

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 4, 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 Leshner, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely.

1. CONTRACT

City of Tucson, to provide an Acquisition Agreement (RPS file Acq-1226) for property located at 202 E. Mohave Road and 201 E. Navajo Road, to develop and maintain a stormwater park, in Section 25, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, Flood Control Floodprone Land Acquisition Program Fund, contract amount \$282,500.00 (PO2500001565)

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

2. CONTRACT

City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for design, construction, and maintenance of Green Stormwater Infrastructure located at 202 E. Mohave Road and 201 E. Navajo Road, no cost/25 year term (SC2500000000)

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

Supervisor Grijalva inquired if this creation was similar to the El Vado Park located in District 5.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that it was a great partnership and the project would be beautiful.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had several questions and he could forward them to staff to response at a later time if they were not prepared to answer them now. He indicated that it appeared the County was purchasing some acreage and some buildings for the purpose of runoff water storage, from the City of Tucson (COT), and questioned why the COT had pulled permits to demolish those existing buildings in 2022, yet they were still standing. He stated that the COT had designated the buildings as the Housing and Community Development buildings and the County was buying all of the buildings and parcels for the purpose of a storm water collection area. He indicated that he had reviewed aerial photos of the area to determine the location of a nearby wash or any evidence of water, collection or erosion. He questioned what criteria was used to determine that the location was applicable for a runoff water storage area as there appeared to be no washes or tributaries in that area. He asked about the storm water park that would be built on the property and the fate of the existing buildings.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that he would address some of the questions now and that additional information would be provided to the Board. He concurred that the area lacked a defined wash or channel, but it was not uncommon in older, urban neighborhoods. He indicated that the neighborhoods in those areas still experienced storm water runoff and in many instances, caused significant problems for the occupants of those structures. He explained that the approach being utilized in partnership with the COT and the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD), aimed to address those storm water challenges in such neighborhoods. He explained that the visible work by the RFCD was in major watercourses, and they also worked in urban areas. He stated that the tool set for addressing urban drainage issues and storm water runoff in developed, high-density areas was different than what was seen elsewhere and that the storm water park concept was a way to capture and slow down storm water flows, releasing them over time, while also creating an amenity that was usable by the public and the community within that neighborhood.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the existing buildings would be demolished or would remain in the area.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded the County would acquire the property with the buildings, and that the RFCD would be responsible for demolishing those buildings. He stated that the area was in a storm water hazard area, which deemed it unsuitable for habitation and the existing buildings were in a deteriorated condition. He reiterated that the RFCD would acquire the site, demolish the buildings, and then the COT would contribute an equal amount to the acquisition and demolition costs to develop the storm water park amenity.

Supervisor Christy thanked Mr. DeBonis, Jr., and stated that he did not need any further information sent to him.

Chair Scott stated that the memorandum included in the background material for this item noted five storm water parks that had been completed, which included the El Vado New Hope Park, and it also indicated that additional green storm water infrastructure projects were in the planning and design phases. He asked if there was a master plan for subsequent projects.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., explained that opportunities for stormwater park projects were identified through collaborations, such as ongoing park improvements within the COT. He stated that as the COT worked on park improvements that were utilized by bond proceeds, the County had partnered with them and provided an example of the Cherry Avenue Park, which had not been part of a master plan, but emerged as an opportunity. He indicated that staff could return to the Board to provide a summary of upcoming projects and how they worked to cooperatively identify potential opportunities. He stated that while there was no formal master plan, staff was aware of potential opportunities for collaboration.

Chair Scott inquired that while there was no master plan, there was a set of guiding criteria used to identify opportunities.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Allen inquired about the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, expressing concern about the potential future of this funding, where funds previously used for important community services might dry up or be threatened.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that as communicated by the County Administrator in several memoranda, the financial landscape was changing daily and the County continued to evaluate potential impacts. He indicated that the COT was doing the same. He stated that if the anticipated CDBG funds from the COT were unavailable, the RFCD would hold ownership of the property, and the County would work with them to identify alternate funding sources. He stated that in the context of this particular project, there was minimal risk to the County or the COT and they would seek replacement funds, if needed.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, commented that staff was working on an analysis that would be provided to the Board, which focused on traditional grants. She explained that those grants had been received by the County annually for so long that they were not thought of as grants anymore. She noted that CDBG and long-standing grants in the County Attorney's office, which had been in place for over 20 years, were part of that group of traditional grants. She explained that while the general rule had been that when a grant ended, it ended, but programs that had become deeply embedded in the County's operations, such as CDBG, would require additional review by the Board.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:57 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, February 4, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz participated remotely.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Audrina Sanchez, Secretary, Los Amigos Technology Academy Student Council.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION

4. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Terri Spencer, Director, Procurement, for over 23 years of service.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, thanked Ms. Spencer for 23 years of dedicated service to Pima County. She boasted about Ms. Spencer and her team's achievements and the award-winning department.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, expressed his gratitude to Ms. Spencer, wished her the best in retirement and that she would be missed by everyone.

No Board action was taken.

5. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Joann Trego, Officer, Tanque Verde Valley Association, addressed the Board in support of the proposed Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan, and stressed the increased wildfire risk to Tucson properties. She recommended that the County adopt stricter building codes and controlled burns.

Laurie Moore spoke about federal funds used to transport immigrants into the country and asked the Board to prioritize citizens' safety.

Don Hayles expressed support for the Wildfire Mitigation Plan and voiced his opposition to Proposition 14, which involved tax increases.

Sally Crum, President, Mt Lemmon Homeowners Association, expressed her gratitude to the Board for addressing wildfire risks. She urged the County to update the Protection Plan that had been outdated for more than 10 years.

Anastasia Tsatsakis spoke in support of the Sheriff's grant and the Wildfire Mitigation Plan, and expressed her opposition to the Conditional Use Permit. She called for accountability in NGO's regarding immigrants.

Dana Kormash addressed the Board regarding the Recorder's online ballot system. She voiced concerns about AI replacing jobs and the environmental impact of developments such as the Rosemont Mine.

Paulla Neal raised concerns about homeowners who lost insurance due to wildfire risks because large insurers were cancelling policies and called for fire mitigation in the area.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Christy requested that County Administration and relevant departments address the issue that Ms. Crum spoke about, regarding abandoned homes, which was a community wide issue. He emphasized that those homes posed fire hazards and created additional issues like homelessness, vandalism, and safety risks. He requested that a response on the matter be provided to the Board. He noted the creation of the Resiliency and Mitigation Council, which addressed homeowners' insurance issues, and praised Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr. as the only County representative on the committee, which was a significant achievement. He noted that the upcoming Resiliency and Mitigation Council meeting could be watched online through the Arizona Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions page and encouraged those facing issues with homeowners' insurance

premiums to watch the meeting, since it could offer useful insights and potential relief.

Chair Scott acknowledged the item regarding this issue that Supervisor Christy brought to the Board the previous year, which contributed to the issue being included in the legislative program. He stated that it had led to the adoption of a Resolution by the State's County Supervisors Association and resulted in the creation of a committee under the State's Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions. He credited Pima County's proactive stance, led by Supervisor Christy, as the reason for Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr.'s appointment to the position.

Supervisor Grijalva acknowledged the importance of respecting everyone's right to speak during the Call to the Public, and Pima County had been and would continue to be committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion, both in its workforce and hiring practices.

* * *

(Clerk's Note: On Minute Item No. 28, there were several speakers who wanted to address the Board regarding general comments related to fireworks permits. At the suggestion of Legal Counsel, the Board reopened Call to the Public since their comments were not specific to the fireworks permits listed on the agenda.)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to reopen Call to the Public.

Kendon Victor, Pyro Planning Specialist, Fireworks Productions of Arizona, addressed the Board and apologized for the fireworks event in District 1 that took place a year and a half ago at La Paloma, which caused a fire and created a difficult position. He spoke in support of the fireworks event at Tucson Country Club. He indicated that he had heard that there would be an upcoming proposal for revisions to the Pima County Code regarding fireworks and expressed concerns about limiting fireworks to only New Year's and the 4th of July.

Kenny Welty thanked the Board for their consistent approval of fireworks events at Caterpillar, Inc. and hoped that fireworks permits for events, like weddings at Tucson Country Club, would continue to be approved by the Board.

John Lashley, Operator, Tucson Speedway, stated that every year they got a fireworks permit for a July 4th fireworks show celebration with varying dates each year and that this year's event would be held on June 28th. He requested that the Board not limit fireworks permits due to varying dates of holidays.

Chris Klok, Events and Marketing Director, Forty Niner Country Club, shared that they held a safe, well-loved fireworks display, "Star Spangled Boom," since 2017, with proper notification and community support. He emphasized the event's

importance and safety, and expressed hope that the Board would continue to approve their fireworks permit for this event.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Grijalva clarified that the Board had not made any decision on fireworks in general and that fireworks permit requests were supported or opposed by individual Supervisors. She stated that if there was a blanket proposal that would come to the Board from Chair Scott's office on a future agenda it had not been seen yet. She encouraged those with strong opinions to reach out to Board members, emphasized that there needed to be a Board majority to make changes. She stated that she was not in favor of wholesale changes, but was open to discussions on enhancing services at different locations.

Chair Scott concurred with Supervisor Grijalva's comments and highlighted that the Board had consistently approved fireworks permit applications for high school graduations and the Forty Niner Country Club's celebration. He noted that a few applications from nearby resorts in his District had been denied due to complaints from constituents. He stated that he believed his office had a commitment from one of the resorts to no longer offer fireworks for commercial purposes, like conventions, as they were too much of a burden on constituents. He clarified that any upcoming proposals would not involve any kind of wholesale prohibition on fireworks, but would address concerns regarding noise, wildlife, and fire risks during drought conditions. He noted that regarding the two fireworks permit requests on the agenda, the Forty Niner Country Club's fireworks request was for a wedding and Caterpillar's fireworks requests were always approved by the Board since they were not located in a significantly populated area.

* * *

6. **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 9:50 a.m.

7. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 10:52 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

8. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion relating to Vertical Bridge, L.L.C.'s request for a Type III Conditional Use Permit.

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

9. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Susan Schroeder, et al. v. Guy Quintance, et al., C20223979.

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

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion relating to the potential waiver of the Attorney-Client privileged memorandum written by County Attorney Laura Conover dated January 27, 2025, regarding "Federal Law Enforcement Presence and Operations in Pima County."

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Jenifer Darland, Director, Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions (OHOHS), stated that Mari Vasquez had joined the County Administrator's team as a Senior Advisor to County Administration and would help with strategies and approaches to addressing homelessness throughout the region of Pima County. She provided a slide show presentation and briefly summarized the five priorities that established OHOHS and stated that the update was to revisit Priority No. 2, with an emphasis around the response system. She stated that it would specifically focus on the County's responses when a constituent complaint was received that related to a homeless encampment on a County owned and maintained asset. She stated that the Board had previously been updated on the various different layers of County responses to homelessness, which included everything from County departments that were responsible for the duties to maintain an actual physical asset or space on behalf of the County, Health and Human Service departments that offered services for County constituents, and jurisdictional partners. She stated that they were all part of the wheel of support that was leveraged whenever they worked to address homelessness throughout the County. She stated that these departments were comprised of Community and Workforce Development (CWD), Health Department, Justice Services, Library and Pima Animal Care, and they worked in response to County Administrative Procedure 50-2, in support of the Public Works Departments. She added that there was also joint, contracted and community collaboration throughout the region to support vulnerable constituents. She stated that within the Public Works Departments that responded to homeless encampments on County owned assets and were charged with maintaining a physical space or asset on behalf of Pima County included the Regional Flood Control District, Parks and Recreation, Department of Transportation, and any other County department that operated a building or an asset on behalf of the County. She stated that maintenance included informing constituents on the appropriate use and hours of operation of that space. She stated that the contracted partnerships with nonprofit service providers, largely leveraged out of either the Health

Department or CWD that would be funded through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for vulnerable and at-risk households, as well as for any of the State funds that were also available for this population. She stated that in their very important partnership matrix was the relationship they had with their jurisdictional partners, incorporated neighbors that interfaced between public works staff and their jurisdictional counterparts, and also working with law enforcement entities that had the law enforcement authority over the area in which some of the assets resided. She stated that it was important to note that the County was essentially a property holder, and properties were distributed throughout the region, and some of those properties would be in incorporated jurisdictions, and others would be adjacent to incorporated jurisdictions. She stated that when a County asset was located in an incorporated jurisdiction, the County had a role and responsibility, just like if they were private property owners, which meant there was a responsibility to maintain the asset to be a good neighbor in that other jurisdictional space. She stated that when crime occurred, the appropriate response fell to the jurisdictional law enforcement agency within that incorporated section. She explained that when the County had a physical asset or a site that was maintained it was the designated County department that had a responsibility to maintain that space, whether it was to maintain general operations, to inform constituents on the appropriate manner in which to recreate, for example, Parks and Recreation and the use of the Loop, or with Regional Flood Control District and maintenance of the flood channel that fell to those particular departments. She stated that those responsibilities when it came to encampment reports were to follow County Administrative Procedure 50-2, which was to conduct a field assessment to take pictures, inspect, post no later than 72 hours, a Notice to Vacate to any of the inhabitants in that space, and to proceed to clean or remediate, and to take whatever steps that were practicable to post further notifications that the space was not meant to be occupied for camping or for anything else that fell outside of the rules of the actual area. She added that the County had the responsibility for the actions of the homeless outreach support which was in alignment with the administrative procedure to support the Public Works staff that inspected the field. She stated that they went out and provided information on available shelters and to find out if individuals had been matched to housing and whenever additional capacity support was needed the homeless outreach staff worked in partnership with nonprofit agencies, as well as any of the jurisdictional coordination. She stated that for example, the City of Tucson, working in partnership with the Housing First Division, were often in these shared spaces where they had shared jurisdictional efforts to address homelessness. She stated that when it came to the criminal behaviors that occurred on County owned or maintained assets, County staff that was responsible for maintaining the site, their duties and assignments exceeded their scope of their responsibilities, and that meant they were not asking for Public Work staff to be law enforcement, so when there was an event or criminal activity that occurred, they were encouraged to call 911 to interrupt that behavior, and whoever responded to that would be the law enforcement entity that had the jurisdictional authority wherever that asset was located. She stated that they also encouraged their building managers and staff that was in charge to maintain relationships with law enforcement whenever possible in order to facilitate

communication around non-emergency challenges, since not everything was going to be an immediate call to 911. She stated that for example, during the process of posting, prior to the cleanup of an encampment, staff notified the appropriate law enforcement entity in which the asset resided and would let them know of the activities that were going to be commencing. She stated that either they would invite them to collaborate in the posting of the notice, or at the very minimum, let them know of when the cleanup was going to commence, especially if staff believed they were under the impression that it may require to have some additional awareness from law enforcement partners and not all of the County properties were going to be located in the unincorporated area. She stated, for example, that this meeting was located in the City of Tucson's law enforcement jurisdiction and some of the physical outdoor assets, such as the park and the Chuck Huckelberry Loop would weave in and out of both incorporated and unincorporated Pima County. She stated that when that program commenced before the end of last year, efforts were made to ensure that they had appropriately identified members within Tucson Police Department so that everyone could have eyes on any of the less than legal behaviors that the Vet Sec team may be encountering, as well as designated points of contact, should they need additional support while they were conducting their rounds and their visits to the various designated sites that were identified in that protocol. She added that they conducted the point in time count that occurred on January 29th and thanked Supervisor Grijalva and her office staff for joining their team, they had a total of over 450 volunteers throughout the community that went out and surveyed individuals experiencing homelessness and it was always a heartening effort to see the complexity of the crisis. She stated that they expected to have those results in the late spring before they were transmitted to HUD.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had reached out to a number of business leaders, business owners and community leaders on this subject and although presentations were provided, it failed to address their complaints. He stated that they had not seen any of the things that were being provided and that he had received a letter from a business owner on East Ft. Lowell. He stated that it was mentioned about having more eyes on issues of less than legal behaviors, but asked about criminality. He stated that this individual received a notification from Tucson Electric Power that folks had been in the back alley, living and camping there for weeks, had set fire to her electrical box and devastated the building and an adjacent building with no electricity for two days. He then read directly from the letter, "We had called 311 earlier in the week to let them know the alley behind our shop was a huge fire hazard all the way through the alley. There were dirty old couches, homeless had drugs in and set beside the electronics, had a fire spot right in the middle of the road of the alley." He stated that they called the other partners, but received no response. He stated that the details of the letter were heartbreaking and as a former business owner, he knew what they were going through, but what was being discussed on this item did not address this. He stated that since he was aware this presentation would be given, he had asked if they had any questions they wanted him to ask and he read their questions, "What was the full context of the regional approach that was being taken by the City and County, and how much money and resources were the City and County contributing respectively into this collaboration?"

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that if Supervisor Christy would like to provide those questions to her, she would provide a full report to the Board, but at this time she was unaware of what the City of Tucson had spent and could not provide those specifics.

Supervisor Christy stated that it would not sit well with the business community.

Ms. Leshar responded that the information would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Christy continued to read his questions, "What kind of public facing dashboards or metrics are available to show the success of any program that the City or County are currently funding? What is the cost per recipient? Success is being defined as getting people back on their feet, not simply supporting them with a roof over their head. We have seen encampments at Santa Rita Park. When they are cleaned up, the inhabitants are offered shelter and services. None of them are taking advantage of them, instead, they wait a few days to go back to the parks and have encampments again. What is the plan for these individuals and what is it so that our community can go back to using public spaces? The Pima County Transition Center is currently looking at a success by connecting people to services, reducing recidivism, and saving taxpayers nearly \$1 million in last year, a positive element, but they understand that Tucson Police Department (TPD) has started to increase drop offs, so what can be done to get the City to utilize this Transition Center in a further manner, what is their hesitation? Substance use disorder is being driven by Fentanyl and Methamphetamine. We have seen several times in the media that when individuals are arrested with large quantities of narcotics, they have low bonds or have their charges drastically reduced. Is there any plan for greater accountability, given that we have seen many of these individuals back in custody for committing even more dangerous crimes?" He stated that he would provide these questions to the department, he knew it was in-depth and there might not be prepared answers now, but to paint this as a rosy picture that everything was going along beautifully with this homeless issue, without involving any kind of legal ramifications by law enforcement was what was driving them crazy and they were very disappointed, frustrated and felt like they were not getting the truth about all the matters, and that this program was not doing what it was intended to do, and they were the ones suffering for it.

Chair Scott stated that he appreciated Ms. Leshar's offer to provide answers to Supervisor Christy's submitted questions, but suggested that she could also interface with their partners at the City of Tucson to see what responses they might provide and asked if Supervisor Christy's submitted questions could be shared with the other Board members.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she understood the frustration of community members and business owners and that it was really important that when the Board listened to these presentations, they tried to understand the complexity of the problem and that there was not one solution that was going to fit all and understood

that people had rights. She stated that someone could not be forced to take services or go into programs, and that there was not enough resources to arrest their way out of this problem. She stated that when there were programs that helped people attain job skills and programs that tried to take people off of the streets, especially those that were vulnerable, and when looking at the number of children and the number of older individuals that were facing eviction, potential homelessness, or were on the street, that was a very telling snapshot of where they were in the community and in the nation. She stated that when she had gone to Las Vegas to look at some of the solutions that they tried, this was not same. She stated that this was a much layered, complex problem and it was not just the County that was going to be part of this effort. She stated that she appreciated that Director Darland was able to talk about how multifaceted the problem was and how many people were working on the issue, but she thought it needed to be acknowledged that in the nation, there was a real serious problem with addiction to narcotics and Fentanyl. She stated that these were all things that were going to continue until they could get a handle on some of those other issues. She understood the frustration, but also acknowledged the incredibly hard work of so many people in the community, from the nonprofit partners, to people in the County and in the City and this was a national and global problem. She stated that there were unhoused Veterans that made up 8% of the unhoused population on the streets, which was significant. She stated that she had spoken with two of them while she completed the point in time count, talked to parents who had their children staying in friends' houses because they could not find housing. She stated that there were significant problems with the system and that continuing to talk about it and to find solutions together was the only way they would be able to do this. She stated that the County had no authority over TPD when it came to what they were going to charge people with and acknowledged the fact that many of the crimes that the unhoused community or people living on the streets were committing were misdemeanor offenses and not something they could be jailed for. She stated that unless they were committing criminal damage or other arrestable offenses, many people were cited and moved on. She thanked everyone for what they were doing, and it would be heard from people that were boots on the ground, an incredible level of frustration. She stated that there were so many cases of wringing hands on how to solve this problem. She commended the people that went out every day and did this work, because it could be soul crushing and that more could be done, but they needed to figure out where those gaps in service were and try to focus energy there because there was no way to arrest their way out of the problem.

Supervisor Allen stated that as mentioned by Supervisor Grijalva, the complexity of compounding issues facing the community was stark and overwhelming. She stated that the thing she heard most from her District residents was the importance of treating folks with compassion, and she had heard that repeatedly from individuals throughout District 3. She stated that treating the unhoused with a one-size-fits-all law enforcement approach, folks knew that was not going to work and it would be incredibly costly. She stated that figuring out the compassionate solutions that were in fact systemic solutions, was where folks wanted the County to invest their energy and time. She stated that she had spent time with the City staff that had their

homeless outreach workers get a call about an encampment, and there was an outreach worker that was assigned to a specific area. She stated they would then go and check that encampment. She asked if this was also applicable in the County areas, if there were outreach workers that were in the areas outside of the City of Tucson and how far out that extended to. She also requested an update on the Loop, the security that was placed around the Loop, what was there and what did success look like for it, and what had happened with the individuals who were pushed out from there.

Ms. Darland stated that the information regarding the Loop would take a moment to submit following with an opportunity to evaluate the metrics, but she would provide the information regarding what the County did to the Board, and would allow Ms. Vasquez to discuss the City processes. She stated that when it came to a homeless encampment report received through the protocol, they first led with humanitarian services. She stated that it did not negate any of the other outreach done in response to having a call come in for assistance. She stated that they had staff at the Sullivan Jackson Employment Center where the Homeless Services Division was housed and they tried to limit duplicative efforts, which meant they tried to focus their resources on or around the unincorporated spaces and to provide additional support where capacity was needed for their colleagues at the City of Tucson. She stated that where and whenever possible, their outreach team went out and offered services there on a text thread, for lack of a more sophisticated system, with shelter providers to identify available beds. She stated that they got supplies from Pima Animal Care Center and offered their cell phones to anyone that needed to call a family member to get reunified with the family member, or a health provider. She stated that there was some frustration with a lack of some of the resources and some of the challenges and whenever possible, these folks worked closely together with their counterparts at the City of Tucson, knew each other by name and often texted and called each other when they ran out of ideas or ran into any brick walls.

Mari Vasquez, Senior Advisor, County Administrator, stated that the City's process mirrored similarly to what the County did and it was a humanitarian effort. She explained that when something was reported they had peers of lived experience go out and let them know if they were in an area where they could not be and that would be posted. She stated that it either got posted for 72 hours or depending on an immediate removal, as needed, depending on the area. She stated that they could not force anyone because they were not law enforcement, so they offered the services they had available, but then law enforcement needed to step in and complete their piece of that puzzle. She stated that there were meetings that happened every month on a regional scale, where they all met with law enforcement personnel and it was a separate piece of the pie to offering the services, but what did enforcement and engagement look like and for the people that did outreach every day, it was a struggle when people repopulated and they had no say over when that happened.

Ms. Darland added that the Public Works staff understood that they did not necessarily need to wait for outreach teams to join them and that they led with compassion whenever it was possible. She stated that County staff cared and interfaced with these people before a constituent had the opportunity to report them through the process, and so that they did their best to ensure that they stayed on the right side and got connected to resources, because they certainly wanted to ensure that they could end their crisis.

Chair Scott stated that in previous meetings he had several requests for additional information regarding the work the County had done to address homelessness in the community and he wanted to add another larger request that was aligned with some of the points heard from his colleagues. He asked that the Board be provided with a report on indicators with metrics that could be used to document the results of efforts to address homelessness, its causes and its effects. He stated that another request he had was directed towards County Administrator Leshner and it followed up on a question that Supervisor Allen had and also some points that Supervisor Christy made in response to constituent concerns about possibly illegal or dangerous behavior. He stated that the security firm the County contracted with had been patrolling the Loop for the last several months and he requested that the Board receive a detailed report on the behaviors that they had addressed and observed. He stated the report should also note areas on the Loop and adjacent to it where possibly illegal or dangerous behaviors had been seen by the patrols or reported to them and the Board needed to have a better sense of what was working or what needed to be done differently or better to lift people out of homelessness. He stated that as heard from his colleagues, they needed to act forcefully to deal with those whose actions were not just a threat to others in the homeless community, but to the health and safety of everyone. He stated that he felt like the public wanted them to lead and act, and they really deserved and expected nothing less. He stated that his requests looked at both sides of the coin when dealing with this, and he absolutely agreed with the sentiments that people in the community whose behaviors were a threat, not just to others in the homeless community, but to the overall health and safety of this community, they had to work collaboratively with the other jurisdictions, with their partners in law enforcement to address their behaviors as well. He stated that he would like both these reports as soon as possible, and no later than the next time this recurring item was set to appear on the agenda.

Chair Grijalva stated that she advocated that when the Board requested these written reports that were really complex with a lot of nuances, it was much more beneficial, in her opinion, for the Board to receive an oral presentation. She stated that slides could be done, but she thought that the exchange where they were able to hear from each other and understand what was going on was much more beneficial to her personally, because she knew it was incredibly time consuming to create these reports.

Chair Scott shared his appreciation for that, which was the reason why he was happy to wait until the next appearance of this item on the agenda, which would be the first meeting in March.

Supervisor Allen stated that she loved metrics and dashboards to track progress, but her question was whether or not they had goals in place that lent themselves towards that degree of specificity around progress, because without having the clarity of goals, then the Board was receiving reports on activity as what they were counting, which she did not think necessarily got them towards knowing the sorts of progress that she thought they wanted to see. She stated that it was more of a question to whether the Board felt like they had the clarity around those goals such that they would lend themselves to a tracking dashboard.

Chair Scott appreciated Supervisor Allen's question and the points she made, and his expectation would be that anything aligned with the requests that he made be aligned with the overall goals for this office when it was established at the end of 2023 and some of those goals were touched on during Ms. Darland's presentation.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

12. Final Plat With Assurances

P23FP00016, Sorrel Ridge Estates, Lots 1-414 and Common Areas "A" and "B". (District 5)

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

PROCUREMENT

13. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 29.4, Contracts.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the proposed revisions would allow departments to use an approved template on outside agency contracts and contracts where the county attorney's signature was unnecessary on the signature page. He stated that there were no legal concerns with the recommendation.

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

Supervisor Grijalva hoped that by streamlining this process, there would be a quicker turnaround with the disbursement of funds to the approved agencies.

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

REAL PROPERTY

14. Acceptance of Right-of-Way

Acceptance of the Right-of-Way along State Route 86 from the Arizona Department of Transportation and issued by the Arizona State Land Department. (Districts 3 and 5)

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Forensic Science Center

15. Banner-University Medical Group, to provide for an Amended and Restated Physician Services Agreement (Independent Practice) for autopsy services, teaching and supervision services at the Academic Medical Center, contract amount \$250,000.00 per year revenue/3 year term (CT2400000069)

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that this item was to provide supervisory functions in the Office of the Medical Examiner, and that Dr. Hess' team had worked with individuals from Banner to oversee some autopsies.

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

Supervisor Grijalva asked whether the ability to do this was due to the build-out and the new facility that increased the capacity for autopsies, or if this had been previously done.

Mr. Leshner responded that the County had a contract with Banner, but it had been limited in scope, and the new facility allowed staff to expand many of the services.

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

Health

16. LexisNexis VitalChek Network, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for ordering of vital records, extend contract term to 1/31/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$1,600,000.00 revenue (CTN-HD-23-110)

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

Supervisor Christy questioned if the vendor was merely facilitating various public records requests, such as birth certificates, or if they were also aggregating and collecting data to later sell.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, clarified that LexisNexis provided a service that allowed access to vital records, and the contract allowed them to work with the Vital Records Department. She emphasized that the vendor did not sell that data. She explained that if someone contracted with LexisNexis and asked for a copy of those records and paid them, they would be providing it to you in exchange for your willing participation in that event. She reiterated that LexisNexis did not sell data to others in that way.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, concurred with Ms. Leshner and clarified that they were the sole provider of that service in the state. He stated that the County procured their services to do the interchange of information for a revenue stream for the County.

Supervisor Christy asked if they were not going to sell to TikTok or any similar platforms.

Ms. Leshner responded no.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if it was to access the online option to be able to order these records.

Mr. Holmes responded that it was an extension of the current contract, which was for the services they provided to access the records. He stated that it was not for additional services that were online-only, but were for both online and other services.

Supervisor Grijalva asked about the process of obtaining a birth certificate, noting that it costs \$20.00 through Vital Records, but using LexisNexis to access a birth certificate from a different location like Tucson or Pima County, while living in Philadelphia would cost between \$39.50 and \$90.50, depending on the complexity of the request. She indicated that she had asked before about bringing the service in-house, as it generated significant revenue, though it was only a percentage of what LexisNexis paid. She asked for clarification on whether LexisNexis paid the standard \$20.00 for a birth certificate while the County received a percentage of anything beyond that.

Mr. Holmes confirmed that it was their business model.

Supervisor Grijalva inquired about the percentage received by the County.

Mr. Holmes stated that he did not know that percentage.

Supervisor Grijalva thought it was around 30% and she felt that given the \$1.6 million in revenue, it might be possible for that service to be brought in-house. She asked to be informed about this possibility.

Supervisor Allen raised concerns about the security of the data and questioned whether LexisNexis already held the data. She acknowledged that the data existed within the system but expressed concern about the security of such critical information, given its sensitive nature.

Ms. Leshner indicated that staff would provide a report regarding the security of the data since the County had been working with LexisNexis for a while. She noted that the County Attorney's Office relied on LexisNexis, and there were various providers linked to it. She stated that there were protocols in place between the company and the County that ensured a secure data exchange, and the specific details of those protocols would be provided in the report.

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

Procurement

17. Award

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000001, Huber Technology, Inc. (Headquarters: Denver, NC), to provide for Huber parts and service. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$370,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Wastewater Operations Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

Chair Scott stated that the metrics available to measure performance indicated that the department would measure product reliability by recording in Maximo the number of times Huber equipment had broken down and caused disruption of the wastewater treatment process. He questioned whether it had been an issue, and if so, how that issue would be addressed, and if it had not been an issue, then why these metrics were used. He referenced the program goals and predicted outcomes and asked if original equipment manufacturer parts had not always been used in the past and whether that was an issue that would be addressed with this item.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that Huber provided specialty equipment, and when parts needed to be replaced, original manufacturer parts were used, and staff had not varied from that approach. He stated that there had not been any disruption due to failure of Huber parts. He stated that staff had

indicated that their approach was preventative, focusing on metrics associated with hours of wear on equipment and various components, and preemptive replacement of parts like seals, switches and things of that nature. He stated that there had not been any issues with that particular manufacturer, their products or their equipment.

Chair Scott clarified that the language reflected their belief in preventive maintenance and was not due to any historical issues.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative.

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

18. Arizona Dental Insurance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Delta Dental of Arizona, Amendment No. 6, to provide for self-funded dental plan, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Health Benefit Self-Insurance (96%) and Employee Contributions (4%) Funds, contract amount \$2,950,000.00 (SC2400001037) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

19. United Concordia Insurance Company, Amendment No. 5, to provide for pre-paid dental plan, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Health Benefit Self-Insurance (50%) and Employee Contributions (50%) Funds, contract amount \$280,000.00 (SC2400001038) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

20. Kone, Inc., to provide for elevator modernization at 110 W. Congress, FM Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$2,747,440.00/2 years, 8 months term (PO2400017675) Administering Department: Facilities Management

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

Real Property

21. Donald Peterson, to provide a County Airport Hangar License for use of a hangar space at the Eric Marcus Airport, total contract amount \$8,400.00/5 year term (\$1,680.00 per year) revenue (CT2500000002)

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

22. Gail Dent, Amendment No. 6, to provide a license agreement for use of a portion of the Children's Memorial Park located at 4875 N. 15th Place and extend contract term to 1/31/26, no cost (SC2400000469)

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

23. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for usage of extra storage capacity at Marana High Plains Effluent Recharge Project, contract amount \$25,000.00/10 year term revenue (CT2500000000)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

24. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**

Arizona Department of Housing, to provide for the Southwest Gas Corporation, Weatherization Assistance Program, \$23,083.00 (G-CWD-82035)

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

25. **Acceptance – Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for Senate Bill 1847 to support assessment of health needs and address youth mental health substance misuse and amend grant language, \$241,334.00 (GA-HD-66215)

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

26. **Acceptance - Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program - HMGP DR-4524-009-015R, extend grant term to 1/22/26 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-WW-72578)

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

27. **Acceptance – Sheriff**

State of Arizona - Department of Public Safety, to provide for Border Crimes and Human Smuggling Enforcement, \$350,00.00/\$87,500.00 State of Arizona - Department of Public Safety (75%) and Pima County Sheriff's General (25%) Fund match (GA-SD-70358)

At the request of Sheriff Nanos and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

28. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, February 19, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 5, for general comments made related to fireworks permits. There were several individuals who wanted to address the Board regarding general comments related to fireworks permits. At the suggestion of Legal Counsel, the Board reopened Call to the Public since the speakers comments were not specific to the fireworks permits listed on the agenda.)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board on this item. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Allen and Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

29. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, February 22, 2025 at 8:00 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether there was anyone who wanted to address the Board on this item. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Grijalva and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Allen and Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

30. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

P24CU00007, SWENSON - W. MASSINGALE ROAD

Shelley Swenson, represented by Vertical Bridge, L.L.C., requests a Type III Conditional Use Permit for a wireless communication facility in accordance with Section 18.07.030.H of the Pima County Zoning Code in the GR-1 (Rural Residential) zone, located north of W. Massingale Road approximately 7,900 feet

east of the intersection of W. Massingale Road and N. Sandario Road, addressed as 10510 W. Massingale Road. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends DENIAL. (District 3)

Chair Scott stated that he had asked staff to lay out the steps that were taken that led to their recommendation of approval for this application and also the discussion at the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) meeting that led to P&Z's recommendation of denial. He stated that after the staff report, he would allow the attorney for the applicant to provide a presentation to the Board. He stated that there would also be an attorney for those opposed to the application, that would be given the same amount of time to address the Board and then he would call on the other speakers who had submitted speaker cards to address the Board regarding this public hearing item.

Chris Poirier, Deputy Director, Development Services, provided the staff report and stated that this was a request for a Type III Conditional Use Permit to allow a wireless communication facility on property zoned Rural Homestead (RH) at 10510 W. Massingale Road in District 3. He stated that to date, staff had received approximately 58 comments and the vast majority were in opposition, with 55 opposed and 3 in support. He stated that the item went before P&Z in October, 2024, and P&Z recommended denial. He stated that at that same hearing, Mr. Portner, Hearing Administrator, provided a written staff report, and had recommended approval, subject to standard and special conditions. He stated that the property was located outside the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System and that this was a continuation of a previous effort of the same company that was trying to fill the same gap of service for the same mobile provider, T-Mobile and the original site came before the County about two years prior and was eventually denied by P&Z. He stated that the applicant chose not to bring that request to the Board of Supervisors, instead, they withdrew and in consultation with staff tried to find a better site as a better alternative. He stated that the previous request from the spring of 2023 had the original tower at 110 feet, but the current proposed tower was down to 80 feet. He added that the previous request was on a lot of about three acres in size and the proposed request was on a lot with over eight acres. He stated that this was relevant because it gave the ability for the applicant to do more, move the location of the tower, and try to dial it into the best spot possible on a site. He stated that the previous tower was in a denser part of the Picture Rocks area and the current site was a little bit more spread out in terms of adjacent homes and the previous request was also located very close to the entrance of the national park, very close to Picture Rocks Road. He stated that the current location, although in the similar region, was not quite as profound aesthetically on those visiting the park. He added that it was nestled up to an old quarry or some mine tailings with some significant previous disturbances that occurred. He stated that during the October P&Z hearing, Mr. Portner, again provided his recommendation of approval with conditions and included very specific considerations of Federal Telecommunications Act criteria listed as part of the staff report, and the official record of a letter dated October 14, 2024. He stated that it

included things like whether or not the applicant really sought true ability to close a gap in coverage, did the applicant significantly explore other co-location opportunities and an overall evaluation of whether or not it was an appropriate location. He stated that at that P&Z hearing, one thing to point out in Mr. Portner's recommendation, was that his recommendation for approval was made prior to having the benefit of public input, so at the P&Z hearing, there were significant members of the public that attended to express their opposition. He stated that arguments were heard and made from the applicant in response to a lot of the opposition, but the P&Z recommended denial, with a vote of 7-1. He added that the item was brought before the Board with a recommendation for approval from the Hearing Administrator, staff recommended approval, and P&Z recommended denial.

Thomas Drzazgowski, Deputy Planning Official, Development Services, stated that a point he wanted to bring up with the cell towers was that each section of the zoning code had a purpose statement, and what they did as staff was use the purpose statement as their guide when they determined approval or denial of requests that came before them in each individual zone. He stated that the communication tower section had their own purpose statement in it. He read from a few of the guiding statements as follows, "To minimize the total number of towers by promoting co-location, to maintain and preserve existing unique attributes of the community, such as architecture, landscape and hardscapes, to encourage towers in commercial and industrial areas, and to minimize adverse impacts of towers on visually sensitive areas such as rock outcroppings, foothills, mountain backdrops, and unique vegetation, to protect the aesthetic qualities of neighborhoods by siting towers to minimize negative aesthetic impacts to ensure to the extent possible, that towers are compatible with surrounding land uses." He stated that these were some of the items in the purpose statement that they used when cell towers came in for co-location or there was a proposal for a new tower.

Chair Scott stated that the Board had the report of the P&Z proceedings, but asked if staff could provide a summary of the reasons P&Z recommended denial.

Mr. Poirier explained that his review of the record was that P&Z was inclined to deny because the applicant failed to provide some level of community benefit. He added there was some concern about it not being the right location and there was some discussion about profit, whether or not profit should be considered. He stated that at the end of the day, it was recognized that these companies were doing work to make a profit. He stated that staff did not support that aspect of the denial.

Chair Scott noted that Mr. Poirier had indicated that the vote had been 7-1 in favor of recommending denial, which meant that two members of the ten-member commission were absent.

Mr. Poirier corrected himself and stated that the vote record was 6-1.

Chair Scott inquired if three members were absent.

Mr. Poirier responded in the affirmative.

Liz Walker, Attorney, Wireless Policy Group, L.L.C., representing the applicant, addressed the Board and stated that she would shorten her presentation so that there was time for the T-Mobile RF engineer to speak. She provided a packet of information to the Board that had three sections and stated the first section was the Vertical Bridge portion of the presentation deck which covered the application process that the Board had just heard about. She stated that the second section was the coverage objective and the engineering justification and that had detailed information about T-Mobile's coverage gap and that the T-Mobile engineer would explain what the facility would do in providing service. She stated that it would provide service to over 2,000 additional residents and it was an important site and coverage gap to close. She stated that in the Vertical Bridge section, they explained the project history and their consultation with staff, and in the end, they were able to submit an application that fully complied with the Pima County Code and was supported by staff. She stated that they made concessions regarding the height, the location on the property, and limiting the parcel to a parcel no smaller than three acres, which were not code-based concessions. She stated that these were things they wanted to work collaboratively on with staff to try to find the right site. She stated that they also addressed the alternative candidates and wanted to discuss the Picture Rocks Fire Station. She stated that the T-Mobile engineer would also discuss it, but that site would not close the coverage gap for T-Mobile because the site was very close to an existing T-Mobile site and not close enough to the coverage objective to solve the coverage gap. She stated that even if they put a site at that Picture Rocks Fire Station site, they would need a site where they were proposing the current site to close that gap. She addressed P&Z's stated reasons for denial and what she had read was that they doubted the necessity of the site, and the T-Mobile engineer would address this and he would discuss why the site was necessary and that it was a for-profit company with no public benefit. She stated the public benefit of the site was that wireless service enhanced public safety and improved access to emergency services and was very important in an emergency situation. She stated that specifically on this site, Vertical Bridge would work with first responders to locate emergency communications equipment at no cost and would accommodate co-location, which would serve a public benefit in that respect. She stated that the other public benefits in terms of convenience and how people used their wireless devices were many, which included using their phone for directions, for reviews, to apply for a job, to conduct business, banking, attend a class or a telehealth appointment. She stated that all of these things were accommodated by wireless service and individuals would not be able to do them without wireless service.

Ben Shapiro, R.F. Engineer, T-Mobile, addressed the Board and stated that he had been a telecommunications engineer for T-Mobile for 26 years and was recently tasked with designing radio facilities for underserved areas, specifically in Arizona, in rural areas, to enhance broadband speeds. He stated that the FCC currently defined broadband as 100mbps, which in this situation would require a new site to

fill a coverage gap, ideally within two kilometers of their transmission station. He stated that slides 7 through 14 detailed their procedures in evaluating the site, the coverage expected, predicted modeling and facilities, or households that would be covered. He added that typically when they identified a need for a new ring, they identified an area within two kilometers to fill a coverage gap and the vendors to release their search ring parameters and to talk to the community and reach out for a viable landlord, which in this case they found.

Ms. Walker pointed out that the difference in the new residents that would be covered by this site, which was almost 2,000 new residents that would be impacted by the improved service. She stated that the difference between 110 feet and 85 feet represented a 39% reduction in the number of people served. She stated that they also looked at what happened if it was lowered to 50 feet and it ended up in a 53% reduction in the number of people served by this site, which would impact a lot of the community in some important ways.

Andrew Campanelli, Attorney, Campanelli & Associates, P.C., representing the opposition, spoke on behalf of about 90 residents and hoped that the Board had the opportunity to review the memorandum and exhibits in opposition that were submitted to the Board and to P&Z. He stated that P&Z correctly recommended that the application should be denied simply because it would violate the requirements of the local zoning code, which were smart planning provisions, and would inflict upon the nearby homes the precise types of adverse impacts the Code was adopted to prevent. He stated that the applicant, a site development company, which did not provide any personal wireless services, had failed to provide a shred of probative evidence to establish the need for this tower and that anyone would derive any benefit whatsoever if this tower was built. He pointed out that according to T-Mobile's own website, it had no gaps in service at the precise location where this site development company wanted to build it, and that the map was attached as Exhibit D to the memorandum that was submitted to the Board. He stated that Vertical Bridge claimed that was for marketing and he also submitted Exhibit E, T-Mobile's actual current coverage map from the FCC. He explained that under federal law T-Mobile was required to provide data showing where it had coverage to the FCC. He stated that the map showed T-Mobile had no significant gaps in its personal wireless coverage at the precise location where Vertical Bridge wanted to build its tower, and this was why T-Mobile had not provided a shred of probative data. He stated that ordinarily, when a local government had a smart planning provision such as Pima County, a wireless company would come in and complete drive tests and provide the County with the actual drive test data. He stated that for example, they would tell the County they completed a drive test and for reliable service they needed a minimum signal strength of -98dbm and would be able to show when the signal dropped below that. He added that if that data was provided, the County would be placed in a position to figure out if there was any need for this tower at all, and that granting an application to put it at the specific site and at the specific height that was consistent with smart planning because that was provided in Pima County Code, Section 18.07.030. He stated that one of the goals was to minimize the number of towers needed to provide wireless coverage, and the way

that was done was to strategically place them. He added that they could not be strategically placed unless the mapping gave data, which would show the existence of gaps, the locations of gaps, and the boundaries and this had not been provided. He stated that the reason why was because as reflected in the FCC's own records, there were no significant gaps at the precise location where they wanted to build this tower. He stated that at the same time, the proposed tower would inflict, as supported by the evidence he submitted, the precise types of adverse impacts the Code was adopted to prevent. He stated that it would have a significant adverse impact on the aesthetics of the nearby homes and federal judges had recognized as substantial evidence, letters from homeowners detailing the adverse aesthetic impact they would suffer. He stated that also submitted was Exhibit A, personalized letters from the residents that explained the adverse aesthetic impact each of them would suffer and reiterated that federal judges ruled that they were in the best position to know and understand both the nature and the extent of the adverse aesthetic impact, and those letters were substantial evidence. He stated that they also had letters from brokers, which were professional letters that were familiar with real estate markets in general and had an acute understanding of this specific real estate market, and they indicated that if this tower was built, it was going to reduce the values of nearby homes, which was entirely inconsistent and would violate the intent of the County Code. He stated that there was ample evidence to explain why this application should be denied, consistent with P&Z's recommendation. He stated that the T-Mobile engineer indicated he was hired to enhance broadband speeds, but speed had nothing to do with the Telecommunications Act and nothing to do with a gap in service. He stated that a gap in service was there was a physical geographic gap, where the signal strength was too low to maintain connections and wireless service. He stated that no evidence of that was provided and moreover, even if their desktop generated coverage maps that had some basis, there was some data to back it up, which there was none. He stated that they only showed coverage for one or two frequencies and the problem with that was T-Mobile provided its coverage on 12 frequencies. He added that if the Board reviewed the Flower Hill case to establish a gap in service, the applicant had to establish that the carrier at issue, their customers could not use their phone to connect to a landline. He stated that they had to show gaps in services in all of the frequencies through which the carrier T-Mobile, not Vertical Bridge, enabled its users to connect to a landline. He stated that Vertical Bridge did not need this to remedy a gap and it was legally impossible because Vertical Bridge, as the site developer, did not provide any personal wireless services whatsoever, so it could not have a gap in service and they claimed that the gap was T-Mobile's. He reiterated that according to FCC and T-Mobile, there were no gaps and that P&Z correctly recommended denial. He stated that there was no evidence that anyone would derive any benefit, and that included first responders, fire and police departments. He stated there was no evidence in the record of the coverage gaps, either in the fire department's coverage or the police department's coverage that would be remedied by this tower. He added there was no evidence which would place this Board in a position to determine that placing it there would be consistent with the requirements of the Code, or that anyone in Pima County or anyone else would derive any benefit if this

site developer was able to put the tower at a location where, according to the FCC, there was no gaps in service.

The following speakers addressed the Board in opposition:

- Sherryl Volpone
- Peter Hnath
- Ryan Lipphardt
- Samantha Wheeler

They offered the following comments:

- There was no need for the proposed communications tower and area residents would not derive any benefit from the tower.
- According to T-Mobile's website, there was no gap in coverage in the area, and in addition, T-Mobile's current coverage maps from the FCC website showed no significant gap in coverage at the site.
- Multiple neighbors had submitted written comments in opposition of this site.
- The current level of wireless coverage was adequate and no additional coverage was needed in the area.
- Building the proposed communications tower at this location was inconsistent with Pima County Code.
- The proposed communications tower would block views of Panther Peak.
- The proposed location was four-tenths of a mile from the Saguaro National Park border and was within the buffer overlay zone.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva, to close the public hearing and deny the Conditional Use Permit, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen stated that a number of residents brought up a concern regarding a conflict of interest, particularly with Mr. Portner. She asked if staff could explain that relationship and respond to that concern.

Carmine DeBonis Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that Mr. Portner was a professional land use consultant and there was plenty of evidence that supported that. He stated that Pima County contracted with Mr. Portner and others to serve as Pima County Hearing Administrators and they specifically sought individuals that had experience and knowledge in land use activities. He stated that this was a perfect example of a very complex land use related request and Mr. Portner always conducted himself in that role as a Pima County Hearing Administrator with integrity. He added that if there was an instance where he had a direct interest in the application for a land use action, he would disclose that to Pima County and they also had other individuals that could be assigned to those cases, who had similarly land use professional experience and activity.

Supervisor Allen stated that she was also interested in understanding more about how this particular location was indeed the least intrusive of the locations. She stated that there was a list of the locations considered, some of which looked like

there were multiple attempts made and some that were not. She asked how this location ended up being the least intrusive.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that when compared to the last request to fill the same gap for the same provider, it was in the department's opinion, including staff and the Hearing Administrator, that this was much less intrusive. He stated that there was information in the record regarding what work was done to look at other locations, but it may behoove the Board to reopen the public hearing so that the applicant could address the Board about the efforts they made or had not made regarding choosing the location.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Chair Scott, to reopen the public hearing. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva agreed that it would be helpful because she had some questions and others might have some regarding the processes or distance. She suggested they could be directed to those individuals who could answer their questions so the Board would not have to reopen the public hearing again if they decided to close the hearing.

Upon the vote, the motion to reopen the public hearing unanimously carried 5-0.

Chair Scott asked the applicant to only address the questions directly from Supervisors and not revisit any other questions, for example, any comments made by Mr. Campanelli.

Supervisor Christy asked that if Supervisors had other questions that did not pertain to the applicant, how the Board would proceed with that.

Chair Scott responded that it would be fine if there were other people that Supervisors wanted to question during this time, including the other attorney, if needed.

Supervisor Allen restated her question, asking how was it determined that the proposed site location was the least intrusive.

Ms. Walker responded that the analysis began with the least intrusive candidate that was a viable candidate, which looked at what was the least intrusive site to fill a coverage gap and the federal standard. She explained that the candidates that were explored and evaluated were not viable, but what was provided in the materials to the Board were viable, which meant it had to be leasable, reasonable, buildable, and had to work to close the coverage gap. She stated that the pool of viable candidates came down to the one that was previously submitted, but it was not viable due to zoning. She stated that the proposed location was the only viable candidate out of those that they reviewed. She stated the information she provided included the circle and all the parcels, and the list of properties that were evaluated showed that they made great efforts to contact many different properties to try to

find the appropriate site. She added that letters had been sent, phone calls were made to try to reach out to the extent they could get that information. She stated that the other important part was that many of these parcels were all in the same area and for many of the parcels that were contacted, there would be dialog with the neighbors for those properties, even if a landlord was in agreement with placing it on their property. She stated that they were all in the narrow area and as stated by Mr. Shapiro, the coverage down to a narrow spot was where the site was needed to provide service in that area.

Supervisor Allen addressed the conflicting maps and gaps in coverage. She stated that T-Mobile's map showed that there was 5G ultra coverage all across the area, but the maps provided in the proposal showed that there was a big gap. She asked how the Board should interpret this conflicting information.

Ms. Walker stated that it had been addressed in their response to the legal brief. She explained that the T-Mobile map that had been referred to was for marketing purposes, but it also showed outdoor coverage. She stated that it did not represent what some of the coverage that someone would get in their house. She stated that was the goal and that was the coverage gap. She added that for the FCC, those were not comparing apples-to-apples when talking about the national marketing map that showed service in a general area. She stated that the maps Mr. Shapiro had were more on a granular level and very specific, so while there might be a certain level of coverage in an area, it did not represent the indoor coverage they were trying to achieve by this site.

Supervisor Allen requested clarification regarding the least intrusive location and why the federal land in the area was not considered viable.

Ms. Walker explained that federal land was not in the search ring of the alternatives that could be explored. She stated that the RF engineer provided the search ring and told them where the site needed to be to provide service to this area. She stated that she believed it was about two kilometers of an area where it could not be farther away than and they had to strategically locate the site so that it was not overlapping with other sites. She reiterated that area was not viable to provide service to this area.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had heard from several speakers that coverage was not an issue and their service was fine and there was no need for this new cell tower because they were being served adequately. He asked how the applicant would like to respond to that.

Ms. Walker responded that the question she would ask was what service they were using. She stated if one carrier had service, the other carrier may not have service in that area, but they would still have a coverage gap. She stated that was really important because that was addressed under the Telecommunications Act, because they wanted to provide that all carriers had the same amount of service in an area, so that there were competitive services, and one carrier was not a monopoly. She

added that service levels could also vary and the service they were trying to serve was for indoor service in this area for T-Mobile.

Supervisor Christy asked whether there were residents in the area that had no service whatsoever. He stated that it seemed to him that what they were trying to do was provide a competitive environment even though people already had service where there were other services available. He asked how many of the residents in the area had expressed that they were satisfied with what they currently had and did not need any more competition.

Ms. Walker explained that in terms of trying to have levels of service in line with other companies was what the Telecommunications Act was for. She added that it was so that carriers gave everyone an opportunity to provide service in an area so that it was competitive service. She stated that someone might be able to make a phone call outside their house service, but could be limited if there were more people, or if there was an emergency, the levels of service had to be high enough to accommodate that and that was what T-Mobile was trying to achieve. She stated that it was not only if someone was outside their house and could make a phone call, but it was to have reliable service so that if there was an emergency and a lot of people were on their phone, or if more people moved into the area as the population grew, that placed a demand on the network. She added it was anything that would affect the network and the engineers decided what the level of service was. She stated that it was also subject to a federal mandate to have a certain level of service, which was another motivation of T-Mobile. She stated that it would not make sense that these companies would come together to try to put a site there without needing the service and it defied the logic.

Supervisor Grijalva asked what efforts were made to co-locate with current cell towers.

Ms. Walker responded that if there was an existing tower that would meet the coverage objective that would have been T-Mobile's first choice. She stated that it would have been faster to provide the service, but there was nothing in the area that would work to co-locate or an existing site in the area that would meet the coverage objective, so co-location was not an option, but this would be a co-location site and other carriers could co-locate.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if it was each carrier's discretion whether or not they chose to co-locate. She clarified with an example, that if there was a Verizon tower nearby, they could decide whether to allow it or not. She asked if the argument that this could be a co-located site was at the discretion of T-Mobile.

Ms. Walker explained that all carriers co-located on each other's towers all the time, which was industry standard. She stated that if there was a tower from a T-Mobile business perspective, it would be quicker and easier to get that site on air and if there was an existing site that would work, that would be the first thing they would

do. She stated that she was sure that was the first thing done when they were looking for a site.

Supervisor Grijalva asked how close the proposed cell tower was to the Saguaro National Park. She stated that she believed it was 4/10th of a mile.

Mr. Poirier responded that it was about half a mile.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that what the County had been trying to do in acquiring open space was to create a greater buffer around national parks and preserved areas. She added there was an argument of the proximity because it was on Picture Rocks Road. She asked if there were any pictures of monoeucalyptus trees and whether they had any pictures of it closer to Lydia or closer to some of the properties that were within 150 feet. She mentioned that she had seen some that looked further away, northwest on Pale Stone Place and northeast on Massingale.

Ms. Walker stated that in the initial application, they provided some photo simulations that were from closer views, and with this round, there was a map that listed all the numbers of the views taken as more views around the community.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if there was a close-up picture of what that looked like because she had seen that there were no eucalyptus there.

Ms. Walker stated that there was a close-up picture in the original application.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that staff provide that to her, but she had not seen one in the area, there were some in different places like Colorado, and it looked like a pine tree. She stated that there usually was a dense population of trees and that made it so that it did not look as artificial as she thought this one might.

Ms. Walker stated that she understood.

Supervisor Heinz asked what efforts were made to explore federal or state trust land parcels by the applicant that would also be viable.

Ms. Walker explained that the majority of the parcels in the search ring did not have any areas of federal or trust lands. She added that the search ring was where they were charged with looking to put a site from the engineer's direction on where the site needed to be to close the coverage gap.

Supervisor Allen indicated that she had looked at the sites considered and pointed out that option No. 19, 468 acres, showed "no reply." She stated that she believed that in a different memorandum or exhibit, it indicated that the owner was the U.S. government.

Ms. Walker replied that with No. 19, the acquisition site consultant spoke with the state trust land about possibly placing a site there, but it was not leasable, and they could not come to terms on a lease.

Supervisor Allen asked whether any of the 21 properties considered were federal government land.

Ms. Walker responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had heard from several speakers with quite authority and certainty that the placement of this cell tower was in direct and irrefutable conflict with Pima County Code, was directly contrary to the codes, and they were not being followed, and that their concern was if these codes existed, they needed to be enforced. He inquired about the County's position on those alleged code violations.

Mr. Poirier responded that Development Services did not agree with that and believed, if approved, this would meet Code and the same Code that outlined this process. He explained that the Code required they went through the public hearings in which the neighbors were all notified, participated at P&Z, and were participating today. He stated there was mention of the buffer overlay zone as if that was some type of a conflict, but it was not, and the buffer overlay zone would allow for a cell tower. He stated they were in no way prohibited, and in fact, under the buffer overlay zone code, it read as follows, "Allowed uses: All uses of the underlying zone are allowed in the buffer overlay zone." He clarified that would include all uses that included conditional uses. He stated that some of the verbiage of the code, their goals, and the purpose statement, was somewhat subjective. He stated that part of it tried to drive applicants to co-locate when feasible, part of it tried to drive an applicant to minimize effects on viewsheds, which were somewhat subjective, but they did not believe this was directly in conflict of the Code.

Supervisor Christy requested confirmation that staff could state with authority, comfort, security and with great belief that there were no codes being violated in the placement of the location of this cell tower.

Mr. Poirier responded in the affirmative.

Chair Scott stated that Mr. Campanelli noted in his presentation that the T-Mobile maps that were available for public perusal, there were no gaps in service and that broadband gaps were not indicative of the gaps in service that should be considered. He asked how this assertion could be addressed.

Ms. Walker asked for clarification if Mr. Campanelli had stated that he was referring to the maps that had not shown a gap in service and if it was the national maps.

Chair Scott clarified that Mr. Campanelli stated that T-Mobile's own data indicated there was no gap in service.

Ms. Walker explained that the national map had a disclaimer on it that it showed outdoor coverage only and at a higher level, so it did not get down to the level of the gap in this community. She stated that the purpose of it was to show an overlay of outdoor coverage. She stated that was the same issue with the FCC and the information provided to them was for voice, or what they called low band coverage. She reiterated this was not at the level that they sought to remedy this and it did not always show the level of detail in this small area that they were trying to cover.

Chair Scott stated that Mr. Poirier had mentioned that Mr. Portner recommended approval prior to any kind of public input. He asked if based on either what was heard at P&Z or at this hearing, if any of the public input heard, especially from neighbors in close proximity, had any effect on the recommendation Mr. Portner had made or the analysis he had done.

Jim Portner, Hearing Administrator, explained that he had considered ahead of time that there would be opposition to this and anticipated that at some point there would be a room full of neighbors that were in opposition. He stated that he did because the area they were in was very challenging and confirmed that he did not have any specific public input due to when the notices were sent and when he had to prepare his report for public consumption. He stated that the more rural they were in they tended to have more of this high level of opposition to these types of towers, especially ones that were this tall. He stated that the public input would not have changed his recommendation and elaborated that in all of these matters they tried to boil it down to the essentials. He stated they had high expectations per the Code, in terms of what was demanded from the applicants' submittal package, they had criteria and standards, and out of fundamental fairness of process, it was essential that they were very consistent with how all applicants were treated. He stated this type of work for cell towers had been done for almost 30 years and had learned a lot over that time and tried to be consistent out of a fundamental aspect of fairness. He explained that in evaluating this particular application, it was the best application that had ever come before him for a Type III application, in terms of its thoroughness, completeness, comprehensive nature and its consideration. He stated that this was a very difficult site to deal with, because if any of the 21 sites they explored came in with an application, they would have had this same level of public opposition. He stated that in the end, they picked the best, least impactful site in an area that would be impacted no matter what. He added that it was not right in the middle and was more on the fringe. He stated they pushed it up against one of the Tucson Metropolitan/Pima County biggest eyesores, in the quarry there for the Portland Cement Company. He stated that there would be a lot of folks that felt they were going to have negative aesthetic impact, but this particular viewshed was already fairly compromised. He stated that given the quality of what was in this package, given the due diligence and their level of working with staff for about three years, they made a very substantial good faith effort. He stated that all things considered, his recommendation was for approval and it remained the same, as with P&Z.

Supervisor Allen asked if some of the concerns that residents expressed around the instability that the tower would face because of its location next to the quarry from blasting could be addressed.

Mr. Portner responded that he was not a structural engineer but knew that from their experience in reviewing these applications, towers were designed to withstand atom bomb type impacts. He stated that the foundations and towers were overengineered, but those were the standards to which they were held at both the federal and local building code level and they knew full well what they were dealing with in terms of environmental factors. He stated that those would be taken into account and reviewed by the County's building code staff to ensure that those were all more than satisfied.

Supervisor Allen asked if providers were required to fill a gap in coverage or if it was optional.

Mr. Portner responded there would be several opinions on this issue, but the position from the Pima County standpoint was trying to look at the burgeoning emerging technology that kept getting more and more robust. He stated that when they first started with these, there was 2G, then 3G, then 4G and currently everyone had to have 5G, including telephone service and data. He stated that it not only included data coverage outdoors, but data coverage in the furthest room inside your home and it had to be robust. He stated that the idea gap seemed to be evolving over time to where if you only had 2G, and it was up to 5G, that was a gap. He stated that there might be telephone coverage, but data was still needed coverage because all the emergency services, all the users, were not only relying these days on telephone calls. He reiterated the County's position was to keep up with the technology.

Supervisor Heinz commented that he wanted everyone to understand that the Board could possibly be preempted by the federal government if they moved ahead and the motion passed for denial. He stated that it could be reversed and that it was important for the neighbors in the area to know that this might not be the final decision.

Chair Scott asked Legal Counsel if there was the potential of any intervention by a federal agency on this matter.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that there may be administrative actions that could be taken beyond the Board's action.

Chair Scott stated that he agreed with Mr. DeBonis, Jr.'s assessment, praising the Hearing Administrator's integrity.

It was then moved by Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Chair Scott, to close the public hearing and move forward with the original motion by Supervisor Allen to

deny the Conditional Use Permit, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that a lot had been mentioned about what the role of the Board of Supervisors was in cases like this, and she thought it was their responsibility to speak for all County residents in any district. She stated that the Board heard from an overwhelming number of people that were opposed to this cell tower. She stated that she looked at the pictures and agreed that it was going to significantly change the landscape for the residents, the views to Panther Peak and the proximity to Saguaro National Park were incredibly concerning to her. She stated that there were other peaks like the Catalinas and felt it was a huge impact and that was her main concern with this tower and its proximity. She commended Ms. Wheeler's daughters for writing a letter to the Board, especially since they were in high school and that she had raised outstanding young people.

Chair Scott requested clarification whether the vote to close the public hearing needed to happen first.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion to close the public hearing unanimously carried 5-0.

Chair Scott clarified that the Board was back to the original motion, which was to affirm P&Z's recommendation to deny the application. He asked if there were any more comments from Board members.

Supervisor Allen commented that she was a big advocate for expanding access to internet and broadband for the value that it brought to education, the ability to work from home, and expanding economic opportunities for people around the District and around Pima County. She stated that the quality of life that rural areas enjoyed, the beauty of views, the desert, national parks, Tucson Mountains, was one of the things that made homes so incredibly special and important. She stated that the profound response from the community spoke volumes about how beautiful this region was and the concerns about the visual impact of a cell tower in an area that was so well loved and in such great proximity to important land and for that reason she was in support of her constituents and was not in favor of the cell tower.

Chair Scott stated that there has been conflicting testimony from both the applicant and those opposed to the applicant as to whether or not the decision to not erect this cell tower would result in gaps in coverage that would be a threat to public health and safety of T-Mobile users. He stated that when one was in this position, there had to be some subjective judgments made based on the evidence presented. He shared Supervisor Allen's general concern about making sure that internet, and all of its levels, were available to all users, but he had not heard any convincing evidence that there would be gaps that threatened public health and safety. He stated that what he had heard was very direct and eloquent testimony from the residents that were going to be in sight of this tower that would have an impact on

the quality of life that they enjoyed, and that in many cases motivated their decision to move into that area. He complimented neighbors for how they conducted themselves during this public hearing and that he would join in opposition to the application. He requested a roll call vote on the motion.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that the motion was for denial as recommended by P&Z.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

31. Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the development of a Pima County Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan by the County Administrator to include, but not limited to the following:

- Explore additional tools and options to enhance the County's clearing and brush management efforts in wildfire prone areas, conducting a feasibility analysis on modern best practices for clearing overgrown and downed vegetation.
- Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all County property, particularly road rights-of-way, parks, and conservation lands in wildfire prone areas for opportunities to apply regular and additional clearing.
- Explore ways to help residents clear their own properties in wildfire prone areas with direct assistance in the disposal of brush and vegetation or through financial incentives in remote regions of the County.

Staff to report back within 120 days with a draft of the plan and its fiscal impact. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy stated that he appreciated the opportunity to express something that he knew had been on the top of mind over the last few weeks with the Los Angeles fires, the devastation and the horrific conditions that so many people had gone through, lost homes, unable to rebuild them, all of their possessions, family heirlooms gone, many with monetary valuable, but by the same token, valuable for sentimental reasons. He stated that it included not having a place to go and watching those horrific films, and the quickness of the tragic aftermath was so impactful. He stated that Pima County was deluding themselves if it was thought that it could not happen here, because it had in the past. He recounted that in 2017 there was the Sawmill Fire in the Sahuarita/City of Tucson area that burned 47,000 acres, the Mulberry Fire, southeast of Vail burned 2,000 acres, the Burro Fire in the Catalina Mountains burned 27,000 acres, in 2020, the Bighorn Fire in the Catalina Mountains burned 120,000 acres; in 2023, the Chimney Fire in Redington burned 650 acres; and in 2023, the Gap Fire, southwest of Oracle Junction that consumed 250 acres; there were historic wildfires in 2002, the Bullock Fire in the Catalina Mountains burned 30,000 acres and in 2003, the Aspen Fire in the Catalina Mountains burned 85,000 acres. He stated that it was obvious that Pima County could have a situation that could be replicated, like the Los Angeles area since they had similar topography, underbrush, environment and flora. He hoped this

resonated with his colleagues because it certainly seemed to be resonating with his constituents, particularly in the southeast region, because the pervasiveness of wildfire and the quickness of its damage was mind boggling. He stated that the community wanted to know that Pima County was prepared to do its part to be good neighbors, to take care of its property, and to ensure that it did not contribute to any combustible issues with fire. He stated that Board members would be heartsick and terribly troubled if properties that Pima County owned contributed to a wildfire situation due to negligence or inaction on the County's part. He stated that in addition to bringing awareness community-wide and County-wide on this issue, he proposed exploring some elements that could be pinpointed and be very specific on some certain areas and form a communications network with all fire, law enforcement and first responders agencies in Pima County to be coordinated in their efforts and that centered on the most important and volatile things that could cause and create wildfires. He stated that, for instance, in the mitigation plan that he wanted explored could suggest additional tools and options to enhance the County's clearing and brush management in wildfire prone areas, conducting a feasibility analysis on modern best practices for clearing overgrown and downed vegetation. He stated complaints had been heard about vegetation not being cleared and all sorts of combustibles that were piled up under more areas of trees, power lines and things of that nature. He stated that it seemed there had been some kind of a reluctance or hesitancy on Forest Service or government agencies' part to clear out underbrush, dead wood and things of that nature. He stated that there were prescribed burns by the Forest Service in the Catalina Mountains that were very successful, and the County should look at those same types of tools. He stated that his suggestion would be to complete a comprehensive evaluation of all County properties, particularly road rights-of-way, parks and conservation lands in wildfire prone areas, to have opportunities to apply regular and additional clearing. He added that this would be a ripe year for wildfires as all indications were pointing to that even though there was some moisture, but it had been dry and that moisture led to growth which led to dried out vegetation later in the year and when it was dried out like that, it was like a matchstick. He stated that he had been very proactive in District 4 with the Firewise Certification Program, which was very successful, particularly in the gold standards of wildfire certification. He stated that the Summerhaven and Mt. Lemmon communities had done a tremendous job and four Homeowner's Association (HOA) communities in Green Valley that were now Firewise certified and there were one or two in the Casas Adobes area that were Firewise certified. He added that the County should explore ways to help residents clear their own properties in wildfire prone areas and direct assistance in the disposal of brush and vegetation, or through financial incentives in remote regions of the County. He stated that he was asking that the County be a good neighbor in preventing wildfires, and it could be done in a number of ways, for example, by providing wood chippers, dumpsters, implements to remove and mitigate combustible materials, and that it would take a County-wide effort of numerous agencies like the Office of Emergency Management and all their law enforcement agencies. He stated that the Board would also be discussing the item placed on the agenda by Supervisor Heinz, to support fire districts and that in his own district, the Elephant Head area had no subscription services to fire districts so there was no

fire protection. He stated that even if they had a fire district to subscribe to, it would take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to respond to a fire in that area, and by then it would be too late. He stated that these avenues needed to be explored, basically with an all hands on deck, county-wide plan to address a potential wildfire issue that could be mitigated, resolved and addressed before it was too late and became volatile, before it went into a series of red flag warnings. He stated that he called through this mitigation plan on the County to devise a plan in all aspects and phases of wildfire mitigation, control and prevention on a County-wide basis, and to submit that plan. He requested that staff provide the report within 90 days, instead of 120 days, since Spring was coming and it was the time of the year when it was going to be hot and dry, and that was when all of the issues appeared. He stated they needed to be prepared for that and the maps that the Forest Service used to describe potential wildfire sites needed to be updated and reviewed, as well. He stated that the Board had heard from a constituent from Rocking K subdivision that indicated they could not get homeowner's insurance and life savings were being threatened with the inability to get fire insurance on their homes, or they could not afford the rising premiums. He stated that all of those were conjunctive, and all intertwined with a County-wide plan to address wildfire prevention. He stated that this was the gist of the plan, and he was aware that the County Administrator had sent a several memorandums regarding buffelgrass mitigation which was certainly a very important part of the entire plan, and also a committee called the Climate Action Committee. He stated those individuals' expertise, knowledge and experience could be used, but law enforcement, fire districts, fire departments, any kind of community leadership that could spread the word on wildfire mitigation needed to be done and there needed to be a plan in place that was feasible, easily understood and would address the situation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that as mentioned, Mari Vasquez had joined the County full-time and part of her extensive background was working with fire and she was asked to lead this effort. She stated that they also had Director Espinoza with the Office of Emergency Management, the Regional Flood Control District and Parks and Recreation Department and that Ms. Vasquez would begin to pull those folks together and address the issues in the item and review anything else needed to update the wildfire plan and it would be brought back within 90 days.

Supervisor Christy reiterated that Board members would not be able to live with themselves if it was determined that Pima County was negligent in not addressing wildfire mitigation and he urged his colleagues to review the issues in their districts, as well as the resources that could be utilized in this county-wide effort.

Chair Scott asked if the information that was brought back to the Board would also consider particular areas of concern in every part of the County.

Ms. Leshar concurred.

Supervisor Allen requested that the plan include the degree to which there were gaps in resources because all Fire Districts were not created equally and there were

similar areas within District 3 in which the Fire Districts were all volunteer, were greatly under-resourced and those were also the areas that had the smallest populations and probably the greatest risk of fire, given that they were rural. She stated this included both an analysis of the threat and of the existing resources and strategy.

Supervisor Christy emphasized the Firewise certification program for HOA's and neighborhoods that could address a huge amount of the potential problem and his office had links to the Firewise certification and would be glad to share that as well.

Chair Scott inquired whether Director Espinoza would have information about that program, or if it was something that the individual Fire Districts would have, along with the District 4 office.

Ms. Leshar responded there was a lot of information available between Supervisor Christy's office, the Office of Emergency Management and others and they would ensure that they pulled together all the known resources and ability for everyone to contact them.

32. Release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum

Discussion/Direction/Action to waive privilege and release to the public the Pima County Attorney's Office memorandum written by County Attorney Laura Conover dated January 27, 2025, regarding "Federal Law Enforcement Presence and Operations in Pima County". (District 4)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to waive attorney-client privilege and release the memorandum.

33. Legislative Agenda Update - Fire District Funding

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to add the following to our 2025 State Legislative Agenda, for pursuit by our county lobbyist at the State Capitol this legislative session:

Using the language from SCR 1049 (Fifty-fifth Legislature, Second Regular Session, 2022; i.e. what became *Arizona Proposition 310, Sales Tax for Fire District Funding Measure (2022)*) as a model, creating enabling legislation that would authorize the Board of Supervisors of Pima County (or all Boards of Supervisors across all fifteen counties) to refer to the electors of Pima County (or to the electors of their respective counties) a countywide sales tax measure of up to 1/10th of one percent (1/10th of a penny) for the purpose of shoring up the finances of all Fire Districts operating within the county. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that this was a request to have the County's contract lobbyist work with the legislative delegation and any other legislator in Phoenix

during this session, specifically, to grant the authority to the Board and to any other County Board in the State with a majority vote, to potentially refer an up to, but not to exceed one-tenth of a cent sales tax to County voters for their consideration and possible approval. He stated that this was in response to things heard and seen with what was happening in Los Angeles, tragically, and the Board had heard a lot about the need for fire mitigation. He stated that this would be another tool, and it was something that was a statewide proposition in 2022, which was Proposition 310 and it narrowly failed at the State level, but had passed by 54% of Pima County voters at that time without a lot of wildfires going on at that time. He stated the reason the County had over 20 mostly smaller Fire Districts throughout Pima County and the reason that the firefighters, Fire District representatives, and the Firefighters Association pushed for this referral from the Legislature in 2022, was because they had identified funding inconsistencies that threatened response times being up to the national standards, which were not in many of these areas. He stated that the number of personnel, paid personnel or even reliable equipment like fire engines was very important. He stated that the reason this was something they wanted done in 2022 was for extra funding going into those districts, as they were much more limited than, for example, County Boards were in terms of their ability to assess any kind of increase in tax rate. He stated that this was not a tax directly, it would simply be an opportunity for the specific support of Fire Districts and for the Board, if given the authority through the Legislature this session, to propose this and put it on the November ballot, for the voters to decide if they wanted to do that and he hoped that his colleagues supported him on this item.

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

Supervisor Grijalva requested clarification whether the majority of the Board was for a simple majority or supermajority.

Supervisor Heinz stated that would be what he would suggest in discussion with the County's contract lobbyist and there was some legislation going forward that potentially would require any kind of vote for any assessment at the County voter level, or County Board level that could require higher than that, but it would simply be referring the Regional Transportation Authority or referring a bond measure to the ballot, would require three of the five Supervisors, or two of the three Supervisors in the smaller districts and the smaller counties.

Supervisor Christy thanked Supervisor Heinz for bringing this item to the Board's attention as it was timely and was a terrific exploration of some very impactful areas that needed to be addressed by the Board. He stated that there were numerous Fire Districts that were either insolvent or had very limited funds to wage any kind of battle against wildfires which he had alluded to earlier, and that in District 4, there was a couple of districts that were teetering on the brink and one area that was completely nonexistent. He requested that in this process, it would be helpful if the Board could receive information on how much money was needed to bring these districts up to speed and for how long, what was lacking in those districts, i.e.

manpower, equipment, facility resources, et al., so that at some point the County could get this entire issue to where they were self-surviving and they could manage themselves. He stated that this could open up very pertinent and positive questions that needed to be reviewed for the entire resolution that was being considered and asked if Supervisor Heinz could acquire that knowledge or refer it to someone with the ability to answer that and it would be helpful in presenting this to the community.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he was in the process of putting together an item for presentations from several of the Fire Districts that were most at-risk and had ongoing concerns, and there would be representatives from the Firefighters and those Fire Districts at the February 18th meeting to discuss this further and to provide a lot of the information requested by Supervisor Christy.

Supervisor Allen stated that she understood this would be added to the County's legislative agenda and asked how the sales tax would ensure the equitable distribution of resources where they needed to be, or would it be applied equally across Districts, and structurally, how would the County rectify the inequity.

Supervisor Heinz commented he had the exact discussion with Mr. Rossi, the County's contract lobbyist that it was flawed and could be improved upon from Proposition 310, because of it being an equal distribution. He stated that for the Fire Districts that were doing quite well, like Golden Ranch and Northwest, they did not need that and they wanted it to go to Picture Rocks and to the other at-risk Fire Districts. He stated that was not how the algorithm for the statewide proposition was designed and it was his goal to provide as much of that autonomy for tweaking that algorithm to the individual counties. He stated that if the measure passed, they would have that authority and would accomplish exactly that. He stated that assessment would then be directed to those districts that were suffering, were close to bankruptcy, needed more personnel or did not have reliable fire engines or the response times that they should have, they could have that directed need-based and potentially there could be some Fire Districts where it might make more sense due to their size and financial situations, to explore mergers. He reiterated this was basically so that the County could have that additional autonomy to make the algorithm that made the most sense and that those resources went to where they were needed most.

Chair Scott concurred with Supervisor Heinz because he had spoken with the Fire Chiefs of Northwest Fire District, Golden Ranch Fire District, and Rural Metro, and they were all concerned about the viability of the smaller, more rural districts. He stated that they would be supportive of some kind of formula in any ballot measure and if the County received permission from the Legislature to forward that to the ballot, which would help those smaller districts. He stated that what he understood was that if the County received permission from the Legislature, the County, working with assistance from staff and the Fire Districts, would craft the ballot measure and then refer it to the ballot for approval by the voters. He asked if this was correct.

Supervisor Heinz responded in the affirmative.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

34. Presentation of the EConorthwest Comprehensive Market Study

Presentation of the EConorthwest Comprehensive Market Study regarding the initial Pima County Comprehensive Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Tyler Bump, Partner Project Director, EConorthwest, addressed the Board and stated that they were excited and privileged to be leading as a prime consultant to the County-wide housing study with Community Workforce and Development (CWD) staff, as well as some of the administrative policy staff. He noted that they also had several other consultants on their project team, MIG, who assisted with some of the public engagement, Chris Nelson, formerly from the University of Arizona as a Housing Policy Advisor, and Corky Poster from Poster Mirto McDonald to help them think through some housing types and physical implications from a design perspective. He provided a slide show presentation and stated that the County's housing study and housing markets were regional and local decisions at a local jurisdictional level oftentimes were made without that context. He stated that it was important to think about these sort of regional housing needs, because they were regional housing markets. He stated that the reason for this housing study was due to the housing crisis for folks across the income spectrum. He stated that there were challenges with housing affordability that had escalated starting in 2019. He went over the project overview and stated they were currently in housing needs assessment portion and would share key results. He stated that they had a lot of work over the next few months, including moving towards housing types and thinking about strategies to address these housing needs. He stated they would also go into more engagement, and they had already done a lot of engagement, which included community open houses, workshops, one-on-one interviews and focus groups with some folks across the County. He stated that they would move into more of an engagement process in June and October, and would end up with the final plan, that would include strategies that would be developed and co-created with folks as part of the engagement process, including CWD staff and other stakeholders. He shared the key findings that influenced the housing needs they reviewed and referred to the charts on the slide. He stated that they were an economics focused policy firm, and they used several charts in the work they did. He highlighted that the community in Pima County was getting older and would only increase over the next 20 years. He stated that in 2023, a much larger share of the population across Pima County was in the 60+ age cohort and worked with AARP on livable communities nationwide, it was something happening across the country and it was important to talk about in the context of Pima County. He noted that the household composition was changing and that there were fewer households with children than 20 years ago. He stated that this was a national trend and was also happening in Pima County. He referred to the next slide that showed a chart for

housing production, housing permit activity of where things were at a peak in 2005. He stated that it showed recession in 2008, global financial crisis recession and then ramped up to the 2021, 2022, 2023 timeline of about 5,800 units per year permitted. He stated that the majority of those units were coming in as detached single family housing, which increasingly made up a larger share of the housing stock across the County. He stated that one of the things they found was that the demand for housing was likely going to shift to other housing types, as household demographics and household characteristics shifted. He stated that there were affordability challenges and that homeownership prices had increased. He stated that the median home sale prices rose about 60% since 2019. He stated that when this information was pulled, the median sales price was about \$442,000.00 in Pima County. He stated that they also looked at changes in home prices and rental prices relative to household income changes. He added that household incomes had not increased at the rate of homeownership or rental prices, so that was one of the things they also tracked. He stated that the ratio of housing price to household income had almost doubled, and in some cases had more than doubled across the County over the last 23 years. He explained that when they conducted their housing needs assessment, they looked at three main components and all of those demographics and trends he shared were influencing the way they thought about these three main components. He stated that one component was underproduction, which was housing that should have been created to meet demand but had not over the last 20 years. He stated that they were in a place of housing deficit, especially in communities across the intermountain west and Pima County was no exception to that. He stated that the second component was housing for the homeless, what portion of homelessness was seen across Pima County, and how they thought about homelessness in the context of overall housing needs. He stated that the third component was about future needs and that was population growth through 2045 and how to accommodate that future population growth from a housing perspective. He stated that all of this was pulled together for overall housing needs. He stated that the need for Pima County was about 116,000 new housing units by 2045 and that accounted for both current need and future need. He stated that the interesting thing about Pima County, which was very unique compared to other communities or regions that he had worked in was there was a lot more affordability currently in Pima County that was in middle income ranges. He stated that in the 80% - 120% Area Median Income (AMI) category, which was why they had seen a lot of the need in the lower income categories of 0% - 60% AMI or 120% AMI and above, which was traditionally market rate housing. He stated that AMI was a threshold that was used for affordability that HUD used and that AMI income in Pima County for a family of four was about \$89,000.00. He stated that when they got to that strategy, conversation and engagement, it would be a conversation around how to support capital, affordable housing and how they thought about attainable housing for workforce housing, middle income. He stated it would include how they thought about market rate housing at the upper income strategy or upper income. He stated that one of the questions they got was how much housing might require some level of intervention, subsidy or investment. He stated that he broke this down by a five-, ten-, and twenty-year need, but he wanted to focus on the five-year need, and it looked like there was a housing need that might need some level of support,

whether that was regulatory, policy, or financial support. He stated that was about 23,000 units over the next five years. He stated that there was a housing need across all the communities in Pima County and they conducted this housing need allocation down to the local level, including all cities or census designated places and unincorporated portions of the County. He added that the next steps were moving into the target market analysis and engagement tasks that would happen in June and October, they would have road shows across the County and conversations with members of the community in the Supervisorial districts, throughout the County, and looked forward to engagement with the Board, staff and the community as part of that process.

Supervisor Allen stated that she looked forward to exploring this more closely. She stated that there was a slide that showed projections over time of the housing needs and asked how that was configured, what were the factors that fed into that and the assumptions that showed that increase over those intervals of time.

Mr. Bump explained that to some extent there was a policy perspective they looked at, which was that they should address underproduction and housing needs sooner rather than later so that they did not get worse into the future. He clarified that it looked at that combination of current needs, five-year housing need for 0% - 60% AMI accounted for underproduction, which included housing for the homeless, and also a five-year projection allocation of the population projection for that income category. He stated that they took the State's, Pima Association of Governments, and the population forecast side and applied an age cohort model and looked at income distribution and how future households might look compared to today and then tried to model that from an income need in the future standpoint. He stated that was available that could be shared with the Board which included some of those assumptions and decisions from an analytic standpoint.

Supervisor Allen stated that on the chart that broke down the needs according to locations for the different areas, she believed it indicated that Sells housing need was about 50. She asked to what degree did the study look at the housing needs of the entire Tohono O'odham Nation, or had it been focused only on Sells and not the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Bump responded that they looked at other portions of the County in terms of the unincorporated County areas. He stated that they were engaging with some of the tribal governments specifically about how those housing needs might apply to folks in the County that were sovereign nations, and they did not want to apply the same assumptions in the same way. He reiterated they would do some sort of specific engagement to ensure that they accounted for that in the right way. He clarified that for Sells, there was 55 units total needed through 2045 and it had an income distribution breakdown that he could also provide to the Board.

Supervisor Allen hoped that the Pascua Yaqui and the Tohono O'odham Nations were reflected in the final comprehensive study.

Mr. Bump stated that they wanted to be intentional about how they were engaging those folks as part of this process and were currently doing that.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if they would reach out to the Board so that they could have some input and feedback on the plan.

Mr. Bump responded stated that he would reach out to staff once they got to that strategy framework process, part of that would be co-created as part of the engagement process and engagement with other stakeholders, along with the Board, and that the CWD staff would have more information about when and how that would be done.

Chair Scott stated that the last slide listed the further work that the firm would do and asked what the upcoming roles of the Housing Commission would be, in terms of making use of this study.

Dan Sullivan, Director, CWD, explained that the Housing Commission had been a part of selecting this group and this was information that would be used moving forward to influence strategic thinking, of where to build, how to prioritize the General Fund support that came from the Board, and also the other priority that came from the original recommendations of the dashboard that would be put up. He stated that this was a fundamental document to push this work forward in a data informed way.

Chair Scott understood that there was a small working group of the Commission who looked at the issues that were outlined, but an original charge for the Commission was coming up with a regional strategy for increasing affordable housing and workforce and market rate housing. He stated that he was also aware that the jurisdictional representatives were also going to have significant input into that planning.

Mr. Sullivan concurred and stated that there a subgroup that would look at strategic planning that had really good representation and they talked about having the municipalities discuss what they had done and it was a regional approach to affordable housing across the spectrum.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that when the Board received the GAP funding proposals, she wanted it to show how they leveraged that funding. She stated that amount was not significant and would not make a dent into what was needed for the community, but the goal of that was to leverage the dedication of that funding from the Board in order to get more funding from either State, Federal, other nonprofit foundations.

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

35. Proposed Settlement in Susan Schroeder v. Guy Quintance, et al.

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Susan Schroeder, et al. v. Guy Quintance, et al., C20223979.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

36. Corrections Officer Retirement Board

Appointment of Cami Evans, to replace Nicholas McCullough. No term expiration. (Chair recommendation)

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

37. County Attorney Investigators Local Retirement Board

Appointment of Cami Evans, to replace Nicholas McCullough. No term expiration. (Chair recommendation)

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

38. Public Safety Personnel Retirement Board

Appointment of Cami Evans, to replace Nicholas McCullough. No term expiration. (Chair recommendation)

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

39. Election Integrity Commission

Reappointment of Cheryl Caswell. Term expiration: 1/23/27. (District 4)

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

40. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the 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. **Pima Animal Care Advisory Committee**
 - Appointment of Charles Shumway, Registered PACC Volunteer, to replace Cindy Bezaury. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (Organizational recommendation)
 - Reappointment of Gail Smith, Board of Health. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (Organizational recommendation)
2. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**
Reappointment of Eric Sullwold. Term expiration: 3/1/29. (District 4)
3. **Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**
Appointment of Mauro Trejo, to replace Rikki Lynn Riojas. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 5)
4. **Small Business Commission**
Appointment of Danny Peterson, to fill a vacancy created by Jewel Mideau. No term expiration. (District 2)

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

5. **Special Event**
 - Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 38 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, January 25, 2025.
 - Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Gym & Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, March 1, 2025.
 - Julie P. Ciruli, The Continental School District Educational Foundation, Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I 19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, February 8, 2025.
 - Peter Lynn Schultz, San Xavier Lodge No. 1964, Loyal Order of Moose, Inc., 9022 S. Nogales Highway, Tucson, February 2, 2025.
 - Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, February 27, 2025.

- Rev. Michael A. Martinez, Our Lady of the Valley Parish, Our Lady of the Valley Holy Family Center Hall, 505 N. La Canada Drive, Green Valley, October 24, 2025.

6. **Temporary Extension**

12104140, Steven Alex Dunn, Z Dunn Enterprises, d.b.a. The Parish, 6453 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, March 4, 2025.

ELECTIONS

7. **Precinct Committeemen**

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Margaret Vaughn-118-DEM, James McPherson-174-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Laurie Soloff-088-DEM, John Shepard-099-DEM, Jeffrey Cinnamond-112-DEM, TreDavon Rhodes-180-DEM, Pat Bakalian-181-DEM, Ethan Rigel-192-DEM, James Lewison-239-DEM, Sharon Wright-006-REP, Douglas Simon-041-REP, Cynthia Bradford-080-REP, Lynda Johnson-108-REP, Kelly Spicer-111-REP, John Sinclair III-125-REP, Marlene Garcia-127-REP, Ronda Ammon-169-REP, Jerry Travers-169-REP, Jacqueline Nangle-Stone-195-REP, Tyler Pruett-197-REP, Anthony Boscarino-252-REP

SUPERIOR COURT

8. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointment**

Appointment of Judge Pro Tempore of the Superior Court of Pima County for the period of February 10, 2025 through June 30, 2025: Rudy Padilla

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

9. Minutes: November 12, 2024
Warrants: January, 2025

* * *

41. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK