

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 18, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair
Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Jennifer Allen, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

1. FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - FC¹, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Flood Control District, adopting the 2025-2030 Floodplain Management Plan as part of the National Flood Insurance Program's community rating system.

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

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

2. CONTRACT

City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for design, construction, and maintenance of the Rita Ranch Detention Basin, no cost/25 year term (SC2500000080)

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

Supervisor Christy expressed his concerns regarding intergovernmental agreements (IGA) with the City of Tucson (COT), citing past issues related to differential water rates. He questioned the value the COT added to the IGA, noting that it was a County project and was unsure why the COT needed to be involved, since the County could handle all the tasks mentioned in the IGA that would be managed by the COT, for example, the IGA stated that the COT would have access to various water quality readings, but he believed that the County's Wastewater Department

could easily produce and periodically send those reports to the COT. He inquired about the COT's involvement and value in the IGA.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that this item was for a no-cost IGA. She stated that the Flood Control District had built a couple of infiltration trenches in late 2024, and this allowed access to the property for the COT and Tucson Water to monitor groundwater levels and quality, and to have the ability to access their water components.

Supervisor Christy stated that the County could provide that information to the COT without giving them access to it.

Eric Shepp, Director, Regional Flood Control District, stated that the County was well-positioned to handle projects like it, as it owned much of the drainage infrastructure, which could be retrofitted to enhance recharge. He emphasized that the COT brought value to the project and they had a series of wells that they monitored, that the County did not have access to, which added value. He explained that the COT had a better understanding of the underground geology, which was important for prioritizing and optimizing where recharge efforts should take place. He stated that they would share information that way. He stated that the IGA granted the COT access to assess the effectiveness of the County's recharge efforts and that the County would be focused on keeping water that would otherwise flow to Pinal County within its own basin. He stated that the COT aimed to measure recharge more precisely, and they were concerned about potential water quality issues, such as if the County started recharging very effectively, they could mix drinkable water underground with surface pollutants. He stated that, as the designated water provider, the COT had a role in monitoring those concerns and he believed the relationship would be mutually beneficial.

Supervisor Christy stated that he rarely found such agreements to be truly no cost, especially when it dealt with the COT.

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

3. **CONTRACT**

Endeavour Active Living Catalina Foothills Tucson, L.L.C., to provide an Exchange Agreement, to develop a multi-family apartment development adjacent to the north bank of the Rillito River and west of the Chuck Huckelberry Loop Craycroft parking lot and trailhead, FC - Floodprone Land Acquisition Program Fund, contract amount \$10,000.00 (PO2500006272)

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

Chair Scott stated that the Board had previously approved a specific plan for the project, which included the current zoning and this item was for the approval of an

updated exchange agreement that was required because the original agreement approved in 2022 had expired a year later. He stated that the new agreement involved one of the original developers and a new financial partner, and it allowed the developer access across County land to access Craycroft Road. He explained that some of the benefits for the County included additional trailhead parking, connection of public bathrooms to the sewer system, and the construction and operation of a public amenity at the trailhead.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that it granted an easement which would provide better access to the Loop.

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

1. FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - FC¹, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Flood Control District, adopting the 2025-2030 Floodplain Management Plan as part of the National Flood Insurance Program's community rating system.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
ES: Eric Shepp, Director, Regional Flood Control District
GS: Dr. Greg Saxe, Environmental Planning Manager, Regional Flood Control District
BL: Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association

RS: Move now to Item No. 9, which is Floodplain Management Plan update. We do have some slides, so I will turn it over to Ms. Leshner to introduce the item.

JL: Thank you very much Chair Scott. Yes, we are looking at approval. Before you today is for our Floodplain Management Plan. We have been working, I believe, since April of '24 to develop this program and talking with the community. Appreciate Mr. Lyons comments. I believe you have received information and feedback from both SAHBA and MPA, who I know have been working with the department over this last, almost year to ensure that we are representing all of the community. And with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Shepp, the Director of the Flood Control District, who will give you a little more detail on the plan.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Leshner. Mr. Shepp?

JL: Thank you.

ES: Chair Scott, members of the Board, thank you very much. I am just going to set up Dr. Saxe. Dr. Saxe managed the development of the Floodplain Management Plan, but I just wanted to give a little introduction to emphasize the importance of the adoption of the 2020 Plan to the Flood Control District. Not only did FEMA smile upon us and change our CRS classification from class 5 to class 2, and the value that we really received from the development of that plan was related to stakeholder engagement. Dr. Saxe led the charge on engaging neighbors over the span of a year. We learned a lot where our gaps in knowledge were, where some problems are, where we could do better outreach, and those crystallize into an action plan that has been very useful to us for the last five years, Dr. Saxe has done it again. He has engaged over the last year a planning committee. I am on the planning

committee, Brendan Lyons is on the planning committee, as well as numerous neighborhood associations to once again dig into where our problems are, et cetera, and the plan that you have in front of you includes an action plan, which, again, is the crystallization of some of the gaps that were identified during this long process. Greg will talk about that in his few slides. Some of the actions are outreach related. Some of them are recommendations for new rulemaking, some of them are for projects. Please note that the adoption of this plan does not, is not rulemaking, and it is not our capital program. They follow their own processes. But this is a beacon on the hill for us over the next five years so that we can listen to the folks who participated in this process. And I am going to turn it over to our environmental planner, Greg Saxe, to kind of go through the process. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Shepp. Dr. Saxe?

GS: Thank you, Director Shepp, Chairman of the Board, members of the Board and the public and staff who are here. Thank you for giving me this time to describe to you a little bit about what the plan is. As Director Shepp indicated, the Board originally approved a floodplain management plan in April of 2020. Like many other plans, it has a five year life cycle, so we are seeking approval prior to April of 2025. It is a plan for our activities, the Regional Flood Control District activities to take place during the years 2025 to 2030. It also meets the State, actually, let us go to slide one please. It also meets the State statutory requirement for a report of our activities over the last five years. So basically it is a written document of some 1,000 pages describing everything we have done for the last five years and what we hope the Board will direct us to do over the next five years. It follows FEMA's guidance on the National Flood Insurance Program, as described in the coordinators manual shown on the screen there. For those who you know, probably most people are not familiar with the National Flood Insurance Program, which establishes minimum standards. The CRS, the Community Rating System, rates each community for how it exceeds those minimum standards, and then provides flood insurance rate discounts to the insured within those communities. Pima County is in the top 0.3% in the United States, so anyone buying flood insurance in the County gets a 40% discount. This plan was a large part of that, as well as our work with the Office of Emergency Management. What the first slide is showing is just the web page that is available, where the draft plan is, the draft action plan progress reports on the previous plan and the letters that we have received to date. That web page, let us go to the second slide. The coordinators manual, it is really a process oriented plan. As Director Shepp pointed out, it does not establish policy. FEMA does not really care what the recommendations of the plan are, they care what the process is and the process is led by this planning committee, which was established by Resolution of the Board in 2019. It is an open and public committee. So even today we were getting new members who would like to participate during implementation. The list on the left there is, you know, not all of those groups were active up to last week. Those are people who have been involved over the five years that the plan has been in place. The committee schedule on the right talks about what we have done. And, you know, back in April of 2024, we provided the public and the Board with a progress report on what we have done. And then the committee began to evaluate

what we, where the gaps are. So, then they identify new information, including the studies provided by SAHBA, about the costs on affordability and information on future climate conditions provided by various environmental organizations. So, then we establish a new set of goals. And this year, I have a slide later of what the new goals identified were. The existing goals are those contained in our Ordinance and those added in 2020. Then it says problems there. But you know, we also talk about opportunities and challenges. FEMA likes the word problems, but then we identify a list of problems. That also comes from a survey, which we send to all 30 some thousand floodplain residents in Pima County and those living behind levees and all the jurisdictions since they are our responsibility. So we get a very large problem list and then or, you know, opportunities and challenges. Then we create an action plan and we publish the draft plan, the full plan narrative document, including action plan in December, sought public comment until February 1st and then finalized the plan. What you now have is the proposed plan. Just to reiterate, we send this mailer every summer to floodplain residents and have a survey for the initial input. We conduct public meetings in addition to the six committee meetings. We report monthly to the Flood Control District Advisory Committee, who are your appointees on this process as well. We conducted public meetings with the Foothills Association, the Green Valley Council, the Southeast Area Council, the Tucson Mountains Association, and the Planning and Zoning Commission. Next slide please. The new goals identified by the planning committee for the next five years are increased beneficial use of storm water, including regional recharge and urban green spaces. Ensure equitable access to flood mitigation services and prioritize neighborhood scale beneficial use of storm water projects in vulnerable and underserved areas. Next slide please. This is just to give you an idea that it all starts with a hazard assessment. We look at any new emerging problems that have occurred. We present that information to the committee. And then they help us come up with ways to mitigate those problems and opportunities. There is a list there on the left which I will not try to read. We also do analytic information, such as the example map there is a building density heat map in the floodplain. So we look at how many buildings are in the floodplain in each of the 28 watersheds in Pima County and we look at where the flood insurance claims are. We also look at complaints permitting, hazard mapping, etc. Next slide please. Then the committee is engaged in coming up with a list of mitigation actions to address those problems and opportunities. There are 61 programs and 108 discrete projects. So an example of a program is Capital Improvements. And then of course there is 27 some individual capital improvement projects listed which are also in the long term infrastructure plan that the County works on, so those are just a couple examples. I do not really expect people to be able to read that, but like Director Shepp said, the real crux of the plan is the action plan that lists just the discrete activities that we will do over the next five years, and we seek the Board's approval of that plan, and I am available to answer any questions you might have.

RS: Thank you very much Dr. Saxe. Supervisor Christy?

- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Saxe, I have a couple procedural questions, but first, you listed the organizations that you presented the plan to and you are reaching out to the community. I noticed you did not include the Tanque Verde Valley Association.
- GS: No, we sought invitations and those are the organizations that invited us. We tried to get a geographic spread, but no, we did not.
- SC: And did they respond or?
- GS: No, we do a mailer to all the HOA's on a list provided by Development Services that is the same HOA and neighborhood association list they use for notifications for Planning and Zoning Commission hearings and then we, you know, kind of reached out. I know I reached out to your organization trying, you know, trying hard to get audience at the Southeast Area Council. But, you know, we kind of go where we are invited.
- SC: Well as, Mr. Chair, as we do know, you know, they are in a vulnerable plane out there and I am hoping at some point that perhaps they can be revisited to participate in that, because I think their position is noteworthy.
- ES: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Christy. Yes, we would be happy to work with them. The nice thing about this plan is, even though we are going to seek your adoption of a five year plan, we do update the plan annually and if there are other problems, it is a living document. So we are, if there are other issues identified, we can incorporate that into.
- SC: Great, if we can help for your reaching out to them, we would be glad to. Mr. Chair, two quick questions, and I this will hearken back to my discussions with Mr. DeBonis on the Finger Rock properties and the flood issues there. How does well, for instance, there is a nursery that has been advertising and I think quite intelligently about some floodplain issues on their property, and they have to have some buildings demolished and all of their inventory needs to be moved. So they are going to have a big sale. And I think we know who that probably is, but they are going to have to demolish these buildings. In the Finger Rocks issue there is that program that actually purchases the property from the owner. How does this work with vulnerable buildings such as the nursery? Are they reimbursed for their expenses in this project or how does that work, and how does it differ from the Finger Rock issue?
- ES: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, good questions. So related to the nursery, the nursery made improvements without building permits or floodplain use permits for changes of use of those. Those new structures were built without permits, and some structures changed the use that were no longer compatible with floodplain management regulations, and when working with them, the nursery had some options about returning the use of some of those and chose this path so as to increase the square foot of retail space. Retail space has a different floodplain standard than a storage space, so we were working with them over a period of time,

and then they chose the option that they are pursuing, with respect to the Finger Rock structures..

SC: I am sorry, could you tell me what the option is they are pursuing for reimbursement or?

ES: It is their demolition of the structures at their cost and a construction of a new retail structure that is compliant with floodplain management regulations. Yes.

SC: Because they did not include in their advertisements that they were not in compliance with the building codes, but anyway.

ES: May not be a good advertisement. With respect to the Finger Rock structures, this type of process, you know, identifies problems or and looks for mitigation opportunities and there are different scenarios that allow for different mitigation opportunities. If we can build bank protection to protect flood prone structures the 49ers subdivision has been flooded a few times, and a levee has been proposed and rejected by the 49ers subdivision. In the case of the Finger Rock wash, based on the location of the structures relative to the wash and its proximity to the wilderness area, there was not much in the way of other mitigation that could happen. There was not things we could do upstream. And the best mitigation opportunity for those was the removal of the structures. They were just in a really bad spot and that had happened in the 60s and 70s.

SC: But they were purchased?

ES: They were purchased by the Flood Control District and then there is most recently some grant funds were received for acquisition of two other ones.

SC: Okay and Mr. Chair, I am wondering if I could ask your permission and indulgence. Mr. Lyons from the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association is here and he submitted a letter regarding this whole plan. Would it be possible that I could ask him some questions on it?

RS: I do not have a problem with that.

SC: Can you come up, Brendan? We received this conveyance from the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association and you were one of the stakeholders of this Southern Arizona Home Builders Association. And in your letter, you outline one, two, three, and six issues that are concerning to the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association. I guess my question to you is, A. could you just briefly expand on why you are concerned about these issues, why they are of concern to your organization? And secondly, given that they exist, would you feel that it would be it would necessitate before this issue is adjudicated upon, that Mr. Shepp's department addressed these to the satisfaction of all the stakeholders, including Southern Arizona Home Builders. Or how would you like to see this proceed? How would your association like to see it proceed?

- BL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, thank you very much. Yes, we have been engaged as stakeholders as part of these processes. This past year has been my first year with (SAHBA) Southern Arizona Home Builders Association. Some of these meetings that have been participating have been extremely technical in nature, so I am trying to learn as much as I possibly can. In addition to participating, we are also doing our own member outreach, and it has been brought to our attention in recent weeks why these issues have been addressed to you at the ninth hour. Needless to say, throughout this entire process, we have conveyed to the District our concerns regarding the impacts on infrastructure costs, as well as the availability of limited land that poses. There has been concerns around statute as well, and we would like to continue to work with the District. The District has been great to work with; staff has been remarkable. Needless to say, concerns remain. And, you know, it is up to the purview of the Board if there is an extension or further.
- SC: So, Mr. Chair, so at this particular point, your organization.
- BL: We are not standing in opposition at this time, but there are concerns that linger.
- SC: And Mr. Shepp, would you care to address those or the condition of the concerns?
- ES: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Yes, thank you very much. We have been engaged with stakeholders regarding rulemaking, and we do believe that it is important that we fully flesh out certain aspects where there are new standards, etc. The floodplain management plan is a much larger document, and it does not create new rules, and it does not establish a capital program. We are absolutely willing to continue the conversation with the SAHBA, Metropolitan, Pima Alliance, etc., regarding any potential new rulemaking. And we absolutely understand the impact that that may have. And, you know, hopefully, Mr. Lyons will agree that we have been engaged with some of him for on the better part of a year, making sure that when we do this, we do this correctly. The floodplain management plan is more of an umbrella, and it does a whole bunch of things related to outreach, floodplain management strategy generally. And it does not create rules. And when we go down that process, you will have the opportunity to see it again as a Board, and it will have that stakeholder engagement.
- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I have no doubt that you will continue your outreach on this issue with the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association and other stakeholders. You have been remarkably well attuned to that in the past, and I know you are now in the present with this issue. So, thank you, Mr. Lyons, appreciate your letter and your participation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- RS: Thank you. Supervisor Christy. Any other questions or comments? Supervisor Allen?
- JA: So, I just wanted to say thank you for a great plan. As you know, I think when my staff sat down with you and your team, we could have spent hours there. So I think

some of the things that we really appreciate, the focus within this plan is the increased use and attention towards stormwater collection, both for recharge purposes, but as well as for creating urban green spaces, as well as looking at the neighborhood level and ways in which we can kind of invest in stormwater projects at that kind of micro level scale, as well as the focus within the Altar Valley and the Tucson Mountains, and digging into watershed restoration in both of those places. So happy to see that focus and thank you for your work.

ES: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, thank you very much.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Allen. Supervisor Heinz, any questions or comments? Okay. Alright. I had a couple of questions unless Supervisor Grijalva you had any? Yeah. Okay, if we go to the discussion section on the agenda item report, my first question follows up using language from that section on the question that Supervisor Christy posed, there is a sentence near the end that says, "This plan also does not contain any new regulations, it provides direction on new policies to consider, which will follow their own process." Now, Dr. Saxe touched on this process a bit during his presentation, Supervisor Christy and Mr. Lyons made reference to them in their comments, but could you get into a little bit more detail, Mr. Shepp, on that process that is referenced in this discussion section?

ES: Chair Scott, members of the Board. Yes. Thank you for that question. There is a statutory process for rulemaking. It requires that we put proposed rules on our website and engage stakeholders for a period of 30 days and solicit input and then report any comments and any changes prior to placement on the Board agenda. But that is the minimum once again and what we like to do is in anticipation of the formal rulemaking process, we engage the stakeholders informally beforehand so that we can hash out the technical issues, and floodplain management has lots of technical issues beforehand so that when we do start the formal process, that it is a smoother process for everybody. And in fact, the process that we have been engaged with related to hydrology associated with future climate conditions is still in the informal process, where we are engaging stakeholders such that we have will have some level of agreement before we start the formal process.

RS: So, the formal process is defined in statute, but the District has historically engaged in, as you described them, informal outreach with our stakeholders?

ES: Correct.

RS: Okay. So, another question that stems from the language in that discussion section is in the last sentence, it says, "The plan includes a Watershed Master Plan including each of the 28 watersheds impacting unincorporated Pima County that identify flood hazard exposure problem areas." I am just curious with regard, and I know part of the answer to this question, but for the public and media's benefit with regard to watersheds and within incorporated areas of the County, Cities and Towns, can you outline what the District does working with Cities and Towns on their own watershed master plans?

- ES: Chair Scott. Yes, thank you for that question. I will start with the statute just to kind of give the framework. The Flood Control District is the floodplain manager for all of Pima County jurisdictions unilaterally, on their own, can adopt floodplain management regulations and take over their own floodplain management functions within their jurisdictions and all of the jurisdictions have done that. But there are many other authorities that the Flood Control District has, including the construction of capital improvements. We happen to also provide technical guidance to the jurisdictions. We do floodplain mapping services, for example, with the City of Tucson, they have their own floodplain management plan. And so, we do not, you know, usurp their floodplain management plan with our own floodplain management plan. So, we do work hand in glove. As a matter of fact, the goal from the 2020 Floodplain Management Plan is to engage jurisdictions to a greater degree such that we are being helpful and we have uniform adoption of standards. And so aspirationally, we are still trying to do that, but for purposes of some of our problem assessments, etc., there is a little bit more focus on the unincorporated Pima County, because from the floodplain management perspective that is our purview. While the other jurisdictions remain floodplain managers of their own jurisdictions.
- RS: So, besides the City of Tucson, the three towns and the City of South Tucson also have their own floodplain management plans?
- ES: So, the City of Tucson has a floodplain management plan and the other ones, I do not think, have floodplain management plans. They are in various stages of their community rating system, some do not participate at all, but we engage them through separate means and through our floodplain. For our Flood Control District Advisory Committee, all of the floodplain administrators sit on our advisory committee. And so, they have had an opportunity for input here, and they have endorsed the floodplain management plan as well. And we engage them on services they might need since we are a regional entity.
- RS: Thank you very much. I appreciate that, and I want to also commend your entire department, especially Dr. Saxe, for his leadership in this realm. And with that, unless there are any further comments or questions, I will move Item No. 9.
- AG: Second.
- RS: Moved and seconded. Any further discussion? All those in favor, indicate by saying Aye? Aye.
- MH: Aye.
- JA: Aye.
- SC: Aye.
- AG: Aye.
- RS: Item passes 5 to 0.

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 18, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Rex Scott, Chair
Adelita S. Grijalva, Vice Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member
Jennifer Allen, Member
Steve Christy, Member

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

*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely. He joined the meeting at 9:20 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 Maria C. Federico Brummer, Director, Mexican America Student Services Department, Tucson Unified School District.

3. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Supervisor Grijalva expressed her appreciation for the outpouring of love, support and kindness her family had received following the passing of her father, and she felt honored by the many people who reached out to share how much her father had meant to them. A moment of silence was observed for her father.

Chair Scott expressed deep gratitude for Congressman Grijalva's consistent advocacy for children, their schools, and their overall well-being. He extended his condolences to Supervisor Grijalva and her family.

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy acknowledged that Empire High School within the Vail School District in District 4 had been ranked Number 1 in Arizona by the State Board of Education.

5. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Kelle Maslyn, Assistant Director, Pima County Economic Development; Liz Pocock, CEO, and Megan Finck, Program Manager, Startup Tucson; Kevin Burke, Deputy Director, City of Tucson Office of Economic Initiatives; Jessica Sueskind, CEO, Tucson Young Professionals; and Cristie Street, Senior Vice President Southern Arizona Leadership Council, proclaiming the week of March 25 through March 30, 2025 to be: "TENWEST WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Courtney Slanaker, Executive Director and Gayle Petrillo, Board Chair, American Red Cross, proclaiming the month of March 2025 to be: "RED CROSS MONTH IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Dante Celerio, Fluxx Productions; Victor Valencia, Building Out Safer Spaces; and Daniel and Lizette Trujillo, Families Transformed, proclaiming the day of Monday, March 31, 2025 to be: "TRANSGENDER DAY OF VISIBILITY IN PIMA COUNTY"

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-0 vote, Supervisors Christy and Heinz were not present for the vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Allen made the presentation.

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Dave Smith addressed the Board and offered his condolences to Supervisor Grijalva, emphasizing the unique bond between a father and daughter, and the importance of personal control in addressing social issues, such as poverty and addiction.

Laurie Moore expressed her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva. She spoke about her concerns regarding the use of federal funds to support illegal immigration, indicated that the federal government was withholding \$51 million from the County and suggested cutting the PEEPs Program while calling for an investigation.

Gisela Aaron offered her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva regarding her father's passing. She criticized the use of federal grants, stated that during the pandemic the

County had not searched for alternative treatments and lockdowns intentionally harmed the economy.

Tim Laux expressed his condolences to Supervisor Grijalva. He criticized the Board for creating problems related to a \$51 million issue, questioned whether legal advice was given regarding federal law being broken, called for the resignations of several Board members, urging for transparency and honesty regarding their actions and corrective measures.

Suzy Lorensen offered her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva. She questioned the funds spent on NGOs for asylum seekers, the \$51 million FEMA reimbursement, plans to repay taxpayers if FEMA funds were not received, justification for NGO funding and the future of the Drexel facility.

Shirley Requard offered her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva. She expressed her concerns with asylum seekers, accountability for the \$51 million in federal funds and urged the Board to take responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

Brendan Lyons, Southern Arizona Homebuilders Association, expressed condolences to Supervisor Grijalva and thanked the Board for their commitment to housing efforts. He requested that the Board consider how flood resilience policies might impact housing affordability, and spoke about the need to balance public safety with attainable housing.

Cory Stephens addressed the Board regarding illegal immigration and fraudulent asylum claims facilitated by local NGOs, claimed that those actions burdened other states economically and violated immigration laws, and highlighted the requirement for affidavits from recipients of federal funds.

Judge Sara Mae Williams, Presiding Judge of Ajo and Consolidated Court of Pima County, offered her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva. She requested that any decision regarding Pro Tempore appointments be tabled, since they had not been notified of the request for Maria Felix's appointment and emphasized the importance of allowing elected Justices of the Peace to have input on such appointments to ensure transparency and reduce costs.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

10. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:57 a.m.

11. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:42 p.m. Supervisor Heinz left the meeting after Executive Session. All other members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding litigation in Arizona Citizens Defense League, et al. v. Pima County, et al., C20242478.

At the request of the County Attorney's Office and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding litigation related to A.R.S. §13-3108 and Arizona Citizens Defense League, et al. v. Pima County, et al., C20242478.

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

14. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Pima County v. Vail School District No. 20, et al., C20222976.

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

15. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding litigation related to recent executive orders and related federal actions.

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

16. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding legal options related to the recent letter from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency to Pima County.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Grijalva stated that there was a Pima Association of Governments (PAG) / Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) meeting on March 3, 2025. She stated that it was the first meeting in 2025 and there was new leadership for both Boards. She stated that for PAG, the Chair was the City of Tucson Mayor Regina Romero, Vice Chair was the Town of Marana Mayor John Post, and the Treasurer

was Town of Sahuarita Mayor Tom Murphy. She stated for RTA, the Chair was Town of Oro Valley Mayor Joe Winfield, Vice Chair was Town of Sahuarita Mayor Tom Murphy, and that she was Second Vice Chair. She stated that there was new membership on PAG/RTA and it changed some of the dynamics. She stated that the discussion had primarily focused on a proposed ballot initiative for the November ballot.

Chair Scott stated that he had attended a Sun Corridor Board meeting that was held at Pima West and it included a presentation on their Center of Excellence for Health Care Professions. He explained that there was also an update regarding the merger between the Metro Chamber and Sun Corridor. He stated that the Board had been invited to the kickoff luncheon that would take place in May for the Chamber of Southern Arizona. He indicated that the President of the United States Chamber of Commerce would be the keynote speaker and more details about the organization's structure would be given.

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

18. The Board of Supervisors on March 4, 2025 continued the following:

COVID-19 Presidential Executive Orders and Pima County Employees

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the impact of the recent recession and execution of multiple COVID-19 related Presidential Executive Orders on Pima County employees, including but not limited to those who left the county's employ, were charged differential health insurance rates, or were rehired in a lesser role or pay rate, together with a report of the status of any related litigation. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that on January 20, 2025, following the inauguration of the new presidential administration, a list was generated of initial rescissions of what were termed harmful Executive Orders (EOs) and under their revocation or orders and actions, they listed all of the EOs that were revoked by President Trump. He stated that a number of them were COVID related, including EO 13987, EO 13996, EO 13997, EO 14002, EO 14099, and revocation of orders and actions continued under EO 13994. He stated that he had never felt like he had gotten a full and complete disclosure about how the County handled its COVID matters and mandates particularly those related to employees. He shared a letter from a retired County employee who expressed concern about overpayments during COVID and called for reimbursement of those overpayments made by employees. He stated that the letter criticized the Board for violating employees' rights by pushing emergency use shots with little scientific justification and for unfair treatment, including denied promotions and/or job reassignments, even for those with approved exemptions. He raised concerns about employees who were forced to pay higher insurance rates for choosing not to receive experimental injections. He stated that he would submit the letters to Ms. Leshar for a written response.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that she would provide a quick overview of the known information and additional detailed information would be provided at a later date. She explained that 20 individuals were terminated during the COVID situation due to COVID-related issues, with 19 of them being reinstated. She stated that there were 236 employees who paid an additional \$45.51 for about one year due to being unvaccinated, with this requirement ending in September 2022. She indicated that there were three litigation cases related to this matter and more information regarding the status of that litigation would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy asked if those employees who had paid an additional \$45.00 a month were reimbursed.

Ms. Leshar responded no and that staff would begin to look through the information. She expressed concern about the possibility of rehiring people at lesser roles because they left the County over the COVID. She stated that if someone left voluntarily due to dissatisfaction with the rules, those details were not typically documented. She explained that if those individuals returned once the rules changed, such information was not usually recorded in the hiring or resignation materials. She stated that while some anecdotal information could be gathered, they only had specific records about individuals who were disciplined, rehired after Merit Commission actions, or the 236 individuals who paid an additional amount. She stated that they had detailed records regarding the litigation, but specifics about those who left because they were unhappy with the rules and then returned would be harder to obtain.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that during the exit interview, employees could express the reasons for their departure, and that that information might be included in the record.

Ms. Leshar stated that some did and some did not.

Supervisor Christy requested that in regards to the COVID-related EOs that were rescinded, that County Administration review each one to determine whether they applied or did not apply to anything related to Pima County employees.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

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

19. The Board of Supervisors on March 4, 2025, continued the following:

Aerospace Research Campus

Discussion/Direction regarding an update from County Administration on the status of past, present, and proposed companies within Pima County's Aerospace Research Campus. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that it had been some time since the Board had received any updates on County projects that were either funded, supported, or otherwise promoted by County activities, specifically with Vector Launch, Worldview. He stated that the last update was in February 2024. He stated that the Battery Factory had already held two groundbreaking ceremonies and requested a status update of those properties and their future plans.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, provided a broad overview of the research campus since its launch in January 2020. She stated that the County had received approximately \$4.7 million in revenue from various partners. She stated that out of a total of 420 acres, all but about 80 acres were encumbered and being used for economic models. She explained that upon reviewing the data, they had confirmed that both American Battery Factory and Worldview were current on all rent owed at that time. She stated that they had been in discussions with 35 different projects that were looking at the research campus, with around 14,000 jobs associated with those projects.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that in addition to what the County Administrator had stated, they were working with American Battery Factory on the company's permitting work, and there was a package that was under review with Development Services. He stated that the last time they presented to the Board was in December 2024, during which they made adjustments to the agreement with American Battery Factory, setting the commencement of work for February. He indicated that the Chief Executive Officer had written a letter to the County stating that between February and June, the bulk of the construction would take place, starting with site clearing and earthwork, followed by foundation construction later on. He expressed confidence that American Battery Factory would move forward with construction. He stated that regarding Vector Space, the project went dormant after an initial agreement with the County and had not moved forward, stating that the exact date of the agreement's termination would need to be reviewed. He stated that Worldview continued to operate and they were current on rent payments through the February time period. He stated that staff would gather additional information and report back to the Board.

Supervisor Christy requested a more comprehensive analysis, including whether the remaining entities, excluding Vector Launch, had met their employment figures and an explanation of the current status and any changes related to the Toole Avenue property, which had been purchased to house Vector Launch at the time. He also sought an analysis of why Vector Launch went dormant. He requested information on the current manufacturing or mission status of Worldview, specifically whether they were still making balloons or conducting space excursions, or if their mission and function had changed.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

20. Update on Federal and State Executive, Legislative and Judicial Actions that affect Pima County

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration, provided a slideshow presentation and stated it was a framework for how they had been bifurcating this information as it came in. She stated that there had been 89 executive orders issued, some by direct action or by rescinding actions of the previous Administration to which the County was sensitive to the content of what was in those executive orders. She stated that currently there were 127 legal actions in response to some of the executive orders and/or some of the workforce changes that were happening at the direction of the executive level of the Federal government, within those executive orders. She stated that while they were monitoring the content pertaining to funding, unless a funding source was specifically called out, they operated off of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memorandum that was issued and subsequently rescinded, by which was the item of a court order and restraining order regarding blocking Federal funding. She stated that as a result, and with the release of federal award numbers, those award numbers were matched across the County's grants portfolio to ensure the match was based on the direction of a Federal agency, not necessarily the content of the executive orders, unless it was specifically called out. She stated this was the methodology used and referencing the OMB direction and subject of the litigation that was currently in court. She stated that there was a substantial reduction in Federal workforce and subsequent cascading of that effect, with some known or anticipated data and what those data sources were as of March 14th, with the expiration of the continuing resolution that has been passed by the Senate. She stated they added a State-level update for what was going on at the State legislature. She indicated that she would not be discussing anything regarding modifications to tariffs or regulations, but those would be included in future presentations. She stated that since her last update to the Board, they had submitted their single audit and had formally matched their data of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) numbers, which were exact numbers that would be presented within their single audit and matched against Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 financial expenditure data. She stated that as they looked forward with a plan for future budgets, and whether or not they got reimbursed in this current fiscal year, the numbers had shifted slightly from her last report. She stated they had \$105 million that represented 67% of the FY24 reported grant expenditures that were wrapped up within the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) and Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Shelter and Services Program (SSP). She stated they would also be highlighting those as they went through FY25 expenditures since a letter had been received from FEMA which notified the County that there was a temporary pause in reimbursement. She added that they had been reimbursed \$3 million, and were expecting a \$10 million reimbursement, but that had been paused, so these expenditures would still be included as they monitored, in lieu of if they did not get reimbursed or ran any risk of clawback of Federal funding that had been issued to the County. She stated they

would closely monitor the \$52 million or 33%, which represented and affected over 20 County departments, but the two largest departments were within the Health Department and Community and Workforce Development. She stated these were Federal and State pass-through block grants that the County received every year, such as for Immunizations, Women, Infant and Children, Maternal Child Health, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and Community Development Block Grant Programs funding. She stated those block grants affected health, human services, workforce and housing and were critical services that the County provided to the community. She stated that they would also monitor what was spent to date regarding FY25 expenditures and once completed would present that to the County Administrator, Deputy County Administrators, departments and the Board to determine if there would be any potential budget impact. She stated that with the passing of the continuing resolution they had more granular data around what had been budgeted, so they would review those funding sources to see if they were still represented in that budget and to provide a truer picture of what the County could anticipate to receive as they looked at FY24 expenditures for planning and working with County departments about what potential impacts they might have. She stated that the slide showed a list of congressionally directed Federal Funds, some of the State pass-through grants, like WIOA were laws enacted by Congress. She stated that ARPA was signed into law in 2021, and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), but they were noticed of a pause for IIJA through the executive order. She stated that the Inflation Reduction Act was signed into law in 2022, which was also called out in the executive order. She stated that the SSP was represented in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2023 and they had recently received a letter from FEMA that those funds were paused for reimbursement. She stated that within the County's grant portfolio, the majority were reimbursement based dollars and as they informed County Administration on any sort of proposals or budget impacts, they would also be providing a distribution of how many of those dollars were awarded versus how many were reimbursement that the County anticipated receiving funding back based on these congressionally directed funds and the requirements therein. She stated that the Senate advanced the bill to avoid a government shutdown, which included significant cuts potentially to Medicaid, FEMA, and Veteran services, among many others. She added that they would also be crosswalking the proposed budget and the grants portfolio through some of the congressionally directed legislations. She stated that a couple of things cascaded together, one was monitoring whether or not the County would be reimbursed for the dollars being submitted, but what was known was that the portals were still open and some of the federal funding agencies were reimbursing timely and some were not. She stated that they could continue to monitor the lag in them in order to make a determination as they got through the next eight weeks. She stated one component of that was the compliance to the court orders and it was known that the Trump Administration had appealed one of those court orders to pause federal funding and the determination of how those court orders made their way through and the outcome of such would be an indicator. She stated the other issue was that they had seen a unprecedented and substantial reduction in the Federal workforce. She stated that this was problematic from a funding perspective and had seen changes in their program officers and the people relied on to get those funds to the

County and the people they worked with. She stated that the federal agencies themselves were taking the executive orders and providing direction and some of those directions had been rescinded, so they had moved in alignment with their federal funding agencies. She stated that it was substantial, especially over President's Day weekend when thousands of employees with probationary status were relieved of their duties. She stated that had gone to court, where a Federal judge ordered six agencies to rehire those probationary employees and would update the Board on that outcome. She stated that Supervisor Allen had asked to receive preliminary data on federal workers affected across Arizona and locally, and depending on the data source used there was variability. She stated that census data showed there was roughly about 64,000 Federal employees across Arizona, and 34,000, not including the Post Office or direct appointees with a 12,000 estimate in Pima County. She stated that there was a huge caveat to the data set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the benefits data and that the April report would be more telling and in May this would determine how many folks were affected in February, especially over that President's Day weekend mass layoff and whether or not there was resolution to the legal status of that court action that pertained to probationary employees. She stated they were closely monitoring this because it not only included Federal workers, but contracted workers, grant funded and academic institutions.

Chair Scott referred to the slide and inquired about the meaning of UCFE.

Ms. Davis explained that it was the Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees by which Federal employees could get their benefits if they were let go from the Federal government. She stated that they worked very closely with the County's lobbyist, Michael Racy, who had been monitoring the State level activity. She stated that the legislature had seen a lot of floor activity, and they were about two weeks behind in reviewing some of the Bills that were still within second and third readings within committees, and they were averaging about 10 to 15 days. She stated that there was a good amount of Bills that could potentially pass along costs to the County with many in the health and or regulatory space, and would update the Board as they were passed and what the financial impact would be to the County. She stated that they did not have any progress or an update on the Governor's Office Final Budget, but expected some new financial revenue numbers to come out around April 15th. She stated that it was anticipated there might be delays, and things were moving slower on a 10 to 15 day average and more granular updates would be provided to the Board as they became available and/or passed their committee.

Chair Scott pointed out that the Board received minutes from the Legislative Policy Committee for the County Supervisors Association and Ms. Davis had done an excellent job of summarizing what had been a snail's pace of business at the legislature, especially with regards to any indication of what the budget would look like.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

21. Workforce Investment Board (WIB) Governor Recertification 2025

Staff recommends approval for WIB recertification as the local workforce development board in Pima County.

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

Chair Scott indicated that he were unsure if there had been an update on the local workforce development plan recently. He knew it needed to be aligned with the state plan and requested the latest status report from County Administration be provided to the Board.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

22. FY 24/25 Pima County GAP Funding for Affordable Housing Development and Preservation

Staff recommends acceptance of the recommendations, as endorsed by the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission, totaling \$5 million for 23 single-family homes, 220 rentals and preserving 30 affordable housing units. Leveraging \$87,713,702.00 in private funding for housing affordability in Pima County.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

23. Final Plat Without Assurances

P24FP00011, Abandonment of Vista Del Sol, Lots 1-15 and Common Area "A" (Private Street). (District 3)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

24. 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 slideshow presentation for March that covered Period 7. He shared positive news, highlighting that both revenues and expenditures were moving in a favorable direction. He noted an additional \$1.5 million in revenue was generated due to an increase in sales tax revenue from the State. He stated they increased their projections for departmental revenues due to elections, primarily from higher fees charged to jurisdictions and additional ballot questions from the jurisdictions which generated more revenue. He provided a follow-up on the Justice Court, explaining that the lower revenues were due to a decline in court fee collections for the year, and Superior Court was expected to have slightly higher-than-budgeted revenues, driven by increased reimbursements for initial appearances and mandated services. He highlighted that, based on the increase of \$7.2 million in revenue and a \$2.9 million reduction in expenditure, the available fund balance had reached \$4.7 million. He stated that it was an improvement of \$1.8 million from the previous month's fund balance of \$2.8 million, indicating positive direction. He stated that on the expenditure side there were no significant changes, two departments were still expected to be overbudget by \$500,000.00 or more, which included Public Defense Services, outside contracted counsel and the Sheriff's Department. He stated that they were working with the Sheriff's Department to provide the granularity requested by the Board in the prior month.

Chair Scott requested that Mr. Cuaron and Ms. Leshar follow up with the Sheriff regarding a discrepancy in the definition of "initial appearance pay" and that the Sheriff had a different understanding of the term that had been cited in the financial forecasts. He indicated that he hoped the Sheriff would provide documentation to the Board detailing his expectations for the budget by the end of the period, along with a historical overview since he has taken office as Sheriff. He stated that he expected the Sheriff to first follow up with Ms. Leshar and then provide more detailed information to the Board, which would help clarify the financial forecasts.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative.

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

25. Quarterly Report on Collections

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending December 31, 2024.

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

26. **Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Capital Improvement Program and Overall Budget Development Overview**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the Capital Improvement Program requests and overall budget development for the FY 2025/26 budget.

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

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

SUPERIOR COURT

27. **Pima County Commission on Trial Court Appointments and Nominating Committee**

Discussion/Direction/Action with Superior Court Presiding Judge Danelle Liwski regarding appointment of public, non-attorney members, to the Pima County Commission on Trial Court Appointments, which are made by the individual District Trial Court Appointments Nominating Committee.

The Honorable Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, addressed the Board and thanked them for allowing her the time for this discussion. She stated that she had sent a note back in October because she became concerned when she reviewed the member list of the Pima County Commission on Trial Court Appointments, and of the ten community members on the commission, all were past their expiration dates and members could not continue to serve past their expiration date, but four individuals continued to serve beyond their term limits. She stated that when she had applied for the judicial position in 2011, it was emphasized to her that the interviews were not conducted primarily by lawyers and judges, rather it would be by public members because public members far outweighed the lawyers on the commission, with five lawyers and ten public members. She stated that it was also emphasized to her how important it was to show they were a member of the public, that the public mattered, and that being a judge was part of the public, and that by losing public members, the Trial Court Commission would lose the voice it needed to have. She emphasized the importance of appointing public members and was aware that Ms. Leshar had sent out information regarding the committees and how the process worked, which could be shared if needed. She explained that there was a provision outlined in the Constitution, Article 6, which outlined the process and A.R.S. §12-131, allowed the Governor to appoint individuals from each district if the Board did not. She felt that the Board should select these individuals since they were closer to the community than the Governor, and it was important for community members to have a say in selecting their judges and based on her calculations, half of the Pima County bench would likely retire within the next five years. She stated that Judge Marner was about to leave the bench to take a Federal position, Judge Hochuli was set to retire in July, she had already replaced Judge Lee and two other judges in the last four months and stressed the importance of public information.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that this was a 16-member commission, each Supervisorial District had two members and asked about the political affiliation of members. She stated that historically, that had been one of the issues they ran into.

Judge Liwski explained that each district had two nominees or members, but they could not be from the same political party. She provided an example that District 1 could not have two Republicans, two Democrats, or two independents, rather there had to be a mix of parties that created a balanced representation of 16 members in total. She highlighted the importance of having a full commission, reiterated that public members greatly outnumbered the lawyers. She stated that there were five lawyers, one from each district, and their appointments were managed by the State Bar and had also pushed them to fill their positions as well.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if it had to be a combination of party affiliations and what were those party affiliations.

Judge Liwski responded that her understanding was they could not be from the same party. She stated they could be Independent, Democrat, or Republican, as long as both district members were not from the same political party. She added that the lawyers also needed to be mixed and could not all be Republicans, Democrats or Independents.

Supervisor Christy asked if members had to live in the supervisorial district.

Judge Liwski stated they had to live in the district for one year and live within Pima County or Arizona for five years.

Supervisor Christy inquired about their term and their duties.

Judge Liwski stated the terms varied with some being two, three or four years. She explained their duties included reviewing judicial applications when there were openings, which included an advertisement for the opening and filling out an application. She stated that the members of the Trial Court Commission reviewed and discussed those applications, determined who would be interviewed, then were interviewed and conducted background checks. She stated that candidates on a judge list would get called and they also contacted all the judges from Pima County Superior Court and asked for any opinions on that as well. She stated after this process, they sent the names to the Governor, with no less than three submitted names.

Supervisor Christy stated that since it was not known of the variance of the length of their term and other issues outlined about their membership and their appointment, he asked if Judge Liwski could provide the Board with a breakdown of the process, including who oversaw, arranged and organized the whole process.

Judge Liwski responded that a Chief Justice was technically on every Trial Court Commission, or designee. She stated that Justice Beene from the Arizona Supreme Court was the liaison for Pima County and he organized and ran the meetings.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification whether he sat on the meetings, oversaw them and made rulings on whether or not the questions that were being asked were germane questions.

Judge Liwski clarified she had never been involved in that piece of the process, but assumed if there was something that he thought could not be asked or done, he would be the one to direct that and confirmed that he called and organized the meeting.

Supervisor Heinz recalled that he looked into this exact issue in 2021 when he was sworn in, and asked if the process could be reviewed by which Board offices were supposed to make these nominations or appointments to the 16-member panel. He stated that to his recollection they had empaneled a small commission of five or more people from the district, screened candidates and then put them forward. He stated that it was not as simple as that, but could move forward if so, and recalled that it was a fairly convoluted and complex process.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, indicated a memorandum that explained the nominating process had been provided to the Board, but it would be sent again. She clarified that each district had to create a nominating committee to appoint individuals and assured the Board that the information would be sent promptly so they could move forward with the request.

Judge Liwski confirmed that it was not as simple as picking a person, rather the committee was tasked with that, but she was hopeful that they had a full commission, or at least more people participating, so that the public was really well represented with the judiciary.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

28. Old Pueblo Community Services, to provide for Pima County Countywide Rapid Rehousing Program, Arizona Department of Housing - State Housing Trust Fund Program, contract amount \$155,000.00 (PO2400015974)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

Procurement

29. Award

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000047, GEA Mechanical Equipment U.S., Inc. (Headquarters: Janesville, WI), to provide for Centrifuge parts and service. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$900,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Regional Wastewater Reclamation Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

30. Award

Amendment of Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, Amendment No. 8, Custom Storage, Inc., d.b.a. cStor, Insight Public Sector, Inc., and World Wide Technology, L.L.C., to provide for Cisco and F5 networking equipment. This amendment extends the term of the contracts commencing on 3/3/25 and terminating on 4/18/26, adds two (2) one-year renewal options, appends the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention and Safety Plan provision to the contract, pursuant to Pima County Procurement Code 11.40.030 and adds the shared annual award amount of \$4,120,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$18,840,000.00. Funding Source: Internal Services Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.

Supplier Contract No./Supplier Name/Current NTE Amount/Increased Shared Annual Award Amount/Cumulative NTE Amount

SC2400001002/Custom Storage, Inc., d.b.a. cStor /\$1,218,100.06/\$1,120,000.00/\$2,338,100.06

SC2400001003/Insight Public Sector, Inc. /\$5,712,813.35/\$1,500,000.00/\$7,212,813.35

SC2400001004/World Wide Technology, L.L.C. /\$6,351,652.13/\$1,500,000.00/\$7,851,652.13

MA200000106/Escape Velocity Holdings, Inc./\$1,437,434.46/Discontinued Vendor/\$1,437,434.46

Total: \$14,720,000.00/\$4,120,000.00/\$18,840,000.00

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

31. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 7, to provide for computer software and related items and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

32. Workday, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Enterprise Resource Planning System and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400001562) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

33. Senergy Petroleum, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for motor vehicle fuel, extend contract term to 10/29/25 and amend contractual language, Fleet Services Ops Fund, contract amount \$1,500,000.00 (SC2400001808) Administering Department: Fleet Services

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

34. Flyers Energy, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide for motor vehicle fuel, extend contract term to 10/29/25 and amend contractual language, Fleet Services Ops Fund, contract amount \$350,000.00 (SC2400001809) Administering Department: Fleet Services

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

35. Holbrook Asphalt, L.L.C., to provide for HA-5 Turnkey Process for asphalt preservation treatment, 20000FD Transportation Fund, contract amount \$460,000.00 (including sales tax) (SC2500000057) Administering Department: Transportation

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

Real Property

36. Tierra Right-of-Way Services, Ltd., to provide right-of-way acquisition services for Valencia Road: Mission Road to Camino De La Tierra Improvement Project, TR - Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$320,264.00 (PO2500004087)

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

Sheriff

37. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Motorola Flex Spillman "Shared Agency" intergovernmental user agreement and amend contractual language, no cost (CT2400000011)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

38. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

City of Tucson, to provide for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care Program - Supportive Services - Coordinated Entry Project, \$44,100.00 (G-CWD-70939)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

39. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

City of Tucson, to provide for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care Program - Supportive Services - Coordinated Entry Project, \$44,100.00 (G-CWD-65894)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

40. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Connie Hillman Family Foundation, to provide support for involving community members in the work of the Prosperity Initiative implementation, \$5,000.00 (G-CWD-78678)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

41. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Social Services Block Grant - Employment Services and amend grant language, \$41,708.00 (GA-CWD-70930)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

42. Acceptance – Health

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Pima County Overdose Data to Action: LOCAL - Pima CARES and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-69959)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

43. Acceptance – Health

Arizona Family Health Partnership, d.b.a. Affirm Sexual and Reproductive Health, Amendment No. 1, to provide for reproductive health services and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-69993)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

44. Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management

Arizona Department of Emergency & Military Affairs, to provide for the FY 2024 Emergency Management Performance Grant, \$498,978.68/\$498,978.68 General Fund match (G-OEM-70327)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

45. Hearing - Acquisition of Control

Job No. 314832, Nathan Thomas Keane, RA Sushi, 2905 E. Skyline Drive, No. 289, Tucson, Acquisition of Control.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

46. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 326208, Andrea Dahlman Lewkowitz, Westin La Paloma Resort & Country Club, 3660 + 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, Series 6, Bar, Owner Transfer.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

47. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, April 9, 2025 at 8:00 p.m.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Allen voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing and approve the permit. No vote was taken at this time.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

48. Creation of Pima County Outreach Program to amend Home Deed Covenants

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposal to create an outreach and education program on the issue of removing racist language from the home deed covenants (CCRs) of Pima County residents, primarily affecting those whose homes were built before 1948. The U.S. Supreme Court declared these racist deed covenants to be unconstitutional in 1948, and they were explicitly banned by the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968. Although unenforceable, the racist language remains in thousands of local home deeds and many of these deed holders are rightfully offended. There is a process to remove racist covenants in the Pima County Recorder's Office, but it is nuanced and not well known. We propose the creation of a Pima County Outreach Program, combined with a series of informational clinics that could enlist University of Arizona experts and local legal non-profits, to assist affected deed holders, and affected homeowner and neighborhood associations, in removing such offensive deed language. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva stated that several neighborhoods, including Jeff Park and Miramonte, had racist Covenants and language in their home Deeds and those communities had reached out and sought a way to expedite the process of removing that language. She explained that the current process involved homeowners needed to go to the Recorder's Office, submit their information, and pay a fee to amend the deed, which had been deemed unconstitutional. She hoped that staff could explore an easier process, possibly by working with County departments to waive or reduce the fee. She mentioned that another County had already passed a similar measure and that such changes were not as easily implemented in Arizona. She pointed out that while there were two neighborhoods in District 5, other districts might have similar issues.

Supervisor Christy expressed his support of the item and appreciated that Supervisor Grijalva had remanded it back to the Administration to explore an easier pathway for neighborhoods. He wanted verification of the solution with the proposal of the creation of a Pima County Outreach program, combined with a series of informal clinics that could enlist experts and legal nonprofits. He stated the only

thing he was concerned with and did not agree with was a carte blanche approach to creating a new department. He wanted clarity that this was going to be worked through resources already available in the Recorder's Office, or by perhaps advising the County's lobbyists to explore ways with the State legislature that there might be issues as well. He stated that if he had assurances that this would not create a new department, then he had no issues with the item. He stated another issue was that this was not new and uncharted territory and had recently read that the Blenman neighborhood went through the same thing and they could be a great resource and model.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that they were able to do this before the law had changed, but now there were other neighborhoods that were not as organized, or some people did not realize it was in their Deed. She stated that if Supervisor Christy felt more comfortable, they could indicate that they work within Pima County departments to come up with a plan and if the plan involved including nonprofits or anyone else, then that could be part of the plan that would come back to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that another concern he had was if there would be a cost to the taxpayer and if so, what would that cost be. He requested an analysis be explored at the County Administration level and did not feel comfortable without an economic or fiscal impact on this matter.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that this was the reason she had asked Administration to look into it, because the fee was currently imposed by the Recorder to change the Deed and her hope was that if this was an Administrative fee, that was something that could be significantly reduced or to try to figure out a way for it to be absorbed if there were homeowners in that area. She stated that if those in the area wanted to change their Deed, but did not want to have to go through all of the rigmarole, there would be a way, and hoped for informational clinics, where the Recorder's Office could go out to different neighborhood association meetings, letting them know they would be there for two weekends and would work with them on site to try to resolve some of these issues to make it easier.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be with current employees.

Supervisor Grijalva responded in the affirmative and that she was not suggesting the addition of new staff.

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

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, requested clarification of Supervisor Grijalva's motion.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that her motion was to propose that County Administration look at a process to reduce the fee or waive the fee, come up with some ways to work through the Recorder's Office and current staff to resolve the

issue for the neighborhoods mentioned, and anyone else that might be experiencing this issue. She stated that there was a Pima County map available that listed different neighborhoods that had experienced this and that she would forward it to Board members.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

49. **Pima County Health Department Update - Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR)**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Improving our vaccination infrastructure and ensuring accessible vaccination opportunities for all students is critical to protecting the health and safety of our community. Recent data indicate that MMR vaccination rates are dropping below the critical 95% threshold in most counties across the state, including Pima County. Falling below this level compromises herd immunity and increases the risk of outbreaks of these preventable diseases.

While the Tucson Unified School District hosts vaccination events at the beginning of each school year, the current efforts are not sufficient to close the gap. It is essential in Pima County that we take a more proactive and targeted approach to ensure that all the schools in Pima County with vaccination rates below 95% are supported with accessible and convenient vaccination opportunities. To address this growing public health concern, I am proposing that the County establish a program to deploy mobile vaccination units to all Pima County schools with vaccination rates below 95%. The goal is to increase accessibility and eliminate barriers to vaccination, thereby improving overall immunization rates and protecting public health.

Key Components:

- Mobile Vaccination Units
- Targeted Outreach and Education
- Data Monitoring and Reporting (District 2)

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

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to direct the County Administrator to develop a plan to deploy mobile vaccination units, to coordinate with the schools and get those units on-site at schools where they would like them to be present and to bring that plan back to the Board within 90 days, with a goal to ensure it is ready to go before the next matriculating school year.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

50. **Strategic Planning**

Presentation and Discussion - Strategic Planning for Pima County.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, provided a slideshow presentation and stated that it included providing input from the Board and an update on the next iteration of how staff was working toward a strategic planning process in Pima County. He stated that in the last budget cycle staff presented some strategic initiatives that were meant to provide some guidance on how they would begin to craft the budget and prioritize what the budget looked like. He stated that had turned into pillars that were worked into the next budget iteration and that missing element was to move forward with the Board to begin looking at the mission and vision. He stated that the whole process was to prioritize what they were doing, why they were doing it and to make that alignment a bit more precise. He stated that the next steps between now and the end of this fiscal year was to focus on working with departments, to start thinking about mission, vision, and values with their input. He stated they would review the existing guidance and plans in place, and generate a tighter alignment to their current priorities or budget pillars. He stated that the idea was to bring a framework back at the end of the fiscal year, so the Board could provide input on a draft of the mission, vision, and values aligned to the budget pillars. He stated that they could then begin gathering more input from the Board to embark on a broader input session with the community on what would be a much more elaborate strategic planning process. He stated that since some things were absent in the current iteration, they thought it would be best to tighten it up with a draft aligned to the pillars and then move forward into the following year with a more detailed plan of what outreach could look like. He went over the proposed timeline and that the first blue section on the slide showed it went to the end of this fiscal year with what was outlined on the first iteration or draft, followed by a draft of what it could potentially look like moving into the full year. He stated that it showed what community input could look like, and more importantly, receiving Board input with how they would like that more elaborate process to look like in the future.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed appreciation for the progress made, stating that when they first took office, they created a strategic plan and recognized the importance of having one for the County. She stated that she felt while there were plans in place, they were not easily accessible or well-understood and hoped that the process would be helpful. She expressed support with the pillars that were outlined represented the County's mission and suggested that it would not be overly complicated to integrate the Prosperity Initiative and the strategic planning processes of other departments. She emphasized the benefit of hearing from all departments about where they saw themselves within a County-wide strategic plan and ensured that everyone had a voice in the process.

Supervisor Allen expressed excitement about the process and thanked everyone that was involved with the process. She emphasized the importance of engaging community and constituent input into the vision, mission and values, and overall plan as it moved forward. She stated that it would be beneficial for the Board to think about how to gather input within each district, ensuring that there was robust feedback as the process moved forward.

Chair Scott concurred and stated that some of the outreach he had seen with regards to the revision of Pima Prospers could provide valuable insights into how to encourage community feedback. He appreciated Mr. Holmes' reference on staff input, so that it was not only a Board-driven strategic vision, but was also shaped by grassroots influence. He also appreciated Supervisor Grijalva mentioning the Prosperity Initiative and its alignment with the strategic pillars, noting that during prior discussions, there had not been much discussion about it between the County Administrator, Deputy County Administrators and department leaders, and he expressed excitement about that.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed gratitude to Nancy Cole for being involved in all of the conversations and for her efforts in piecing everything together. She acknowledged that much of the responsibility fell on her shoulders and thanked her for all of her work on this matter.

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

51. **Litigation related to A.R.S. §13-3108 and Arizona Citizens Defense League, et al. v. Pima County, et al.**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding litigation related to A.R.S. §13-3108 and Arizona Citizens Defense League, et al. v. Pima County, et al., C20242478.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as recommended in Executive Session.

52. **Proposed Settlement in Pima County v. Vail School District No. 20, et al.**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Pima County v. Vail School District No. 20, et al., C20222976.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to accept the settlement as discussed Executive Session.

53. **Litigation related to Federal Actions**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding litigation related to recent executive orders and related federal actions.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to seek preauthorization of legal action up to but not including initiating or joining litigation.

54. **U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Letter to Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding legal options related to the recent DHS, FEMA letter to Pima County.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

CONSENT CALENDAR

55. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to pull Consent Calendar Item No. 5 for discussion purposes.

PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

SUPERIOR COURT

5. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**

Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore for the Pima County Justice Courts for the period of March 24, 2025 through June 30, 2025: Maria Felix

Chair Scott asked Judge Liwski if she could share some comments regarding this Pro Tempore Appointment.

Danelle Liwski, Presiding Judge of Superior Court, provided an update regarding the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court, explaining that there were judges consolidated into the court and there was a need for pro temp judges in every court, including Ajo and Green Valley. She stated that the process involved receiving suggested names for pro temp judges, which were then forwarded to the Board for approval, typically during the summer, along with lists from the Superior Court pro temps. She stated that Pima County Consolidated Justice Court had a slightly different procedure, and while a panel group had previously reviewed the nominations, she was working to simplify the process while ensuring compliance with the statutes. She explained that the statutes required her to nominate pro temp judges, while the Board's role was to confirm the nominations. She stated that regarding Judge Felix, she was on the pro temp list on a limited basis, primarily for animal welfare court and arraignments. She expressed her concern with there being three Justices of the Peace who were unavailable at the same time: one on medical leave, another due to a family death, and the third on a pre-planned two-week vacation out of the country. She stated

that Judge Felix had previously served as a Justice of the Peace and that the current policy regarding pro temp appointments was that whenever there was a question about someone becoming a pro tempore, it was usually handled collectively at one time. She noted that this situation was unique due to a shortage of judges, and that in Judge Felix's case, she sent her application for review, as that was the normal procedure. She indicated that she had received some concerns from two Justices of the Peace about how she managed calendars, but the other Justices of the Peace, along with Ron Newman, the full-time pro tempore Justice of the Peace, praised Judge Felix and her work. She stated that the majority view was that she was well-suited for the role and would be a valuable addition. She stated that she had the support of the Administration, which was the reason she was added to the pro tempore list, allowing her to serve full-time and help address the ongoing emergency shortage of judges.

Chair Scott requested clarification on what Judge Liwski meant by supported by Administration.

Judge Liwski clarified that it was the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court Administration. She stated that she had solicited information and feedback from all the judges at the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court, as those were the judges she would serve under. She clarified that under the current policy, the Judges could reject anyone listed on the pro tempore list from sitting on their calendar. She stated that Judges still had the control to say that a person could not fit on their calendar for any reason. She explained that they would remain listed as a pro tempore, as long as the person was approved through the process. She stated that she did not want her serving on anything beyond what she was already approved for without bringing her forward, which was why she was included on the agenda.

* * *

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva, and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Workforce Investment Board

Reappointment of Magdalena Verdugo, representing Workforce; CBO. Term expiration: 9/30/27. (Staff 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**

2. Special Event

- Joel Goralnik DeLarosa, Chad's Champions, Inc., Ciao Down Culinary Studio, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, No. 138, Tucson, March 29 and 30, 2025.
- Robin A. McArdle, Sculpture Tucson Org., Brandi Fenton Memorial Park, 3482 E. River Road, Tucson, March 28, 2025.
- Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Church Parish, Corpus Christi Catholic Church Tucson, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, March 15, 2025.
- Peter Lynn Schultz, San Xavier Lodge No. 1964, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc., 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, March 14, 15 and 16, 2025.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, March 15, 2025.
- Caroline Christine Wesnitzer, Valley View Family Faculty Organization, La Encantada, 2905 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, March 8, 2025.
- John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, March 15, 2025.

3. Temporary Extension

07100326, Thomas Robert Aguilera, Tucson Hop Shop, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, Tucson, April 26, May 24, and June 28, 2025.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

4. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Salma Duarte \$520.00; International Corp Apparel, Inc., \$391.31; SMS Construction, L.L.C., \$246,686.12; Miles Terrell Hill \$123.00; The State of Arizona \$446,855.32; Toshiba America Business Solutions \$124.73; Toshiba America Business Solutions \$985.22; Toshiba America Business Solutions \$30.43; Fabiola Jimenez \$285.16; Specialized Loan Servicing, L.L.C., \$705.04; Green Leaf at Broadway Boulevard \$3,366.00; Peaks at Redington \$2,839.68; Pacifica Brentwood, L.L.C., \$3,106.42; Kevin Luckenbill \$542.44; Penny Anderson \$144.98; Salma Duarte \$264.40; R & M Assets, L.L.C., \$2,525.00; Banner-University Medical Center South Campus, L.L.C., \$11,288.56; Administration of Resources and Choices \$1,396.62; Pavement Sealants & Supply, Inc., \$31,373.64; Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., \$60.60; The Quails Apartments \$4,730.13; Canyon Creek Apartments \$5,000.00; CRS Somerset Place Housing Corporation \$1,743.00; Desert Springs Apartments \$2,740.00; Glenn Verde Housing, Inc., \$562.00; DH Pace Company, Inc., \$217.40; Alborada Apartments, LP \$2,079.00; Roman Andrew Romero \$86.50; Staples Contract & Commercial, L.L.C. \$307.88; Tapanga Parham-Horton \$364.53; SCE Engineering \$11,542.50; Arizona State Land

Department \$2,400.00; FW Dorinda Vista Apartments, L.L.C. \$5,305.76; American Lung Association \$23,079.59; Raymond J. Carroll \$157.11; Salma Duarte \$264.40; Salma Duarte \$520.00; Arizona Department of Health Services \$210.00.

SUPERIOR COURT

5. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
(PULLED FOR DISCUSSION)

TREASURER

6. **Request to Waive Interest**
Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$464.73.
7. **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 \$14,021.70.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

8. Minutes: December 17, 2024

* * *

56. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

26. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Capital Improvement Program and Overall Budget Development Overview

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the Capital Improvement Program requests and overall budget development for the FY 2025/26 budget.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
RC: Ray Carroll, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 7, Green Valley Justice Court
AC: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management
RL: Rod Lane, Director, Project Design and Construction

RS: Item No. 22, Fiscal Year 2025/26 Capital Improvement Program and overall Budget Development overview. We will have a presentation from former Supervisor and current Judge of Green Valley Justice Court Judge Carroll, but before I turn it over to Judge Carroll, just wanted to see, Ms. Leshar, if you wanted to go through your presentation or if we should wait until after?

JL: Our presentation today focuses on the Capital Improvement Project. We are prepared to have any discussions about ongoing with the budget. So I think if you are asking people to speak to something other than the capital improvements.

RS: Okay. Alright.

JL: You might want to do that.

RS: Alright, Then we will ask Judge Carroll if you are ready, if you could step forward.

SC: Thank you sir.

RC: I did not fill out a speaker card, sorry about that. Do you want me to fill one out?

RS: Hold on just a second. No, you do not need to fill out a speaker card. Supervisor Heinz, can you let us know if you are present, because both Supervisor Grijalva and Supervisor Christy had to step away from the Dais. He is here. Alright, okay. You have spared Ms. Manriquez some anxiety. Alright. Thank you, Judge Carroll.

RC: Thank you, sir. Thank you all Supervisors, Ms. Leshar, especially Ms. Manriquez. Today it has been a tough week for Pima County, and I was able to see Supervisor Grijalva and give our condolences now and I appreciate all the friends and staff that

also worked right in this room with the Congressman. We are sad to see him leave. When he left the County Board for Congress, but especially sad from house to house in Green Valley to see him leave his friends and family. Now the most important thing I just wanted to touch on today was, and ask about our growth in Green Valley. Thank you for listening to the Board of Supervisors. When you talk about our forecast, I wanted to just be aware that we are just asking in three points. There is a PCN request that we are looking for a court case manager generalist. We have had great success recently hiring two U of A graduates, both fluent in Spanish, who were able to pick up the reins and it takes a little time to train a person, but it was an excellent series of interviews, and we wanted to say that Workday is possible to hire people through. It took a little while to get the kinks out earlier, when we switched over, and we appreciated all the help that we had from the County HR. Lastly, when we look at our growth this year, we had stats to prove it. We have a dashboard that the Supreme Court provides and the Office of the Courts around the state provides. It shows that our growth has been phenomenal in Green Valley, especially since we inherited the former precinct that was occupied by Judge Doug Taylor two years ago. All of our forecasts have been met, and we accurately provided background for you. It includes each year we have put on a couple hundred more misdemeanors, a couple hundred more civil filings, including evictions, small claims and regular cases. We, our limits are \$10,000.00, but we approach our limits now almost 50% of the time on these types of filings. We have had a thousand new civil traffic cases. It was really a lot to absorb. But this year we find out that the good news is for the courts that they are correcting a wastewater collections. This is point number two. So when we are having a thousand in this altogether a 30% increase in our cases. Last year, just when that was settling in, we worked the bugs out. We are now going to have the Tucson wastewater collections cases. All the Pima County wastewater collections cases filed in Green Valley under the court where they should have been filed all along. So that is going to include about 700 to 800 minimum. That is a conservative estimate of new cases. So just when we are up grasping, you know, getting above water, unfortunately for our Clerks, we are going to have more cases and a new caseload. So I wanted to say we can justify the new PCN. It is for one generalist. The phones ring constantly at our court. The work window is always walk-in traffic, with everything from civil to protection orders and even wedding license. We had 100 people last week for free wedding Friday. It is an incredible place to work. We hope that now that our staff surveys are out, they feel the same about us, that we feel about them. We are devoted and we really certainly enjoy working the work that we are doing and the exhibits that I have included, again, our forecast, you know, in State of Arizona. This is a good comparison, hopefully, and I will leave you on this note, \$1 billion with a revenues from the Arizona state courts budget. So that billion dollars was the budget for the pardon me, was the budget for the state Arizona courts budget, and the revenues were collected \$350 million. So a third, our budget is close to about \$900,000.00, and we collect last year, \$732,804.00 of revenues. February was our biggest month ever. I take the money to the bank at lunch hour every day, to the Bank of America, and we had a \$71,000.00 month in February. So it just shows that although we increased our caseload by 25% this year, our increased revenue is 21%. It just continues to grow every year, including this memo that I just reminded

you of. With wastewater, we are going to get like another 600 to 800. And lastly, my predictions for the caseloads continue to rise, not just because due to wastewater this year, but there is a lot of urgency in Green Valley. You had responded with our probation officer earlier when we came back here in October, but right now I have to tell you that domestic violence charges have increased. We appreciate the Sheriff's Department and all the work that they do on this. Following back in 2020, before COVID, we have had 140% increase. It is steady and it is urgent and we have hired the probation officer. But it is not just a just add water situation. These are cases that have come down the pike. We are now up to 12. And anybody who has basically two cases like this is now in our treatment program, which follows a clinician's recommendation to address the root causes of an offender's behavior and to reduce recidivism. Lastly, so it is pretty much like our DUI court, which many of you have visited. We just want to say thank you for your time this morning and hopeful that we will see one more PCN for a generalist clerk before. Even though it is going to be a very difficult year. We understand that, but before we wanted to plan ahead, certainly because of our absorption of the former precinct and the work that we are doing. Thank you for your time.

RS: Thank you, Judge Carroll. Any questions from Supervisors for the judge? Alright.

SC: Thank you, Melissa, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RS: Thank you very much. Appreciate your time for you coming down here. Alright we will turn it back over to the County Administrator for the presentation that she and her team have prepared.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott. Again today we are focused on the Capital Improvement Program. We, here today is Rod Lane, the Director of Project Design and Construction, along with Art Cuaron and Andy and Javier from our budget team. I think we are going to start with you, Mr. Lane. Thank you.

RL: Good morning, Chair Scott. Excuse me. Good morning. Chair Scott. Board members, Ms. Leshner, this morning I will be introducing you to the next evolutionary step in Pima County's integrated infrastructure..

JL: Rod, can you get a little closer to. Yeah. Okay. Thank you, sir.

RL: Let us start over again. Good morning, Chair Scott. Now I can hear it. Board members, Ms. Leshner, this morning I will be introducing you to the next evolutionary step in Pima County's integrated infrastructure plan. The IIP was first introduced in 2019. It is a plan to capture various capital project needs over a ten year period. The plan collates this information into a single planning document to assist with identification. Excuse me, can you move to the next slide, please? There we go. There is the cover sheet. The plan collates this information into a single planning document to assist with identification of potential efficiencies and better use of County's limited resources. On the screen is the cover sheet and the public link to the pdf printout. For the FY 2027 through 2036 IIP, which includes FY 2026 funding

requests. This updated IIP would not be available until after this presentation, so this afternoon the link will be, should be activated. Can you go to the next slide, please? The plan is essentially a live document and will be maintained and updated through the Project Design and Construction Department. The plan is informed by each department reviewing/updating their existing needs, reviewing their department specific planning resources, reviewing an incorporated County adopted initiatives and strategic planning documents. Prioritizing and organizing these needs, such as to allow for appropriate planning, design, and delivery. Each department then reviews those with County Administration. The process then moves into the capital improvement programming process, where the Finance Department uses this information to develop the tentative Capital improvement plan. Each department then meets with both the Finance Department and County Administration to further refine the tentative CIP, which takes us to the point we are at today, where Mr. Cuaron will present the tentative CIP to the Board to further refine it with the intent of approval in June, at which time the process starts all over again. Hence the circle. And we will continue on as a live document. Since this is a live document, the plan is to take snapshots at two critical points in the process and then publish these to the website. The first spot in which we are going to take the snapshot is the tentative CIP, which as it is presented to the Board of Supervisors. So that is what you will see on the page today. And then after the Board of Supervisors approves the CIP, we will then take another snapshot of it and also put that on the website. Next slide please,

JL: If I may interrupt for just a moment if I may, Chair Scott and one thing I want to comment on this may not seem like a lot, but one of the things you have before you today and the and the movement that has occurred with this team, you see before you and our deputies, is that now what the Board will be able to review is our budget will actually be the first year that overlays on the five year process, which is CIP, which actually overlays on the ten year process, all of which that relates to the budget. And sadly, this has not really been the case before. And I think for departments and people who wanted to understand how to impact the infrastructure plan and to make sure that we are getting programs designed and constructed or moved, it was not as clear as to when there could be impact in the system. So I just wanted to take a moment to really thank the team, to make sure that there is an understanding of how significant this new system might be, so that we can all plan for the future. Thank you.

RL: Thank you, so here is an example of the page and it kind of demonstrates to Ms. Leshner's point, how this whole thing comes together, and I think Mr. Cuaron will speak more to this as well. You can see the red line across the top, and that represents kind of the whole ten year process that goes through with the IIP, including the current funding year that we are looking at in 2026. And then the second red line is the five year plan. So it is really just the next five years of it that will show the current CIP or the tentative CIP, whichever it is, and then we will get down to the one year. So we are referring it to kind of the 10, 5, 1, view of the whole planning process from initial planning of ten years out to looking at the actual budget process of the current year we are looking at. To the bottom left, you will see

where that printed date is for each time we publish it. And that will give you an idea of the snapshot when this was taken. And they will all be published on the website. As we progress through this process on an annual basis. And with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Cuaron, my colleague, to talk about the CIP program.

AC: Can you forward the slide, please? Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Ms. Leshner, I think this slide really hits on what Ms. Leshner was talking about just a minute ago in terms of how our departments collaborate together and how the IIP and the CIP are interrelated. So as Mr. Lane mentioned, the ten year IIP identifies the needs Countywide, which then through that process that he talked about a little bit ago is vetted and refined with County Administration, which then feeds our CIP, what you see in the budget documents and what we will get into a little bit in a few minutes, that feeds the five year CIP funding plan. And then that five year CIP funding plan then correlates to the FY 25/26 CIP budget, which is the one year that you will approve in June and you will see here today. So I think this is a high level overview of how the documents are interrelated and how we work together and collaborate with one another on the creation of both the IIP and the CIP. Next slide please. So this slide here is a prospective view of what we are projecting for our CIP needs out into FY '29/30, may be a little hard to see on the slide. The white bar is representative of our CIP requests for '25/26, and I will take the opportunity to remind the Board that this is a fluid document, that no firm decisions have been made. But as of today, the request is a little over \$200 million. It is \$200,300,562.00, with a total five year CIP of just north of \$900 million. How this relates to the '25/26 budget is about a \$8 million reduction over the current year adopted budget of \$208 million in FY '25. Over the past four fiscal years that number is \$874. So you can see the need in terms of CIP is growing at the County. And so just want to highlight that on this slide. Next slide please. This slide talks about our five year overview by department. I realize that some of the minor departments may not be seen from the Dais. But what I want to identify here is the is the larger departments that really drive our CIP. Red is wastewater, they have a large capital program that is funded by their own department. Yellow is transportation, as you probably all know, great need in our community for roads and street improvements. And we also have facilities, especially in the early part of the CIP in '26 and '27. They are represented by the gray bar that is really related to facilities maintenance Countywide, and then the other large department is Flood Control. And you heard from Mr. Shepp a little bit earlier, and that they are almost north of, just north of \$20 million for the fiscal years, going out to 2028. Next slide please. So as we talk about what are the requests from the departments for '25/26. Again this total is just north of \$200 million highlighted by wastewater with a little about \$63 million with the red circle there. I mentioned Facilities, they have a \$40.6 million request, Transportation is \$17.4 million, and Flood Control at just over \$25 million at \$26.1. Some of the projects that we have talked about here, wastewater as a Tres Rios biosolids program of \$10.8 million, a couple other projects just north of \$9 million for Wastewater. Flood Control has a couple of projects at the fairgrounds for \$4.8 million, \$4 million, and they have floodplain land acquisition again at about \$4 million of that \$26. Facilities maintenance, you will see a large portion of that is at the Superior Court. Two intended improvements, \$18.3 and then

another \$5.3 at 33 N. Stone. Again, just highlighting a few of the projects that are driving each of these departments. I am going to pause here before I go on to the funding to see if there is any questions in my presentation thus far.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I just want to make a quick comment regarding Mr. Lane. I was on the State Transportation Board for five years and I still have contacts with that department, and they have advised me since you left there and came down here, the Arizona Transportation Department has deteriorated so drastically. So, we are glad you are down here. Just as a note, I will sit and listen to the presentation and try to see the numbers, but we did not get any background on this. We did not get any information in our background. This is a lot of money. This is a lot of projects. It is a lot of information to digest, information I cannot even see. I would like to be able to continue this item and receive the background that is applicable to the presentation, so we can make some educated decisions on this. I do not feel comfortable with this kind of money and these kinds of projects. Making any kind of determination on how we should spend it, because it does say discussion, direction, action. Now, if it is just going to be discussion, then I am fine with it, but if we are asked to take action, I am uncomfortable not having the information at hand.

RS: To follow up on that point. I do not know if this is pending in the presentation, but I would certainly appreciate knowing how the CIP requests fit in with the priority areas in the budget that were outlined last time, and Supervisor Christy makes a point that we are being asked to provide direction on inclusion of these projects in the County's overall '25/26 budget, provide direction on the incorporation of these requests into the Capital Improvement Program budget, so getting a better sense of how they fit into the budget framework that was outlined at our last meeting, I think would be very helpful. And we can certainly return to this item to get into more of that granularity after our time certain item at noon.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, I am not sure, we put on action should the Board wish to take any, but much like the supplemental that we had at the last Board meeting, this is a very different way we have handled the budget in the past. We simply bring you the final documents. We were looking last time to introduce you to all the different supplemental requests that have occurred. This was designed for us to be an overview and an introduction into the capital program. We do not need specific direction today. But what I would be interested in is what more is helpful from the Board's perspective to make decisions when they come to you on the capital budget, because I think historically, frankly, the capital budget has simply been part of the budget and approved without a great deal of discussion or really a look at all the different elements. So happy to use today simply as the introduction and to welcome any and all questions that we can then provide the Board for discussion at the April 1st meeting.

SC: And Mr. Chair?

JL: Supervisor Christy.

SC: To Ms. Leshner's point, that would be great with the background supplied after this meeting. Also, I would invite Mr. Lane and the Finance Department and your office or whoever you designate to visit with each Supervisor. We have staff meetings twice a month. I know that my staff would like to be very much apprised of the situation, and I think it would be a better interchange than watching a slide presentation that is very difficult to ascertain.

JL: Thank you sir, and I hope today is simply the sort of laying the foundation or foaming the runway a bit, so that you all know the kinds of communication you can have and we are more than happy to have staff meet individually with each of the Board. Thank you.

RS: And then just to reiterate, Ms. Leshner, either later in this presentation or as a follow up to the Board, hearing how some of these requests from the various departments are incorporated into those four priority areas that were outlined last time, is going to be helpful for me to see how they fit. No, I assume that might be the case, but that is going to be helpful in terms of knowing how they fit in with to use the language from the agenda item report, how they are included in the recommended budget. Any other questions or comments before we turn it back to Mr. Cuaron? Alright, sir. Thank you.

MH: Chair?

RS: Oh, I am sorry, Supervisor Heinz, did you have a question? I cannot see you because we have the slides up. Go ahead. Supervisor.

MH: Thank you. Okay, so just quickly on that last, like, pie thing, what can someone clarify for me what PDC is, we have at the bottom there. It is probably really obvious.

JL: Project Design and Construction and Supervisor. I am sorry, Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. About a year ago now, I believe I am trying to, we divided what was then the Facilities Management Department to have the ongoing sort of maintenance, if you will, of the buildings that continues under the direction of Tony Cisneros. We split from that the actual construction, design, development of buildings. That is the new Project Design and Construction Department that is led by Mr. Lane.

MH: Okay. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Go ahead, Mr. Cuaron?

- AC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have just one final slide. If we could advance the slide. And this really just relates to the funding sources that are funding the CIP project. So you will see in the red, again, correlated with Wastewater throughout the presentation there. The largest funding source at 65, a little over \$65 million. We have a grant funding at \$29.2. Some certificates of participation that we have already issued at a little over \$21 million and then Flood Control at \$17.8. So that really is just a diagram of our funding sources for FY '26. You may note that the funding sources are \$197, while the requests are \$200. Some of this is due to funding from the prior year that is being carried forward with that. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, I am happy to answer any questions that you may have related to this item.
- RS: Any other questions or comments for Mr. Cuaron? Mr. Supervisor Christy?
- SC: Thank You. I want to thank the Clerk for providing that I can put that screen on my computer here, but then I got to put my glasses on. So, thank you.
- RS: Thank you Supervisor. Anything else for either Mr. Cuaron or Mr. Lane or Ms. Leshar? I had a couple of questions, not so much connected with the CIP project, but the other part of this item, which is overall budget development for the Fiscal Year '25/26 budget. I just wondered if there were any updates for the Board on what was presented last time with regard to the strategic framework that was presented and how that is helping to shape overall budget development.
- JL: Chair Scott, the team continues to meet. The finance team is meeting daily. We meet with the deputies at least weekly to continue to see what we believe next year's budget is going to look, what the revenue is going to look like, which will significantly inform all of the different requests. At this point in time what we really are focusing on is the various supplemental requests, looking at how they relate into current needs, with the understanding that right now we are dollars short to fund the current budget. If we took next year and brought it forward, we are I am going to say we are a couple about \$20 million without adding a single supplemental.
- AC: Without adding a single supplemental and any of the..
- JL: And when you get to look at the supplementals and they are in buckets if we look at categories one and two, we are still those are adding up to about \$40 million at this point looking at a few of the priorities. So we still continue to struggle with how we are going to fund the current year, much less look at any of the supplementals and then with that, as we all know, we continue to monitor the federal and state pictures to see what is coming through to this, come to us. We are planning by next Monday to have a really first draft of how we balance a budget for next year, and what a tentative recommendations might begin to look like, which would then be our first opportunity to really come back to the Board at the April 1st agenda and show you again, this is all still a work in progress. We send the tentative budget out to the Board the last Friday in April, but my hope is we will show you our first chop at an

actual balanced budget and what might tentatively be recommended at this point with the various funding sources we believe are possible.

RS: Ms. Leshar, thank you very much, and just so my colleagues know, we will have items on the agenda in both April meetings dealing with the overall budget development process. I am wondering, Ms. Leshar, if at the April 1st meeting, the Board could get a report on what might be the ramifications of changing the percentage for the General Fund reserve. It is recommended to be between 15% and 17% of expenditures. We have it at 17%. Certainly would not want to go below 15%. But if we could get some.

JL: If I may, Chair Scott right now, I believe moving from 17% to 15% is about a \$12.2 million advantage to the County. What we are looking at is the Board policy that was recommended. The 17% was based on two things making sure that we kept our bond rating where it is, and an estimate of about two months general fund operating. We are looking at two things, staff is in touch with our bond counsel to see if there is an impact on our bond rating with that adjustment. The second thing is, as our budget goes down, the amount we need for the two months operating expenses is estimated to go down. So at this point, those are the things we are looking at and to be able to come back and say, we believe that we would not recommend. I will tell you, amending the budget, the Board policy, but to looking at a perhaps one-time adjustment to the 15%, if we can show you that it does not impact your bond rating and that it will still cover the two months.

RS: And we are just waiting?

JL: But it will be \$12.2 million and we are waiting to hear from that. We will have.

RS: From bond counsel?

JL: Yes, sir.

RS: Alright, thank you, Ms. Leshar. And then another big ticket item in terms of how the budget is structured and certainly has specific impact on the capital improvement program are the PAYGO percentages and wondered if for both the Board and the and the media, if you could give an overview of how PAYGO is currently funded and what options the Board might be able to consider if possible moving forward.

JL: Chair Scott. And this is the PAYGO, if we recall, was a in effect, the band aid, the policy that the Board put in place to ensure that we had dollars available for infrastructure projects. After a couple of rounds of various unsuccessful attempts to get bonds passed in the community as a County that every decade or so went out with about another \$100 million bond package, we did not have that any longer. We looked at PAYGO. What we look at it currently is 60/60%. We look at 60% of the increase in the assessed valuation for the year and 60% in the additional dollars that are available as we pay down debt, since we do not have those, since we are not paying on old bonds anymore in that way, we look at that 60/60% and see what

that number is and see how we allocate it towards primarily transportation, but all of our critical infrastructure needs. We have been tweaking around a bit and looking at coming back, we can what does it mean if we are at 70/70, 50/50, 80/80? What does that do? I am not going to attempt to explain, but maybe someone will have that with us today. But happy to provide that to the Board of what that looks like, because we look at it quite a bit about what any of those tweaks up and down might be. Mr. Cuaron or Andy, anybody?

AC: Ms. Lesher? Mr. Chair, members of the Board, we can certainly bring that back. We have that analysis. I do not have that in front of me today, but we can bring that back as requested on 4/1.

RS: I would appreciate that greatly and just to go back to a point that you made with regard to the priority areas and the Supplementals. Are the items in the CIP also put into those priority areas, or has that already been done as part of each department, going through that process that was laid out for us today?

JL: Mr. Chairman, we have not formally gone through that. When we meet and look at each of the projects, there is a discussion about how it impacts the system. We have not necessarily put them in those categories. To some extent, the operating budget begets the priorities of the capital, because if we are building parks and, you know, we are looking at continuation of programs, but I am looking to staff, we have not done that the allocation with the additional column by project with the priorities, but we can certainly do that and provide that to the Board.

RS: I would absolutely ask that and also, given what we are trying to accomplish in terms of getting the budget into balance, maybe in the discussion of projects that go into different priority areas, we can also consider which ones could reasonably be deferred into another budget year to help us get to that point of overall balance.

JL: And if I may, Chair Scott, just one comment. We have just been finalizing and hope by the end of business today to send to the Board another, a memorandum that is a delineation and exploration of revenue sources that I want to be clear, we have spent and we continue to spend significant time looking at the expenditure side and how we can cap continue to modify the expenditure side. But at the request several times in the past from the Board to really, you will see a chart of all the different funding opportunities that are available, be they bonds, jail districts, health districts, sales tax, what are any of the options that might be available to the Board, and what is the requirement for each of those? Some require unanimous vote of the Board. Some require unanimous vote of the Board to send something to the public for vote. We are simply providing to the Board what all the options might be, not just for this year, but in years to come that you should have that by the end of the day.

RS: I appreciate that greatly. Any other questions or comments on this item from Board members? Alright. Thank you, Ms. Lesher. Thank you to your team. I appreciate you all being here.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

49. **Pima County Health Department Update - Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR)**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Improving our vaccination infrastructure and ensuring accessible vaccination opportunities for all students is critical to protecting the health and safety of our community. Recent data indicate that MMR vaccination rates are dropping below the critical 95% threshold in most counties across the state, including Pima County. Falling below this level compromises herd immunity and increases the risk of outbreaks of these preventable diseases.

While the Tucson Unified School District hosts vaccination events at the beginning of each school year, the current efforts are not sufficient to close the gap. It is essential in Pima County that we take a more proactive and targeted approach to ensure that all the schools in Pima County with vaccination rates below 95% are supported with accessible and convenient vaccination opportunities. To address this growing public health concern, I am proposing that the County establish a program to deploy mobile vaccination units to all Pima County schools with vaccination rates below 95%. The goal is to increase accessibility and eliminate barriers to vaccination, thereby improving overall immunization rates and protecting public health.

Key Components:

- Mobile Vaccination Units
- Targeted Outreach and Education
- Data Monitoring and Reporting (District 2)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
TC: Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director, Pima County Health Department

RS: We are on Addendum Item No. 8. This is an item that was added to the addendum by Supervisor Heinz. So before I turn it over to Administrator Leshner and Dr. Cullen, I just wanted to see if Supervisor Heinz had any introductory comments.

MH: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Scott. So as we have seen, measles unfortunately has become a bit of a resurgent situation. It for a little bit of context, I have been a practicing hospital physician for nearly two decades. I have never seen or treated a case of measles, and that is because of just widespread universal vaccination, MMR, polio, and those other things that we get when we are kids. And the reason I put this item on and asked Dr. Cullen to come and speak to us a bit about it, is,

frankly, because this is terrifying, measles. We went through a pandemic with COVID, I mean, COVID, and I watched it kill dozens of people right in front of me and right in front of the nurses I worked with. COVID is laughable compared to measles. Measles is a terrifying potential viral epidemic and it is incredibly, incredibly contagious. Far more contagious than COVID. So and we learn about it in medical school and we are told you are not going to see this because we have kind of vaccinated out of existence. But here is what it looks like. So now that we are seeing measles outbreaks in a dozen states and we have seen two children, I believe it is two children now that have died as a result of measles in the state of Texas. I am sad to say there will likely be more because this is a very nasty virus and our herd immunity number needs to be right about at 95%, and we are falling below that. I recently looked at the numbers statewide, and we are starting back in 2016. I think it was the average for matriculating kindergartners, which is how they measure this into our public school system fell just below 95%, which is concerning and it has fallen every year since then with a precipitous drop starting in 2020, coincident with the pandemic, of course. So here in Pima County, we are doing a bit better than statewide. The average for matriculating kindergartners in terms of their measles vaccination status is 93.7%. So, but that is still not okay. And we can do better and this represents a very serious, urgent public health crisis, and because frankly, I need an update. It has been over two decades since I have done a heck of a lot of research or heard or learned about measles. What it does, how it spreads, how well it spreads. I think it is important to hear from Dr. Cullen, a public health expert, about measles and she is going to teach us all a bit about this, this very serious illness. And then I would like to discuss a bit after her presentation, what I am hoping we can do as a Board to help mitigate this. And Dr. Cullen?

RS: Thank you Supervisor Heinz. Administrator Leshar any introductory comments or should we turn it over to Dr. Cullen?

JL: Simply thank you, Chair Scott. The request to staff today was to address and to communicate with the public about the growing health concern of measles, mumps and rubella, and then to perhaps look at some of the vaccination requirements, education and some of the data monitoring. So with that, we will turn it over to Dr. Cullen for the update. Thank you.

TC: Chair Scott, Board of Supervisors, Ms. Leshar, thank you for the opportunity to present. I do have a slide deck that we are going to go through. Next slide please. Before we go into the cases and outbreaks, I want to respond to something Dr. Heinz, Supervisor Heinz talked about. It is true that the vast majority of providers in this country have never seen a case of measles, with huge chagrin for all of the health care providers, we are now starting to see that. So what we know is that recognition of measles is important. We have been doing a lot of work at the Health Department with our health care providers in the County. As you may or may not recall, we did set up a web-based system called Provider Hub, where we push out information in specifically to providers that have signed up for that listserv. In the past month, we have pushed out specifically information about measles, how it presents, what to look for. The most important thing is that there is an incubation

period for measles, where people may or may not have any symptoms, and that is the period that we are most concerned about. If you will recall, there is a concept called r -naught. That is the number of people that get infected for one case. The belief is that when measles is in a room, it usually will last for at least 2 to 3 hours after someone in the room has had measles and the expectation is that up to 90% of people that have been exposed will then develop the disease if they do not have immunity to it. So this is an update of what we are seeing in the U.S. right now. This is through March 14th. I actually do have updated data on that. As of today, there have been 279 cases in Texas and 38 in New Mexico. So that 301 confirmed measles cases that were from March 14th is now 317 across the U.S. 93% of the cases, as you see here, have been linked to the three outbreaks you are probably most familiar from what is in the public eye of what is happening in Texas and then the spread into New Mexico. At the current time, you can see that measles typically kills 1 to 3 out of every thousand cases. So the belief is that there is significant underreporting of measles at the current time, given that there have been two deaths prior to this current U.S. outbreak. The last death due to measles was in 2015. Next slide. So to give you a local measles update, local meaning Arizona in the State, there are currently no reported cases of measles in Pima County. I will finish up this presentation talking about what we are doing to prepare to ensure that we will be able to respond. The last reported case was in 2019. It was an unvaccinated returning international traveler. At that point, there were no known transmission. Much of that was due to a rapid response that occurred at that time with our epidemiology team, where we were once again investigated the case and looked for the contacts and ensured that the contacts had appropriate vaccination and/or isolation. There has been no reported measles cases in Arizona in 2025, but you may recall there were cases last year, and you may recall some of those cases occurred in Maricopa County, where they initiated what we would call the EOC, an Emergency Operations Center, familiar to us from COVID to ensure that they could activate their epidemiology and their clinical team in time. Next slide. The best way to protect against measles is vaccination. Community protection requires a vaccination rate of 95%. That is what Dr. Heinz was alluding to when he talked about the lower rate of 93.8% in kindergarten. I will tell you that depending upon what your source of data is, you will see variation in these rates. Sometimes people report 92.7%, sometimes they report 94.8%. I just want you to be aware, depending upon the source, you may see some differences. The differences are minor. However, what we are seeing is a consistent rate below 95% in the kindergarten time period. The reason why that is so important is for many children, kindergarten is the first time they are now living within a congregate setting, and so it is important that immunization occur at that time. And two doses of MMR are required prior before entering into kindergarten. The state itself allows for multiple ways to get exemptions. These are forms that are filled in and then should be, in most cases, at least shared with the school. There are personal, medical, and religious reasons for exemption. They are dependent upon the family or the guardian to request that exemption. Those exemptions are not challenged. It is really up to the family to decide whether they are comfortable with vaccines or not. An exemption can be granted for a new, all the vaccines that are required or for a specific one if chosen. Next slide. So we really wanted to spend just a little time as the Health Department

to talk a little bit about vaccine safety and some common misconceptions. The reason for this is we are part of our educational approach to vaccines, is to really ensure that the public in and mass understands that safety is monitored regularly with vaccines. The vaccine for MMR has been available since 1971. That actually is why if you were born 1957 or before, the presumption is that you are most likely immune because you contracted the disease of measles, mumps and rubella. That is what MMR stands for. Today we are focusing primarily on measles. VEARS, which is a Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, is available to anyone to report any kind of adverse event to a vaccine. This is maintained by the federal government. But a provider can report, an individual can report, a family member can report. It is considered an early warning system and we pay attention to it. We actually queried the VEARS system in the last three weeks to look at what has been reported specifically for measles in terms of vaccine adverse events since 2019. Since then, there have been 17 reports. The vast majority of these are what we call urticaria. That is a rash reaction and/or fever. Since 2024, in the State of Arizona, there was one VEARS report given, there were none in 2025. VEARS itself does not show that there is a causal relationship between a vaccination and what is being reported. However, it does give us insight, especially from the general public, to know whether there is some significant number of adverse reactions occurring due to a vaccine. And once again, this data is queried for measles. There is data is available for every vaccine. Next slide. We just wanted to go over some common misconceptions and to just really address these and make sure people understand vitamin A and prevention of measles. Vitamin A does not prevent measles. However, vitamin A does have a role in individuals and/or communities that are vitamin A deficient. Before my current position, I spent four years doing global health, where we did supplement vitamin A in many communities that are low and middle income countries. However, at the current time, the recommendation for vitamin A is not to prevent measles. It can be given for acutely ill individuals that are hospitalized under the direction of a physician. We do not recommend that individuals themselves embark on supplementation for vitamin A. There is no indication that this is indicated in the United States. There is not a known large community that has vitamin A deficiency here. Homeopathic remedies to prevent measles. Once again, we are talking about prevention here. There is no known homeopathic remedies that we are aware of that prevent measles. Natural immunity is better than vaccine. You may have heard that there has been some indications that people have had what they call measles parties, similar to what people did decades ago for chickenpox parties where you got children together to get them to have chickenpox prior to, at that point, varicella vaccine, we do not recommend this. We do not believe that natural immunity is better than the vaccine. And the reason for that is because of the risks that accompany acute disease. The risks with the vaccine are very, very minimal. As you note, it has been around for decades. However, a small percentage of people that acquire measles, especially children, can become acutely ill. That has been evidenced by the deaths that we have seen up until today. Breastfeeding protects babies from measles while breastfeeding and maternal antibodies do provide some protection to children and neonates, they do not provide adequate protection. Now, the difficulty is that the first vaccine is usually indicated between 12 and 15 months. In places and communities where there is an outbreak, that

recommendation has been dropped to six months, so we do see early vaccination of children down to six months. That is not the recommendation in Pima County and Pima County, because we have not had a case or an outbreak, we are abiding by the traditional recommendations. And then the MMR vaccine causes autism. There has been multiple scientific studies to disprove that. However, you are probably aware that the CDC has embarked on another, what we call a meta analysis, to see if there is a relationship between MMR and autism. A meta analysis means that they will put together an innumerable number of studies that have already been published, and do an evaluation to see if there is a relationship. Next slide. I have two more slides. These are really about how to hopefully reassure you as a community and as a Board. We are monitoring community protection through MMR vaccine rates. Should a case be reported, we will embrace and embark on timely epidemiological monitoring of that case contact tracing and reporting. Those words should all be familiar with you. Those are the basis of how we stop transmission of diseases. We identify a case. We identify who may be at risk because of exposure to that case and then we work with the cases and the contacts to ensure people are aware. The multiple options that are available to them, including with the highly recommendation that they get vaccinated if they are not. We have pushed out provider information. We are coordinating with other systems in the County, including the health care systems, to make sure that they are up to date. In their response, we have asked hospitals to review their plans. We did internally conduct a measles preparedness drill. This was in February of '25. It was anticipating if and when we do get a case. I am very comfortable saying that all of the divisions that were part of the Health Department participated in that drill, and we identified some issues where we needed to improve. We have already done those improvements. So we are ready if and when there is a case. Because measles is considered so, as a sentinel event. One case, if there is just one case identified, we will stand up a virtual emergency operation center. That is the EOC. What that means is that we will bring all of our staff together. We will work with other departments within the County and make sure that we are responding. And then finally, the last, which I think is really important is to talk to you about. And next slide, to talk to you about the support for children, parents and schools. So and you can see this we do have ready to go after I do this presentation, information and guidance that will go out to all our Pima County K-12 schools, as well as childcare facilities. This includes information about what we know about measles and a letter in Spanish, as well as English, that facility, a school can choose to push out to their parents if they want. That is the letter that is noted on the second bullet. Finally, in response to Dr. Heinz' concern, which he had shared with me two weeks ago, we have the ability to stand up our mobile vaccine clinics, to go to specific schools where we know that the vaccination rates are lower if the school chooses for us to participate. And I just want to share with you a few of these numbers. This is from kindergarten data from the Arizona State website. This is available data. So we actually know the names of these schools, but as we entered the 23 to 24 school year and we know this is similar now at that point, 53% of the schools had 95% immunity. So the vast majority of schools that do not have 95% immunization rates tend to be the smaller schools, they may be charter or private schools, though, because we do have that list, it is a public list. I did not bring that list with me, but it is available on the

website. Like I stated, we will be reaching out specifically to those schools to offer mobile vaccination on site if they want. I want to remind everyone that vaccination for children does require parental permission. There is written permission that would be required. We will not just be giving vaccinations, and with that, I will stop and I appreciate the time to present to you. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. I am going to turn it back to Supervisor Heinz because he said that he had some comments that he wanted to make after your presentation. Then I will open it up to other Supervisors. Go ahead. Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott and thank you, Dr. Cullen, I really appreciate that. I did not see that or hear that from with regards to the slide deck, but could you just throw out some of the like signs and symptoms, that kind of thing? Just I know it sounds like you are going to be communicating that with, you know, through the school, through the schools to parents in English and Spanish, which is fantastic, but just is that something you might be willing to do just briefly here and then I wanted to talk a little bit about what I think we can do to mitigate this.

TC: Yes. Supervisor Heinz, Chair Scott and the Board, there are there is a fairly typical clinical presentation of measles. It usually starts with the three C's, which are coughed, coryza that is runny nose, and conjunctivitis. At that point, most people do not have a rash when the rash develops, which is what most people think of when they think of measles. It starts at the head and goes down from the hairline, down the face to the rest of the body. Now that is not 100% true, but by and large, that is what we look for. So symptoms of what would may appear to be a normal viral situation and then coupled with the rash. The other thing you hear about repeatedly is a thing called koplik spots. Those are white spots in the mouth. You will see lots of pictures of people opening a child's mouth to look inside. And that is what we call pathognomonic of the disease. That means, if you see it, the only disease that causes that is measles. So a fairly rapid onset but you can have, remember you have a delay, so 7 to 14 days after exposure may be the wait you have prior to getting those three C's and then usually 3 to 5 days. Children with measles tend to be quite ill. People talk about a stare where a child themselves may have very limited engagement with what is around them, and that is because they feel so poorly. Thanks, Dr. Heinz.

MH: Great. Thank you. So. Oh am I muted?

RS: No you are fine.

MH: Alright. So thank you. I think before and it sounds like we will be ready to respond should a case occur again in Pima County. I do not want to get there, I think we should jump on this right away. I do think that after our experience with the pandemic, we learned a lot. We saw mobile vaccination clinics all over, I think all of our districts. I literally was giving COVID vaccinations to constituents. So, I mean, it we have the capacity to, I think, have a very targeted, not incredibly costly response that looks at the 40%, 45%, 47% of schools were not hitting that 95% rate for

matriculating kindergartners. And be sure to the best of our ability get mobile units there. The rate of personal belief exemptions has been going up and up and up. A medical exemption, of course, understandable that there has been a reaction to other vaccines or the child, you know, has some known allergy that would prevent administering that, that is fine. And those folks are protected by the herd immunity being 95% around them, but there is not really a valid religious exemption. Personal belief unfortunately, in the state of Arizona, you can just say it does not and I get it. Parents are incredibly busy, they have multiple jobs maybe it is a, so if you are matriculating with your kindergartner, you did not get the full series done or you did one of them, but not the other, or for the MMR and a staff member at the school says, oh, do not worry, you can just sign this personal belief exemption and they can go ahead and matriculate. No big deal. It is a big deal. I know everybody wants to be more efficient and save time. But if at those schools where we have that rate below 95%, we have the option of not just the personal belief exemption, but hey, there is a mobile unit right there, there is only two people in line. Just take, you know, take your kiddo right over there and you will be good to go. And that is just a, I think we as the, as the public health authority for, for Pima County, I think we can and should do that. I would love to hear Dr. Cullen's thoughts on that and eventually I will make that a motion.

RS: So, in terms of what you referenced in your last slide, Dr. Cullen and what Supervisor Heinz mentioned in the item, where he said he is proposing that the County establish a program to deploy mobile vaccination units to all Pima County schools with vaccination rates below 95%. Could you address, as was noted on the final slide, how we are following up with the 47% of schools that have, according to state data, below that 95% rate?

TC: Yeah. Chair Scott, Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Heinz, we are in the process of doing a few very specific things. One is, we will be sending out this letter to the schools private, charter, parochial public, as well as early childhood care centers, to alert them to what the signs of measles are, what they should look for, and what we know about the rates. We will then secondarily follow up specifically to the schools that have been noted by the State health Department to have rates below the 95%. Now, most of these schools are smaller schools with perhaps 20 children in kindergarten and our focus will be on kindergarten. The reason for that is by the time you are 4 to 6 years old, you need two MMR's. What we see in early childhood education, which is the preschool, and remember the first dose, well, you do not need to remember because I did not tell you the first dose is between 12 and 15 months. The second dose is between 4 and 6 years. The early childhood education have higher rates than 95% overall. Overall, there are about 96%. What we see is the failure to get that second shot, which you would need for kindergarten in most cases because you are between the ages of 4 to 6. So our focus will be on the schools that are falling below 95% in the kindergarten setting. We will reach out directly to them. And at this point, the plan is to ask them if they would like us to have a mobile vaccine come on campus or to their facility, and give them the information that can be needed for parental consent. Parental consent can be asynchronous, which means it could be done at home. They could send home their

standard consent form and bring it back. Ideally, the parent would be with the child, but asynchronous consent is allowed within the State for that. And in that way we will attempt to ensure that all these facilities at least have access to a mobile vaccine clinic. The issue of going beyond an offer about a mobile vaccine clinic. We have not gotten there yet. Our hope is that most will just take us up on this offer. At the same time, our clinics, our three clinics are offering immunizations 8 to 5 Monday through Friday. In most cases for children independent of insurance status. It does not matter if you are on Medicaid, it does not matter if you have private insurance, it does not matter if you are not insured. Vaccine for Children Program enables us to give you the vaccines for you, for you as an adult, for you as a child, for your children, and for anyone else in your family that needs it. So our hope is that by doing increased communication and press on the need for this, that many people may choose to just come to our facilities. It is true what Dr. Heinz talked about, that the exemption rates, which remember can be personal, religious or medical, are higher in certain schools. Those rates once again are published rates. So that is why our initial approach is really to offer to come to the schools. We do know that private and charters have a higher exemption rate than the public schools.

RS: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. So, Supervisor Heinz, you said that you wanted to entertain a motion. I do not know if you are intending to expand upon what Dr. Cullen has laid out, but go ahead with whatever it was that you were proposing in association with your item.

MH: Sure. So I would move that we direct County Administrator in conjunction with Dr. Cullen and our Health Department to develop a plan to deploy the mobile vaccination units to coordinate with the schools and get those units on site at schools where they would like them to be present and to get back to the Board with that plan in 90 days, with a goal to make sure this is ready to go before the next matriculating school year.

RS: Thank you.

AG: I will second.

RS: That Is moved and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva. Any discussion? Supervisor Grijalva?

AG: Thank you for proposing this. I think that in light of the cuts to Medicare and the fact that 2 million Arizonans utilize Medicare, and in our rural areas, 36% of the people would be. So it is disproportionately impact people that are rural versus people that are urban. That is why I assume that a lot of the schools you are talking about are kind of smaller and out of the way. I think that it is important for Pima County to fill in the gaps in service wherever we can. I am glad that you are going to be bringing forward a proposal, and I am wondering if we are limiting this plan to MMR or if we could include flu and other vaccines? I do not know, but if you, as you are planning it out, if you can think about it, because I also understand that there is a cost issue.

So when you are thinking about the plan, help us to understand what the impact might be if our federal government is not going to reimburse like they used to reimburse for some of these common vaccinations.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you. Just to be clear, what Supervisor Heinz is proposing is to remand it to the Administration to come back with a plan, and at that time, will we vote to approve it or not? Correct?

MH: That is right.

RS: Yes.

SC: Okay. So I would support that motion to come back with a plan as long as it included certain elements. First of all, in the resolution itself, it says "Recent data indicate that MMR vaccination rates are dropping." And we did a little research in our office, we looked at the CDC analysis that goes back to 1985, and it shows on this chart that the highest incident since 1985 was in 1990, and that had 27,000 cases, almost 28,000 cases in the entire country. Then it drops precipitously in '91 to 9,600 cases, and then in '92 down to 2,000 and from '93 all the way to 2024, it never goes above 250 cases. And right now, according to the CDC, on this chart, there have been only 301 cases in the country reported and I am having a hard time equating this as another COVID epidemic and that we are in a pandemic situation, especially when also in the resolution it says, "we propose the creation of a Pima County outreach program." There has not been any presentation or discussion of a fiscal impact for this. My question is, how are we going to pay for this? Who is going to pay for it, and how much does it cost? And I also have a question where is, is there a problem of availability for people who want to have, their kids or whoever receive the vaccination? Measles vaccination? Where is the unavailable areas?

RS: Were you posing your questions, Supervisor Christy, to Supervisor Heinz or to Administration?

SC: To either to Dr. Cullen or well, that is Administration or to Dr. Heinz. Where is it? Where is a problem where you cannot get an MMR?

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: And I just want to be clear, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, when you began, you had indicated that you had three questions you wanted us to include when we respond in the plan.

SC: Yes.

JL: So is that if, identify where there is a problem. And indicate that, what is the cost of an outreach plan? And then?

SC: How long is it going to be in effect?

JL: And then 300 cases in the country. What is the significance? Do we really think it is a problem? I think is what I heard and you would like us to include those elements in our response plan in 90 days, is that correct?

SC: That sums it up and that is when we will vote on the plan.

JL: Yes, sir.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor, any other questions or comments on the motion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye?

SC: Aye.

RS: Oh thank you, Was it a clarification or does he need to amend his motion because it did not sound, it sounded like the County Administrator was speaking to the motion when she did that. Okay. Alright. So, all those in favor of the motion, indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

AG: Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Item passes 5 to 0.