

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 3, 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 Leshar, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Scott joined the meeting at 9:06 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Matt Lutheran, PLA, Project Manager - Landscape Architecture, Regional Flood Control District.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Supervisor Scott acknowledged Catalina Foothills High School staff for their annual Falcon Connections event, where he and other area employers spoke with students about potential career opportunities after high school. He expressed gratitude to La Cima Middle School, where he spoke with students about local government and the role it played in their lives. He also spoke about his visit to Richardson Elementary School, where he read to first grade students, and thanked Supervisor Cano for inviting him to the Stories that Soar! event at Blenman Elementary School, which was sponsored by Literacy Connects.

Supervisor Christy congratulated Mica Mountain High School for hosting the Western Welding Academy, as part of the Blue-Collar Tour, where more than 100 students in the welding program demonstrated their skills and explored career opportunities in the trades.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Scott for his attendance at the Literacy Connects Stories that Soar! event at Blenman Elementary School, an event that was dear to the District 5 office for many years. He explained that the program encouraged students to submit stories, poems, pictures or videography, to the Magic Box and then the Magic Box came back to the school with a professional troupe of actors who put on a 60-minute show and the students found out if their stories were selected during that show. He explained that the program was at over 13 schools in southern Arizona and encouraged everyone to learn more about them at LiteracyConnects.org. He noted that the Stories that Soar! event would be at the Tucson Festival of Books on Saturday, March 14, 2026, at Noon. He added that their "Best of Stories that Soar Show" where all of the stories were chosen from the variety of the 13 schools, would be held on May 17, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., at the Marroney Theatre.

Supervisor Heinz announced the hiring of Luis Encinas and Kristen Randall, new staff members in the District 2 Office.

Supervisor Allen stated that the annual Amado Chili Cook-Off would be held on Saturday, March 7th, at The Amado Territory from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. She noted that the event was a fundraiser for the Amado Youth Center. She announced two District 3 office hour events; the first will be at the Sahuarita Food Bank on March 10, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., and the second would be held at the Picture Rocks Community Center on March 18, 2026, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Alexa Castillo, winner, Yvette Valerio, and Keyli Meza, runners-up, recognizing and commending: "TAKING ACTION AGAINST GRAFFITI PROGRAM POSTER CONTEST WINNERS"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. Andrew Saal, Assistant Medical Director, and Crystal Rambaud, Clinical Services Division Manager, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the day of Wednesday, March 18, 2026 to be: "HEALTH WORKFORCE WELL-BEING DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Larry Fisher, et al., Empire Ranch Foundation, celebrating the first 150 years of: "THE HISTORIC EMPIRE RANCH"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Rev. Dr. Jonathan Zenz, Senior Minister, Sherie Hoffman and Karen Ives, proclaiming the day of Saturday, March 14, 2026 to be: "UNITY OF TUCSON DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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.

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Elizabeth Pocock, CEO, Startup Tucson and TENWEST, proclaiming the week of March 24 through March 29, 2026, to be: "TENWEST WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Bruce D. Collins, Director, Pima County Procurement Department, proclaiming the month of March 2026 to be: "PROCUREMENT MONTH" and the day of Wednesday, March 11, 2026, to be: "PROCUREMENT PROFESSIONALS' DAY"

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

11. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Trista di Genova addressed the Board regarding her service dog and flock of birds that were unlawfully removed from her property in August 2023 by Pima Animal Care Center and Pima County Sheriff's Department. She asked the Board to consider two resolutions she had written; the first was requesting the return of her animals, \$200,000.00 in financial reparations and the removal of County officials that were involved in the removal, and the second was to request the shutdown of the Pima County Jail due to excessive inmate deaths.

Laurie Moore spoke about the County's spending priorities and stated that resources were being directed towards illegal immigrants and proclamations rather than U.S. citizens and County taxpayers. She also voiced her opposition to Propositions 418 and 419, and that existing transportation revenues should be managed more effectively, rather than creating new sales taxes.

Robert Reus spoke about his critique of U.S. foreign policy from World War II to the current military intervention in Iran. He stated that bombing campaigns should not be the foreign policy for any great nation.

Suzy Lorensen expressed her concerns regarding safety precautions at the Kino Sports Complex when it would host the Iranian national soccer team for the FIFA World Cup. She inquired about the security protocols that the County and Sheriff's Department would put in place to ensure public safety.

Elizabeth Cozzi expressed her support for Minute Item No. 25 and asked the Board to approve the Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan. She explained that the plan was developed in collaboration with various community groups to address the lack of affordable housing.

David Smith expressed his opposition to the proposed mask ordinance and stated that the Board was exceeding its authority by attempting to regulate federal agents. He questioned whether the County would be able to enforce its own ordinance. He asked the Board to prioritize protecting its residents and monitoring County officials rather than interfering with federal immigration actions.

Betsy Smith expressed support for the Health Workforce Well-Being Day proclamation and suggested that a proclamation be declared in support of the mental health of law enforcement officers, as well. She also voiced her opposition to the proposed mask ordinance and explained that the County lacked the authority to regulate federal ICE agents.

Mark Clark, Chair of the Regional Affordable Housing Commission, encouraged the Board to adopt the 10-year Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan and thanked staff, consultants and the Board for their support throughout the process. He explained that the County and other local jurisdictions had already benefitted from the data developed from the planning process, specifically the identification of community revitalization zones.

April Putney voiced her support for affordable housing and the proposed masking ordinance. She spoke about the recommended use of proceeds from the Project Blue land sale, expressed her opposition to allocating funds to attract similar economic development projects, recommended any decisions be delayed due to ongoing litigation, urged the Board to seek public input and suggested directing funds to mitigate the harmful impacts from the project, such as increased health risks and rising utility costs.

Vivek Bharathan shared his concerns with the County Administrator's memorandum on Project Blue land sale proceeds that was made public last week and that there needed to be some community involvement in determining how those funds were spent due to the overwhelming community opposition to Project Blue. He stated that it was insulting that much of the funds under this plan were dedicated to the same economic development team who brought Project Blue to the area.

* * *

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Heinz explained that the current RTA vote was a continuation of an existing tax and did not represent a new or increase in tax. He stated that it was important to differentiate between the heads of government and its citizens, in regard to the Iranian national soccer team potentially training in Tucson. He noted there was uncertainty on whether the team would still travel to the U.S. but ensured that the Kino Sports Complex had security protocols in place.

Supervisor Scott asked the County Administrator if there was an update regarding the status of the potential use of the facility by the Iranian national soccer team.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that her office had been working closely with FIFA, from the beginning and through the past weekend, on any necessary security precautions and that she expected an update on the status of the visit later that week and would keep the Board and public notified.

12. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:46 a.m.

13. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:57 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

14. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a settlement recommendation in Post Acute Development 3, L.L.C. v. Pima County (TX2025-000334).

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

15. **RECESS**

Chair Allen recessed the meeting at 11:58 a.m., to take part in the joint meeting with the City of Tucson Mayor & Council.

16. **RECONVENE**

The meeting was reconvened at 3:03 p.m. All members were present.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

17. **Hearing - Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - 2, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to public peace and welfare; amending the Pima County Code, Title 9, by adding Chapter 9.25,

Regulation of Unidentified Masked Groups, Exempting Identified Law Enforcement Officers.

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

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz that the ordinance be revised to incorporate feedback from the public and feedback from the Board into a final version that would be brought back to the Board at the next Board meeting for final vote. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Allen withdrew her motion.

It was then moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of March 24, 2026 and that the ordinance be brought back with any revisions that the County Attorney gleaned from this hearing and that he deemed legally defensible. Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

18. Presentation of Supercharging the Pima Early Education Program (PEEPs) Campaign

Presentation of Supercharging the PEEP's Campaign. Presented by The Preschool Promise and Pima County Community and Workforce Development. (District 1)

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

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

19. Review of Community Foundation of Southern Arizona Report

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the Community Foundation of Southern Arizona's report "Southern Arizona Funding Impacts: A Survey of Southern Arizona Nonprofit Organization." (District 3)

Jenny Flynn, President and CEO, Community Foundation for Southern Arizona (CFSA), provided a slide show presentation and stated that in 2025 the nonprofit community was affected by the cancelling of grants from the federal government due to executive orders and changes in the funding guidelines for most of the federal agencies, the non-profit sector, including Pima County, that were unprecedented in the history of the non-profit sector. She stated that those impacts became very evident and that was something they wanted to understand better by the fall of 2025. She stated that as a result, they conducted a survey to hear from nonprofits themselves and what they were experiencing. She stated that since 1980 CFSA had been a place-based charitable foundation that connected donors to the causes they cared about, and served nonprofits through grants, through CFSA's collaborative campus and co-located with 20 nonprofits through free and low-cost

capacity building, training and through advocacy and storytelling. She stated that the non-profit sector traveled alongside government, business and philanthropy to create a whole community network that allowed the community to have basic needs and workforce development, but also to have things that allowed them to enjoy the beauty, gorgeousness, and amazing art of the community, which was an important factor in the quality of life in southern Arizona, and specifically a part of the social safety net for Pima County. She stated that more than 140 non-profit organizations responded to their survey and provided quantitative data and qualitative data. She stated that the survey was given during the time of impact, but it did not ask how they were doing yet. She stated that most of the responses were from across southern Arizona, but primarily in Pima County, and the goal was to understand the impacts of policy shifts on the region's non-profit organizations and service recipients to gather data on the non-profit job sector in southern Arizona, including Pima County, and to anticipate the funding environment in 2026 and beyond. She stated that the survey highlighted themes that were rough and the reductions were creating incredible strain and were fraying. She stated that it was important to note that organizations with budgets over \$500,000.00, considered mid-size and large nonprofits, were the hardest hit because they were the ones that had the capacity to receive federal funding so they would be the ones to lose it. She stated there were subsequent ripple effects throughout the sector showing some organizations reporting impacts to over 10,000 service recipients. She stated that most of respondents were from Pima County and their budget sizes were very evenly distributed. She stated they were very small grassroots organizations with budgets under 100,000 represented, as well as every other level, including the largest nonprofits. She stated that nonprofits were mainly funded privately and in Pima County, about 47% across the sector and about 50% came from individual donors, charitable grants from foundations and corporations, etcetera. She stated that 19% was from local and state government, 8% from federal, 13% earned income and services, rental and merchandise and about 4% from endowments. She stated that the impacts were extreme and 44% of respondents indicated changes to federal funding had impacted the organizations, and they were already experiencing layoffs of 15% to 20% of nonprofits, ranging from 1 to 2 staff, all the way up to 60 staff that had already been laid off. She read the following from the respondents, *"Given the uncertainty of federal funding, we made the painful decision to reduce staff. Earlier this year, 35 FTE were laid off from a staff of about 200. Others chose to depart and positions were not refilled."* *"While we do not have government funding, we did go through a reduction in force to right size the organization, in light of unpredictable private donations and grants."* She stated that human services organizations were the hardest hit because they had the most government funding. She stated that policy shifts were seen impacting certain communities, immigrant and refugee communities, LGBTQIA+ communities, women and children, low-income families and rural communities. She stated some organizations serving communities were reduced in their funding and the need had increased because government funding had also been cut for direct programs from the government, so they were experiencing impact from both ends. She shared another respondent's quote, *"Two of our permanent supportive housing programs have been defunded. We are unsure if another one may be cut, approximately 200 households are facing possible eviction."* She stated that increased demand for services included food,

basic needs and housing which were expected but also in areas like veterinary services. She stated that it was across the board and that high demand in no specific area of need but across all sectors monitored. She went over the reported concern to impact ratio and stated that in Pima County, the percentage of nonprofits noting direct impact was 56.7%, but 74% reported high concern. She stated that concern was a subjective measure, but it represented some of the things seen in the qualitative data, which were fear of persecution, uncertainty around funding and a general sense that things were fraying to a point where they were breaking. She stated that these left nonprofits strained and stressed and they were not exactly very well staffed to start with and as layoffs continued, they found that they might reach a point where some of these organizations did not have enough staff to continue. She stated that community members were not served with what they needed and there was reduced staff morale. She also discussed the impacts of past government funding and donor confidence. She stated that donors had taken a big wait-and-see approach and were nervous about putting investments forward, and the scope of what donors had to offer could not meet the same need that government had. She stated that non-profits were very committed and were taking smart and strategic approaches to try and resolve this, combining services, selling off buildings and other assets to try and reduce down to core services to get to a point of rebuilding. She stated that nonprofits needed general operating support, education and advocacy and an opportunity to have partnerships to rebuild.

Chair Allen thanked CFSA for their presentation and their important role in the community and impact had already been seen from both the government and nonprofits. She stated that earlier the Board had presented a proclamation that talked about the stress and strain put on healthcare workers and the burnout, and that the same thing was similar within the social service sector, organizations and nonprofits that the community faced and tried to weave together the safety net and protect the communities. She stated that it was very distressing, but she was thankful of County Administration for dedicating nearly \$2 million in emergency relief and assistance grants that went out to non-profit organizations in the community that were trying to fill that gap around emergency services. She stated that it was not enough but was thankful that the County tried to do what it could at this moment of need. She stated that she was very grateful for this information to know that other donors would know of the intense need that there was and particularly for some more vulnerable and marginalized communities.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

20. Downtown Tucson Partnership Board of Directors

Discussion/Direction/Action: Selection of Ex-Officio Member, to fill a vacancy created by Kylie Walzak.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to appoint Montserrat Caballero as Ex-Officio Member to the Downtown Tucson Partnership Board of Directors.

21. Request for Legislative Change to A.R.S. §11-356

Discussion/Direction/Action: Request by the Pima County Merit Commission/Law Enforcement Merit Council to support a legislative change to amend A.R.S. §11-356.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

22. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 4.4, Compromising Taxes, Interest and Penalties.

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

23. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Christian Faith Fellowship has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2024, for Tax Parcel No. 122-15-312B.

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

Supervisor Scott noted that Minute Item Nos. 23 and 24, were similar in nature to items that had been on the last meeting agenda and at that meeting, he had asked for input from both the County Administrator and the Assessor's Office or Treasurer's Office, whichever was the most appropriate, regarding how eligible applicants were being informed of their eligibility for tax relief. He stated that these petitions seemed to appear on the agenda on a regular basis, which was why he questioned how well the public was being informed that certain entities, often religious organizations, were eligible for these types of exemptions. He reiterated his request that the Board be provided with information about how the County made the public aware of their eligibility.

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

24. **Petition for Relief of Taxes**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Vail Valley Baptist Church has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2022, 2023 and 2024, for Tax Parcel No. 305-90-2780.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion related to this item.)

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

25. **Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan**

Staff recommends adoption of the Pima County 10-year Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan.

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

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.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

26. **Settlement Recommendation in Post Acute Development 3, L.L.C. v. Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a settlement recommendation in Post Acute Development 3, L.L.C. v. Pima County (TX2025-000334).

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve as discussed in Executive Session.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

27. **Monthly Financial Update**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a monthly financial update on the County's financial performance.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slide show presentation and overview of the Period 7 forecast, which represented actuals through January 31. He stated that the County was in a healthy financial place as of this period and they had General Fund revenues that were projected to exceed the budget by \$12.2 million. He stated that was an increase of \$3 million over last month, expenditures continued to trend lower and it was flat from the prior month. He stated that departments continued to do a good job of monitoring their budgets

and stayed within or even below budget. He stated that the combination of those two items had projected the Fund Balance to increase by \$25.1 million at the end of FY26, which concluded in June. He noted that this report did not include the Project Blue \$20.8 million which was the last item on the agenda. He referred to the slide and stated that they updated the presentation and changed the table of numbers into a pictorial representation. He explained that the blue bars going to the right represented a positive variance to the budget and the bars going to the left represented a negative variance to the budget. He stated that as shown the beginning Fund Balance was up, positive \$8.3 million and on the right, the General Fund revenues were at \$12.2 million. He stated that General Fund expenditures were also positive to the variance, by \$5.1 million, leaving that ending Fund Balance of \$25.1 million. He stated that they also included a slide that showed a trend of revenue and expenditure in terms of how they collected money on the left, the solid bar chart on the top represented FY26 sources. He stated that the solid green line represented actuals and the dotted green line represented the forecast. He stated that the slightly shaded line below represented FY25 sources. He stated that it showed how they tracked year-over-year on revenues and the same concept on the right where the solid blue line on the top represented expenditures and uses for FY26. He stated that the bar on the bottom represented expenditures over \$25 million and it showed they were steady in how County dollars were spent that had been collected. He discussed reconciliation of the Fund Balance for FY25/26, and that the unrestricted General Fund Reserve was over \$117 million. He stated that when they reduced that for the Short-Term Crisis Funding of about \$838,000.00 and \$855,000.00 left them with \$115.4 million, less reserve at 15% for this fiscal year at \$92 million, leaving an unrestricted Fund Balance of \$23.4 million, projected as of June 30, 2026. He stated that the bottom part of the slide represented their estimate of where they might be in '26/27, using those same numbers. He stated that the only number that changed was the required Reserve moving back to 17%, with an estimate at \$103.3 million, which left \$12 million over the required Fund Balance, as they reviewed the '26/27 projection. He went over the General Fund contingency and reminded the Board that they had \$1 million budgeted in the contingency line for FY26 and there were three uses from contingency. He stated that the most recent was the Treasurer's budget remediation which had been approved by the Board, which left a Contingency Balance of \$483,000.00 for the fiscal year. He went over their budget calendar and stated that he would come back before the Board on March 24th to provide an overview of the Capital Improvement Plan, along with the Integrated Infrastructure Plan, the Administrator's recommended budget was expected to be received on April 17th, followed by a few budget discussions before adoption in June and the adoption of the tax levy on August 11th.

Supervisor Heinz asked about the Sheriff's budget and the massive amount of expense happening with the Guthrie investigation because he was sure that was going to have an impact that might burn the rest of the Contingency Fund.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that they had not looked at that but in speaking with the Sheriff, they estimated about an additional half a million dollars. She stated that they were currently looking for an additional, approximately, million dollars related to Nancy Guthrie, in the situation in that area. She stated that they

had been talking with the Sheriff about how it could be accommodated within the current budget, what he needed to do, or what kind of allocation was needed in the future. She stated that had not been programmed, but it was being closely monitored with the Sheriff.

Supervisor Scott stated it was mentioned that Mr. Cuaron would be reporting back to the Board on the 24th regarding the Capital Improvement Plan review. He inquired about the impact or positive effect on the overall Capital Improvement Plan of infusing \$10,750,000.00 million from Project Blue proceeds into capital improvement projects, if the recommendations for the use of Project Blue sale proceeds were approved by the Board.

Mr. Cuaron requested clarification on the question.

Supervisor Scott clarified what would be the positive effect on the overall Capital Improvement Plan if the Board decided to approve the recommendation to use \$10.7 million from the land sale proceeds towards capital projects and how it would benefit the overall Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. Cuaron asked if Supervisor Scott would like that information to be provided as a follow-up at another time.

Supervisor Scott asked if it could be included in the discussion regarding the overall Capital Improvement Plan review at the Board's next meeting.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative.

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

SUPERIOR COURT

28. Classification/Compensation

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

Class Code/ Class Title/ Pay Grade (Salary Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

6116/ Courier/ 1 (\$16.54-\$22.34 hourly)/ 4/ NE*

*NE = Not Exempt (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.

TREASURER

29. The Board of Supervisors on February 17, 2026, continued the following:

Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$157,077.57.

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.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

30. **William Shaw Wildlife Corridor**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 12, of the Board of Supervisors, designating the Avra Valley portion of the critical landscape linkage identified in the Conservation Lands System as the William Shaw Wildlife Corridor. (District 3)

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

Christina McVie, Board President, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, introduced her fellow board members that were also in attendance; Kate Hotten, Co-Executive Director, Nick Maya, Program Manager, and Carolyn Campbell, Board Member. She stated that they were also fellow members of the Desert Fence Busters and described their work, clearing wildlife inhibiting fences in the Avra Valley area. She stated that their work had been inspired by Dr. William Shaw and designed to celebrate the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (SDCP) and enhance the Multi-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), by restoring the connectivity for wildlife with willing land managers. She recognized Dr. Shaw's work, from developing his first Bunny Map in 1986, which identified the genetic and geographic isolation of the Tucson Mountains, to leading the Science and Technical Advisory Team, which informed the SDCP and MSCP. She expressed her appreciation to the Board for acknowledging all of Dr. Shaw's contributions to the community, as part of the 25th anniversary celebration of the SDCP.

Chair Allen thanked Ms. McVie and Ms. Campbell, of the Desert Fence Busters, who brought resolution forward and shared how reading Dr. Shaw's book expanded her appreciation for his work as an ecologist and professor, reporting on the critical and sensitive wildlife habitats of eastern Pima County and being one of the first to create a map that identified local wildlife corridors. She noted that it was fitting to honor those whose work led to the development of the SDCP and MSCP, as the County celebrated the 25th anniversary of the SDCP, by recognizing Dr. Shaw and naming a portion of the Avra Valley Wildlife Corridor after him. She invited the public to the official naming ceremony at the Red Hills Visitor Center at Saguaro National Park West, that would be held on Friday, March 6, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

Supervisor Cano thanked those in attendance who supported this item and acknowledged the kickoff event for the 25th anniversary of the SDCP, held at the Pima County Courthouse last week. He highlighted the numerous upcoming activities planned for the yearlong celebration, encouraged the public to participate and directed the public to the pima.gov/SDCP25 website for more information.

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

31. **2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election**

Discussion regarding Pima County's first all-mail, countywide election with Pima County's Recorder and Elections Director, and/or designees, updating the Board on election operations including, but not limited to, activity at early voting sites, ballot processing and tabulation, and further discussion regarding the Recorder's new "Votemobile," its acquisition and current deployment plan during the special election period. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that he had several questions and that they might be best served to be asked as a wrap-up type of a meeting after the elections, to have an analysis of how things went. He stated that regarding the press release from the Recorder on February 18th about the vote mobile, it stated that the project was made possible by a grant from the Tohono O'odham Nation, in partnership with the Pima County Board of Supervisors, and that he received a list from the two years that the grant was awarded to the Recorder for the purchase and acquisition of the mobile voting trailer, and it showed that in a two-year period, they were granted roughly \$215,000.00 for the vote mobile. He stated that when compared to the Board of Supervisors agendas for those years they found no evidence or relation to anything from the Recorder's Office that let the Board know they were in the process of acquiring the grant, much less that it received the grant. He stated that the press release was a very misleading statement and that this never came before the Board and the Board was unaware that they were trying to acquire the grant and that they received the grant. He stated that they were joined at the hip of the future of this acquisition and were not notified. He asked the Recorder how she devised or interpreted this as a partnership with the Pima County Board of Supervisors, when they had nothing to do with it.

Chair Allen clarified that the item being discussed was the Regional Transportation Authority Special Election.

Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder, explained that her understanding was that this project had come through and had received approval from the Board to receive the dollars. She stated they had been communicating about this mobile voting unit and had been before the Board previously to discuss the mobile voting unit over the past two years. She stated that she wanted it to be clear that at no point was it mandatory that questions from Supervisors be directed to her only during meetings and they were very welcome to contact her office directly, at any time to discuss this matter.

Supervisor Christy stated that the first time the Board heard about this acquisition was when the Deputy Recorder made reference to it at an Elections Integrity Commission meeting in January, which was the first time it had been heard by anyone. He stated that there was no evidence that this was brought before the Board and no evidence that the Board engaged in a partnership and had given their blessing.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly thanked Supervisor Christy for bringing this to her attention and stated that she would review the documentation they had since the item was placed on the addendum during an active election, and at this time, was not prepared to respond to his question regarding a timeline of communication regarding the vote mobile.

Supervisor Christy stated that another issue with a press release stated, *"One-envelope ballot-return solution aims to reduce voter confusion."* He asked if the return solution, getting rid of what was known as the privacy envelope, was designed to solve a problem and if there was a problem with having the privacy envelope.

Ms. Cázares-Kelly responded in the affirmative and explained that the two-envelope system was creating many challenges for her office. She stated that the change was made specifically to address several issues, number one, voter confusion, the number of ballots that they were receiving without the required ballot affidavit was incredibly high. She stated that in the last Presidential Election, it was upwards of over 700, in an election where, in a County where they had razor-thin elections, that was quite significant. She stated that when people returned those ballots only using the privacy envelope and not the ballot affidavit envelope, it would often be sent back to the Recorder with absolutely no name to attribute to that voter, which meant they were not able to verify that ballot, meaning that voter was disenfranchised. She stated the other thing that was happening was the removal of the privacy envelope was incredibly labor intensive and slowed the process and would not allow them to verify with a voter, if they were calling over the phone or they were checking up on the website, whether or not their ballot affidavit was received, and that would put them at risk for double-voting, if they were not sure if the Recorder had their ballot and they could not confirm if they had their ballot because of the privacy envelope. She stated that created a delay and the voter might get nervous and vote again. She added that they had also been responding to public's demand for faster processing, faster signature verification, and that led to turning them over to the Elections Department for tabulation. She stated they had seen a statewide issue with that, a national push and it was really important for them to remember they were currently at 680,000 registered voters, and counting, including inactive voters, at around 720,000 registered voters, that was three-quarters of a million. She stated that in 10 to 15 years, there would be a million voters in Pima County, and they had to address those changes. She stated that Maricopa County has been utilizing the single-envelope return system for three decades and it was not a concern for a jurisdiction of their size. She stated that with Pima County's growth, they had to be thinking about this.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was concerned for a jurisdiction the size of Pima County and he was not pulling any punches about the number of inquiries, complaints and concerns his office had received as a result of the removal of the privacy envelope. He stated that this was a whole new ball game for many traditional voters, particularly those that resided in his district. He asked if the Recorder was familiar with the Blog for Arizona.

Recorder Cázares-Kelly responded yes.

Supervisor Christy stated that he would not characterize it as a right-wing conspiracy site, blog and he had never heard of it until he was provided with it, but their headline was "New Mail-in Ballot Design Has Voters Concerned About Privacy." He asked if the Recorder had a chance to read it.

Recorder Cázares-Kelly responded no.

Supervisor Christy suggested the Recorder read it because it was illuminating as to how much concern there was. He stated that his final question was for the Elections Director and asked with all this new efficiency, with no privacy envelope being removed in the name of expediting the counting and tabulation process, had she seen a huge influx in the Elections Department as a result of the privacy envelope being removed, over and above what was normally seen.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, stated that it was hard to gage because it was a different type of election. She stated that they received a large volume of ballots handed over to them the first week, and then it decreased. She stated that it was hard to say how quickly they were processing them and providing them to Elections, but so far they had received over 110,000 ballots.

Supervisor Christy asked if that was considered good, at this particular point, and if tabulation had just started on the 27th.

Ms. Hargrove confirmed that tabulation started on the 27th and they had processed 95,628 ballots, but had counted basically 65,354, leaving 30,000 ballots to tabulate today. She stated that she believed she would be receiving more ballots from the Recorder's Office this morning.

Supervisor Christy asked if she had not felt if the privacy envelope removal system had increased returns to her office.

Ms. Hargrove responded not at this time.

Supervisor Heinz thanked the Recorder for her presence and stated that he dropped off his ballot the day before and that staff was excellent, but they were a little confused because a Supervisor was asking to talk to her. He congratulated her on kicking off the new mobile voting unit and thanked her for stationing it in

Sahuarita for a number of days, which was in his district and he expressed his appreciation for that.

Chair Allen thanked their Elections leaders for their recognition that change was not always easy, and they looked ahead and thought toward how their elections could be cost effective and efficient. She stated that there was a clamor for results to be turned around more quickly, and she appreciated that they were using evidenced-based practices that could help speed up and reduce the cost of elections. She acknowledged and expressed gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the ribbon cutting of the mobile vote unit in Sells. She stated that it was a beautiful event and was a clear recognition of how having a mobile unit in which people in rural areas could come and hand in their ballot, check and see if they were registered and participate in the election process in places where there was not great access to participate in elections. She stated that people were coming at that moment to hand in their ballot, it was an incredible honor and it was rooted in communities' commitment and understanding of the value of democracy.

Supervisor Cano extended his gratitude to the County Recorder and the Elections Director for the public's information. He stated that he believed it was important for them to know the fact that he verified with the elections team, 2.5 million voters in Maricopa County, 1.9 of them vote-by-mail. He stated that they got a ballot, and it was the same ballot that Pima County was currently using with their return envelope. He stated they had been doing that for more than ten years and it was important for the County to ensure that any kind of change in the systems was dealt with in a responsible manner, but the reality was that a majority of their sister county, the largest county in Arizona, was using the same envelope and that was a very important distinction to make as discussion wrapped up.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

32. Recommended Use of Project Blue Land Sale Proceeds

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the recommended use of Project Blue land sale proceeds.

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

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of March 24, 2026. No vote was taken at this time.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item with the exception of the capital improvements line item that would allow flexibility for other priorities to be considered.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, requested a friendly amendment that if the Board approved the substitute motion that they also approve movement of those dollars from the General Fund into the Special Revenue Fund.

Supervisor Cano and Supervisor Heinz accepted the friendly amendment to the substitute motion.

Supervisor Cano withdrew his substitute motion.

Upon the vote of the original motion, it carried 3-2, Supervisors Heinz and Scott voted "Nay."

HUMAN RESOURCES

33. 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 Department) from within its current budget:

Class Code/ Class Title/ Pay Grade (Salary Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

6125/ Justice Navigator II/ 10 (\$52,291.20-\$73,174.40)/ 5/ NE*

*NE = Not Exempt (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.

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

34. Trial Court Appointments - Nominating Committee District 2

- Appointments of David Higuera, Vanessa Barchfield, Kate Hiller and Ryan Anderson, Democrats, to replace Mary Soltero, Eric Ponce, Sofia Blue and Gabriel Morales. No term expirations.
- Appointment of Shaliqua "Shaq" McCoy, Independent, to replace Dana Moore. No term expiration.
- Appointment of **James** "Jim" Kloster, Independent, to fill a vacancy created by Barbara Enos. No term expiration.
- Appointment of Brice Elliott, Republican, to replace Tom Murphy. No term expiration.

Supervisor Heinz noted that Jim Kloster's legal first name was James and he corrected it for the record.

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

35. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 1, 2, 9 and 16 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

At the request of Supervisor Heinz to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 15 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. La Frontera Partners, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the West Point II Apartments and extend contract term to 12/31/26, no cost (PO2400010219)

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

Human Resources

2. United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Employees Care About Pima County (ECAP) 2026 Campaign, extend contract term to 12/31/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$33,151.65 (CT_24-435)

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

Procurement

9. Claflin Service Company, d.b.a. CME Corp., McKesson Medical-Surgical Government Solutions, L.L.C., Medline Industries, Inc. and School Health Corporation, Amendment No. 1, to provide for medical supplies and equipment and amend contractual language, Health Special Revenue (50%) and General (50%) Funds, contract amount \$480,000.00 (SC2500000131) Administering Department: Health

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

16. Acceptance - Health

City of Tucson Housing and Community Development Department, to provide for the Choice Neighborhoods - Supportive Services Project, term date 1/1/26 to 9/30/28, \$202,734.00 (G-HD-95726)

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

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR HEINZ

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

15. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Garcia Family Foundation, to provide for the Pima County Homelessness Prevention Hub, term date 2/15/26 to 12/31/28, \$2,000,000.00 (G-CWD-104898)

Supervisor Heinz expressed his appreciation to the Garcia Family Foundation for their generosity and noted that this was a great example of a public-private partnership coming together to address a complicated issue that affected the community.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. La Frontera Partners, Inc., Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Human Resources

2. United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Inc., Amendment No. 2, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Information Technology

3. Simply Bits, L.L.C., to provide a Tower and Rooftop License Agreement for Wireless Communications Facilities at 6950 S. Beehive Avenue, Tucson, AZ, contract amount \$99,954.12 revenue/5 year term (CT2600000011)

Pima Animal Care Center

4. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, Amendment No. 1, to provide Funding for the Eastside Adoption Satellite Project and amend contractual language, no cost (CT2500000064)

Procurement

5. Award

- Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001625, Amendment No. 4, Ricoh USA, Inc., to provide for Ricoh MFD/copier, maintenance, parts and supplies. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$280,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$805,000.00. This increase is required to purchase commercial-grade printing equipment and services to replace outdated units and ensure continued operational efficiency and reliability. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.
6. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 13, to provide for computer software and related items and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology
 7. EyeMed Vision Care, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Mason, OH), to provide for the employee vision plan, Employee Contributions Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (SC2600000028) Administering Department: Human Resources
 8. Line and Space, L.L.C., Amendment No. 3, to provide for architectural and design services: Richard Elias Mission Library Expansion and Renovation (XREMLB) and extend contract term to 9/30/26, no cost (PO2500007246) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction
 9. Claflin Service Company, d.b.a. CME Corp., McKesson Medical-Surgical Government Solutions, L.L.C., Medline Industries, Inc. and School Health Corporation, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
 10. A J P Electric, Inc. (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for the Romero Road at Ruthrauff Road, Flowing Wells - In Tucson Project, U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA HSIP Fund, contract amount \$388,365.00 (PO2600003195) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

Real Property

11. Verano Community Association, Inc., to provide a Pima County License for Right-of-Way Encroachment to construct and maintain a decomposed granite multi-use path, landscaping and irrigation, contract amount \$55,419.75 revenue/25 year term (CT2600000013)

12. Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide a Pima County Public Utility License Agreement and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2600000029)

Sheriff

13. Arizona Department of Administration, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for services related to the implementation, maintenance, and support of a Law Enforcement Records Management System, contract amount \$171,800.00 revenue (CT2600000001)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

14. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for Southwest Gas Corporation, Weatherization Assistance Program, \$23,083.00 (G-CWD-82525)
15. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
Garcia Family Foundation, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
16. **Acceptance - Health**
City of Tucson Housing and Community Development Department, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
17. **Acceptance - Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Tuberculosis Control Program and amend grant language, \$184,472.98 (GA-HD-70289)
18. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**
AZ Department of Child Safety and Administrative Office of the Courts, to provide for the FFY2026 Title IV-E Foster Care Administrative Costs for Legal Representation Child or Parent, \$1,898,437.00 (G-PDS-82516)
19. **Acceptance - Sheriff**
Phoenix Police Department/Arizona Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force Lead Agency, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Arizona ICAC and amend grant language, \$72,700.00 (GA-SD-66369)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

20. **Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission**
Appointment of Maria Vianey Valdez-Cardenas, to fill a vacancy created by Christa Lindsay. Term expiration: 5/20/26. (Commission recommendation)
21. **Industrial Development Authority (IDA)**
Appointment of Patrick DeConcini, to fill a vacancy created by Jeff Singleton. Term expiration: 9/5/28. (IDA recommendation)

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

22. Special Event

- Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Church, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, February 21, 2026.
- Karla Looby, Angel Charity for Children, Inc., La Encantada Shopping Mall, 2905 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, April 19, 2026.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, March 21, April 18, and May 2, 2026.
- Geoffrey William Hill, Tucson Conquistadores, La Paloma Country Club and The Westin La Paloma Resort & Spa, 3660 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, March 15 through 22, 2026.
- Rev. Michael A. Martinez, Our Lady of the Valley Parish, Our Lady of the Valley Parish Hall, 505 N. La Canada Drive, Green Valley, May 1,

ELECTIONS

23. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Mary Theroux-031-DEM, Hunter Holt-040-DEM, Christopher DeYoung-058-DEM, Barbara Von Papen-084-DEM, Kimberly Cartwright-105-DEM, Blake Walker-105-DEM, Alex Sanchez-127-DEM, Morgan Miholich-185-DEM

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

David LaDow-012-DEM, Michael Crawford-042-DEM, Christopher DeYoung-073-DEM, Hunter Holt-223-DEM, Elizabeth Wilson-232-DEM, Austin Albright-014-REP, Richard Cornejo-108-REP, Mary Alsterbeg-115-REP, Grant Kellams-173-REP, Richard Guthridge-184-REP, Carol Archbold-239-REP

RECORDER

24. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the months of November and December, 2025, and January, 2026.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

25. Minutes: December 16, 2025
Warrants: February, 2026

* * *

36. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ATTORNEY

17. Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - 2, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to public peace and welfare; amending the Pima County Code, Title 9, by adding Chapter 9.25, Regulation of Unidentified Masked Groups, Exempting Identified Law Enforcement Officers.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
SB: Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

GA: Glenda Avalos
MI: Margo Itule
FJ: Florence Johnson
RB: Rolande Baker
KD: Kristin Downing
TN: Tanya Nuñez
JC: Joanna Carichner
VB: Vivek Bharathan
AP: April Putney
BS: Betsy Smith

JA: We are going to move to our time certain, which is Agenda Item No. 13. It is a hearing on Ordinance No. 2026-2, relating to the public peace and welfare, amending the Pima Code, Title 9, etc., regarding the regulation of unidentified masked groups. For that hearing, we have a number of speakers who have signed up. So, I will, for a quick context, at our first meeting in February, we asked the Administration, County Attorney's Office to develop an ordinance prohibiting law enforcement officials from wearing masks or face coverings to obscure their identities. At our second meeting in February, we passed a resolution, affirming that commitment. And today we have a proposed ordinance before us. So, we are holding this hearing today to take in public comment. I will flag that it is my hope that my colleagues will support gathering the public's feedback and then feedback from this Board that can be incorporated into a final version that we will vote on at our next meeting on March 23rd. With that, I will call up the first three speakers, Glenda Avalos, Margo Itule and Florence Johnson, will be our first three speakers.

GA: Buenos días. I just want to say really quick that I am Guatemalan and my country still has yet to recover from what the earlier, the gentleman who said it earlier, and I agree with everything that April has said. With that said, I am part of Casa Maria's team and I am a resident in District 5. Our communities have always been systemically threatened and that threat has escalated and it is expanding to all since the beginning of the year. We at Casa Maria witness daily, the weary, the vulnerability and how our communities are pushed to the brink every day. We are all connected spiritually and when one thread is ripped, it affects us all. When we do all that we can to take care of each other, it is divine will. We can then easily hold on to each other and embrace what is to come. This threat will only get worse. In creating this ordinance, there is no room for exemptions. We need the ordinance to be as solid, as solid as it can be. We look to you to do what is in your power to protect and alleviate the weight of the community that it bears. Time and time again this morning, people have said to you that you need to look out for your residents, your constituents, your so forth, but this community is made out of more. And because we are all intertwined spiritually, you have to look at it as a whole. We cannot leave people behind. So, when we are looking at it as a whole and you look at your hand, if your pinky seems so useless because it is so small, it does not take away what its purpose is. And just because somebody cannot vote for you, because they are either unsheltered, because they are either unstable, because their health is somewhere where they cannot get to be registered somewhere, does not mean that they do not matter. So, when we look forward to creating this idea of a paradise, that so many said today, it needs to include everyone, not just the ones that vote. Because we walk together and we cannot be able to embrace a future where we do not include everyone. But if you are going to continue to act only on the behalf of your constituents and your own district, then just simply say you do not care about anybody else. Let us just be transparent and clear in that. But if you are really, are being convicted, then let us work on everybody's behalf.

JA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Margot Itule.

MI: Good morning. My name is Margot Itule, and I am speaking today as an unpaid, independent, concerned Tucsonan. Americans are fed up with the unlawful, destructive and reprehensible actions of secret police invading, terrorizing and disappearing people in our cities and neighborhoods. These agents under the federal DHS system have absolutely no accountability, while they murder and brutalize our communities. We have had enough. And as we take to the streets to protect our neighbors, we too are being attacked, sent to jail, concentration camps, and yes, even murdered. To quote Christopher Armitage, *"We are playing in a system where one side breaks all the rules and the referee calls fouls only on the other team."* I am really proud of Tucson's strong coalition of grassroots community organizations. One of these groups, the Community Protection Task Force, has been meeting with local law enforcement to try to convince them to resist complying with the Trump Administration's deportation agenda. The outrageous corruption and abuse of executive power of this administration is severely and negatively impacting us all. We, the people, are organizing to preserve what is left of our Constitution and democracy. Now, we need our elected officials to step up, push back, protect our rights, our safety, our country. Thank you for presenting the ordinance regulating

masked groups. I fully support Item 13 on the Agenda. It is a good start in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. Tucson's Community Rapid Response Team has identified over 600 unmarked vehicles being used in ICE arrests. Law enforcement vehicles must also be identified. There are a number of other critical issues that should be taken into consideration. For example, the judicial warrant rule, no facilitation rule, privacy protection rule, surveillance prohibition redress rule, no agents on public property. I am asking that the council continue to coordinate with our City Attorney and Attorney General to secure adoption and enforcement of strategic, comprehensive and long-lasting policies and rules. I would also ask that you continue including community feedback. The ACLU has outlined nine model state and local law enforcement policies and rules, which, if adopted, will protect us from the worst abuses of the Trump Administration. These policies can be found on the ACLU Arizona website. I strongly urge you to implement these nine policies. Tucson is behind you and will support you and assist you in accomplishing this goal. Thank you.

JA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Florence Johnson, and then after Florence, we will hear from Rolande Baker, Kristin Downing and Tanya Nuñez.

FJ: Good morning, Supervisors, I am a resident of District 3 and I am part of the Community Protection Task Force, which does meet monthly with our police and Sheriff's Department, as well as members of City governance and we hope County governance, as well. So, we would like to invite you to participate in some of these discussions, or to send a staff person to participate. I am here to support the ordinance that Pima County is putting forth, Item No. 13. I want to say that I am hearing from members of the community who do not look like me, who will not be calling 911 when they see domestic violence or child abuse or elder abuse because they are afraid when police come or when the Sheriff comes to their neighborhood, and what happens to their neighbors or their families or their coworkers. So, I want you to know that we are not safer when we have these federal agents conducting immigration enforcement in our community, because when people are not calling 911, they are afraid to go to the doctor, too. They are afraid to go to the hospital. They are going to be sicker. They are going to be out on our streets, and people will be in dire need of assistance. And this is something that a lot of people who support the president's policy do not really consider how this would endanger a community like Tucson. So, I just want to urge you to continue with this, to take a look at the ACLU Arizona's nine policies, and I will keep this brief and say thank you for your public service, and being part of an elected Board, which represents everyone in our community, all residents, not just people who can vote. Thank you.

JA: Next is Rolande Baker.

RB: Good morning, Chair Allen and all Supervisors, I am a proud member of District 1 with Supervisor Scott. So, today I am here on, sort of, two situations. The first one is ordinance 2026. I want to thank all four of you who voted for this ordinance when it was a resolution. We need, absolutely need this. What my other friends have said. I am also a member of the Community Task Force. In fact, we are meeting today so that we can talk with the Sheriff and the Chief of Police, and make sure that they will

protect all of our residents. And like Florence said, people like myself, I do not have to worry about making a phone call, but all of my friends, and I have many of them, they cannot. Every Thursday we have a meeting at Derechos Humanos at Global Justice, and at that meeting every Thursday night, we have families who come and speak to us about the horrendous things that have happened to them in their houses, their children are afraid to go to school, their children are staying in their rooms because they are afraid to get out of their homes, because they are afraid of being picked up. They are afraid of their parents being kidnapped and taken to these detention centers, actually internment camps, because we have a long, long history in this country of detention centers, starting all the way when we started to put our indigenous people in those detention centers and killing them. We have been doing this for very long time. We have not learned our history. We need to learn our history. What I would like here also is to ask that you incorporate the part of wearing your masks. They, all law enforcement seem to wear their masks. There should not be an exception. So, I am hoping that with this ordinance you include that they wear their masks. The other thing to which I want to talk about is what is going on in Marana. And the, sorry about that. I want to leave a quote for you, and it is from someone who I have honored for many years, Angela Davis. I want to talk to you about what she says about immigration detention, and I quote, *"Prisoners do not disappear problems, they disappear human beings. And the practice of disappearing vast numbers of people from poor, immigrant and racially marginalized communities has literally become big business. How can we prevent the criminalization and the demonization of people who are called noncitizens? How can we prevent the incarceration of ever-increasing numbers of men and of women as well? And children?"* In her last quote, oh...

JA: Thank you.

RB: ...Thank you.

JA: Our next speaker is Kristin Downing.

KD: Good morning. I am Kristin Downing. I am, scrolling my phone, there we go. Thank you for taking the time to discuss ICE and how best to protect our community, which is not a silly endeavor, as others have said, it is the most important endeavor you can take. I am speaking in favor of the ordinance that prevents ICE agents from hiding their identities with masks. I have now lived in Pima County for almost half my life, and I can say with absolute certainty that what makes southern Arizona the wonderful place that it is, is because of all the diverse cultures and rich traditions that are steeped into our community. This is why my husband and I chose to raise our family here and be involved in scouting and sports and organizations that are doing all they can to help the community. That is my favorite thing about Tucson, how everyone pulls together, to learn from each other and to help their neighbors. We have seen what ICE does in the face of this type of community. They employ racist and violent tactics without hesitation to rip apart families and scare those who are involved in working to protect their friends and families. This administration is doing all it can to erase anyone who truly makes this country great. If you are not a white, cisgendered, heterosexual, Christian male, you are un-American and

deemed a threat to the regime. This mandate is what ICE is carrying out. So, the laughter is okay? Ugh..Laughing at people's demise, that is fantastic, that is what they are about. This mandate is what ICE is carrying out across the country, and why they have to cover their faces as they do it. Thank you for standing up to ICE's horrific practices and being an example of how elected officials in southern Arizona should be looking out for their people. No human being is illegal for simply existing, and we must continue standing up to anyone who says otherwise. The resolutions and ordinances you are passing, and the work our local organizations are doing to protect our neighbors is an example of how, in the words of James Baldwin, *"Hope is invented every day."* Let us keep bringing hope forward. And thank you so much for all that you are doing.

JA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Tanya Nuñez, and then after Tanya, we will hear from Joanna Carichner, Vivek and April.

TN: Good morning. Chair Allen and Board of Supervisors, my name is Tanya Nuñez. I am a proud daughter of immigrants. My family and I are not illegals and we should vehemently condemn such disgusting, dehumanizing language. Especially on land that was pillaged through genocide by European immigrants. I have lived in Arizona my entire life, living in Pima County for over ten years, and was born and raised in Douglas, Arizona, a border town. I know firsthand the reality at the border. I am part of the immigrant community, unlike many of the people here that come with hate and ignorance in their hearts and who believe poisonous lies being spread about our immigrant neighbors, not because they actually know and coexist with immigrants, but because they hear it from racists and white supremacists on TV. Immigrants are not criminals. They are not a danger to our communities. This is simply a racist lie and the facts do not support it. Study after study shows that immigrants are far less likely to commit crimes than U.S. citizens. They are our essential workers. There are people who take care of our family members and our homes, who pick our food, who pay taxes into a social security system that they may never even benefit from. They are not tearing our neighborhoods apart, they are holding them together. So, why are we being told this lie? Because politicians and the billionaires they serve want us to fight each other. They want non-immigrants to look at immigrants and blame them for our struggles. They want us to believe that immigrants are the reason we cannot afford rent or groceries or a home. But we know the truth. The real problem is not our neighbor. It is rich people and corporations who hoard our country's wealth, drive up the cost of living, destroy our planet for profit and wage war abroad, and have nothing to do with democracy or security, but about trying to take over the world and its resources. Bombing schools and killing hundreds of school girls, as the Trump Administration has just done in Iran, is a real and most egregious crime there can be. So, how dare him and his supporters talk about the crime and threat that immigrants supposedly pose, as they bomb children abroad and execute citizens in cold blood in our streets. We will not be fooled, and we say no to Trump's mass deportations. These mass deportations are not just policy. They are violent attacks on our communities. We are seeing ICE carry out massive raids in our neighborhoods, hunting down our family members, our friends, our coworkers. Millions of families in this country are mixed status. That means family members could be taken away, leaving their

children behind, ripping the breadwinner away from the table. This is not enforcing the law, it is cruelty. And let us not forget why people leave their homes in the first place. No one makes a decision lightly. They are fleeing extreme poverty and violence. Violence often fueled by the United States' corporate interests and foreign policies that create instability abroad. The same systems that hurt working people here are the ones creating refugees overseas. So, yeah, we say no to these mass deportations that are costing us money. Estimates say that \$90 billion of our tax dollars are going to go to these deportations. Imagine what that money could go to. And so yeah, we say ICE out of the community, money for jobs and education, not deportation.

JA: Our next speaker is Joanna Carichner and I will again remind the audience to not make sounds, laughter, coughing. If you need a cough drop to alleviate the coughs, I believe that there are some by the door. Thank you, Joanna.

JC: Thank you, members of the community, members of the Board, I am Joanna Carichner. I am a resident of District 5. I am a massage therapist and a small business owner. I have never spoken at a Board meeting before. In fact, last time you had one meeting was the first time I had been to one. The last time I was here at the Supervisor's meeting, a man in our community stood up and told a story about not feeling safe in his neighborhood because an undocumented immigrant had broken into his house and held him at gunpoint. Now, that is certainly a terrifying experience for this man, and I am sorry that it happened, but I would like to tell you a couple of different stories. I have been sexually assaulted three times in my life, all three of them, U.S. born American citizens, white men. Terrifying experiences, all of them, haunted me for years. But does it equate that all U.S. born white-male citizens should be assumed to be sexual predators, rounded up and put in concentration camps because I was assaulted by three of them? Now I live in South Tucson. The majority of my neighbors are nonwhite. Many of my neighbors are undocumented. I have lived in that house for 20 years, and in that time, I have never been broken into, never been assaulted, never been harassed. What has happened is that when my car broke down, my undocumented neighbor came over and spent hours fixing it and tried to charge me less than most mechanics would. When my mother's house had a lot of extra debris in the yard, my undocumented neighbor came over and cleaned it out and took it to the dump and again tried to charge me less than most other similar services. I have never had kinder or more helpful neighbors in my life. You can always find someone to scapegoat if you want to. ICE claims to be rounding up the worst of the worst. Julia Benitez, also known as "La Abuela," a 79-year-old grandmother with dementia, spent nine months in a detention center in Eloy until community outrage finally helped her get released. She is not the worst of the worst. Our current administration is full of sexual predators. Our current president is an adjudicated sexual predator, but he is wealthy and white and his friends are, he and his friends are not being rounded up and put into concentration camps, but our hardworking, kind, community oriented, black and brown neighbors are. The very least we can do is ensure that ICE thugs are not rounding up our hard-working neighbors, that they are showing their faces and their names and only taking people who have, they have signed judicial warrants. That is the very least we can do. Thank you.

JA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Vivek Bharathan.

VB: Hi. Just want to add my voice and echo everyone who has spoken so far in support of this ordinance. I appreciate your efforts in bringing it up. Thank you for doing that and I hope you will vote for it.

JA: Our next speaker is April Putney.

AP: Hello again, Chair Allen and Board of Supervisors, like Vivek, I want to echo pretty much what everybody has said before I came up here to speak. I am unpaid. I am in District 5. I also want to add that I do not think, although I support this ordinance, I do not think it necessarily really goes far enough. I think it could have more teeth. I identify some potential issues with the Sheriff's Department actually following through and enforcing it as a law. I do not have confidence that the Sheriff's Department will do that, but I hope that you write the ordinance so that there is teeth, so that you can encourage the Sheriff's Department to enforce the law against masked vigilantes, including federal officers who break the law. I do not think there should be exceptions for ICE to wear masks when they otherwise identify themselves. They are wearing masks because they know that they are doing something wrong, and they do not want to be held accountable by the community, many of whom in the community go out of their way to do unpaid volunteer positions, spending their time that they could otherwise be doing things they would rather do, to film these thugs and hold them accountable in a very minimalistic baseline, the "least we can do" type of way, filming and witnessing, bearing witness on the evils that are occurring. So, although I want to say that I very much support this ordinance, I think it could go a little bit farther. I would like to see it actually enforced, and that there should not be exemptions for ICE to wear masks if they are clearly identified. I think they should also have to clearly identify as ICE, let us just say that. They should definitely have to clearly identify who they are, but they should not be allowed to wear masks while they do so. I also agree specifically with the speaker who mentioned that they should not be allowed to roll around in kidnapping vehicles. By the way, a lot of them are dark Dodge Durangos, black or charcoal gray, and the prefix typically associated with these kidnap vehicles that ICE is using on their license plate is CWW or C, whatever, whatever. So, if you see a dark Dodge Durango, you can call the Rapid Response Hotline number. If you think it might be ICE, the number is (520) 221-4077. Yep. Okay. So, with that I support this in general. I would like to see it go a little bit farther. Thanks.

JA: Thank you. And thank you for bringing Selena into the room today. With that, we will close the public hearing provided there are no other speakers. Okay. Did you fill out a speaker form for this hearing?

BS: I did for the other one, but I can fill it out for this.

JA: Please do.

BS: Okay.

JA: You can do that afterwards and hand it in, so you can speak now.

BS: Okay.

JA: You can hand that in afterwards. Yeah.

BS: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you. Let me get organized here. So, thanks for that comedy show. That was fun. The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States. Every law enforcement officer.

[Audience member talking and interrupting her comments.]

BS: Wow, I feel very unsafe. Now, I feel very, really?

JA: Can we pause for time?

[Audience member continues to make comments as she is escorted out of hearing room.]

BS: Bring it, bring it lady, bring it, honey.

JA: Alright.

BS: Okay. We will start over here. Sorry about that. But it was...Wow, disturbing language. So, every law enforcement officer in the country, me included, for 29 years. The first thing we did was we took an oath to the Constitution and there is something called the Supremacy Clause. So, this ordinance will have no effect on federal law enforcement. So, what you are doing is you are endangering our local law enforcement who need to wear masks in certain situations, who drive unmarked cars in certain situations. So, I do not know why you need to endanger our local law enforcement when our Sheriff's Department is woefully short-staffed. Our Tucson Police Department is also short-staffed and unfortunately, our Pima County Sheriff's Department is the laughingstock of the country. Not thanks to our brave men and women in the Pima County Sheriff's Department, but thanks to our Sheriff that probably most people in this room voted for. Harvard Harris Polling, which is considered to be nonpartisan, shows us that 56% of people want criminal illegal aliens removed from this country. And 78%, I am sorry, 56% want all illegal aliens removed from the country, and 78% want criminal illegal aliens removed from this country. Understand that the law allows for the removal of people in this country illegally, without criminal warrants. And so, as I listen to these speakers, I hope that you understand that you all here have a zero impact on federal law enforcement. Most people want ICE to continue to do their jobs. And again, by entertaining this abject silliness that we are seeing, this overly emotional nonsense, you are endangering our local law enforcement here in Pima County. So again, I hope that I see a proclamation, probably in May, celebrating our law enforcement in Pima County. And I hope that you all say no to this ordinance that will have zero, zero enforceability here in Pima County. Thank you.

JA: And with that, we will close the public hearing and open it up for discussion among the Board. I will note, this was an item that our office had requested that I, as reflected in our discussions both, this goes back in early February and late February. You know, I feel the urgency around addressing this issue, but I also feel the importance of getting it right. As has been noted, right, we have a responsibility to uphold the Constitution and ensure the safety and those constitutional rights of our constituents and all of the County, right. This ordinance as written, serves to protect law enforcement officers and the community from the very real danger of imposters who are going forward as though they are law enforcement, right. And we have seen the dire consequences of that, right. The political killings in Minnesota were conducted by people who were dressed as law enforcement. Widespread reports of bad actors impersonating law enforcement and attempting traffic stops have been occurring across the country. And we also, as the border region, have had periods of vigilantism along the border. What is missing from this draft, I think, is clear and distinct prohibition on the use of masks. While I appreciate the clarity that there should be identification both of an identifying number and an agency, I think that the ordinance, as some speakers have shared, can go farther and should go farther and prohibit the use of masking. The power of federal immigration officers right now is unfathomable, in the sense that U.S. citizens, legal permanent residents, people here with asylum cases are being removed from this country. Mothers are being separated from their children. Grandmothers are being separated from their caring families. The power of those agents to do that, to have that kind of profound effect, is one in which accountability and rule of law and transparency should be applied to. We are experiencing generational trauma here in our community of people both witnessing and experiencing this sort of activity, and particularly done behind masks, in which those who are perpetrating it, are unable to be held accountable. So, with that, I will open it up for other discussion from my colleagues.

MH: If I may?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair Allen, and thank you for bringing this forward. Look, I think it is incredibly important to look at this as an anti-impersonation and a safety ordinance. Masks frighten and divide our community and for the safety of law enforcement, as well as our residents, we really cannot be allowing unidentified, supposed law enforcement officers. That kind of behavior really erodes trust, the necessary trust that we must have in our local authorities. And also, as we heard from one of our speakers here, has an absolutely chilling effect on community reporting, especially crimes like sexual assault, domestic violence, things like this. So, we really are safer as a community when our residents trust and communicate with our law enforcement. And, I do have concerns with providing exemptions, I could dress up in a vest, I could put a mask on and goggles and a hood and put, you know, Jennifer Allen on my vest. Right? You would not know, probably, I do not know. But anyway. But like, I think that we cannot have exemptions that allow for such a large, you know, that does not help. And maybe there are operations, special ops, things like that, that we need to contemplate and look at. But I think it is important not to

have massive exemptions that make it essentially not effective. And it is also important not to just say this is about federal, I mean, we should, this should apply to all law enforcement period. I think that is really important to look at it that way, too. Yeah, I think, so, I appreciate the work that has been done by District 3 and by our attorneys. And I do look forward to supporting the final version, which hopefully is a little bit stronger.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. To follow up on some of the comments made by yourself and Supervisor Heinz, I wanted to ask Mr. Brown if he could share with the Board how the language in the draft ordinance was developed by our attorneys. Because I will go back to something, Chair Allen, that you said at the beginning of the conversation, which is that it is important that we do this right. And so, I would like to get some input from Mr. Brown on behalf of the County Attorney's Office in terms of how some of the language that has been addressed during the hearing today was devised by you and your colleagues.

SB: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, a few things that have been mentioned by speakers and that I will reiterate. These types of ordinances at local levels or at state levels, are becoming more prevalent across the country. So, we have been taking a look at what others are doing, number one. Number two, we have been following case law. This is a novel area of the law. There is a California state bill that is currently being challenged. So, we have been meticulously following that case to try to project what may happen in the future. We are also very, very aware of the Supremacy Clause issues with some of the sort of balancing act of what the law allows, which, as I stated, is unknown because there is very little precedent in this area. The courts are still figuring these questions out. So, in developing the language, we just tried to balance Supremacy Clause issues, issues of local authority, what this Board is authorized to do and not do, and what is the problem that this ordinance is seeking to address, which is at its base, unidentified people, whether they be law enforcement or not? Acting in law enforcement functions in our community.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Brown. And Chair Allen, I would just ask that all of us keep in mind and take into consideration the processes and legal considerations that our attorneys are mindful of as they are drafting this ordinance, before we consider any changes from the dais. I would ask that if we do that, we, prior to making any recommendations, that we ask our attorneys to consider their legal ramifications. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Up in the state legislature, a representative by the name of Sandoval made a very similar proposal to what we are dealing with here today. And it was determined that the proposal she was forwarding would not have affected federal officers who were beyond state regulation. But she wanted to make sure the practice of masking does not spread to state and local officers. If we are trying to do this to ICE officers or

impose this upon ICE officers, it is already announced in the state legislature that such a proposal would not affect federal officers. So, that takes care of that issue, again, the Supremacy Clause. The second thing I found that this ordinance, in this manner that it was proposed today, is really pretty slick because from this point backwards, the whole idea was that it was so bad that ICE officers had masks on because you could not identify them and that they were terrorizing people with these masks. And these masks were causing great consternation. Well, the whole emphasis has now been changed to prevent, and the argument is now, to prevent imposters and that there are the ability for imposters to pose themselves as law enforcement agents if they were masked. I was noting that in our speakers, not one of them brought that up. Not one of them seemed concerned about that, because I think this is a, that is a full-blown strawman theory. The real basis and emphasis on this is, what I believe, is to reveal the officers so people, probably people in this room again, who can find out the individual officer's personal information, his family, his or hers family's information, and they can do what is known as doxing and terrorize and try to beat into submission with such terror, these federal officers, to prevent them from doing the job that they were hired to do, that the Congress has authorized. So, this really is a very good twisting of the emphasis, because I challenge anyone on this Board or in this Administration to present an incident of verifiable proof where an impostor agent wearing a mask created any kind of an act of violence against anyone. I have yet to see that in any of the media, and I challenge, and I, if there is one out there, I would like to see it, but I have yet to see where a masked agent or a masked individual posing as an agent has created an act of terror or violence. And this notion that the community does not want to come forward if there is a situation like a domestic violence or something of that nature, because they are afraid that they will be revealed as illegal aliens, there are anonymous tip lines. They do not have to give their name and address. There is ability to report incidents, and it is well known, everybody knows of all the law enforcement available entities that you could call in anonymously, even get rewards sometimes, and nobody's identity is revealed. So, the final thought is, if there is some way that this ordinance could be enforced or has any teeth, what is being suggested is that other local law enforcement agencies fire or take up their firearms and go after ICE, and we have a battle of law enforcement agencies on Pima County property? That makes no sense at all. So, I would close by asking the County Attorney, Mr. Brown, what is your recommendation at this particular point with this ordinance?

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, we have heard from the public, their public comments, so our recommendation would be to take the input, and if there is going to be a vote, to do so at the next meeting.

SC: I am sorry. Take the input. Do we have to vote to take the input?

SB: Vote on the ordinance at the next meeting, after we have had a chance to digest some of the input.

SC: And is there going to be more reformation of the ordinance or additions? Amendments?

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, it is very possible.

JA: So, I would like to move that the ordinance be revised, that feedback from the public, feedback from the Board, be incorporated into a final version that comes back to the Board at our next meeting for a final vote.

MH: Second.

SC: Madam Chair, discussion?

JA: Supervisor. Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Discussion, Supervisor Christy.

SC: I would suggest that in order to be fully rounded in this whole issue, that there be some reference to protecting law enforcement officers from doxing, but that needs to be addressed because that is the reason why they are wearing masks.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. It has almost been a year, but I am still the new kid on the block. Can you tell me a bit more? I do not know if this is a question for Chair Allen, for Administrator Leshner or for Mr. Brown. The motion that was just presented by my colleague from District 3, isn't that already what we usually have in process as part of the consideration? We are on step two, right? And so, were you asking, Chair Allen, for specific changes or are you, does that, I just want to make sure we are providing our County Attorney with the most ability to gather today's input and come back and I am not sure what the motion is germane to. In other words, Mr. Brown, aren't we already coming back with the revision based on today's ordinance?

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, it is helpful to have a motion from the Board directing that that occur rather than sort of us doing it at our own discretion. We have heard from most of the Board members today. It would also be helpful to hear from each of your offices, if you have input, that you want to pass along to us to consider, in addition with what has been provided by the public, we would be happy to take that.

AC: Thank you for that clarification and I look forward to supporting your motion.

JA: In my understanding, is that we can vote on it today. That was an option. Or we could have it come back to us at our following meeting. So, hence the motion to just clarify that I was suggesting that we not vote on it today, but that we let the feedback percolate its way into a revised version that come back to us at the next meeting, was where I was going. Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen, what particular sections of the draft ordinance are we proposing for consideration for possible revisions because I share Supervisor Cano's concerns, in that I do not understand what we are voting on in terms of directing our attorneys?

- JA: Well, so, my feedback is related to Section 9.25.030 Exemptions. I would like to eliminate, I think eliminate, Section A, that allows an exemption if the law enforcement agency is the, it allows an exemption if the name of the agency and a unique identifier is present, then a mask can be worn. I would like it to be that no masks be worn, and there is a unique identifier, and the name of the agency is visible. So, that is in Section A. That is my primary concern.
- MH: If I may, Chair Allen? I think doing that here, I think the idea is that incorporating everything that we have discussed today and incorporating public comment and coming back to us next time, as well as incorporating your concerns and mine as well, that we monitor what is going on in other jurisdictions and kind of frame things that way. That gives our attorneys the opportunity to pull all that together, and we do not have to kind of, sort of, do it right here at the dais. So, I think that makes sense.
- RS: Can I ask Mr. Brown a point of clarification? Mr. Brown, if it was your opinion as our counsel, based on the legal ramifications of any amendments to the ordinance, that they might weaken or undermine the ordinance in any way, would you be recommending to the Board that we not make any changes to the draft?
- SB: Chair Allen. Supervisor Scott, I guess I will answer that by saying we created the draft that we thought was most defensible by law and carried out what appeared to be the desire of the Chair for putting this item on. And there is nothing, as I sit here today, that would make me change my analysis of the draft that is in front of you now. However, the case in California right now is fast developing. Every time there is an order coming out, in that case, it provides some insight into how courts may interpret laws and ordinances like this. So, it is a rapidly evolving and ever-evolving analysis. But, as I sit here today, I cannot think of a reason to change our initial analysis and the initial language.
- RS: Okay, given that input from our counsel, Chair, Allen, I am not going to be able to support this motion. I was in support of the language of the resolution that we passed. I am in support of our attorneys doing their work in terms of creating an ordinance for our consideration that is going to be legally defensible. And again, based on the input that I just heard from Mr. Brown, I supported the resolution, I intend to support the ordinance, but I cannot support this motion.
- SC: Madam Chair?
- JA: Supervisor Christy.
- SC: I am just suggesting, perhaps, if maybe your motion was withdrawn and we just ask for a continuance. This has not been notified to the public as a draft, today. It is an actual ordinance. Perhaps we could just withdraw the motion to send it to the County Attorney and just ask for a continuance for the County Attorney to bring back his amendments based on the hearings today.
- JA: I think you were absolutely in sync with our Clerk.

SC: Do I need to make a motion? I move that this item be continued and brought back at the next meeting in March, with any revisions that the County Attorney has gleaned from this hearing today.

JA: And I...

RS: Pardon me, Chair Allen. Supervisor Christy, could you add to your motion these words, "That he deems legally defensible."

SC: That you deem legally defensible.

JA: And I will, let us see, do we, can we, do we? I withdraw my motion.

MH: I will second Christy's.

JA: Motion seconded by Supervisor Heinz. All those in favor of? Oh, discussion? Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I especially want to thank the District 3 office for bringing this item to the Board's consideration. As I have mentioned, I also look forward to supporting it in the interest of public safety, I do want to thank members of the public on both sides of the issue, who came out to your local government to make your voice heard, to ensure that as we are navigating uncharted territories, that we are doing this in a manner that is transparent, that we are doing the public's work right here in front of you. And I look forward to the recommendations that come from our legal counsel. Jurisdictions are extremely paralyzed right now with the type of response that is needed. And what I know Pima County is doing is in the interest of protecting our neighbors. And that, to me, at the end of the day, is one of the most important parts of the entirety of this resolution, as proposed as an ordinance, as proposed and I commend my District 3 colleague for navigating this process with us.

JA: All those in favor of the motion related to Ordinance No. 2026-2, to continue? Aye.

RS: Aye.

MH: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: All those opposed? Passes 5-0.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

18. Presentation of Supercharging the Pima Early Education Program (PEEPs) Campaign

Presentation of Supercharging the PEEP's Campaign. Presented by The Preschool Promise and Pima County Community and Workforce Development. (District 1)

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
NS: Nicole Scott, Pima County PEEP's Program Manager
DS: Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community & Workforce Development
CS: Cristie Street, Southern Arizona Leadership Council
PJ: Penelope Jacks, The Preschool Promise
MG: Michael Guymon, Chief Advocacy Officer, The Chamber of Southern Arizona

JA: I would like to go to Addendum Item No. 15, which is a presentation that we are looking forward to about Supercharging the PEEP's Campaign.

MH: It is still Regular Agenda.

JA: Oh, yes. Did I say something different?

MH: You said Addendum.

JA: Oh, Addendum, alright. Sorry. Regular Agenda Item No. 15, Presentation of Supercharging the PEEP's Program Campaign. I would invite up our speakers.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Yes.

RS: Can I make some?

JA: Oh, yes. I am sorry.

RS: That is okay.

JA: It was your item.

RS: No, no. No worries, no worries. It is a long day, that is getting longer. That is what we get for scheduling these joint meetings in conjunction with our own. Chair Allen and colleagues, appreciate the opportunity to hear this presentation because without question, now that we are going into our sixth year with the Pima Early

Education Program scholarships, we would not be here, were it not for the support that the County team has gotten from Preschool Promise. Some of you may know that Preschool Promise came about in the wake of a city election, where there was a measure to provide scholarships to children only within the City, and after that measure went down, people who were in support of the measure came together with people who were not, because all of them shared a belief in the importance of reducing barriers to access to quality early childhood education. Both Supervisor Cano and I have been part of meetings that Preschool Promise has led with representatives from the business community and the non-profit community, the education community, to look for ways to, as the agenda item says, "Supercharge the Early Education Program scholarships." Because although the County has made a commitment every year since it started and will continue to, and we are delighted we have a stable source of funding because of the permission that we have been given from state government to make use of a portion of the secondary property tax that funds the Library District. It is going to take more than just a commitment from the County. It is going to take a wholesale commitment from the rest of the community. I am grateful to Supervisor Cano for calling for the formation of a roundtable group. I understand that that group is going to be having its first meeting very soon. And when I heard about the work that Preschool Promise was doing, I asked if the Board could get a presentation on what they are trying to do to bring more sources of funding into the program. But I ask that that program include participation, I am sorry, that that presentation include participation from our staff so that the Board could see how the efforts of Preschool Promise are working in alignment with Pima County staff, that has done such a tremendous job in advancing these scholarships over, now, as I said, now, going into our sixth year. So, delighted to have with us today, Nicole Scott from the Pima Early Education Program scholarships, Michael Guymon from the Chamber of Southern Arizona, Penelope Jacks from Preschool Promise and Cristie Street from the Southern Arizona Leadership Council (SALC), I am sorry. And Kelly, you are not going to, you are going to let them have all the fun? Alright, a silent partner today. Okay.

CS: Great. Well, thank you, and good afternoon...

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen.

CS: Thank you. My name is Cristie Street, as Supervisor Scott said. I am a working mom. I have employed hundreds of working parents over the past 25 years as a local small business owner. And today, I am here on behalf of Southern Arizona Leadership Council and more than 150 CEOs and senior leaders to voice our support for Pima County's investment in PEEPs. Quality, affordable, early childhood education is not just a social priority, it is economic infrastructure. When parents cannot access reliable, affordable care, businesses face higher turnover, absenteeism and workforce shortages. That is not sustainable for our communities or for our regional economy. Right now, the math simply does not work for most families. In Pima County, full-time ECE often costs more than many families can reasonably manage on typical household incomes. When parents cannot make that equation work, they reduce hours or leave the workforce altogether, and our economy loses talent and momentum. At SALC, we believe public investments

should be accountable, measurable and aligned with economic outcomes. We commend Pima County for taking a fiscally pragmatic approach by leveraging the existing Library District tax as a targeted tool, and we pledge to work with the County and the business community to help scale this effort responsibly. Aligning employer incentives, encouraging private sector participation and ensuring results justified the investment. PEEPs is not simply an expenditure, it is a strategic investment in workforce stability and our long-term competitiveness. Supporting working parents today strengthens our economy tomorrow. A strong community depends on a healthy economy, a healthy economy depends on participation, and participation begins with the ability to work knowing your child is safe and cared for. Supercharging PEEPs is practical and a responsible step for protecting our economic future. And now I will turn it over to my colleagues to tell you more.

PJ: Thank you for having us. It is so nice to be here to talk about something that is going so well. Supervisor Scott, you said nearly everything I needed to say, so I will be kind of quick. As we know that there are not enough government dollars in the world to support this program, just as we would like it to be, which is for every child to have access to high-quality childcare and early education. The earlier you begin, the better. So, if we could start with infants, that would be better. We now serve, you know, less than half the kids who would be eligible, even if three- and four-year-olds, much less younger kids. So, there is a long way to go. And with that long way to go, starting with the library funds that you all have made available and I also want to say before I say anything else, we are not preschool people, we are not library people only, we are literacy and prosperity people and we are mutually in support. Here is the director of your library system, Tessa Mayer, here. We are working together. These are not alternatives; these are synergistic projects. And we support, absolutely support, full funding for both. They should not and will not hurt each other. In any event, the more we thought about it, the more we thought we need a organized way of seeking money from the private sector, from philanthropy and on the national scene. So, we put together Supercharged PEEPs. We have had two of four projected meetings in which people from schools, from philanthropy, from the County, from private sector, big business and small business and advocates and educators have all gotten together to say, how are we making the case at the national level, starting locally with our goal of adding \$1 million to the PEEPs budget for this coming year, \$10 million in the next three years and then the big aspiration \$150 million a year from national donors. So, what we are doing is putting that case together. And that is what Supercharge is about, basically, with participation from every sector. And I have to say, you know, it did not start off easy, but it is now one of the best collaborations I have ever seen in my entire life. Is that fair to say? So, questions? Answers? I hope I have answers.

RS: Chair Allen. I think just in response to Ms. Jacks' question, we usually wait until the end of the presentation for the Board to ask questions.

PJ: Got it. Okay, I am going to turn it over to Michael Guymon.

MG: Thank you, Penelope. Chair Allen, Supervisors, I am Michael Guymon, I am Chief Advocacy Officer for The Chamber of Southern Arizona, and I really appreciate the opportunity that we have to talk about, as Penelope said, the collaboration that we

really have formed. So, from an economic development standpoint, early learning is both an immediate workforce issue and a long-term strategy. When families can find reliable, affordable childcare and preschool, parents can go to work, show up consistently and enroll in training or credential programs, which matters in a labor market like ours that is already tight, and when employers are still competing for talent. Our national partner, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has framed childcare as essential economic infrastructure because breakdowns in childcare lead to absenteeism and turnover, like what Cristie talked about, that directly disrupt business operations. Their research and analysis also notes that States lose about \$1 billion per year, on average, in economic activity due to childcare breakdowns. Here in Arizona, the stakes are especially clear. A recent report estimates \$1.77 billion in lost economic potential, tied to turnover and absences stemming from inadequate access to quality childcare. That is not abstract. Those are missed shifts, stalled career pathways and employers struggling to keep teams fully staffed. At the same time, we have to keep our eye on the future workforce. Simply put, today's students are tomorrow's employees, and early childhood education is where foundational skills and long-term outcomes begin. Nationally, families are also facing rising costs. The U.S. Chamber Foundation has cited, on average, a cost around \$11,000.00 per child, per year. When those costs or shortages force parents out of the workforce, our entire regional competitiveness takes a hit. That is why this work sits squarely on both the national and local agenda for business led workforce solutions. At the state and local level, we are elevating practical approaches that help employers and communities expand childcare and early learning capacity. Locally, we are proud of the collaboration underway. The Chamber and Southern Arizona Leadership Council are working alongside education partners, local government and nonprofits, and we are especially proud to co-sponsor Supercharge PEEPs, building on what PEEPs has already achieved for Pima County families. So, in closing, thank you for your leadership and the progress and the success PEEPs has delivered so far. The business community's commitment is long term, because helping every child get their best start is not only the right thing to do, it is a core strategy for family stability today and shared prosperity tomorrow. Thank you so much. Thank you for your partnership. And here is Nicole.

NS: Good afternoon, Chair Allen, Board of Supervisors, I am Nicole Scott and I manage the PEEPs program here with Pima County. And as it is within our Prosperity Initiative, access to high-quality early childhood education is critical for our workforce, for our families and for our children in their long-lasting benefits. It is our goal as our team, to continue to provide access to as many children as possible, and here in Pima County. We are committed to doing that by partnering with these wonderful folks here, attending monthly meetings, providing programmatic updates and data as necessary to help them make the case and then helping to brain-build and be a thought-partner with them as well, in this process. We are also working internally to have a strategy to accept those philanthropic dollars, as these wonderful folks go out locally, state and nationally to bring those into this program to serve our youngest learners. So, thank you.

JA: Thank you. Questions or comments from the Board? Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I want to start off by saying to my colleague from District 1, your leadership to make PEEPs possible is something that is very heartwarming to me, because I recognize that your role as an educator and the value you bring to this Board has helped create the success that we have had today, working in partnership with our community. I will always love the PEEPs program and the pipeline that we are now creating with our business sector. We have got to think creatively about what kind, as we are recruiting folks, so it is more of a statement for the Chamber and for the business leaders, as we are recruiting, how can we be asking for commitments from some of these entities to pay into a program like this, as part of a good neighbor recruitment strategy? I think that is really important because that is the only way this is going to happen. Taxpayers are already footing a tremendous portion of this, and we need to diversify the funds and I am really grateful that we are doing that. And I just want to applaud the roundtable happening. We look forward, I dream with Penelope to make this as close to universal as possible, because I do not care if you are making \$70,000.00 or \$100,000.00, it is pre-K and it is investment down the road and we need that. Last, I do believe that it is really important that we hold hands with our Library District, because this is the funding source. And so, I will, I am asking our County Administrator and our Library Director to have the Library Advisory Board receive a briefing on the success of the PEEPs program and I have offered to do site visits with the District 5 Library Advisory Board members. We have worked on that. We did one at the Desert Vista Campus at Pima Community College, and I encourage all of the Supervisors to go to your PEEPs sites and to take your Library Advisory Board members so that they can see the cradle-to-career pipeline that we are creating. And I would like to have the Library Advisory Board be briefed prior to the budget adoption, please, but those are my requests. That is my input. Thank you.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Supervisor Cano, thank you very much for your comments. And to follow up on the importance and really the joy that is derived when you visit the sites. I would love to see, and I have said this to Nicole before, more of what you see every day at Canyon del Oro High School, where you have not only a PEEPs program, but you also have high school students who are in early education classes coming in and working with the preschoolers. It is extraordinary. I think it is the only place where we are doing that. Or is it also now at Ironwood Ridge?

NS: Every high school campus that has a PEEPs class. So, CDO, Ironwood, Flowing Wells High School, they all have high school interns that are in the CTE classes, coming in and working with our preschool.

RS: I clearly need to see those other two high schools then, and we will make those arrangements. I just wanted to ask, by way of the Supercharging Plan that I know is a work in progress, is there any kind of preliminary document that you are able to share with the Board in terms of what has happened so far and what next steps are?

PJ: I will use my teacher voice. We do have summaries of the meetings that have taken place. The first one, not quite as good as the second, because the second we had

professional facilitators. But I can tell you what, just very briefly, is at the last one, working groups were created about one, publicity, one, making the case in the data gathering, working with the County, all kinds of different groups. And those groups are now meeting and we will put together the next piece. So, no money has come in yet. But we have begun the process of asking for it, using the materials that the working groups are creating. Does that help?

RS: It does. And we will look forward to hearing more as things get more fleshed out. I wanted to ask Ms. Scott and perhaps also Administrator Lesher, in terms of the County's partnership in support of what Preschool Promise is trying to achieve with their Supercharging Campaign. What have been our chief contributions and roles?

NS: Sure, absolutely. So, Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we attend the monthly meetings and provide programmatic updates. We also participate in the working group. So, I, myself, participate in the data working group because the data they need comes from our program operations and then our own, Nicole Fyffe, also participates in one of the policy groups, our own, our marvelous, wonderful Nicole Fyffe, because she has that policy mindset and the relationship between the County and the advocacy group as well. We have also internally, because we are expecting to get philanthropic dollars from this group and the hard work they are doing, we are working with our agency, United Way of Southern Arizona, as they now hold the Accelerate Quality program that has worked in partnership with philanthropic dollars for PEEPs. We are working with them to see if we need to create a memorandum of understanding for when more dollars come in, in tandem. Also working to see what we can do as a department level with Community Workforce Development. And Mr. Sullivan can speak more to that, if you want to hear. But creating a Friends of CWD to take on philanthropic dollars, as well to use for programs within the CWD Department. So, we are trying to do those two things at once, to ensure that when those dollars start to come in, we, as the County, are able to help facilitate those and get those out to our children.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Scott. Chair Allen, if I may, Ms. Fyffe and Director Sullivan, since you were both referenced in Ms. Scott's remarks, anything that you wanted to add to what she had to share with the Board?

DS: Chair Scott, members of the Board, I think we are both good.

RS: Alright. Thank you and Ms. Lesher, anything that we left out in terms of the work of your team.

JL: I will just, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, and thank you, just for the recognition of not only the work of the entire community group, but, particularly, Nicole Scott and Nicole Fyffe are the Nicole team that have been extraordinary in keeping this moving and how much that is appreciated. So, thank you.

RS: Thank you. And Chair Allen, thank you.

JA: Oh no, thank you. And I had some comments I was going to share. But you know it has all been said. So, sum it up with a thank you. You are doing amazing work and it makes us all proud and proud to be part of it. So, thank you.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

25. Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan

Staff recommends adoption of the Pima County 10-year Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
SB: Sophia Blue, Division Manager, Community & Workforce Development
CP: Chris Poirier, Director, Development Services

JA: We are going to move to an item. We are a smidge late. I apologize and appreciate the patience of staff for Regular Agenda Item No. 22, the Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan. I believe we have a presentation.

JL: We do. And if I may, Chair Allen, and I think Dan or Sophia, an intro, thank you. Sophia Blue is here from CWD and will introduce and guide us through the presentation with our colleagues. Thank you.

SB: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisors. I am here to present on a plan that we are putting forward to you today, that has been a long time in the making. One of my slides will show a timeline. The Pima County 10-year Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan, and it is a collaborative framework designed to coordinate efforts across jurisdictions, organizations and sectors, to address critical housing shortages and stability challenges. It serves as a regional roadmap, aligning the County's role as a funder and convener with the land use and zoning authorities of cities, towns and tribal governments. This process started back in October of 2024. As you can see, we had, I think, kick off, I think Nicole said it was March of 2025 that we kicked it off with you all. And since we started, we had a housing needs assessment, and we had a target market analysis. We also, throughout this process, brought the Regional Housing Commission along with us, including having them participate in a work group. We had lots of engagement with community members, with stakeholders, housing advocates, housing organizations, non-profit, for-profit developers, developers of market rate housing, all the way across the housing continuum. Now we find ourselves at our final plan, final 10-year Housing Strategy Funding Plan. And if I could go to the next slide, please. The plan includes five goals and 27 strategies. We have \$250 million from the BOS Policy D 22.17. We anticipate a \$163 million in anticipated state and federal funding. So, over the 10-

year period, we are looking at \$413 million funding plan. Really, one of the things that we are excited about or I am excited about, is the community revitalization areas. So that Community Revitalization Plan will really help to bring people, developers over the finish line with their low-income housing tax credit applications, and all of their applications for other funding to put these projects together. We, in the plan, have the roles and responsibilities of not only Pima County, but also the cities and towns and nonprofits and for-profits. And then we also have targets and metrics. Next slide, please. This is the County's role. We wanted to be clear about what the County's role in this is, because we are not expecting the County to do everything. Strategic policy setting and regional coordination, which we have already begun. Development services, public land and infrastructure, housing stability and eviction prevention, which CWD has already been doing a fair, more than a fair amount in that space. Workforce development also CWD and being a funding partner for all the efforts for affordable housing. Next slide, please. Okay. I think this is where I am going to turn it over to our Development Services Director Chris Poirier. So, we can talk about the things that he knows about best.

CP: Very good. Thank you.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Pardon me for interrupting, but, and pardon me for interrupting the start of your presentation Mr. Poirier, but, Ms. Blue, with regard to the targets and metrics on this slide, how often will the Board be updated on the progress towards achieving those targets and metrics and is it conceivable that any of them could be adjusted up or down?

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisors, that is, the answer is anytime you want an update, and, yes. What I will say is that we do have a goal of giving you regular quarterly updates, in whatever form you would like them. And then, of course, targets and metrics are going to have to be adjusted over the course of the 10-year plan, and we will keep you apprised of that.

RS: Appreciate that. Thank you, Chair Allen.

CP: Very good. Chair, members of the Board, want to quickly highlight some of the information on this slide. I heard at the earlier, I was listening to the Joint Board of Supervisors/Mayor & Council Meeting, many of you know this, I heard some of you even offering the data from this slide, which is great to see. So regionally, these are regional metrics, we need over 6,000 units per year. Along with that, we need to increase housing choice, increase the different types of housing and also increase where they need to be. In addition to it, huge effort in keeping people currently housed, housed. So, one thing I want to really make clear is when we are talking about something like ratio of multi-family to single-family housing, or greater emphasis on density and infill, that is not at the expense of what we are currently doing. It is not at the expense of what the region has been producing for over 60

years. It is in addition to, so, most of the efforts in here are in addition to, and leveraged beyond just what we are doing, right, we want to open up more opportunities for more people, in more places, and not at the expense of the current development industry. Next slide, please. This was not done in a silo. There was significant work with, done by the ECONorthwest consultant team, working with lots of different, affected County departments, multiple housing commissions, stakeholders throughout the region, including nonprofits and the for-profit community. They have all participated and a lot of outreach at community events. Next slide, please. Quick highlight of where we are at. So, at the end of February, the Commission recommended the plan to advance before you. There were a few slight tweaks that were made that are captured in the record presented to you today, and want to reiterate the fact that the County is committed to working with some of our most core stakeholders, SAHBA and TAR, to implement their ideas. Their ideas are very complementary to a lot of the strategy, strategies and goals that are in this plan or in other County plans as well. So, we are firmly committed to working with them to implement their goals.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. To that point Mr. Poirier, I wanted to direct a question to you or perhaps to Administrator Leshner, whoever she would want to designate, the Board received, and I appreciate that it was attached to the County Administrator's memorandum of February 27th, and we also received them directly, very extensive, very detailed letters from both the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association and the Tucson Association of Realtors. It was noted by you in this presentation and also by Ms. Leshner in her memo to the Board, that staff are committed to working with both organizations during implementation. I really would like some more substance shared with the Board, in terms of the very detailed recommendations that were made by both organizations, and which ones are most likely to be taken up, moving forward. I am not expecting or anticipating an answer to that very broad question right now, but I think given the detailed nature of the correspondence from both organizations, I would like to know, and I imagine other members of the Board would like to know, what specific recommendations from those two organizations are most likely to be taken up, as we work with them towards implementation. The heads of both organizations are our members of the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. Both of them voted to advance the plan. I would like to know, and again, I think other members of the Board would like to know, specific to their recommendations, which ones are most likely to be taken up, which ones may not be.

CP: Chair, Supervisor Scott, I would like to give some response to that, to get on the record...

RS: Certainly.

- CP: ...because it is very important. You are right. We are not just saying this loosely. We are committed. So, there is a theme throughout, both from SAHBA and TAR, asking for a recommitment to our review time frames, right, time is money. If we are taking extra long, doing a review on the permit, everyone pays more for it. Whether it is an affordable housing project or a market-rate housing project. So, we are committed to working with them, reaffirming and recommitting to our turnaround and review times. They have also both asked for greater transparency with tracking that goal, right. So similar to a question you asked earlier, during this meeting, about how often will you see the data? So, we are looking to work with them to also try to push out our data to provide a dashboard or in my mind, more of a scoreboard about how we are doing, meeting the time frames. And then there is another element we saw on both about really looking to explore more buildability of land. You know, another word for it is maybe density. We are committed to doing that. So, at the very least, we will put that on the record of things we will work with both SAHBA and TAR on.
- RS: You know, I am encouraged and not surprised to hear that response. I apologize, Ms. Leshner. Go ahead.
- JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, what we will do, I appreciate Mr. Poirier's comments, I know I would like to ask Mr. DeBonis to add a couple of comments, but we will get back to you with an almost point by point, happy to go through the comments made. But you have heard the general tenor, and I know Mr. DeBonis has worked with them quite a bit as well, and would like to give him an opportunity, if I might.
- RS: Yes, ma'am.
- CD: Thank you, Ms. Leshner and Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott. So I spoke with David Godlewski at SAHBA when that letter came in from them ahead of the Regional Affordable Housing Commission consideration of the plan, and what he indicated to me is he felt it important to go ahead and get those items on the record, that he is fully supportive of the plan, as he voted in favor of it. I did not speak with Shawn Cote from Tucson Association of Realtors, but also take their input, you know, very seriously. And so I think what, two things, what David pointed out to me from SAHBA's perspective is that this is a regional plan and that while Pima County has worked closely with the association and accomplished some of those things that are on the lists, the time frames, for example, that Mr. Poirier spoke of, they would like to see some regional conversation and attention given to that. The second thing I talked with him about was putting together a matrix of those items so that we can track them, and that will be an important tool for us to identify things that we can do, right. This one we can do, and here are the steps, and then we got it done. There may be things that they have suggested or asked for, that we come back and say, you know, we do not think the way you have suggested it, is something that we can accomplish, but we think we can get to the same outcome through a different means, and have that conversation. And then there may be certain things, you know, to one of your requests that we say that is something that we are not prepared to do. But, I think having the visibility of that will enable us to track

progress, not only with those entities, but report that back to the Board. So, thank you for giving me the opportunity to just comment.

RS: Thank you, Mr. DeBonis. And thank you, Ms. Leshner. Chair Allen, if I could just sum up by saying this, when we have been talking about the need to increase housing stock in our community, not just at the affordable level, but at the workforce and market rate and other levels, as well. We have talked about some of the roles that government can play. And one of them, this Board and County staff have led on, and that has been making use of gap funding to get more affordable housing onto the market. And I think we are right around, what, 6,000 additional units or am I lowballing that number?

AC: Six.

RS: Is it? Is it six? Thank you. Another one is to get more publicly owned parcels of land, County-owned parcels of land out onto the market. And that was a point of discussion when your team met with District 1 staff. And I know it was something that was emphasized by both SAHBA and TAR in their letters to the Board. But, another big point of emphasis in terms of what government can do is being very thoughtful and deliberative in examining our own regulatory processes in terms of getting more housing on the market, more quickly. And that was an overarching theme, obviously, of the letters from both organizations. I am not surprised, given our track record of staff working in partnership with our stakeholder groups, that you have already had those conversations. I am not surprised, given their commitment, that both Mr. Godlewski and Mr. Cote voted to move the plans forward, and I really am looking forward to hearing about how we are working with both of these organizations to address those issues and the critical overarching issue of supply. So, thank you very much, and Chair Allen, thank you.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: The \$250 million over ten years provided by the County, where is that coming from?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, that is an allocation based on \$0.03 stacked each year from the property taxes.

SC: Property taxes.

JL: Yes.

SC: General Fund?

JL: Yes, sir.

SC: So it is coming out of the General Fund based on property taxes. Now, we have heard a lot about how we have all this collaboration with organizations SAHBA,

TAR, etc., and commissions and committees and things of that nature. That is all well and good. And I think if you dug deep into some of those organizations, they would have to feel rather reluctant to get into such a deep program. Perhaps they feel like they are forced to, or else there might be ramifications from the County down the road. I do not know, but one thing that I find most egregious in this whole process, and I voiced these, when this first came before the Board, is that if you talk to "Joe Average" or "Mary Pima County Taxpayer," they have no idea that the funding for this \$250 million, 10-year program is coming out of their property taxes and the General Fund, they have not been consulted. There have been no public hearings. There should be County-wide public hearings on this and presentations to the community, to the public, to the taxpayers, not the commissions, not the boards, not the organizations, but to the taxpayers. And let them know, that when you open up your tax bill and you see a property tax increase coming up, a lot of it is due because you are paying for somebody else's housing, to subsidize some contractors, building at your expense. And that has never been addressed. It has never been taken into consideration. And it is, I think, this Board is compelled to get more general public input and to expend and to send out more information to the public, so they are aware on this. After 20 or 30 years of paying for a mortgage and having a nest egg build for your retirement years, or to do other things with that money, it is all accrued and you have paid off your home, and of course, you are still renting from the County with property tax that you still owe. You open your tax bill after all of that, and you see it being increased on an annual basis for perhaps 10 years, the length of this program. And you are realizing that the reason why is because you are paying for somebody else's housing, you are paying for some contractor subsidization. That is not fair and that is not correct. And that needs to be explained to the public in County-wide public hearings and information-gathering sessions on this before this is enacted. Because I will tell you, that they do not care about SAHBA or TAR or commissions or boards. They care about when they open up their tax bill and they see it going up all the time because they are subsidizing somebody else's housing.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Yes. And Supervisor Christy, to that. Are you asking that this would be in addition to or different than the three, at least three Board meetings that we had discussing this very item? The countless people who attended, the people who submitted letters, the people who called our office, who weighed in on this exact topic?

SC: I have said this before, that the general public does not know the details of this. And before it goes into any more of a process, the general public should be notified of this, that their tax bill will be going up because out of their property taxes, they are paying for all these projects. And I guarantee you, if they knew that, they would be dead set against it.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. Supervisor Christy, you recognize that this Board has not increased the primary property tax over the last two years? And correct me if I am wrong, did you vote for the budget last year?

SC: I voted for a portion of it.

AC: Right. You voted for, not the secondary, but for the primary, which is the source of funding that you are now criticizing for the three-cent annual allocation for affordable housing. So, your fingerprints are on this as well, Supervisor Christy, and this is a good investment for our region. When we have 6,000 units a year that need to be built for us to keep up with demand for a growing County, when we do not have programs that Republican administrations and Republican legislatures have provided to jurisdictions like low-income housing tax credits at the federal and state level, when that funding is no longer there, opportunity zones. What other solutions are we going to have at the table other than just saying no, no, no? I believe that if you are a fiscal conservative, you will pay attention to the fact that increasing housing supply is going to help bring down costs and whether that is market-rate or affordable housing we have a responsibility to be at that decision-making table. And I commend our staff for developing a 10-year plan to be able to do exactly that. There is no other jurisdiction that is leading in the way that we can. And thank goodness we are, because we are not waiting on the state legislature. We are not waiting on Washington D.C. Instead, we are saying we are going to help lower costs and we are going to help mitigate some of these needs that are happening right here, right now. And I do not believe it is fair to say that the non-profit sector that is doing the good work, that is doing God's work to house people, are being held hostage by any one of these Board members for funding. This is good economic development. And what I will say that we really need to focus on at this point as a region is figuring out, to my colleague from District 1, what parcels does the County and the City hold on to right now that we can encourage for market rate and affordable housing? I am more interested now in the next iteration of this plan. As we figured out the affordable housing portion, how we can look at other cities and what they have done. I mean, the University of Arizona and Arizona State University, when they have used parcels that they own to be able to have dense apartments that are being built up, that is also a big part of the solution. And I know that Mr. DeBonis has parcels from the Rio Nuevo District. I do not think the public, the private sector realizes that they too, actually can tap into some of this stop-gap financing and can be a part of that 6,000 solution. And so, we have got to do it both ways. And I just am really encouraged by the hard work. I know that this took a lot of effort. One of my, you can tell it is 4:00 p.m., one of my favorite things to have done when I was in grad school was look at the housing affordability strategy for Tucson, which is the City's adjacent version. And I am just so glad that I can now be able to be a champion for the investment that we are doing as a County with this new 10-year plan. And my last appeal is that we have got to work hand in hand with our federal delegation to be able to bring some more resources our way. And that, you know, we know HUD is being slashed left and right, but the congressionally directed spending projects that are super important to our County should be prioritized in the next phase of all of this. I look forward to those conversations with majority

members and minority members in Congress to be able to bring more resources back to southern Arizona. Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair. Just to quickly respond to Supervisor's comments, then I am assuming you would support me in holding Countywide public hearings on this matter?

AC: Supervisor Christy, Chair Allen, we already do that as part of the budget process.

SC: No, I am talking about, in every district at some point throughout the County, just like we did with the chemical company that was here five years ago.

AC: I do not know what the point of your question is, Supervisor Christy.

SC: The point is, would you be willing to have public conversations and public meetings to explain this situation? It is pretty clear. It is not hard to understand.

AC: Why? What are you? What more additional...

SC: ...Alright, I will take that as a no.

AC: No, I...

JA: I am going to move us along, if I may. So, I wanted to say that I am super thankful for the Regional Affordable Housing Commission for Community and Workforce Development, for Development Services and for all of the County staff who have put in incredible hard work in thinking this plan through, from the level of high-level goals through implementation. I am, there were a couple of things that I just wanted to highlight. So, you know, just to be clear, I believe that housing is just a basic human right. Everyone needs housing and we see, we just left a meeting largely focused around justice services and the unhoused. We have seen what happens in a community and to people when they are unhoused and have housing instability. So, this investment is so important in a similar context to thinking about preschool, the investments upfront to creating stability in people's lives benefits our community in ripple, upon ripple, upon ripple effect. So, thank you for this incredibly important work. A few things to just tease out, because I think it reflects the complexity of the plan. Because while the plan does talk about expanding the housing supply and the diversity, the types of affordable housing, I appreciate that it also names expanding the workforce, right, and ensuring that we have got, are supporting workers to access training and quality jobs in construction and trades to ensure that we have got the construction and trades workforce to be able to meet the demand and the need and the gaps for affordable housing. It also talks about the tools to keep people in their homes, work that we have been leading on, and that has been incredibly successful from eviction prevention and tenant legal services, emergency rental and utility assistance, home repair and weatherization and increasing enrollment in property tax relief programs. Also appreciate that the plan reflects the need to help people get housed, including supporting rapid rehousing and bridge housing. So, the plan also acknowledges that within the context of the County, we

have an incredible diversity of communities, and the housing needs within each of those communities is incredibly distinct. Within the Community Revitalization Plan, there is a highlight of ten different areas in which to target investment and development of affordable housing. Seven of those ten areas are in District 3, so I appreciate the acknowledgment of those unique places and those needs within the district and across the County. I want to thank my Board members, who have been really pivotal in laying the foundation so that we can get this plan in place, this strategy and the funding plan. And I look forward to tracking its successful implementation and impact across the County. So, thank you.

SC: Monsanto, that was the name of the company.

JA: Any other comments? So, I will move the item.

MH: Second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

RS: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Opposed?

SC: No.

JA: Motion passes 4 to 1.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

32. Recommended Use of Project Blue Land Sale Proceeds

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the recommended use of Project Blue land sale proceeds.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator

JA: I am going to move us to our, last but not least, final item, which is Addendum Item No. 5, Recommended Use of Project Blue Land Sales.

JL: Can we, would you want me to give you a little, just to, where this came from...

JA: Yes, please.

JL: ...Thank you. If I could, and thank you, I want to share a bit about what the process was, what we went through, how we got to these recommendations before you today. Looking at, historically, we have received feedback from other Boards. It is not been a formal policy of the Board, but we have been provided with suggestions that as an overall guideline, when dollars are, when we, the benefit of dollars that come into the County from economic development programs, ultimately, have some positive impact on the economic development effort. So that is one thing we looked at. We did then really recognize the unique nature of the public participation in this project, and therefore, really realized the need to focus on environmental issues, on health issues, on things that we heard a lot about during the discussions on Project Blue, that would be potentially or possible negative impacts on the community. We went back to all the CIP projects. We looked at capital projects before us today. We looked at all the dream requests, and we went through the supplemental requests to see what were issues that had been presented to us and how we might be able to look at that with these dollars. We recognize that these are one-time dollars, but we also recognize the fact that when built out, we have estimated \$5.8 million a year that will continue to come into the County, as a result of the property tax for Project Blue. That obviously ramps up, \$5.8 is the average that we believe we will be receiving on an annual basis. But in the beginning, it is much less than that, which is why we looked at some of the ongoing costs, some of the positions being recommended for use of the one-time funding, projecting it for three years. So that that ramps us up until the time that then dollars can be, those projects would be funded by the actual income that is coming in from the project, from the property tax on that project. That makes sense, because I am never a fan of one-time money

being used for ongoing situations, but this is the desire to connect it then to the project in an ongoing basis, recognizing that there would not be the dollars right in the beginning. So that is the conversation that came through because all of our departments had weighed in in their supplemental and dream requests, we were able to really, in effect, work with the departments as we looked at those issues, so that is how you got what is before you today. Obviously, if the overall guidelines or the structure is approved, still work to do in that we have, if you look at neighborhood reinvestments or special funds, assuming we would be coming back to the Board with additional policy direction and guidelines requested so that we know what are those steps, what does that look like? How would those specific projects, how would we allocate those additional dollars? But we will ramp out any kind of process or program or policy following any adoption of it by the Board. So, I just wanted to provide a little how we, how we got here, why these from whence it came? Thank you.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thanks. Could I ask the County Administrator a follow-up clarification question?

JA: Sure.

RS: Just to be clear, for the public and media, the three categories that are going to be funded for three years by land sale proceeds are economic development, intergovernmental relations and workforce development. And then after the three years, we will use expected proceeds from the property tax revenues from Project Blue to fund those ongoing expenses?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, that is correct.

RS: Okay, then a connected question, when do we expect to start receiving money from the developer for workforce development, as they pledged in the agreement with us?

JL: Excuse me, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, have we gotten information on that? The timing, I do not, it might be Mr. DeBonis or Mr. Cuaron.

CD: So, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, so you are talking not about the sales proceeds, but the dollars that were the community investment?

RS: Yes, sir, I am.

CD: So, I do not have an update on the timing of that. We will have to come back to the Board with that information.

RS: I appreciate that. Thank you, Chair Allen.

MH: One quick...

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair. Any that, the \$5.8 million ongoing that we think starts in three years, we know starts in three years, that does not involve anything with regard to the Town of Marana approved 600-acre, second hyperscale data center site, is that correct?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz, that is correct. This is looking at simply property tax that we are estimating from the Project Blue development.

MH: Perfect. And I guess Chair and Administrator Leshar, I would just be curious to know, I know it is a different timeline, but that we should be also collecting significant amount of property taxes from that location assuming it moves forward as well. So, I would love to see some of those estimated numbers in the future when those can be brought forward.

JL: Thank you.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Administrator Leshar, I am really grateful for everything that you have recommended in this memo. This was a project, as you know, that I did not support, but I see the investment potential, both in one-time and ongoing expenditures. This Board has been asking for additional investment to support small businesses in our economic development team and grow the people power in that department. We have been asking for us to focus on how we are working with our federal and state partners, that request is in here. We have not seen, since the voters approved a bond, a proposal from Administration on neighborhood reinvestment. Thank you for doing that. Because neighborhood reinvestment means infrastructure, that is playgrounds, sidewalks, improvements for communities that are often underserved, environmental health initiatives, the ability for us to link our community workforce development teams with the incredible programming that we have in our Flood Control District, working to ensure that we are taking care of our lands and supporting youth, giving them jobs. Workforce development will continue to be a priority as we work to create jobs in our region, and I will say that the other areas, I am less excited about, because I do not know too much about them yet, particularly the Capital Improvement Projects. But I recognize where you are trying to use one-time funds for existing resources, and I see elements here in at least the \$10 million that you are proposing in solar, open space preservation at Canoa Ranch, ensuring that the amenities are there, digital equity with the Middle Mile, as well. And so, I will say that I look forward to supporting these recommendations. And I want to thank you for looking for an opportunity for us to come together on, after a difficult moment in our County's story. And what I will just say is that we do need to have a greater conversation with the public about what this economic development is going to mean down the road as we grow with the County, as this department grows. I really want us to stay focused on supporting the businesses that are already here, looking for opportunities to support small businesses, whether that is financing, whether it is

technical assistance, whether it is space allotments, using County facilities. That, to me, is an opportunity for us to alleviate any concerns that we are going to go after more data centers. And I have received affirmation from this Administration on this dais that the County is not pursuing additional data centers in our recruitment strategy for economic development. So, Administrator Leshner, thank you. Between the Pima Early Education Program scholarships, PEEPs, and particularly the \$2 million investment we are going to be making on neighborhood reinvestment, which District 5 neighborhoods benefit from. And indeed, all of our districts do as well. I am looking forward to these one-time and ongoing dollars making a significant impact in Pima County.

JA: I also want to echo the thanks to the County Administrator for getting the ball rolling on how best to use the \$20 million from Project Blue and the land sale. I appreciate that the funding plan is connected to the Strategic Plan, the Prosperity Initiative and One Pima. You know, I think clearly this, the use of the money because it is tied to the fact that we opened up the door for data centers, it touches a nerve in the community, as well as for me. So, it is good that there is something out, right, for the community to be able to respond to and for our office to react to and to give some feedback. I wanted to share a few initial, kind of, recommended changes. So, you know, I am not confident that the utility companies' assurances that residents are not going to be stuck shouldering increased utility rates as data center electricity demands continue to expand. So, I would like to see some dedicated funds to expanding funding for utility assistance and weatherization programs that are housed within our housing strategy and acknowledging that this is already a stress point for our communities, and I think we can anticipate that it will become greater. I would also want to make sure that we are staying kind of true to the Prosperity Initiative in how we think about neighborhood investment. And so, specifically, if for neighborhood reinvestment and Prosperity Initiative, prosperity notes that the focus should be on high poverty and rural communities. So, I want to make sure that as we think about neighborhood investment that we are advancing prosperity in those particular areas. Relatedly, prosperity also has shown that or, you know, that the research has shown that around workforce development, that apprenticeship programs that result in good paying jobs, right, that, that end, that impact needs to be kind of at the forefront of the workforce development investment. Around the environmental health category, which I am very glad to see is in there, I would like to see how it can be utilized, some funding could be utilized to bolster our air quality compliance. We have at least one area, potentially more in the County that are out of compliance. I would like to see that we have got the capacity to be able to get us a nice, squeaky clean report card from the, I think it is the American Lung Association. Also related to that, I would love to be able to see how we can expand our code enforcement capacity, so that we have more eyes and ears on the ground in unincorporated Pima County as to what is happening. And it is one of the things that we hear most often, of limited capacity of County and requests for more. Also, you know, after being caught off guard, I think, by Project Blue, last year, we put in place some, several policies that address some of the blind spots and how economic development projects move forward in the County, what is included, not in NDAs, having sunshine periods, public and sharing information analysis, etc. So, I would like, and this may not be something that comes out in a line item, but we

have a robust Due Diligence policy and I am concerned that we do not have the capacity to be able to implement it to its fullest extent. And so if there is a need for money to ensure that, you know, if we can put money at that problem to ensure that we are doing the due diligence in the way that it has been outlined in that policy, then by all means, I would like to make sure that at least through that land sale money, we are guaranteeing that the due diligence process is going to be successful and robust as intended. And then I think last around, the economic development items, I think I am, would like to say I appreciate that there is investment in business retention and expansion, and my hope is that that is focused on sort of our small, medium businesses in our community. For the focus on foreign direct investment, I have, I think I asked this in the last time, and I will note that the Board has voted that down, and myself, my comments at that time were like, I get the concept, on the surface it makes absolute sense, right, like, Mexico is right down the road, however, I would like to see the evidence, right, of how, if and how foreign direct investment programs are successful, what are the models in which it is worked and in which models does it not work? Because I do not want us to be duplicative with, because there is a landscape of many organizations and chambers and commerce authorities, etc., that are in that space, and I just want to make sure that we have figured out what is the approach to foreign direct investment that is successful, if there is research evidence that points that out and let's do that. But I just need to know that before, you know, give that my own blessing. So, with that all said, I would like to move that we continue this item to the next meeting on March 23rd, 23rd? 24th?

RS: 24th.

JA: 24th. And that is also to give the community more time. This did come out on Friday. And so, you know, it has been sort of a quick turnaround. It is a sizable chunk of revenue, and it is related to an issue that has been kind of a hot spot in the community. So, I would move to continue it to the next item.

SC: I will second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Christy. Any further discussion?

RS: Chair Allen, I appreciate all of your thoughtful comments. And I think there is a way of ensuring that they are addressed within the categories, as described and as funded. So, speaking personally, I am willing to approve the item today and do not see the necessity in pushing it forward three weeks. But I think there are ways of incorporating, as I said, your concerns and thoughts, and I saw the County Administrator writing quickly while you were going through them, within the capacity of the recommended categories and how they are implemented.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: This is a big pile of money and I think it requires some reflection and discernment. And to make the recommendations that the County Administrator has put forward,

basically, law at that, if we vote for it, I think is a little bit jumping the gun. I notice in the cold proposal that we are spending money that is forecast, in other words, potentially, we do not know for sure. And I maybe like to see some recalculation of what this might look like without the potential forecast of the money. For instance, what if the developer ends up not building a data center and doing something else that is within the zoning? How does that, how could it affect the property tax revenue? Also, we are creating in-house positions for economic development, after we just gave, what, \$500,000.00, \$700,000.00 to the chamber for that. Now we want to have another \$150,000.00 position for three years. I think there is a lot of issues that, you know, after a while, all it adds up to is money. And I would like to have an opportunity to have a more reflective discussion on the particulars, because these are pretty broad topics and we do not really know exactly what they are, so I support the Chair's motion to continue, and that is why I seconded it.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. I love it when the far left and the far right are kind of coming together. It is cool. So, physically as well. So, okay, Chair and Administrator Leshar, can you just share with us? My understanding is this has been a process for a number of weeks, and that you were working with a lot of departments on this. This was not like a, you did this on Thursday and vomited out on Friday, kind of thing. It was, can you just tell us about how the process happened just so we can hear publicly, kind of, what that process was a little bit.

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz. Again, we looked at comments that had been made from the dais, as I say, about connecting economic development to economic development. Primarily, what we did was sit and go through the Capital Improvement Project, you know, your CIP budget, looking at all the capital projects on the list today, we looked at all of the dream requests and the supplemental requests that came in from the different departments that we, at this point, did not anticipate being able to fund or make it into the recommended budget. As we begin to draft that, looked at those, because those were the programs or projects that had come to us from all the different departments, and then looked at the overlay of making sure, as I say, because of the, sort of the unique conversation that came around Project Blue, how are we aligning it up with need within the community? Looking at some of the neighborhood reinvestment, for example, or how will this, will there be an interest in the Board in aligning it closely to neighborhoods and areas that might be more impacted by the project, by Project Blue. We looked at, you will see solar lighting, things that we hoped that of the capital, the extensive list of potential capital projects, those that we felt had a nexus with the environment, environmental health and things of those nature. So that was the conversation that has taken place for several weeks, several weeks between the Deputy County Administrators, me and our Finance team.

MH: Great. Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair, one other item I was just remembering. It would be nice to have maybe a quick presentation from some of the department heads that are in charge of the deep infrastructure of the County that needs funding for some immediate improvements or repairs or maintenance or something that they do not have access to, and that is being deferred and deferred. I am sure there are plenty of issues that need immediate attention that this money could take care of, and ease some pressure and give the community the services that we are supposed to be giving them. So, I would like to hear from those as well, I am sure maybe you already talked to some of them.

JL: And what I made sure, Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, as you have heard, we plan to bring the capital budget to you at the next meeting and that will reflect, I hope it shows in that, all of the departments' requests and many of the departments prioritized their requests...

SC: And that comes next meeting?

JL: The next meeting, the 24th. Yes, sir.

SC: All the more reason to continue.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: I do not know if I am going to have support for this, but in the interest of compromise, I like to motion to approve the item, with the exception of the capital improvements line item that will allow flexibility for other priorities to be considered. And I do believe that part of the message that I am hearing is, are there other opportunities for us to look externally with mitigation, instead of looking internally for CIP projects? And so I am going to offer that as a motion. And with the understanding that the CIP budget may be reduced, and we maybe need to have a conversation about where that, where those proposals by the Administrator are going to be prioritized and what additional sources of funding we possibly have, how the budget that was already going to be voted on, with the CIP budgets to Supervisor Scott's point would be mitigated. So, I am going to offer that as a friendly motion, substitute motion.

MH: I will second your substitute motion, Supervisor Cano.

JL: If I may Chair Alan, just if, if this were to go forward, if I could ask for a friendly amendment to it, that if the Board approves this, that you also approve our movement of those dollars that were received into the General Fund, into Special Revenue Fund, so that it can then be allocated? Because we need your approval to move it out of General Fund.

AC: Yes.

JL: Thank you.

MH: And seconded.

JA: So just to clarify, it is approving, which line items are excluded?

AC: The CIP, which is the largest amount and where I think there might be better flexibility for other recommendations.

JA: I guess the piece that is, that gets lost is the fact that this has been, this was made public, right, and shared out on Friday, today is Tuesday, and in, given the high degree of community interest around and engagement around Project Blue, we missed the opportunity for the public to weigh in, you know, letters and phone calls, people to look at it, share their two cents, because I think in that we get other ideas, creative solutions, things that are consistent from, you know, how the money is coming in to how the money is going out. So that piece gets lost, if we, if we move forward and even with the carving out capital improvement, then we are, you know, kind of tinkering with capital improvements, but we are sort of missing then the flexibility to be able to incorporate and think through community input.

AC: Administrator Leshner, is there any, Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano, go right ahead.

AC: Administrator Leshner is there, do you have a preference on timeline at this point, given the Board's discussion?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano. I do not, around the timing, but I would be, we had told you we would come back with recommendations, we have spent, jeepers, a good six weeks working through recommendations. You have those. So, it would, we would be looking for is just then making sure that we had some feedback of where you want this modified.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. Given that we are now discussing Supervisor Cano's substitute motion, I just have to say that with respect to his motion and also the one made previously, I am not able to support either, as the County Administrator has said, we have been told that this has been going to be a project of County Administration since the land sale was finalized on Christmas Eve. And so, I am comfortable with the recommendations that have been made to us, given not only the fact that we have known this has been in the works since the end of December, but also because I think a lot of the concerns of everybody on this dais are incorporated into these recommendations and the categories addressed. So, I respect the concerns of all four of my colleagues, that they might have. But I am comfortable with the package as it was presented to us. And it does not come as any particular surprise to me in its content or details, because I, although our office did not offer or ask for any input into the recommendations, I knew that they were in the works. Just like I knew that Mr. DeBonis and Ms. Leshner were taking point in terms of the negotiations with

Project Blue developers, in terms of the contributions, the community contributions that they might make. So, I have to say that with regard to both motions.

AC: I will withdraw my motion.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: I am pretty comfortable. I think the process was a good one. I am perfectly fine approving the package. It seems like there might be majority support for that but if a majority wants to wait for three weeks, that is fine too. Administrative Leshner will that cause any problems? If there is a three week, if we wait till the next meeting?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz. No, the timing is not a problem.

JA: Well, I am going to move forward and see if we got the votes...

SC: OK, what are we going to be voting on this time?

JA: On my original motion.

SC: continuing?

JA: Of continuing it to the meeting on the 24th. All those in favor say, "Aye." Aye.

SC: Aye.

JA: Those opposed?

RS: No.

MH: No.

AC: Aye.

JA: Okay. Sorry. So, the motion passes 3-2. Alright.

SC: To continue?

JA: To continue the item until March 24th. I think we are done.