

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The 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, October 14, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**Mr. Jurkowitz replaced Mr. Brown at 11:45 a.m.

1. AWARD

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001815, Amendment No. 2, Bestway Electric Motor Service Co., Inc., to provide for pump repair service. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$440,000.00 from \$482,000.00 to \$922,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,404,000.00. This increase is required for unanticipated repairs necessary for two pumps that are currently not functional. Funding Source: Regional Wastewater Reclamation (90%), Stadium District (4%), Regional Flood Control District (4%), and General (2%) Funds. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

2. CONTRACT

Solis Engineering Co., L.L.C., to provide for Construction Administration Services for FC - Santa Cruz Cortaro Narrows Training Structures Project, term date 10/14/25 to 3/31/29, Regional Flood Control District Capital Project Fund, contract amount \$618,092.20 (PO2500028827) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

3. **CONTRACT**

Dry River Forge, to provide for Canoa Ranch Pollinator Garden Public Art, 40067FD Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$150,000.00 (PO2500027198)

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

4. **RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION PLANS**

Pursuant to Pima County Code, Section 16.30.050(B), quarterly report of District approved Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans.

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 14, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**Mr. Jurkowitz replaced Mr. Brown at 11:45 a.m.

1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, to provide for the State Grants-In-Aid SGIA 2026 for Pima County Public Library, \$25,000.00/\$25,000.00 Library District Fund match (G-LIB-95760)

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 14, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**Mr. Jurkowitz replaced Mr. Brown at 11:45 a.m.

1. AWARD

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001815, Amendment No. 2, Bestway Electric Motor Service Co., Inc., to provide for pump repair service. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$440,000.00 from \$482,000.00 to \$922,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,404,000.00. This increase is required for unanticipated repairs necessary for two pumps that are currently not functional. Funding Source: Regional Wastewater Reclamation (90%), Stadium District (4%), Regional Flood Control District (4%), and General (2%) Funds. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

2. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

VERANO COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Verano Community Facilities District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 14, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**Mr. Jurkowitz replaced Mr. Brown at 11:45 a.m.

1. VERANO COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - VCFD¹, of the District Board of the Verano Community Facilities District taking certain actions with regard to organization of the District; approving and authorizing the execution and delivery of a development and intergovernmental agreement for Verano Community Facilities District; and ordering and calling an election with respect to issuance of bonds by the District and the levy of an ad valorem property tax therefor and to the levy of a separate ad valorem property tax attributable to the operation and maintenance expenses of the District.

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that he met with the development team and one of the things they discussed was the need for additional housing and density beyond the first phase, which had already been platted, and he appreciated their willingness to look at future phases to potentially increase density for other types of housing.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 14, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**Mr. Jurkowitz replaced Mr. Brown at 11:45 a.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Penelope Jacks, J.D., Retired, representing the Preschool Promise.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Allen stated that she appreciated the Procurement Department noting within agenda items the headquarters of companies being awarded contracts or that the County was doing business with, because investing more in Arizona and specifically in small businesses in the County was a big priority and highly needed. She explained that it aligned with the Prosperity Initiative and the Economic Development Department's priorities in the strategic plan. She asked that this practice be extended and continued through other departments.

Supervisor Cano acknowledged Supervisor Allen's birthday and wished her a happy birthday.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Daniel Sullivan, Director, Marjava Ramirez, Community and Workforce Manager I, Ana Camarillo, Navigator, Community and Workforce Development; Gilbert Ybarra, Administrative Specialist III, Public Works; and Carlos Valles, Executive Director, Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center, Toy Drive Committee, proclaiming October 6 through December 12, 2025 to be: "ANNUAL TOY DRIVE DAYS IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Jessica Ogiba, Mark Campbell, Pedro Valladarez, Valeria Fuerte, and Jim Olson, KE&G Construction, Inc., proclaiming the month of October 2025 to be: "EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP MONTH"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Sheronda Jordan, Kayla Walker, Kelly Evans, Elise Lopez, Xavi Ramirez, Karina Valle, Lori Aldecoa and Josue Romero, Emerge, proclaiming the month of October 2025 to be: "DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Brenda Goldsmith, Executive Director, and John B. Fung, Director of Major Gifts & Planned Giving, El Rio Health Center Foundation, celebrating: "EL RIO HEALTH CENTER'S 55 YEARS OF SERVICE"

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

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Joel Smith, Field Operations Manager, Laurie Cantillo, Board Chair, Bob Feinman, Vice Chairman of the Board, David Sarando, Board Treasurer, Dora Rodriguez, Scott Larson and Jose Vasquez, Board Members, and Dinah Bear and Gene O'Meara, Volunteers, Humane Borders, celebrating: "HUMANE BORDERS INC."

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

PRESENTATION

10. HSL Properties 50th Anniversary

Presentation of a Certificate of Recognition to Humberto S. Lopez and Omar Mireles of HSL Properties to commemorate the company's 50th Anniversary of business in and contributions to communities in Pima County. (District 4)

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

11. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

The following speakers addressed the Board in opposition of Project Blue:

• Jordon Walker	• Jenny O'Neill
• Nina Luxenberg	• Kitana Alinda
• John Ralston	• Derrick Espadas
• Luke Felix-Rose	• Jim Haunley
• Roger Voelker	• Julie Dittmer
• Reyes Suarez	• Michael Atlas
• Kathleen Dreier	• Ori Green
• Hazel Heinzer	• Isabel Garcia
• Christoph Heinzer	• Jo Jaeger
• Vivek Bharathan	• Mike Humphrey
• Katherine Packard	• Asa Ramsey

They provided the following comments:

- Concern about the contrast between the presentations given, the Pima Prospers presentation, and the Project Blue Amazon data centers.
- Amazon and other companies' actions in other states used large amounts of electricity and water and produced lots of fossil fuels, which would not be a good idea for Arizona.
- Concerns about process secrecy, unidirectional engagement of the public, and conferences attended by Beale, AWS, elected officials, city and County staff, and Board members.
- Confusion about how the Board had behaved and voted on Project Blue. Board members should listen to their constituents and the full community about the project.
- Environmental concerns that the global AI movement was building thousands of data centers with power requirements many times larger than that of San Francisco, which would bring immense amounts of emissions and use of resources.
- The data center would not benefit Tucsonans and would contribute to the mass surveillance of U.S. citizens done by AWS and its partners.

- Board members had ignored and disregarded research and feedback from the community about the project.
- Beale should not be given power without demonstrating local renewable energy without higher rates for Tucsonans, which other developers had demonstrated was possible.
- The Board should not go through with the land deal, not waive the closing conditions, and should understand the will of the community.
- The economic benefits were meager, and the jobs that would be created would end up underpaying people.
- Amazon was aiming to embolden surveillance technology with the data center, and the Board must use their power to stop it.
- The land deal with Beale should not go through since the closing conditions had not been met, and the energy usage would be a public safety issue with Tucson's deadly heat.
- The deal was deeply flawed, and negotiations failed to produce the needed safeguards and local benefits. The Board should insist on studies in electric reliability.
- Project Blue would not have any net economic benefit for the City of Tucson or Pima County, and the current tax structure would not be able to renumerate the profits from the data center.
- There were multiple inconsistencies in the contract.
- There were better resource alternatives for the data center that would use less power, such as closed loop water cooling, solar on site, and battery storage.
- The data center would cause greater air pollution, which was not compatible with the County's plans about adapting to climate change.
- The contract with Project Blue was rushed and the community should know the truth about the economic plan.
- Concerns with public health impacts from Project Blue.
- The required power usage would increase electricity costs for residents and would put strain on the power grid.
- The PSA should be looked at by an expert in Arizona contract law, and the County should not repeat the mistakes of the City in relying on certain information.

Willie Blake expressed his gratitude to the Board for their work and the assistance that is provided to rural areas.

J.P. Salvatierra addressed the Board regarding court cases about public records requests, public defenders in immigration court, and lawsuits filed against HSL Properties.

Mike Lippman expressed his support of Minute Item No. 69 and stated that the compact would be dangerous for democracy.

Raye Winch spoke about rising rental prices in the County and accusations of price fixing against HSL Properties and RealPage. She stated that the companies needed to be held accountable for price increases rather than celebrated by public officials.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Cano thanked everyone who came forward and spoke about their concerns regarding Project Blue and reiterated his steadfast opposition. He stated that it was important for the community to keep the pressure on and ask for accountability. He requested that the County Administrator provide the Board with an update on all outstanding public records requests related to Project Blue and a plan for releasing all the files in partnership with Beale, within 45 days.

Supervisor Allen requested an update on the investigations that the Arizona Attorney General had submitted on several apartment complexes regarding uninhabitable conditions as well as the lawsuit alleging HSL illegally conspiring to fix rents, and its impact on County renters. She stated that as the County worked to provide affordable housing and prevent homelessness, landlords should be held accountable for their actions.

Chair Scott stated that the sales purchase agreement that was approved on June 17th was negotiated by attorneys from the Pima County Attorney's Office (PCAO) who were familiar with the subject matter, and that the Board had received legal counsel from PCAO regarding how it was negotiated.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

12. Joint Meetings with the Tucson City Council

Discussion/Direction/Action: Scheduling joint meetings with the Tucson City Council to address issues related to unsheltered homelessness and how our two governments can build on the collaborative efforts we have already undertaken. (District 1)

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to direct the County Administrator to have conversations with her counterparts in the City of Tucson about time and location of meetings and to also include that Supervisor Heinz had a discussion at a Pima Association of Governments (PAG) meeting, with regard to expanding PAG's scope of involvement. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

13. Creation of the Agenda Review Committee

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of the creation of a committee to review agendas for Board of Supervisors' meetings. (District 1)

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

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

14. Addition of Study Sessions

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of the addition of study sessions to the Board of Supervisors' meeting schedule. (District 1)

Chair Scott stated that this item was a result of the Board's retreat, and he thanked Ms. Leshner and her team for a tremendous job of encapsulating some of the items discussed as being particularly conducive to study sessions and for a revised calendar until the beginning of June that would add a monthly study session. He stated that something that had been discussed at the retreat was the ability to speak freely in a way that they could not do outside of an agenda meeting. He stated that study sessions would provide the Board with the opportunity to engage with each other and with staff in much more flexible ways. He stated that he was interested in hearing from his colleagues about their thoughts on the calendar, start times for study sessions, and whether they should be implemented.

Supervisor Cano expressed his gratitude for the proposal that was provided to the Board for their consideration and thanked the Chair for introducing the item. He expressed hesitation with the current structure that would add an additional day, but he believed a study session format could be added on regularly scheduled days. He stated that he would support the item for the time being to test it out but reminded everyone that they should not replicate the wheel. He stated that the addition of a third date could be accommodated in the mornings. He stated he wanted to offer a substitute motion to get through quarter one into April but in the spirit of the conversation they had at the retreat, and to be able to see how it would make better use of their time to avoid long meetings, he supported the motion as introduced. He added that they should start meetings at 9:00 a.m. or 5:00 p.m., whatever the pleasure of the Board was and taking into consideration that these meetings needed to be accessible to the public.

Supervisor Heinz echoed Supervisor Cano's comments and stated that the Board had just heard from the constituents who were very passionate about Project Blue, and many had mentioned that they left their business or had to take part of the day off. He stated that had been heard before from speakers and he preferred the Board stay until 7:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. He stated that staff would be minimally affected since they were largely salaried and time could be adjusted. He stated it would be much more accessible just like their colleagues at the City of Tucson Mayor and Council, that had afternoon study sessions and then 5:00 p.m. early evening council

meetings. He stated that the Board should explore this and they did not need to stick to Tuesdays for any reason. He stated that he was open to study sessions as well but did not necessarily want to have a third meeting each month.

Supervisor Christy expressed confusion and asked if they were talking about having a study session the same day as a regular Board meeting.

Chair Scott responded no, that was not what the County Administrator had put together after hearing input from the retreat and that the proposal was to add a study session as a third meeting day on a Tuesday. He clarified that what Supervisors Cano and Heinz alluded to was they reserved the right to suggest that moving forward. He asked if this was correct.

Supervisors Cano and Heinz nodded in agreement.

Supervisor Christy stated this is what threw him off because they were just talking about streamlining the meetings and avoiding long meetings but there was also discussion about having regular Board meetings and then a study session or vice versa on the same day and that would make meetings even longer.

Chair Scott clarified that was not currently being proposed but that it could be a similar arrangement to the City of Tucson's that could be considered in the future. He stated that the reason they stuck with Tuesdays was to not conflict with other elected bodies that had meetings on other days of the week. He asked if this was considered when it was put together.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, confirmed that Board meetings were held on Tuesdays and other jurisdictions met on other days. She stated that the initial thinking was to avoid the confusion with the public and to ensure they knew how to access the Board. She stated that if the Board added a study session on a different day, it could confuse the public.

Supervisor Allen appreciated this discussion and that it being carried forward from the retreat. She proposed the Board conduct study sessions in the evening starting at 5:00 p.m., so that one of their gatherings was accessible for people after work hours. She sympathized with the strain that it would put on some staff but that it outweighed the public benefit to have one time and space out of the meetings that were offered at which the public could readily come after work hours and that benefit was an important one.

Chair Scott stated that to Supervisors Allen and Heinz's point, when they added study sessions, they start at 9:00 a.m., one of the regular meetings at 9:00 a.m., then the second regular meeting in the evening, because it was at the regular meetings where they made decisions. He stated that it was at the regular meetings where they also had Call to the Public and most likely would hear from constituents. He wondered if, should that direction be taken, it might be valuable to move one of the two regular meetings to the evening instead of the study session.

Supervisor Heinz stated they could have one morning regular Board meeting, and an evening study session because people might want to contribute to that, and then an evening Board meeting as well.

Chair Scott requested clarification if what Supervisor Heinz meant was, in a month when there were three meetings, two of them would be in the evening and one would be in the morning.

Supervisor Heinz responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Cano echoed Chair Scott's comments that study sessions might not be the forum for an evening meeting. He stated that he supported Chair Scott's suggestion to have a regular Board meeting in the evening instead. He asked if there was any consensus to do this on a trial basis until April. He stated that it would be an adjustment, but they were trying to be innovative and if they approved a calendar all at once, every one of them would need to be posted and they could technically cancel them if it was a model that was not coming to serve the Board's needs. He asked if this was correct.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, responded that the Board had already approved a regular meeting schedule from January 2026 to June 2026, and it would need to be brought back on a future agenda if the Board wanted to amend that approved schedule.

Chair Scott asked for clarification that the item as submitted was sufficient to add study sessions, but if the Board wanted to change start times to regular meetings, that would be another item.

Ms. Manriquez responded in the affirmative. She added that if the Board decided to have evening meetings, it would put strain on the Clerk's Office and on staff. She stated that there were seven employees that produced these meetings, and the majority of them were hourly employees, and those employees' time would need to be adjusted during regular business hours, which was 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and then additional time for evening meetings. She stated that she was unsure if it would also cause strain on the other departments, Communications, Information Technology, Facilities Management, that helped run these meetings as well. She stated that another thing that needed to be considered was the parking garages since they closed at a certain time and her staff parked in several different parking garages in the downtown area, and the safety of staff when they walked to those garages at night.

Chair Scott requested the item be continued and asked if it would be sufficient time to gather the information needed to consider evening meetings of any type if the item was continued to October 21st or if it would be better to continue the item until November 4th.

Supervisor Cano stated that this should be done the right way and they needed to ensure they listened to their Clerks. He stated that any action on this matter should

be delayed until the first meeting in December so they could see what that plan could look like and that it would allow them to figure out these real-world implications to both people and staffing, and the budgetary restraints. He clarified that he should not call them restraints, because the narrative needed to be reframed that they were trying to ensure that the public had access to these meetings, and figure out a cost-effective way to do that. He stated that if the Board heard that this multi-department approach was better off to wait until the next fiscal year in June to provide additional support, he was willing to have that conversation. He stated that he was even concerned with some of his own suggestions on the dais because they did not want to take away something from the public, an expectation that they were available in the evening, and then had to revert back if it did not work. He stated this was at the pleasure of Board, but it needed to be done right and suggested waiting until December.

Chair Scott stated that what Supervisor Cano suggested was to continue the item until the first meeting in December to receive a report from staff, both the County Administrator and the Clerk, regarding the impact of moving one or more of the Board meetings to evening hours and explore those options.

Supervisor Christy commented that as an aside, and to Clerk Manriquez's point, like many departments in Pima County, the Clerk's Office had been experiencing high turnover, which could have another negative impact and should be taken into consideration.

Chair Scott thanked Supervisor Christy because he thought what he and Supervisor Cano were pointing to regarding the time to consider this was also the time for offices to have internal conversations.

Supervisor Christy stated that if Supervisor Cano wished to formalize the suggestion in the form of a motion, he would second it.

Supervisor Cano declined.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of December 2, 2025, and request staff to provide a report about the implications of having one or two of these meetings in the evening. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he thought it would not take that long since the City of Tucson Mayor and Council had done this for many years and they also had support staff and similar departments that would be involved in those meetings that could be mirrored. He stated that they could explore their example of how they had adjusted and collaborated in managing these changes. He hoped to receive the information sooner but also supported the motion as presented.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

15. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

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

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

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

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that this item was to be brought back if needed and with the government shutdown at two weeks, she felt it was appropriate for staff to provide an overview of the status of things.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator, stated that since the last update on the topic, the County Administrator had provided several updates to the Board by way of memorandum on policy directives or notable federal impacts that affected the County, such as executive orders, federal public benefits, and most recently, a few weeks back on impending federal government shutdowns and the status of appropriations. She stated that the County Administrator and her team had discussed providing this update on the status of appropriation and subsequent impact to the County's grant portfolio, programs and services, and deviation from the previously reported impacts of the President's proposed budget, otherwise known as HR1, or the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," and/or the subsequent impact of a federal shutdown. She stated that the appropriations process was far from complete and was on day fourteen of the federal government shutdown, which started October 1st, resulting from failure to complete the appropriations or pass a continuing resolution to fund the federal government. She stated that the most recent shutdown prior to this was in 2018/2019 which lasted 35 days. She added that Pima County departments and leadership were closely watching the potential scenarios and impacts on funds and function disruptions during the shutdown period. She stated that she would underscore the risks to critical areas and specifically, discuss with the Board the federal benefit funds expected first quarter payments at the start of the federal fiscal year, as often they did not carry year end balances and relied on timely government payments, substantial furloughs or disruption to staffing and fund availability for programs during a shutdown period, and the ability to withstand or sustain during the shutdown period. She reminded the Board that in previous presentations provided over the summer, central to the current shutdown, there were components that underscored the HR1, that specifically centered mostly around Medicaid. She stated that in part, the larger \$1 trillion planned cuts over the next five years, and health care subsidies which made it more affordable to get health care in the marketplace for families and individuals. She stated that in Pima County, one third of residents were insured by Medicaid, 37% children, which fluctuated into the 40% range, and 66% were in the expansion groups by which over 60% of those were more likely to have a co-occurring disorder or complex health needs. She stated that SNAP was also a benefit that was central to this conversation, and over 10% of the region between 2020 and 2022 were

identified as food insecure, with 13% of Pima County residents receiving SNAP benefits in 2023. She stated that another central component of the shutdown was the executive office's ability to abruptly shut down or rescind congressionally obligated dollars, and so those were the core components of what they were monitoring as these discussions continued across Congress and the executive offices. She went over the next slide that showed that the Grants Management and Innovation team were monitoring the status of the County's grants portal. She stated that these were the portals by which funds were received and put into the General Fund, of which there had been some disruptions to grant applications, portal capacity for reimbursements. She stated that there had not been substantial disruptions to reimbursements, but they were watching some of the larger departmental grant recipients, such as Community and Workforce Development and the Health Department. She stated that the Justice grants portal was reopened as of this week and that they were also watching statewide and nationally around Women, Infants and Children, otherwise known as the WIC program, which was a critical program that had some disruption nationwide, and was dependent on fiscal allocations at the start of the federal fiscal year. She stated that last week, they received word that at just about day eight of the shutdown, the Arizona Department of Health Services received contingency funds to keep WIC programs funded through October 31st. She stated that the Arizona Department of Health funded three WIC local agency providers in Pima County, the Health Department and their federally qualified health centers, specifically, El Rio and Marana Health Centers, that together provided monthly benefits to over 21,500 women, infants and children monthly. She stated that the Pima County Health Department was the largest provider for the County, with a contracted caseload of over 11,500 participants and 38 full-time employees, so WIC was something they were watching closely in addition to State shifts to counties in terms of that programming dollar amount. She referred to the table on the slide that was a status of appropriations discussions to date and was also provided to the Board by way of memorandum in mid-September, but wanted to focus on transportation, housing and urban development and the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Committee. She stated that these were the County's largest funding sources from federal funds. She stated that through the appropriations process, and through committee work, some of these critical funds were coming in as retained at fiscal year '25 spending which was important for some of the work they did across this community. She stated that deviating from proposed full elimination in HR1, the community development block grants, originally slated for full elimination, had been retained at fiscal '25 levels with the proposed increase from the Senate. She stated that some critical homeless services, continuum of care and emergency solutions grant funding had also been retained. She stated that programmatically, that meant the community development block grant served over 80,000 people, HOME funds for first time homebuyer assistance served over 200 families, the community services block grants, which existed in the Health and Human Services appropriations group served by Community and Workforce Development, which included LIHEAP served over 20,000 residents, and the Homeless Services programming served almost 2,000. She added that the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act funds served over 8,000 residents in training so they saw some of those funds being retained at fiscal '25 levels, but knew that everything was fragile and delicate, they were reviewing

everything. She stated that there was uncertainty with Health and Human services and the table showed agencies versus program line item and lack of clarity on the intention of program retention of health programs and the redirection to the Make America Healthy Again budget line. She stated that the Centers for Disease Control was one of the largest funded federal agencies to the County portfolio and the services provided. She stated that while funding had been retained through the appropriations process, the agency had experienced a tumultuous few months, with the most recent as of Friday night, reduction in force effort, removing thousands of employees. She added that the public health emergency preparedness programming had anticipated fiscal cuts. She stated that there were currently 443 lawsuits against the federal administration and they reported on these because some of the County's funds were tied up in the outcome, partial block of these cases. She stated that annual funds received by the Office of Emergency Management were frozen due to the status of one of the Department of Homeland Security lawsuits. She explained that this funding was essential to the office's operation and had an impact of just under \$1 million, approximately \$750,000.00 to the General Fund until funds were released. She reiterated that the County had 212 grant awards and 77% of those were federally funded or pass through. She stated they continued to report on expenditures versus award was due to the General Fund impact if these programs and services were removed or shut down. She stated they hoped that through the appropriations process and some of the positive activity seen would slightly delay the urgency by which they developed a risk assessment to General Fund dollars but as the shutdown continued and subsequent disruption of funds by way of either programmatic impacts at the federal level, complete shutdown of programs or funding access points, that fiscal impact risk assessment was imminent. She added that in conjunction with the fiscal '27 Pima County budget preparation, they would provide the County Administrator with a risk assessment to the fiscal '27 budget or General Fund impacts based on the federal fiscal year 2026 budget, and discussions and outcomes.

Supervisor Cano requested a list of the 212 grants and their amounts.

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

Supervisor Cano thanked Ms. Davis for providing more of the qualitative information that told stories of impact, people losing their homes, losing their health care, and neighbors who wondered where their next meal was going to come from. He stated that these were all shifts that came almost daily with a gut-wrenching reality of what they were faced with. He also thanked the County Administrator for working with state and federal teams to be able to keep a pulse on this. He stated that it was important, as the County engaged in this work with their federal and state partners, to work with elected representatives, and continue to paint a story of impact. He stated that since the Board's last meeting, they had not had the opportunity to publicly thank the County Administrator and Senator Ruben Gallego for visiting them on September 23rd so that they could celebrate some of the historic federal investment that had come to Pima County. He recalled all the investments that truly made an impact that helped County taxpayers were now at risk under this administration because of Senate delegation. He stated that the County received

\$25 million to expand internet access across Southern Arizona and that kind of strategy of bringing the senator to the courthouse and be able to talk about that need for additional federal dollars. He stated that he looked forward to working as an entire Board to look to congressional delegation for continued support, including those that were currently in the majority in Congress, to let them know the true impact of these decisions by the federal administration. He stated that the trickle-down economics of all of this was that it was going to fall on County taxpayers to have to foot the bill for critical services. He stated that he also recognized that some may disagree with that statement, but asked everybody to, as they navigated these uncharted territories, think about the humanity of this. He stated that the fact that somebody may not have access to support, to have a home over their heads, to be able to provide food for their kids, to be able to go to the doctor without wondering how they were going to pay for it, these were all real things that were happening, and he knew that working with the County Administrator would continue focusing on these issues.

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

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

17. Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund

Pursuant to A.R.S. §12-284.01, staff requests approval to expend \$106,765.50 from the Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund to purchase OnBase licenses for Clerk of Superior Court employees, and to pay an invoice from the Administrative Office of the Courts for the maintenance of their digital evidence system, Case Center.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

18. Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. E 36.1, ~~Review of Requests and Monitoring of Contracts for Discretionary Funds Allocated to Outside Agencies for Economic Development, Health and Social Services~~ **General Funds Allocated to the Community & Workforce Development Outside Agency Program to Fund Non-Profit Organizations.**

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

Supervisor Christy asked for a definitive, very cursory explanation of what the actual goal was of this revision and the difference of what was currently in place versus the revision.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that primarily these amendments were to line up the outside agency program to reflect, understand and support issues within the Prosperity Initiative. She added that it was to mandate a community needs assessment that would occur every five years and provide for an annual report moving forward for some additional transparency.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development (CWD), stated that it would be aligned with the Prosperity Initiative, but also ensuring they had youth and family services, basic needs, health and wellness, education and workforce and also a category for general services that were generally pulled out of the competitive process.

Supervisor Christy asked what the differences were between the current policy and proposed revisions.

Mr. Sullivan responded that the basic change was that it aligned more closely with the Prosperity Initiative.

Supervisor Christy asked if it had not already aligned with the existing policy.

Mr. Sullivan stated there was some alignment, but the revisions provided better alignment.

Supervisor Christy stated that the item spoke to metrics and reporting and that after it was adopted, there would be some metrics given as to its success or failure. He asked when that report would be presented to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan responded that they expected to have an RFP out to the community in late November/early December and that those awards would probably be finalized months after that. He stated they would complete quarterly reports that would be shared with the Board. He added that on an annual basis, if agencies were not spending or performing, the Outside Agency Committee would meet and reallocate their funds to agencies that may need those funds, so they would report to the Board as they did to the Outside Agency Committee.

Supervisor Christy asked prior to this revision if there was no reporting.

Mr. Sullivan replied there was the same amount of reporting.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was going to differ from what they already had versus what was being proposed.

Mr. Sullivan responded no that it would ensure it aligned with the newly proposed framework.

Supervisor Christy stated that Mr. Sullivan mentioned an RFP, which indicated there was a cost involved and he asked what the RFP was for.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the Outside Agency fund was about \$3 million allocated every three years. He stated that each Board member had a representative, so it was that RFP for the \$3 million and those were selected by the Outside Agency Committee.

Supervisor Allen acknowledged awarding additional points for rural based organizations which was one of the changes not mentioned. She stated that this was something heard from District 3 organizations frequently, in that they felt like they did not get a fair shake in the review process because their communities were small, they would not stand out, though their programs were as significant in the number of people that they served. She stated that a senior meal program in Ajo that served 25 seniors was statistically significant given the size of the overall population. She stated there was a similar dynamic in Arivaca and Three Points and other facets of District 3, so she was very glad to see that and thanked them for the revisions.

Supervisor Heinz stated that as they looked forward to 2027 planning, it would be great if they could find a way to increase what they were able to provide, just because of the need that was increasing in so many aspects. He stated that with the federal government and the actions it was taking, he thought that all local jurisdictions needed to step up. He stated that he knew money was tight, but that should be considered as they looked forward to 2027.

Chair Scott stated that as a follow up to Supervisor Christy's questions he wanted to offer a hypothetical. He stated that after the RFP came out and an organization responded to it, they touched on at least one of the previous priority areas but then they also touched on the new priority area, which was in alignment with the Prosperity Initiative, he asked if that would hypothetically make them more competitive when the citizens committee reviewed the different proposals.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative and explained that for the nonprofit community to prepare, Helen Schaffer, their Prosperity Initiative Manager, went out and spoke with everyone. He stated they had a technical assistance session at the Rio Nuevo Center and would continue this to ensure the nonprofit community would be prepared for the change.

Chair Scott stated that given that the addition of this new priority area might induce interest from other members of the nonprofit community who perhaps had not responded to previous RFPs, he asked how they would reach out to the community at large.

Mr. Sullivan responded that it would happen through the needs assessment. He stated they had more than 2,500 respondents and they had spoken to every nonprofit agency they thought of. He stated that if there was anyone that they had not talked to, they would talk to them. He stated that CWD had contracts with most, if not all agencies in the community in this line of work. He stated that they wanted

to figure out how they could be better partners and their goal was to collaborate, not duplicate, and to add value so that was their way forward.

Chair Scott stated that the staff Mr. Sullivan had assigned to support the Citizens Review Committee was outstanding in terms of responding to inquiries from the citizens. He thanked him as the District 1 Supervisor, because he knew Ms. Davis there was a long-standing member representing District 1, and she had been appointed by former Supervisor Ally Miller but he kept her in place because she was so committed to the work of the committee. He stated that she recently resigned and the person they appointed to replace her had been very complimentary of the work that Mr. Sullivan's staff did to bring him up to speed.

Mr. Sullivan concurred and stated that Manira Cervantes and Melanie Bustamante were fantastic and overseen by Andy Flagg. He stated that they did a great job managing complex contracts with limited resources and the Board would see future recognition of some of those people in the future.

Supervisor Cano thanked the County Administrator and Director Sullivan for revisions to the policy. He echoed the comments from his colleague from District 2 about the Board really needing to have a strong pulse of the community and the unmet needs that the community would be faced with in the coming years. He stated that they had three more years of this federal administration hampering at the County's ability to support critical services and programs that the outside agency program supported. He indicated that District 5 supported exploring innovative ways to continue meeting the needs of the community. He stated that he hoped to get a response from the County Administrator on an email he had sent a few weeks ago related to the Pima Association of Governments (PAG), which was a line item that he believed existed in the CWD space, and it seemed to him that it was more like membership dues that was thrown into the community workforce world. He stated that he was curious how it started and if they would continue that in the coming years. He asked for some additional background on how they could ensure that what should be a fund supporting nonprofits and the incredible unmet need not be hampered by a membership payment of nearly \$300,000.00 to PAG. He stated that outside of those inquiries, he was extremely grateful because the alignment was needed, and clearly the work of the Outside Agency Committee was reflected in the proposal before the Board.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

19. Final Plat With Assurances

P24FP00013, Ajo & Kinney, Lots 1-141, Block 1 & 2, Common Area "A" (Open Space, Recreation Area, Private and Public Drainage and Public Utility) and Common Area "B" (Natural Open Space/NOS and Public Utility). (District 3)

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

Supervisor Allen stated that she wanted more information on how the housing that the Board was being asked to approve correlated with the housing study, particularly the buckets that had been identified for the types of housing needed in the County. She requested that information be provided to the Board as a recurring report.

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

20. Final Plat With Assurances

P25FP00007, River and Hansen, Lots 1-60 and Common Areas "A, B, C, and D". (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 19, for discussion related to this item.)

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

21. Final Plat With Assurances

P25FP00009, Ocotillo Ridge being a Replat of Ocotillo Ridge, Block 1 Lots 451-616, Block 2 Lots 241-450, Block 3 Lots 76-240, and Block 4 Lots 1-75. (District 4)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 19, for discussion related to this item.)

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

22. Final Plat Without Assurances

P24FP00005, Abandonment of Oeste Lomas, Lots 1-30 and Common Areas "A" and "B". (District 3)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 19, for discussion related to this item.)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

23. Formation of the Verano Community Facilities District

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 40, of the Board of Supervisors, declaring its intent and ordering and declaring formation of the Verano Community Facilities District and

approving and authorizing the execution and delivery of a development and intergovernmental agreement (Verano Community Facilities District).

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

GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

24. Tohono O'odham Nation State-Shared Revenue Program Funds

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 41, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve acceptance of Tohono O'odham Nation State-Shared Revenue Program funds and pass-through to the entities in Pima County selected by the Tohono O'odham Nation.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that there was a stark contrast between Minute Item Nos. 24 and 25 and pointed out that Minute Item No. 24 listed the applicants but did not provide any background for the recipients of the Tohono O'odham Nation State-Shared Revenue Program funds. He stated that in Minute Item No. 25, the applicants and recipients were provided for the Gila River Indian Community State-Shared Revenue Program funds. He stated that it would be helpful to know who was receiving that money.

Chair Scott stated that he had received an email as the Chair of the Board of Supervisors, from the Tohono O'odham Nation that listed who was approved to receive those funds.

Supervisor Christy asked if a copy of the recipients of the funds could be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Cano thanked the Tohono O'odham Nation and the Gila River Indian Community for working with the County and regional nonprofits to provide a critical lifeline of funds for the region's nonprofits. He stated that the items reflected the commitment that voters asked for and that Arizonans had critically depended on for years. He stated that the proposals provided the full picture and was confident that the County Administrator would provide additional information regarding Minute Item No. 24, so that his colleague in District 4 had an informed decision-making process to support this item. He stated that they were in the middle of the grants process and applicants were being vetted because the County had a unique role as a fiscal agent. He added that this type of partnership with the tribal nations was a critical need and he fully supported the project.

Supervisor Allen thanked the Tohono O'odham Nation for their significant portion of revenues that benefited nonprofits which impacted thousands of people and families across the County. She stated that she was glad to see rural communities such as

Ajo and Sahuarita that would receive funding. She also thanked the Gila River Indian Community for their contribution to Pistor Middle School, which would fund their mariachi program.

Supervisor Heinz echoed his colleagues' comments and stated that the RFP process was ongoing for the Tohono O'odham Nation and the awardees were at their discretion.

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

25. Gila River Indian Community State Shared Revenue Program Funds

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 42, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve acceptance of Gila River Indian Community State-Shared Revenue Program funds and pass-through to the entity in Pima County selected by the Gila River Indian Community.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 24, for discussion related to this item.)

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

26. Classification/Compensation

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

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

6108/ Procurement Officer II/ 16 (\$75,816.00 - \$106,163.20)/ 1/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

27. Southern Arizona Land Trust, Inc., to provide for the Elstone II Project, term date 10/14/25 to 12/31/26, General Fund, contract amount \$1,000,000.00 (PO2500026282)

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

28. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Amazon Flats Permanent Supportive Housing, term date 10/14/25 to 1/15/27, General Fund, contract amount \$749,625.00 (PO2500016491)

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

29. State of Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, d.b.a. First Things First, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), amend contractual language and scope of services, CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$170,000.00 (PO2500011165)

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

Supervisor Cano stated that Minute Item Nos. 29 through 31 were the direct result of the Board strengthening the PEEPs program and that it prevented looming cuts. He thanked the Chair for his support, and County Administration and the PEEPs staff for the incredible report regarding the impact of this program

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

30. Sunnyside Unified School District 12, d.b.a. Sunnyside Unified School District, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), amend contractual language and scope of services, CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$155,545.20 (PO2500008368)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 29, for discussion related to this item.)

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

31. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a. Amphitheater Public Schools, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), amend contractual language and scope of services, CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$274,454.80 (PO2500009251)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 29, for discussion related to this item.)

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

Health

32. Tucson Unified School District, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the provision and administration of childhood immunizations and other health services and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000615)

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

Pima Animal Care Center

33. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, to provide funding for the Eastside Adoption Satellite, contract amount \$1,000,000.00 revenue/2 year term (CT2500000064)

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

Chair Scott expressed his gratitude to Friends of Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) for this funding, and he remembered when he was a candidate for this Board in 2020 when an eastside adoption satellite was being discussed and it was now moving forward.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that staff had been looking for either a more central or eastside facility and this was that critical first step. She stated that communication with the City of Tucson (COT) had begun since the facility was in the COT's eastside wards and she felt that there would be a positive reception to the expansion of the facility. She hoped staff would eventually be able to provide the full range of services at this facility.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had a very comprehensive discussion with Steve Kozachik, the Director of PACC and it was gratifying to know that this was a donation of support for them. He reiterated a conversation with Mr. Kozachik that PACC continued community outreach to the neighborhood to ensure that the public was aware that there would be dog kennels and dogs there and that the way the system was working would not create any kind of issues with them.

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

Procurement

34. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001815, Amendment No. 2, Bestway Electric Motor Service Co., Inc., to provide for pump repair service. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$440,000.00 from \$482,000.00 to \$922,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,404,000.00. This increase is required for unanticipated repairs necessary for two pumps that are currently not functional. Funding Source: Regional Wastewater Reclamation (90%), Stadium District (4%), Regional Flood Control District (4%), and General (2%) Funds. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

35. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001111, Amendment No. 5, FX-Tactical, L.L.C., to provide for Sheriff's Department uniforms and accessories. This amendment exercises a six-month extension commencing on 10/6/25 and terminating on 4/16/26, no additional funds are needed. No renewal options remain. Administering Department: Sheriff's Department.

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

36. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002372, Amendment No. 2, Merks Enterprises, L.L.C., to provide for electrical parts and supplies. This amendment provides a one-time increase of \$150,000.00, bringing the cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount to \$400,000.00. The additional funds are necessary for the installation and upgrade of plate emergency lighting systems at the Wastewater treatment facility to ensure compliance with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards. Additionally, this amendment seeks retroactive approval for the \$118,000.00 increase to the annual award amount that was made under Amendment No. 1 without prior Board authorization. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

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

37. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000021, Amendment No. 1, Parkson Corporation, to provide for Parkson aqua guard bar screen and sand filter parts. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$200,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$350,000.00 (including sales tax). This increase is necessary to allow for a direct replacement of an original bar screen installed in 1997. Funding Source: Regional Wastewater Reclamation Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

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

38. **Award**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000513, Gresham Petroleum Company (Headquarters: Indianola, MS), Offen Petroleum, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Commerce City, CO) and RelaDyne West, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Cincinnati, OH), to provide for motor vehicle fuel and service. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$3,500,000.00 (including sales tax) and

includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Fleet Services Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

39. **Award**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000557, Center for Disease Detection, L.L.C. (Headquarters: San Antonio, TX), Laboratory Corporation of America Holdings (Headquarters: Burlington, NC), and Sonora Quest Laboratories, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for laboratory services for PCHD clinical services. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the shared annual award amount of \$375,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Title X (60%), Well Woman Health Check (10%), HIV Prevention (10%), Ryan White (5%), TB Control and TB DOT (5%), and Health (10%) Funds. Administering Department: Health Department.

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

40. Workday, Inc., Amendment No. 4, to provide for Enterprise Resource Planning System, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (SC2400001562) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy stated that according to the history of the Workday program the County had spent \$45 million in order to save money and that ten months into this new program, they were paying former vendors. He asked when Workday would be fully functional and who was responsible for implementation of this upgraded system.

Javier Baca, Director, Information Technology Department, responded that there were multiple vendors that comprise the entirety of the Workday Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system with multi-year contracts for many of those vendors. He stated that some were former vendors, such as ADP, that had a subset of services that made it necessary to retain these vendors to support the entire program. He stated that the implementation was complete, and the vendors that were included in the ERP system represented those long-term contracts and the County had obligations to continue to support the entirety of the program. He stated that Workday was the most critical part of the system but interconnected to Workday were systems that allowed the various components of the system to work together, like Maximo and AmpliFund.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it was anticipated that former vendors would be retained to support Workday when the County implemented and purchased the Workday system.

Mr. Baca responded yes.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was because Workday could not stand on its own.

Mr. Baca said that there were parts of Workday that did, but there were certain sections of Workday that did not satisfy the needs of the County, so they had to acquire other products to supplement those deficiencies.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was known at the beginning of the acquisition of Workday.

Mr. Baca responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy asked if there would be a time when Workday would stand on its own.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that Workday was the personnel function, understanding that it was the backbone of the enterprise system and that other departments had programs that were integrated into it. She stated that it could be helpful to provide a chart or diagram of the ERP system to the Board that included the various components and software elements that were used and to delineate what services those programs provided to the County, the timeframe for the end of service for those programs, if appropriate, and the dollars that had been allocated to each of those programs.

Supervisor Christy stated that would be satisfactory.

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

41. W. W. Grainger, Inc., to provide for material handling equipment and related supplies, term date 10/14/25 to 12/31/27, Wastewater Ops (25%) and General (75%) Funds, contract amount \$400,000.00 (SC2500000539) Administering Department: Parks and Recreation

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

42. Pilkington Contracting Co. Inc., d.b.a. Pilkington Construction Co., to provide for Design-Build Services for Tres Rios Emergency Backup Power (3TREBP), Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs (90%) and RWRD Obligations (10%) Funds, contract amount \$407,715.00/2 year term (PO2500024700) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

43. Accela, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Migration and Subscription Services of Land and Permit Management System and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$410,000.00 (SC2400001072) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

44. HDR Engineering, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for design engineering services for: Madera Canyon, Medium Wash Bridge Replacement (4MADMB) and Madera Canyon, Florida Canyon Wash Bridge Replacement (4MADFL), extend contract term to 3/31/29, amend contractual language and scope of services, U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA OSB (93.64%) and HURF (6.36%) Funds, contract amount \$99,895.02 (PO2400007958) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

45. Granite Construction Company, to provide for the construction of the Ajo Wash Bridge, Telera Street (4AJOWB) Project, term date 10/14/25 to 8/30/26, U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA OSB (79.59%) and HURF (20.41%) Funds, contract amount \$1,030,193.00 (PO2500030082) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Project Design and Construction

46. 20 Digit Design, to provide for artist services for Valencia Road: Mission Road to Camino de la Tierra (4VALMR), Transportation CIP Projects Fund, contract amount \$207,692.00 (PO2500018423)

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

Chair Scott stated that it was his understanding that there were always some funds allocated towards public art projects regarding road construction projects and asked the County Administrator to provide comments on public art in general regarding road projects.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that in accordance with Board policy, a specific amount from each project was designated for public art.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that 1% of the construction cost of each project was devoted to public art, and there was a Board Policy and an Administrative Procedure on this. He stated that the County worked with the Southern Arizona Arts & Cultural Alliance (SAACA), their partner contracted agency on the artist selection process and the creation of a piece of art to meet that 1% requirement set by policy.

Chair Scott asked if the Public Art Review Committee was involved in that process.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that this was separate from that committee's duties.

Supervisor Cano congratulated the selection panel for their due diligence. He noted that it may not have been the same group, but there was a citizen review process in this that chose Daniel Hornung as the contractor for creating this public art and he was excited about the work he had done throughout the region and for some of his art to come to District 5.

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

Real Property

47. El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County Highway Maintenance Reimbursement Agreement, contract amount \$200,000.00 revenue (CT2500000067)

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection the item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of November 4, 2025.

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

48. The State of Arizona, to provide for Arizona Department of Transportation Utility and Railroad Engineering Section Utility Agreement (No. 3877-25-PCRWRD) for I-19, Irvington Road Traffic Interchange, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount \$504,155.00/10 year term (PO2500027601)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

Arizona Community Action Association, d.b.a. Wildfire, to provide a memorandum of understanding for the Diaper Distribution Demonstration and Research Pilot to distribute diapers and supplies to low-income families, term date 10/14/25 to 9/29/26, \$25,000.00 (G-CWD-97925)

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

50. Acceptance - County Attorney

City of Tucson, to provide for the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant, \$166,668.00/4 year term (G-PCA-79941)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this grant was going to be split between the City of Tucson and the Pima County Attorney's Office (PCAO), and that PCAO would use its half to pay for one FTE prosecutor. He asked if that position had been filled.

Chair Scott requested that PCAO provide additional information to the Board.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that additional information would be provided to the Board.

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

51. Acceptance - Environmental Quality

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Amendment No. 1, to provide for PM2.5 Monitoring Network to maintain fine particulate matter monitoring networks and amend grant language, \$262,196.00 (GA-DE-65961)

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

52. Acceptance - Health

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for Arizona's Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention Program, extend grant term to 9/29/27 and amend grant language, \$418,015.00 (GA-HD-70319)

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

53. Acceptance - Health

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 8, to provide for the Pima County Overdose Data to Action: LOCAL- Pima CARES for the following:

Project/Grant Amount/Grant No.

Component A/\$2,224,980.00/GA-HD-69959

Component C/\$319,395.00/GA-HD-69960

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

54. Acceptance - Health

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 2, to provide for sexually transmitted infection investigations, amend grant language and scope of work, \$208,987.28 (GA-HD-69948)

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

55. Acceptance - Parks and Recreation

Freeport McMoran, to provide for the Ajo Youth/Teen Archery Program, \$5,000.00 (G-PR-95549)

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

56. Acceptance - Public Defense Services

AZ Department of Child Safety and Administrative Office of the Courts, Amendment No. 19, to provide for the FFY2025 Title IV-E Foster Care Administrative Costs for Legal Representation Child or Parent and amend grant language, \$1,728,862.67 (GA-PDS-66302)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

57. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 357280, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Uptown Burger, 6370 N. Campbell Avenue, No. 160, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

58. The Board of Supervisors on September 16, 2025 continued the following:

Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

P23CA00001, PIMA COUNTY 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - PIMA PROSPERS

The Pima County 2025 Comprehensive Plan, known as Pima Prospers, will update the 2015 Comprehensive Plan (Co7-13-10). Pima Prospers contains background information, goals, policies, and implementation strategies addressing all content required by state statute for a comprehensive plan, as well as other elements including but not limited to economic development, flood control and drainage, wastewater reclamation, cultural resources, housing, neighborhoods and communities, and other services provided by the County. Pima Prospers also includes an amended land use legend, land use map, and rezoning and special area policies which govern land use for unincorporated Pima County; administrative sections and appendices are also included. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 6-1 (Commissioner Maese voted NAY; Commissioners Becker, Tronsdal, and Truitt were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (All Districts)

Kate Hotten, Co-Executive Director, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, addressed the Board in support of the item. She stated that it was nice to hear staff call this Pima Prospers Day and thanked them for their efforts. She stated that over the past several years, they worked together on Chapter 3. She touched on the specific policy they worked on, A.5. under goal, 3.A.1, which was referenced in the letter provided to the Board. She stated that the policy helped ensure that when development occurred in areas of high-quality habitat, at least 70% of any open space that may be required was conserved nearby, rather than offset in other parts of the County, so, this helped to avoid losing entire areas of high-quality habitat to development and also helped to balance conservation alongside growth. She stated that it was a general target and goal, not a project-by-project goal, so it would be a conglomeration across all the work done on the conservation land system. She added that the County already did this to a higher standard of 73%, and they were glad to see the County thinking about this for the next ten years as well. She stated that they were encouraged to see several public comments in support of this policy, and they also supported the letter submitted by the Southern Arizona Home Builder's Association (SAHBA). She hoped the Board would consider and approve SAHBA's proposed amendment. She stated they supported the comments received from Tucson Mountains Association and the Dark Sky Southern Arizona Chapter.

Brendan Lyons, Government Affairs Director, SAHBA, addressed the Board and expressed appreciation for the collaborative and transparent process throughout the updated Pima Prospers. He stated that County staff went above and beyond to work with SAHBA, other stakeholders and the broader community. He stated that the final plan had struck a thoughtful balance and set clear goals to guide growth over the next decade. He stated that as outlined in the letter they submitted,

ECONorthwest's Housing Needs Assessment highlighted the significant housing challenges facing the region and the need for approximately 116,000 additional housing units over the next 20 years. He stated it was critical that policies reflected multiple priorities, protecting natural resources while advancing much needed housing. He stated that they proposed amending the language and goal of 3.A.1 under Policy A.2. which read, "To encourage the preservation of natural open space in those areas subject to the CLS..." Added language includes, "...and balance the need for new housing development, Pima County has a holistic, landscape-level target that at least 70% of all lands set aside as mitigation across the designations should occur on-site." He stated that this language was created in collaboration with the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection and reflected a shared commitment to conservation while acknowledging the region's housing needs. He stated that they looked forward to continuing to work together to ensure Pima Prospers supported a thriving and resilient future for the region.

Steve Dolan, Constituent, Tucson Mountains Association (TMA), addressed the Board in support of Pima Prospers 2025. He stated that TMA was founded in 1934 by homesteading families, and by approving Pima Prospers 2025, TMA could protect Tucson Mountains for a century. He recognized Supervisors Allen and Cano and their staff, and Pima County Development Services in helping TMA create compromise language in S-8, Tucson Mountains. He stated that S-8 was one of 14 special areas in Pima Prospers that recognized unique, physical and geographic locations. He stated that the two Supervisors were aware of Tucson Mountains' future concerns of compatible and harmonious development in the Tucson Mountains. He stated that Pima Prospers 2025 contained compromise language in S-8, Tucson Mountains that would continue the TMA goals to preserve the low-density residential and open space scenic character in the Tucson Mountains. He stated they also worked with Catalina Foothills Association, and they supported the revisions to Special Area, S-38, which was in District 1 and they strongly supported the Coalition for Sonoran Desert, for onsite conservation to mitigate localized area impacts to the Sonoran Desert plan and animal habitats and wildlife corridors. He stated that TMA would continue to work with the Board of Supervisors and with Development Services for the success of Pima Prospers 2025.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to close the public hearing and approve P23CA00001, the Comprehensive Plan Update, as amended by the recommendations made by Mr. Holden. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

59. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

P25CA00002, GOOKIN - W. DESERT OASIS TRAIL PLAN AMENDMENT

Jill Gookin requests a comprehensive plan amendment on approximately 4.2 acres (Parcel Code 211-17-005D) from the Low Intensity Rural (LIR) to the Medium Intensity Rural (MIR) land use designation. The site is located on the south side of W. Desert Oasis Trail, approximately 850 feet west of the intersection of W. Desert

Oasis Trail and N. Sandario Road, in Section 9, T14S, R11E, in the Avra Valley Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Becker and Truitt were absent) to recommend APPROVAL. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P25CA00002.

60. Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

P25CA00003, STEWART TITLE AND TRUST TR 1580 - W. IRVINGTON ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT

Stewart Title and Trust TR 1580, represented by Paradigm Land Design, L.L.C., requests a comprehensive plan amendment on approximately 12 acres (Parcel Code 212-50-012M) from the Low Intensity Urban-0.3 (LIU-0.3) to the Medium Low Intensity Urban (MLIU) land use designation. The site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of S. Camino de Oeste and W. Irvington Road, in Section 36, T14S, R12E, in the Southwest Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Becker and Truitt were absent) to recommend APPROVAL. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (District 3)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P25CA00003.

61. Hearing - Modification (Substantial Change) of Rezoning Condition

Co9-76-46, GIESKE - LIMBERLOST ROAD REZONING

Kristine and George Valdez Revoc TR request a modification (substantial change) of rezoning Condition No. 1 to allow an additional residential unit. Condition No. 1 requires recording a covenant to restrict the property to a maximum of one residential unit. The 1.68-acre parcel is zoned CR-1® (Single Residence - Restricted), located on the north side of E. Limberlost Road, approximately one-quarter mile east of N. Melpomene Way, addressed as 11301 E. Limberlost Road. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-0 (Commissioners Lane and Tronsdal were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

Completion of the following requirement within five years from the date the rezoning request is approved by the Board of Supervisors:

1. ~~Recording a covenant to restrict the property to a maximum of one residential unit;~~
2. ~~Completion of a satisfactory arrangement with the Pima County Department of Sanitation;~~
3. ~~Recording a covenant to hold Pima County harmless in the event of flooding;~~
4. ~~Dedication of necessary rights of way for roads, drainage, and sanitary facilities by separate instrument;~~

- ~~5. Submittal of a complete drainage study, if determined necessary by the County Highway Department; and,~~
- ~~6. Conformance with Pima County paving requirements as determined necessary by the County Highway Department.~~
1. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
2. Cultural Resources condition: A caution must be noted concerning human burials. In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
3. Adherence to the sketch plan as approved at public hearing.
4. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
5. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(l)."

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve Co9-76-46, subject to modified standard and special conditions.

62. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 22, P20RZ00006, Diamond - N. Finger Rock Place Rezoning (Catalina Foothills Zoning Plan). Owner: Donald and Joan Diamond. (District 1)

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

63. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 23, P24RZ00003, Hawks AZ Land, L.L.C. - W. Pecos Way Rezoning. Owner: Hawks AZ Land, L.L.C. (District 1)

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

64. **Hearing - Rezoning Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 43, P19RZ00008, Unisource Energy Corp. - N. La Cholla Boulevard Rezoning. Owner: Plaza de Luna, L.L.C. (District 3)

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

65. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning Resolution and Ordinance**

P24CR00001, 1722 Ina, L.L.C. - N. San Anna Drive Plan Amendment and Rezoning. Owner: 1722 Ina, L.L.C. (District 1)

If approved, pass and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 44 and ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 24

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

66. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Resolution and Ordinance**

P24SP00003, Black Angus Mine, L.L.C., et al. - E. Valencia Road Specific Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Owner: Black Angus Mine, L.L.C. & Rocking K Development. (District 4)

If approved, pass and adopt RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 45 and ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 25

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

ELECTIONS

67. **Hearing - Fee Schedule**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 26, of the Board of Supervisors, amending fees for election-related services provided by the Pima County Elections Department.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

68. West Coast Health Alliance

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 46, of the Board of Supervisors, calling on Governor Katie Hobbs to have Arizona join the West Coast Health Alliance. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that considering the tumultuousness and disruption at the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), where he worked for two years under the Obama Administration, he continued to be horrified at the rejection of facts. He stated that under the leadership of Robert F Kennedy Jr. he did not know what they were doing, but they were severely eroding people's faith in that institution. He stated that HHS was massive and it included the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and thousands were laid off and fired. He stated that what had been seen with the dismantling program and all the institutions within HHS that were there to help protect and help provide local public health departments like the County's with good information, not just on vaccines, but on many other public health issues. He stated that it made sense for the Board to follow in the footsteps of Washington, Hawaii, Oregon, and California to get reliable, data driven, truly scientific based, research inspired recommendations that they could all have faith in and trust. He stated that this resolution was asking the Governor to consider that and it did not require the legislature, it simply required the Governor to sign up.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that when he first saw this resolution and read his colleague's opinion in the newspaper, he thought this was going to deal with some kind of a collaboration between streets to explore ways to provide more affordable pharmaceuticals to the public, or to provide more services that they could access, and it was probably something that was similar to what they already had in Pima County. He stated that the more he looked at it, it was nothing more than an anti-administration tirade. He stated that these high and lofty words were heard when they were first elected during the COVID years, about following science. He stated that this was the same science that told them that the COVID shot was a one-time shot but that was not the case. He stated that nothing eroded faith more than finding all the absolute mischaracterizations of the COVID pandemic and all the activities that took place after them. He stated that everything from the shots to masking, public distancing, shutting down of businesses and restaurants, of putting kids in masks in school had eroded public faith. He stated that his colleague wanted to go back to that erosion and to that mischaracterization, if not a complete lie of following science. He reiterated this was nothing but a screed against the Trump administration and return to the lack of faith and confidence that was transpired by

the previous administration. He stated that he could not stress enough that the issue here was not to try to improve any kind of health issues but to throw water or any kind of a liquid onto the Trump administration as a way of getting back for what was currently happening since the last election. He stated that they could see through this, and this was really a very transparent resolution that should not be before this Board.

Supervisor Allen stated that she supported her colleague's effort and that one of the things she found very compelling, to understand a little bit more about what the Alliance was, a great quote from the governors of California, Oregon and Washington and it was in the Resolution. She read the following from the resolution, "Our states will provide evidence-based immunization guidance rooted in safety, efficacy and transparency. Residents receive credible information free from political interference." She stated that was what the Alliance was aimed to do and that was needed. She thanked Supervisor Heinz for bringing this to the Board and hoped the Governor was responsive.

Chair Scott stated that he also supported the Resolution and that it was interesting that the Resolution cited the firing by the HHS director. He inquired about that person.

Supervisor Heinz stated they were from the CDC.

Chair Scott stated it was Director Monarez and that he had watched her testimony in front of a Senate committee, and several of the Democratic senators who voted against her confirmation apologized to her because she handled the office with integrity. He stated that because she tried to handle it with integrity, tried to make informed database decisions, she was fired by the HHS secretary who had politicized this department to an extent that he did not think anyone could have possibly predicted. He stated that it was seen during the pandemic that when public health was politicized, it led to outcomes like they saw in this country where it led the world in infections and deaths. He stated that he would like to see a return to what they saw in the first Trump Administration with Operation Warp Speed. He stated that he thought Supervisor Heinz would acknowledge, as a member of the medical profession, that were it not for that Trump Administration initiative, the COVID-19 vaccines that saved millions of lives would not have been on the market as quickly as they were. He stated that the President got one of the first vaccines so there had been politicizing public health during the pandemic. He stated they had seen the result of politicizing public health by this firing of somebody who had done their job, and that the people of the West Coast were more likely to get informed public health opinions through the formation of this Alliance. He stated that he also hoped the Governor was responsive and joined her colleagues in the other four states.

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

69. **Higher Education and Human Rights**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 47, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to higher education and human rights; opposing targeted federal interference and disinvestment in higher education and defending the University of Arizona against the proposed "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education." (District 3)

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

Supervisor Allen stated that the Resolution was identical to one passed by the City of Tucson authored by Ward 5 Council Member Rocque Perez and co-sponsored by Ward 1 Council Member Lane Santa Cruz, thanking them for their leadership on this issue, along with the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (UofA) and the UofA Faculty Senate. She stated that there had been several opinion pieces in local news outlets that explained the UofA was a land grant university responsible for advancing education, research, and outreach to directly benefit the state's diverse communities, including tribal, rural and underserved populations. She stated that the UA's mission was contrary to the conditions called for in the compact, and that there was no guarantee that more would not be taken if the compact was to be signed. She hoped her colleagues joined her in support of the Resolution.

Supervisor Christy expressed his opposition to the item and stated that the whole issue was hyperbole. He listed examples of requirements suggested in the compact, such as banning the use of race or sex in hiring and admissions, freezing tuition for five years, capping international undergrad enrollment at 15%, applying a strict definition to gender for campus bathrooms, locker rooms and women's sports teams, et al. He stated that it seemed like the university was only promoting one side of the picture, and that Pima County and the UofA needed to find ways to rely less on federal funding for their programs and live within their own economic means.

Supervisor Cano stated that the compact was about control and that tying funding to political conformity was about government censorship. He stated that it threatened programs that benefited students who needed it the most, such as first generation and low-income, and widened inequality instead of closing it. He added that the compact was hypocritical, and that it erased progress towards fair access to higher education. He expressed his support for the Resolution.

Chair Scott stated that he supported the Resolution because he believed one could not make deals with people who did not have interest in academic freedom. He thanked UofA President and his team for their work to resolve the financial situation at the university and hoped they resisted the temptation to sign the compact.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

70. AST Revolution, L.L.C., to provide a lease for space at the Abrams Building, term date 10/14/25 to 7/13/26, contract amount \$724,885.68 revenue (CT2500000058)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

71. **Acceptance - Health**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the PimaREACH Coalition: Restoring Cultures of Health among Native American and Hispanic/Latinx communities in Pima County, AZ and amend grant language, \$680,038.00 (GA-HD-69949)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

72. **Conservation Lands and Resources Advisory Board**

Appointment of Erick Meza. Term expiration: 6/30/31. (District 3)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

73. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Library Advisory Board**

Correction to name: Appointment of ~~Kathryn Thomas~~ **Katherine Thomson**.
(District 1)

2. **Conservation Lands and Resources Advisory Board**
Correction to name: Appointment of ~~Jack Dash~~ **Philip Jackson Dash**. (Staff recommendation)
3. **Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission**
 - Appointment of Joyce Wong, to fill a vacancy created by Brandi Smith. Term expiration: 2/4/29. (Commission recommendation)
 - Appointment of Halle Aquino, to fill a vacancy created by MaryAnn Phininzy. Term expiration: 9/2/29. (Commission recommendation)

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

4. **Special Event**
 - Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Parish - Tucson, Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Parish, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, September 27, 2025.
 - Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D. Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, October 17 and 18, 2025.
 - Donna, Pedota, Oracle Schools Foundation, Rancho De Los Cerros, 13500 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, October 26, 2025.
 - Stephen Paul Kindred, Green Valley Recreation, Inc., GVR West Center Auditorium, 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, October 10, 14 and 23, 2025.
5. **Temporary Extension**
14103021, Joseph Carl Melhorn, American Legion Madera Post 131, 249 W. Esperanza Boulevard, Green Valley, October 18, 2025.
6. **Wine Fair/Wine Festival**
 - Morris Garfinkle, Beshert, L.L.C., d.b.a. Los Milics Vineyards, Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, November 22, 2025 from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
 - Dan C. Pierce, Bodega Pierce, Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, November 22, 2025 from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
 - Carlos de Leon, Soaring Wines, Historic Canoa Ranch, 5375 S. I-19 Frontage Road, Green Valley, November 22, 2025 from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

ELECTIONS

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Carla Andrews O'Hara-077-DEM, Jenise Porter-089-DEM, Kristine Hammar-219-DEM, Dorothy Allen-205-REP, William Allen-205-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Steven Hartman-006-DEM, Taylor Glaser-036-DEM, Adam Stevenson-042-DEM, Kai Chapman-Bilby-044-DEM, Lucas Felix-044-DEM, Valeria Calderon-051-DEM, Carlos Cardona-Morales-056-DEM, Eduardo Barron-059-DEM, Nola York-066-DEM, Fabiola Bedoya-072-DEM, Alan Belitsky-080-DEM, Branden Lau-091-DEM, Samantha Severson-116-DEM, Connie Sadler-Nelson-117-DEM, Casey Harkleroad-119-DEM, Sakinah Zaki-123-DEM, Susan James-141-DEM, Janet Labate-143-DEM, Eric Rosenwald-144-DEM, Steven Brown-166-DEM, Candace Jay-166-DEM, Christopher Cosico-172-DEM, Steven Linder-194-DEM, Belicia Lynch-195-DEM, Gregorio Mangaoang-198-DEM, Tom Coury, III-200-DEM, Adelina Grijalva-Gornez-203-DEM, Kim Walters-218-DEM, Rahel Hehn-243-DEM, Dacia Franklin-Hicks-262-DEM, Felicity Haro-011-REP, Theresa Smith-011-REP, Scott Albright-014-REP, Wendy Nash-Albright-014-REP, Margarita Corral-048-REP, Anita Wagner- 140-REP, Wayne Allen-141-REP, Ronald Cocco-141-REP, Barbara Stockwell-141-REP, Steven Azhar-194-REP, Margaret Fox-224-REP, Daniel Lanning-264-REP, Kristin Overn-057-LBT, Mikel Miller-072-LBT

RECORDER

8. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of August, 2025.

SUPERIOR COURT

9. **Fill the Gap**
Staff requests approval to submit a Fill-the-Gap Application to the Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Office of Courts for Fiscal Year 2026.
10. **Hearing Officer Appointment**
Appointment of Hearing Officer of the Pima County Superior Court:

T. Clayton Kamm
11. **Court Commissioner Appointments**
Appointments of Court Commissioner:

Superior Court and Juvenile Court Commissioner

Luke Brown, Soo Chang Conatser and Maricela Meza

TREASURER

12. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Jose Martinez \$44.00

13. **Request to Waive Interest**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$37.18.

14. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$132,370.11.

15. **Fill the Gap**

Staff requests approval of the annual certification, as directed by A.R.S. §41-2421, that the five percent set-aside "Fill-the-Gap" funds in the amount of \$1,146,810.75 be transferred to the Local Courts Assistance Fund for supplemental aid to Superior and Justice Courts for processing of criminal cases.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

16. Minutes: August 18, 2025
Warrants: September 2025

* * *

74. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

12. Joint Meetings with the Tucson City Council

Discussion/Direction/Action: Scheduling joint meetings with the Tucson City Council to address issues related to unsheltered homelessness and how our two governments can build on the collaborative efforts we have already undertaken. (District 1)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Let us go to the final item on our agenda, "Joint Meetings with the Tucson City Council." Since I put this on the agenda and since this did not come out of the retreat, let me begin with some introductory remarks, because what it says is, "to address issues related to unsheltered homelessness and how our two governments can build on the collaborative efforts we have already undertaken." This is not a new discussion. When I took over as the Chair, our former colleague from District 5, Supervisor Grijalva, told me that she and Mayor Romero had been having discussions about a joint meeting. Correct, Ms. Leshar? I wrote to all of you a few months ago. Responses from the three offices that responded are attached to this item, and as I heard from Mayor Romero, she and her colleagues discussed joint meetings recently. What we should discuss today are all possible topics connected with unsheltered homelessness, not just the ones that are attached to this item. I should tell you that both the Mayor and I feel that we need more than one joint meeting on this topic. Ultimately, when we are done talking about this item, we will direct the County Administrator and the Clerk of the Board to work with their counterparts in the City of Tucson in terms of getting dates and locations. As all of you know, I have continued the practice that was begun by Supervisor Bronson, continued by Supervisor Grijalva when they were Chairs, of meeting monthly with the Mayor. The topic of unsheltered homelessness and its effects have been addressed often, by the way, these meetings include not just myself, but Ms. Leshar and Ms. Perez, her Chief of Staff, Mr. Thomure, often members of his staff. So, it is the Mayor and Chair meetings, but the manager and administrator are present as well members of our staff. We have talked about unsheltered homelessness many many times. We have convened, the Mayor and I, have meetings of our justice system partners. I talked about that earlier during Ms. Darland's presentation. Those include representatives from the Sheriff's Department, from the police department, from the courts, from the County Attorney's Office, from the City

Attorney. And as the former City Attorney said, the focus of these meetings should be especially on what we are doing to deal with repeat offenders. We have got some working groups that are coming out of those meetings. We have talked about the County's transition center. As you know, the city provides support for staffing there. I requested, and we received recently, a memo from the County Administrator on how to make the transition center, which was approved by a unanimous vote of this Board, seven days a week. We have talked about that in these meetings. We have talked about the use of Opioid settlement funds and the work of the Regional Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee. We have made outreach to the Attorney General and the Department of Health Services to combine state Opioid settlement fund with local funds. We have talked about the work of Ms. Darland's department, we have talked about the work of County teams that go out to respond to encampments, County teams that include Detainee and Crisis Services, Community and Workforce Development, Regional Flood Control, the Sheriff's Departments. We have talked about data and the Loop. I mentioned earlier when I had Mr. Stuckey come up, that Ms. Leshner and I shared with the Mayor and the City Manager the data that we got from Mr. Stuckey, and that was passed on to TPD. We have talked about the work of the INVEST program and Medically Assisted Treatment in the jail. The reason I mention this is because we had our October meeting, the Mayor and I did, ironically, yesterday. The same day that she had announced the Safe City Initiative and I made it clear that we are happy to build on collaborative efforts already begun, and we are ready to discuss what are the actual statutory responsibilities of both of our local governments. We agreed that we should look for more opportunities to partner with the state. This Board knows that we have been and we are going to continue to be at the table with all of our local partners when it comes to dealing with unsheltered homelessness and its effects. Not just the City of Tucson, but also the City of South Tucson, the towns, the tribes, and the many private sector organizations. And I have said this to the media in response to the Safe City Initiative, and I know this to be true for all of us. The County has been and will continue to be a leader in this space, not an idle bystander. Those are discussions that, as the two biggest governments, we need to have, I am looking forward to having, and I just wanted to share those introductory comments about what has already been discussed between the Mayor and myself, oftentimes building on discussions that she started with Supervisor Grijalva. Those would lead to joint meetings of our two bodies. With those introductory comments, happy to hear from my colleagues. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You just made a point that I wanted to underline, and that is the collaboration between all of the jurisdictions in the County. Supervisor Heinz is our representative to RTA and at some point at one meeting, I heard in the media, that he made what I think is a very salient point, and that is, that in addition to regional transportation, there are many more areas that PAG could involve itself in or be part of that heretofore is pretty much been ignored. Supervisor Heinz rattled off several topics that deal with all of the jurisdictions, and what better venue and vessel than the Pima Association of Governments. I have no real desire for the Board just to meet with the City Council of Tucson, but I would support a PAG effort that would include all jurisdictions, all the towns and cities and nations within Pima County at the same table. That would be, I think, much more collaborative, much

more effective, much more inclusive. And they are experiencing, in their own way, the same types of problems that we are, maybe not to the extent that we are, but nonetheless they are affected by what we do and the County level and what the city does at its level. It makes perfect sense to bring all of those players into the fold of a meeting of PAG. I would give that my full support, but I am not interested in meeting with just the City Council.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. I appreciate your comments. I appreciated Supervisor Heinz's comments at one of our earlier meetings when I was our representative to PAG and the RTA board. I had discussions not just with my colleagues, but also with County staff about the fact that it is an association of governments, and it has been primarily focused not just in the last five years, but the last 20 plus years on transportation, often to the exclusion of other topics that it could take up.

SC: And to your point, Mr. Chair, how would the other jurisdictions within our own Pima County family feel if they were purposely excluded in something as potentially important as the subjects that you want to deal with? I think they have input, they have insight, they have experiences that they can contribute. To exclude them would be missing out on some great opportunities for some great ideas. I think it has to be a collaborative, County-wide, jurisdictional-wide effort of inclusion. I am starting to sound like a Democrat.

RS: I appreciate your comments. I do not disagree that there would be value in having discussions outside the area of transportation in the Pima Association of Governments. I think we could tap into not only the expertise of other jurisdictions, but as Ms. Leshner and Mr. DeBonis know, there are advisory committees with jurisdictional representatives that are part of PAG right now that deal with issues other than transportation, but their issues do not often come before the larger body. Having said that, because of the work of the Homeless Management Information System, because of the work that is designated to the City and the work that is designated to the County by the federal government in terms of funds that we receive, I do see value in meeting with our counterparts with Mayor and Council to talk about this particular issue, because our roles are the most significant to in the valley. But the larger point of having a PAG discussion about more issues than just homelessness. I absolutely agree with. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: And, actually, Mayor Romero is still the PAG Chair.

RS: So she is.

MH: I think we could do both of those things. I think that would be great. I would also say that homelessness is a great topic for this first joint meeting. I have had discussions with three, maybe four different members of the City Council if you include the Mayor there. There is an interest, bilaterally, in talking about other ways we can work together more efficient. I mean, merging of departments or, there are just a lot of other ways that we can talk about things between the City and the County that might make sense as well. So, for future meetings.

RS: Supervisor Heinz, thank you. And Ms. Leshar, I just did, I think, a pretty poor job of talking about the City's responsibilities and the County's responsibilities with regard to our federal role under HUD. Can you flesh that out better for me than what I did or, as Supervisor Cano said, phone a friend to one of the guys in the back?

JL: Chair Scott, you did a fine job.

RS: Alright, I did not think I did.

JL: Yeah, there is interconnectivity. There has been some conversation lately about the role of the Health Department related to the jail, that they do not have a role in that space. But there is some of the little specifics we can pick through. I think the greater issue is that we both have significant roles in this space, from both federal and state responsibilities, and appropriate to have a conversation about what we are doing to address this issue.

RS: Alright, thank you, Ms. Leshar. Other comments from other Board members, Supervisors Cano or Allen? Supervisor Allen?

JA: So my understanding that part of this agenda item is to also be putting potential agenda items together, correct?

RS: [nods in agreement]

JA: So, with that I have a couple of things that I think might be helpful for at least initial meetings. One would be figuring out where our values aligned with the city as it relates to joint work around issues of homelessness. And I say that there is some hesitation, in that we use homelessness as a broad category, when in fact we are dealing with populations that there is folks who are unhoused. There are folks with mental illness, there are folks with substance use disorder, and then there are also folks that are involved, and I think it is especially when we talk about the Loop, there is criminal activity, right? There is some overlaps, but there is also, those are distinctive things. So, I think getting some understanding about what the values are, as we want to work together to figure out what is that sweet spot in which it really makes sense for some strong, coordinated collaboration where we are aligned. Second, I think it would be helpful to just make sure that we are aligned in around the gaps and identifying what the gaps are. And again, thinking about gaps in those four areas, specifically. I think it would also be helpful, because one of the ways in which in, acknowledging I have very short tenure in this role, but one of the ways in which I see a lot of success between collaboration of the city and the County has been around housing, and the County has committed \$250 million for affordable housing over the next ten years. And thinking then about how the city and the County can work together and utilizing our investment, our commitment to affordable housing, to be able to deal with the need for supportive transitional housing. I am also interested in understanding, and this may not necessarily be something that has to be done in a meeting, but where we are at with the homeless protocol that was shared between the city and County. Where we are at with the

position that was formerly held by Mari, and if that position is still open, and if it is open, what we might be able to do if there is still interest and need for filling it to be able to have somebody whose job is literally to foster that connection between the city and the County on these strategies. I think discussion around the use of the annex would be helpful. I hear a lot of interest, a lot of ideas, different ideas, for how to use it. And then, sort of a larger conversation around, thinking through the housing funding, thinking through Opioid settlement, thinking through law enforcement resources. And what then are some of the short-term things we can do and need to do, the mid-range, but the long term. We have, in the long term, resources we hope we continue to have and how can we have a force multiplier over the long term on these issues and understanding that they are four different strategies. But what are some of the short term bites that we can take off and then what is some of the longer term.

RS: Supervisor Allen, thank you very much. I appreciate especially what you said about gaps, because if you go to the attachment to this item, which are the suggestions from my office, your office and Supervisor Cano's office, the first one under District 1 says "continuum of care issues." And that was what I was trying to say, Ms. Leshner, is the city has certain roles in the continuum of care. We have certain roles in the continuum of care. So does the wider TPCB organization and I wrote, "identification of service gaps within the local COC" and connected with that is a discussion as to bodies about one of the tasks from Ms. Darland's department that is listed under number three, leveraging existing programs to meet the needs of vulnerable and at-risk individuals and families. I feel like that addresses gaps as well. But then to your point about the position, the joint position that used to be occupied by Ms. Vasquez, I believe, Ms. Leshner, that you and Mr. Thomure continue to be in discussion with each other about that position.

JL: Chair Scott, I believe the position has been filled but let me get you some additional information.

RS: Okay, thank you very much. [Directed to Supervisor Allen] I appreciate you mentioning all those things because I think they will be added to what was listed here. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Very quickly. Another what-if scenario. And it is certainly a very improbable one, but what if our Board suggested in this meeting with the City of Tucson that the City of Tucson discontinue free bus fares? I mean, we are not going to get anywhere with that, and it is not going to help the issue. Secondly, today we talked about the Loop and the issues with the Loop and all of the dangers that are inherent currently at certain spots within the Loop. We have established the fact that the Loop goes through many jurisdictions, and some of it is in incorporated areas. So, they have a say in this manner too. So, I again think it would be most beneficial that we have a collaborative effect and include all of the jurisdictions. And with that, Mr. Chair, may I please call the question?

RS: You may, and if you do not mind, could I add your suggestion that Supervisor Heinz also bring up at the next PAG meeting, a discussion of how PAG can expand its scope beyond just transportation?

MH: Yeah, I am actually just texting Ortega.

RS: Alright.

AC: I want to make sure parliamentary procedures is being followed, and if I am even allowed to speak because I was not aware of there being a motion. So, can we go to the parliamentarian?

MM: Board members, there is no motion.

RS: Oh, I apologize, the discussion started without a motion. That is my fault, Supervisor Christy, not yours. Go ahead, Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thanks, Chair Scott. I want to thank my colleague from District 1 for bringing this item to the Board's agenda. Unsheltered homelessness remains one of the most visible and complex humanitarian challenges and public safety concerns facing our region. It is a shared responsibility that spans City, County and regional jurisdictions, and it requires coordination that matches the scale of the need. No single government agency or nonprofit can resolve this crisis alone. A cross-jurisdictional approach allows us to align our resources, our data and strategies to ensure that people experiencing homelessness are met with compassion, safety and long-term stability, no matter where they reside in the metro area. I believe that the agenda format that has been provided to the Board by the District 1 office, and of course, all of the additional input that we have received is headed in the right direction. But I will say that our city and County jurisdictions need to meet, Chair Scott, and we need to do that sooner rather than later. I am curious if there is a plan for a date right now, Chair Scott and Administrator Leshner, is there a timeframe that we are thinking of right now?

RS: No.

AC: Okay, so I am hearing no.

RS: Only because, sir, I wanted to have this discussion with all of you before. I think there are some dates that have been bandied about at our Mayor and Chair meetings. But I was clear with the Mayor that I wanted to talk with all of you before we committed to a date. And by the way, she has not asked her colleagues to commit to a date either.

AC: So, Chair Scott, thank you for that explanation, a lot of this is going to go to you as our Chair, working diplomatically with our Mayor to ensure this happens. I am not going to put this in the form of a motion today, but I am asking you as one Supervisor that you put this request to the Mayor so that she can talk to the members of her council. I am looking at both our Board calendar and the city's and I

believe that November 18th is a prudent day to meet. My proposal is from 8:00 – 12:00. We are meeting that day, City of Tucson is meeting that day. City of Tucson meets in the afternoons for their study sessions. We meet in the mornings. I am proposing we meet from 8:00 – 12:00, two hours each for each jurisdiction, and we delay our regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors meeting until the conclusion of that special meeting that is between the two entities. I am not certain if this is going to be amenable to members of this Board, or if it is going to be amenable to the members of the City Council, but I do not want to continue delaying this conversation. The idea of this has been discussed since I was appointed to this Board on April 15th. And as I have said before, I am extremely grateful, Chair Scott, for you engaging in these discussions, and I hope you will consider my request that we work with the city for November 18th as our date.

RS: Supervisor Cano, thank you, and as I said at the beginning of the discussion of this item, joint meetings between the city and the County were discussed between Supervisor Grijalva and Mayor Romero so this is a conversation of long standing. What the Mayor and I talked about yesterday is that the likely outcome of this item on our agenda would be that we, the Board, would direct the County Administrator and the Clerk to work with their counterparts in the city to come up with a date and location for a joint meeting, which all of us agreed needed to be sooner rather than later, to your point. So, what I will do is make a motion that we direct the County Administrator to have those conversations with her counterparts in the city about time and location, and I will amend that to include, and he is already doing it advise requests that Supervisor Heinz have a discussion at a PAG meeting with regard to expanding PAG scope of...

SC: ...Involvement...

RS: Thank you, I was looking for the right word, and I did not have it. Thank you. So that would be my motion.

AC: I will second that motion, and if I may, Chair Scott, just some additional comments. I do absolutely appreciate my colleague from District 4's suggestion that PAG look at this as well. I look forward to learning more from Supervisor Heinz. I really just ask that the County Administrator and the city manager not overthink this. I have proposed a date. I do want to be the host of this convening as a County. I believe the retreat format that we used in the courthouse is a beautiful space and can perhaps allow for that eye-to-eye conversation that is going to be critical in this discussion. And we have also got to pay attention to the engagement of the public in that room. And all of those details you will work on, right, but it is important for us to recognize that as a County representing over a million residents, that we are good to all of our partners and that we do this in a diplomatic, respectful way in our County courthouse to meet the needs of this issue head on. I am encouraged and grateful for your leadership on this Chair Scott.

RS: Supervisor Cano, thank you. And just so you know, when we talked about potential locations yesterday in the Mayor and Chair meeting, the County Administrator's Chief of Staff said that she had had conversations with the City Manager's Chief of

Staff about the Copper conference room, and they saw some problems with that setting. The Mayor suggested the big round table that they use for study sessions, and so that is another possible location that is being discussed. But I have a lot of faith in Ms. Leshner and Mr. Thomure in terms of following through on this motion, and I am grateful that while we were talking, Supervisor Heinz was already texting Mr. Ortega about what PAG might do.

AC: Why not the PAG room, Chair Scott? I mean, here we go.

RS: Hey, it is a good space for something like that. It absolutely would be. That is a good thought. Definitely. Go ahead, Supervisor?

MH: This is a little strange, but seating is important, so we should be alternating. We should not be sitting in tables across from each other because we will look like corporate legal teams ready to go to battle. So, I would prefer that it is like, Nikki Lee, me, whatever. I do not care who is sitting next to me.

RS: You will appreciate the fact, Supervisor Heinz, that yesterday during the Mayor and Chair meeting, Mayor Romero made the very same suggestion, that we intersperse Supervisors and Council members. And I know that should this happen, that Supervisor Christy is delighted with being in a room with eleven Democrats. All right, all in favor of the motion indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: Opposed.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Alright, item passes 4-1 with Supervisor Christy opposed.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

13. Creation of the Agenda Review Committee

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of the creation of a committee to review agendas for Board of Supervisors' meetings. (District 1)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
DJ: Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: So, let us take up the two that came out of the retreat first. The retreat that we had at the end of August, which Administrator/historian, Jan Leshar pointed out was the first Board retreat ever, so we are happy to have accomplished that. These were two items that came out of the retreat. Number 21 was the "Creation of the Agenda Review Committee." If my colleagues will go to the item and click on the attachment, this is what we got from the County Administrator and her team in response to what she heard from the Board during our retreat. It addresses the membership and purpose of an agenda committee and talks about all of the work that that committee would do its deadlines. But it also, and I believe, this is specific to an item that Supervisor Cano brought up during the retreat. It also addresses how we might handle the Consent Calendar moving forward if you look at the last item on the attachment. I know from serving as your Chair that Ms. Manriquez has already scheduled agenda and addendum review meetings, and it is very easy to add people to our appointments. I would certainly welcome Vice Chair Allen and a representative from the other three offices to serve on the agenda committee with us, and also with Ms. Leshar, or her designee, and Mr. Brown, or his designee. Just wondered if my colleagues had any comments about the Agenda Review Committee. I am sorry, Mr. Jurkowitz, were you trying to get my attention? Alright, my apologies. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Going back to Mr. Jurkowitz, do we have a legal opinion of how this affects open meeting laws?

RS: I appreciate that question.

DJ: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Because of limited scope of this committee, it would not constitute a public body as defined by A.R.S. §38-431, or an advisory committee

or subcommittee, as also defined by that same statute and therefore would not fall under the purview of the open meeting law.

SC: So, there would be no clear violation of any open meeting laws?

DJ: That is what it appears to be based on the scope of the committee.

SC: Would it require further investigation for a legal opinion? Because, you say, "as it appears."

DJ: So, in Section 4. it says, "The Committee shall review agendas and addendum agendas for all regular and special meetings, view the language of each agenda and addendum item to ensure the public will understand what is to be discussed and acted upon by the Board, ensure adequate supporting materials are included with agenda and addendum items." It is not making a recommendation concerning any decisions that this Board might make at an actual meeting. It is not recommending a course of conduct or what items to be considered by the Board.

SC: So, it is not designed to determine the content of the agenda?

DJ: Correct. Other than the language for how the public would be apprised of the nature of the agenda item.

SC: Okay, that seems kind of tortured. What problems are we trying to correct here? What are we looking to correct?

RS: The discussion that came up at the retreat, Supervisor Christy, was that there was value in having each Board office be able to have some say into the construction of the agenda. Currently, the agenda review team is myself as the Chair, Ms. Manriquez as the Clerk, the County Administrator, or her designee, and Mr. Brown, or his designee. And we do the same thing that is described in that review section. Those functions would now involve all of our offices, two Supervisors, the Chair and the Vice Chair, and then whoever the other three Supervisors designate from their offices, as members of the committee.

SC: Well, I keep getting the feeling by reading this that what you are really saying is that Supervisor Christy, we are not going to allow you to put anything on the agenda.

RS: Well, that would not be the case. And if you remember, Supervisor, you and I, along with Supervisor Bronson, joined to defeat a measure by the previous Chair, that would have set up more of a vetting process for items. This is not that.

SC: That is a good clarification because that is what I was sensing.

RS: I can understand why you were. Again, you and I were in the same camp, if you were, when that item came up during the previous term. This is not that. This is involving all Board offices in the construction of the agenda.

SC: Thank you.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I, actually, Chair Scott, and to my colleague in District 4, I think it is incredibly important that this be bipartisan, because I remember back when we were not even at the dais, we would have a Consent Calendar with 30-40 items on it and one or more of us would pull off 10, 12, 15 things. It kind of made the consent agenda look ridiculous because there was anything but consent. There was no consensus, having not to obligate your staff, Supervisor Christy or you, but I think having your office's input, will help just on that thing alone, help us to craft a more sensible, efficient, consent agenda so that we are not all sitting here at the dais trying to figure out what things can we bundle or not bundle. I just think that it makes a lot of sense, definitely not something that would restrict your ability or anyone's ability to put something on the agenda. Just to make these meetings go a little bit more efficiently and ensure that every office and every Supervisor can opine and vote the way they want to. I think it is a good idea.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to offer my appreciation to you and to our Administrator and our Clerk for introducing this item. I do believe that this reform is going to be an important one that will allow us to ensure that these meetings are making most use of our time. I look forward to our office and my staff working with the District 4 team to alleviate any concerns about what I believe is now a discredited assumption that, you know, we want you at the table, Supervisor Christy, you are one of five. I wish you would have joined our Board retreat to engage in this discussion because we, of course, had a robust conversation about some of the items that are before the Board right now. My only comment on this, and I appreciate on the Consent Calendar item, it is pretty crystal clear that we are following what is the practice of the legislature, controlled by the Republican Party by the way, to be able to streamline this process by requesting a consent item be pulled from consent in advance. The language here does not give me assurance that we are, in the legislature we had a time certain the week prior to be able to request that that item be pulled, and that was used by members of both parties to be able to continue conversation. I think this just says that they are allowed to do it, and that is okay. Because this is new, let us experiment with it, let us see how it works. I have greater questions or more questions, I should say, of the County Administrator working with our Chair and with the Clerk to look closely at what should be on consent and what should not. There are going to be things that you just know is going to require robust discussion, and if it is not, place it in there. And now, under this policy, any one of us in advance or at the meeting, as this current practice, are able to pull that item. So once again, just to summarize, I would have liked a date, like the Friday before, but I do not want this to be perceived as anything other than trying to streamline our meetings.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just, of course, all these what ifs come to mind. Let us say, for example, that the agenda meeting was for such and such a date at such and such a time, and for whatever reason, I cannot attend. But I have submitted something that I would like on the agenda and I am not there. Am I going to be the recipient of the feeling that well Supervisor Christy's not here, so we will not even bother to put his item on the agenda.

RS: Well, a couple of things. First of all, you would not be on the agenda committee. Whoever you designate from your staff would be. The only two Supervisors who are on the agenda committee are the Chair and the Vice Chair. In this case that would be myself and Supervisor Allen. You, Supervisor Cano, and Supervisor Heinz would each appoint somebody from your office to serve on the agenda committee.

SC: So, again, my question.

RS: That would not factor into the decision. There has not been one instance since we rejected that item that I mentioned previously, there has not been one instance where a Supervisor's item was not added to an agenda, unless, because I remember there was an issue with regard to an item that Supervisor Heinz wanted to bring forth, unless there was an issue that was raised of a legal nature by the County Attorney. And this was before Supervisor Cano and Supervisor Allen were on the Board, but we talked about that in exec. There has never been a time that that would happen, and it would not happen in this instance either. I really appreciate that Mr. Jurkowitz spoke to the items in number 4, because that is exactly what the committee will do. It is exactly what the committee will do. And I also appreciate how consent has been crafted through most of our previous term, and definitely this term. I cannot remember the last time somebody asked to pull an item from the consent agenda. I think there has been really very a great amount of care put forth by both the administration and the Clerk's office in terms of what goes on consent and what does not.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Let me ask this question in a different way so that we have clarity about what we are doing here. Will the agenda committee be able to block an individual Supervisor's desire to put an item on the agenda?

RS: No, sir.

AC: To my colleague from District 4, is that pretty crystal clear to you?

SC: Then why are we doing this? Because you can do that now.

RS: Again, the discussion at the retreat was to have each Board office be involved in construction of the agenda, instead of it just being the purview of whoever is the Chair.

SC: This gives the impression that things are being constructed behind closed doors. Where is the transparency element in this and the safeguarding of transparency?

RS: I would imagine what we would be spending most of our time talking about is this third bullet, "ensuring adequate supporting materials are included with agenda and addendum items." The language of each agenda and addendum item is constructed based on the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report (BOSAIR) and the work of the Clerk's office. And then what I will often hear Ms. Manriquez say in our current agenda meetings is she will ask the representative from the County Attorney's office, are you okay with this language? Are you okay with this language in terms of it being okay by form? What I think we would probably spend most of our time talking about is, are there adequate supporting materials included with agenda and addendum items. And I think the person who would have the greatest input into that would be either the Supervisor or the representative of the Supervisor who put that agenda or addendum item on. Any other questions or comments? Oh, I am sorry, Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Right, thank you. So, then this committee would not, of course, be blocking any one of us or our ability to put anything on the agenda, but might come back to say hey, could we tweak the language that the public will be seeing about this item? Because we think this would make it clearer to them that this is what is going to be discussed. That might be a recommendation.

RS: It could well be. Although, like I have said, most of the comments about language that I have seen in agenda committees come from the County Attorney with regard to whether it is appropriate to form.

MH: Okay. And in the case that a change was suggested or recommended, that would go to the Supervisor as well?

RS: Oh, unquestionably. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I also have a question. So if I cannot make the meeting, is it implied, because it is not stated here, that I can have a representative? That is one question. And then if I cannot make it, can another Supervisor then swap out with their staff so that there is still two Supervisors?

RS: That I do not think you can do. Based on how this is written, there have been times, it has been rare, that I have not been able to take part in an agenda review or an addendum review. If I feel like it is important that Board input is given, I will either ask that one of my staff members be there, or that Ms. Manriquez follow up with me after the meeting. So my opinion would be, were you in that position, that you could send somebody from your staff. But another Supervisor? No, I do not think we could do that because then I would have to pick between these three guys. I would make two of them mad.

AC: I nominate my colleague from District 4.

DJ: Chair Scott?

RS: Mr. Jurkowitz.

DJ: To address that concern, the language could be amended to say, "The committee shall be comprised of the Chair of the Board, Vice Chair of the Board, and one staff member of any of the remaining Supervisors, or Supervisors who are not attending the meeting."

RS: Okay, so instead of it saying, "who are not the Chair, Vice Chair of the Board," it could say "who are not attending the meeting?"

DJ: Sure.

RS: Okay.

DJ: Then a staff member would be able to attend.

RS: Alright.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Please, Supervisor Cano?

AC: I would just say this is going to be a beta test, and the Board has the ability to figure out if this worked or not in a year's time. That input is going to be especially important from our Clerk, and so I ask for our Clerk to just ensure that you are communicating with our offices as well. As this process gets going, we want to ensure that it works for your incredible staff as well. We recognize that this is a new chapter, but more than anything, it is going to streamline our ability to have more effective meetings. We are going to come prepared. I am not going to mention the item today, that I have, in particular, an issue with, that I think could have been addressed in a way, had an agenda review committee been processed, and that was for a simple proclamation. I think instead of offering an individual certificate of recognition, we should offer a full proclamation at our Board meetings, right, and that is something that could, with additional eyes, with planning in advance, we can work out a lot of those kinks. I feel like this is a new step and one that I am going to be paying close attention to, and it is up to the individual offices to participate in this process. I highly encourage all five Supervisorial districts to engage in this so that we can create good opportunities for us to have streamlined meetings.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments from Board members?

JL: [inaudible] so that we could add another Supervisor?

DJ: [inaudible]

RS: So what I believe you are suggesting is, instead of it saying, "who are not the Chair," it should say, "one staff representative of each of the Supervisors who are not able to attend the meeting." Is that what you are saying?

JL: [inaudible]

RS: Okay.

JL: [inaudible] Supervisor could attend if the Chair [inaudible]

DJ: So, if the Chair was not present, that would be [inaudible]

RS: Okay.

DJ: If the Vice Chair was not present, that [inaudible] one of the Vice Chair's representatives.

RS: Okay.

MH: But I could not go?

RS: No.

DJ: Not as it is currently [inaudible].

RS: Okay. Does that make sense Ms. Manriquez?

MM: Chair Scott, I think it should be amended to say, "The committee shall be comprised of the Chair of the Board or one of his staff members, if he is not able to attend." Vice Chair of the Board, and we use that same language again. I think that is clearer...

RS: Okay.

MM: And makes it sound, so everyone knows it is the Chair and the Vice Chair that can attend of the Board. It is representatives of the other three districts.

RS: Got it.

MM: And if the Chair and Vice Chair cannot attend, then one of their staff member may attend in their place. It is not required, but they may attend in their place.

RS: Okay.

MM: Does that make sense?

RS: I am fine with that. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Sorry, one more pickle here.

RS: You are fine.

MH: Does that not mean that technically you could have an agenda meeting with no Supervisors. The way you are just writing what I just heard?

RS: It is strikingly unlikely. Technically, sure.

MH: Should we not do that?

RS: I think that the likelihood... I will tell you, these meetings are all on my calendar already.

MH: Oh, no, I am sure that it will not.

RS: It is strikingly unlikely. It could happen, but it is strikingly unlikely.

AC: To that point, there are instances at the chamber across where no electeds are present in these calls.

RS: Really?

AC: Where no electeds sometimes are able to make it, so their designated representatives participate.

RS: So what you are saying is, based on your experience working in the city, Supervisor Cano, is that sometimes their agenda committee does not include any of the members of the council?

MH: Or Mayor?

RS: Or Mayor?

AC: Mayor is usually present, but sometimes Mayor has got to do Mayor duties. And so I feel like what is most important, the point I am trying to make is, everybody has a representative, and if you cannot make it, you cannot make it. But I know who will be there, our Clerk, and this is that process that makes it ensure that we are doing the public's business in the right way.

RS: I got you.

MH: I would just suggest that one of the two Supervisors who are either the Chair or Vice Chair must be present, and then otherwise I do not really care. There needs to be one elected official present at this thing.

RS: Supervisor Allen and I will do our best.

MH: Okay, thank you.

RS: To meet that commitment. Alright, okay. Do you need a motion to change it to that language, Ms. Manriquez?

MM: [inaudible]

RS: Okay, I move that we approved this item as amended.

MH: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Further discussion? All those in favor indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: Opposed.

RS: Item passes with Supervisor Christy opposed.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

15. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator
JS: John Stuckey, Facility Safety and Security Manager

RS: Let us go first to Item Number 23, "Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety." Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, and as always with you today is Jen Darland, our Director of the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions, to provide an update.

RS: Thank you.

JL: Thank you.

JD: Thank you. Chair Scott, Members of the Board, County Administrator Leshar. Just while they pull up the slide deck, just again, remind the Board that these updates are always grounded in the five priorities that established the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions back in December of 2023. And just real briefly, those are. Just wait for the slide deck to come up. Thank you. Next slide please. Thank you so much. So just briefly, of the five priorities, the first is to inventory all County and partner programming. The second is to describe and illustrate how services are being accessed and delivered. Third, priority to develop County and public facing communications. The fourth, to develop a strategic and continuous improvement plan with the goal of ensuring that County programming is responsive, sustainable and equitably distributed. Finally, the fifth, on developing a means of tracking the efficacy of County assistance programs and work with departments and partner agencies and governments to develop attainable measure of success. Today's update is going to be focused on Priority No. 2, specifically how service strategies are partnering with law enforcement efforts to address community safety. Next slide please. So just really briefly and broadly, in October of 2024, I was able to present to the Board on essentially what is a representation of both a status and a behavioral response model. These are not necessarily wedded in stone, but these are at least illustrative of the two different approaches to addressing both status, meaning people who are experiencing homelessness, and the various types

of actions and associated service providers that would be utilized in responding to individuals in unsheltered and sheltered situations. And then the separate, on the right-hand side, would be that most associated with a law enforcement engagement for criminal behaviors in public spaces, and how that would be facilitated with those partners being locally a law enforcement entity, also with our Crisis Response Center and other systems aligned programs and services. The model, as you can imagine, is also somewhat illustrative of what can be a disconnected strategy, meaning that you have two independent approaches to addressing situations, and they are often utilized in a disconnected manner. Tucson Police Chief Chad Kasmar is known for saying things such as “The right work, in the right hands,” and this model would represent two hands that are absolutely disembodied from a shared body of a strategic approach to working together and in partnership. When you have siloed approaches, you create, again, silos. That reinforces the inability to even operate with situational awareness. It creates data blindness, meaning we do not know what sort of programs and resources are available for individuals and unsheltered settings, so we run the risk of delaying their access to timely care, and/or we run the risk of delaying access to housing because we have not properly put them in connection with the very programs that will help to quash a warrant, for example. People with active warrants are often denied access to housing. It stands as a barrier also to employment. So when these responses can work together, that creates an opportunity to collaborate for effective coordination of and responses. Next slide please. So again briefly, when these two programs can work together, and many times we are finding in the situations today here locally, we find that there are overlapping areas of effort between our outreach programs as well as our law enforcement efforts as well. And so when we can work in partnership with one another, we create that opportunity. When you have the ability to work in close proximity with a service provider, with a law enforcement agent, you have the opportunity to navigate an individual to resources such as shelter, treatment, access to a behavioral health provider. It works much more timely to connect people to resources and care. And again, one thing I would also point out, in August of this year, I presented to the Board on strategies aligned with increasing shelter utilization, and part of that presentation also included a high level overview of a review and evaluation of other communities across the country and emerging trends around how communities are responding to the local challenges associated with chronic homelessness. Again, knowing that chronic homelessness is not necessarily caused by things like substance use or mental health challenges alone, but certainly homelessness can exacerbate those challenges as well. And so it is really becoming more of a trend for local communities to really lean into a multi-jurisdictional and a multi-disciplinary approach that builds a relationship with the individuals and ensures a more thoughtful and connection to care. Again, leveraging partnerships with first responders means that we can also lead to a more immediate resolution to the crisis that might be contributing to homelessness and also de-escalate any of the behaviors that are causing or exacerbating any challenges associated with public safety. Next slide please. So, this slide really represents what is becoming an evolving strategy at work here locally. This is a multi-jurisdictional strategy between law enforcement, local courts, city and County resources, as well as multiple networks of care, including local shelter providers, treatment providers, and shelter and housing providers as well. It is operated with a priority around

community safety through the facilitation of engagement and enforcement in areas where data would suggest criminal behaviors are interrupting the ability for individuals to be connected with resources. The engagement strategy here is just, again, it is a visual to show how things can be connected to one another. So, when law enforcement is taking the lead, if they encounter someone and it is a felony issue, it is a transport straight to jail. However, when law enforcement encounters an individual for whom a misdemeanor is more appropriate, it is an expedited facilitation of an adjudicated process with local community courts to ensure that the individual is properly processed and also connected to other available resources, including shelter or any other services that might be part of a condition of release at the time of the of their hearing being adjudicated. When it is not a misdemeanor nor a felony, but just someone who happens to be in the area and encountered through this effort, they are navigated over to outreach services and provided the opportunity to connect with treatment, medical care, shelter providers, all voluntary but it is still equally made available to those individuals as well. Next slide please. So, key within this strategy, is sometimes it will lead with a law enforcement effort. When we know that there are areas where there are certain data that suggest that it is a high level of criminal activities or criminal behaviors, in other instances, it may be led with outreach engagement in advance to ensure that we are making connections to resources and care. Again, it is very important to make sure that in these spaces where the dynamics can change and evolve, that our strategy be as nimble and have as much dexterity to provide our ability to provide prompt and resources and support, and for folks in these settings and also to restore community safety. Always want to encourage these processes that we are providing actual warm handoffs between care. So, when an individual is encountered by law enforcement, they receive a citation that is a misdemeanor. They are navigated by Justice Navigators over to the court proceeding. The Justice Navigator explains to them the process is about to take place, explains what a zone restriction, if that happens to be the order from the judge, also explains any of the other conditions of release, including making sure that they understand when their future court date may be, and then provides a handoff to those other programs in the same strategy that will again ensure that they are being connected to care and resources and reduce the risk that they are going to recidivate back into a justice involved stream. And again, this is partnered with both County and city courts and County and city programs, as well as outreach staff and land managing departments for both the County and the city. So that means for Pima County, that is working with our Parks and Rec department, that is working with our Regional Flood Control District, and as well as working with the City of Tucson's Department of Transportation and Mobility and their Parks and Environmental Services teams as well. It is a multi-jurisdictional, multi-resource effort and strategy. Next slide please. So, in specifics, the last three engagements that utilize this sort of strategic approach. One occurred May 22nd of this year, this along the Santa Cruz. The second was August 12th along the Pantano, on the east side of town. And the September 4th deployment was going back to the Grant and I-10 location to encourage connections with resources. The lead in these strategies or in these deployments has been the Tucson Police Department, because most of these assets have been, if not all of these assets have been in the City of Tucson's jurisdictional boundary. Again, the partner agencies have been the City of Tucson through their city courts, through

their outreach agencies, their housing and community development teams, as well as their park and environmental services. On the Pima County side, it has been our justice programs as well. The Transition Center has been a huge participant in both the development of the strategy and then the operational exercise in the field. Pima County Health Department has also participated to provide some medical on-site wound care and any other sort of assessment, testing, etcetera. The things that they are already statutorily empowered to do. And then finally, with our land managing and outreach staff as well, community service providers look like your Primavera. We have had Gospel Rescue Mission involved in this strategy as well. Really beginning to see an emerging new trend in that partnership and a leaning in to connecting individuals with the programming that they offer at the Center of Hope. And again, the County programs are listed right there below that I articulated already. Next slide please. So, in the evolution of all things, there are opportunities abound with respect to strengthening certain approaches to make this a more strategic and more impactful operation. Part of that is about strategic placement with the Justice Navigators and coordination with the courts, not just the city courts but including the coordination with the County courts to ensure that when it is appropriate to be adjudicated through a County lens, then we have the resources there to also facilitate that proceeding as well. Also, just what you would imagine, we are out in encampment settings, places not meant for human habitation, so it is not as though transportation is easily going to be accessible for individuals, or their possessions, or their pets. So, working out some of the kinks with respect to transportation and the logistics of arranging providers to be able to take folks to where it is that the individuals elect to go when it is not a straight arrest and transport to jail. And again, with the peer and outreach before and after efforts, this is really about after there is a deployment, what can we do after the event to ensure that we can start to measure the overall impact? And as previously stated, when it is not the criminal behavior that is driving the activity, it is important that we lead with outreach. Humanitarian services are always going to be leading the charge when it is not a law enforcement related matter, but when it is law enforcement, it is absolutely appropriate for law enforcement to be taking that lead. And once the scene is secure, then we can have our outreach service providers, and our community partners as well, come in to address some of the non-felony related matters. It is also identifying some shared metrics and approaches to case management, meaning that when we have individuals who voluntarily accept services, how do we come back to the table after the event and determine whether or not, if they accepted a transport to treatment, did they indeed stay for treatment? How long did they stay for treatment? When they left, where did they go? Where are they now? So that we can ensure that they are staying on that path or where we are encountering them in other places? Again, that may be in violation of a zone restriction, but these strategies have to be informed and be measurable to know whether or not we are succeeding in our approach. Next slide please. This is a little bit of a pivot. I just wanted to make sure to go back to, and I apologize for not having a pivot slide here, but just wanted to bring to the Board's attention as I close my presentation and open it up for questions from the Board Members, just a reminder that we have an upstream strategy on ways to really interrupt homelessness and address our affordable housing needs. EcoNorthwest and Pima County staff will be holding a roadshow beginning this Friday at community events

across the County, with the objective of sharing the findings from the housing study and gathering inputs from your constituents on housing goals and the priorities that will inform the Regional Housing strategy and ten-year funding plan. These are really incredible events that ECONorthwest and their team have put together. It is going to be a hands on, interactive opportunity to hear back from community members about the types of strategies that mean the most to them, to their neighbors, and then the opportunity for them to also tell us and share with us what additional approaches they would also like to be considered before the finalization of that strategy and funding plan that will be forthcoming to the Board before the end of the calendar year. Apologies for the abrupt pivot, but I am happy to pause here and take any questions from the Board.

RS: Questions or comments from Board members, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Director Darland, I want to say first, with deep gratitude, I am just so grateful for you and all of the work that you have been leading on for many years on this issue. There is a widespread belief right now that we are going to need to be innovative in our approach moving forward and working with our cross-jurisdictional partners to ensure that we are tackling homelessness and public safety head on. I am curious, and I am not sure if it is going to be answered by the County Administrator, by Mr. DeBonis, or by Director Darland, but can you please provide the Board with a quick summary of the recent Loop activity that has been on headlines everywhere across the region? We continue to be contacted about not only the conditions of the Loop, which are trash ridden, for lack of a better term. I understand why we are in those predicaments. I think I am just curious a little bit more about the County Administration's efforts to clean up the Loop and what it would take for this Board to make mid-year adjustments to our current budget, or work with the public at our hearings that we are going to be having in the next few weeks to hear how they want to approach this. I recognize that it is not just an us responsibility, Chair Scott, it is everyone, but the Loop is our asset so I want to start there.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. I think I will turn it over to staff for a little bit of a deeper dive into some of this. I think one thing that is important for us to remember, and I am going to get the number wrong, but almost 140 miles of the Loop is an extraordinary asset throughout Pima County. And we have what I would describe as a couple of points within the Loop that need additional work. I think we do a lot to make sure that we are keeping the Loop open and accessible to all the folks who want to continue to use the Loop for a variety of recreational purposes. There are very specific locations that have been problematic. And as we have reported to the Board, I think the last numbers were about three quarters of \$1 million in expenditures to Vet-Sec to assist with the patrol in those very specific areas. I know the recent, another operation that occurred, led by Tucson police, that was supported by the County in whatever way we could, did occur on the Loop, at I believe the Stone/Wetmore area. I do not know who would like to speak to these issues. Maybe Jen start and everybody jump in?

JD: Thank you, County Administrator, Chair Scott. Supervisor Cano, on October 7th, Tucson police did conduct an operation on the Loop along Stone and Wetmore, and from that stretch going east. The engagement began at 6:00 in the morning, and they encountered over 50 individuals. They had several felonies, they actually...

SC: [Inaudible] Five O?

JD: I am sorry, yes, over 50, five zero individuals. They had several felonies. They did recover two firearms, one from an individual who was a prohibited possessor. So, it was an effort that got underway and they did encounter a number of individuals. I want to be thoughtful here to that I am not authorized to speak on their behalf, but having watched and observed the effort on the 7th, it was a full deployment of TPD resources for the opportunity to interrupt some of the criminal behaviors that have been occurring in and around that asset. And so it was successful in the sense that it did interrupt individuals who were, I do not want to say interrupted, but it did create an opportunity to engage with those individuals. There were a couple of handful of individuals who were not either arrested. They were just individuals who were navigated to treatment because that was a more appropriate strategy, but TPD in their effort did lead that, and we were happy to support in terms of providing some land management support. So following their deployment both on the Loop itself and in the channel of the Rillito, we had our land managing department, the Regional Flood Control District made available, the contractor who pushed behind them to do the cleaning and the restoration of that space after their effort.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and Director Darland. Unfortunately, I have not received information from the City of Tucson about a contract that I am very curious about, and I am curious to hear your input, Director Darland. With Old Pueblo Community Services (OPCS), where the city is contracting with OPCS to provide the unsheltered with an opportunity to gain some compensation and clean up targeted sites in Tucson. Are you aware of this model? Have you seen its success? Are there, and really, as it relates to the Loop with it being within the County's jurisdiction, what recommendations have you and the County Administrator talked about for cleanup of the Loop, and what kind of resources it is going to take for us to restore our County?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. I am familiar with the homeless work program that OPCS operates. They work in partnership with many of the low barrier and high demand shelter settings. They provide limited work, limited because they only have so much space and resources to provide the supervisory supports. So, I am familiar with the program. I know that it is a useful alternative, I think, for some of these areas where we have ongoing need for trash cleanup, not necessarily associated with homeless encampments. I cannot speak to the specifics of the city's agreement with Old Pueblo, but I am aware of the program. In terms of conversations with the County Administrator and also Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Regional Flood Control District has been the lead on most of our efforts to address encampments, while we are only maybe 11% on average of the overall impact, meaning about 11% of the individuals who are reported to be experiencing homelessness will fall in the unincorporated space and on assets that are under our

maintenance authority. Of that, about 60% is going to fall within the water channels under their administrative review. And so they have been incredibly gracious and key in looking at our strategies to improve upon these processes. And one of them is the procurement of a special contractor to work with a more expedient process to address cleaning up areas in the water channels in which they are responsible. Right now, it is a bit of an arduous process where it is a bid process that takes a couple of weeks in order to get a contractor on site to do some of the larger efforts. This would provide the district with a more responsive arm to be on site to address some of the smaller areas. Most of the debris is going to fall in the channel, irrespective of activities, especially with weather that we have seen this week, you are going to get downstream litter that is going to start to collect in these channels anyway. It gets more complicated when some of that debris is associated with encampments that are further upstream. They are working right now to ensure that they have a more responsive arm of their operations. And I believe that they will be having a contractor identified. I do not want to get ahead of my skis, Mr. DeBonis, but I believe they will be having a contract come before the Board shortly.

AC: Thank you. I recognize that this issue is more than the Loop, Chair Scott. So this will be in my last question, and I want to just direct it toward Administrator Leshner. Administrator Leshner, do you have an outline of recommendations that you might be able to share with us in the coming weeks about how we can ensure that Loop safety and cleanup is a part of the discussion moving forward? I continue to hear from District 5 residents on each of the intersections of our bridges and washes with concerns about the need for us to come up with a plan. I recognize that you have additional information related to security and Vet-Sec with the Board, but I think more specifically, this Board now has to decide what deployment of assets we would like to make moving forward. Is that already in motion, Administrator Leshner? And I, of course, want to thank our incredible Flood Control team, who I know has been working day to day on this issue, and I recognize the realities that they are confronted with. They are maxed out with resources and a limited budget. I look forward to our tour of the Loop in the coming weeks with the District 5 team.

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, yes. Staff talks regularly about many things related to the Loop and how we make sure that it is both safe and clean. Secure for everyone. But what we are happy to do is provide a report back to the Board of everything that has been going on, what we recommend currently. And then if there were any enhancements to that, that we might recommend for consideration by the Board, we will certainly bring that forward.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, Administrator Leshner. The only thing I, as we prioritize what sites, given that it is such a huge asset looping around the County, I am very curious about where the highest concentration of trash debris is. I have heard that you can do an aerial tour in a helicopter and see it all. I just kind of feel like as part of the report that you send back to the Board, I would just like to see a prioritization of which sites are going to need more investment. I think, Chair Scott, I look forward to the Board's continued discussion on this. And I just want to, of course, applaud the County's role that is instrumental to this conversation as a jurisdiction that represents the entire region. I know that we are going to take this seriously, and I

think related to housing investments, I firmly believe that we are headed toward a direction where the County is about to award its largest investment in housing dollars in just two months, \$8.5 million that this Board allocated and approved. And so I am saying that in the same breath as talking about cleanup, because I think the underlying issues of poverty and of housing supply. We are doing our diligent work as a region to support that work and I think it is worth mentioning.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I concur with Supervisor Cano's concern about the cleanup and the physical condition of the wash. It is our biggest assets. It has been touted as a driver of economic development as well as tourism. I have had numerous complaints from constituents that have said, we moved close to the Loop, we moved into Pima County so we could enjoy the Loop and now it is trashed. We are seeing the degradation of one of our biggest elements and attractions that we have. Director Darland, this most recent deployment of TPD on the Loop that you refer to, would you consider that a success?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, bearing in mind that I am not a law enforcement expert. I would state that operationally, based off of what I observed, I would state that it was a success. With the one stipulation that there is a number of adjudicated processes on the back end that still remain to be seen. But on the front end, it appeared to be successful, yes.

SC: My point of asking you that is we see in various situations and in various venues in Pima County, a collaboration of law enforcement agencies. A task force. They have one for SWAT teams. They have one to investigate officer shootings. They have internal investigations that are made up and comprised of representatives from various law enforcement agencies throughout the region. Would it not be an idea to explore the ability or the availability of creating a Loop Task Force that could encompass various law enforcement agencies throughout the region? Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita, Sheriff's Department, TPD. Some kind of a joint task force to deploy assets together along the Loop. That might create that presence that signified some sort of a success with the last one with just TPD. Imagine if we had all the cooperation and collaboration of all of the assets of law enforcement. That is just an idea. I noticed in your presentation you used the term, strategy, quite a bit. And, you know, obviously we have to have some sort of strategy. In your interview on October 8th with Channel 9, you made some statements, and I would like to have you describe them in the context that they were given. You stated that, "Patrols would vacate the groups." And I am quoting from the transcript that, "Patrols would vacate the groups, and they would just move to another spot along the Loop and they felt like they just kept chasing the problem." That is problematic, obviously. If they are going to do that kind of activity at one point and law enforcement comes in, they are just going to move down. Maybe that deployment of a SWAT team or, not a SWAT team but a joint task force might address that issue. You also, and I think this is a little more troubling because part of the strategy that you talk to is a pretty comprehensive outline of all of the agencies and services and facilities that are offered in your process to address the issues of drug addiction,

homelessness, and mental health issues. And again, going back to your interview, you added that, "not a single person in the ten months that these patrols..." these patrols I am sure are the contracted ones we had with the agency, "...not a single person in the ten months of these patrols accepted help from their offices to navigate the resources available." This is kind of troubling because you have an extensive and comprehensive list of issues that you could direct these people, but according to your interview here, you state that not a single person in the ten months accepted help. Is this the proper context?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. The interview in question is the one where we were talking about the ten-month Loop patrol effort using Vet-Sec, and at the time, the strategy I presented earlier was not part of the equation. One of the pieces I was remiss to also point out during my interview was that Vet-Sec guards were there to remind and enforce around Park Rules at time of closure. When the sun goes down, the Loop is closed, and there are certain parts that are under the County's administrative responsibilities that also closed at specific hours. So, they would go and close gates and they would lock up restrooms. And in their attempts, when they would encounter individuals who they assumed might be experiencing homelessness, they would offer a resource pamphlet, or in some cases, attempt to find if they could get a crisis response team. We had one individual who, pretty consistently, would lock herself in the restrooms at time of closure, and unfortunately, it would require a law enforcement response working specifically with the Sheriff's Department in that case. In that situation, we do not have very many resources that are available after hours. That is a challenge, which is one of the reasons why trying to connect with individuals during the daytime when the Loop is open, working in partnership with the district. And I would be remiss if I did not also point out the valiant efforts also by County Parks and Rec team, who also maintain the bicycle path, in and around, and also are encountering this daily. So when we can work in partnership with those two districts, that is always going to be helpful to get folks connected to resources. But in general, overall, the data suggested that individuals were more often than not, the congregation that we were seeing in and around the loop at the time of closure, was not about individuals bedding down for the night as much as it was individuals who were congregating and engaging in open drug use and even drug sale.

SC: And hence the lack of official police presence that could actually enforce the law?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. We routinely spoke with law enforcement on opportunities to address the behaviors because just as when our guards would go and they would observe and they would acknowledge the time of closure, people would disperse. That is why our strategies have to be a little bit more nimble, a little bit more connected, and a little bit more strategic. When there was an opportunity where the guards observed criminal behavior, like starting of fires, things of those natures, where 911 call or an emergency call was warranted, our guards did make those calls, where warranted.

SC: Well, just to reiterate, Mr. Chair, excuse me, the idea of a regional-wise task force made up of all jurisdictional law enforcement and get them to coordinate the efforts

for after our issues. That might be something to think about and something to incorporate. And finally, Mr. Chair, the last question I have, I would like Director Darland's opinion. City of Tucson Council Member, Nikki Lee, has suggested that Fentanyl use be reduced from a felony violation to a misdemeanor. Of course, the first thought was, well, why are you decriminalizing a criminal conduct? But her goal was to put it at a level where it was not going to be adjudicated, or in the jurisdiction of Pima County Attorney, because the Pima County Attorney was not prosecuting at the felony level, but instead it would be remanded to the city courts that could enforce the law, albeit at a lesser degree, but at least have some sort of enforcement. Your thoughts?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. I will defer to County Administrator Leshar because frankly, I appreciate the question, unfortunately, I do not have a lot of subject area expertise with respect to Council Member Lee's presentation to Mayor and Council, and defer to others who were more legally astute in terms of the prosecutorial opportunities that abound in that particular ordinance recommendation.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy. We do not have a comment about what a member of the council had indicated. I know that the city, like the County and other jurisdictions, is looking at how they can develop any and all tools necessary to look at a critical issue in the community. Supervisor Cano may have more, I have not had an opportunity to speak with Council Member Lee about this, or understand the full context.

SC: Mr. Chair, Ms. Leshar. I think the issue that is being driven here by Council Member Lee is the lack of faith in the Pima County Attorney to adjudicate and prosecute Fentanyl use in public, and she is trying to bypass that and bring it into the city courts, knowing that it will get prosecuted there.

AC: Chair Scott, to that point, I know that Supervisor Christy might have more questions, but I have a similar desire to hear more from our County Attorney on how she will be addressing this issue. In a conversation just a few weeks ago with the County Attorney, I asked for a wish list of diversion programs that are already in existence that perhaps could need some more funding or consideration from this Board so that we can ensure that treatment becomes a priority. Our County has an incredible drug treatment alternative—What is the term? DTAP Program that is vastly successful. Without going into the questions about what Council Member Lee is trying to do, I do still need to hear from the County Attorney what additional resources are needed to tackle this issue head on. I believe that a DTAP-like program, in addition to supporting more Attorneys to support some of the backlog that is happening when you let me know what we need. But I have yet to receive that, unfortunately, from the County Attorney. So, I am putting that into the record here now.

RS: Supervisor Cano, thank you for your comments. It would interest you to know that Mayor Romero and I have convened several meetings of our justice system partners that include representatives from TPD, the Sheriff's Department, the County Attorney, the City Attorney, and also the courts, and there has been a robust

conversation between the presiding judge of Superior Court, the County Attorney, and the Chief of Police with regard to the DTAP program. There is a courts working group that has come out of those justice system partners' meetings that we believe is going to have some recommendations to policy makers with regard to diversion programs. But that specific one, DTAP, has led to a lot of robust conversations between those three offices.

AC: Thank you. I look forward to receiving more information.

RS: Thank you, sir. Supervisor Allen?

JA: So, our office, like other offices, has received a lot of notes from people concerned about the state of the Loop. One of our responses, some of what we hear is that people will make claims that the entire Loop is just trash, that they would not send anyone out there. As Administrator Leshner noted, the Loop is nearly 140 miles. I am on the Loop twice a week and it is not trashed. The vast majority of that 140 miles of the Loop is a well-maintained, highly utilized with mothers pushing strollers, their children with their little dogs. And there is folks out doing Tai Chi in the adjacent parks. People are in groups riding their bikes. It is an incredible outdoor recreation space that we have been, and should be now, still proud of what the Loop is. The trick is figuring out where the concentrations are, because the reality is that there are issues and they are concentrated, that is not dispersed across the entire Loop. So, I just want to make sure that we are not falling prey to some of the hyperbole that does us a disservice, does the Loop a disservice, but it also puts us in a position where we are likely to waste our resources on places and things where the issue is not. The thing that I am concerned about is that, and I think this is what we saw with Vet-Sec, and one of the reasons I understand that we did not continue with the program, is that we can have the effect when we rely on enforcement, that treating problems is like squeezing a balloon, where you squeeze it in one place and you just push it somewhere else. And that happens when there is not meaningful solutions. The data shows, the research shows, that enforcement is not the solution when people are unhoused. Housing is the solution when people are unhoused. Enforcement is not the solution when people are struggling with mental health and substance use disorder. Treatment is the solution. We know this. The research shows that going to jail is one of the most costly, ineffective things that we can do. So, I know, as we have on the agenda later discussion item around collaborations around these issues with the city, I think being clear around what our understanding is, of what works and what the values are that we want to put on the table, I think is going to be very important. And as we think about the Loop, it is also very important to stay focused in what works and what ends up being a show. I think a lot of effort can be a show and feel very performative that we have come out with these great shows of force. But at the end of the day, if it is not going to solve the problem, I think we are fooling ourselves, and we are wasting money and deceiving our constituents. Continuing to really dig into housing and treatment is what we got to do.

SC: Mr. Chair, I am offended that Supervisor Allen would equate someone getting murdered on the Loop as hyperbole. You tell that to the family. You say to them that

there is no problem on the Loop, and they lost a loved one that will never come home. It is not hyperbole. It is a distinct problem, and all kinds of goody feely, touchy feely issues are not going to solve it. We need a police presence on the Loop at all times until this problem has gone away. We need the encampments removed. We need the garbage and trash cleaned up, and we need the absolute flagrant use of drugs and other illegal activities resolved. And just to say to the family, we do not want to talk about hyperbole. I am sorry.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: I want to be very clear, that when I am talking about hyperbole, it is more in the sense that the entire Loop is trash, and that is what I am hearing from constituents. That is what I am talking about. I am not equating the loss of life, of that family, of a loved one, of a member of our community, to that. I spend time on the Loop and I fully acknowledge that there is stretches on the Loop, and particularly that Stone and Wetmore place, it is tragic. I just biked through there the other day to make sure that I could see it, and there was a ton of drug use. It was a rough stretch. I do not question that, and I in no way, shape and form minimize the loss of a loved one in our community. I just want to make sure that as we respond, as policymakers, that we respond with the scalpel, with the precision that is needed to solve the problem, and that we are not fooling ourselves or anyone else of other gestures that are not going to solve the problem. That is my point.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions for Ms. Darland or comments from my colleagues? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Who provides security, law enforcement for the Loop? Is it a combination of multiple jurisdictions or how does that work? And that might be ignorant, but I just I am kind of curious.

RS: Administrator Leshner?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. It depends on the jurisdiction in which that portion of the Loop resides. So, if it is an unincorporated Pima County, it is the Sheriff's Department. If it is in the city limits of Tucson, it is Tucson Police Department, etcetera, Oro Valley, Marana.

MH: Are there any law enforcement officers on bikes?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. Not to my knowledge.

MH: Okay, just curious. Thank you.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

- SC: Just one last thought. Regardless of where this issue is on the Loop, I do not think anybody is expressing that there are certain sections that that do not need patrol or things of this nature. But what I am also hearing from some of my colleagues is we have to, as Supervisor Allen has said, we have to use a precision scalpel rather than a bulldozer for a problem. This is an invasive, flagrant problem that has to be looked at in entirety and the programs that we have to understand is that we cannot service our way out of this problem. It is going to require law enforcement, a police presence, and hold people accountable for their actions, regardless of their physical state. That is the only way we are going to be able to address this.
- RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Mr. Stuckey, if I could put you on the spot for a moment. A couple of months ago, you shared data with the Board with regard to hot spots on the loop in terms of criminal activity. As Ms. Leshner knows, she and I shared that report with Mayor Romero and Mr. Thomure during one of our monthly Mayor/Chair meetings. You indicated that you had asked for some follow up support from TPD in those areas within the city. Just wondered if you could share with the Board the outcome of that follow-up, and where things may stand now?
- JS: Certainly, Chair Scott, Board members, I will just defer to Ms. Darland's comments about these operations that have happened starting in May and are becoming more frequent. We have developed a certain amount of momentum based on that intelligence, that data that we gathered over that ten-month period using our Vet-Sec guards, to identify those problem areas. I believe that the Tucson Police Department, and other jurisdictions for that matter, are aware of where the hotspots are and have focused deployments. We had some rain delays most recently and so a few were canceled, but I believe that there is a plan for several weeks in a row for deployments, such as happened a week or so ago, where there was fifty arrests, including felony weapons recovery and so forth. So that is planned with the Tucson Police Department utilizing resources from the Sheriff's Department as well, so it is happening.
- RS: So you feel that there was responsiveness with regard to the data that was shared with the Board, that we then passed on to the Mayor and the City Manager, and that you passed on to your colleagues in the police department.
- JS: I believe they are being responsive. It has taken us a little bit of time to get here, but we have momentum. And my hope is that moving forward, I believe one of the cornerstones to solving this problem is consistency. And so, coming in and doing isolated operations will help and be useful in some ways. But consistency over time, I believe would be the best strategy, and how that can be done would be left to law enforcement professionals that have the resources to dedicate, and things like that.
- RS: And some of those multi-agency deployments that that Ms. Darland described in her report. Those happened in some of those areas that were identified by Vet-Sec, Ms. Darland?
- JD: Yes, Chair Scott. As Mr. Stuckey alluded to, the data from those deployments actually informed the first one on May 22nd. TPD, their efforts with the Community

Outreach Resource Engagement officers, otherwise known as CORE, they also were running into a lot of efforts there as well. So, it was a strategic decision to focus this at that initial stretch, that initial effort in that area and location. I think that to Mr. Stuckey's point, the Vet-Sec guards, the data that they were able to provide created a really foundational basis of understanding after hours that helps reinforce what TPD and other law enforcement partners may be able to do to interrupt the criminal behaviors that are occurring after hours.

RS: Outstanding. Thank you.

JS: Chair Scott, if I may add one other thing. The importance of the collaboration with other County entities and other non-governmental organizations to make sure that we are approaching this, not only from an enforcement perspective, that is part of it, but also providing these resources in a collaborative effort. So there is a lot of communications that is happening behind the scenes to help support law enforcement operations and provide the resources necessary, court, transition centers and so forth. Again, it has to be all of those things and that is happening.

RS: Thank you very much.

JS: Yes Sir.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Stuckey. Any other questions or comments?

SC: Can I ask Mr. Stuckey?

RS: Go ahead, Supervisor Christy.

SC: What is your opinion or impression of creating a multi-agency task force for enforcement of the Loop, amongst other jurisdictions, all collaborating together, like we see with SWAT teams and the likes of those collaborations?

JS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. I will rely on my 26 plus years of law enforcement experience at the Sheriff's Department. I believe that a task force model is very effective. In fact, I served on the regional SWAT team for many, many years. It does take collaboration. It takes a devotion of resources, money, personnel, and so forth. But again, to my previous comments regarding consistency, to make sure that there is consistency so that we are engaging people in the right ways and providing the right resources but also making sure that people are held accountable for bad behaviors. So of course, if there is a shared responsibility, shared resources, that often makes it easier to achieve the task.

SC: Mr. Chair, Mr. Stuckey. The Loop does pass through numerous jurisdictions?

JS: Yes sir, it does.

SC: So, it would make sense that they all be involved?

JS: I believe so, yes, sir.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Thank you, Mr. Stuckey. Any other questions or comments for Ms. Darland from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott. I just want to thank Administrator Leshner for the herculean effort that we are asking her to identify. I always learn a lot in our memos, and I am looking at the July 22nd memo that talked about the Loop Patrol Program. I am really just speaking out loud, Chair Scott, to say that a lot of the data that would guide us to those concentrations on the Loop where we can ensure that there are some additional resources allocated their way, says, "We have already identified six of them." And so this data exists, and I hope that we do not replicate the wheel and that we figure out what our approach can be. I agree with the sentiment that this is going to take lots of jurisdictions and lots of collaboration. It is going to be an effort that I know this Board will commit itself to. So, appreciate you.

RS: Appreciate your comments, Supervisor, thank you. Any other comments or questions from board members? Alright, Ms. Darland, thank you very much.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

58. The Board of Supervisors on September 16, 2025 continued the following:

Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment

P23CA00001, PIMA COUNTY 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - PIMA PROSPERS

The Pima County 2025 Comprehensive Plan, known as Pima Prospers, will update the 2015 Comprehensive Plan (Co7-13-10). Pima Prospers contains background information, goals, policies, and implementation strategies addressing all content required by state statute for a comprehensive plan, as well as other elements including but not limited to economic development, flood control and drainage, wastewater reclamation, cultural resources, housing, neighborhoods and communities, and other services provided by the County. Pima Prospers also includes an amended land use legend, land use map, and rezoning and special area policies which govern land use for unincorporated Pima County; administrative sections and appendices are also included. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 6-1 (Commissioner Maese voted NAY; Commissioners Becker, Tronsdal, and Truitt were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT. Staff recommends APPROVAL. (All Districts)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
MKH: Mark Holden, Planner III, Development Services Department
KH: Kate Hotten, Co-executive Director, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
BL: Brendon Lyons, Government Affairs Director, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association
SD: Steve Dolan, Constituent, Tucson Mountains Association

- RS: We are going to go ahead and move to Item No. 66 and I am going to let my colleagues know that we are going to do the other hearings after 66 because we have some folks either online or present with regard to some of those other hearings. So, Item No. 66 is unfinished business from our September 16th meeting. As the Clerk pointed out, when we get to a vote, it requires, as a matter of state law, a two thirds affirmative vote from the Board. This is a hearing on the Comprehensive Plan amendment. What we are going to do is go to our staff presentation, and then we have a number of citizens who would like to speak during the hearing portion. Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott. As you have noted, what you have before you today is the update on our comprehensive plan. There has been considerable work in the community and meeting with many partners. With that, I will turn it over to staff, I believe is it, Mr. Holden who will be leading today's presentation? Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Holden. Go ahead and proceed.

MKH: Thank you, Chairman Scott, Supervisors, County Administrator Leshner. Good morning. This is case P23CA00001. This is the Pima County 2025 Comprehensive Plan update, also known as Pima Prospers. State statute requires Arizona counties to prepare and update comprehensive land use plans every ten years in the state. Comprehensive plans are required to conserve natural resources, ensure efficient expenditure of funds, and to provide for public health, safety and general welfare of County's residents. The goal of the 2025 plan update was to consolidate and streamline the plan from the 2015 version, and to also address critical issues that have come up in the last ten years, which include housing supply, affordability and variety, water supply and economic development. Staff began meeting with the Supervisors in January of 2023. We met individually with each Supervisor to discuss initiating the update. Following that, we met with many of the County departments who were involved in the 2015 update through the summer of 2023 and into '24 to work on content for the plan. Could I have the next slide, please? In working on some of the critical issues, we also contracted with the Drachman Institute at the University of Arizona to produce background reports on those critical issues, which include housing, water resources, transportation, climate change and energy. Next slide please. There was also background information, goals and policies, content for the plan that was provided from other sources of data in Pima County, which include the Economic Development Strategy from 2023, the Prosperity Initiative, the Integrated Infrastructure Plan, and the Housing Study that was done by ECONorthwest. Next slide please. County staff also contacted, held meetings and requested content with a number of stakeholder groups. This included federal groups, tribal nations, state agencies, the local municipalities, surrounding counties and utilities. Next slide please. If you could go back one, please. We also met with a number of stakeholder groups which included the development community, environmental groups, the business sector, community development, recreational groups, as well as neighborhood associations. We used input from County departments and the stakeholders to create a number of drafts of the plan. In 2025, we created a preliminary draft, which was online between January and March. There was a required 60-day draft, which was online between April and June, and then finally a draft that went to the Planning and Zoning Commission in July of 2025. I am going to stop the slides there to just to get us moving. Staff is recommending approval of the 2025 Pima County Comprehensive Plan Update, with updated policy document and elements, the land use designations, rezoning and special area policies, and associated land use maps. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval of Pima Prospers 2025, subject to an additional amendment of a policy to the Comprehensive Land System for a holistic landscape level target of 70% onsite mitigation under CLS Policy 3.A.1.a. Staff is also recommending minor revisions to two special area policies in the plan. One is Special Area Policy S-8 Tucson Mountains, which some revisions were made in

cooperation with the Tucson Mountains Association. The second is for Special Area Policy S-38 Catalina Foothills Estates, again with minor revisions made with cooperation with Catalina Foothills Association. And then finally, staff is recommending minor revisions to the CLS Policy with additional policy to address housing development in Pima County in the policy. And then finally staff would like to take this opportunity to thank the Supervisors, County Administration, various County departments, the stakeholder groups, neighborhood associations, and the general public for their support and contribution to the Comprehensive Plan update. We look forward to implementing the plan over the next ten years, and I can answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

RS: Questions for Mr. Holden from Board members? Alright. If not, we are going to go ahead with our testimony from three citizens who signed up to speak. They are, in this order, Kate Hotten, Brendon Lyons, and Steve Dolan. And each speaker will have three minutes.

[Speaker comments are summarized under the agenda item in the minutes. Ms. Hotten provided her comments.]

RS: Thank you, Ms. Hotten, and just for the record, the amendments that Mr. Holden proposed included the ones that you referenced in your comments. Thank you very much. Mr. Lyons?

[Mr. Lyons provided his comments.]

RS: Thank you, Mr. Lyons. Our final speaker is Steve Dolan.

[Mr. Dolan provided his comments.]

RS: Thank you, Mr. Dolan. Alright, there are no other public speakers. I am going to move to close the Public Hearing and approve the Comprehensive Plan Update as amended by the recommendations made by Mr. Holden.

AC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Cano. Discussion? Supervisor?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to thank our incredible Development Services staff for your hard work on this document. It is such an important task to try to get all of these diverse interests into one room and into one plan. This document does everything that we need it to do as we work as a region to look for how to build more homes but also grow in a sustainable way. As mentioned in our public hearing, I also want to thank the Development Services staff for working closely with the District 5 office to ensure that our constituents, my constituents, were heard throughout this process. Compromise is a very difficult thing to do when you have got a lot of competing interests, but I believe that this document represents the incredible body of work and leadership of our Development Services staff. I just wanted to make sure that I thank our County employees for their diligent work on this, Chair Scott. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Any other comments from Board members? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I too want to echo the thank yous, the jazz hands, perhaps, for Development Services and for all the staff of the County who have just dug in, rolled up their sleeves. This was the first time that our office has gone through a plan update. We loved it. Does it have to be every ten years? I am just kidding. Also really wanted to thank all the stakeholders, the coalition, folks from out in Ajo, from Whoopsie, Tucson Mountains Association, from District 3 that were engaged in the process. And thank you Development Services for being open in your creativity and working with our constituents and finding some good solutions. There was a few things that I just wanted to highlight that we are really excited about, that we are so glad that are in there. The focus on middle housing, additional density to reduce sprawl, transit-oriented development and careful management of our water supply. Very much appreciate the affirmation of the County's commitment to the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. In the plan, laying out policies by which we can conserve land across the County that protects plants, animals and all the people who call it home. I have said this before about how the Prosperity Initiative should inform almost everything we do, and so I very much appreciate seeing how many references there are throughout the document for the way that prosperity goals are furthered through plan prospers. I also very much appreciate that the document prepares us as a County to address the evolving needs of our community and given the multiple layers of crisis that we have got from an economic instability to climate crises and the way that that plays out in our desert, housing crises, and that the plan ensures that development mitigates rather than exacerbate some of those challenges and really identifies opportunities for us to build on our strengths. There is a few references in the plan to other plans, and other processes that are unfolding, so we are very much interested in and look forward to the Economic Development Strategic Plan and how that will link into plan prospers. Our office has also been really closely following the work of the Joint Code Committee, and we look forward to the energy portion of the building code update later this year and how that will intersect with the plan as well. Then there are a couple of things that I just want to flag that we are very interested in understanding the implementation of, and really digging in once this is approved and following through up. On page 36, it states that, "Manufactured homes and similar dwelling types permitted in rural zones," and in parentheses "Tiny homes, RVs and fifth wheels should not be thought of as long term solutions to affordability." My question is why? Because modern manufactured homes are often, just as if, not more efficient, than site built homes, and tiny home complexes are functionally part of the missing middle. Those should not be equated with fifth wheels and RVs. As we look forward to how we implement some of the goals, I think we are going to be wanting to kind of push and explore how we can think differently about manufactured homes and tiny homes. Page 51, Goal 2.8.3 Policy C., it is about the Urban Heat Effect Mitigation. I just want to make sure, because some of these sort of seem like it is planting more trees, creating more shade. To me, these are low hanging fruits that we need to do throughout development and throughout a lot of the development as it expands across our community. I want to ensure how these strategies can be properly implemented in a consistent and rigorous way. Page 54, Goal 2.F.3., the Use of Reclaimed Water and

I look forward to understanding more about how we will be working with RWRD to advance this goal and some plans for expanding the use of reclaimed water throughout our region. The last piece is, that I just look forward to implementation plans, and really understanding and seeing how we can dig in, consistently, and where we are making progress, and where there is obstacles, and how we respond to those obstacles from now for over the next ten years. So, thank you all for this great plan and excited about it moving forward.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Any other questions or comments from Board members? Can we go back to the slides that showed the number of stakeholders involved in this process, please? [Pausing to bring up slides] Thank you. Take a look at that list of regional stakeholder groups and neighborhood associations. I mentioned to Development Services staff yesterday that I believe one of the reasons that Board members have not received a lot of concerns from our constituents with regard to this plan is because of the extensive work County staff has done in reaching out to various stakeholder groups who have an interest in Comprehensive plan updates. As Supervisor Allen pointed out, are required every ten years as a matter of state law and I want to especially commend our representatives from the Southern Arizona Homebuilders Association and the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, who are sitting in the same row. These are groups that in many communities might be in conflict with each other, but in Pima County, and this dates back to the assembling of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and the conservation land system associated with it, you see unique levels of collaboration and cooperation between all segments of our community who have an interest in land use. That does not happen by accident. It happens as a function of leadership. I want to not only thank Ms. Leshner and everybody on our team, but I also want to pay tribute to former County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry, because I think a lot of the processes that you have seen play out during the revisions to this comprehensive plan update were shepherded under his leadership. So, it is just another example of how we benefit from the legacy of Mr. Huckelberry. I also wanted to thank, with regard to District 1, the work that staff did with our office and our constituents in the Catalina Foothills Association. Mr. Dolan made reference to that in his comments on behalf of the Tucson Mountains Association. But I know our constituents with the Catalina Foothills Association are grateful for the outreach and collaboration with your office. So thank you all very much. Unless there are any further comments, let us move to a vote. All those in favor of approving the Comprehensive Plan amendment as amended, indicate by saying "Aye." Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: Opposed.

RS: Item passes 4-1 with Supervisor Christy opposed.