer money was used to divide individuals and that the use of the term "white fragility" when referring to this statute, was not only dismissive, but was a direct affront to the principles upon which the nation was built. She also noted that speakers needed more than three minutes at Call to the Public.

Laurie Moore expressed her support for A.R.S §41-1494 and objected to Chair Allen's comments regarding the statute. She stated that the statute forbade special privileges based solely on race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation and that no individual was inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive. She added that the Democratic party never wanted equal opportunities.

Robert Reus spoke about his prediction from 15 months ago when he declared that President Trump would be historically unpopular by this time because the President was a classic federalist, and federalism only served the top 15% of the population and was inherently unpopular. He also added that the Democratic Party did not need to do gerrymandering to hold onto their power since they were in the position to pick up 50 seats in the House of Representatives and a majority in the Senate.

Ken Silverman, Board member of the Industrial Development Authority (IDA), spoke about Minute Item No. 32 and described the work the IDA had done over the past 10 years, in financing over $1 billion in bonds to provide funding for three nonprofit affiliates. He asked the Board to table the item until the IDA could bring its own legal counsel to evaluate what the IDA and Board had done.

Max Larnerd, as general counsel for the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) of the County of Pima, expressed the IDA's concerns that the proposed action to remove all current directors would create a significant disruption to the IDA's current implementation of reforms. He asked the Board to engage in a collaborative discussion before making a decision of this magnitude.

Patrick DeConcini, Board member of the Industrial Development Authority (IDA), stated that as the newest member of the IDA he recognized that reforms were needed and listed several reforms that had already been implemented. He noted that the entire IDA board had not been notified by the Board or their staff of the item and asked for the opportunity to discuss the changes that the IDA Board was making and how the reforms would support the mission of the IDA.

Mike Humphrey, Vice President of the Pima County Board of Health, expressed his support for the supplemental funding request for the Community Health Workers Program, and stated that community health workers would be especially important due to the upcoming changes to Medicaid access enrollment. He noted the crucial role that community health workers played in protecting public health and recited a poem by a Loyce Nyachio Nyaboke, a Kenyan community health worker.

Vivek Bharathan stated that Beale Infrastructure had acquired permits from the state to drill two wells and would use up to 20,000 gallons a day, which endangered the water supply of nearby families. He called for the resignations of Supervisors Christy, Scott, and Heinz since they had allowed this to happen. He spoke about Supervisor Scott's recent comments discrediting protestors that disrupted a webinar hosted by Project Blue's attorneys and asked what Supervisor Scott would approve as a palatable form of civil disobedience.

Mr. Bharathan proceeded to climb onto the podium table in protest.

Chair Allen asked Mr. Bharathan to remove himself from the podium or he would be removed from the podium and escorted out of the hearing room by the Sergeant at Arms. Chair Allen stated that the Board would take a short recess.

8. **RECESS**

Chair Allen recessed the meeting at 6:09 p.m., due to the disruption at Call to the Public.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting was reconvened at 6:11 p.m. and continued with Call to the Public. Supervisor Heinz was not present. He rejoined the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

Amy Bass, Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., and representing the Rural Amado Youth Center Project, expressed her support for the supplemental funding request for the Community Health Workers Program (CHWP). She described the beneficial impact that the community health worker assigned to the youth center had made while assisting those in rural areas to access resources and services. She requested that the Board make the CHWP a permanent item in the budget instead of being funded through grants.

K. Bharathan stated that he had tried to follow the logic behind the Board's support for the data center and thought the answer lay in the County's need for additional income through property taxes due to cuts in federal funding. He noted that a decline in water quality and access could cause a drop in property values and the income generated by property taxes, which could result in Board members being voted out of office.

* * *

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

10. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 4:23 p.m.

11. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 5:30 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding federal grant conditions.

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

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding the Industrial Development Authority and the Board of Supervisors.

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

14. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board regarding the Tentative Budget for FY 2026/2027. No one appeared.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

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

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027 in the amount of $1,809,953,662.00 at an effective tax rate of $5.2835. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Allen offered a friendly amendment to include an additional $450,000.00 for the benefit of rural communities, specifically an additional $30,000.00 from the General Fund for International Sonoran Desert Alliance programming, $20,000.00 ($10,000.00 each) to provide continued funding for the Ajo and Flowing Wells Senior Meal Programs from July 1st through October 1st, and $400,000.00 for a Pilot Program with the Department of Transportation that supported a quarterly grading schedule for the areas throughout the County that had the greatest need and that greatest need would be determined with criteria by the Department of Transportation.

Supervisor Heinz accepted the friendly amendment, as the seconder to the original motion.

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

16. Review and adoption of the Debt Service Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Services Tentative County Budget in the amount of $98,766,269.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.0875. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

17. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Wendy Cross, Forty Niner Country Club, 12000 E. Tanque Verde, Tucson, June 27, 2026, from 8:50 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. (Independence Day Celebration)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz abstained and Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

18. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, July 3, 2026, from 9:00 p.m. - 9:10 p.m. (250 Year Club Member Celebration)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz abstained and Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

19. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, July 4, 2026, from 9:00 p.m. - 9:20 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz abstained and Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

20. **Rezoning Closure and Rezoning Time Extensions**

A. **Hearing - Rezoning Closure**

P16RZ00001, HUEBNER 50% ET AL. - N. LA CHOLLA BOULEVARD REZONING
David Sandra, L.L.C. 50% & OJS, L.L.C. 50%, represented by Snell & Wilmer, requests closure of a 3.18-acre rezoning (Parcel Code 101-12-8920) from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to TR (Transitional) zone, located on the west side of N. La Cholla Boulevard, approximately 800 feet north of Oracle Jaynes Station Road. The subject site was conditionally approved in 2016 and expired September 6, 2021. Staff recommends DENIAL OF THE CLOSURE OF THE REZONING. (District 1)

B. **Hearing - Rezoning Time Extensions**

P16RZ00001, HUEBNER 50% ET AL. - N. LA CHOLLA BOULEVARD REZONING
David Sandra, L.L.C. 50% & OJS, L.L.C. 50%, represented by Snell & Wilmer, requests two five-year time extensions. The 3.18-acre rezoning (Parcel Code 101-12-8920) from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to TR (Transitional) zone expired September 6, 2021. The property is located on the west side of N. La Cholla Boulevard, approximately 800 feet north of Oracle Jaynes Station Road. Staff recommends APPROVAL OF FIVE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION SUBJECT TO ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

At the request of the applicant and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

21. **Hearing - Zoning Code Text Amendment**

P26TA00002, PIMA COUNTY SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT STREET STANDARDS
An Ordinance of the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona, relating to zoning (Title 18); amending the Pima County Zoning Code Chapter 18.69.040

(General Performance and Design Standards), creating a new Section 18.69.100 (Preservation Treatment for New Public Streets) and adopting a revision to the Subdivision and Development Street Standards Section 4.17, Pavement Design, to establish an in-lieu fee for subdividers. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Becker was absent) to recommend APPROVAL. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (All Districts)

If approved, pass and adopt: ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - 7

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

22. The Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2026, continued the following:

Release of NorthStar Employment and Legal Solutions Report

Discussion/Direction/Action to consider the potential waiver of attorney-client privilege, and the scope of such waiver, of the 65-page report prepared by NorthStar Employment and Legal Solutions, as referenced in the March 19, 2026, Administrative Investigation Final Decision regarding Sheriff Chris Nanos and other command staff. (District 2)

At the request of Supervisor Heinz and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

23. **County Administrator Hiring Process**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the County Administrator Hiring Process. (District 3)

Chair Allen stated that as of May 21st, the County had received 50 applications for the County Administrator position. She stated that the deadline to apply for the position was on May 31st, and applicants could send their cover letter and resume to administratorrecruitment@pima.gov. She added a brochure was available online at County Administrator Recruitment, which provided more context about Pima County. She explained that after the deadline all final applications that met the minimum qualifications for the position would undergo a subject-matter expert review by Human Resources. She indicated that during this process each applicant's qualifications of education, experience, and certifications would be evaluated to determine which applicants would move forward to the next step in the selection process which was supplemental questions. She stated that the supplemental questionnaire would be sent to applicants in early June and applicants would be given the opportunity to provide written responses that highlighted the applicant's ability to focus on and prioritize the County's Strategic Plan, Climate Action Plan, and closing the gap in Affordable Housing. She added that the questionnaire would also allow each applicant to highlight their ability to build relationships with multiple stakeholders and to develop innovative ideas in leadership. She noted that the responses to the supplemental questions would be due to Human Resources by June 22, 2026. She indicated that on May 8th, the County Administrator had sent a letter to the members of the Search Committee notifying them of their participation and the expected timeline of events. She stated that the search committee would review each applicant's cover letter, resume, and responses to the supplemental questions for evaluation and scoring, and that the top scoring applicants would be selected as semifinalists that would be interviewed by the search committee. She noted that semifinalist interviews were expected to occur in July and that the committee would further narrow down the list to the top finalists, at which point the names of the finalists would be made public. She explained that this would keep the process on track to complete finalist interviews in August, with final selection to occur shortly thereafter, which would allow for the final selection to be announced at the beginning of September.

Supervisor Christy asked as the process went along if it was possible to keep all Supervisors advised on the number of applicants and who they were, with the understanding that it would be confidential.

Chair Allen stated that she would check with Human Resources about providing the names of the individuals who applied for the position and would get back to Supervisor Christy.

Supervisor Cano clarified that on the County website it listed the deadline for applications was May 30th, not May 31st, and that the website also listed that only finalist applications will be made public, in accordance with the Arizona Public Records law. He stated that Board would only have access to the identities of the finalists.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that it may be possible to see the list that the search committee reviewed, but that names of all applicants would not be released because there may be people who might have initially applied that had not yet provided that information to their employers.

Supervisor Christy stated that he understood the confidentiality involved, but asked if there was an available methodology of keeping the Board apprised of the amount of applicants and their backgrounds, from a purely informational aspect, while remaining confidential.

Ms. Lesher stated that she could provide the number and would have to look into if there was a way to keep the Board apprised of applicant backgrounds, but that she needed to speak with Human Resources to learn what would be possible, while working with Chair Allen and the team.

Supervisors Scott noted that each Supervisor had submitted two names for the search committee and asked to receive the list of the full committee.

Chair Allen responded in the affirmative.

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

24. **Joint Meeting between Pima County Board of Supervisors and City of Tucson Mayor & Council**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Pima County Board of Supervisors and City of Tucson Mayor & Council Joint Meeting on Thursday, August 13, 2026, from 12:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m., at Pima Associations of Governments Office, 1 E. Broadway Boulevard, 4th Floor, Tucson, AZ.

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

25. **Pima County Health Department Supplemental/DREAM Request: Reducing the Burden of Chronic Disease and Maintaining Access to Care**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Adding the Health Department's DREAM Request for FY27 of $186,000.00 for the Office of Non-Communicable Diseases, including funding for currently grant-funded Community Health Workers (CHW) for whom grant funds are set to expire in the coming months, to the FY27 Tentatively Adopted County Budget, and directing the County Administrator to re-appropriate the funds necessary from whichever other area of the budget makes most sense in order to fund this Health Dept. priority while maintaining the FY27 property tax rate at the Administrator's Recommended Budget level. Additionally, directing the County Administrator to ensure that in the development of the FY28 and FY29 Recommended Budgets, our CHW workforce is maintained at current staffing levels or grown in size and not allowed to shrink, regardless of any potential Federal grant changes, expirations or the like. (District 2)

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that as the Board had heard from the public and the Board of Health, community health workers were incredibly important. He stated there were Hantavirus, Ebola and COVID, but that was not what killed people in Pima County, or anywhere else, it was actually heart disease, diabetes, obesity and cancer. He stated that without proper screening and the help of community health workers, through expanded education and screening, it would not help connect residents to care. He stated that many community health workers' positions within the department were grant funded and he noticed this back in 2021 when he took office. He stated that there was much grant funding in the Health Department, but it did not provide long-term certainty for some of these vital roles. He stated that the $186,000.00 was in line with a Department Request for Expenditure and Money (DREAM) request from the Health Department, because they would be losing that exact number of dollars in grants for the Office of Non-Communicable Diseases. He stated that he was proposing this due to available funding this cycle, the ability to keep people permanently, and it was aligned with the Prosperity Initiative. He stated that as indicated by the letter from the Board of Health, chronic diseases like heart disease, cancer, respiratory illnesses, Alzheimer's, and other forms of dementia touched nearly every household in the County and that heart disease and cancer remained the two leading causes of mortality in Pima County. He stated that these diseases had modifiable risk factors like tobacco use, poor nutrition, inadequate physical activity, hypertension, and responded to prevention, screening, treatment, and self-management support. He stated that this was something that community health workers did and was the reason he thought it was important that this additional adjustment be made for 2027.

Supervisor Scott asked why the DREAM request from the Health Department was not included in the recommended budget and requested a general overview of the process for evaluating DREAM requests.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that there was no opposition to this program per se, however, they needed to draw lines when there was not enough money, review every DREAM request and the amount of allocation in each department. She stated that in October staff began reviewing these documents and walking through the budget on a weekly basis, and as they began to narrow down and get through everything, they recognized the need to make very difficult cuts and recommendations on every item in every department to get to a balanced budget that would be considered today that continued to provide service with the least impact to the tax system.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that another important piece at the time they considered this supplemental request was that they were entertaining a Health District and those discussions included funding non-communicable diseases but that had not come to fruition. He stated that a study was done but there was not enough community support, which was another reason why it was not funded and that this budget stream would decrease over a three-year period. He stated that there were also concerns due to some false cancellations of grants at that time, and they were not sure about the status of those funds.

Supervisor Scott stated that as indicated earlier there were $49.6 million in DREAM requests, $15.8 million were approved and were included in the recommended budget but this one for $186,000.00 was not approved. He stated that his concern, which had not casted any aspersions on the merits of the proposal, or the recommendation by his colleague, or the recommendation of the Board of Health, was that if the Board approved this one DREAM request, and then all the other ones that were not approved were not considered, what message that would send to the other directors, elected officials, and employees with those over $33 million in DREAM requests that were not approved. He stated he was concerned about that in terms of the process followed and anybody that saw a DREAM request denied could put together a similar argument, and for that reason, he was not able to support it.

Supervisor Heinz stated that community health workers kept people on Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) or helped them enroll if they have been pushed off, which H.R. 1 was designed, to push as many people off of Medicaid in the state of Arizona, as possible. He stated that keeping these folks employed and granting would make a big difference and what they heard from staff was that things have changed since they were evaluating these DREAM requests. He stated that because a Public Health Taxing District was not in the offing at this moment and the grant got canceled, they were not sure if it was going to be at the time changed. He stated that it was important to keep people from dying and hoped his colleagues would consider passing this.

Supervisor Cano stated that he would support the item with the expectation that it came out of the contingency that has been set aside for federal grant losses. He stated that this was a specific contingency and felt that an appropriation at this amount was certainly prudent to ensure that public health was maintained, while fully recognizing the constraints that his colleague from District 1 mentioned, that should be considered in adoption of this proposal.

Chair Allen stated that community health workers in some of the rural areas of District 3 brought a transformative effect to the community. She stated that Ajo's community health worker jumped in to help fill the gaps around the loss of the Senior Meals Program. She stated that person staffed the cooling center and went above and beyond. She stated that they also heard from Amy Bass about the important role the community health worker played in the Amado area and they provided an important bridge and gap for folks in rural areas. She stated that she wished they could continue to fund things that were very important and saw that there were so many threats looming the budget and potential strain up ahead but was very appreciative of District 2 and the Board of Health for bringing this item forward. She stated that she could not imagine Ajo without a community health worker and supported the item.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Christy and Scott voted “Nay.”

HUMAN RESOURCES

26. **Revisions to Personnel Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Personnel Policy No. 8-102, Premium Pay.

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

27. **Classification/Compensation**

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

Class Code/ Class Title/ Pay Grade (Salary Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code
2123/ Deputy Director Justice Services/ 18 ($93,392.00-$140,067.20)/ 1/ E*
*E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

RECORDER

28. **2026 Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2026 Primary Election.

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

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

29. **Amending the Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule - June 2026 through December 2026**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding amending the approved meeting schedule for June 2026 through December 2026. A 1:00 p.m. start time for the Study Session of every month was originally approved on January 6, 2026, the Board of Supervisors will consider adding built-in flexibility, as needed, to change the start time to a later time, depending on the number of items placed on the Study Session agenda.

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to allow the start time of each Study Session to be on a case-by-case basis.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that this meant a Study Session meeting could potentially start at 2:00 p.m.

Chair Allen concurred and stated that it would be determined by the number of items submitted for a Study Session Agenda.

Supervisor Scott asked if the recommended start time for a Study Session meeting would be made by the agenda review committee.

Chair Allen responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Cano stated that as guidance for the Clerk and the Chair he requested tracking of the additional expenses associated with evening meetings and asked that a report be provided to the Board in September or October of those additional costs. He stated that it would be a mid-year check-in on the efficacy of public tax dollars on evening meetings.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5.0.

30. **Elections Oversight 2026**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the County Administrator's re-establishment of an Elections Oversight Task Force, originally created in 2020, per her memorandum dated April 27, 2026 to include, but not limited to, greater detail as to its composition, mission, and activities reporting to the Board of Supervisors during the upcoming election season. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that the first communications regarding the Elections Oversight Task Force was generated back in 2020 by former County Administrator Huckelberry. He asked if there were any records of communication transcripts generated by the task force committee to the Board of Supervisors of the activity that the committee had done.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that she did not believe there were and was not aware whether that committee had ever met, but would be happy to look for any and follow up with the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked that since this was formed back in 2020, based on an election cycle at that time, why was it not reformed in 2022 or 2024 but asked why it was brought back for this one.

Ms. Lesher stated that in 2022, they explored whether they would form this and in the Spring of '22 they hired a new Elections Director from across the country and had thought to put that in place but at that time, there was a lot of change in transition and it was not done. She stated that the point of this was not to in any way engage or involve in elections operations and what they saw in watching 2022, even though it was new, and in '24, was that the ability to have a group come together, at least once, to see if there was muscle memory for them to be able to convene, not regarding the elections, but if they needed to get information out to the public about problems at a site. She stated that it was something that might need to be done in order to ensure they got the right information out to the public immediately and it did not have an impact on how elections was operating or to get in the way of the Recorder or the Elections Director, but to find another way to facilitate communication, if necessary, while they were busy running actual elections.

Supervisor Christy stated that the communications element was the focus and asked if he could add to the action part of this item, the list of activities or goals that the committee was designed to reach, that every effort of communication be made on the activities of this committee to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Lesher responded that she would do that and if there were further concerns or issues, there were individuals, like Supervisor Scott, that was a member of the committee, they could be addressed. She reiterated that they had yet to convene a meeting of the task force.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was also happy to add the committee to his report when the Board discussed their service on other commissions and committees.

Supervisor Christy asked if this item required any action by the Board because it had not indicated in the original document forming this committee that the Board of Supervisors would have access and communication to the activities of the committee.

Chair Allen stated she did not believe so.

Ms. Lesher stated that she would provide a revised memorandum to add that information to the documents and share it with everyone.

Supervisor Christy responded that would suffice.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

31. **Contingency Request for Pima County's Victim Service and Domestic Violence Response System**

Staff recommends $250,000.00 from the Contingency Fund be allocated to provide additional support for Pima County's Victim Service and Domestic Violence Response System.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that this was a request to provide $250,000.00 from this year's Contingency Fund to support critical programs provided by the Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse (Emerge) and the Southern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault (SACASA). She stated that funding for Emerge would expand after-hour victim services and advocacy, as well as emergency shelter support, while funding for SACASA would provide for strangulation exams related to domestic violence incidents. She stated that $90,000.00 would fund half of the Domestic Violence Firearm Transfer Program, a program that had come to the Board in the past and had been asked to be supported by members of the public, as well as Judge Million and those involved at the City's Domestic Violence Court.

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

Supervisor Cano recognized Ms. Lesher for her leadership on this particular issue, while she navigated difficult fiscal circumstances, listened to community need, and presented the Board with a comprehensive package. He added that Ms. Lesher's work was deeply appreciated by District 5. He remembered Richard Elias, former Board Supervisor, as a champion of domestic violence prevention, and that Mr. Elias would be proud of this recommendation, particularly because of the tremendous need in the community. He explained that this was an issue that had impacted generations of Pima County residents, including people that he loved in his own family, who had died due to domestic violence. He reflected that too often individuals were taught to say nothing, to grieve in silence, to carry those hardships quietly, and to not discuss the harm that happened inside their homes and families. He added that this Board was being asked to lead and to ensure that there was a coordinated response, while working in partnership with the County Attorney, Courts, Detainee and Crisis System staff, and community partners to had a robust investment in a compassionate system that supported them. He stated that it was good to invest in after-hours victim advocate services, it was essential to ensure that strangulation forensic service exams were funded, it was critical to sustain emergency shelter and housing for survivors of domestic violence, and that he had heard the public loud and clear that the Firearm Transfer Program needed to be maintained and that the need was clear. He added that this proposal was prudent and met the needs of the time.

Chair Allen stated that a significant portion of these funds were replacing funding lost due to the Trump Administration's decision to reduce or to altogether defund critical programs that addressed violence against women. She stated that domestic violence was increasing and, in the U.S., nearly three women were killed every day by an intimate partner, and more than 2 million women suffered injuries every year. She added that more than $500 million had been cut from the Office on Violence Against Women and the grants they managed and expressed her gratitude for the local work of Emerge and for their efforts in trying to maintain services in the face of lost funds. She expressed her support for the item and thanked Ms. Lesher for bringing this item forward to the Board.

Supervisor Scott thanked his colleague from District 5 for not only his passionate advocacy for these issues, but also the work that he had done to facilitate dialog between the County Attorney's office and their partners in the private sector, who took on issues of domestic violence. He thanked Ms. Lesher for her dialog with her counterpart at the City so that the program overseen by Judge Million could continue, noting that the Board had heard several passionate advocates from the community speak in support. He expressed his support for the item.

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

32. **Industrial Development Authority Board of Directors**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Industrial Development Authority Board of Directors Membership/Composition/Appointment.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that on March 9, 2026, there were concerns about the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) that were brought to the attention of the Board. She stated that there were decisions that needed to be made before the end of the month related to the availability of approximately $45 million in mortgage assistance that had to be resolved. She asked the Board to direct her to meet with the five current members of the IDA Board, staff for the three affiliate organizations, or the three CEOs of those organizations, and legal counsel for the organizations, to follow up to ensure that there was fiscal responsibility and that things were moving appropriately. She added that she would report back to the Board in time for both the IDA Board and the Board of Supervisors to take whatever action necessary before the end of the month to ensure that those dollars were made available to the people of Pima County. She stated it was her understanding that this was what the Board hoped to be codified at that time.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to direct the County Administrator to proceed as described. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano expressed his sincere desire that all parties involved worked with Ms. Lesher to ensure they were focused on the unmet need in the community. He added that he was troubled when he saw that organizations got stuck and not focused on the purpose of what they were supposed to do, which was the mission of delivering millions of dollars of resources to the region. He stated that he had full confidence that in the coming weeks the volunteer leadership of the IDA Board would be fruitful and thanked the IDA Board. He hoped the IDA Board recognized that the Board of Supervisors had a lot of fiduciary responsibilities to ensure oversight and compliance with the law and that the Board was ensuring the timeline was not disrupted by the external circumstances that had brought on this conversation.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

33. **Bond Advisory Committee**

Appointments of Blake Eager, Russell Federico, and Andrew Heinemann. Term expirations: 5/25/32. (District 1)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

34. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. YWCA of Southern Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Facility Improvement Project - House of Neighborly Services Campus and extend contract term to 6/30/27, no cost (PO2400012793)

2. IMPACT of Southern Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Facility Improvement Project - Hawser Street Catalina and extend contract term to 5/31/27, no cost (PO2400012764)

Elections

3. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 5/26/26 to 12/31/27, contract amount $1,850,000.00 revenue (CT2600000048)

4. Pima County Community College District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 5/26/26 to 1/31/27, contract amount $975,000.00 revenue (CT2600000041)

Procurement

5. **Award**
   Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2600000081, RWC International, L.L.C., d.b.a. RWC Group, to provide for various medium duty trucks. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of $1,120,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. <u>Funding Source</u>: Fleet Services Fund. <u>Administering Department</u>: Fleet Services.

6. **Award**
   Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002223, Amendment No. 2, Underwood Brothers, Inc., to provide for landscape and vegetation management services ROW. This amendment increases the annual award amount by $300,000.00 from $2,700,000.00 to $3,000,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of $5,700,000.00. This increase is required to account for prior and potential future price increases, and for a one-time service of buffelgrass management. <u>Funding Source</u>: Highway User Revenue Fund. <u>Administering Department</u>: Transportation.

7. **Award**
   Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2600000085, Harvey Trucking, Inc. (Tucson, AZ) and Arizona Material Services, L.L.C. (Tucson, AZ), to provide for aggregate materials. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1)

year in the shared annual award amount of $400,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Highway User Revenue Fund. Administering Department: Transportation.

8. **Award**
Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2600000084, C&S Sweeping Services, Inc., to provide for roadway sweeping services. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of $500,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Highway User Revenue Fund. Administering Department: Transportation.

9. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, Amendment No. 7, to provide for veterinary supplies. This amendment extends the term of the contract commencing on 5/7/26 and terminating on 11/6/26, and increases the shared amount by $400,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of $1,700,000.00. The extension is necessary to ensure uninterrupted service and provide additional time to process a new solicitation. Increased funding is necessary due to chronic overcrowding experienced over the past fiscal year, which has led to higher costs for veterinary supplies. County is currently housing more than twice its kennel capacity and has over 1,300 animals in foster care, all of which require necessary veterinary supplies for their care. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Pima Animal Care Center.

Supplier Contract No./Supplier/Total Contract Amount/Allocation of $400,000.00 Amount/Updated Cumulative NTE Amount
SC2400001193/MWI Veterinary Supply, Co., d.b.a. MWI Animal Health/$858,000.00/$280,000.00/$1,138,000.00
SC2400001194/Midwest Veterinary Supply, Inc./$123,000.00/$80,000.00/$210,000.00
SC2400001192/Patterson Veterinary Supply, Inc./$312,000.00/$40,000.00/$352,000.00

10. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 12, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Northwest County Service Center (XNWHLC) and extend contract term to 12/31/26, no cost (PO2400018739) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

11. Poster Mirto McDonald, Inc., to provide for architectural and engineering design services: Southwest Library, term date 5/26/26 to 1/31/30, Library Capital Projects (Library District Funds), contract amount $1,318,190.41 (PO2600013414) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

12. Progressive Services, Inc., d.b.a. Progressive Roofing, Amendment No. 4, to provide for Job Order Contract: Roofing Services. This amendment increases the maximum job order amount from $200,000.00 to $350,000.00 due to an increase of project costs and large-scale projects (SC2400001482) Administering Department: Facilities Management

Project Design and Construction

13. Szaboworks, to provide for Northwest Service Center Public Art, General Fund, contract amount $175,000.00/3 year term (PO2600003602)

Real Property

14. Rillito Park Foundation, Amendment No. 5, to provide an operating agreement for the Historic Jelks House, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount $24,000.00 revenue (CT2400000014)

Recorder

15. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 5/26/26 to 12/31/26, contract amount $25,000.00 revenue (CT2600000027)

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

16. Town of Marana, to provide sewage conveyance and treatment services to Saguaro Bloom 9 and 10, Lots 1 - 174, Blocks 1 - 4 and Common Areas A - C, no cost/100 year term (SC2600000083)

17. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for wastewater billing services, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount $450,000.00 (PO2600011573)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

18. **Acceptance - Health**
National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) - U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), to provide for NEHA-FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program - Strategic RPS Mentorship and Collaboration, $12,000.00 (G-HD-109687)

19. **Acceptance - Health**
National Environmental Health Association - U.S. Food and Drug Administration, to provide sustaining and advancing retail program standards through continuous improvement and professional engagement, $4,000.00 (G-HD-109689)

20. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Well Women Health Check Program, amend grant language and scope of work, $1,169,705.80 (GA-HD-66425)

21. **Acceptance - Office of Digital Inclusion**
AARP, to provide for the AARP Community Challenge Grant Agreement, $20,000.00 (G-ODI-105690)

22. **Acceptance - Transportation**
Federal Highway Administration, to provide for AZ FLAP Madera Canyon Small Wash Culvert Replacement, $3,000,000.00/5 year term (G-TR-100155)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

23. **Bond Advisory Committee**
Appointment of Chris Cornelison, representing Town of Oro Valley, to replace Joyce Powers. Term expiration: 5/25/32. (Jurisdictional recommendation)

24. **Election Integrity Commission**
Appointment of Kimberlee Holaway, to fill a vacancy created by Lori Cinnamond. Term expiration: 5/25/28. (District 1)

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

25. **Special Event**
- John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, May 24, 2026.
- Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Church, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, May 17, 2026 and June 14, 2026.

RECORDER

26. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of March, 2026.

SUPERIOR COURT

27. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Christopher Holguin

28. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Ronald L. Newman

29. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Murdock E. Holloway

30. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts and Liaison between Superior Court Presiding Judge and Justices of the Peace, for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Laine McDonald

31. **Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Courts for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Vera Bell, Bruce Chalk, Darlene Chavez, John Davis, David Deibel, Maria Felix, Sherwood Johnston, William Parven and Virjinya Torrez

32. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Ajo Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Frederick S. Klein

33. **Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Green Valley Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027: Erika Acle and Frederick S. Klein

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

34. Minutes: March 3, 2026

* * *

35. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

14. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Verbatim

JA:	Chair Allen
RS:	Supervisor Scott
MH:	Supervisor Heinz
SC:	Supervisor Christy
AC:	Supervisor Cano
JL:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator
ART:	Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management

JA: We are going to now move into some of our budget discussions. So, Item No. 10 is where we are on the regular agenda. This is a presentation by Director Cuaron on the Tentative Budget.

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen, if I may, I would like to just start for a moment and give a little overview before I turn it over to the Director, and I will comment. I know staff is checking with people who are here just to see if there are items that they might be here for, if we might need to move them up, but we will check with you on that. Chair and members of the Board, today, what we are presenting is the budget for Fiscal Year 26/27, a budget designed to maintain fiscal stability while continuing to invest in the essential services and infrastructure the residents across Pima County rely on every day. This tentative budget reflects a balanced and strategic approach to financial management, amid ongoing economic insecurity and uncertainty, rising operational costs, and continued pressure from both the state and federal funding changes. Our goal throughout the process of these last many months has been to protect County core services, maintain long-term financial sustainability, and advance the Board's priorities in public safety, transportation, housing, public health, environmental stewardship, and economic opportunity. The budget before you continues Pima County's commitment to responsible fiscal stewardship while preparing the organization to meet future challenges and community needs. As we develop the budget, we focused on several key principles, and they are preserving strong reserve levels and long-term financial stability, supporting recruitment and retention of a high-quality workforce, investing in infrastructure and deferred maintenance, protecting services for our vulnerable residents, leveraging grant funding and partnerships whenever possible, and maintaining transparency and accountability to taxpayers. Like counties across Arizona, Pima County continues to experience inflationary pressures affecting labor, construction, utilities, insurance, and our operational costs. But at the same time, demand for County services continues to grow as our region grows. The tentative budget recognizes those realities, while we believe remaining disciplined and measured in our recommendations. This budget also reflects the County's continued efforts to modernize operations, improve service delivery, and align spending with strategic priorities, as identified by this Board and the community. Importantly, the adoption of the tentative budget establishes the maximum expenditure authority for the fiscal year. As you know, the Board may continue refining and adjusting the budget prior to final adoption, but after today, expenditures cannot go up. They cannot exceed the tentative budget, once approved. Throughout the year, staff will continue working with departments, stakeholders and this Board to ensure that the adopted budget reflects community priorities and operational needs. We appreciate the work of the County departments, our elected officials, the community departments, partners, and all of our residents who contributed throughout this budget development process. Staff looks forward to discussing the details of the Fiscal 26/27 Tentative Budget, and to answering any questions you might have here today. And now I will turn this over to Director Cuaron to walk through the recommended budget. Thank you.

ART: Thank you, Administrator Lesher, Chair Allen, members of the Board. Before I launch into the presentation, I wanted to take a minute, if I could, just to extend and express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the gentlemen sitting to my left, Mr. Andy Welch, the Deputy Director, and Xavier Rendon, my Budget Manager, both for their exceptional work and dedication in developing this budget. I should also give a shoutout and kudos to the staff in Budget and Departmental Analysis. They just play a key instrumental role in preparing this budget, and really so does anybody in my department that does touch the budget. So, it would be remiss if I did not acknowledge them today. So, thank you, gentlemen. That being said, we will get going on the presentation. Next slide please. This slide really talks about the process for budget, and I will admit, as I have admitted to you in my monthly budget presentations, the budget is really an annual process anymore. Yeah, we go through it for a short period, but then in September and October we are really right back up into it. So, you have seen this slide in prior year budget presentations, and it really just illustrates the annual cycle of the budget, which begins again in September and October and culminates in June with the final budget adoption that the Board will be asked to approve this year on June 23rd. The one thing I want to note here is we did include bullet point three on the slide, which is the Board of Supervisors Budget Retreat that was held in February. So, we wanted to codify that in this slide here moving forward. Next slide please. Administrator Lesher outlined this in her opening comments and remarks but the FY26/27 budget was really developed using the Strategic Plan as our framework for our budget allocations, during budget discussions with the departments. So, what we have tried to do on this slide is illustrate the investment in the pillars of the Strategic Plan in totality with the $1.8 billion budget. So, you can see in the Public Service pillar, there is $957 million allocated for that pillar, $525 million for Quality of Life, $306 million for Infrastructure and Growth, and $23 million in Sustainability and Conservation. Underneath that framework, or rolled up into that framework, on the pillars, are the One Pima Initiative and the Prosperity Initiative. One Pima Initiative funding about $9 million and Prosperity Initiative $260 million. I do want to note that these numbers do overlap, they are not additions, they overlap within the pillars. Next slide please. As we talk about what our key funding elements that are included in our FY27 budget, we continue with affordable housing, $5 million from PAYGO, along with the Board of Supervisors (BOS) Policy, closing the gap on affordable housing, those dollars are also included. I just mentioned we have the One Pima Initiative at about $9 million, that does include $8 million in Opioid funds and

$100,000.00 increase in both the Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP) and the Supportive Treatment and Engagement Program (STEPs) program, along with $750,000.00 in flood control for The Loop wash cleanup. We have dollars allocated to the Climate Action Plan, Pima CAN, from some solar projects and field lighting out at Arthur Pack. We continue the County's efforts to be the employer of choice through a variety of means. There is a 3% market adjustment included, there is dollars allocated for benchmarking and in-demand jobs, bringing those jobs up to the appropriate grade, in the class. There is $1.3 million in student loan repayment program and $1.3 million for childcare stipend. We also held health insurance premiums flat for employees next year, so we are keeping employees whole. We also have the Prosperity Initiative through a variety of different funding mechanisms through the departments. Again, approximately $260 million there. We continue our critical infrastructure, as Ms. Lesher outlined at the top. Through core functions, we have the $25 million for PAYGO and roads. We also are maintaining fiscal stability and sustainability. This is largely due through our $11.9 million contingency that was referenced in the budget memo that went out in mid-April. And then we have adherence to Board of Supervisor Policy with the three cents for affordable housing, the state cost shifts, and the PAYGO. Next slide please. This chart was included in the recommended budget document. This is from the budget at-a-glance. You can see the total Revenues by Source and Fund Balance for ‘27 is $2.1 billion. That is about a $57.1 million increase, or 3.9% compared to Fiscal ‘26. And we have expenditures of $1.8 billion. That is a $58.5 million increase, or 3.3% over FY25/26. I will note that that $58.5 million increase is spread out through the categories that are listed on the pie chart there. Next slide please. This slide breaks down the total budgeted revenues by fund. So, you can see the General Fund, there, is the largest fund in the County at $850 million. That is the largest fund that we have in the County, followed by Special Revenue. Special Revenue Funds are Department of Transportation, Library, Flood, and Department of Environmental Quality, to name a few. On the right here, we have our total Transfers In, which is defined as money received from another fund in the County. Some examples are listed there on the right. Indirect cost recoveries provided from the Grants Fund to the General Fund, and funding by Flood Control into the General Fund for emergency preparedness. Next slide please. This slide is doing the same thing, except it is with Countywide expenditures. Again, listing them out by fund, General Fund being the largest at $870 million, followed by our Special Revenue Funds and our Enterprise Funds. Enterprise Funds are Wastewater, Development Services, and Facilities Management. Transfers Out here, total $342.3 million. Examples here are General Fund money transfers to Debt Service to pay debt. And then we have a General Fund subsidy out to the Health Department to fund Health Department operations. Next slide. This slide on Fund Balance talks about our financial sustainability and fiscal stability. Just giving you a high level here, overview of our total Fund Balances for FY27, totaling $661 million, spread out across the five different funds that you see on the slide. I do want to note that these are restricted for use for specific operational purposes. An example would be in our Capital Projects Funds. These funds are largely restricted for capital projects within those specific departments. Debt Service would be restricted to pay debt service on our debt. Next slide please. As we turn our attention to the General Fund, which again is the largest fund in the County, the revenue budget is $850 million. This is an increase of $47.9 from

FY25/26. The majority of the General Fund money comes from two sources, as you can see on the pie chart here. That is property taxes at $530 million and state and other tax revenues at $260.5 million. When we talk about our property tax increase of, it is about a $34.2 million increase over last year. That is largely driven by the Net Assessed Value increase, along with our adherence to the Board policies that I mentioned earlier. State-shared and other tax revenues are increasing $18.2 over ‘25/26, with the majority coming from State-Shared Sales Tax coming in at $14.8 million over last fiscal year. Next slide please. General Fund expenditures, $870 million, as we showed in the slide, a couple slides prior, you can see majority of the expenses are centered on General Government Services and Justice and Public Safety. This $870 million represents a $56.8 million increase over our ‘25/26 number. I do want to note that there is one small change on this slide, and that is really the alignment of our General Fund expenditures with the Strategic Plan. So, you can see the bar at the bottom represents the menu, if you will, of our Public Service, Quality of Life, Infrastructure and Growth, and Sustainability and Conservation pillars. And what we have tried to do is identify the majority of the expenditures found in the categories on the pie chart with how they aligned in the pillars. So, for example, just as in Public Safety, you will see it is centered on Public Service and Quality of Life. What that means is for majority of those expenditures, we are aligned with that particular pillar. Next slide please. So, as we talk about our Restricted Funds and taxing districts, this is $493 million for FY27. It is actually a slight reduction from ‘25/26 of about $17 million. And again, we did include the table to the right to align with the Strategic Plan. And I will also mention that the tax increases, the recommended or proposed tax increases, are also included in these numbers, the authority to spend. Next slide please. Property taxes, a little note on property taxes, the FY26/27 recommended budget does not propose a property tax rate beyond what is required by BOS Policy. So, as we look at ‘25/26 adopted, it was a little over $5, $5.19, ‘26/27 recommended is $5.28, with the difference being about $0.08 in total. Next slide. This slide really just provides detail on the breakout. You will see here at the bottom, especially on the secondary tax rate, $0.02 for the Library, $0.01 for the Flood, and there is no proposed adjustment for the primary rate beyond the state cost shifts, PAYGO, and the Affordable Housing Policy. So, you will see the Primary Rate going from $4.19 to $4.27 in our recommended budget. Next slide, please. This slide just gives you a high-level history of our property tax rates going back to Fiscal Year 19/20. If you cannot see that, I will do the math at the high level. So, the top line represents the total tax rate, the middle line represents our primary tax rate, and the bottom line represents our secondary tax rate, dating back to that fiscal year. So, we are down, despite the small increase in ‘26/27, we are still down from the ‘19/20 number by about $0.27. And I do want to note, it is not shown on the chart, but dating back to Fiscal ‘18, which was our high at $5.97, we are down $0.69 from that period. So, just to give you a little overview in context there. Next slide please. As we talk about the tentative budget changes and what changed from the recommended budget you received in April to the tentative budget that you are being asked to approve today. There are two small changes. One was a reduction of a duplicate $3 million budget that we had in Conservation Lands and Resources and the Capital Improvement Program budget for Canoa Ranch. We caught that and made that small adjustment. And we are including $2.5 million in Regional Transportation Authority-funded project. That is Silverbell from El

Camino del Cerro to Ina. I should also note these are Non-General Fund changes to the tentative budget. Next slide. So, as we talk about what are we going to be looking at and monitoring in ‘26/27. We are monitoring our federal grant landscape, specifically around terms and conditions and the language and the uncertainty that that presents. State cost shifts, you know, the state has not adopted their budget as yet and so, we are concerned with what may come our way with respect to the state and economic unknowns, right. We have the geopolitical concerns over in Iran and, I cannot think of the other name, Ukraine. So, we also have the Permanent Base Adjustment that the Board adopted. We will send it to the voters in November. We are beginning preparations for that now. We also have the November 2027 Bond Planning. Those committees are getting going in earnest. And so those are the things that we will be monitoring as we bring you financial updates throughout FY26/27. Next slide please. We do have a wealth of information online about the budget and all the memos, the recommended budget, the transmittal letter, are all posted there, if anybody wants to go out and take a look, if you have not already. Next slide. With that, that concludes my prepared remarks. I am sorry that I went over. I am happy to take questions.

JA: Any questions from my colleagues? Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen. And I want to extend my thanks to Administrator Lesher and everybody on her team for all of the work that goes into crafting the recommended budget. And I also want to extend my thanks to the County Administrator for involving the Board in budget discussions very early on in the process. I think that helps us to know the decisions that are being made as the process moves forward. And you also are able to consider the input we offer at those various intervals. I had some clarification questions based mostly on language in the transmittal memo. On page 21 of that memo, there is a reference to the funds set aside for Contingency. It says, *“A total of $11.9 million in contingency funding is set aside to address a range of potential needs, including $5.4 million for general operational needs, $5.5 million for grant transitions, and $1 million for inflationary pressures.”* Just wanted to get a little bit more detail on each one of those three areas, if we could.

JL: Thank you. Mr. Cuaron?

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott. Sure, the $5.5 million for grant transitions is set aside to the extent that the Board does not choose to award a grant or re-award a grant that may have some language that the Board does not deem appropriate. If that comes to fruition, this money is set aside to augment what the funds that the grant were providing and have a backstop for the department that may need the dollars, in the event that the grant is not accepted by Pima County. The $1 million for inflationary pressures is just that, and recessionary pressures. If we see State-Shared Sales Tax begin to decline, that money can be used to augment our state-shared revenues. As far as general operational needs, that would be for things that come up from day-to-day. I mean, you have seen what we have funded in FY26 from our contingency, things like the 25th anniversary of the conservation program. There is, you know, $250,000.00 that the Board is being asked to approve today for domestic violence issues. It is that pot of money for unknown things, that come up during the year that the Board wishes to fund, you know, Short-Term Crisis funding was allocated from that as well. So, it is that pot of money.

RS: Thank you, thank you. And then also in the transmittal memo, first on page 6, it says, *"To strike an appropriate balance between long-term financial stability and near-term community needs, the recommended budget proposes an adjustment to the reserve requirement, lowering it from 17% to 15% of the previous year's audited operating expenditures."* Further, in the memo on page 11, it says, *"To help alleviate pressure on the property tax rate and still preserve a strong reserve position that safeguards the County's fiscal health and credit worthiness, the FY 2026/27 recommended budget incorporates an adjustment to the reserve requirement,…"* again noting the reduction from 17% to 15%. Now, I will have to admit, I was kind of surprised to see this, given the discussions that we had had in this room, and some of the input that you shared with us, Director Cuaron. How did we get to that point and what does it portend for future years, in terms of the reserve requirement? Because if we do this, it is going to be the second year that we have gone below the recommended level of 17%.

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott. Let me take a first shot and then turn it to the experts on this. But I think, as you see in those two pages, the summary that you really put together is, we came back, let me go back a moment, remember, we came just a few years ago to the Board looking for a policy on a Fund Balance. The Fund Balance in the recent years has been between $40 and $42 million, and we recognize that we needed to come back with a policy that really made sure we had the right amount to not impact our bond rating, and to ensure that you had the dollars needed if the wheels just truly fell off at some point, and we came to the Board with the 17% policy. After last year, we again revisited the conversation with our bond counsel, primarily, one of our great concerns is that it will impact our bond rating. And as you see in those documents, we look at three elements: What are the services we need to provide to the people of the community? How do we do that with having the least impact possible on our tax rate? And then, can we do that, by allocating dollars coming out of that, what would be the Fund Balance that simply allows us to protect those services and not impact our bond rating, but make sure that we are maintaining the right amount of Fund Balance. And so those are the three elements that we looked at as a team, week after week after week, as we developed the budget. Mr. Cuaron's team, is there additional information you would like to add?

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott. I think that sums it up quite nicely.

RS: So, the recommendation when we approved the policy was 17%, but we have lowered the recommendation last year, and it is being recommended that we lower it this year. Is it expected that we are going to take up discussion of the policy again at some later point?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott. Yes, I think what we have been talking about is simply that, in looking at how do we make sure that we come back to the Board with a policy that is the appropriate one for inclusion in the budget, that we are not asking for a regular tweak, if you will. But again, that is primarily informed by our bond counsel. Thank you.

RS: Thank you. I note that there were, in terms of both supplemental and Department Requests for Expenditure and Money (DREAM) requests, there were $31.2 million in supplemental requests, $28.1 million of those were approved. There were $49.6 million DREAM requests, but $15.8 million of those approved, a much lower amount. Can you just please share for the Board and the members of the media and the public are here. What is the distinction between supplemental and DREAM requests, and why, in general, were the former much more likely to be approved and included in the recommended budget?

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott. I will take the easy part of this and then turn it to staff. Supplemental requests are requests that came in for elements over the current year's budget from Non-General Fund departments, DREAM requests and, they will tell you what DREAM stands for when we turn to them as well, are requests over this year's budget that came in from General Fund budget departments. Gentlemen?

ART: Chair Allen. Supervisor Scott, that is correct. So, supplementals had their own dedicated funding stream, whether it was coming from Department of Transportation or Library or Flood, those were considered supplemental requests. DREAM requests, on the other hand, did not have dedicated funding and were largely in the General Fund. And so the differentiation and the percentage funded in the DREAM, I am sorry, in the supplementals, because of the Non-General Fund and the fact that they had their own funding source, is the reason for the significant increase in percent funded in the supplementals, as opposed to the DREAM requests that had to fight for limited dollars.

RS: Okay. Thank you. I just had two more questions, Chair Allen. On page 27 of the transmittal memo, talks about the PAYGO Program and says that the PAYGO, this is under part B on page 27, the second paragraph, *"The PAYGO Program's objective is to repair roads within ten years ending in FY 2029/30, provide funding for General Fund capital improvement projects and initiatives subject to Board approval, reduce debt interest expense, and lower the combined County property tax rate."* Further on page 31, it notes that, *"Over the past years, the County has… past seven years…"* I am sorry, since the adoption of the policy, *"…the County has steadily reduced its outstanding debt and transitioned to a General Fund PAYGO capital funding model. This approach has significantly decreased the combined County tax rate…The recommended tax rate of $5.2835 represents a 5.8% reduction…since FY 2018/19."* Are we saying that the entirety of that 5.8% reduction in the overall property tax rate can be attributed to PAYGO?

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, the reduction, I do not know if it is the entire amount, but the significant portion of that is the reduction in the Debt Service that the County has seen because the Debt Service is a component of the PAYGO calculation. And so that is the reason that you are seeing that, right here today, right now, I cannot tell you that that is the sole reason, but it is a significant reason. And we can come back with that additional information.

RS: If we could get some data on that, based on that 60/40 formula, I think that is going to really be helpful to the Board now that the policy has been in place for seven years, we have seen the effect that it has had on the road repair and maintenance program. We have seen how it has helped to fund other capital needs, but I think it would also be really instructive to the Board to get some sense, again, based on that 60/40 formula of using both the reduction in the secondary tax for our debt service and the growth in the property tax base, seeing how much PAYGO has been responsible for the reduction in the overall property tax rate. I hope I am verbalizing that well.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Just to address that. It is actually, my understanding, is the actual debt reduction is what makes PAYGO work. So, because we have been very focused on paying our debt and lowering it, it has allowed the other elements to come in to fund PAYGO. PAYGO did not lower the debt, the debt was lowered, and then PAYGO came.

RS: No, I was not talking, thank you, Supervisor. I was not talking about lowering the debt. I was talking about lowering the primary property tax rate, which is one of the goals of the policy. And we are using a 60/40 formula in terms of the reduction in the secondary property tax for the long-term debt, and also the growth of the property base overall to both fund PAYGO and reduce the primary property tax rate. And what I was trying to get a sense of, Supervisor Christy, is how much of that has resulted in this 5.8% reduction in the overall rate since 2018/19. Thank you, sir. My last question, Chair Allen is, the reason the Board approved the class/comp plan, which is now the Compensation Strategy Plan was chiefly to improve recruitment and retention. We got some data a while back about recruitment and retention. I wonder if we could get some current data on recruitment and retention now that we are, I think, in the third year of implementing the compensation strategy, and then later on, maybe this time next year, would love to see the potential effects on recruitment and retention after some of the benchmarking decisions that are incorporated into this budget. Chair Allen, thank you for letting me ask all those questions. I promise I do not have any others.

JA: It is ok.

SC: Get that in writing.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen, Administrator Lesher, and Director Cuaron. I want to thank you for presenting a balanced budget to the Board, and I applaud you for your diligent work over many months to get to this point. One of the highlights in this budget, and I do have prepared remarks that I would like to go in detail, but I would like to have a few questions as well. My questions focus really on employee compensation, and I was hoping Administrator Lesher, Director Cuaron, you might be able to give us a preview of what this Board has done in last year's budget, i.e. this year's budget, and this year's budget. So, it is just kind of the proposed budget next year. So let me just confirm this with you, Director Cuaron. Last year, this Board allocated an additional 5% for employee compensation. Is that correct?

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, that is correct.

AC: And the recommendation this year is 3%. So, in a matter of two years, we have considered an increase in compensation nearly 10%, but the actual is 8%, right?

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, yes, that is correct.

AC: If adopted. Thank you and can you tell us a bit more about the two proposals in this budget that focus on two benefits that employees will be able to benefit from? They are actually new administrative procedures that have gone out. One is focused on an education reimbursement, and the other is one on childcare. Can you, Administrator Lesher, Director Cuaron, give us some insight as to what that entails? And what I would like you to specifically say is how much an employee will be eligible to apply for. And let us start there.

JL: Mr. Cuaron? Thank you.

ART: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, what I can tell you is that there is $1.3 million in the budget allocated for each of those. Unfortunately, I am not familiar enough, with the specifics of the policy to know that, but I am certainly happy to come back and bring that to, unless, I am certainly happy to look that up and bring that back to you before tentative adoption with the policy specifics.

JL: And if, sorry, Chair Allen and Supervisor Cano, if I may, I believe, first of all, in the student loan reimbursement, it is a maximum of $5,250.00 a year, I believe is the amount that is eligible under the federal requirements, and our employees would be eligible for that, for up to that amount. What I am looking at quickly is our new, very excited about the employee childcare subsidy that will allow a maximum amount up to $4,000.00 if an employee attests to the different costs. So, we are seeing, I am looking at what those limits are, but we are looking at right now, I am sorry, $2,500.00 a year will be the starting amount for childcare for our employees. So those are two new buckets. Remembering, in the last couple of years, we have added a couple of other new amounts, but those are the dollars we are looking at for the two new programs. And again, happy to provide additional granularity about how those programs can work and what the total amounts are. Thank you.

AC: Thank you, Administrator Lesher and Chair Allen. What I hope our 7,000 employees can recognize from this is that this Board is now considering two proposals, three, a 3% increase, an education reimbursement program up to $5,000.00, that is money in the pockets of our employees, and if they have a kid, a childcare reimbursement of up to $4,000.00. So, we are putting nearly $10,000.00 back into the pocket books of an employee who has a student loan and who has a kid. I believe that those are really important investments for recruitment and retention of our employees. And that, combined with the 5% increase from last year, I do believe that we are investing wisely in our employees, in our workforce, and we are one of the major employers in the region. And so, I hope that others can take notice that this is the investment we are making. In that same breath, leave it to District 5 to also mention our opportunities for future engagement. I appreciate Administrator Lesher's memorandum that was sent to the Board of Supervisors last week, in response to questions that I had about those who work for the County and who are at the lower end of the salary range. With 7,000 employees Countywide, what we learned in this memo is that 1,000 of our full-time County employees earn less than $45,000.00 a year, and 217 of them, full-time employees, take home less than $1,000.00 in a bi-weekly paycheck. I want us to think about whether we can survive on $1,000.00, on a bi-weekly paycheck. And while I recognize the importance of a classification and compensation strategy, I do believe that one of the unmet needs that ends up happening is we assign people to a pay grade, we assign them to, kind of, a very linear idea of what they should be, what our investment should be to them as an employee. I have a hard time believing that the Prosperity Initiative is something that can be successful in our region if we are not looking within our own to give voice to those employees who are making less than $45,000.00 a year, and who in particular are expected to survive on $2,000.00 a month, working on the County dime. So, for next year's budget, please know that this will be at the top of my priority list to figure out how we can offer one-time adjustments to those at the lower end, because I believe it is our duty to give voice to them. Administrator Lesher, this is the last full budget that you are going to be overseeing, so I want to thank you again. I support the recommended budget because it keeps faith with the people who make County government possible, and that is the taxpayers of Pima County. Every dollar in this budget comes from someone's household, someone's small business, someone's hard work and that means that our responsibility is not only to spend carefully, it is to spend in a way that makes daily life better, safer, and more stable for the people we serve. This budget invests in the workers who keep this County moving. Roads do not repair themselves, Libraries do not open themselves, Health emergencies do not respond to themselves. County employees do that work. Our nurses, medical professionals, deputies, correctional officers, library staff, road crews, public health teams, and frontline workers are the people who turn public dollars into public service. This budget says that we value that work. It helps us recruit and retain the people who care for our residents, protect our neighborhoods, respond in crisis, and deliver the basic services that families count on every day. And this year, we are taking real steps to support our County workforce. As I have mentioned, this recommended budget includes employee pay adjustments, market-based compensation investments, childcare support, and education reimbursement. These investments matter because our employees are also taxpayers, parents, students, caregivers, and working people trying to build a stable life in the same community they serve. We also know that healthcare costs continue to effect take home pay, especially for lower-wage employees and I believe that we must continue looking at ways to reduce those burdens for the people who keep this County running. I am grateful that the Administration has let us know that premiums will stay at a constant rate in the year ahead. That is super critical, because supporting our workforce is not separate from serving the taxpayer. It is how we deliver our services. This budget invests in housing stability. It invests in early education. It strengthens our future workforce. It invests in treatment and recovery. It makes our communities safer. And when we invest in things like heat mitigation, flood control, libraries, we are not just funding programs, we are protecting quality of life. And that is especially true through One Pima, we have removed nearly 500,000 pounds of trash from The Loop, County parks, and washes. That is respect for our neighborhoods, our public spaces, and the taxpayers who have asked for action from these five decision makers on this Board. This budget also makes additional investments in public safety, including our Sheriff's Deputies, and Correctional Officers. These jobs require training, professionalism, accountability, and support, and I also appreciate that this budget is disciplined, ensuring that we have a contingency, preparing for economic uncertainty, responsibly paying for PAYGO investments and capital needs. I will continue to advocate for District 5 investments in the PAYGO Program, and it also recognizes that we can be careful with taxpayer dollars and still be bold about housing, health, education, infrastructure, and opportunity. So, to me, Madam Administrator, this budget is the promise of what this Board can do with very limited resources. Results that people can see when they drive on a safer road, walk along a cleaner Loop, visit a library, call for help, or know that someone in County government is working to keep their families stable. This budget is responsible, people-centered, and honest. And I am so proud of the work that you have done to get us to today. Thank you, Administrator Lesher.

JA: Before I call on Supervisor Heinz, I will just say ditto. Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Yeah. I would associate myself with all of these remarks. Very good. I think it is nice to see that we have about $12 million in contingency. And I think last, just, this is not a proposal to be voted on, but something I will probably bring to another meeting in the future, but just for my colleagues to, kind of, think about it. Maybe considering since it is such a much more robust amount than we had, I think, $1 million less this time, right? Maybe, in light of the two successful deployments of short-term crisis and emergency resources. I know we are already getting requests, our offices, certainly the County Administrator's Office for those types of things right now, and it might be, given the $12 million we have in contingency, like, setting aside a little over $2 million of that and kind of pre-announcing like 7 or $750,000.00 of, you know, like tranches of those funds coming out every four months, just so some of these organizations that have benefited from that, can actually know that is going to be there and know that there is going to be a process. That is just something I would like everyone to keep in mind. It might be a nice way to, to give them some, you know, reassurances that there will be some emergency funds periodically coming forward, given that we have a little bit more, a bit more to work with this year. That is all.

JA: In addition to my ditto, I have a couple of questions and I am wondering, you know, one of the things right now, I have had this role for a year and some change, and I am, never ceases to amaze me how there are so many things of which we, we do not have control over, things that are pushed down onto us that we just sort of adapt to. So, I am wondering, there is two particular memos, that I am wondering if you could talk a little bit about, either the County Administrator, Director Cuaron. One of them is, the title of it is, “Percentage of Total County Property Taxes Levied by Pima County,” and I ask you to just talk about it a little bit, because I think it is an important picture. I mean, literally a picture of the pie chart of where, within somebody's tax bill, kind of what piece, what slice of that pie, Pima County actually has to sort of work with, you know, the punch line of it is 37.84% of the levy. So, I am wondering if you could kind of talk a little bit about how those tax levies play out and they are divided and kind of what it is that we get to work with.

JL: Thank you, if I may, Chair Allen. I think it was on May 22nd, we had a memo talking about the percentage of the total County property taxes levied by Pima County. Just a reminder that when people get their tax bill, it includes, you are right, there is Pima County, is at the top of it, state cost shifts are almost 8% of what is on that bill, Pima Community College, 8.91%, cities and towns do have some property tax, that is about 3%, the school districts over 39% of that tax bill, we have got fire districts at 9% and change, and then a few other smaller districts at 1.74%, with Pima County at 30%. So, as you can see, when you get your property tax, we are less than a third of that total bill. Is that the information you were looking at? Thank you, Ma'am.

JA: I am also wondering if you could talk a little bit about state cost shifts, what those are, how they show up in impacting us in our budget. And then I will note that there is a reference, a specific one that, in the same memo that Supervisor Scott was referencing, the Transmittal of Fiscal Year 2026 Recommended Budget. There is a reference to a Class 1 Assessment Ratio, and particularly, how state cost shifts resulting from continued revenue reductions tied to the Class 1 Assessment Ratio. I am looking specifically on page 8, it is one, two, three, the fourth bullet down. But there were some other references to the Class 1 Assessment Ratio. I wonder if you could explain what that is but also state cost shifts in general and the impact that that has.

JL: Thank you. And if I may, Director Cuaron? Thank you.

ART: Chair Allen, members of the Board, so, as we talk about state cost shifts, there is a table in the transmittal memo on page 311 that really defines all of the state cost shifts that the County has seen, at least dating back to 2021/22. Things like costs for the ALTCS, the Arizona Long Term Care System, that is a primary driver. We have seen, you know, them pass along costs for Superior Court and Juvenile Court, Justice Court, Justice of the Peace salaries and benefits, Constable salaries and benefits, Superintendent of Schools, Accommodation Districts. These things that are important and necessary for us to fund that the state then shifts over. That led to the adoption of the policy, the State Cost Shift Policy from the Board so that we could capture those increased costs that the state was then passing down. So, I do not know if that specifically answers your question, but I will move on to the commercial assessment. My understanding is that the ratio that is used to assess taxes on Class 1 properties commercially, is moving down every year. From 18% in the early 20s, down to 15%, in half percentage point increments between FY23 and FY28. So, they are going to move down half a percentage every year until FY28, which will, at that point, it will be 15%. So, the ratio that is being applied is getting smaller and smaller, essentially shifting that burden to the County. And so, because the ratio was getting smaller, the pie is getting smaller.

JA: And I am sorry, can you explain a little, again, what are Class 1 properties? What does that include?

ART: Commercial properties.

JA: All commercial properties, any size? Just, commercial properties?

ART: Yeah, I believe so. If I may, I can follow up with you directly on that, or in a memo to the Board.

JA: We see a lot of comparisons that are made between Pima County's tax rate and Maricopa's tax rate and I am wondering, there is a memo that does a comparison around that. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about what is in that and sort of the distinctions between us and Maricopa and why our rates are different, and why theirs is what it is, and ours is what ours is.

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen. And I think what we have been trying to do is provide to folks, if you look, people frequently comment that, as an example, the most recent Maricopa County tax rate at a $1.1591, while Pima is at over $4. When you look at an adjusted rate, we really come down to about 1.8 from the $4. Because when you look at a Maricopa County as an example, they have their overall property tax rate and they have a Jail District Excise Tax. So, the things that we are paying for the jail and for that part of the Sheriff's Department, they have in a separate tax. They have a Road Excise Tax, which we do not have. They have a Special Health Care District. They have entrance fees at a variety of their parks. They have additional cost of state-shared revenues, and then the taxable net assessed value in Maricopa County is considerably different, including a nuclear power plant. So, when we look at simply, all of the different buckets of assessed valuation, of taxing districts that combine together to provide Maricopa County services versus in Pima County, it is you. And so that is when we look at trying to make sure it is apples to apples, it is not nearly as off base as people seem to think Pima County might be, when you look at the relationship. Is there additional information, gentlemen?

AC: Chair Allen, can I just, to that point, Administrator Lesher, there is a talking point that I have heard that property taxes in Pima County just continue to go up, and this Board has not increased the primary property tax in two years, right. And what has perhaps gone up is the valuation. Can you walk us through that? And I used to think that your property being worth more was a good thing because it is worth more. But can you kind of help us clarify what that means for the average taxpayer?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Cano. If I am understanding that question, yes, if we establish a tax rate, you provide, for an example, $5 per $100 assessed valuation. And so, if your home increases in assessed valuation, that is a larger number that we are multiplying the $5 by. And so that is how your dollars go up, the total bill might go up based on the assessed valuation, while the tax rate remains the same. Is that what you are, I can look for help to do a better job at that.

AC: I am just trying to really point out, Chair Allen, that it is not this Board that has done that in prior, in the current or prior years. It is the assessed value. And ultimately, most homeowners would be celebrating the fact that their investment, their home is worth more.

JL: And if I may again, Chair Allen and Supervisor Cano. Also to look at the fact that while their overall tax bill may be going up when they receive it from the Treasurer's office, 30% of that bill is coming from your taxes paid to Pima County.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: To that point, though, there is a method and a calculus whereby you can lower the primary property tax enough to compensate for the rise in the assessed value, making the actual final bottom line revenue neutral. You can find the level by lowering the primary property tax that would compensate for the assessed value rise and you can make it revenue neutral. Is that not available to this Board?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, if I may, if one were only looking at the revenue side of the equation, yes, it could. Could taxes go down on any given year? Yes. With increased costs of services, with the increased variety of services that I think people are expecting from Pima County, we do not look at the revenue side, absent of the need to pay for the services being provided.

SC: I think, Madam Chair, that the discussion point might be that the Pima County residents are demanding, I think what they are really demanding, is a revenue neutral or lower tax rate rather than more services, or there is at least an issue out there where it has been brought up by my colleagues that there is this thought that property taxes are always rising. It is the assessed value that is causing the rise, because the basic tax rate is not being lowered to compensate for it. That is the bottom line on how that could happen. Thank you, Madam Chair.

JA: Any further questions for Director Cuaron? Alright. We will revisit the Tentative Budget on the Agenda Item 17, is when we will actually vote on it.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2026/2027.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

JA: Now we are back as the Board of Supervisors and this is the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 26/27. Is there anyone present who wishes to speak on this item? I move to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 26/27, in the amount of $1,809,953,662.00, and an effective tax rate of $5.2835.

MH: Second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Discussion? I have a friendly amendment to add to the budget. District 3 is nearly 80% of the land mass of Pima County. A massive share of our district is in unincorporated areas, which means that for many District 3 residents, and this is true of District 4, as well, the counties are only local government. What we are seeing, an increased need in both rural and lower income communities, of which there is much overlap. I would like to offer a friendly amendment to the budget to support some of our rural communities. So, it is three things. So first, in Ajo, for example, the International Sonoran Desert Alliance (ISDA) is functionally the largest and the only nonprofit in town, providing supportive services to residents. They operate the Ajo One-Stop, which is an extension of Community and Workforce Development efforts in the Tucson Metropolitan area. I would like to request an additional $30,000.00 from the General Fund to provide for ISDA programing. Combined with some other additional funding for some of their work for home repair, will get their contract with us up to $300,000.00. The second is, as you have heard me talk about before, senior meals. We have been supporting two Senior Meal Programs, two sites that lost funding last summer, Ajo and Flowing Wells. Pima Council on Aging is anticipated to begin another round of senior meals funding starting October 1st, and there is a need for us to provide some continued funding to support these programs from July 1st to October 1st. So, my request there is $10,000.00 per program for a total investment of an additional $20,000.00. And then finally, I will note that some of the most common requests seen in our office are about roads, dirt roads, in particular, from Arivaca to the Avra Valley. We have got communities asking for more frequent maintenance and then faster responses after monsoon rains and storms. Constituents are often advised that the County grades on a quarterly basis but as we have delved into it more, we come to understand that it is actually 16 weeks, three times per year. After speaking with Transportation and Administration, what we would like to do is a Pilot Program to support a quarterly grading schedule for the areas throughout the County that have the greatest need, and that greatest need can be determined with criteria by the Department of Transportation. So, we are requesting an additional $400,000.00 to get that program started. So, I would like to move to amend the Tentative Budget to include an additional $450,000.00 for the benefit of rural communities.

RS: Second.

MH: You stole it again. That is cool.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Scott.

SC: Pardon me. Where does the money come from?

JA: The money tree. It is a mesquite tree out beyond Arivaca. No, General Fund.

MH: Anywhere, if I may, Chair Allen. I think anywhere that the County Administrator deems it most appropriate to take it from, to have maximum flexibility. Also, I believe there was some duplication somewhere. Was there not a duplicate $3 million for Canoa Ranch, like under Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and department budgets, I think, anyway.

[Inaudible, off-screen response]

MH: Did you fix that? Oh well, okay, maybe, but there are places, I am sure.

JL: Chair Allen and members of the Board, what I hear is that if the amendment is accepted, it will be out of General Fund dollars allocation in some way, and we will bring it back as we… You have set the cap today, and then we will come back with how we are going to fund that as a presentation when you do the Final Budget Adoption.

AC: Just as a point of order, is the motion germane? Because we had one on the tax limit and I think what I am hearing is that these are priorities from the District 3 office and I just want to make sure we are not having competing motions and I feel like I am supportive of your additional request, but I think that can come at a later time through the budget process, if that makes sense.

JL: [Inaudible response]

JA: I mean, I was doing them now so that it gets integrated into the Tentative Budget prior to Final Budget Adoption, was the thought but if there was a better time or place.

ART: Administrator Lesher, if I may?

JL: Regarding transportation dollars. Go ahead.

ART: Chair Allen, members of the Board, the most simplest way to accommodate what is being requested here is to adopt the $1.8 billion number that has been proposed and if the Board desires to move money within that $1.8 billion, we can do that. My recommendation would be to reduce that $11.9 million contingency but again, that is, need to confer with Administrative Lesher on that.

JL: But if these come forward as amendments to the motion, it is simply to indicate to find it and to come back. We have set the cap. We are not increasing the budget. So, we are looking at how we would come back…

ART: …how we would come back and fund that.

JL: …and we would bring that back at the time of final, with these amendments. And I believe under the agenda item of Tentative County Budget, we can do it.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Just to clarify, the $450,000.00, $50k of it is specific to District 3, but the $400k could be any place in the County where there is a need for roads, dirt roads to be graded more frequently. I can think of one in District 1 right away, and Mr. DeBonis knows the one I am talking about. So, when that list is developed, I am sure all Supervisors are going to be interested in seeing it.

SC: Madam Chair? Is there a way to… you have three items. What if you do not want but one?

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Will you vote for the budget Supervisor Christy?

[Laughter erupts]

JA: Just to clarify, is this an amendment? Do we vote on this as an amendment, as my…?

SB: [Inaudible]

JL: Yes.

JA: Yes, Okay. Alright. So, it was…

SC: So you vote the dollar amount is the amendment, that you are proposing under those three categories, but we will have a chance to discuss them at a future date?

JL: The Final Budget will be coming back in June for approval at that point and it will be there then. Yes, sir.

AC: But Chair Allen? I do not think we can have, technically, the motion is now a substitute, right?

SC: The maker of the motion offered the substitute.

JA: I mean, I framed it as a friendly amendment, to integrate something into the Tentative Budget.

JL: So was that accepted by…?

MH: You are amending your own motion, and your seconder is… wait, was I the seconder of the first?

RS: No, I jumped your claim.

JA: Oh right. Seconded by Supervisor Scott.

MH: This is the overall Board thing…

JL: …the budget was Supervisor Heinz, I thought.

RS: That is correct.

JL: Yes, if he accepts.

MH: Which number were we supposed to say. Were we supposed to say the combined rate of $5.2835? Or we were supposed to say the $4.2733 rate for this motion? Because I just want to make sure we do not need to make a correction.

MM: [Inaudible]

MH: The full one? Okay. No, that is what I was making sure. Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Yes?

SC: Is there a possibility of tasking staff to provide the road issue that you have presented before the Final Budget Adoption?

JA: To develop the criteria? Is that what you are asking?

SC: No, to develop the roads that you say they need to identify as the recipients.

JL: Yes. We can bring the name, identify the roads in need.

SC: I mean, if they are heavily [inaudible], well yeah, so I will request that.

JL: Yeah, thank you.

JA: Alright. So, all those in favor?

MH: So, what are we voting on exactly?

JA: Oh, you had to ask. I was just going to like, we are voting on the amendment, right? The amendment to, the friendly amendment to include this $450k into the budget.

MH: Okay, great.

AC: But, I still, I do not think this will pass legal muster yet, Chair Allen. So, I think we can still, the motion before that was on the adoption of the Tentative Budget, which is the ceiling.

JA: Yeah.

AC: And I do believe we can do that with guidance that that cap stay at the amount that has been recommended, but that staff come back with the appropriation in that amount. It is unusual for them to be, for there to be two different motions on one adoption and you guys are the longer standing ones. But I would feel like we should probably just withdraw it with the understanding, the substitute, with the understanding that you have got this Board's commitment and the Administration's to come back or can we pass the ceiling, Mr. Brown, with guidance on the remaining with up to $500,000.00 from the General Fund?

MH: This will just amend the original motion, and then it will be the motion, as amended, that we vote on after that, right?

SB: Chairman, Supervisors. It would be amended but I think the clarification you are seeking, Supervisor Cano, is that the ceiling stay the same and that there is not an assumption that this is additional funds. That is very clear in the amended motion that that amount of money that is requested to be added must displace some other funding. Is that correct?

AC: It is not related to the taxation. It is really what I am more specifically trying to get to.

JA: The original motion is about the rate and so my friendly amendment is not about changing the rate. So that is why you are saying that it is not a germane amendment.

JL: [Inaudible]

MM: Chair Allen, you first offered it as a friendly amendment, which Supervisor Heinz was the seconder to your original motion. So, he should have accepted it as a seconder. Then you moved it as an amendment and Supervisor Scott seconded it. You need to withdraw that item, then, it is just going to be a friendly amendment to your original motion, which is, they are going to find where to pull that and bring it back at the Final Budget Adoption. So, you will withdraw your motion of this amendment.

JA: Alright, so I am doing what Melissa said, withdrawing my amendment and replacing it with…

MM: Going back to the original motion…

JA: …going back to the original motion…

MM: …with the friendly amendment that was accepted by the seconder?

MH: Yes.

JA: Alright.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I think Director Cuaron might have previewed what we can expect, which is a $450,000.00 reduction in the $11.8 million contingency.

JA: Right, alright.

MM: And then now roll call.

JA: Now roll call. I just repeat what Melissa says.

RS: It is always wise.

JA: Yes.

SC: And this is of course going to have a final vote?

JA: In June.

SC: Okay.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Aye.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Scott?

RS: Yes.

MM: Chair Allen?

JA: Yes. Motion passes 4-1.

RECORDER

28. **2026 Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 31, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2026 Primary Election.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
GCK: Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder

JA: We are now going to go a little bit early to Item 32 in the regular agenda, because we are blessed with the presence of our County Recorder. This is the 2026 Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Sites and Emergency Voting Locations. I will move to approve Resolution No. 2026 - 31.

MH: Second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Discussion?

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Recorder Cázares-Kelly, in the BOSAIR, the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report, under Discussion, No. 1, it says, *"There are five recognized political parties in Pima County and the state of Arizona. Members of those parties will receive the ballot for their party's partisan races. Of those five, only Democratic, Republican, and No Labels Parties are holding open primaries. Voters registered as Independent or Party Not Designated are able to choose a ballot for one of those three parties."* If you are an Independent or Party Not Designated voter in Pima County, what is the process that you have to follow to choose a ballot for the primary election?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisors, thank you so much for that question. We have mailed out notices to all vote-by-mail voters. They have so many opportunities to request a ballot, they can do so by returning that mailer that we sent to them, checking the appropriate information and signing that document and that would work. They can do it online through our online portal. They can call and request a ballot over the phone. They can show up to an early voting site once early voting begins, or they can show up to Election Day vote center and they can request it that way. So, there is a multitude of ways that Independent or No Party Designated voters can participate. Yes, they can still participate. We simply cannot automatically send them a ballot because as No Party Designated voters, we would not know which ballot to send them, and that would be inappropriate for us to choose for them.

RS: So, in Arizona, not just in Pima County, but throughout the State, that is the process that an Independent or No Party Designated voter has to follow. I wonder if I could ask, and please feel free to wait until after the 2026 Primary, but I would really like to know what were the percentage of Independent or No Party Designated voters who requested partisan ballots in 2022, 2024, and this year? And when I say percentage, what percentage of the registered Independents or No Party Designated voters in the County requested partisan ballots in the primaries in ‘22, ‘24, and this year? Would be very interested in seeing that data.

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, I also agree, I am also very interested to see if that number has changed. We have provided a lot of opportunities for communicating with the public and letting them know. Unfortunately, around one-third of all voters in the state of Arizona are No Party Designated or otherwise known as Independent voters. Very hesitant to use the term Independent because there is some connotation to the No Labels Party. And one thing that we are seeing in this election cycle, so far, is that there may be people who are confused, what No Party Designated and No Labels, they are kind of conflating the two. And so, they are saying they are No Party Designated and then requesting a No Labels Party, thinking that it is somehow unaffiliated when in fact it is a partisan ballot. So, we are really interested to see that data as well. Customarily, we do, just as a trend, we do see lower participation from No Party Designated voters in the primary elections. That is very typical because many people are very confused and are not aware that they do have the ability to participate.

RS: And have to take those extra steps and I will just make one final point, which is that Arizona law does not allow people who are registered as Independent or Party Not Designated to participate in the Presidential Preference Elections that are held every four years.

GCK: That is correct and that does create a lot of confusion for those voters in the Presidential Preference Election. That is only limited to people in a political party and it is incredibly disappointing, because, as I said, over a third of all voters in Arizona are No Party Designated.

RS: Thank you, and I apologize. I wanted to use this information from the BOSAIR to make that request. And if we can get that data after this year's round of primaries, I would be most grateful. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you, Chair Allen. Good evening, Madam Recorder. A couple, three quick questions. Will early ballots have the privacy envelopes for return mailing?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, no, we have made the change to a one-envelope solution. So, you will see a visible signature on the outside of all ballots moving forward. That is the standard, what we are doing from now on, and we will not be making that change for a privacy envelope.

SC: And the second question is, will observers be allowed at early voting centers in their locations?

GCK: Yes, they will be.

SC: Will there be observers of all political parties that are eligible for representation?

GCK: If their party designates them, yes.

SC: So, we will have observers at those locations?

GCK: As I said in previous meetings, we are not required to have observers to conduct early voting services. However, if they are designated, they may be able to be on site. So, yes, I am compliant with the law that now allows observers to be in any early voting location. And yes, I will honor the law.

SC: And that was the next thing I was going to bring up because I wanted your clarification on what that law says that you just referenced. And what does it mean for this upcoming election in Pima County?

GCK: I am not understanding your question, sir.

SC: That law that you just referenced about, it compels you to have observers?

GCK: Yes. So recently, and I do not have the A.R.S. number off the top of my head. However, if a party Chair wishes to designate an observer to observe at the early voting locations, they may do so. And we are compliant with the law. Again, I will allow them in our facilities. We have worked very closely with the political parties. I have given them personal tours myself. They have their designated areas. In the Regional Transportation Authority election, was the first time that we allowed observers in our locations. We did not have any major issues. As I shared in the After-Action Report, we plan to move forward again. I do want to clarify though we are not required to have them, they are simply allowed to be in those locations. Our locations, our early voting sites, some of them operate for the full 27 days of early voting. To have volunteers come and be with us every single day. I think that is a hardship on the parties. So…

SC: The law, though, just to be clear, you say it allows you, to allow them, but it does not force you to allow them or compel you to allow them? The observers?

GCK: I am sorry. I am not understanding the semantics of what you are asking me. Yes, it is required by law. I am required by law to allow observers into my early voting sites.

SC: And that is the clarification I was looking for.

GCK: Yes.

SC: And in accordance with that law, you are going to allow them?

GCK: Yes. I am going to follow the law.

SC: Great. Thank you. And finally, I notice on the list of locations for the Votemobile, Sahuarita is not included in that. And we, in my district, we struggle with those locations down in the Green Valley area, and this might be some source of relief. I am just curious why Sahuarita was, I think it was on the list initially, and now it is not there.

GCK: I am looking at the list, and I see, we typically will have one location in either Vail or Sahuarita, and we do have a location in Vail, and that location will be open from 7/13 to 7/17, as well as emergency voting. And so, because we have that location available there, we are not going to have an early voting site in that location. I am working very closely with the Sahuarita Town Council to provide a ballot drop box. We are really hoping to have that, and I am going to be asking for your approval. Once we have that solidified, I am going to come back before this body to request for, even if that is in an emergency basis. We are in the middle of, I think they are shipping them or, I do not know what the exact status of, but we need to get those installed as soon as possible. We are really hoping to get them in before the primary election. At the very latest, it will be in the General Election.

SC: Well, thank you very much. That is all I have, Madam Chair.

JA: And I will note that I am looking at the list right now and that the Anamax Recreation Center in Sahuarita is one of the permanent, well, not permanent, but the early voting ballot drop-off or emergency voting locations so that...

SC: But no trail mobile. Do you see any trail mobile activity there?

JA: The mobile voting?

SC: I am sorry...

JA: No...

SC: Votemobile.

JA: I mean, I think my understanding is...

GCK: Chair Allen, I am sorry, you are right, I completely missed that. Yes. So, we will have one at 17501 S. Camino De Las Quintas, Anamax Recreation Center, and we will have one at W. Anne Gibson-Esmond Station Library. So we will not have the mobile voting unit in locations where we have an early voting site, a brick-and-mortar early voting site, because the point of the Votemobile is to show up in locations where we do not have a site, where it is difficult to get a site, or it is a more rural location, where that community usually has a struggle to give us that much space for that amount of time. And so, you will notice that we have on the Exhibit A, Ajo Library listed, I am sorry, Ajo, and it is just the sites because at the date of printing for this document, we did not have all of them confirmed. We are still working on getting that document up on our website. We have Ajo, Three Points, Sells, and Marana, and on our website, the way that we will intentionally have this listed, because there was some confusion about the mobile voting unit. We had it at Nanini Library and people thought that it was there the entire duration of the election rather than the one day that we had it scheduled there. And so, because of that, we are putting the mobile voting unit schedule behind a hyperlink, so, people have to hyperlink, click on that, in order to bring up the vote mobile schedule, so that it is more likely that they will recognize it is a one-day-only event, or in the case of Sells, two days only.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Madam Recorder.

GCK: You are very welcome.

JA: And then if there is no one else, I just wanted to thank you. We are looking forward to seeing the mobile voting units in District 3 at the locations, and then just really appreciate the effort to diversify the location for where early voting can happen, as well as ensuring that the sites are safe and secure. And, yeah, and just always encouraging folks to just mail in the ballot and make it easy. Thank you.

GCK: Thank you.

JA: All those in favor? Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Opposed? Resolution No. 2026 - 31 passes 5-0. Thank you.