

## **FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MEETING 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, April 1, 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 joined the meeting at 10:48 a.m.

### **1. Award**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000073, Southwest Heliservices, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Mesa, AZ), to provide for helicopter transportation. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$335,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Flood Control Support Fund. Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District.

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.

### **2. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

---

CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES**

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 1, 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 joined the meeting at 10:48 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 Carolyn Campbell, Founding Executive Director and Current Board Member, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection.

### **3. PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

### **4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Supervisor Christy acknowledged Corona Foothills Middle School located in the Vail School District, for being No. 1 in the State of Arizona by the State Department of Education. He also acknowledged and congratulated the Green Valley Council for holding their first Wildlife Awareness and Prevention forum which included approximately 200 people in attendance. Lastly, he spoke about the tragic incident that occurred in Redington, Arizona. He stated that a good Samaritan who was helping motorists that claimed to be stranded was murdered by those individuals. He stated that a community meeting was held in Redington and many County department representatives along with Pinal County representatives were present, and he thanked the County Administrator for sending representatives to the meeting to offer support to that community.

## **PRESENTATION**

### **5. Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Carla Blackwell, Director, Development Services Department, for 23 years of service.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, expressed gratitude for Ms. Blackwell and her dedicated service to the County.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, recognized Ms. Blackwell for 23 years of service to Pima County. He expressed his appreciation for her service and the great friendship they had developed over the years.

No Board action was taken.

## **PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Rocque Perez, Executive Director, Metropolitan Education Commission; Sharon O'Brien, Executive Director, Literacy Connects; Yissel Salafsky, Executive Director, Make Way for Books; Lori Masseur, Executive Director, Read On Arizona; Abra McAndrew, Executive Director, Tucson Festival of Books; and Amber Mathewson, Director, Pima County Public Library, proclaiming the week of April 27 through May 3, 2025 to be: "PIMA-TUCSON READ ALOUD WEEK"

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. Chair Scott made the presentation.

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Laura Conover, Pima County Attorney, Virginia Rodriguez, Director, Victims Services, Nicole Vigil, Victim Advocate, and Courthouse Dog Arrow, proclaiming the week of April 6 through April 12, 2025 to be: "CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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. Supervisor Grijalva made the presentation. County Attorney Conover read the proclamation.

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Sam Miller, Chair, Southern Arizona Chapter of Dark Sky International, proclaiming the week of April 21 through April 28, 2025 to be: "INTERNATIONAL DARK SKY WEEK"

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. Supervisor Grijalva made the presentation.

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Amy Morales Baum and Jayme Jacobs, Regional Directors, Jessica Harrington, Senior Regional Director, Matthew Vrvilo, Program Coordination Specialist, Chinna Garza and Rose Hattab, Community Engagement Coordinators, First Things First; Ashley Barbara, Executive Director, and Diana Hill, Vice President of Advocacy, Southern Arizona Association for the Education of Young Children, proclaiming the week of April 5 through April 11, 2025 to be: "WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD 2025"

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. Chair Scott made the presentation.

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Anissa Taylor, Epidemiology, Monica Nicholas, Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Food Program, Cameron Grott, Consumer Health and Food Safety, and AJ Velde, Training/Business Operations, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the week of April 7 through April 13, 2025 to be: "NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK"

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

11. Presentation of a proclamation to Nancy Gutierrez and Chris Mathis, Arizona State Representatives; Dr. Stephen Dahmer, Director, Andrew Weil Center for Integrative Medicine; and Ricardo André Pereyda San Nicolás, proclaiming the month of April 2025 to be: "ARIZONA GARDEN MONTH"

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. Supervisor Allen made the presentation.

## 12. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Gisela Aaron addressed the Board and read a proclamation about Liberation Week in Pima County.

Laurie Moore spoke about the Transgender Day proclamation that was presented at the last Board meeting and that she felt discriminated against, and heterosexual people also deserved to be recognized with a proclamation.

Anastasia Tsatsakis expressed her concerns regarding the possibility of the City of Tucson and Pima County establishing homeless encampments in public parks. She explained that families, organizations, and sports groups used parks as a way of gathering together and holding events, and that encampments made the parks unsafe.

Joseph La Salvia expressed his concern regarding dog noise complaints that he had filed with the County that had not been taken care of. He stated that the barking

and dog fights that took place at a home closest to his house was causing mental health issues for him.

Phineas Anderson stated that he had organized the first Telsa protest in the nation which consisted of 50 people and had since grown to over 1,900 people in attendance. He read a proclamation titled "No Executive Overreach – Supporting the U.S. Constitution, Defending Our Democracy" and hoped the Board would adopt the proposed proclamation.

Robert Reus spoke about running for previous political seats and hoped that his Jeffersonian concept would be implemented into the County.

Bart Berlin spoke in support of Minute Item No. 35. He stated that he was a volunteer with the park and cherished his time working there.

AnaKarina Rodriguez thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her many years of support within the community and wished her good luck on her campaign for Congresswoman.

Cecila Valdez stated that she had been Supervisor Grijalva's preschool teacher and expressed how proud she was of her. She thanked her for all of her support and hard work.

Eva Carrillo expressed appreciation to Supervisor Grijalva for her years of service, support and help she offered the community. She stated that Supervisor Grijalva's next step towards Congress was going to be powerful and impactful.

Isabel Garcia stated that Supervisor Grijalva's late father, Congressman Grijalva, had made a big difference in her families' lives and expressed how proud she was of her.

Steve Valencia, Arizona Jobs for Justice Coalition, spoke about Supervisor Grijalva running for Congress and how impactful it would be for the community.

Fabiola thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her service and for her time when she served on the TUSD Board.

Carolyn Campbell thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her time on the Board and expressed gratitude to County staff for their work on Minute Item No. 35.

Jeanie Colaianni offered her condolences to Supervisor Grijalva for the loss of her father. She also spoke in support of Minute Item No. 35.

Suzy Lorensen stated that she was speaking on behalf of a friend and that he was happy with Supervisor Grijalva's resignation from the Board.

Christina McVie expressed her support for Minute Item No. 30. She stated that she was on the committee that vetted it for bond and it was the best fitted location for

the County. She also expressed appreciation and support for Supervisor Grijalva's decision to run for Congress and thanked her for her years of service with the County.

David Higuera addressed the Board regarding the Pima County Community Health Needs Assessment and discussed the biggest areas of concern within the County's health system.

Melissa Tuccio spoke about homelessness issues in the County and offered some solutions to the problem.

Stacy O. thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her years of service and support to the community.

\* \* \*

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Chair Scott requested that County Administration follow-up with Mr. La Salvia regarding his concerns about the Pima Animal Care Center.

\* \* \*

13. **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 11:00 a.m.

14. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:43 a.m. Supervisor Heinz was not present. All other members were present. Supervisor Heinz rejoined the meeting at 11:47 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

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

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

16. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Sunland Asphalt & Construction, L.L.C. v. Pima County, C20235486.

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

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

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

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

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

### **18. Update on Federal and State Executive, Legislative and Judicial Actions that affect Pima County**

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

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

### **19. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Overall Budget Development**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the FY 2025/26 overall budget development.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that at the last Board meeting there were two very specific questions asked about how the County might look at two Board policies; one regarding the Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) model, and the other regarding the amount that was required for the County's Fund Balance, which the presentation would address.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a brief slideshow presentation and stated that the first slide was a PAYGO policy refresher, which had been adopted by the Board in November 2019, which dedicated a portion of the primary sales tax to fund Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) in the General Fund. He explained that the policy outlined the calculation for which the dollars were moved into the Capital Improvements Fund (CIF) of 60% of the cumulative reduction in Debt Service, combined with 60% of the increase in the Net Assessed Value (NAV) in any given year. He stated that this combination was levied and those dollars were then moved into the CIF to fund General Fund Capital Improvements. He stated that the chart from the slide showed the County's collections since the policy's inception, and that from Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 the amount went from \$9.3 million to currently \$51.7 million, with an estimated \$53.2 million for 2026 at the current 60/60 rate. He stated that the chart on the following slide showed what the County's current budget was, and starting on the far left consisted of the levy and the tax rate. He explained that the orange bar represented the County's non-PAYGO levy, the white numbers on each bar was the tax rate, the gold bar was the PAYGO levy dollars generated for the PAYGO Program, the green bar was the County's total tax levy with the tax rate. He stated that the FY24/25 budget totaled \$461.3 million, and of that, \$51 million was PAYGO, and if they stayed at the 60/60 calculation for FY26, there would be a \$53.2 million estimated revenue with a tax rate of \$0.4508. He stated that they also looked at other scenarios with calculations of 70/70 or 80/80 distributions. He stated that a 70/70 distribution generated \$55.4

million, a \$2.2 million difference over what the County was projected for FY25/26 if at the current 60/60 model. He added that the 80/80 model would generate another \$4.4 million over the estimate of the 60/60 model and noted that while it generated additional revenues in PAYGO and non-PAYGO, it also increased the tax rate. He explained that the intent of the policy was that the 60/60 model or 40% base was to be used to keep the primary rate lower and when increased to 70/70 or 80/80 that tax rate amount would increase. He pointed out that he sent a memorandum that included this information presented on the slide. He explained that the PAYGO reconciliation for FY25/26, if at the 60/60 model, would be at \$53.2 million and they would continue to use \$25 million for Department of Transportation road prefunding debt service, \$5 million for affordable housing, \$2.2 million for open space, \$1.7 million for the Parks Renewal Fund, and Conservation Lands and Resources Renewal Funds at \$250,000.00, which left a total of \$19 million that would be included in the County Administrator's recommended budget that they proposed be reallocated to the prior year's capital debt expenditures that would allow them to be utilized to fund County operations.

Chair Scott asked if the prior year's capital expenditures were inclusive of only Certificates of Participation (COPs) or for all forms of capital debt.

Mr. Cuaron responded that it was primarily for COPs. He explained that the General Fund Reserve policy was adopted in October 2022, with the purpose of establishing General Fund Balance guidelines that the County would follow and it required an unrestricted Fund Balance of 17% of the prior year's General Fund audited expenditures in any given year. He explained that if that balance was less than 17% at the end of the fiscal year, then County Administration was required to develop a plan to bring that within target within two years. He stated that if the balance exceeded 17%, County Administration may submit a recommendation to the Board on how to allocate and spend those dollars. He stated that much of the policy recommendations came from the Government Finance Officers Association, which were best practices most that were held during construction of the Board policy. He stated for FY25/26 they were recommending a one-year moratorium to that policy, which would yield \$12.2 million in one-time revenues to help with the General Fund budget. He stated with this, the County's projected FY25/26 Fund Balance Reserve at 15% was \$92 million, which was still a healthy Fund Balance Reserve and they planned on resuming adherence to the policy in FY26/27. He acknowledged the Board's concern at the last meeting on what impact this would have on the County's credit rating and rating outlook, and assured that there was minimal to no impact. He stated they touched base with their financial advisor and they advised that if it was only for a one-year use of Fund Balance, there would be minimal to no impact on the County's bond rating and rating outlook and believed they could move forward without any financial repercussions from the bond rating agency.

Chair Scott recalled that when the Board adopted the Fund Reserve policy in 2022, it was recommended they stayed between 15% and 17% and that they decided for it to be at the upper portion of that recommended span, but now it sounded like what had been heard from Bond Council was that they could implement a moratorium on the policy for one year without having any real effect on the bond



rating. He asked if this had changed their initial recommendation to stay within the 15% to 17% range.

Mr. Cuaron responded that while it would be difficult to ascertain the reasoning, he believed that staying between 15% and 17% was a prudent path forward and that the intent back then might have been that it was for two months of operating expenditures. He stated that was the framework with which the policy was presented and approved, and that the 17% would get them to two months of operating expenditures. He stated that if the County wanted to look at 15% as a more permanent range, it would be prudent to look at it as a range rather than a hard target.

Chair Scott asked if that change would require amendments to the policy.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative and that the policy indicated 17%.

Chair Scott stated he did not think the policy question was explicitly addressed since it was regarding the one-year moratorium. He requested a report on the long-term ramifications of this change and asked for the question regarding changing the policy from 17% to 15% to be sent to Bond counsel.

Ms. Leshar replied in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that when she had previously served on other boards, she knew that moratoriums would have an impact on the County even if it was a slight percentage and how it affected the bond could still have a big impact. She expressed concern with the County going forward since they were already looking at reductions in force and what that looked like for everyone and so trying to keep as much of a General Fund Reserve as possible, to better anticipate some pretty significant financial stresses, was going to be hard.

Mr. Cuaron went over the January forecast and pointed out the \$4.1 million in the General Fund Contingency that the Board had set aside for FY25/26, which action had been taken in October/November. He requested direction from the Board on whether to use \$2.2 million of that contingency to address the one-time supplemental requests as a result of the FY25/26 budget process. He stated that this was prudent to allow them to accomplish some of the needs of the FY26 budget, with dollars that were currently available. He stated that the Board should take this action since things were getting more costly, such as equipment related purchases, paving, striping, etcetera and it would get them ahead of cost increases that might be realized with tariffs and other economic indicators.

Ms. Leshar stated that while there had not been a great deal of discussion on this, these were items included in drafts of the supplemental and/or the CIP budget that was provided to the Board. She stated that they had looked at them going to next year and the idea was that if it was not done this year, there would be a larger fund balance the following year to pay for it. She explained that it was not going to get any cheaper and that if the funds were available at this point, then they should

move forward to get through the capital project list and supplemental requests and use the dollars this year to pay for them rather than rolling them over to the following year.

Chair Scott asked if each of them were for a one-time expenditure.

Ms. Leshar responded yes.

Supervisor Allen asked about the criteria that led to these items being listed as opposed to others.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that as the supplementals were discussed, there was a prioritization scheme presented to the Board, with Priority 1 being County-wide, Priority 2 was maintaining existing services, Priority 3 was expanding of existing services and Priority 4 was new programs or services. He stated that they followed that scheme of selecting these particular projects and by approving the use of Contingency Funding this fiscal year, took pressure off of the supplemental package and budgetary dollar amount for next fiscal year. He stated that with regards to equipment purchases and capital projects, they were concerned that pricing would continue to increase, and if they waited, the cost might outpace the dollars that were allocated for it.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the recommended one-time expenditures, as outlined in the presentation.

## **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

### **20. Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds**

Staff recommends approval to utilize Anti-Racketeering Revolving Funds in the amount of \$329.00 to help fund a National Crime Victims' Rights Week event under Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 6.3.

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

## **FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **21. Contingency Request for Self-Insurance Trust - Internal Service Fund**

Staff recommends \$1,200,000.00 in budget authority from Non-General Fund Contingency be allocated to the Finance and Risk Management Self Insurance Trust - Internal Service Fund, to enable the continued payment of settlements and legal fees without going over budget.

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

## **FLEET SERVICES**

### **22. Annual Vehicle Exemptions**

In accordance with A.R.S. §38-538.03, staff requests the Board of Supervisors authorize the annual vehicle exemptions for 2025.

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

## **REAL PROPERTY**

### **23. Condemnation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 6, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the Pima County Attorney to condemn real property interests where necessary for the Magic Lane Sewer line in Section 3, T13S, R13E, G&SRM. (District 1)

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

## **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

### **Attractions and Tourism**

24. Arizona Aerospace Foundation, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide an Operating Agreement for Pima Air & Space Museum and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000032)

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

### **Community and Workforce Development**

25. Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., to provide for the Amado Teen Center Program, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$33,000.00 (PO2400010193)

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

26. Flowing Wells Unified School District 8, to provide for the Flowing Wells Family Resource Center, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$45,000.00 (PO2400010181)

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

27. Sahuarita Food Bank, to provide for warehouse logistics improvements, USHUD Fund, contract amount \$65,000.00 (PO2400012726)

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

28. YWCA of Southern Arizona, to provide for the Pima County Teen Court Volunteer Program, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$30,000.00 (PO2400010197)

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

29. Habitat for Humanity Tucson, Inc., to provide for the Habitat Home Repair Program, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$73,000.00 (PO2400012732)

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

30. The Safford Marana Leased Housing Associates I, L.L.P., to provide an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for the Safford Project, General Fund:

- A. Contract expense amount \$1,000,000.00 (PO2500001949)
- B. Contract revenue amount \$1,600,000.00 (CT2500000005)

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

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

31. Old Pueblo Community Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Opioid Abatement Funding - Coordinated Reentry Planning Services Programs, amend contractual language and scope of services, Attorney General State of Arizona Opioid Abatement Grant Fund, contract amount \$111,000.00 (PO2400000685)

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

#### **Justice Services**

32. CODAC Health, Recovery & Wellness, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for co-responder peer services, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Safety and Justice Challenge Capstone Grant Fund, contract amount \$56,250.00 (CT-24-459)

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

## **Procurement**

33. Chasse Building Team, Inc., Concord General Contracting, Inc., Durazo Construction Corporation, Kapp-Con Incorporated, Kitchell Contractors, Inc. of Arizona, L.L.C., Kittle Design & Construction, L.L.C., Lloyd Construction Company, Inc. and S.D. Crane Builders, Inc., to provide a job order contract: remodel and construction services, Various Funds, contract amount \$6,000,000.00 (SC2500000074) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Supervisor Christy asked staff to briefly describe the scope of services and if some of the funding was for the jail, the Administration Building-East or the Northwest Service Center.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that it would be used for all County facilities. She explained that these were job order contracts for remodeling and construction services, it made the contracts available for when the County needed them and then staff could execute those contracts for the specific projects.

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

34. KONE, Inc., to provide for routine elevator maintenance and repair at various Pima County facilities, General Fund, contract amount \$350,000.00 (SC2400002406) Administering Department: Facilities Management

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

## **Real Property**

35. SunChase Estrella Limited Partnership, to provide for Acquisition Agreement Acq-1237 to acquire the Desert Springs Subdivision, a.k.a. Kelly Ranch, to preserve wildlife habitat and known Hohokam archeological sites and provide future recreational opportunities adjacent to Catalina State Park, CLR-Capital Projects/Conservation Land Acquisition Fund, contract amount \$6,255,000.00/2 year term (\$2,000,000.00 initial down payment, \$2,000,000.00 annually, up to \$15,000.00 in closing costs, up to \$240,000.00 in interest payments) (PO2500007703)

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 opposition to this item. He stated that the Kelly subdivision was located on Oracle Road and across the street was a very busy retail commercial center that had been there for a long time. He stated that it seemed that the property was not being properly utilized particularly when there

was already a state park adjacent to it. He stated that the property would be more beneficial if it was given to the private sector for development. He stated that the Board was always concerned about economic opportunities and housing opportunities being so limited in Pima County, but they would be taking a large piece of property off the tax rolls. He stated that the Board was worried about the future of the County's budget and elements that threatened it, but this was an opportunity to turn that piece of property into a private equity, commercial retail, or residential area that could be developed in an area that was already heavily developed with those categories of use. He stated that it was not a smart idea to take the property off of the tax rolls and lose the opportunity for economic growth, job growth and tax base growth. He stated that the County did not need more open space and were not hurting for environmental areas and recreational opportunities, which they already had at Catalina State Park.

Supervisor Grijalva expressed her support for the acquisition. She explained that it was almost 109 acres and would abut right up to Catalina State Park, which was a perfect location to continue to extend the goals of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, which were to ensure a wildlife corridor and the protection of it. She stated that visitors to the Sonoran Desert were a huge economic boost for the County and she wanted to continue to preserve that area. She explained that in 1990 when her dad sat on this Board, he was an integral part of ensuring that a huge development of Kelly Ranch did not happen and this was a full circle moment for her. She thanked the conservation and environmental justice organizations who reached out to her office to express their support and stated that this acquisition would be impactful to Pima County and to the County's conservation land system with expanding that footprint.

Supervisor Allen stated that she supported this item and that the long history of protecting this wildlife corridor was a testament to the long term commitment made by the County to protect the integrity of the Sonoran Desert in all of its complexity, from wildlife corridors to understanding its economic value of preservation of lands. She stated that it was a destination County for ecotourism and outdoor recreation. She explained that the integrity of the Sonoran Desert and the tourism around it were incredible reasons to support Kelly Ranch.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that the property was identified as being important in maintaining habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors. He explained that it was within the biological core and included important riparian habitat areas of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. He stated that its location was relative to Catalina State Park which was immediately adjacent to it and Oracle Road was on the western boundary of the property at 108.8 acres of land. He stated that there was lush vegetation and important riparian habitat corridor on the site. He explained that the purchase agreement was \$6 million plus closing costs with a down payment of \$2 million and the balance was to be paid in installments of \$2 million plus interest over time, and that there was no penalty to the county if the balance was prepaid. He stated that starting with this fiscal year, \$2.1 million was available from open space dollars which were already allocated by the Board, and the balance of it would be made up by subsequent allocations from

the Open Space fund, as well as a contribution of \$600,000.00 from the Regional Flood Control District. He explained that the County was pursuing options to offset the county funding and, if successful, in a grant application submitted to Arizona State Parks, the County could apply for \$1.5 million. He stated that there was a residence on the property and if the County decided to sell it, the market value for that structure would be around \$1 million. He stated that the Pima County Park Lands Foundation had also set up a private donation fund to collect contributions to go towards the purchase.

Chair Scott expressed his support for this item. He shared that he had attended a ceremony at Catalina State Park where he saw a sign that was dedicated to recognizing the creation of the park and met former Supervisor David Yetman, who had done a great deal to ensure the creation of the park. He thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her advocacy for an open space acquisition fund that helped purchase the property. He indicated that his office had received numerous messages of support from District 1 residents, including the Mayor of the Town of Oro Valley and he was grateful for the support of the town.

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

### **Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

36. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., to provide for WW Intelligent O&M Solutions to optimize performance at the Tres Rios Water Reclamation facility, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount not-to-exceed \$432,000.00/3 year term (estimated \$12,000.00/month) (PO2500003063)

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

Chair Scott stated the item indicated that although there was a not-to-exceed cost over a three year term of \$432,000.00, there was an expectation of \$400,000.00 annually in savings by entering into this agreement with Jacobs Engineering Group. He asked if the \$400,000.00 was an annual amount or if it was the total amount during the three year term.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that with the use of this contract and the technology, the County would be able to reduce costs for operating the wastewater treatment system, chemicals, energy, and things of that nature, and the intent was that over the term, the County would see an annual savings of \$400,000.00.

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

### **Transportation**

37. Santa Cruz County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for cooperative highway maintenance, no cost/5 year term (SC2500000082)

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

## **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

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

Arizona Department of Economic Security, Amendment No. 13, to provide for the Community Action Services Program and amend grant language, \$2,751,401.52 (GA-CWD-70943)

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

### **39. Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Well Women Health Check Program and extend grant term to 2/25/26, no cost (GA-HD-66425)

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

### **40. Acceptance - Sheriff**

Governor's Office of Highway Safety, Amendment No. 1, to provide for occupant protection education related materials and supplies (car seats distribution to communities for education and awareness) and amend grant language, \$3,030.54 (GA-SD-78651-2)

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

## **FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

### **41. Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 323406, Tanner Caldwell Cook, Urban Distributors, 2433 W. Placita Desierto Morado, Tucson, Series 4, Wholesaler, New License.

The Chair 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.



42. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 326388, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, Series 6, Bar, Location Transfer and Person Transfer.

The Chair 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.

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

43. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

P24CA00001, WILMOT 8890, L.L.C. - S. WILMOT ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT

Wilmot 8890, L.L.C., represented by Mission Clean Energy, requests a comprehensive plan amendment for approximately 18 acres (Parcel Code 140-45-0340), from the Higher Intensity Urban (HIU) to the Industrial (I) land use designation. The site is located on the west side of S. Wilmot Road, approximately 1.3 miles south of Interstate 10, in Section 25, T15S, R14E, in the Southeast Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL TO INDUSTRIAL (I). Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 2)

Emma Riley, Development Manager, Mission Clean Energy, provided a brief presentation. She stated that Audrey Copeland, Head of Development, as well as Brian Scholl, a representative from the Energy Safety Response Group, were also in attendance. She explained that Mission Clean Energy was a national utility scale solar and battery energy storage developer. She stated that they had projects throughout the country, and they started from the beginning site acquisition all the way up until the financing, right before construction. She explained that this project was a 250 megawatt standalone battery energy storage system, was located about four miles east of the airport, was on approximately 18 acres of privately owned land and was zoned suburban homestead. She explained that the firm was there to request approval from the Board to amend Pima County's Comprehensive Plan and redesignate the 18 acre parcel from the suburban intensity category to the general intensity category or industrial land use designation. She stated that the company felt their project met a lot of the needs and stated goals on the local level. She explained that the project was really in line with the stated goals from the current long term comprehensive plan from Pima County. She stated that the plan also met the needs and goals of the utility, Tucson Electric Power, to increase their alternative energy resources, that a large chunk of that was storage and the overall goal to increase the reliability and efficiency of the grid. She stated that they also met the needs at the state level of having clean energy goals as well. She provided an image of the site layout outlined in red and stated that it was located off of South Wilmot Road. She explained that the nearest neighbor could be seen just across the street and it was a federal corrections institute and that they had already sought

consultation from them. She explained that the rest of the surrounding area was public land, with no slated plans for residential development, and that the closest residences were in the northwest corner. She provided an image of what the containers actually looked like on the ground and a layout of a more detailed configuration of their batteries that would be included in the package. She explained that if someone faced the project site the prison could not be easily seen and the structure would be much taller than the project. She stated that the company was confident that there would be minimal impacts to the viewshed of the local residences. She stated that there expected to be almost \$4 million in tax revenue over the 25 year lifetime of the project, and the vast majority, over half, would be going to the local unified school district.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24CA00001, as recommended by staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

#### 44. **Hearing - Specific Plan Rezoning**

##### P24SP00006, MANZANITA INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. - W. VALENCIA ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN REZONING

3000 W. Valencia, L.L.C., on behalf of Manzanita Investment Group, L.L.C., represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., request a specific plan rezoning for approximately .11 acres (portion of Parcel Code 137-22-0250) from the CB-1 (Local Business) to the SP (Specific Plan) zone, located at the northwest corner of W. Valencia Road and S. Cardinal Avenue, addressed as 3000 W. Valencia Road, Suite 210. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Multifunctional Corridor. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 5)

IF THE DECISION IS MADE TO APPROVE THE SPECIFIC PLAN, THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE MADE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MAY RESIDE WITHIN THE SPECIFIC PLAN DOCUMENT:

1. Not more than 60 days after the Board of Supervisors approves the specific plan, the owner(s) shall submit to the Planning Director the specific plan document, including the following conditions and any necessary revisions of the specific plan document reflecting the final actions of the Board of Supervisors, and the specific plan text and exhibits in an electronic and written format acceptable to the Planning Division.
2. In the event of a conflict between two or more requirements in this specific plan, or conflicts between the requirements of this specific plan and the Pima County Zoning Code, the specific plan shall apply. The specific plan does not regulate Building Codes.
3. This specific plan shall adhere to all applicable Pima County regulations that are not explicitly addressed within this specific plan. The specific plan's development regulations shall be interpreted to implement the specific plan or relevant Pima County regulations.
4. Adherence to the specific plan document as approved at the Board of Supervisor's public hearing.

5. The hours of operation shall be limited to 7 am through midnight.
6. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
7. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

Supervisor Grijalva inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P24SP00006, subject to standard and special conditions.

#### 45. **Hearing - Rezoning**

##### P24RZ00010, RAICA - W. BOUNTIFUL LANE REZONING

Teague and Devra Raica request a rezoning of approximately 3.31 acres from the SR (Suburban Ranch) zone to the SR-2 (Suburban Ranch Estate) zone, located approximately 900 feet east of the T-intersection of W. Bountiful Lane and N. Camino Del Fierro, addressed as 2602 W. Bountiful Lane. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 1.2. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 5-4 (Commissioners Cook, Gungle, Hanna and Matter voted Nay; Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

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

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 3, 2025, and during the time between now and then, for staff to prepare a report for the Board on the pros and cons of sticking with the current zoning or going to the proposed rezoning in terms of the effects on all parties. If rezoning remains, the staff recommendation during that time, they are to work with the applicant, adjacent landowners and other neighbors to craft conditions that most reasonably address concerns regarding potential adverse impacts.

#### 46. **Hearing - Zoning Code Text Amendment**

##### P24TA00001, HOUSING CHOICE

An Ordinance of the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona, relating to Zoning (Title 18); amending the Pima County Zoning Code Chapter 18.03 (General

Definitions), to adopt the definition of a triplex dwelling; Amending 18.09 (General Residential and Rural Zoning Provisions), Section 18.09.020 (General Requirements and Exceptions) to allow duplex dwellings and triplex dwellings as uses permitted in all rural and residential properties; Amending 18.13 (Rural Homestead Zone), Section 18.13.020 (permitted Uses), to allow duplex dwellings and triplex dwellings as permitted uses; Amending 18.14 (Rural Residential Zone), Section 18.14.020 (Permitted Uses), to allow duplex dwellings and triplex dwellings as permitted uses; Amending Chapter 18.71 (Development Plan Standards) Section 18.71.010 (Purpose and Scope) to revise the number of residential units from three to four residential units or less on an individual lot before requiring a development plan to be submitted. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 10-0 to recommend APPROVAL. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (All Districts)

If approved, pass and adopt: ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 8

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

Supervisor Christy requested an overview of the item.

Chris Poirier, Director, Development Services, stated that this item was to allow more choice for different housing types. He explained that currently, there were certain zones in the County's antiquated zoning code that was continually evolving, and there were certain zones that only allowed for a single family home regardless of the acreage. He stated that this would reintroduce the "plexes" or a term called the "missing middle" back into the choice a property owner could have on their property and this was extra rights for a property owner. He stated that if a property owner chose to maintain a subdivision of single family homes, they could or they could develop something with a slight alternative with plexes, and this was a way to develop properties more efficiently and creatively.

Supervisor Christy asked if staff had received any responses from the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA), construction companies, or Tucson Association of Realtors regarding the proposed amendments.

Mr. Poirier responded in the affirmative. He stated staff had received outright support from SAHBA, they wanted the County to take it further and staff would work with them to figure out what that meant. He stated that the Tucson Association of Realtors supported the item as well.

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

## **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

### **47. Hearing - Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 9, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to air quality; repealing Sections 17.12.040(E), 17.12.180, 17.13.020(C), and 17.13.200, which provide affirmative defense provisions for startup/shutdown/malfunction and emergencies; and renumbering Section 17.12.040(F) to 17.12.040(E), and 17.13.020(D) to 17.13.020(C); effective May 1, 2025.

The Chair 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, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **48. Elections Operations Report**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the development and presentation of a two election-cycle operations review and cost/benefit analysis of Pima County's transition from precinct level voting to the countywide vote center model, as recommended by the Pima County Elections Director and Pima County Recorder, and adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2022. (District 4)

At the request of Supervisor Christy and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 6, 2025.

## **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

### **49. Proposed Settlement in Sunland Asphalt & Construction, L.L.C. v. Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Sunland Asphalt & Construction, L.L.C. v. Pima County, C20235486.

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 approve the proposed settlement.

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

### **50. Board of Adjustment, District 4**

- Reappointment of Peter Backus. Term expiration: 2/5/29.
- Reappointment of Tim Healy. Term expiration: 3/15/29.

- Reappointments of Robert Fee and R. Craig Finfrock. Term expirations: 3/1/29.

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

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **51. Board of Supervisor, District 5**

- A. Acceptance of the resignation of the Honorable Adelita S. Grijalva, effective April 4, 2025.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to accept the resignation of the Honorable Adelita S. Grijalva, effective April 4, 2025. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve with all of them, and that it was a privilege to be able to talk to people about what was happening in the community. She stated that the Board had a responsibility to the County and it had been her pleasure to serve her community and district. She acknowledged the importance of continuing a strong, collegial relationship for the departments and the residents that relied on the work that they did in the County. She stated that the Board would be faced with some difficult decisions regarding next year's budget and urged to the Board to continue to keep the residents of the community in mind when making difficult decisions.

Supervisor Christy stated that he enjoyed serving with Supervisor Grijalva on this Board and wished her the best.

Supervisor Allen stated that Supervisor Grijalva would be missed and that her role was irreplaceable. She explained that her presence, standing up for what was right, for speaking truth to power, remembering those who needed to be remembered and centered was an inspiration. She stated that as a woman and Latina in leadership Supervisor Grijalva inspired others to follow in her path and would undoubtedly continue to inspire young and old women alike to push themselves into stepping into new roles and doing things that were bold and that were right.

Chair Scott shared a brief memory of Supervisor Grijalva walking into his office at Howenstein High School when she was a first time candidate for the Governing Board and the immediate connections she made with staff and students that day spoke to not only how much she cared, but how well she listened. He expressed his appreciation for their friendship and was excited to see what was next for her.

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

- B. Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a selection process to fill the vacancy of Board of Supervisor, District 5.

Chair Scott provided an outline of the draft selection process to fill the vacancy of Board of Supervisor, District 5, as follows:

1. Applicants for the position need to meet the following statutory requirements:
  - 18 years of age or older at the time of appointment
  - Resident of the state
  - Resident of the district
  - An elector of the county or precinct in which the duties of the office are to be exercised
  - Literate in English
  - Same political party as the person vacating the office (Democrat)
2. Interested parties are required to file the following documents with the Clerk of the Board:
  - Letter of Interest
  - Resume
  - Financial Disclosure Statement
  - Conflict of Interest Forms
3. Pima County will conduct a background check on all qualified candidates.
4. The Clerk of the Board will begin accepting the required documents on April 2, 2025.
5. The submission deadline will be on Monday, April 7, 2025, at 5:00 p.m.
6. The selection process information will be posted on the Pima County Homepage. Information regarding how to submit public comments will be included. A press release will be issued by the Pima County Communications Department.
7. If requested by the Board of Supervisors, a virtual public forum for the candidates will be scheduled and conducted by the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson (LWVGT), during the week of April 7 – 11, 2025.
8. The Board of Supervisors are encouraged to conduct individual candidate interviews if they choose.
9. The Board of Supervisors will make the appointment of the Pima County Board of Supervisor, District 5, at their meeting on Tuesday, April 15, 2025.
10. The person appointed by the Board of Supervisors will serve through December 31, 2025.
11. A Primary and General election will be held in 2026 and the candidate elected by the voters of District 5 will serve the remainder of the term until December 31, 2028.

Chair Scott thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her suggestions regarding this process and that it showed her concern for the residents that she represented and that they continued to have a voice during this time, which was especially important given that the Board would be considering the County's budget for the upcoming fiscal year. He stated that the draft selection process had been reviewed by the County Attorney's Office to ensure it aligned with statute.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern that the turnaround time was short and only left five days, excluding the weekend, for the applicants to be processed, and felt that there would be more vetting and the ability for his colleagues to talk directly in a more substantive manner if they had more time to do so. He explained that even though this appointment was not for his political party he would receive requests from applicants for interviews and that this was not enough time for those interviews to take place. He suggested that the Board extend that window by at least a week.

Chair Scott stated that the window that was being discussed was that individuals needed to indicate their interest in applying by Monday then the Board had until the next meeting to conduct any personal interviews that they wanted to have or have a public forum that would be conducted by the LWVGT, similar to what was done when former Supervisor Bronson resigned and the Board appointed her replacement. He recognized that it was a more accelerated timeline, but they were in the middle of budget season and he wanted the residents of District 5 to have a voice at the dais, as the fiscal blueprint for the coming year had been considered.

Supervisor Christy stated that he understood why there was a short time frame, but voiced concern that potential applicants might feel pressured to make a decision in a very quick and decisive manner without considering all the ramifications.

Chair Scott stated that most people who were interested in being considered for this appointment were very likely taking that into consideration now. He stated that applicants had until next Monday at 5:00 p.m. to submit the required documents.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that the Board took more time to appoint a constable than a Board member.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that the application was not that comprehensive and the conflict of interest forms and financial disclosure statements were available online. She explained that the Clerk's Office ensured the applicants met the requirements early in the process and there was still enough time for Board members to interview the applicants. She expressed concern with not having someone advocating for the residents of District 5 for a long period of time.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he supported the selection process and thanked Supervisor Grijalva for her suggestions. He stated that he was not concerned about the process being viewed as rushed or too short of a timeframe given the amount of press coverage. He explained that interested individuals were going to know through the media, internet, and through all sorts of sources that this opportunity was available far more so than when former Supervisor Bronson had stepped aside. He expressed confidence that the Board would be able to find an excellent representative for the constituents of District 5 within this time frame.

Supervisor Allen asked if it was a statutory requirement for the applicant to be literate in English. She stated that it seemed subjective and suggested that if it was not required then it should be removed.



Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that it was not in statute, but was in case law.

Chair Scott directed the Clerk to schedule a virtual public forum with the LWVGT. He stated that Board members could conduct individual candidate interviews and stated that he was planning on doing that. He stated that the Board would appoint a new District 5 Supervisor on April 15th and invite the person appointed to join the Board on the dais that same day.

Supervisor Christy asked if that was the meeting date.

Chair Scott responded in the affirmative. He stated that the individual would be sworn in and invited to join the Board at the dais at that time. He stated that it was important to point out for the public that the candidates were potentially going to be on the ballot twice in two years because when Supervisor Grijalva scheduled her resignation, the person would have to be on the ballot in 2026, to serve out the remainder of Supervisor Grijalva's term. He explained that if they wanted to serve a term in their own right, they would have to go through the primary and general election process in 2028.

Mr. Brown stated that he needed to correct his earlier response to Supervisor Allen's question regarding if an applicant needed to be literate in English. He stated that it was a statutory requirement listed in A.R.S. §11-402.

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

52. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

\* \* \*

**BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

1. **Metropolitan Education Commission**  
Appointment of Dr. Kasey Urquidez, representing At-Large, to fill a vacancy created by Mark Hanna. Term expiration: 8/12/25. (MEC Board of Directors recommendation)
2. **Regional Affordable Housing Commission**  
Appointment of Kim Lucas, to fill a vacancy created by Steve Huffman. Term expiration: 11/14/26. (District 3)

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

**3. Temporary Extension**

- 01210012055, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Barnfire Mesquite Grill, 8310 N. Thornydale Road, No. 180, Tucson, May 17, 2025.
- 12104529, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Wild Garlic Grill, 2870 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, May 3 and 11, 2025.

**ELECTIONS**

**4. Precinct Committeemen**

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Christopher DeYoung-016-DEM, Gerald Spann-012-REP, Mary Spann-012-REP, Maria Segundo-116-REP, Valerie Solomon-169-REP, Cliff Hutchison-174-REP, Sandra McPherson-174-REP, Sandra Canatsey-197-REP, Santiago Inclan-233-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Kathryn Mikronis-014-DEM, Mary Cowan-018-DEM, Phoebe Teskey-021-DEM, Angel Martinez-026-DEM, Erika Fisher-067-DEM, Cynthia LaFrese-067-DEM, Bradley Turner-070-DEM, Abigail Cox-073-DEM, Sharon Youngblood-073-DEM, Gage Bolt-079-DEM, Michael Bailey-082-DEM, Michael Borger-082-DEM, Miranda Lopez-082-DEM, Jeremy Zarzycki-082-DEM, Erin Matyasik-089-DEM, Evangeline Erickson-093-DEM, Alexandra Geiser-100-DEM, Moira Silverman-112-DEM, Aaron Rubio-120-DEM, William Winkelman-120-DEM, Retta Schriener-131-DEM, Lee Ezzes-166-DEM, Carter Santini-166-DEM, Pam Treder-184-DEM, Steve Treder-184-DEM, Theresa Riel-189-DEM, Christine Dayton-194-DEM, Michael Dayton-194-DEM, Elizabeth Dean-209-DEM, Luther Creed-211-DEM, Jason Stanhibel-224-DEM, David Meek, Jr.-225-DEM, Chris Donat-243-DEM, Kya Teskey-245-DEM, Corey Burson-275-DEM, Sandra Ehrlich-009-REP, Nelida Sprunt-011-REP, Jonathan Homan-080-REP, Henry Santa Maria-094-REP, Linda Shields-141-REP, David Hubble-182-REP, Yvonne Hubble-182-REP, Sharon Thomas-192-REP, Neely Roessler-214-REP, Patti Polk-215-REP

**REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION**

**5. Public Announcement**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §49-391(C), a public comment period of 30 days must be provided before any Pretreatment Consent Decree or Negotiated Settlement Agreement is made final. The Public Information Enforcement File for the

following case will be made available for public review or copies may be obtained for \$.35 per page at the Public Works Building, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department's reception desk, 201 North Stone Avenue, 3rd Floor, Tucson, Arizona, 85701. Comments will be taken for the next thirty days and written comments may be sent to Industrial Wastewater Control, 2955 W. Calle Agua Nueva, Tucson, Arizona 85745-9750. If sufficient interest is expressed, a public hearing may be held by the Board of Supervisors. After the comment period, the Board of Supervisors will vote on acceptance of the following Settlement Agreement:

Busy D Pumping. The proposed settlement in which Busy D Pumping, located at 3255 East District Street, agrees to pay a penalty of \$1,500.00.

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

6. Minutes: January 7, 2025  
Warrants: March, 2025

\* \* \*

**53. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott  
MH: Supervisor Heinz  
JA: Supervisor Allen  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AG: Supervisor Grijalva  
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator  
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator  
KV: Kate Vesely, Director, Justice Services Department

---

RS: We will now move to Item No. 12 under the County Administrator. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety. Administrator Leshner?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and we are going to focus today on the Transition Center. We have Deputy County Administrator Holmes and Kate Vesely from the Justice Services Department to give a quick update.

SH: Absolutely. Chair Scott, Administrator Leshner, I am going to turn it over to our Director, Ms. Vesely, so she can speak a little bit about the update. Last time we presented to the Board, we were looking at about 100 people roughly coming every month to the Transition Center. We are over 300 people coming and I am going to give a little bit of, have turnover for more detail on what that population is looking like now and who we are serving.

KV: Good day, Board. I will have you move to the next slide please. So we have surpassed serving 2,000 unique individuals at the Transition Center. Month over month, we continue to see more and more folks coming through. What we are tracking with most note is the increase in the number of felonies that we have coming through, as opposed to misdemeanors, which was primarily our target population. Next slide. So we have had great staff at the Transition Center. Many of you have come through to tour, and you can attest at how wonderful the individuals are that are maintaining, and they are really a credit to how successful the Transition Center has been. Some of our changes that have been occurring is an increase in the number of law enforcement drop offs, particularly by the Core Team at Tucson Police Department. We also have a high number of referrals coming out of Tucson City Court. The Transition Center Model has been published in a number of different trade associations with the Pretrial Network nationally, as well as the MacArthur Foundation, and we are having virtual tours, in-person tours and lots of national interest with this emerging as a best practice standard. We are always very concerned about ensuring that our demographics are roughly equivalent to the jail population. And in our last analysis, we were able to determine that we are serving,

we have an overrepresentation of communities of color compared to the jail population, so we are doing better than we had expected to. Next slide. You can see from this chart here. The bottom line was our average from January through August of last year, we were averaging about 115 individuals per month. You can see through February we topped over 328 and was roughly similar in January too, so we have really been picking up speed. We largely attribute this to increased word of mouth among the community, especially those who are likely to take advantage of our services. So those folks who are in jail, who are talking amongst themselves. Next slide. The first two columns here demonstrate the shift that has occurred. We have not had fewer people coming through via our pre-booking modular. We have just had that much of a dramatic increase in individuals coming over after they have gotten released from the jail. Again, we attribute this to having additional information on the tablets available for the detainees, but Facilities has also kindly made a more expedited route to make it over to us by cutting a hole in a wall and we are updating that blue line so individuals can more easily walk through without having to go up on the sidewalk on the main street. Next slide. What is notable about this is about 22% of those who are utilizing the Transition Center did not come from the jail or from the pre-booking modular. This includes law enforcement drop-offs, but also folks who have just come in off the street. Many of them have pending charges but have not been to jail or got released from jail some time ago. Others are family members who are trying to find services for incarcerated loved ones, and they are looking for how to navigate the justice system, but also get connected to other services. Next slide. You have heard me talk about this before, so I will not belabor it. Housing continues to be our most critical need, and the data demonstrates that our community is safer when we do have housing placement for individuals coming through. That orange slice, right there is the number of individuals who were rebooked into the jail within 7 or 30 days after their visit, as opposed to that blue slide, the blue column there, which is the rebooking rates for somebody who does have secure housing, makes a huge impact on whether we see them again frequently. And the last slide, so we are changing our data metrics, particularly to account for those folks who are coming out of jail directly. Those felonies anecdotally, our navigators are telling us that those who have felony charges are a more challenging population, and they have adjusted their strategies and their interventions accordingly. We are collecting new data metrics. As you know, it takes some time to collect data so that we can understand what the trends are. But I hope in our next report to have a better idea for all of you. We expect the data to change because our population is changing. I do not know if that is going to mean that we are going to have, better or worse alignment to our ultimate strategies, which is appearance for court and a reduction in rebooking. But we are monitoring those metrics and are optimistic, but we will see. We are also trying to create a new control group like we did for the misdemeanors when we first started all of that. So you all can see, compared to the overall population, how this intervention is performing. Our objectives over the next six months are also to create a public facing dashboard. We have, we were founded on the values of transparency and public accountability and so this public facing dashboard will not only show how we have been performing but allow individuals to export that data for their own individual analysis as well. That is all for me. I am happy to answer any questions.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, that is a great report. For the 22%, the 18% plus 4% that you showed in that slide or graph a few slides ago. How are they finding out about the center? You said some of it was law enforcement drop offs. But I am just curious, are you, do you know, or do you ask them I am just curious how did they find out?

KV: So Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, primarily we do have a metric in our intake sheet. How did you find out about us? Lots of times it is multiple things. They know somebody who went through, it tends to be our emerging strategy. We have lots of individuals who know somebody else who had a family member. In one instance, a city bus driver told somebody to get off his bus and go to the Transition Center right around the corner. We also had bail officers try and refer folks over to us. What has been really helpful is the number of tours that we have provided through our community service providers. Many in your offices have really helped to spread the word to constituents who are calling. And so word of mouth is number one for us right now. We have also had a lot more, like I said, law enforcement drop offs. But individuals who are struggling with housing, the encampments, we are continuing to really support those encampment outreach efforts, especially around resolving warrants so those individuals can get into shelter.

MH: One quick follow up. Would you maybe use that to inform further outreach, like going to the bail officers and others just to let them know you are there because it is kind of new?

KV: Yes.

MH: Perfect.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Holmes, maybe you can answer these questions I have or direct to whoever you feel is appropriate. But we did some background and you go to Pima.gov and you go to the homeless section or the tab, and I know nobody can see this, but this is a copy of what we found there. And I will just read the highlights. It says homeless encampment rights and resources. And it states off the top, Know Your Rights. And then there is subheadings right to remain silent. Right to an attorney. Right not to have your property searched. Public use of marijuana and other drugs, warrant salute resolution. Sex offender registry obligations, rights restoration and other post-conviction relief. This is on the website. My question is several-fold. We are in one element of this process trying to remove or mitigate homelessness and on another spectrum, we are providing information on what your rights are to be homeless. So how do you square this with that process and what are the what are the neighbors, the communities, the neighborhoods? What would they think? Or do they even know that the County is providing legal information for folks to remain homeless and the rights therein, when the neighbors are constantly in an outcry that they want the homelessness gone, that they want it out of their neighborhoods, away from their businesses and off the streets. Yet the County is

providing them with all types of advice as to how to protect their homelessness. This is contradictory, as far as I can tell, and it certainly would not bode well with businesses and neighbors and neighborhoods that have been impacted by the ravages of homelessness in their living areas. Second of all, if you are homeless, how are you going to have access to the Pima.gov website and know that there is this information and first of all, who do you and how do you disseminate this information to? And secondly, why?

SH: Vice Chair Grijalva and Supervisor Christy. So that information is part of our Public Defense Services website. They continue to provide information on rights for any individuals. And I know this is something that they do as well for any anyone, regardless of their status. I think the challenge in this space, Supervisor Christy, as you know, we have been working in there is how do we balance this idea of accountability and support. Right? And that continues to be something that we are working on. I know as Kate and her department are working in this space, we are trying to kind of present some support in the back end as people are being coming through the criminal justice system or as a drop off. It continues to be the balance that we serve as a government. We continue to have people that have rights that they are entitled to. At the same time, we want to be able to provide some types of support systems that address the concerns of the business community as well. I think this is one of those areas, one of those tools that we really, truly believe has added value in this space for individuals where there is an accountability mechanism that is part of why they are coming through to us. We are seeing some great success. Right? And so the way kind of we square those off, at least in the departments that works with me directly, is to try to make sure that we are balancing those two efforts that we are really trying to find out ways in which we can get people the help that they need, using the tools that are available to them. Specifically, when it comes to law enforcement, we do not oversee the law enforcement. The decisions that they make, both in the Sheriff or in TPD. But at the same time, if we have systems that we can provide back end support that can change that trajectory for folks. That is the way we kind of square those two areas.

SC: Mr. Chair. Mr. Holmes, it would seem to me that instead of bolstering the homeless folks' rights and what they can do to maintain their rights while homeless, where is there any information or discussion about what penalties and repercussions you can go through if you are homeless and break the law? Is there any mention of what the legal ramifications of homelessness or trespassing, drug use, vandalism that they could be brought into? Isn't it just as important to tell them what the penalties for homelessness are as opposed to you have rights to be homeless?

JL: If I may, Chair Scott, thank you.

AG: Administrator Leshner?

JL: I am sorry, Vice Chair Grijalva, and Supervisor Christy. And as I think as we have been pointing out there with 35 departments and a variety of additional elected officials, there are many sections on the Pima County website that speak to different elements of every issue. Obviously, the things that you are referring to about what is

the legal concerns? There is any number of places on the website where we provide information about how we're cleaning up those facilities, how the community can reach out to the County if there are concerns about any kind of location regarding homeless behavior with next to property, I am more than happy to get back to you and the members of the Board with the bibliography, if you will, of all the information provided on the website for different elements of this concern.

SC: Mr. Chair, Ms. Leshner, thank you. But I would venture to say that if you went to a Walmart or Costco parking lot on any Saturday afternoon and corralled 15 to 20 customers there or anywhere else where folks congregate in commercial places, and you said, look what homeless people can find on the PimaCounty.gov website. They have a whole page on homeless people's rights. How do you think the community would respond to that?

JL: Again, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, there are thousands of pages of information on the website, and you pulled out one element of that. I do not know what focus group you might be speaking with, but I am more than happy again to provide...

SC: How about the Chamber of Commerce?

JL: I am sure is familiar with all of this.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: I am very grateful for the fact that our webpage includes content that reinforces the Bill of Rights or Constitutional Rights, and the fact that we can do it in such a way that acknowledges that those rights that are enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, they are not exceptions. Whether you have a home, whether you live in your car, whether you are in the jail, right, like the Constitution, thankfully, should apply to everyone. And the fact that we as a County put that information out there is to our credit. So I want to thank staff for continuing to reinforce, not just the dignity of people, especially folks who are going through hard times, but also the Constitution and the rights that are contained therein. And as they apply to every single person within our County, that is an important job, and I am thankful for folks doing that. Going to the report, I would say one of the offices that have taken the tour of the Transition Center very impressed, very thankful for that work and the coordination that happens between Pretrial Services, law enforcement, the jail, and really trying to figure out ways to both transition people effectively out of incarceration and moving into the community in a safe and dignified and productive way. In reading the report, there was a stat that kind of jumped out at me that I did not see in the slides, but I am wondering if you can elevate that was about the success rate, which around recidivism that people who go through the Transition Center, that we are not seeing them back. Can you talk a little bit about that, that number and sort of what what's the causality to that, if you can point to it?

KV: Of course. So Supervisor Scott, Chair sorry, Chair Scott. Supervisor Allen, that is a, so that is based off of a control group we developed when we were first launching



for the misdemeanor. So comparing apples to apples, misdemeanors who have come through the jail versus those who come through the Transition Center after 30 days, about 28% or so of those misdemeanors will be rebooked and if they go through the Transition Center, it is either at or less than 10%. We have even had it as low as, I think, 4 or 5% on certain months. So and it just indicates I mean, what is great about this program is that it is good for everyone. It improves public safety. We are seeing a reduction in re-arrest, which our ultimate goal is to improve community safety. But the data demonstrates for us that the more likely, the more frequently we are arresting somebody if the objective is to change behavior, that is not changing behavior the way that we want to see it, we see those folks coming through more and more frequently. And so this is an experiment. Nobody across the country yet has really figured this out. But what we are seeing is that by combining a certain number of levers in the form of housing, in the form of peer support, in the form of justice, navigation, access to treatment that those levers tend to change behaviors, which is ultimately what we want for our community. And it is, you know, less expensive. On top of that, on top of going to the jail.

RS: Go ahead, Supervisor Allen.

JA: One other follow up, what are the gaps that you are seeing in terms of services and things that we need to be providing more of gaps that need to be filled so that the Transition Center can be more effective in in transitioning folks back into the community?

KV: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, we really struggle to see services available after 5:00 p.m. As you know, people get released from the jail. It is not smart for the community to have individuals who are getting released at midnight, 2:00 a.m. And then, you know, having limited access or no access to transportation or housing in the middle of the night. So it is not safe for that person. It is not safe for those who live around that community. And so we would really love to see improved access to, especially shelter after 5:00 p.m. There are, you know, emergency shelter facilities throughout Tucson. Many of them will only accept individuals in the morning or will have certain types of barriers or simply do not have beds available. And so we hustle every single day when we have folks who come in who express that they are interested in having shelter, and we start calling, and we go down a list of all the housing providers that we work with to see who has a bed and who would be willing to take them. But it gets, you know, the phone lines stop picking up typically around 5:00 p.m. So at 9:00 p.m., 10:00 p.m., it is much more of a challenge, more immediate intervention with services is also helpful. We have folks who come in who are ready to start whatever kind of treatment, but they cannot get an appointment until a week or two later with their treatment provider and intake. And at that point, we have lost them. Typically they go back to whatever they were doing before they got arrested. If we do not have an immediate intervention. So we deal in immediacy as much as humanly possible, and we try to take folks right then and there to whatever service they are willing to accept.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We talk about constitutional rights. It appears in this kind of a format that is being provided on a website for Pima County to let homeless people know what their rights are. It appears that the County is more involved and concerned about the rights of homeless people, as opposed to the rights of those who have had criminal acts perpetrated upon them by those who happen to be homeless. There does not seem to be any kind of equilibrium. It is in black and white here, telling and stating the rights for homeless people, but nothing about, that I can see, about creating a situation that can prevent people in their neighborhoods, their businesses, to be protected from those criminal acts. I do not think that there would be any problem with my office making certain that business groups and neighborhood groups and HOA's know that this is being presented on a website so they can see for themselves the emphasis that is being placed on the County to protect the rights of homeless people, but nothing to address the rights of those who are victims. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- RS: Supervisor Christy just wanted to go back to when we voted unanimously to create the Transition Center. One of the entities that was most in support of it and continues to be in support of it was the Tucson Crime Free Coalition, which represents a great many members of our business community. In fact, I see in their newsletters that they frequently tout the successes of the Transition Center. I wanted to ask with regard to following up on Supervisor Allen's question about gaps. When the Transition Center was approved by the Board, one of the goals was to ensure that knowledge of the Transition Center was seen throughout the law enforcement community so that law enforcement could direct people to the Transition Center. I wonder if you could comment on how we are doing with that, and also with the twin goals of warrant consolidation and warrant resolution, because those are also ways of ensuring that the jail is a place for people who are risks to public safety or flight risks. So I realize I asked two questions.
- KV: Chair Scott, I will start with the second first. So we do have a website called the Consolidated Warrant Resolution. This is a hand-in-hand partnership with Pretrial Services as well as our Transition Center. It all goes together in one, all of this should be leveraging each other. The primary issue with warrants is that it goes to one jurisdiction. And so if I am an individual who has open warrants in both Marana, Tucson Superior Court, I would have to go individually to each of those courts to try and identify what I needed to do. This one stop shop is intended to tell you how to navigate each one of those systems. What one court prefers you do as opposed to another. Some courts will let you call, other folks require you to go in, and that is in those instances where somebody does have to appear in person. Then the Transition Center steps in. We can arrange transportation for that individual to go to court and work with the navigators to go through, to navigate all of that. Pretrial has leveraged some of their resources to check for warrants in any jurisdiction. So if an individual goes to that website and is not sure if they have warrants or where the warrants are, they can call Pretrial without any obligation to do anything, get that information, and in some instances, Pretrial can even resolve some warrants right there over the phone. As far as law enforcement goes and law enforcement awareness that has been personally my biggest objective over the last year. We have the benefit of also overseeing the crisis response and intervention training for

all of Southern Arizona under our department as well. So we train hundreds and do thousands of officer training per year and included in that training is information about the Transition Center and the Transition Center Resources. But what I have found to be most helpful is to actually be there on scene when it comes to, there is an encampment decommissioning. If we have communities who have been concerned about the impact on homelessness, and they are trying to bring together multiple experts in the area, I show up for those meetings. I have been working very closely with the captains of many of the police departments here throughout. There is 11 different jurisdictions, and I think I have hit every single one of them in the last couple of months. And the more that I can understand what each community is experiencing uniquely like Marana as compared to the airport, for example, the airport police are high utilizers of our Transition Center because we have so many individuals who are experiencing mental illness who are trying to get on planes. So really understanding the unique needs of each law enforcement agency comes through that personal connection. And then we are able to customize our appeal to each of those officers. But we are trying really hard to make sure that we are not forcing and we are trying to make sure that we understand what each community needs and marketing our services based off of that.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Vesely. Any other questions or comments? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just a housekeeping. Ms. Leshner, we have submitted a couple of different requests for some answers.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, I was just finding you had indicated previously that you would be submitting questions. I just got word a little bit ago that your office said no, you were not submitting questions, that they were included in previous motions, I believe. So let us run to ground. And if there is outstanding questions on items, we are more than happy to get.

SC: That one dealt with another issue, but mine was responses of the Transition Center and other issues of homelessness that Ms. Darling stated that she could not answer because it was a City of Tucson issue.

RS: You are referring to the questions that you posed at the last meeting when Ms. Darling made her report Supervisor?

SC: And then the follow up on that too.

RS: Okay.

SC: Take a look.

JL: And I thought we had responded. Let me make sure we get that back out. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, ma'am. Alright. Any other questions or comments for Ms. Vesely or Mr. Holmes? Administrator Leshner, was it just that presentation under this item?

JL: Yes, the Transition Center.

RS: Okay. Alright. Thank you very much.

DRAFT

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 18. **Update on Federal and State Executive, Legislative and Judicial Actions that affect Pima County**

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott  
MH: Supervisor Heinz  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator  
SB: Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administrator's Office

---

RS: We will then move on to Item No, 13, also under the County Administrator. Ms. Leshar did you just want to turn it over to Ms. Davis?

JL: That would be terrific. Thank you.

RS: Okay, Ms. Davis, update on federal and state executive, legislative and judicial actions that affect Pima County.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Leshar, thank you for having me here today. It is an honor to be in front of you to discuss a large-scale amount of activities that have happened since our last update, mid-March, so we will get right to it. There is a lot of content in this presentation. So next slide please. So just to create the landscape since January 20th we have 103 executive orders that have been signed by our Executive Office and this number is now 158 legal action in response to the executive orders. Now that we are just about almost three months in, we are starting to see a few trends within the executive orders. Lots are directed to the policy agenda of the Executive Office, but some are directed at the review and potential modifications to the federal workforce and the review of funding that goes from the federal government through state pass through agencies, or to direct grant recipients. To date, we have been focused on telling you that impact to our grant portfolio, but I want to underscore that this a few actions that have happened over the past few weeks, not just affect our grant portfolio, but in a way a lot tied to some of the things we are seeing in changes to potential relaxation of regulations. We are not going to talk about tariffs too much today, but those will be in a future update as we start to see the impact of potential cost increases to some of our projects, specifically our capital improvement projects. But there seems to be about three legs to the stool on how we are potentially affected by federal activity and subsequent funding or risks. As you know, the Office of Management and Budget issued a memorandum to stop and pause all federal funding that is still in court. That was stopped by a federal judge in 22 other states. Subsequent to that, we are starting to see the second leg of that stool, and that is considerable changes to the federal workforce that includes shifts of federal agencies, a lot of which are our

fundings directly or indirectly. And the third is enhanced scrutiny to the types of charges that are within these grant agreements executed to our Pima County departments, through our state agencies and directly with our federal funders. So we are seeing really an enhanced scrutiny of an overall attempted pause directed to policy decisions from the executive office, changes to our workforce, which affect our federal agencies that we work directly with, and enhanced scrutiny and review of charges within our grant agreements. So we will be talking about all of those today, and we will do a state level update to close out. Next slide please. So just as a timeline of what we have discussed in these presentations to date, friendly reminder that there was an intended pause of the Office of Management and Budget memorandum and court orders. County staff did a detailed analysis of the grant impact. We made a determination that Health Department and our Community Workforce Development were the most impacted departments and the largest grant recipients of, not just discretionary grants, but annual pass through grants for critical services. You also know that we received a notice from the Federal Emergency Management Agency pertaining to our shelter and services programs, with a potential withholding of reimbursements to Pima County for services rendered. But a recent memorandum to build upon that was released from the FEMA administration pertaining to enhanced scrutiny across all FEMA awards to determine whether or not those awards have any scopes tied to immigration or asylum seeker work, or if jurisdiction recipients are considered a sanctuary jurisdiction, and those will require Department of Homeland Security review. This is important because it affects our Office of Emergency Management budget and associated regional training that is done through our Office of Emergency Management. So we know that those grant awards that our Emergency Management teams receive are under DHS review. So for the Board to note, we will update as we know more on if there is any risk to those. Late last week, Pima County Health Department received termination directly from the Centers for Disease Control or stop work orders for nine grants tied to immunizations. We received those notices midway, and we will talk in detail about the grants of those. And they were CDC funding, source funded from Department of Health and Human Services, which we will review the changes to that agency as well. Next slide please. This is a very wordy slide and this list will continue to get longer. But just to underscore, we broke out the Fiscal Year '24 grants portfolio to look at the percentage of expenditures, because and this is important, because we are seeing some withholding of reimbursements and potential recoupment. What we know about the Shelter and Services Program is that we have a paused potential, \$10 million in reimbursement. We did receive a notice from the American Rescue Plan Act, U.S. Treasury funding department, that they would review the expenditures, but mostly a recruitment of unobligated funds. The County has obligated all of their funds within the federal regulations as of the award deadline date, which was December 31, 2024. So that was, I think, more of a programmatic standard, best practice. But we will continue to update if there are any potential speed bumps for the ARPA funding. We will focus on the Health Department today because we are starting to see this across all of our granting departments that we are getting word from our federal agencies that potentially stop work or change scope or terminate grant agreements. And so that is kind of the third leg of the stool, this stool with enhanced scrutiny to the funding lines. Two big ones in the Board received a

memorandum from the County Administrator and Dr. Terry Cullen, Director of the Health Department, around these grants. But the important thing to note, the two big ones, specifically Covid-19 health disparities and vaccine equity were termed or stop work order before their performance period end date. The Health Disparities grant had an extension that was approved via contract to go through May 2026. We had an average annual expenditure of \$1.6 million and would have fully spent that if had we gotten to our performance period end date of May of 2026. The Vaccine Equity Grant was due to term at the end of this fiscal year, 6/30/25, that was termed three months early, leaving almost \$2 million across those two grants on the table. And importantly, critical plans for full-time staff that were homed on those grants and part-time staff that were charging to those grants. So these grants really tied to access to public health services, immunizations, supplies. We have three grants that were still active but have no staff charging. Those were state pass through grants, as is Vaccine Equity and Health Disparities is a direct grant from the CDC, which was terminated. Those three grants were really tied to equipment, supplies and communication campaigns about importance of vaccines and immunizations. And then four grants tied to the epidemiology and laboratory capacity were also stop work orders. However, those were closed across the County last year. So that is an update on what we have heard to date. We have also heard other updates to our County departments in and around shifting parameters of the scope of the grant agreement, especially if it was extended and the future of those grants. But we will go into detail as those come to more fruition. Next slide please. As you may have seen late last week, the Department of Health and Human Services saw a tremendous shift in scope, staff and potentially funding. It is important to know that our Health Department of their grant portfolio, 92% roughly is sourced from Health and Human Service agencies specifically, including but not limited to the CDC, which is the center for Disease Control, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the Health Resources and Services Administration. Please note it is not just Health Department that receives grants from HHS source agencies. We see grants across these agencies tied to our behavioral health services, tied to justice, tied to human services. So the modifications that are happening across the Department of HHS will likely be realized across more County departments than just our Health Department. Next slide please. As a federal workforce update, as I updated last meeting, we will know more about the large-scale federal reduction in April and May. Bureau of Labor Statistics reporting and the unemployment compensation for federal employee benefits, which will be produced in mid-April, mid-May to know the impact of specifically what happened in February with the large-scale layoff of probationary employees that is held up in court as well as of March 13th. But we estimate at least the count as of last week was over 121,000 federal workers were dismissed. The Department of Health and Human Services announced cuts to 20,000 jobs, with a direct firing of 10,000 employees, which is to take effect in the upcoming weeks, and a notice to or intent to close or entirely cut federal departments, specifically USAID. And we have heard a lot about what is happening at the Department of Education. Next slide please. The one thing that we did not discuss last meeting is the potential modifications to regulations and that affects our Department of Environmental Quality and regulations that we have pertaining to air quality and ambient air quality standards. So there is a few things that are happening at the EPA. In addition to potential

funding freezes tied to unleashing American energy, which is one of the early executive orders specifically for air quality, there is potentially a relaxation in and around emission standards. The ozone National Ambient Air Quality standards are evaluated every five years. The last one was done in 2020, so we can probably see some modifications here in 2025 pertaining to climate. There is a potential for deregulatory actions associated with greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and the requirement to report such. And the EPA has moved forward with advancing their cooperative federalism, which shifts these regulation obligations to the state versus a federal regulation. And this would be through state implementation plan. So we will continue to update you as the EPA makes those changes. Next slide please. The state legislative update is very similar to the one we shared last week, although there has been a significant movement in some of the backlog in bills that have been reviewed. There is a shared concern about executive orders and the state budget impact. We still do not know a final detail around the Governor's Office's official budget, the House and Senate Appropriations committees are set to meet today and tomorrow or Monday or Tuesday, pardon me, after the backlog of floor hearings, which were taking roughly about 2 to 3 weeks to review and second and third committees. There is a sizable amount of Bills moving through that limit local authority and potentially transfer the cost to County governments. Most of that is tied to health services, law enforcement. But we do see some positive movement in terms of stormwater legislation, post-conviction relief needs and some work in the court ordered evaluation space. Next slide. And with that, I will take questions. Thank you.

RS: Any questions for Ms. Davis, Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Oh does it have to be specific to staff or just we are talking about this item?

RS: We can certainly talk about this item.

MH: Okay. And in part, yes. So you said that with regard to the public health side of things, that \$2 million and change of encumbered funds basically they are trying to not give us. Right? These are grants or contracts. I think you even mentioned that there is a signed agreement, we are going to get x amount of dollars for a specific purpose, and if you violate the terms of that grant contract, like we are using it for other stuff, then there are some, of course, ways to stop the grant or get the money back. But we were not using these grant funds for anything other than the stated approved contracted purpose. And in my estimation, I think we need to. Frankly, I do not know if I can move it now, but we need to join the lawsuit that 23 states and Washington, D.C. announced earlier today on this public health funding because it is affecting every state. I do not know why every state would not be suing for this. So that is a pretty easy thing for us to jump on to that lawsuit whenever our council feels that is appropriate. And I would advocate that we do that.

RS: Mr. Brown?



- SB: Chair, Supervisor Heinz, we are aware of the lawsuit that filed today. We will look into it pursuant to previous discussions we have had about actions the County can take or should take.
- MH: Okay.
- RS: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Supervisor Christy?
- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Davis, we have on our agenda under grant application and acceptance. One, two, three, upcoming grant acceptances. Would it be advisable that we do not accept any grants at this time until we determine whether or not we are actually going to be recipients of them, and not only on the agenda items, but any future grant requests or applications?
- RS: Hold on just one second. County Administrator Leshner?
- JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, I will tell you, those are the conversations we have been having. Do we continue to go after or move forward with the grants that we are presenting to you today? I think what we are looking at doing, if we have legally binding contracts for which monies have been authorized and appropriated, we will continue to bring them to the Board. I think what we are looking at and discussing is even if we can move forward with grants, if there will be additional costs in any way occurred to the County. If this is, funds that may just be part of the bucket, if you will, and not necessarily identified to a specific piece of equipment, program or person, then we will continue with them. But I think we need to look long and hard at a grant that might be obligating us in any way to something new.
- SC: And Mr. Chair, Ms. Leshner, just to reiterate, perhaps we should have a sea change shift in our approach here with grants and rely much far less on the government for funding.
- JL: If I may, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, I think part of it is we have discussed in the past there are many grants, if you will. I think when we hear that term grant, we apply for something, they give us a piece, a small amount of money to do something. Some of the grants that have been on the table for discussion this week are, for example, Title 10 funds on women's health. I believe those first began in the 70's or the 80's. Community Development Block grant when we have grant funding, if you will, that is formulaic and has been coming to the County for 40 or 50 years. I think we see the continuation of those services to benefit the people of Pima County, something that will continue versus that new grant that might be for something we have not done previously, or to expand or somehow enhance the service that we have not done. We are looking at, as we do every day, not only how we spend dollars that come in from other governments, but from any private sector granting grant source or our taxpayers.
- RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Any other questions or comments on this item? Ms. Davis, thank you very much. I am sure that takes a tremendous amount of time to prepare

a presentation of that nature, and especially since the information is continually changing.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, thank you.

DRAFT

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

### 45. Hearing - Rezoning

#### P24RZ00010, RAICA - W. BOUNTIFUL LANE REZONING

Teague and Devra Raica request a rezoning of approximately 3.31 acres from the SR (Suburban Ranch) zone to the SR-2 (Suburban Ranch Estate) zone, located approximately 900 feet east of the T-intersection of W. Bountiful Lane and N. Camino Del Fierro, addressed as 2602 W. Bountiful Lane. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 1.2. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 5-4 (Commissioners Cook, Gungle, Hanna and Matter voted Nay; Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

#### Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott  
MH: Supervisor Heinz  
JA: Supervisor Allen  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AG: Supervisor Grijalva  
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator  
CP: Chris Poirier, Director, Development Services  
TD: Thomas Drzazgowski, Deputy Planning Official, Development Services  
DR: Devra Raica, Applicant  
TR: TJ Raica, Applicant  
JL: Jim Luckow  
MM: Michelle Miller  
TA: Terri Amonson  
LV: Louisa Viles

---

RS: The next item is a hearing. This is a rezoning. Is your last name pronounced Raica or? My apologies Raica, West Bountiful Lane Rezoning and this is in District 1. So I am going to have us begin with a staff report, then we are going to have testimony from the applicants. Mr. and Mrs. Raica, then testimony from other interested parties. So at this time, Administrator Leshner, who should we call on for the staff report? Thank you.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott. Mr. Poirier, I believe, or Tom. Sorry, Tom, thank you.

RS: Mr. Drzazgowski?

TD: Chair. Scott, Board members, before you is a request to rezone an approximately 3.3 acre property from SR to SR-2. If approved, the rezoning will allow two homes in

the location where SR would only allow one. Public comment to date, we have received four unique letters of protest from property owners in the area. We have also received two letters of support, two letters of concern, and a petition with 14 signatures from property owners who are in protest. Some of those are duplicates with the letters of protest. A couple of the letters of concern addressed issues with the property that affected property owners would like addressed. Some of these concerns that have come up recently have to do with amount of grading, protections of the wash, access to the property, lighting, colors of buildings, height limits. Those are some of the things that have come up recently. After hearing the case, the Planning and Zoning Commission made a motion to recommend approval, 5-4. Staff also recommends approval of the case, subject to the conditions included in the packet. Since the Planning and Zoning Commission, additional letters have been received. In addition, staff has interacted with some of the neighbors, met with them out on site to get a better understanding of what is occurring out there and some of the concerns from the immediate property owners. I did walk the neighboring properties to get a view and understand the concerns and some of the issues that the neighbors had with the development. That concludes my staff report, and I can answer any questions you may have.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Just curious if this is passed, would it allow for, say, the second property to be turned at some point by a future owner into, like an apartment complex or something?

TD: Chair Scott, Board members, no. What is before the Board today is the current zoning is SR, which would allow one home and all ancillary uses that are permitted with SR, guest houses, garages, things like that. The proposed rezoning would allow two residents on the property. It could be split, but no increase in density from there would be allowed by the rezoning.

MH: Great. Thank you.

RS: Any other questions for staff? Supervisor Grijalva?

AG: This item narrowly passed the Planning and Zoning Commission, it was 5-4. There was one absent. And then even in D1, the representatives were on opposing sides. And so can you speak a little bit to some of the conversation during that meeting, just to help me understand a little better what the biggest issues were?

TD: Sure. Chair Scott, Board members, I will give an overview and then Mr. Poirier will provide some additional comments after that. This was a very interesting case at the Planning and Zoning Commission. We did have neighbors show up who spoke in opposition immediately against the case before the Commission. It is a unique portion of the County, because you do have higher density properties in the area, but you also have a little notch area of lower density SR and this is in a transition area. So I think the way I would characterize it is some of the commissioners looked at it from, this is more consistent with property densities to the south and the east,

which are higher density. Others looked at some of the areas where right in the immediate area it is lower density. And so I think that had a major impact on how the commissioners voted at the hearing.

CP: Yes. Mr. Chair, Supervisor Grijalva, to add Tom is spot on. It was a very contextual conversation amongst the commissioners. It was not an easy decision, as indicated by the vote. But, you know, near the property is some other SR. However, you know, one lot away is a very high, dense subdivision of CR-3 or CR-4 homes. The Town of Oro Valley, at a higher density, is directly to the east as well. So it was a 5-4 vote, a very difficult decision for the commissioners because of sort of the nature of the current zoning and the surrounding properties, and the history of how other properties have developed around it.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: I wonder if you could talk a little bit about how conservation is impacted through the rezoning or not?

TD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, one of the things to consider in this case is that conservation land policies are implemented through rezonings. So if this property is rezoned, the property is within the conservation land system, and it will require 80% of the property to be left as natural. The proposal in front of you today meets that requirement, with all conservation being done on site. If the property is not rezoned, then we get into the standard suburban ranch requirements in regards to setbacks, grading limits, native plant preservation, which in a case like in SR, would allow substantially more grading than in a case where the property was rezoned. That is one of the impacts of a rezoning and developing under the current zoning, which has not been rezoned.

CP: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Allen, to also add to that, you know, the SR zone is also what we would consider a horse use and equestrian type zone. So if you look at, especially this part of town, if you were to look at an aerial image of SR zoned properties, some of those properties are significantly graded or denuded to sort of serve the purpose of equestrian use. If this rezoning is approved, Tom is spot on and the conditions are imposed, then there will be much more significant conservation conditions imposed on the property than would otherwise occur if it stays SR. If this rezoning is denied or withdrawn, the property owner simply has to meet the regular zoning. They do not need to meet the more stringent conservation land system policy requirements.

RS: Supervisor Allen, did you have any follow-up? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Quickly, I heard there are multiple letters of concern, protest, objection, etc. Did that rise to the level of requiring a supermajority vote of the Board or not? That is the staff determination. It is not to that level?

TD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, this case has not triggered supermajority.

MH: Okay.

TD: Most of the protests are outside of the 300ft located to the south and east of the property.

RS: Supervisor Grijalva?

AG: Yeah. So what is the current, I guess I am reading some of the concerns, and one of them is that this is 3.3 acres, which would allow up to 48 residences in a multifamily structure, or 28 units of single-family residences. So, I just want you to say, what is it exactly that this density is going to allow, so I have a response when people say, hey, I told you this was going to happen. And I always, I think we have neighbors and very concerned community members about changing any sort of the environment when they purchased the home and this was supposed to be what they were buying into. And so I just want to make sure that we can say it out loud.

TD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Grijalva, this rezoning will only allow the increase in density to allow two homes and on the 3.3 acres. Generally, the density would be one home for 1.68 acres. No additional units would be allowed. Anything further would require further action by the Board. Would need to be consistent with the comprehensive plan. This is a lower density area, and units at that level would not be allowed. And the rezoning, if approved, is conditioned specifically to match what the PDP, Preliminary Development Plan, including in the Board packet shows. So that is what would be approved.

AG: Okay. Thank you.

CP: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Grijalva, there was I think some of the neighbors got confused. They grabbed a Code, I think, from South Tucson, where I think their version of SR allowed a whole bunch of things. Pima County SR allows, like Tom said, one home for 3.31 acres. Typically, you see horses with it. There are some other conditional uses that occur but never has a County Code ever allowed significant density or apartments, as maybe the other jurisdictions that the neighbors confused their notes with.

RS: Any other questions for staff from Board members? I just wanted to follow up on a point that Vice Chair Grijalva made, and I have shared this with Mr. Drzazgowski, but I want to share it with other staff members, including the County Administrator. I think when there is a close vote of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Board needs more information in terms of the reasoning of our commissioners. And there was really only one commissioner who was cited in the report. I think just as a matter of course, moving forward, we need more information when there's a vote like that, because that is very out of the ordinary to have such a closely divided vote.

TD: Chair Scott, as the Board is probably aware of, most of our votes are either unanimous or very close to that. 5-4 is something that comes up very infrequently. We will make sure that the commissioners are better articulating their positions

when we get into these close votes, so that the Board has a better understanding of how each of the commissioners is thinking when they vote on this. 5-4 comes up very infrequently, and we will make sure that we get better information from the commissioners that we can present to the Board.

RS: I know we all appreciate that. Thank you very much. Okay. I am going to unless there are any other questions or comments for staff from Board members, I am going to call on Devra and TJ Raica, who are the applicants. And then I will call on other interested parties who have filled out speaker cards. And no, you do not. I just you are married, so I am calling on you together. But you each have three minutes.

DR: So we are going to go first. Hi, I am Devra Raica, and I first wanted to thank you guys for your time today. This has been an education for us. I have been homeschooling and raising my kids for the last 30 years, and so I am like, wow, I did not know this all was happening. So our application is in accordance with the Pima County statutes and regulations for rezoning from SR to SR-2. And again, it is a normal piece of property. It has the wildlife, it has the vegetation, it is a normal piece of property for that area. This has been a learning process for us and I am sure we will continue as the process goes forward. It is a process for us. It is not personal, it is just going through that process, striving to do everything according to the Pima County regulations and statutes and that is what we want. Also, change is not easy. This property we bought, we bought a year ago, and it has been used for people to walk across, people have walked across for a long time. And I do believe that that is the change that is hard is that there will be a couple of homes there. We desire to keep the wildlife and preserve as much of the property as possible, because we also just live a walking distance away currently. And we, I guess I will say cohabitate with the animals like they live right there. We see them and we love it. And just within this week, we have seen javelina and coyotes and, you know, other birds and hawks and species, and we love that. So our plan was never to try to build anything except two homes and our daughter is sitting over here and our son-in-law and we are just the parents and we are trying to build a home just next to each other. So that is really all it is. And after sitting here, I also just wanted to thank each of you. I know we probably do not all agree, maybe politically even, but just the job that you are doing, I just think it and just the things that were said earlier by several other people, I just appreciate, like your willingness to serve our community in this way. And yeah, so thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Raica. Mr. Raica, you also have three minutes, sir.

TR: Hi, my name is TJ Raica. I actually live at 2665 Bountiful Lane. We have a one acre property that that is just a short ways away from the lot in question. And just given some of the discussion I heard from the department regarding SR versus SR-2 and what could happen there. I want to point out, if you took an aerial view of the one acre lot we live on now, I would say over half of it is natural vegetation. My neighbor next door is cleared and built corrals and done all those sort of things. But our lot is, is pretty well preserved. And because of that, like my wife had said, we see wildlife all the time just roaming through our lot passed within ten yards of us the other night, sitting out by a fire. Our purpose is to build two residences. One we would

move to and one my son or my daughter and my son-in-law would build on this lot. It is consistent with precedents of other lots in the immediate vicinity there, one right across the street from us. Despite attempts to portray it otherwise this lot is really no different than any other lot in the area in terms of what the sizing would be. It is consistent with what is in the vicinity there, the impacts associated with what would be done, all those sort of things. It conforms to what we are proposing, conforms to the Pima County codes, ordinances, guidance, all those sort of things. It is consistent with the objectives of the County to efficient and effectively develop rezoning for to meet housing demands and those sort of things. All we are really asking for is the same rights and privileges that are that our neighbors enjoy. The property is no different. It is not a biological oasis. I would not describe it as that. It does have a delineated riparian zone which the properties to the west or the north or the south all have that as those zones follow the tributaries that exist through there. But the conditions that the department has proposed, the special conditions are address those sort of things as they stated. Some of that is even more restrictive, which we are fine with. We love the natural, the natural area there. While we recognize the concerns and comments of others out there and some of the passion around this, you also got to recognize that that 1,000 foot perimeter, there are 150 residences inside of that, and it is just a small representation that is really voicing opposition to it. I am concerned with some of the things that I think are do not quite are accurate in some of the things that have been written about it, but I am not going to speak to that. I was going to say that the development of SR versus SR-2, that there really is no difference. But actually what I just heard is actually what we are adopting is something a little more stringent, which really serves the purpose from a conservation perspective, as well as a development perspective for the County. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Raica. Okay, we are going to move now to testimony from other interested parties. Jim Luckow.

JL: Good morning. My name is Jim Luckow. My wife and I live one lot away from the proposed rezoning of the Raicas' request. We lived in the area for over 30 years. I have been an educator for over 45 years and a general contractor for 35 years. Accurate information is needed to make informed decisions. Narrative create concern when using words like pygmy owl, destroying the riparian area cause more erosion, light pollution, impeding emergency response, lowering property tax values, and the applicant's intent is questionable. But narratives are not always accurate and even true. This is what I know. We have seen and built several homes in the area. It is a great neighborhood where we enjoy privacy, wildlife, and a prosperous community. We have seen wildlife increase abundantly over the years. The increase in coyotes, bobcats, javelinas, hawks, owls, rabbits, doves, all the animals, bird species have just increased tremendously. I actually saw mule deer just a month or so across the street from my house. Property values. Let us talk about. I wish property values would slow down. My neighbor, my next door neighbor, just sold their house for \$400 a square foot. What that means for me and others, that means my property values goes up. I am not sure what the word is for that, but it is the right word. My property taxes go up. Ridiculous, I do not know. This is what it is, and so that those are not changing. Historically, there have been several approved



rezonings in our area. As mentioned, 15 of the 20 homes within that 300 mile radius 75% of them have less, have equal or less square footage than what the Raicas are asking for. Of the 150 homes in that 1,000 square area, 93% or 140 of them have equal or to less square footage than what they are asking. As a builder, I know Pima County has ordinances, regulations and codes that we have to adhere to the address, all the concerns. When I start building projects, I found that people do not like change. As mentioned, Devra said walking trails, which we use for years, get restricted or eliminated. Views take on a different look and landscapes change. We respond like we have lost something that actually was not even really ours. On October 22nd, the Board appointed new Regional Housing Commission to work on for you guys to work on increasing the supply of houses across the County. At that Board meeting, the Supervisors also expressed interest to having input on zoning requirements to promote more housing. Well, here is an opportunity for you to do that. And we just I just ask that you do that in their favor for us. One thing I did not mention also, they mentioned that is their daughter there. She married my son. So we are going to live right next to each other. So thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Luckow. Alright. Michelle Miller is our next speaker.

MM: Hi. Thank you for allowing some time for me. I agree with you. This has been very interesting and eye-opening, humbling to see the process in front of me. Anyway, so I have lived in my home in the higher density community that is on the south of this area for 22 years, and I bought it because of the desert right back there, and it was undeveloped for years and years and years. And it is a place that my children, you know, explored and all of that. So as I said, I get and I wrote a letter and I was talking about all of the wildlife that comes into my yard and bobcats and quail and all of that. Recently we had the two plots north of me built, and that has been very difficult because it has changed. They have torn down a lot of things and made a significant impact on that desert and now I look out and I see their lights instead of seeing the open desert like I did. So my concern really is about precedent, about continuing to carve up area that is supposed to be conservation land. I understand there have been thousands of units put down Shannon and in different places, like right close to me. And my question is, when do we draw the line in the sand? Like how far do we let that go? The impacts like that, we just keep carving up the desert. And the thing that I was asking for was a continuance. If we could have 60 more days. I started going door to door to my neighbors. Most of them are opposed, but I only worked on it a day, so I need more time. And they all were like, what can we do to help? So I think, you know, given more time, we can start figuring out what the what, they all what their, what they think people did not know what to do is what it sounded like when I went door to door and they were happy that I came. So thank you so much. I think that is everything. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Miller. Terri Amonson is our next speaker.

TA: Chair Scott and members of the Board, thank you for having us all here today. We really appreciate your time and listening to us. I am on 2610 West Bountiful Lane. Three quarters of my property will be impacted by the rezoning. I, too, have learned a lot through this process, and the first thing I would like to say is to look to my

neighbors and say, we do not want a battle that is not what we want, but we do want what is reasonable, and we do want to keep and preserve what we all moved there for. There are conditions that we would like to have put in place that I do not want to go into, because they are very long, that we have already submitted, that we believe are reasonable to help mitigate some of the concerns and impacts that we are going to face. The light impact, the noise impact, the dust impact, the building impact that we are going to have, the view impact that is going to be taken. I have already lost three fourths of the view on the south of me from the two that have been built. I am now looking at losing my east of the mountains, losing that view. Part of the view will still be there. Three fourths of it will be taken. My bigger concern is the erosion. The prior owners that these owners had nothing to do with. As I learned as an owner, when you purchase property, you now own that property and everything that comes with it. The prior owners graded it without a permit. When they graded it, they took out all the shrubbery that is along our property line. It is now eroding. It has eroded almost two feet. We have planted almost \$15,000 of trees and shrubs to help shore it up. We have put rip rock in. We continue to clean it up. We are trying to manage our own property to make sure we can stop the erosion and what is happening. Our whole side backs up to the riparian area. We own the wash. The wash runs 50 to 1,000 cubic feet per second. We have seen telephone poles. We have a 100 foot pipe, round pipe that came down our wash and landed in our property because it runs up the road. Someone put in an unpermitted culvert, which is also contributing to the erosion to our property. There are multiple things that are going on. I have concern about access to the property is on an easement egress/ingress road right now that may or may not be designated correctly on the sketch. We are unsure. We have pulled deeds trying to figure it out without having to go down the law area to see where everything is going to lie and what is going to actually be protected. Because we are very concerned about fire access, first responders, if they want to live up there, it is landlocked. First responders are going to have a hard time getting up there. Fire danger is our biggest thing. It is not a typical land. It is on a slope. The flat part is on the top. It slopes on one side and it slopes on the other side. Because of the riparian area and washes on both sides. Getting up that slope and up that hill. If there is a fire, I am very concerned about going over the wash, up that grade and affecting my property on that too. Thank you.

RS: Ms. Amonson. Thank you. Louisa Viles is our final speaker.

LV: I was going to say good morning, but I got to look at my watch. Good afternoon. Thanks to Chairman Scott and the Board for having us here today. My name is Louisa Viles and I live also at 2610 West Bountiful Lane. We have lived there for 15 years. When we moved to Tucson looking for property, we saw this amazing house, stucco house up on a hill, and I think we quoted to each other, I am not driving down that washed out road to go look at a house that is not for sale, and a week later it was ours. I grew up in rural Vermont. My dad was town moderator, and so most of my civics lessons happened on the floor of town meeting, doing my homework. So I feel like I am kind of back there today. So I am grateful to the Board, to the Board of Supervisors and to Pima Planning and Zoning. They have really helped educate us individually as the homeowners, but also the neighborhood to educate us in the community about the processes and the values that the County has. This

thoughtful, intentional approach weighing the pros and cons of proposed development. I do not think it is an accident that we have sat through today. Discussions of the merits of dark skies, pollinators, wildlife corridors, quiet and kindness is the other thing that came up a couple times today. So my goal is these are probably common themes. We are just new to this process. So what we are asking is that we have learned that a lot of our neighbors along with us share a lot of our concerns and also need to be sort of educated about the pros and cons of proposed development and how we can be part of the mitigation and preservation of that neighborhood. It really sort of, it really comes down to the wash, because water in the desert is responsible for everything we are here talking about today. And that wash and that property, along with our property and several other adjacent SR properties. They are not, let us say because of the wash, we believe that they are special interest areas. They are integral to that northwest neighborhood, which is why so many people from outside the 300 foot zone are concerned. This pocket has preserved a modicum of quiet and light and mitigated light pollution, and kept the wildlife corridors such that everyone can enjoy that. So we are looking forward to the opportunity with them, with the Board through this process, to really look at some intentional, possibly mitigation or other concerns as we move forward. But the bottom line is that we are here representing the wash, because that is what drove us to our neighborhood. We picked it not because of the washed out easement road, but because of the wash behind it. And we really feel like we are stewards of the property along with the rest of the neighborhood. We have learned, and we just want to see any future improvements, development or whatever word is used for it be done intentionally and with the idea of conservation foremost in mind. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Viles. Anybody else present wish to address the Board on this matter? Okay. Do you have a question for one of the speakers? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: It is based on a statement from a speaker, but for one of our staff members.

RS: Okay. Go ahead. Please Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Great. Thank you. So not our last speaker, but the one two speakers ago, there were conditions provided, I believe, to staff and I was just curious if that list had been reviewed by staff and if any of those conditions that they presented to us in that list have already been incorporated in the special conditions that are associated with the item that we are currently discussing?

TD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, this has been an evolving process from the Planning and Zoning Commission and then to the lead up to the Board. I would have characterized the Planning and Zoning Commission as the neighbors were adamantly against the rezoning. In the lead up to the Board meeting, I would characterize a few of the neighbors, especially some of the most impacted adjacent, like the two speakers who just recently spoke as wanting to mitigate the impacts on their property. I was able to meet with them last week on, I believe it was Thursday afternoon after work, I went out there, looked at the properties, walked their properties to try to get an understanding, and then what they submitted was a

comment letter that included some of their concerns and what they were hoping to mitigate. These included things like the wash, lighting, and then informally, we have talked about height limits and color of the building. Some of those are things that can be incorporated into conditions to reduce perceived adverse impacts on them. So that is something that can occur.

MH: And so do we need to direct you to do that into this discussion before we vote on it, or is that something that you are going to already do?

RS: Supervisor Heinz, after I close the public hearing, I may make a motion that you will probably be interested in hearing.

MH: Okay. I will defer any further comment then.

TD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, we can be part of crafting conditions that reduce adverse impacts on affected property owners.

RS: Alright. Does anybody else wish to address the Board on this matter? If not, I am going to close the public hearing and I have a motion that I would like my colleagues to consider. And that motion is to continue this item until the June 3rd Board of Supervisors' meeting, during the time between now and then, staff is to prepare a report for the Board on the pros and cons of sticking with the current zoning or going to the proposed rezoning in terms of the effects on all parties. If rezoning remains, the staff recommendation during that time, they are to work with the applicant, adjacent landowners and other neighbors to craft conditions that most reasonably address concerns regarding potential adverse impacts. That is my motion.

JA: I will second.

RS: Okay. Moved and seconded. And just to add some further discussion before I call on my colleagues, I was concerned not only with the divided vote, which, as Mr. Drzazgowski said, is very uncommon with the Planning and Zoning Commission. But I am also concerned with the very detailed and substantive concerns that have been raised by the adjacent landowners and also by other neighbors, and that is why I felt that the request for this continuance and all of the work that should be done during that roughly 60-day period was appropriate. Any other questions or comments from my colleagues? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: And this is maybe more to staff, but would I know before when we have done this kind of thing, I remember from the dais, we just approved it and told you to not, you know, to incorporate the conditions at the staff level before anything happens. Do you need us to do this for 60 days? I mean, I am just I do not mind voting yes on that as well, but I am just curious from staff perspective. I know we have done it the other way before. Do you need us to continue it and not vote on it finally until June, or can this be 30 days? Or can we just say, because I am okay approving it now, as long as those conditions are going to be applied?

RS: Supervisor Heinz, if I could interject, the reason I have asked for this amount of time is because of the substance and details that my staff and I have heard from our constituents who are concerned with this matter. I did discuss the amount of time, not only with Mr. Drzazgowski, but also with Mr. DeBonis, because I want there to be ample time for staff to engage, not just with the Raica's, but also with the adjacent landowners, who we heard from, Ms. Amonson and Ms. Viles, and with other neighbors who have contacted our office. And this felt like an appropriate amount of time to not only engage in that dialog, but also to hear whatever responses the applicant and other concerned parties have.

MH: That is great. My only question then would be maybe to you, since you have maybe already done, are the petitioners okay with that amount of time to 60 days?

RS: Well, at this point I did not check with the Raica's to see if they were okay with the 60 days, because I feel like that is a decision to be made by the Board before the Board has to agree to anything. I think we need to ask for sufficient amount of time for not just the applicants, but for other interested parties to have their concerns addressed.

MH: Then may I direct that question to the Raica's now, please?

RS: You certainly can.

MH: If one of you could come forward. Thank you.

AG: We already closed the public hearing.

RS: Well, but he is..

AG: You are asking a specific question.

RS: Oh, okay.

MH: I move that we reopen the public hearing.

RS: I will second that.

MH: Thank you.

RS: All those in favor of reopening the public hearing indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AG: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Alright. Go ahead, Supervisor. Thank you, Mr. Brown. Sorry.

MH: Thank you. Sorry. This is a little unorthodox, but I was just curious in terms of that timeline. Does that impact any plans ongoing? I do not know, just if you could speak to that quickly.

TR: I guess I would just say that we are not interested in doing that. I would prefer you just to deny it if that is the case, I am concerned that there was a couple times I tried to ask questions to the department, and I am concerned the department went out and met with the neighbors, but I was specifically told we could only communicate via email and they never spoke with me, and I had a question on process. So given all this, I would prefer you just deny it. Honestly, I feel like what is in the staffing report addresses the various concerns. I mean, they have all been looked at by that staff over the last, I do not know, too long. So thank you.

MH: Okay. Thank you.

RS: I can assure you, Mr. Raica, given the terms of this motion, that you will have ample opportunity to engage with staff during this time and that it will not have to be in writing. Any other questions or comments from Board members. Alright. We are going to go back to the original motion. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AG: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

MH: No.

RS: Okay. Item passes 4-1 with Supervisor Heinz opposed. Thank you all very much. Alright. I am sorry. Thank you, Ms. Manriquez, and we will also close the public hearing at this time.