

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 15, 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
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Cano joined the meeting at 9:08 a.m.

1. 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 Cano 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 2:45 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, July 15, 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
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Cano joined the meeting at 9:08 a.m.

1. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Library Services and Technology Act, to provide for the Writers in Residence in Libraries Project, \$7,500.00/\$300.00 Library District Fund Match (G-LIB-84725)

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

2. GRANT ACCEPTANCE

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Library Services and Technology Act, to provide for the Strategic Community Engagement for Pima County Public Library Project, \$57,500.00/\$2,500.00 Library District Fund Match (G-LIB-84727)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 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, July 15, 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
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Cano joined the meeting at 9:08 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 Dr. Michael Kotutwa Johnson, Assistant Professor, School of Natural Resources and the Environment, Indigenous Resilience Center, University of Arizona.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Chair Scott shared an excerpt from a letter addressed to the Amphitheater School District community written by Superintendent Todd Jaeger, which expressed his deepest sympathy for the passing of Patricia Harris, and described her decades of service and commitment to the Amphi School District. Chair Scott stated that Ms. Harris changed students' lives, uplifted her colleagues and stood firmly for what she believed was right. A moment of silence was held in honor of Ms. Harris.

Supervisor Cano acknowledged and thanked the employees at the Elections Department and Records Office for their diligent work in preparation of the Special Primary Election of Arizona's 7th Congressional District occurring that day and was excited to see those results.

Supervisor Cano thanked Lorenzo Cierra, his former colleague in the State Legislature, for attending the Board meeting.

PRESENTATION

5. Recognition of the “We A.R.E. Gems” Quarterly Recipients

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 23-5, Employee Recognition Program, the following employees have been selected for the quarterly "We A.R.E. Gems" recognition:

- Mark Rethy - Assessor's Office
- Rosemary Leyva - Clerk of the Board
- Cathy Cota - Human Resources
- Sigifredo Quintana Corona - Facilities Management
- Yvette Romero - Office of Digital Inclusion
- Caroline Lewis - Health Department
- Robin Freiman - Department of Transportation
- Kathryn Rhea - Attractions and Tourism
- Cheryl Lopez - Community and Workforce Development

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, presented the awards to the recipients. No Board action was taken.

6. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Dennis Crosby, Electronics Specialist Supervisor, Facilities Management, for 25 years of service.

Tony Cisneros, Director, Facilities Management, recognized Dennis Crosby for his dedicated service with Pima County and praised him for being a reliable and dependable employee.

No Board action was taken.

7. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Maria Reyes, Financial Analyst III, Finance and Risk Management, for 20 years of service.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, acknowledged Maria Reyes for her hardworking nature and dedication throughout her 20 years of service with Pima County.

No Board action was taken.

8. **Recognition of Pima County Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers**

Presentation of a Certificate of Recognition to the Pima County Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers acknowledging their exceptional and exemplary assistance in raising fire safety awareness among visitors to the Coronado National Forest and Summerhaven during the recent Stage 2 fire restrictions. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy presented the Sheriff's Auxiliary Volunteers with an Award of Recognition and thanked them for their exceptional and exemplary assistance in raising awareness of the current drought conditions and high fire risks to members of the public.

No Board action was taken.

9. **Recognition of Consul Rafael Barceló Durazo**

Presentation of a Certificate of Recognition to Consul Rafael Barceló Durazo, for his outstanding leadership and service in leading the Consulate of Mexico. (District 1)

Chair Scott recognized Consul Durazo's distinguished career in public service and highlighted his five years of dedicated leadership at the Mexican Consulate in Tucson. He wished him success in his future endeavors.

No Board action was taken.

10. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

J.P. Salvatierra addressed the Board and he believed the Board approved Project Blue without knowing all of the facts. He appreciated Supervisor Allen's attempts to find true answers from the developers of the data center project, which went unanswered, and he gave her a bromeliad plant as a token of his appreciation.

Rolande Baker expressed her opposition towards the actions of ICE under the current Administration. She requested that the Sheriff's Department reinstate the program they had under Sheriff Napier where citizens were informed when the department was in contact with immigration officials, that immigrants lived in fear and the Board needed to demonstrate that they cared for them.

Cristina Mokhtarian stated that a Federal District Court Judge in Los Angeles ruled that the Fourth Amendment forbade ICE from stereotyping individuals and arresting them. She urged the Board to make statements requiring local law enforcement to report when they were in contact with immigration officials.

John Doherty voiced his concern over the dehumanization of immigrants in the media and likened the current sentiment towards immigrants in the United States to the treatment of Jewish people during WWII. He asked the Board to hold local law

enforcement accountable, as ICE's treatment of immigrants was a violation of human rights.

Dr. Denise Bowls requested that the Board diversify its investments to include the Greater Vail Chamber of Commerce. She requested an annual investment of \$80,000.00 towards that Chamber and identified how they would use those funds. She stated that they would be committed to submitting quarterly reports that detailed measurable outcomes and described how funds were tied to the goals of the Prosperity Initiative.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Cano requested that the County Administrator come back in 45 days with a plan regarding the Board's commitment to the County's Regional Chambers of Commerce. He asked for more information on Green Valley, Vail, the Hispanic Chamber, and any other entity that was not currently supported by the County so that the Board could discuss that at a later time.

Supervisor Heinz directed staff to provide clarification on the referenced policy under Sheriff Napier's tenure about the program regarding interactions between law enforcement and immigration officials. He also requested additional information on the current Sheriff's Administration policy and why the previous program was discontinued.

Chair Scott reminded the County Administrator that at the last Board meeting after Call to the Public, he had requested additional information regarding direction to departments when they were encountering federal immigration authorities.

11. CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

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 convene to Executive Session at 12:22 p.m.

12. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Pima County v. L&W Supply Corporation, C20235294.

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

14. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Dickinson Wright, P.L.L.C.'s request for a conflict of interest waiver.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Chair Scott noted that the Chamber of Southern Arizona's Board of Directors met and unanimously voted to advocate for the support of Project Blue with the Tucson City Council.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

16. **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.

17. **2026 Legislative Agenda**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 24, of the Board of Supervisors, adopting a Pima County Legislative Program for 2026.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to add a new condition under Section D., Fortify Public Safety, as Condition No. 4, "support criminal justice reform efforts, including but not limited to, the elimination of cash bond and the restoration of voter rights." Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted, "Nay."

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Christy to add to the legislative agenda a request that the contracted lobbyist look into statutory authority for Boards of Supervisors to contract with outside counsel without seeking permission from the County Attorney. Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Scott and Supervisors Allen and Cano voted, "Nay."

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to add an amendment to Section A., Protect the Taxpayer, to direct our lobbyists to investigate the elimination of the exemption of data centers to state and local sales tax. Upon

roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Scott and Supervisors Cano and Christy voted, "Nay."

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

18. Proposed Settlement in Pima County v. L&W Supply Corporation

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Pima County v. L&W Supply Corporation, C20235294.

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

19. Conflict of Interest Waiver

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding Dickinson Wright, P.L.L.C.'s request for a conflict of interest waiver.

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

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

20. The Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2025, postponed consideration of this item due to a tie vote:

Contract

The Chamber of Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide economic development support services for Pima County and Southern Arizona, General Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (PO2500018868)

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

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

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to reduce the contract amount to \$300,000.00 and move the difference of \$250,000.00 to the County's Economic Development Department, and to remove the words, "if releasable," from Sections 1.1, 1.2, and 3.2, of the reporting section. Upon roll call vote, the substitute motion failed 2-3, Chair Scott and Supervisors Christy and Heinz voted, "Nay."

It was then moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to amend Chair Scott's original motion and remove the words, "if releasable," from Sections 1.1, 1.2, and 3.2, of the reporting section. Upon roll call vote, the motion failed 2-3, Chair Scott and Supervisors Christy and Heinz voted, "Nay."

Upon roll call vote, the original motion unanimously carried 5-0.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

21. Pima County Community Land Trust, to provide an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for the Barrio Kroeger Lane Infill Project, General Fund, contract amount \$250,375.00/1 year, 5 months term (PO2500014201)

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

22. Southwest Nonprofit Housing Corporation, Rio Azul Partners, L.L.C., to provide an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for Rio Azul Apartments Phase II Project, General Fund, contract amount \$600,000.00/2 year term (PO2500016432)

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.

23. Arivaca Community Center, Inc., to provide for Arivaca Community Center Park and Surrounding Facilities Premises Improvement Project, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$35,000.00 (PO2400012721)

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

Detainee and Crisis Systems (formerly Behavioral Health)

24. Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center, Inc., to provide for forensic medical examination and evidence collection for juvenile abuse, General Fund, contract amount \$375,000.00 (PO2500017048)

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

25. CODAC Health, Recovery & Wellness, Inc., to provide for medical forensic examination and evidence collection for victims of sexual assault, General Fund, contract amount \$312,000.00 (PO2500016949)

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

Facilities Management

26. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 5, to provide for maintenance of the City of Tucson premises located at 201 N. Stone, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$107,035.50 revenue (CT2400000018)

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

Health

27. Arizona Board of Regents, The University of Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Pima CARES Project, extend contract term to 8/31/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400001342)

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

Pima County Wireless Integrated Network

28. Southern Arizona TV Stations, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide a communication site lease amendment for Mount Bigelow, extend contract term to 7/31/30 and amend contractual language, PCWIN Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$123,762.75 (CT_20-88)

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

Procurement

29. **Award**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000475, Goodmans, Inc., d.b.a. Goodmans Interior Structures (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for systems furniture and warehouse management services. The supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of \$500,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Project Design and Construction.

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

30. Kiewit Infrastructure West Co., to provide for Design-Build Services - Pima County Tres Rios Wastewater Reclamation Facility Digester, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount \$2,881,117.11/3 year, 5 months term (PO2500016871) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

31. Hunter Contracting Co., to provide for Pima County Southeast Regional Park Pump Well Replacement Phase 1, Project Design and Construction Capital Improvement Project Fund, contract amount \$1,584,268.00/1 year, 7 months term (PO2500016300) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Supervisor Christy asked if the contract was related to Project Blue and whether the well was located on property that would be annexed by the City of Tucson, and if so, if the County would be reimbursed for it upon annexation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded no, it was not related to Project Blue and the County would not be reimbursed for the well because it was not part of the City's annex.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the well was located on the property that would be annexed.

Ms. Leshar responded no.

Supervisor Allen asked if water from the well would be used during the initial period of Project Blue because of its proximity, until water service was able to be provided to the project site.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded no, and that the well's use was for County operations or for the County's contracted operators in that area.

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

32. Canyon Building & Design, L.L.C., to provide for Himmel Park Library Renovation and Expansion, Project Design and Construction Capital Improvement Project Fund, contract amount \$4,566,632.16/3 year term (PO2500017665) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

33. International Business Machines Corporation, d.b.a. IBM Corporation, Amendment No. 2, to provide for Maximo subscription and hosting and amend contractual language, Non-Bond Projects Fund, contract amount \$175,000.00 (SC2400001603) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy questioned why the County was renewing its subscription to Maximo if the service was supposed to be discontinued.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that Maximo had been upgraded and it continued to be an integral part of the County's ERP process with a significant role in their management tools.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Maximo subscription was meant to be discontinued.

Mr. Holmes responded no.

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

34. Roadway Asset Services, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for pavement management software, amend contractual language and scope of services, HURF Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (SC2400001843) Administering Department: Information Technology on behalf of Transportation

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

35. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., to provide for a Broadband Gap and Feasibility Study, 20377FD ODI - Grants Fund, contract amount \$446,000.00/1 year, 6 months term (SC2500000178) Administering Department: Office of Digital Inclusion

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

Supervisor Heinz requested clarification whether this was a countywide feasibility and gap study.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative and asked Deputy County Administrator Holmes for the granularity on the location and whether it was countywide.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that it included Santa Cruz County, mainly studying the rural areas of Pima County and Santa Cruz County to look at feasibility as they engaged in broadband expansion. He added there was a

lack of information around what was available underground and that the consultant would help determine the scope of need across some of their rural areas.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the \$952 million in Broadband Equity Access and Deployment Program (BEAD) grant for Arizona went away due to the Trump Administration and that it was related, but not the same issue.

Ms. Leshar responded that she would get the specifics of where they were with the funding and the grant and provide that information to the Board. She added that they were optimistic about a large portion of the funding coming in to the Pima County Office of Digital Inclusion.

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

* * *

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz to suspend Board of Supervisors’ (BOS) Rule No. H-3 for reconsideration of this item. He explained that he requested to suspend the BOS Rule because a contract that had already been voted on could not be reconsidered and the Board had to agree on pausing the Rules so that it could be.

Chair Scott asked Legal Counsel if Supervisor Heinz’s motion was framed appropriately.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had recently learned about some additional information and was concerned that a lot of this information already existed from other sources, and he wanted to ensure that this was not duplicative and a waste of funds.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Cano voted “Nay.”

It was then moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Cano and Christy voted “Nay,” to reconsider the item.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he hoped to receive additional information in terms of exactly what this contract would do and through the Federal BEAD grant process, there was a lot of data and gap analysis that had taken place. He stated that a lot of that information was private and private businesses had also done it and asked for more information regarding what the funds would be used for and why it was necessary.

Michelle Simon, Director, Office of Digital Inclusion, explained that there was confusion about what was happening on a Federal level when it came to monies associated with broadband expansion, including changes that had happened with the National Broadband Map and the rules and regulations for BEAD funding. She

reiterated that there was confusion on the County level and for community members trying to figure out how they would get internet and have access to that connectivity. She stated that for this effort, it was a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) grant through the Broadband Technical Assistance Program and it would allow the County to make data driven decisions about how they would expand and the focus was on rural and very remote areas of the counties. She added that it had nothing to do with the urban areas at all. She stated there were pieces of information all over the place, but none of it was in one place, and she did not have access to much of it. She stated that when they looked at the current National Broadband Map through the Federal Communications Commission it showed that almost all of Pima County was served because satellite internet qualified as high speed internet. She stated that satellite and internet was not affordable for every person in the County and that this Broadband Gap and Feasibility Study would allow them to look at the areas where internet service providers were very unlikely to build out to because of the low return on investment. She added they would identify the different technologies, which may include satellite or wireless or unlicensed fixed wireless, to be able to make really good decisions. She stated that the contractor would be responsible for the data that existed and to create Geographic Information System mapping. She stated they would complete significant community engagement so that the County received information about what was lacking. She provided an example of a constituent from Redington that talked about the issues in her community and that these were the types of things that they would do outreach about. She stated that as part of their mapping, they would provide all of the current assets available so they could leverage to expand broadband internet, as well as ideas for public private partnerships and other things.

Supervisor Heinz asked if this was a kind of cut and paste project and then they would get \$450,000.00 from the Feds.

Ms. Simon responded no. She stated that 18 companies responded to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and there were a number of companies that had done that in their reply to the RFP. She stated they indicated they would look at the different data points and they would pull that information together to provide a report but that was not what the County was asking for. She stated that they were asking for design concepts, financial projections, mapping, and identification of all of the internet service providers in the community and what their price points were, so that they could help people get connected to the internet because it was required. She stated that it was no longer a luxury, and they needed that data all in one place, and that would help them make decisions for the work they were doing with the Middle Mile Project and for future efforts that they were trying to take in areas of the County.

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

Supervisor Cano requested a legal opinion on an instance like this because it was the second time over the last several weeks where the Board had a potential reconsideration of an item. He stated that he would feel more comfortable moving

forward with clarity on what they could or could not do, because he did not want this to become a habit. He added that if the Board was not following compliance with their legal responsibilities, then they were not doing their job and he wanted to ensure they did.

Chair Scott stated that he knew there were issues related to reconsideration that were addressed by an opinion that the Board received in this particular instance. He stated that Board Counsel was okay with the Board suspending the rules for reconsideration, but he agreed with Supervisor Cano that it should not be a normal pattern of behavior. He stated that perhaps the issue would be to look at how the Board's rules for reconsideration were written since they had been in place for some time. He asked Supervisor Cano if this was consistent with his request.

Supervisor Cano responded in the affirmative and stated that it was not clear to him that the Board needed to vote on the contract again and thought they were saying yes to the discussion. He stated that a flowchart or however it was presented to the Board might be helpful and if there were reforms needed to Board policy on reconsideration of items, or a formal process of requesting that at the next meeting.

Chair Scott inquired if Supervisor Cano was requesting that the Board's parliamentarian, Mr. Brown, look at the rules for reconsideration and make any suggestions on any necessary revisions.

Supervisor Cano responded in the affirmative.

Chair Scott asked Mr. Brown if Supervisor Cano's request was clear to him.

Mr. Brown responded yes.

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

36. Spray Systems of Arizona, Inc., to provide for asbestos and lead-based paint abatement at Roger Road Wastewater Treatment Plant, EPA Brownfields Investment and Jobs Act Fund, contract amount \$262,975.00 (PO2500017050) 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.

Real Property

37. Serrano Solar, L.L.C., to provide a Pima County License for Right-of-Way encroachment located on North Trico Road for drainage purposes, total contract amount \$4,375.00 revenue/25 year term (\$175.00 per year) (CT2500000042)

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

Sheriff

38. San Miguel Corporate Internship, Inc., d.b.a. San Miguel Corporate Work Study Program, to provide for the San Miguel Work Study Program, General Fund, contract amount \$37,500.00 (PO2500015753)

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

39. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Public Health Improvement Program, amend grant language and scope of work, \$113,700.00 (GA-HD-70304)

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.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

40. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 347454, Sergio Ayala Hernandez, Tacos El Tarasco Restaurant, 661 N. 2nd Avenue, Ajo, 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 Heinz 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

41. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 17, P24SP00005, DMCI Enterprises, L.L.C. - W. Valencia Road Specific Plan Rezoning. Owner: DMCI Enterprises, L.L.C. (District 5)

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.

42. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 18, P24RZ00009, 1455 River Road, L.L.C. - W. River Road Rezoning. Owner: 1455 River Road, L.L.C. (District 3)

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.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

43. **Feasibility of County Excise Tax**

Discussion on feasibility of County excise tax to provide bridge funding to complete countywide transportation projects as a contingency to RTA Next. (District 2)

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

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

44. Watershed Management Group, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Enhancing Site Sustainability of Local Shelters, extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_23-343)

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

Supervisor Christy recognized the Watershed Management Group for their amazing work. He stated that under metrics available to measure performance for this item, it listed a minimum of two rain garden projects would be constructed at local transitional housing facilities and requested an explanation of that. He questioned which individuals would attend education and onsite workshops to complete the project and if they were residents of the transitional center or staff, the location of the projects, the costs and why the project had not been completed.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the item was a no cost extension and there would be no additional costs from the original contract.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that he did not have all of the details of this project, specifically the locations, but the Watershed Management Group usually worked with local residents, community members, and participated in stormwater collection projects.

Supervisor Christy requested that a memorandum be provided that answered his questions, and he reiterated his questions.

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

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-0, Supervisor Christy abstained and Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote.

Economic Development

45. Metropolitan Education Commission, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the A1 - Metropolitan Education Commission and A2 - Regional College Access Center, extend contract term to 6/30/26, amend contractual language and scope of work, General Fund, contract amount \$122,000.00 (PO2500020436)

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

Rocque Perez, former Executive Director, City Liaison, Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC), stated that with the shift in the Executive Director role it created a lot of additional capacity for MEC and a lot of its programs. He stated that throughout the last year there was a significant level of engagement with MEC and their officials, primarily with the Chair, then it was Chair Grijalva. He stated that this year, there would be a lot more activity with Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen. He stated that they had been invited to their Teen Town Hall, 20 under 20, the Evening to Empower Ed, and there was a lot of exciting things on the horizon. He stated that it was important to note that in the next couple of months and he had already begun discussions with Administrator Leshner and Chair Scott, was that the MEC would be proposing an amendment to its composition. He stated that as they discussed in the last amendment, which would also include a name change and a set of proposed imperatives that really focused on democratizing access to learning and service. He stated that the Board would see a big undertaking that centered the programs around civic empowerment, as well as academic empowerment. He stated that this was inclusive with collaborations with the Arizona Board of Regents, in the civic space in Phoenix and in northern Arizona. He stated that it would hopefully be in collaboration with Santa Cruz County and the City of Nogales. He stated that it would not necessarily change the programs, but would focus on the name brand and the aspirations and needs of the organization.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the City of Tucson's financial contribution to the MEC.

Mr. Perez responded that historically, there had always been a noncompetitive allocation of \$19,750.00, which had not fluctuated within the past decade or so. He stated what had fluctuated was the allocation, that was historically done through a department level similar to how Pima County did with the Economic Development Department. He stated that within his ward office he had made up for a bit of the

difference in what had historically been the lacking investment on the City's side and would continue. He stated that with an added component of him being a part of that Body, advocating for a more consistent connection to the department, the same way they had with economic development as well as a sustained investment. He stated that he was aware there had been asks about the County and City shares, and as they moved into the next year, a lot of their service had reached beyond City limits more than ever, primarily within Vail and Marana. He stated that now that their respective programs were in collaboration with the Arizona Board of Regents, MEC would be more heavily within Marana, the Catalina Foothills area, and Vail. He stated that what was different and what might have been a point of contention last year around this time, was that there was not a lot of diversity in the fundraising efforts. He stated that there was a significant change in that and they would be receiving more funding from outside sources, beyond the City and County than the total of both investments, so there was more diversity in that investment.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that though it was not legally required, but since the vote would happen before speakers could address the Board on agenda items at Call to the Public, they could inquire whether anyone came to speak on this issue before the vote.

Chair Scott confirmed that none of the speaker cards specifically listed this item or included comments regarding on item. He stated that there was reference in the background materials regarding the agency completing quarterly and annual reports and requested that the Board receive copies of those quarterly reports. He stated that he was especially interested with Goal No. 3 that the agency would drive a 25% year over year increase in Free Application for Federal Student Aid submissions and the Board would be interested in the progress of that goal.

Mr. Perez responded in the affirmative.

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

PROCUREMENT

46. Hearing - Solicitation No. IFB-2500009743, Paint and Paint Supplies

Appeal of Procurement Director's Decision

Pursuant to Pima County Code 11.20.010(H), The Pittsburgh Paints Company, appeals the decision of the Procurement Director regarding Solicitation No. IFB-2500009743, Paint and Paint Supplies.

Bruce Collins, Director, Procurement, explained that a low bid solicitation was issued on May 19, 2025, and the bid opened on June 18, 2025. He explained that the basis of a low bid solicitation was to award the bid to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. He stated that two bids were received, one from Sherwin-Williams Paint Company and the other from The Pittsburgh Paint Company, who

was doing business as PPG. He stated that the initial recommendation was to award the bid to Sherwin-Williams Company since they had the lowest bid, and the Notice of Recommendation to Award was issued on June 26, 2025, naming Sherwin-Williams Company as the potential selected vendor. He stated that a protest was received on June 27, 2025 from PPG indicating that they protested the award to Sherwin-Williams Company due to their pricing structure, which was inadequate, incomplete and did not match. He stated that upon his department's review of the protest it was determined that PPG was correct. He indicated that the solicitation had also been reviewed and it contained substantial errors in their description of the products and because of those deficiencies the decision was made to reject all of the bids, cancel the solicitation, and reissue it after the department made the appropriate corrections to the Scope of Work. He stated that the bidders were notified of the cancellation and upon that cancellation the appeal was submitted by PPG. He explained that in the interim, the Procurement Department had taken steps to provide refresher training to staff on scope writing, bid formation and bid evaluation.

Supervisor Christy asked why the appellant was protesting the Procurement Director's decision.

Mr. Collins responded that the appellant felt the Procurement Director should not have rejected all of the bids and reissue the solicitation, and that they should have been awarded the bid. He explained that it was the department's decision to reject all bids and reissue the solicitation since the original solicitation contained many errors and they felt the public could not submit an adequate bid. He stated that he had consulted with the Pima County Attorney's Office and they collectively agreed that it would be in the County's best interest to reject it, remove all of the errors from the document and reissue it so that all prospective bidders could bid.

Supervisor Allen asked whether it was practice or policy to reject all bids when there were errors found in the solicitation.

Mr. Collins responded that the national tradition in public procurement was that when the governing Body that issued a solicitation found an error after the bid opened, they would typically cancel the bid and reissue it. He stated that this was the national practice because at that point, once bids were received there was no way to correct it.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the possibility of reopening this bid, pointing out the mistakes and once they were corrected it would be reconsidered.

Mr. Collins responded that after the bid was opened, they could not issue an addendum to correct any deficiencies because all bidders' prices had already been seen.

Chair Scott asked the Procurement Director to recite the areas in which staff needed additional guidance or training.

Mr. Collins responded that his staff would receive refresher training focused on specification writing, bid formation and bid evaluation, and he felt that a reemphasis on those areas would help these types of situations be mitigated.

Chair Scott inquired if staff had found deficiencies in any of those three areas in other solicitations that were currently open or being developed.

Mr. Collins responded no. He stated that in order to increase quality control and quality review, a new internal system would be put into place by his department that prior to the issuance of bids, division managers and senior team members would review the documents that their staff would be releasing and would also review the recommendations before they were finalized.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. 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 close the public hearing and deny the appeal.

CONSENT CALENDAR

47. Approval of the Consent Calendar

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote, to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety.

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission**
Reappointment of Richard Barker. Term expiration: 6/30/31. (District 5)
2. **Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee**
Appointment of Hank Peck, to replace Onita Davis. No term expiration. (District 1)

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

3. **Special Event**
 - Sierra Paige June Mollenkopf, Girl Scouts of Southern Arizona, Camp Whispering Pines, 12500 E. Organization Ridge Road, Mt. Lemmon, August 21 and 22, 2025.

- Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of St. Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Gym & Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, July 19, 2025.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

4. Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification

Frank Perolla \$141.86; Jason R. Ponza \$85.31; Hunter Contracting Co. \$52,503.38; The Standard Raintree Apartments \$897.00; Junella Gil \$17.68; Coronado National Forest \$10,865.46; Robert G. Sipos \$462.00; Judy Young \$385.09; A & M Personnel Services \$3,082.93; A & M Personnel Services \$1,032.40; A & M Personnel Services \$245.19; A & M Personnel Services \$832.37; A & M Personnel Services \$825.92; A & M Personnel Services \$1,071.11; A & M Personnel Services \$825.92; Verizon Wireless \$8,564.02; Robbins Equipment Co., Inc. \$16,949.98; Friends of the Arivaca School and Historic Townsite \$12,123.90; Batteries Plus \$27.27; United Fire Equipment \$417.30; Law Offices of Cornelia W. Honchar, P.C. \$13,396.40; Arizona State University Office of Research & Sponsored Projects Administration \$13,532.40; Farhang & Medcoff, P.L.L.C. \$422.50; Cascade Apartments, L.L.C. \$5,000.00; Aircool \$8,055.49; City of Tucson \$167,630.49; Graffiti Protective Coatings, Inc. \$7,800.00; The State of Arizona Dept. of Public Safety \$22.00; DXP Enterprises, Inc. \$2,641.48; Kevin Kendrick \$720.00; Green Leaf at Broadway Blvd. \$3,275.32; Country Club Apartments \$899.00; The State of Arizona AZ State Library, Archives and Public Records \$2,442.62; The State of Arizona AZ State Library, Archives and Public Records \$2,790.14; Sage Canyon Apartments \$2,026.91; Jessica Cardenas \$32.50; Jessica Cardenas \$261.00; Jessica Cardenas \$14.34; Banner-University Medical Center South Campus \$9,200.00.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

5. Minutes: April 1 and 15, 2025.

* * *

48. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

16. 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
KD: Kat Davis, Continuum of Care Lead Team Manager, City of Tucson

RS: Alright. So we will now go to Item No. 17, which is Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety. Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you.

SC: Mr. Chair, excuse me?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: On the Addendum, did we address Item No. 4?

RS: Yes we did.

SC: Thank you. Excuse me, go ahead.

RS: You are fine. Administrator Leshar?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott. And here today to walk through today's presentation, Jen Darland, our Director of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions, but also to welcome back her colleague from the City of Tucson, Kat Davis. Some of you may remember working with Ms. Davis when she was part of the Pima County Health Department for dog years, decades of the pandemic. So thank you for being back with us today, and we look forward to your presentation.

JD: Thank you. County Administrator Leshar, Chair Scott, members of the Board, Good afternoon. You can go ahead and go to the next slide, please. Thank you. As has been the practice, updates to the Board from the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions are on activities and efforts aligned with one or all five of the five priorities set by the County Administrator when the office was established in December of '23. Just briefly again, that is, to inventory County and partner programming, to describe and illustrate how services are accessed and delivered,

to develop County and public facing communications, develop a strategic and continuous improvement plan with the goal of ensuring programming is responsive, sustainable and equitably distributed, and develop a means of tracking efficacy of County assistance. Today's update will touch roughly on the top of our Priorities Nos. 1 and 2. So for this month's update, as County Administrator Leshner alluded to, I have asked Kat Davis to join me to provide the Board an introduction to and an overview of the local Continuum of Care (CoC), more commonly referred to as the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness, often referred to as TPCH. Ms. Davis is a Continuum of Care Lead Team Manager at the City of Tucson's Housing and Community Development Department, and prior to her time with the City of Tucson, again as County Administrator Leshner mentioned, she was at the Pima County Health Department leading emergency response work, including extreme heat and southwest border responses. In her current role as a Continuum of Care Lead Team Manager, she supports TPCH and system level homeless response in Pima County and is supporting and facilitating the development of TPCH's strategic plan. TPCH data such as the Point-in-Time Count, the scope of homeless programming has informed memoranda from the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions, as well as has been part of previous presentations and updates to the Board. The County and the City are integral partners to TPCH, which Ms. Davis will speak and highlight that role. Each of these jurisdictions play equally, TPCH an integral partner to both jurisdictional efforts to address homelessness in our community. And with that, I will pass the mic to Ms. Davis.

KD: Perfect. Chair Scott and members of the Board, thank you so much for having me today. It is great to be here. We can go ahead and go to the next slide. So today I am going to cover, as Jen mentioned, the Homeless Response System, TPCH's role, and then we will talk a bit about our strategic planning process. We can go on to the next slide. So to start out, what is a Continuum of Care? So the Continuum of Care programs are actually required by HUD and they are designed to do these four specific things. This is a really unique program design from a federal funder, in that it puts a lot of ability to tailor the community's response and the community's needs in the hands of the community to determine, you know, what is working best for us. It also places roles like evaluation and funding oversight into the community's hands that would normally be done by the funder, which in this case is HUD. And next slide. So TPCH, the CoC Tucson Collaboration to end Homelessness. These are all the same thing. So different names for the same thing. But TPCH is an independent self-governed coalition of community members, housing service providers, government representatives as well as aligned service providers in Pima County. There is a General Council, a Board and Committees that are made up of elected members, and they all share varying levels of authority, as well as having a Lived Experience Council that advises the Board. TPCH is governed by the Governance Charter, as well as written policies and procedures that are upheld by general council and the Board. And so while TPCH does not directly report to Mayor and Council or to the Board of Supervisors, we will talk about the City and County roles and what that looks like. So next slide please. So TPCPH locally has five pillars of responsibility at the systems level of homeless response. So TPCH is not providing direct service, but we support the agencies that do. So responsibilities can be

broken down into these five pillars of rating and ranking, funding applications, doing needs assessment and gaps analysis, strategic planning as well as evaluation of the funded programs, and then building and providing the necessary infrastructure to support the system. And next slide. So what are the City and County roles? City and County are both in really unique positions within TPCH because they play several different roles. So Continuum of Cares have two lead agencies. So the City is the CoC lead agency providing operational and administrative support, but the County is the Homeless Management Information System, or HMIS lead agency. So what this means is that the County staff provide support for HMIS, which is a shared database of people experiencing homelessness, similar to like a medical record. And as the lead agency, they operate the HMIS system. They provide data cleaning and reporting to HUD, as well as community data requests, and they follow and enforce the TPCH HMIS policies. So aside from being lead agencies, the City and the County both also have two appointed Board seats each, so there is Board representation. Currently, these two positions for the County are held by two staff from Community Workforce and Development. The third role that both the City and the County have within TPCH is as a funding recipient. So Community Workforce and Development for Pima County and the Housing First Program for the City both receive funds to operate supportive housing projects. Next slide. So who does this funding serve? The CoC funding is intended to serve people who are experiencing homelessness specifically. So TPCH has eligibility criteria for the CoC funded housing programs and these criteria are based on HUD's definitions of homelessness. So to receive supportive housing services through the CoC, somebody must either be literally homeless, a youth at imminent risk of homelessness in the next 14 days, or somebody who is fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence that lacks the resources to obtain their own permanent housing. So there are many other people in our community who may be late on their rent, or they just need a low income housing option, and those folks are better served through other parts of the housing spectrum of different solutions, such as prevention funding, or through public housing or a voucher system. If they are not actually homeless, then they will not be served through CoC funding. So next slide. Alright. So within the homelessness landscape, there are many different funding sources braided together to provide these services in our community. So the CoC funding, as I explained, provides supportive housing, which is the rental subsidy, plus the supportive wraparound services such as case management or resource navigation. CoC funding also includes funding for the two lead agencies, so the City and the County both receive a small percentage of funding to help support the work of the CoC. And then there is also the Emergency Solutions Grant. So this funding is formula funding that goes to both the City, the County as well as the State, and these partially fund homeless prevention, emergency shelters, rapid rehousing and outreach services for people experiencing unsheltered homelessness. Many other funding sources are also used to support this work, including the Community Development Block Grant, General Fund through grant making processes, as well as state funding through DES and ADOH, as well as philanthropic funding from the nonprofit partners that we have. So prevention services are funded almost entirely through philanthropic funding. So next slide. So TPCH's level of oversight of these different kind of areas within the homeless landscape depends largely on the

funding source. So we have the most oversight and authority for the Continuum of Care funds, as well as the unsheltered homelessness set-aside money and the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project, which are now all wrapped into the Continuum of Care funding. For the Emergency Solutions Grant, we have some oversight of programs that are funded through ESG funding, and we also make recommendations about who receives that funding. And then there is other funding, other state and federal funding, as well as the philanthropic funding that we do not have any direct oversight of, but can work with our partners to have some level of influence and coordination with those funding sources. Next slide. So for this upcoming fiscal year, our community is receiving \$14.5 million in Continuum of Care funding. So this is going to TPOCH member agencies. Of that total, \$12.3 million is going directly into housing, either permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing. The remaining \$2.2 million will go into supportive services only projects. So those projects provide supportive services but do not include a housing subsidy, as well as the funding for the lead agencies who are supporting this work. Next slide. So one of our roles as TPOCH is to do strategic planning. Our current strategic plan ends this year. And so we are working on creating our new strategic plan that will guide us through the next five years. During the information gathering process, we completed a literature review of a bunch of other plans within our region, including the Prosperity Initiative, Plan Tucson, Pima Prospers, and the HUD Strategic Plan. Beginning in April, we began holding engagement sessions with the TPOCH community. We also had a Homelessness Alliance Services workshop in June that some Pima County staff attended, so that was great. And then this month we are working on drafting goals and action steps to inform the plan. Next slide. So this is part of the literature review. And I am happy to share the entire literature review with you. It is very long. So it is not all held on these slides today. But I just wanted to highlight for you there is a lot to be said for affordable housing, housing stability, workforce and economic development. A lot of these plans address those issues, but where there is kind of a big gap is around the homeless response system specifically. And so most of these plans do not cover that information, which to us gives TPOCH a great opportunity to step in and be the planning body for that specific area. Next slide. So these are the draft priorities that we have come up with so far in our strategic planning process. These were approved recently by the Board. So our four priorities for moving forward are improving the individual client experience within the homeless response system, improving workforce capacity of homeless service providers, optimizing and increasing efficiency within the homeless response system, and collaborating with external partners on multi-sector solutions. So TPOCH's hope is that collaborating with our County leadership will not end today but will be ongoing collaboration to create these multi-sector solutions to homelessness. So next step of our strategic planning is using all the feedback that we have received through all of our engagement sessions to draft goals that will align with these priorities. So today, I would love to hear any feedback you may have on alignment between TPOCH and the County's goals. And next step. So the next steps are two upcoming opportunities for your offices and your constituents to have some input into our strategic plan. So this month, in the next week or so, we will be coming out with a public survey that will allow folks to help us rank the goals

for the plan for the next five years. And then this fall, we will also have a public comment period on our draft plan. And back to Jen.

JD: Thank you and so to that point, one of the ways that I am supporting Ms. Davis, I will be reaching out to each of your respective offices to see about this planning or scheduling time, wherein you can provide some direct feedback to Ms. Davis that can also inform the further development of that strategic plan. As an aside, the conversations that have been informing the development of the strategic plan as well as other initiatives addressing homelessness throughout our region, also are informing the development that the County has underway at the direction of Chair Scott from the May 6th Board meeting related to the Shelter Feasibility and Work Plan. So one of the consistent themes in our community is that we attack or we strategize in silos. And so one of this opportunities that again, bringing this item before the Board, helping to increase the public awareness about ways in which both the County and the City, as well as TPCH, can align our responses to unsheltered homelessness, are opportunities for us to really work up and outside of those silos, and to ensure that we are delivering programming in timely, efficient and effective processes or strategies. Next slide please. So right now we will hold for any questions from members of the Board.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I hate to, I do not know if we need to, but is there a possibility that quickly we could go back to 1 or 2 of the first slides, the one that shows...that is as fast as you can go? [jokingly] Okay. Wait. This one. One question I have here on this particular chart, it says General Council. Who is your General Council?

KD: Yes. Thank you. Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, our General Council is made up of our general membership. All of our meetings are also open to the public. So public is able to attend, as well as folks who have applied to be members of TPCH, those who receive funding or not.

SC: When you say General Council, I am sorry, I thought you meant like Counsel, like counselors, like a lawyer.

KD: No, no.

SC: This is not your legal advisor or anything like that. Okay.

KD: Yeah, correct.

SC: Let us see one more before that, if we could.

- RS: And actually, before you go off that slide, if you do not mind, Supervisor, there was a new group that you were working on specifically Ms. Davis, that I do not think is listed on that slide.
- KD: Yes. Thank you, Chair Scott. So we in March began an Executives Coalition. So it is not named specifically just kind of under the Coalition's banner. But we have an Executives Coalition that is made up of the executives of agencies who are receiving Continuum of Care funding. And so this just helps us be able to communicate and get additional buy in and greater strategy across our community. Working with the executive level.
- RS: And that was besides those reasons, were there any other reasons for that council being formed?
- KD: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Scott. So, on our Board and in our committees they are elected positions. And so at the end of the year term you term out from participation, have to take a break before you are able to come back and be elected again. And so if we want executive leadership to be involved consistently and aware of what TPOCH is doing, have some advising role as far as kind of creating standardization or buy-in across agencies, just greater collaboration. We needed that consistent communication with them and just having them be in an elected role was not consistent. They would term out and have to be removed from the Board or whatever committee. So by creating this Coalition, this gives them an opportunity to participate in a way where they do not have to term out and, you know, try and get reelected or something.
- RS: Thank you and Supervisor, thanks for letting me jump in there, but that slide sparked a memory of that Executives Council. I appreciate it. Go ahead. Supervisor and then Supervisor Heinz.
- SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just on this chart or maybe another one before. It does not matter. I did not see any presence of law enforcement.
- KD: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy. So law enforcement does not receive funding from the Continuum of Care to provide supportive housing. However, we do partner really closely with law enforcement on a lot of our initiatives. So, for example, we are speaking with the Tucson Police Department currently on how they can be involved in the Point-in-Time Count and other operations like that. So they are a close partner, but they do not receive any Continuum of Care funding.
- SC: I see, and Mr. Chair, Ms. Davis, in some of your categories of those that would be recipients of the program, I did not see anyone with a drug issue or mental health issue.
- KD: Yeah. I thank you Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy. So that does not specifically give you access to these services. Your homeless status does. However, we know

that many of the people that we are serving who are experiencing homelessness have also other issues like substance use disorder or severe mental illness. They may be fleeing domestic violence, all of those things. When we are supporting people experiencing homelessness, they often have multiple different concerns. It is not strictly economic.

SC: So where do those categories fit in with this plan?

KD: Sorry, with the strategic plan? Is that what you are referring to?

SC: Mhm.

KD: Yeah. Go ahead. Did you have something?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, if we can go back to the slide that shows the housing continuum or the house, the little houses from. One more. There we go. So, Supervisor Christy, you ask a very important question. So one of the things that we understand about trauma as well as mental health challenges, substance use, it is an overlay of any individual who may be in any of the housing situations that you see on this particular slide. Substance use is not discriminatory. It does not matter where an individual may be residing that they can still have a substance use issue. It can be a complicating factor for individuals experiencing homelessness, absolutely and create and present a very significant barrier to that individual—either A. accessing services or B. remaining stably housed, once housed. But one of the things that we also understand is that these are co-occurring crises that can happen irrespective of what a certain, what an individual's housing status is when they reach homelessness, when they reach to an unsheltered setting or an emergency shelter situation. One of the things that we are seeing in our community is a pivot to addressing the crisis that the individual is having as step number one, before we can start to address the status of where they are sleeping. So that means can we connect them with detox before we can even start to have a conversation around, where are you going to sleep tonight?

SC: And it would it be, Mr. Chair, Ms. Darland, it would be interesting to see the breakdown of those individuals that you just mentioned with the issues of mental illness and addiction versus those that are just homeless for other reasons. Is it a significant difference or is it down the middle, or do you have that information now?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, so the Point-in-Time Count did give us a little bit of a snapshot of those individuals who largely adults, we only survey among people age 18 and over, and we are seeing a significant increase in the number of adults who are experiencing homelessness, chronic homelessness, and/or substance use and/or mental health. Now through the whole system. These are all self-report data, right? So when we do have an individual who enrolls in shelter and even someone who gets enrolled into a housing program, they do not necessarily disclose and they are not mandated to disclose, it could be that they can be sheltered and or housed, and we would not necessarily identify that they have a substance use issue until we

start to work on ongoing challenges that are getting in the way of them maintaining stable housing.

SC: And they are transferred maybe to another entity and out of this program or?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, you are asking a great question with respect to the ability for our agencies to work in a cross-disciplinary strategy. So we have housing partners who develop relationships with our behavioral health system, as well as our substance crisis intervention system. Being your CODAC, your Community Bridges organizations. And really, they start to triage and resource amongst one another to make sure that they are bringing resources to individuals before they fall out of housing. And we are even seeing this strategy with a multidisciplinary outreach approach that the City of Tucson is employing through a three year supplemental funding opportunity. It is largely meant to put a medical provider, a substance use provider with an outreach individual in a space or like an encampment area and start to triage the crisis that that individual is having while also navigating them into housing. So it is proving to be a more successful approach at bringing care to the individual versus simply moving somebody out of the...

SC: So those categories are not just an abrupt cut down the middle, and those are over here, and your end is over here. There is a blending.

JD: Supervisor, Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Yes, unfortunately, there is not a way to bifurcate the crisis from the status sometimes.

SC: Good point. Last question. Are any of your funds under administration review?

KD: Thank you so much for that question. Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, so currently the funding that was on that slide that has been awarded, and we are awaiting contracts for that funding. As far as we know that funding has not been cut. That funding was awarded as part of a two year appropriation that was supposed to go from 2025 to 2027. Unfortunately, they have decided to cut that and make it one year appropriation, have us do another, you know, another note. They are going to release another nofo within the next month or so, probably to reapply for the funding for this next year. So there has been a bit of a change in process, but as far as...

SC: And it is being monitored, I am sure.

KD: Yeah, but no cuts that we know of yet.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. I think Supervisor Heinz had his hand up first and then Supervisor Cano.

MH: So what is working well and maybe not so well, with regard to our community's efforts to end homelessness by way of permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing initiatives?

KD: Thank you so much for that question. Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz, so the Point-in-Time Count data did just come out recently, and it gives us a bit of a snapshot as to kind of what is happening in our community. It is not, you know, an overarching picture of, you know, the last year, but it does give us some important trend data. And so we really saw an explosion in our unsheltered homelessness during COVID as we had a housing affordability crisis. The lack of affordable housing is the number one driver for homelessness. And so as housing becomes less affordable, we see an increase. Since that time, our overall homeless population has remained steady. However, we have increased sheltered homelessness by 63% since 2022. So that is important because we know that people who are sheltered are safer and generally more stable than people who are unsheltered. So while shelters are definitely not a solution and are not permanent housing, it is encouraging to know that our system has been able to expand to help meet the need that was created. So we still have a ways to go, but that is some signs of improvement. As far as permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing, one of the challenges that we have is due to the lack of affordable housing. It is difficult to exit people from the programs into longer term housing that is affordable for them sustainably. So we continue to work in increasing income and things like that to prepare folks to pay market rate housing levels. But that lack of affordable housing is a big challenge overall for our system.

MH: Great. And Chair Scott, just a couple more questions. Could you just for folks who might be listening at home, permanent supportive housing, can you define that and also then rapid rehousing initiatives. Can you define those two things for folks?

KD: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you so much. So Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz, permanent supportive housing can be permanent. It is for people who are living with disabilities and so it is not time bound. Whereas rapid rehousing you do not have to have a disability, but it is time bound to a maximum of two years.

MH: Okay. Thank you and then I think second to lastly, are we, in your estimation, dedicating too much time, energy, resources, I mean, to emergency shelters and other emergency type measures and maybe not enough of those resources on the permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing, the things that actually move the needle. What would you say about that?

KD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. Yeah, shelters are not permanent housing, as you mentioned. So, you know, any dollars that we can use to create additional housing is going to be a benefit. However, the problem that we have currently, there was a big move kind of away from sheltering and just housing people directly. But the problem that we have now is with the increase in housing costs, there is less ability to do that and so there is more need for shelter right now. I know there is a lot of effort in the community with the new property tax and things like that, to develop

that funding to support more affordable housing, but that is a longer term solution. So we are in the situation now where we have the need for this emergency response and for these emergency shelters to provide that short term solution to help get people into a more permanent solution. So ideally, yes, we would just house everyone who is experiencing homelessness, but without the resources to do that currently, it does give us more of a need for emergency shelter.

MH: Right. Okay. And then lastly, I guess quality versus quantity. And we heard that the numbers of street living homeless are stable. But it looks like and correct me if I am not seeing this accurately, but there is a higher proportion of folks that are suffering from serious mental illness and/or struggling with substance abuse disorders, that kind of thing. How does the fact that while the overall number might be relatively stable, the concentration of those who truly, really are the ones that are the most at risk and the ones that we need to really trying to be helping the most, the number of those folks that have so many, really complicated needs and are suffering from serious mental illnesses and maybe substance use, how does that complicate or how does that kind of change how you have to do this? Because it is not just that one number. It is like, what does that number represent right?

KD: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you. Chair Scott and supervisor Heinz, what the information from the Point-in-Time Count showed us this year is that we do have, you know, kind of a stable number of overall. But the populations you are talking about. So people with serious mental illness, people with substance use disorder, as well as survivors of domestic violence, and people who are experiencing chronic homelessness, which is kind of a specific definition from HUD. But all of those categories of people we are seeing increases. So what that tells us matches with what we are hearing from the direct service staff, is that the people that they are working with, their issues are much more complex. So it takes a lot more work and a lot more resources to really meet the needs of those folks, compared to somebody who maybe just lost housing due to economic reasons. And so as our population of people experiencing homelessness gets sicker or more complicated, it requires more staff time from our agencies to really meet the needs of those clients. It also makes housing stability really difficult. So if we are able to house folks that is only the first step. Then we have to keep them housed. And so having the staff time to be able to, you know, create stability is really a challenge and it creates a lot of burnout within the direct service staff as well. And so that is one of the reasons why we have also identified that priority for our strategic plan of supporting the workforce.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and thank you Ms. Davis and Director Darland, for your presentation today. As you are aware, a few weeks ago, the Board of Supervisors passed Policy No. D 22.17. That is the Affordable Housing Fund and I am curious, we are supposed to get recommendations from the Commission in just a few weeks, August 31st is what the policy says. And given what we have heard from both Director Darland and Ms. Davis, about the need for short term emergency

support, I am just curious how we are communicating that to the Commission so that their recommendations are consistent with meeting Ms. Davis's point, which is the need is now. And that was kind of one of my worries, Chair Scott, at first is that we passed this historic investment focused on the supply side, but then have to juggle those priorities of the emergency relief that is needed in the interim. And so I do not know if it would help from this discussion. If we suggest a percentage that is going toward the supportive housing that is needed in the interim. I also am curious, so I want an update on that process. How is the Commission doing based on what we pass as a Board, but also in looking at the policy here, the Board was very, our definitions are very expansive and so I feel as though, for instance, if a jurisdiction in the region had a really good program that they wanted to see funded to keep people housed, I want to make sure that this policy is allowing that flexibility, not just for the public, excuse me, the private sector or nonprofits to be able to offer their proposals but I do not want to see us duplicating something that is already happening. And so specifically Director Darland, I mean, are we getting any word that any jurisdictions are considering coming to the Commission for funds from Policy D22.17? I hope that makes sense.

KD: Thank you, Chair. Scott. Supervisor Cano, yes. So as a matter of fact, prior to the Board's action on the Board policy, we had established a timeline to establish a housing draft housing strategy. And one of the strategies under discussion, including the funding, was to address housing for individuals exiting homelessness. So that is a specific strategy that the Commission and the working group are taking under review and I am leading that conversation with agencies. I have had conversations with La Frontera. I have had conversations with Primavera and also informed by my ongoing dialog with Ms. Davis at the City with TPOCH. Right now, where we are slated, I believe that the Commission is going to be taking, we are having the conversation at the August meeting. The strategies around addressing homelessness are really about the brick and mortar. We have not gotten to the service strategy, but that is not to say that it will not inform that. As a matter of fact, Ms. Davis has been invited to present to the Affordable Housing Commission to provide the same presentation that she has provided to the Board, as well as the same presentation she has provided to Mayor and Council as well. So as the Commission starts to formalize the recommendations that will be brought forward to the Board that will also be part of the conversation that commissioners take under review.

AC: Thank you. Chair Scott. Really just a comment now, that I believe we have reached a perfect storm where you have got varying levels of jurisdictional oversight. Now, City of Tucson's Mayor and Council just last month voted on an ordinance that bans camping in washes and in parks. And so I do believe that as we figure out the enforcement mechanism of this, there is going to have to be an immediate ability for our jurisdictions, no matter where you live, to be able to take care of people and ensure that people are housed. And so I did not hear Director, any specific guidance that you need from this Board yet. It appears that the Commission is doing its due diligence and that they are going to come forward. But I do believe that housing supply is not something that is really going to be figured out in the next year or so.

The market's a bit chilled in terms of new development. And so I would encourage our Commission to keep an open mind and the recommendations that are going to come before this Board in just a few weeks, because I do think that we need that as enforcement happens across the region, we are just we are also going to see an uptick in need as what will end up happening. Thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. Supervisor Christy?

SC: I just want an apology to the Board. I should have caught when I talked about lawyers being involved, that that was Council. It should have been spelled e-l, not i-l. So I apologize for that. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor. Allen?

JA: So. Thank you, Ms. Davis. A couple a couple quick questions. So looking at the diagram that is got the, I do not know if they are concentric when they are tilted up that way, but the increasing circles. So if those are the new kind of priorities or strategies, I am wondering about how those differ from what they were in the past and kind of what led to that shift? What was the data or the observations that led to that pivot?

KD: Yeah. Great question. Thank you so much. Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen. So previously our last strategic plan was a lot more kind of tied to numbers of, you know no more than x number of people experiencing homelessness. The problem with goals like that is that the homeless response system is really responding to the crisis. We are not creating homelessness and so we do not have control over how many people become homeless. All we can do is respond to the need to the best of our ability. And so we wanted priorities and goals this time that really measure the work of TPCH. Like, what are we actually able to control? What are we able to improve? And so that is why we are focusing more on the people, the individual client experience, the staff workforce experience, our own efficiency within our system, as well as those partnerships and collaborations outside of our system and across the region. And so those things are much more things that we actually are able to improve, and areas where we have a bit more control. And so that is, we felt like these were better measures of the actual work of TPCH.

JA: Thank you and then my last question is just about the Point-in-Time study. My understanding is that there are a few places that do not participate in the study and do not share data, and I am wondering which places those are and what kind of margin of error then does that create in the data set?

KD: Thank you for that question. Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen, I do not know of any specific places not sharing data. Did you have? Oh yeah. Got it. Oh some shelters okay. My apologies. Yes. So the shelter system is super complex and mostly funded through funds like state funds, FEMA funding, philanthropic dollars. We have very little funding that is City or County controlled that goes into shelters and so we do not really have the ability to compel folks to participation. So we do our best to

coordinate with partners. But you know, we cannot make everyone participate. So there are many shelters that do participate in the Point-in-Time Count. And really the point in time count is really great for actually looking at trends. The year over year data is kind of the best way to look at the Point-in-Time Count. It is just a snapshot. We have other data reports that show kind of, you know, throughout the year, how many folks did we serve? But the Point-in-Time Count is really just that snapshot. So keeping our methodology similar year to year so that we can do those comparisons year to year is really kind of the best way to look at that data. And so we know that it is an undercount. We know that. And I think we go out and do a thorough of a job as we can. This year we expanded what we were doing. We are using over 400 volunteers. So I think that what we do is actually really thorough. We are definitely counting, I would say the majority of folks who are either unsheltered or sheltered that day, definitely the majority of folks who are sheltered. And so it is absolutely not perfect, and it is definitely an undercount, but it does give us those trends from year to year to kind of show us, like, are we trending in the right direction? How do we compare against other communities nationally? HUD releases a point or it is called an AR, but it is the annual report of all the nationwide Point-in-Time Count information and the last couple years there have been huge increases across the country. And so when we look at our data, we can say, okay, our data, you know, we are pretty flat. We are at a very high level, higher than we would like to be, but we are not seeing the giant increases that are happening across the country and so comparing those trends is really the best way to kind of look at the Point-in-Time Count data rather than, you know, counting on the exact number. Is this the exact number of people we have experiencing homelessness? No. But it gives us an idea of the overall trend.

JA: Thank you so much.

KD: Thank you.

JA: And thanks for your work.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Could we go back to the slide that lists the four areas of focus for the strategic plan? It is near the end I believe. Now the, it is a little further along. There we go. Draft Priorities, that one. And Director Darland that is what you are going to be meeting with each district office about correct?

JD: Chair Scott. Yes, that is correct.

RS: Could I ask two favors? Number one, could you prepare some guiding questions to help frame the dialog that you have with each district office? And as you know, I meet each month with Mayor Romero, and we talk about common areas of interest and concern for both the City and the County. We have had, as Ms. Leshner knows, discussions about TPCH in those meetings, I would like to be able to share with the Mayor the input that Board members have on TPCH draft priorities and then would also ask that she share the draft priorities of Mayor and Council as well.

JD: Yes, Chair Scott, I will work with Ms. Davis to make sure that we come up with those questions and then reach out to each of the respective offices to schedule some time.

RS: Fantastic. Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments for our guests? Alright, thank you both so very much.

JD: Thank you.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

17. 2026 Legislative Agenda

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 24, of the Board of Supervisors, adopting a Pima County Legislative Program for 2026.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Alright, now we are on Item No. 18, which is our Legislative Agenda and I would like to draw your attention to the Legislative Agenda and the categories that are covered. And I would like to make an amendment to add a condition, add an area of focus to Section D, which is Fortify Public Safety and I am going to make this amendment based on a meeting that I had with the local leadership of the NAACP, and they asked us to consider this addition to the agenda. It is consistent with legislation that the Board has supported in the past. So what I am proposing is, if you look at the section that says Fortify Public Safety, after No. 3, add a new No. 4, and that No. 4 would say, "support criminal justice reform efforts, including but not limited to, the elimination of cash bond and the restoration of voter rights."

JA: Second.

RS: Alright. Moved and seconded. And again, that comes at the request of the local NAACP. They are working with the State NAACP on this. I should say this is something that would be part of our legislative program, but not necessarily something we would bring before the legislative policy summit of the County Supervisors Association. Alright. Any discussion on that? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I had something else I wanted to add, but we should probably discuss and vote on yours first.

RS: Yes. Thank you sir. All those in favor of that amendment indicate by saying, "Aye." Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: Opposed.

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

MH: Thank you. I was hoping to add a request for our contract lobbyist to work during this next legislative session to, I guess, check in with other counties and explore the potential for allowing other County Boards, including, of course, our own, to hire independent counsel. It is difficult for us to do right now, and I think that that is something that has been previously adjudicated a bit in Maricopa County, but I think that could potentially be a significant benefit for us and other counties as well. And I do not know how possible that will be in this next session, but it would be something I would like Mr. Rossi to start exploring.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: If Supervisor Heinz is putting that in the form of a motion, I would be glad to second it.

MH: Yes, that was in the form of a long, rambling motion. Thank you.

RS: And that would require legislative action?

MH: I am surprised, Chair Scott, that it would require legislative action. But right now our Board is restricted to the County Attorney basically only unless there is a conflict or for the purposes of litigation, we could actually just go out and hire anybody like that, but for like just general legal counsel or advice or whatever, like that, there might be a way but it has not really been tested. So I think that a statutory solution would be the most clear and definitive way to make that happen. So yes.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just to reinforce what Supervisor Heinz is saying, but I would not try to restrict it to advice versus litigation. I would like to say that we would be able to enact that right at any particular time under any particular instance.

MH: Whatever the Board wants.

RS: I do not know if you know this right off the top of your head, Mr. Brown, but what are the current statutory restrictions for Boards of Supervisors?

SB: You are correct Chair Scott. I do not know all of the answers off the top of my head, but generally the County Attorney is the attorney for the Board. And if the Board chooses in a certain situation based on the facts to hire counsel, it is the County Attorney who will decide who that outside counsel is depending on the situation.

RS: I am sorry, Administrator Lesher, do you want to say something?

JL: No, I was just answering that question. Yes, it is in statute.

RS: Okay. Alright. Go ahead Supervisor Heinz.

MH: And just my understanding, talking to some outside counsel as well as the County Attorney herself, based on some case law that exists on a particular issue, this Board could vote to find that there is a lack of harmony with the County Attorney and us, and for that particular situation, then engage other counsel independently. But it would not be something that we could just do freely. So that is why I am seeking the statutory solution. And again, I do not know how possible it is going to be in 2026. I just think it is something that could be a benefit to this Board potentially in the future and certainly other Boards, as well, and that should be something that we have him explore.

SC: And Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor.

SC: Again, just to reinforce the situation that Supervisor Heinz is bringing up, it should not be limited to areas such as a second opinion, not just litigation, and not just having an outside counsel approach or address something. But if we should wish to seek a second opinion, I would like to see that that would be included in your request as well.

MH: I want statutory authority potentially for anything that any independent counsel use that a majority of any County Board deems as most appropriate for their own purposes, whatever that is. So yeah, I am trying to keep it as general as possible.

RS: So just to put this into motion language, you are suggesting that we add to the Legislative Agenda a request that the contracted lobbyist look into statutory authority for Boards of Supervisors to contract with outside counsel without seeking permission from the County Attorney.

MH: Yes. That is good, I like that.

RS: And that is what you are seconding, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

RS: Supervisor Cano, do you know if anything like this has come up in discussion at the Legislature in your recent tenure? And it did during yours too Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I know it has come up.

RS: Okay.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott not aware of it and not in support of adding that to our Legislative Agenda for the time being. I think what is really important with the Agenda is that it is open for modifications throughout the year. It is meant to be an inclusive document that will guide our lobbying efforts. And I think, generally speaking, what is most important is that we also get our County Attorney to be able to opine on this before the Board moves on this item, in my opinion.

RS: I appreciate that and you raise another important point, which is, and Administrator Leshner and I were talking about this earlier, which is that this is not a document that can only be amended now. It can be amended in the future as well. And I appreciate your suggestion that we get the County Attorney to, as you said, opine on this before we vote on it. And you indicated Supervisor Heinz that you had had a conversation with Ms. Conover about this?

MH: Yeah. It went kind of like this: No.

SC: And Mr. Chair, I can attest to the same thing. I was admonished and warned and heavily lobbied by the County Attorney not to ever even consider seeking outside counsel because there could be ramifications involved in that.

MH: And I will remind Chair Scott and my colleagues, just last year when we had a rogue Sheriff, I think violating multiple election laws again and again and again. Abusing from an electoral standpoint, his opponent at the time, we referred that to, well, kind of posthumously, but we refer that to the County, to the Attorney General. But at the time, we could not be represented by the County Attorney. These kinds of things happen multiple times. Recently on the, as the representative for PAG RTA, we had a very unexpected, precipitous departure of the retained counsel for PAG RTA and in going through the process that required an executive session, looking at an interim director, all that kind of stuff, I was told multiple times by our County Attorney and their office, very politely, but kick rocks. I mean, it was like, we cannot. Sorry, we do not work for PAG RTA. We cannot offer you, though you are the County representative to PAG RTA, we cannot offer you legal advice on anything. Open on some stuff but open meeting law, no. We adjudicate that. We cannot talk to you about that. And I mean, come on. It is not just that, but there have been multiple occasions where our needs have not been adequately served, I think. And so whether it is a situation like that happening again or it just seems to me like this Board and others could be better served by having a different type of legal counsel relationship and that is not a disrespectful thing at all. I am just noticing a system

that does not work well. And I know other Boards, including Maricopa Board of Supervisors, have tried this as well and are interested in this. So I cannot speak for other Boards or other people, but I do think this does make sense to at least explore.

RS: Well, knowing that we can amend this at any point, and knowing that the legislative session is not going to start up until January, I would like to formally request Mr. Brown that we get an opinion on this suggestion from the County Attorney, and Ms. Leshner, I would like you to please reach out to the County Supervisors Association to see if there has been any similar action taken in other counties. And perhaps, Mr. Brown, you could also ask Ms. Conover to reach out to her professional association, because I know the Attorneys General have one as well. But, you know, I agree with Supervisor Cano. I do not want to decide this today. We do not have to decide it today. And I would like to get as much input as possible before we make a decision. So I will not be able to support the amendment today.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I just want you to know I do have an opinion already on that very same issue from prior requests for outside counsel.

MH: Oh that is right.

RS: Oh, I recall that. I recall that.

SC: And the answer was basically, could you say it again, Supervisor?

MH: No.

RS: Alright. That is true, I remember that Supervisor Christy and maybe we could have that reissued as part of what I am requesting. Alright. Let us do Supervisor Allen, anything that you wanted to say?

JA: No.

RS: Okay. Alright, let us go to a vote on this amendment. Let us do a roll call vote.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: No.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: No.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No. Alright. That is defeated by a vote of 2-3, with Supervisors Christy and Heinz in support. I will move approval of the 2026. I am sorry, did you have something else, Supervisor Allen? My apologies. Go ahead please.

JA: That is alright. I wanted to also propose an amendment to the Protect the Taxpayer section of the Legislative Agenda to direct our lobbyists to investigate the elimination of the exemption of data centers to state and local sales tax. So, you know, data centers are not a new industry anymore to Arizona, this exemption was introduced, established in 2013. Since then, the industry has proliferated across the State. So continuing with this exemption, when this industry is already firmly rooted at a time when Arizona is facing severe economic impact, City, County, State budgets are severely strained. Just does not make sense any longer. So for, you know, as an example, and I am not presuming that these are the perfect precise numbers, but we are estimating that the equipment costs for Project Blue at about \$2.4 billion, which would mean that the City, County and state are collectively losing out on roughly \$209 million in sales tax revenue. So that combined with the impact on our community's water use, energy demand, air quality, noise pollution, it just does not feel like there is a need to have such a substantive tax break. Generally, these things are used as incentives to pull industry here or establish some new routes. I guess I would also note that there is increasing concern around this proliferation. So I think that this is something that on our agenda, I have been led to believe might actually garner some bipartisan support and might gain some traction. We have seen just recently new regulations introduced in Phoenix, Mesa, Marana, Chandler all have some new regulations related to data centers. And we recently saw some comments from a member of the Arizona Corporation Commission as well. So I think there is a little bit of a shift in tide and I think this is something that would deeply benefit the financial state of our community.

MH: I will second that and I do not know if it is a demand, but the concern that as a legislator and I know my colleague, Supervisor Cano, can reflect on this as well. One of the most frustrating things as a legislator was that you can slash taxes, enter into, you can add an exemption, add a tax credit with a simple majority vote, which happened again and again and again and again, and to remove a tax credit, to remove an existing exemption or to raise any sort of assessment tax, whatever, that requires a supermajority vote of the Legislature. And it is just the stupidest thing ever. So not even Utah does that, Anyway, so I do support that.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I think injecting in this in a Pima County matter during the middle of a pending transaction with a data center before it has even been approved, before it is even been annexed, could create a situation where the end user was relying on certain conveyances that were made to them in order to come here. And in the middle of this, before it is even approved, I think it is putting the cart before the horse and opening up Pima County to lawsuits, and it could have a detrimental effect on the entire situation and could expose Pima County to a very vulnerable state at this particular time. I think after the deal should come to fruition, then perhaps we can revisit it. But at this particular time before it is even in place, I think it would be exposing the entire project not only for failure, but for a lawsuit to the County.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: On that point that Supervisor Christy is making. I think this would be a question for our legal counsel. My understanding is that we would incur potential liability for doing anything that would somehow make us not in good faith, like if we did something to sort of torpedo the real estate contract or..

SC: Breach of contract.

MH: Yeah. Would adding something to the legislative priorities like this, would you think that would be, like it does not seem like a meaningful sort of torpedoing of a contract we voted on. That is the only thing that would bring us liability, I think, but I wanted to hear you.

SB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. I think a general addition to the Legislative Agenda would not create liability. Something more specific I would be more concerned about.

MH: Thank you.

RS: I will just say I am generally opposed to the legislature putting in exemptions, credits that detract from public revenue unless there is some economic incentive that is going to lift all boats. That does not usually happen. I cannot support this amendment because it is specifically targeted at one very topical and specific area. But I am generally in support of what you are saying Supervisor Allen, I just would rather take it on in a more general way. But to Supervisor Heinz's point, because we have and I think we have had since 1992 that amendment to the Arizona State Constitution rolling back any credit or cut or exemption, requires a two thirds vote of both houses of the legislature. So I think we would also be asking our lobbyists to do something that is extraordinarily unlikely. Any other discussion on this?

- SC: I am just wondering if it would be a more prudent way to handle this thing by tabling it until we do get a formal legal opinion from the County Attorney.
- RS: You are talking about tabling the motion that Supervisor Allen has made?
- SC: Correct on the Legislative Agenda.
- RS: And what are you requesting from the County?
- SC: A full legal opinion from the County Attorney's Office in terms of whether or not this would affect a breach of contract situation or proposed liability to the County.
- JA: I am not a lawyer, but this is adding, just to clarify what this is not, it is not us passing an ordinance or a resolution. This is us adding a piece to our Legislative Agenda that only if under the best of circumstances is successful, is approved in next year's legislative session, which would come into effect after they sign that. Like this is I do not see how this would actually affect the implementation of what is currently on the table. The motivation behind it is looking ahead and how do we start to not open up, sort of slow down the floodgates of what I think is coming here for our community.
- AC: Chair Scott?
- RS: Supervisor Cano?
- AC: So, I too would like to see us delay the conversation about specific language related to any tax exemption until we are able to really, as a Board, figure out how we are going to put some more meat on the bones for our legislative strategy in the year ahead. I am not sure where our contract lobbyists are on the federal or state side right now, but I am going to take it that the County Administrator can certainly speak to our Legislative Agenda. Supervisor Allen's suggestion I am supportive of, because less revenue means less in our State shared revenue and that is what impacts counties and cities. And so I do believe that somewhere in this beautiful document there is the ability, the adaptability for our lobbying team to be able to go in and make that case for Pima County opposes carve outs that hurt our state shared revenue, but I want to make sure that we are providing the best language moving forward. And so I commit to figuring out how we can do that at another meeting. I think because I want to talk generally about the Legislative Agenda, I am going to keep those comments to that right now and then would like to talk generally with the overall motion.
- SC: Supervisor Cano if you are putting that in the form of a motion to table, I would second it.
- AC: Well, I mean, I think it is really Supervisor Allen, how would you like to proceed? Would you like to vote on the specific exemption now?

JA: Yeah, I think I would rather. And then, you know, we could bring it back up if need be, but yeah. And you know, just say I have done legwork on it and I have talked to people about it and including the language, but...

AC: What is the specific language?

JA: To investigate the elimination of data centers as to the state and local sales tax exemptions.

RS: Alright, I agree with Supervisor Cano and he did a better job of expressing what I said earlier, which is I am generally opposed to, as you call them, carve outs. But I think having a specific reference to a specific carve out does not allow us to weigh in on the larger issue, which is all of these carve outs that affect not just state shared revenue, but revenue for the entire state. Go ahead, Supervisor, please.

JA: If I may, I agree, but we have a greater likelihood of success in being specific in a legislative strategy. And you know, I say that with a like, you know, sitting next to a couple legislators. I begin the legislative strategy, having the larger trying to fight the bigger fight, but far less likelihood of success, but trying to find a specific fight around an increasing concern of data centers in particular, that is shared by local governments around the state, there is a far greater likelihood of success on one, and sometimes it is beneficial to get the one win on one item and then proceed the larger fight to the next item. Because this state tax exemption is written specifically, it is not a subset of something broader. It is a very specific exemption. So that is what.

MH: If I may Chair Scott?

RS: Please.

MH: Just one more quick thing of the legislators. I feel like we are talking too much, but I was able to get the last Blue law eliminated as one of my crowning achievements as a legislator. That would be the, you cannot drink on Sunday between 6:00 a.m. until 10:00 a.m. Everyone is welcome. So I did that, like Andy Biggs voted for my bill. Andy Biggs, Congressman Biggs. So it is really interesting when you get a specific sometimes kind of little bit of a niche issue. You can find so many people and I needed a majority, not a supermajority. So I am not saying this is likely. I am just saying that if there is already a bipartisan interest in something like this, I had way more than the supermajority, though I think I had pretty darn near a supermajority for this. Frank Antenori, who would have appointed to move from the House over to the Senate. He was like my Republican guy in the House and then he got appointed to fill Jonathan Patton's seat. And then, like he was me, toss it on the Liquor Board Reauthorization Bill, which really pissed off Brewer. Anyway, but it got done. So it is really interesting how the sausage is made at the legislature. So I think we can be more creative about these kinds of things and that is why I seconded the motion if this is already bipartisan supported it might actually go. So I think we should give it a chance.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Any other comments questions? Alright. Let us do a roll call vote on this.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: No.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

RS: Chair Scott?

RS: No. Okay. That is defeated by a vote of 2-3, with Supervisors Allen and Heinz in favor. Unless there are no further amendments. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, I want to thank the County Administrator for putting together this Legislative Agenda. I do want at our next meeting for us to get either a memo or a presentation from our contract lobbyists on the prior legislative session and wins, you know, highs and lows, to be able to figure out how we are going to be proactive in the year ahead. We are the second largest County and received the second lowest amount of appropriations from this legislative session. And that needs to change. It is not a criticism. It is just an opportunity for us to be able to be very specific about what kind of ask we are going to be making as a County and as a region with our jurisdictional partners. I believe that there are legislators on both sides of the aisle that want to bring wins to Pima County, and I want more wins. And I do believe that we will be able to proceed with this legislative agenda with that in mind and I also commit to Supervisor Allen figuring out language that will honor the spirit of the motion that was just defeated, so that we can really begin to have a conversation about the local impact of what the State's inaction or action really is. I mean, we are at the mercy, as a County, to our state legislature and the State of Arizona, and I do wholeheartedly believe that carve outs have been disastrous to our bottom line, because state shared revenues have gotten us to where we are at today. And so I commit to figuring out with Supervisor Allen the specific tasks that we need to empower our lobbyists to be able to advocate on our behalf at our next meeting.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Go ahead, Supervisor.

SC: Just very quickly. There are a number of items that I do not particularly care for, nor could I support if they were stand alone in the Legislative Agenda. However, there are several that are near and dear to District 4's heart, and that is dealing with wildfire mitigation as well as the insurance issue of folks being unable to obtain adequate fire insurance for their homes, as well as rising premiums and there are several items on the agenda addressing that. And even though there are others that I cannot, I will be supporting the Legislative Agenda on that basis.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. And Ms. Leshar, will you check to see if Mr. Rossi is available on August 5th, per Supervisor Cano's request? And we could put that under the County Administrator section of the agenda. Alright. Okay. So I will move approval of the, I am looking at the right title on the agenda. I will move approval of Resolution No. 2025-24, which is the 2026 Legislative Agenda.

MM: As amended.

RS: As amended, thank you, Ms. Manriquez.

MH: Second.

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

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Item passes 5-0. Thank you to all my colleagues for that discussion.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

20. The Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2025, postponed consideration of this item due to a tie vote:

Contract

The Chamber of Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide economic development support services for Pima County and Southern Arizona, General Fund, contract amount \$550,000.00 (PO2500018868)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
JS: Joe Snell, President and CEO, The Chamber of Southern Arizona
FM: Fletcher McCusker, Treasurer, The Chamber of Southern Arizona

RS: So let us go to Item No. 21. This is Unfinished Business, Chamber of Southern Arizona and I am going to move that we accept the County Administrator's recommendation and approve the contract with the Chamber of Southern Arizona for the period of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026, in the amount of \$550,000.00.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. Discussion? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I commented on this last time. I wanted to kind of resume my comments around just some concerns about the contract, the amount of money that it represents. And so first, I think that the Chamber has little reach across the rural communities and across the expanse of the County. The primary focus is around the Tucson Metro Area, leaving behind other chambers and some of the small businesses that comprise the rest of Pima County. The Chamber is a membership based organization that is accountable to that membership and as we have seen in the past we have been at odds with one another on different initiatives, where the Chamber has come out against some of the efforts of local government. And we can also have different goals. Right. The Board has goals that are reflected through the Prosperity Initiative, through Pima Prospers, through the development of a Climate Action Plan that have to show up and weave into the decisions and the things that we support as a Board and understanding the complexity then, of the decisions and

of our community that do not necessarily get reflected in decisions and efforts that are pursued by the Chamber as it relates to economic development opportunities. So for those reasons and others, I would like to make a substitute motion that reduces the amount of the contract to \$300,000.00 and moving the difference of the \$250,000.00 to our County's Economic Development Department, and then also removing the words, "if releasable", from Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 3.2, of the reporting section and this is within a section in which if the Chamber is subject to nondisclosure agreements, that we would not receive information about the projects that are being pursued that would impact them.

AC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Cano, discussion on the substitute motion?

SC: Mr. Chair. This again is typical of this Body because no one has served in the capacity of a business ownership or put in private capital or private equity into an enterprise. So it is very difficult, I am sure, for my colleagues to understand what businesses go through and that is why it is so important that this Board keep its hands out of the daily efforts of the Chamber. The important thing is to keep the structure alive and in place and that it is a uniform body that speaks as a whole for the business community, one that has really been attacked and criticized time and time again by this Board. And this Board does not seem to realize that this is where our tax dollars are generated from, that support the County's efforts. It is not the Chamber's job to rubber stamp the decisions or the policies or the direction of the Board of Supervisors. That is why we need the Chamber of Commerce to keep it together, to have a formation where the business community can come together, can defend themselves, can speak up for themselves, and can put forward their points of view. They may conflict with the Board of Supervisors, but that is no guarantee that we have to be, the Chamber has to be a rubber stamp for anything that the Board of Supervisors enacts or pursues. The most important thing to in addition to this is by denigrating the amount of money that we are originally going to contribute with the Administrator's recommendations to the Chamber. If we deny that or mitigate it, or cut it or slash it, it sends out yet another big billboard to the world that Pima County is not open for business. This Board should be supportive of the Chamber, its efforts, its decisions and its membership. And I can tell you, as a former Chair of the Chamber and a longtime member of the Chamber, there is no other vehicle in Pima County that stands up for them or speaks to them, as the Chamber does, and it is a direct slap in the face to business owners, mom and pop generational enterprises, to employers, to entities that allow people to put food on their table and to grow and expand and enjoy the fruits of their labor. It is a slap in their face by taking away monies that supports their efforts. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other comments on the substitute motion? Alright. Let us do a, Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yeah. If I may. So I guess that was technically before that, shoot. How does this work? So I cannot talk about diversifying funds for the Chambers. I have to talk about just the substitute..

RS: We are just talking about the substitute motion that Supervisor Allen made that was seconded by Supervisor Cano.

MH: Alright. Okay. Got it. So I do support continued county funding for the Chamber of Southern Arizona. As to the level, I think that is something that we can definitely take up. I think right this very second is not great just because of the recent merger and we are kind of into this cycle now. I think that it makes more sense to do that for the next budget cycle. But I would like to have increased transparency as to various activities that they are doing and how those are generating economic activity, more regular reporting of kind of just how the County's investment is, you know, bearing fruit, so to speak. I know we have had that conversation in previous Boards as well, so I would appreciate that. I do think it makes sense for us to look at these specific amounts and kind of how we are allocating things. But to deviate from the County Administrator's recommendation now I think is just a little bit too last minute. Not that I do not support looking at this in the future, but at the moment I do want to just stick with the recommendation of the County Administrator.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I do not think that \$300,000.00 being allocated to the Chamber is a face slap. I think it is a very significant investment. But furthermore that is what the proposal is, to fund \$300,000.00 to the Chamber, \$250,000.00 of an increase to our own Economic Development Department. That is supporting and bolstering economic development and supporting business that is around in the greater Tucson area. I think we need to think about and this is part of the problematic nature of the relationship, is that we also have to think about other Chambers. It opens it up. I have heard from other Chambers that have said in addition to aside from today that have asked about what the contribution would be now to them as well, so that is a reality. I just also have to because I have heard this before, I have worked for 30 years for nonprofit organizations, which just because there is not a profit tied to it, does not mean that I do not know what it is to be responsible for hundreds of employees and covering their payroll and their health insurance, and ensuring that we are meeting the needs that the organization goes to serve and the people, and being responsible and accountable, the Boards of Directors, and those end up being experiences that have enabled me to connect with and support small business. They are not two separate worlds, so there is tremendous support, I think, on this Board, including for myself, for the small business community across Southern Arizona. And it is based on my own experience, but it is also based on experience for the value that they bring and contribute to everyday families and the vision of where we live. So I just cannot let that, you know, sort of sit and hover without responding to it. So thank you.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Supervisor Cano?

- AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, since we are in the middle of voting on the substitute motion, I just wanted a parliamentary process inquiry. Are we going to be voting on this and then hear from our Chamber representatives after this particular substitute motion? Where would you like to see them speak?
- RS: I was not going to call on Mr. Snell or Mr. McCusker unless Board members had questions for them. So they are here for the same reason that Councilmember Perez was here.
- AC: Got it. So, Chair Scott, would you prefer to have them come up now or in the next?
- RS: That is it. Thank you for the question. If your question for them is related to the substitute motion, then we would have them come up. Now if you have a question for them that is related to the original motion, then we would have them come up later.
- AC: Okay, I think they are interlinked. So if you are okay with it, Chair Scott, I am going to proceed with asking President Snell to come join us.
- RS: Absolutely. Mr. Snell, Mr. McCusker, if you could come forward, we would appreciate it. And you could also, if you wanted to, Supervisor Cano or any of my colleagues' direct questions to Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi or Mr. DeBonis or Ms. Leshner, if you had questions for staff.
- AC: Thank you so much, Chair Scott and President Snell. I am really grateful that you are here and of course, have deep respect for Mr. McCusker, whose community engagement I value dearly. President Snell, Pima County, you mentioned this at our last meeting represents about a seventh of the Chamber's budget. I do not know if that is an accurate number. I am curious, what is the Chamber's plan in this new merged organization that you have to treat this investment as more than a passive contribution and as a public partnership that demands public benefit.
- JS: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board, thank you for your time today and your consideration. Supervisor Cano, I think I understand your question. If I do not, please redirect, but we take it more than a passive. It is not a donation and it is not a passive investment for us. It is we sign a scope, a contract with you, and we have to provide a scope of services on that contract. So for us it is a very important contract that we need to provide returns to you on. So it is not a contribution or something like that. It very much so has metrics that we have to adhere by and those are negotiated back and forth every year. I hope that answers it.
- AC: It does and I think I have 2 or 3 more questions. Chair Scott, thank you. Quarter 1, you reported 23 jobs. Quarter 2, you reported zero. Quarter 3, you reported zero jobs created and in Quarter 4, there was an uptick. You had a lot more numbers. And I want to thank you for ensuring that public dollars are going where they need to go. What happened in Quarter 2 and Quarter 3, with the job performance

numbers coming to the Board at zero? If I were in the private sector, I would probably be fired.

JS: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board. What happened? You know, job creation is not linear. It does not fit equally in quarters. We had a national election, and frankly, a major disruption with tariffs and stuff, and it caused a disruption in the number of companies that we thought would land when they landed. So very common. We can see deals that can take 3 to 5 years. The deal that you looked at last time, Project Blue, we have been dealing with for, for almost three and a half years. So they do take a long. So there is no way to predict exactly when those happen. You know, I would like to spread them out equally, but it does not work that way. And I think this year in particular was a little extraordinary. Again, presidential elections disrupt. Businesses do not like unpredictability. They absolutely do not. They want predictability. So between any presidential election and this one was a little different. It was a controversial and then the tariffs coming in did throw businesses, it made a pause happen for them. So when they were thinking about investment they paused that a little bit. And I still think there is some of that going on.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. One of my other questions is what role does the Chamber see itself playing in advancing the Prosperity Initiative? That actually is not just a County document that is a document that the entire region has embraced and I am curious, when you are recruiting and retaining major employers, how you are talking about our incredible need to reduce poverty in our region. And I am thankful that the County Administrator has ensured that in this new contract, there are some metrics tied to how you are going to be embracing the Prosperity Initiative, but I am worried that perhaps the spirit of that has not made it into the boardroom.

FM: I will let Joe answer that. A couple quick comments as to this money, how it is different than investments in other Chambers and the 20 year history that this appropriation has with the County. These are attraction dollars. We use them exclusively to cater to, market to, post, publish in their newsletters, site selectors and companies that are looking at coming to Tucson. It is been the historical nature of these dollars seriously for the last 20 years. They are earmarked to that marketing effort. They are in our budget. The Treasurer are now responsible for that budget as marketing dollars. So if you reduce it, the only thing that is going to affect is our ability to market outside of the region to people that are looking to coming to Tucson. I share Supervisor Allen's passion about small business. Rio Nuevo is all about enabling small business, but that is not the conversation about this appropriation. This money goes entirely to, I do not know that the Chamber has done a good job being accountable to you for these dollars, and we can change that. So you can see exactly where they go, but where they are budgeted to go and where they are earmarked to go, Supervisor Cano, is into the attraction side of what we do. The Sun Corridor side of what we do. Chambers do not interact with sites selectors. We are the site selector receiving agency and have been for Tucson. I think the merger has confused that element of what Sun Corridor does, because we have combined the history of the Small Business Chamber, as Supervisor Christy identified with this attraction organization, that for years has brought companies to

this region that understand our values, our mission and our economy. Caterpillar, Amazon, Hexagon, HomeGoods, Target, and on and on and on. We promote our values when we are first introduced to these companies. One way that we do that is that any inbound CEO sits down with at least a dozen of us in their introductory dinner, and it is the CEOs of companies in our region talking about the value and virtues of our region, from affordability to weather, to accessibility to nearness to the border, to things that we need them to embrace. Our conversations with the Caterpillar Foundation were significant as part of the recruitment of Caterpillar to Tucson. They invest in things that matter to us, and I think that is the point of this. And to Supervisor Heinz, if there are issues with this, we budgeted for this appropriation. If we lose it, we have got to go back to our budget. If there are issues with us in the next year, or if you are unhappy with the accountability that we have, we can address that. But I think it is important that you understand these are attraction dollars. They are not earmarked to help small business. It is not a Chamber dues. It is specific to our marketing efforts outside of the region.

AC: Thank you so much, Chair Scott and Mr. McCusker. Can you tell us a bit more, Mr. McCusker, in your role as Treasurer, what the neighboring jurisdictions are pitching into the new Chamber for Southern Arizona in terms of contributions? The only one I am aware of is City of Tucson at \$50,000.00.

FM: This is the only government entity that contributes anything at this scale. There are other jurisdictions that pay Chamber dues, but again, we are not responsible to them for attraction. We view your role regionally as the organization that is not parochial when it comes to attracting a company. If we have a contract with the City of Tucson to attract a company, they are only interested in attracting that company into their city limits. So it creates a conflict with the County and with other jurisdictions. So we have always looked to the County as the primary funder of our attraction dollars, because you do represent the entire region. This has been much higher historically. It was \$650,000.00 two years ago. It was dropped to \$550,000.00 last year. But again, it is used to promote the region, not any one jurisdiction within the region.

RS: Supervisor Cano any other questions? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, gentlemen, both of you, for being here to talk on this issue. You mentioned, Mr. McCusker, that the funding has already been cut from Pima County to Sun Corridor, and that amount was how much and when?

FM: Chairman Scott, Supervisor Christy, a year ago, our allocation from the County was \$650,000.00. So it was reduced to \$550,000.00.

SC: So it is already been reduced to \$100,000.00 since a year ago?

FM: Yes.

SC: Mr. Chair and gentlemen, whoever or both of you to respond, when you are out doing the function of your mission of trying to attract and bring new industry and businesses into Pima County, trying to grow jobs, trying to have a better quality of life for our populace in the terms of gainful employment, what is the opinion that you run into with many corporations, many site selectors, many industries who may be considering moving here? What do they say as far as the opinion they hold of Pima County, as far as bringing business into Pima County?

FM: We can share that survey with you and there are parts of it that are very flattering. The least flattering part of that is that our region, the City, the County, particularly are not pro-business. And we have to change their opinion, Steve, and that is part of why we bring them to town. I do not think there is been a deal that any of us have participated in, that we do not ask them to come visit us. See for yourself the values and to tie into my friend Mr. Ortega's comments, the other issue we hear far too often is, "what is the deal with your roads?" We had six site selectors come to town a year ago. Most of them had not been here ever, or those that had, had not been here for ten years. We had them stay downtown. We toured them of everything within the region. We held a webinar at the Fox Theater, and we went down the line and asked them their views of Tucson. The first question was, "what stood out most to you about your visit to Tucson, Arizona?" Five of them said, your new downtown. The sixth said Pima Community College, workforce development talent. If Joe said it once, he said it a thousand times. Talent attracts all jobs. Companies come here for talent, and you are beginning to see us now. You may or may not know this statistic, but a year ago, Tucson was ranked above Austin in terms of new tech jobs. We are finally on the map for some of these companies, but it takes some effort on our part, Mr. Supervisor, to convince them that Tucson is indeed pro-business. And a lot of it goes to exactly what we try to represent the economic value of what they bring, but also the unique culture of this region and how we really want a company that is going to fit in here. There are a lot of companies that do not get invited to those dinners.

SC: Mr. Chair, one final question?

RS: Please.

SC: What would the impression be in the community that you are articulating and as well as trying to attract to come here what would the opinion of them be or how would it look if they were to learn that another \$100,000.00 or \$200,000.00 was cut by this Board of Supervisors to your operations, how would that play?

FM: I am a volunteer Treasurer, so they cannot fire me. It is the optics that we are concerned with. It is the messaging behind that as much as it is the money. But it goes to, you know, the level of support that outsiders see from our government entities because it would be a cut. It does speak to your point that it appears to be less supportive than we would otherwise like.

JS: Let me just add, you know, Fletcher did a great job of capturing that. One of the challenges is we are perceived a lot of times as not being business positive. When our friends up the road in Phoenix are. The other thing is a lot of questions come back. Are we able to solve our issues regionally? Do we work cooperatively? I think that would speak to our inability to work together among the private, the academic, the government sector, I think that could hurt us.

SC: Thank you Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. And I just want to point out for clarification that when the Board voted last year to reduce our allocation from \$650,000.00 to \$550,000.00, that that was a unanimous vote and that it was based on the recommendation from the County Administrator. It was Supervisor. We voted 5-0 for \$550,000.00 last year. Yes, sir. We did. So the County Administrator made the recommendation. She made recommendations to cuts not only to Sun Corridor, but also to Job Path and to a couple of other entities and when we voted on the Sun Corridor recommendation, we voted 5-0. But let us move now to a vote on the substitute motion, and let us do a roll call on that.

MM: Okay. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: No.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No. Okay. Substitute motion is defeated by a vote of 3-2, with Supervisors Allen and Cano voting in favor. Let us move now, back to the original motion, which is to approve the recommendation for \$550,000.00. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. You know, I want to offer some comments to both the County Administration and to the Chamber leadership. It is important to me when a half million dollar contract is on the Board agenda. And when we are one-seventh of a private entity's budget for there to be some public accountability, and for us to be asking ourselves as a jurisdiction what we are going to do to support greater investment in this region. It is a new chapter for the Board. I look forward as a

County Supervisor to figure out how we can work together to bring more employers to the region, and I want us to figure out how we can continue to ensure that the Prosperity Initiative and our work to attract major and large employers to our region will produce benefits. I believe that this contract amount has ebbed and flowed over many budget cycles, with no clear stipulations about the return on investment for taxpayers. I am going to be supporting this contract today because I have been asked by key leaders in this community to give this new entity a chance. Your Treasurer is sitting right next to you, President Snell and I trust in his understanding of this public private partnership that is critical and you do need advocates on this dais advocating for you. In that same breath, the County Administrator needs to look within so that we can ensure that our economic development teams have the resources to grow as a region and to have Pima County leading the way, not outsourcing our economic development to a third party that has very little accountability to our region from a financial standpoint. And I take great issue with this new entity continuing to expect a half million dollar buyout and still criticize local government in the same breath, hampering our ability to go forward with any proposal to the taxpayers moving forward. Again, it is a new entity, so I am going to hold my breath and hope that after this discussion and two meetings, we might be able to have some more clarity about what the Chamber is producing for taxpayers. If in two quarters I submitted a report to the Board that said that zero jobs were created directly or indirectly, that is not just a point for pause. It is a point for us to ask, is this amount where it needs to be? Should we be doing more? Should we be doing less? And I think these are all good questions. And in the spirit of honoring the County Administrator's recommendation and the spirit of providing an opportunity for the Chamber to prove us wrong, I mean, President Snell, I just I am asking this rhetorically, has the Chamber Board had an in-depth presentation on the Prosperity Initiative? And if not, is that something that we can work with our liaison through the Chair of the Board to be able to really figure out in depth how we are going to put some movement into this contract? Those are the questions that I am thinking, and it is not easy for me to be listening to the tremendous need in our community. One organization, getting the whole pie and our other important organizations, other Chambers, other entities who are committed to this same mission, not be at the decision making table. So I am going to take a giant leap of faith as a new County Supervisor to say, let us do better together, and let us stay focused on how we can make our region the best place to live and to work.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Any other comments or questions on the original motion? Supervisor Allen and then Supervisor Heinz.

JA: So I would like to make an amendment to Supervisor Scott's motion by removing the words, "if releasable" again from Sections 1.1, 1.2, and 3.2, of the reporting section. And I do that so that we are always ensuring that there is a flow of information between what the Chamber is doing and negotiating that is pertinent to us and that our, be it our Economic Development Department or the Board, knows what is being negotiated, knows what is happening. I think we are seeing and continue to see and will see the fallout of the NDA and Project Blue as it is related to, to our decisions. And so the not sharing of information with us and having that in

the contract, I think is just problematic and we have heard from our constituents that it is not acceptable. So, I want to make sure that the information is still communicated to the proper Pima County entities or individuals. So that is my amendment.

MH: Chair Scott, may I ask a clarification?

RS: You may.

MH: Okay. This is to release information, not publicly, but to our offices and to the County Administrator and her staff. Correct?

JA: It is.

MH: Yes, I will second that.

RS: And just to be clear, what Supervisor Allen's amendment is referring to is on Exhibit A of the contract under Reporting. That is correct, isn't it, Supervisor?

JA: Yes.

RS: Because if you look at 1.1, which is reporting per occurrence, it says if releasable and then it is also under, which other one Supervisor? Please?

JA: 1.1, 1.2 and 3.2.

RS: Okay. Alright. Now my understanding is that the reason that is in parentheses is because of non-disclosure agreements that might have been entered into not by the jurisdiction, but by the Chamber of Southern Arizona. Is that correct, Ms. Leshner?

JL: [inaudible] gestures to Mr. Brown.

SB: Chair Scott, that would be my interpretation, but I am not sure. I think we would have to ask the entity.

RS: Okay, Mr. Snell and Mr. McCusker, what Supervisor Allen is referring to is if you look at Exhibit A of the contract under Reporting, there is in parentheses the two words "if releasable" with regard to per occurrence reporting and then also under...is it monthly or quarterly? Is that right? Yeah. So it is under the per occurrence reporting 1.1 and 1.2, and the quarterly reporting 3.2. The in parentheses "if releasable". I said that I thought that that might be referring to non-disclosure agreements that the Chamber has signed. Mr. Brown thinks that that is likely accurate. But if you can clarify that for us.

JS: That is likely because we share all the companies we are working with the County when we meet with them, if we are bound by a non-disclosure as the Chamber of Southern Arizona and they ask us not to share that, we will not share that.

RS: Okay. That was my suspicion and I am not going to be able to support the amendment because there is a difference between non-disclosure agreements that County staff enter into on behalf of the County, and non-disclosure agreements that the Chamber, more specifically to your point Mr. McCusker, the site selector side, the traditional Sun Corridor side enter into. So I would not be able to support the amendment.

FM: The other issue, Chairman Scott, is that we are not allowed to disclose the name of the target, and we could not do that to staff any more than we could do it to the Board.

RS: Thank you.

FM: If they know it, it is discoverable. It is in the public domain and subject to freedom of information request. That is the very reason that site selectors want to be under an NDA, so that it is not public until they are prepared for it to go public. And if we did not sign those, the deal would never get to first base.

RS: And that is less in terms of keeping information from staff, as you said, or certainly from decision makers. It is more to keep information from competitors.

JS: It is Supervisor Scott and members of the Board. If there is any incentive or a property sale that comes in front of the County, you still need to, that will still need to be disclosed at some point and it is not just site selectors. I am going to be very candid. It is companies that are local that are expanding. They might be looking, and we could be dealing with a local hospital that is looking at an expansion, for example. Well, they do not want the competitors knowing what they are working on until they are ready for that. And it might have nothing to do. They might not be coming in front of a governing board asking for any incentives, any approvals, because they might not need them [inaudible].

RS: Well, I appreciate that the amendment, the motion to amend was seconded so that we could discuss it. I would encourage my colleagues not to support it for the reasons cited. So unless there is further discussion on the amendment, let us move to a vote and let us do a roll call vote.

MM: Chair Scott, this is a roll call vote on the amendment?

RS: Yes, to remove the two words "if releasable" in parentheses from Exhibit A, 1.1, 1.2 and 3.2.

MM: Okay.

RS: Those were the three sections.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: No.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No. Alright. The amendment is defeated, with Supervisors Allen and Cano voting in favor. Let us now go back to the original motion, which is to approve the recommendation for the contract for \$550,000.00. Any further questions or comments from Supervisors? Okay. I want to ask you to stay on Exhibit A, and I appreciate that this contract is not presented to us by the Chamber of Southern Arizona, that this contract was negotiated between representatives of the Chamber of Southern Arizona and representatives from the County, and I want to thank Ms. Leshner, Mr. DeBonis, Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, for their work on behalf of the County in terms of negotiating this item. And if you look at the cover memo of June 27th that Ms. Leshner gave us with this contract attached, she listed some highlights in bulleted format and one of those highlights was that the contract quote clarifies the focus of supporting the region, including Pima County and the local cities and towns. And with regard to that, I want to draw your attention to Exhibit A and look at Item No. 3, which says, "support Pima County's Economic Development Strategy 2023-2026 and provide assistance to the region with the implementation of areas of the plan," and I will not read the rest of it. And you will see that the Economic Development Strategic Plan is attached to this item. Now, I want you to look at Item No. 7 and this might be of particular interest to Supervisor Cano. Based on the request he made of Administration after Call to the Public and also to Dr. Bowls and thank you for staying Dr. Bowls, with regard to her role as a member of the Chamber, No. 7 in Exhibit A, says, "work with other corporations, agencies or entities that are involved in economic development activities. More specifically, collaborate with regional partners that support the economic development mission of Pima County and the Chamber of Southern Arizona." I take that to mean the Regional Chambers, such as the one that Dr. Bowls represents. I take that to mean the Hispanic Chamber of Southern Arizona. I take that to mean the Southern Arizona Leadership Council. And I am pleased that the County, when it was negotiating this contract, put that item in there. So what I would like to ask, and I have already communicated this to Ms. Leshner, Mr. DeBonis and Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, is that in the monthly coordination meetings, which are also described in

Exhibit A, that those two items, Item 3 and Item 7, be standing agenda items so that we know as a Board that supported that Economic Development Strategic Plan, how it is being focused on through the work of the Chamber, and so that we can hear some of the outreach that you all are doing to the other regional economic partners. And I have heard from you, Mr. Snell, and also from Mr. Guymon, about the work that you intend to be doing with our other local economic partners. I just would like that to be a more regular focus in these monthly coordination meetings. Alright. Yes. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, I appreciate you giving the County Administrator a little bit more direction and our Economic Development staff some guidance on that. Administrator Leshner, you have heard a lot today about this contract and we have talked about it. I am curious, you know, you are going to be coming back to the Board with some additional information about ways to ensure that we are being a strong regional partner on economic development. I am just curious if you can give us some takeaways from today's conversation, please.

JL: Thank you.

RS: Ms. Leshner?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano and members of the Board. What I have heard is that we are continuing to support an organization recognizing it is going through change. And that while we are looking at all of the ways in which we evaluate and collaborate with and report on the activities of what has historically been Sun Corridor, it has now including that Chamber element, and it has not done that before. So we need to look and ensure that all of our Chambers are reflected in reports. I see a distinction between Chambers and economic development organizations is the difference in business attraction and business retention, and that we will continue any efforts to monitor all the work being done to retain our businesses, particularly our smaller businesses in the community. As we look at the attractions component, when we need to continue to ensure that our economic development team is embedded, that we are getting the information and that we are getting real numbers back to the Board to evaluate the success of that organization. So I think what I am hearing from the Board is we are in on the new experiment and now let us see how this works as the year breaks out of how the economic development, how that attraction is continuing to work, and that we are working as a region to ensure that that all of the various jurisdictions and communities can take advantage of the lead opportunities, can be part of looking at ways in which businesses might be located in all the different jurisdictions in the region, and that we are looking to continue to monitor the work with all of the Chambers.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I want to request a clarification and a correction of the record. Our staff did some background. On May 7th of 2024, I voted against reducing the contract. On July 2, 2024, I voted to approve the contract, so this should be corrected and clarified.

RS: Supervisor, I apologize. Thank you for that clarification. I was only thinking about the vote on the final approval and I apologize that I mischaracterized your position.

SC: I appreciate the apology. Thank you.

RS: Thank you.

MH: Can we vote?

RS: We can.

MH: That would be amazing. Thank you.

RS: Alright. I am sorry, but Supervisor Allen wanted to make another quick comment.

JA: So I just have to emphasize, though, that it is a misnomer to think that a community is not business friendly if it is also a community that works to raise the per capita wages, that works to ensure that our long term health and sustainability is one that benefits all of us, and that there is long term thinking. These things, I just want to make sure that as we, as you all, are evolving this organization to do both retention and attraction, but that underneath that is still this commitment to who we are, which is not who we are, who they are up the road, that we are different indeed we are, and that we should be proud of that difference and that difference is what makes locating and staying in Pima County unique and important. And that is great, right? It is. I take the position because of my love for our community and our love for bringing business here and for supporting small business because of the uniqueness of who we are. And that in and of itself is incredibly important. And that is the thing that I hope that we are, that we are pitching out to business and industry. So I just have to emphasize that bit about, I hope folks are also taking from this conversation.

SC: Can't we be just a little bit like the place up the road, just a little bit?

RS: The final comment that I will make is I appreciate that. Supervisor Cano has indicated that he is going to support the contract and that he expects staff to follow up on the direction that is given to them through the contract. Please hold me accountable, as well. I am going to be our representative, not just to the Board of Directors, but to the executive committee of that Board of Directors. I am going to be the representative to our Economic Development Council, the Public Policy Council. I am probably leaving out a council, Mr. Snell, but hold me accountable as well and share your comments with me as colleagues. Alright. Let us move to a roll call vote on approval of the recommendation.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: How is this unanimous? Yes.

RS: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. Item passes 5-0. I thank my colleagues for the dialog. I thank Mr. Snell and Mr. McCusker for being here and sharing their input and I thank Ms. Leshner, Mr. DeBonis and Mr. Vescovi-Chiardi who I think we have made late for his next appointment. Alright.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

43. Feasibility of County Excise Tax

Discussion on feasibility of County excise tax to provide bridge funding to complete countywide transportation projects as a contingency to RTA Next. (District 2)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
MO: Mike Ortega, Interim Executive Director, Regional Transportation Authority

RS: We had a time certain item for 10:00 a.m. That was for Addendum Item No. 3, Feasibility of County Excise Tax, but I see that our special guest is here with us. So if we could do that a few minutes early. Supervisor Heinz, is that okay with you?

MH: Yeah.

RS: Since Mr. Ortega is here.

MH: That is fine with me, for sure.

RS: Okay and before I turn it over to Supervisor Heinz, on behalf of the Board, Mr. Ortega, thank you very much for coming out of retirement to take on this position as an Interim Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Authority. I am sure everybody in Pima County is grateful to have somebody of your experience and expertise in this role at this very important time. Thank you. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott, and again, Executive Director, welcome. Appreciate you being here. This item actually comes to us at the request of my colleagues on PAG RTA. And just to give you a little bit of a background, you have a lot of material that was attached to this. I have a bit more material to kind of pass out right here, as well. But what we have found is that there is significant situation we have with PAG RTA in terms of the funding, and that was presented to the Technical Management Committee (TMC) as well as the at the most recent meeting of PAG RTA really excellently and frankly, the first time the Body had seen things presented in this way. But basically the financials just showed us over the 19 years of the 20 that we have had from the 20-year program, there has not been a single year in which going back to 2006, that the revenue projections were consistent with what was received, literally not once, not one time. In fact, I think this year the projections were for over \$200 million, and we are bringing in about \$124-\$125 million. This is for a lot of

reasons, but basically we do not have 1.3 million people. We have less than 1.1 million people. We had a multiyear Great Recession. Nobody's fault. It just happened. Pima County's recovery was longer than some of the other counties like Maricopa and others. We had of course, following the global pandemic, inflation, inflationary pressures and then of course construction costs just skyrocketing. So all of these things kind of coming together to create a terrible storm for the overall projections. And what we basically found is we have a \$1 billion problem, and that is we need another billion dollars to have really accomplished what is called for in the 2006 plan that the voters enacted. We can see that all very well in the financials. I know that you have this attached. It is a very large spreadsheet, but it is very, very and this is despite the, for example, previous Boards, RTA PAG did notice this, and of course have been pooling regional funds from the state and federal level to try to mitigate this, but those are not able to take care of a \$1 billion problem. So in looking at this and trying to figure out what we do now, because we are going to be closing out the 20-year program at the end of June of next year. And we still have we have 19 of 35 named road projects in that particular element that have been delivered. Most others have been started, or at least planning has started. But we will not be delivering everything by the end of June, or even by the end of 2026 that the voters were told to expect back in 2006. So based on the significance, the really catastrophic financial situation that we see, the Technical Management Committee and to remind everyone here, my colleagues, which I am sure you know, but also the public and the media, Jan Leshner, our County Administrator is the Chair, but that is the city or town manager from all the jurisdictions and also the transportation directors. This group reviewed the materials that you have before you and attached to this item, looking at this large deficit of funds and made the recommendation, actually it was a motion from Sahuarita, the Town Manager, specifically seconded by the City of Tucson, to not pursue an election for new RTA program in March of 2026. Based on all of this, because this delivery completion of RTA One for the voters being the thing that must be paramount and going back to the voters at this time with so much not complete and without necessarily funds identified, how to complete things did not make sense. So that is the recommendation that came to us unanimously from the Technical Management Committee at the last meeting, which was on Thursday of last week. No action was taken by the Body, however, in the discussions, we asked staff under the leadership of our new Executive Director, Mike Ortega, to please review. And that is what I just passed out. Let us look at three scenarios for when we put this new RTA plan to the ballot. We can try for March of 2026, November of 2026, and then a third scenario where we identify and figure out how to complete everything that was promised to the voters in 2006, in the initial RTA, and then after probably two and a half to three years, we go back to the voters and put forward another RTA 20-year plan. Those are the scenarios that will be brought back to PAG RTA to review on July 31st. And one of the, I think, very prudent questions from my colleagues of me specifically was would this be feasible? Because scenario two and scenario three require bridging revenue, because the TPT, the half cent sales tax that is currently funding the RTA projects, which of course came in far lower than we expected, goes away on June 30th of 2026. This Board can by unanimous vote, which has never happened since 1864. This is true, but this Board can take the extraordinary step of continuing that not

raising, but continuing the half cent sales tax at the same level and directing those funds just as they are currently being directed to PAG RTA for the purposes of completion of the RTA One projects and continuation of those elements until such time as the voters can have an opportunity to vote on a new plan and enact that. And so what actually was Mayor Murphy, as well as Chair Winfield and actually everybody, frankly, Mayor Post, all the jurisdictions were curious, "Hey, will the Board of Supervisors help? Will they do this? Will they entertain this idea?" And I almost did not bring the item because it is kind of a sticky wicket because it is a discussion item. I am not asking for a vote. There is not, we have not been formally asked by PAG RTA to do anything at all. But before that Body gives up on March as a time to do the ballot initiative. Sorry, the ballot measure, we would like to know and my colleagues on that Body would like to know, would all of us here be willing to consider that as a bridging option should that be necessary and should the Body take the recommendation of the Technical Management Committee and focus on either November 26th or possibly a little bit a couple of years later, following delivery of all the items. And so, I think, I would like to hear from my, after we hear from, of course, the Chair of the Technical Management Committee, we will have Mr. Ortega come up and speak to us a little bit as well. But that is why we are here. I know it is kind of a lot going on. It is a bit of an extraordinary situation. But I believe in light of and this was discussed as well, in light of what we have seen with recent efforts put to the voters, Prop. 414 had nearly 70% approval before that, before the campaign for Prop. 414 and then before it went down, I believe nearly 70/30 at the ballot box. And then one of our other jurisdictions, Sahuarita, actually recently put forward a property tax override, which was defeated 60/40 at the ballot. So with, you know, being so far away from delivery of all, especially the named road projects, you know, letting things go to the ballot and/or pushing things to the ballot in March is really a concern for the TMC as well as the entire PAG RTA Body. So I think that is a pretty good summary of why we are here and I am going to ask Administrator Leshner and Chair Leshner in this case, to give us some more details from the discussion and the Technical Management Committee, why they made the recommendation that they did make and then we will have Mike Ortega come up and talk to us a little bit.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just as a clarification point, my colleague, Supervisor Heinz, said that this was not going to be put to a vote, that there was going to be just discussion. I am just curious because on the handout it says, discussion, possible action under 6. The last paragraph.

MH: Oh, forgive me. This is just to show you what the three scenarios were. So this is from the agenda from the meeting last week of the RTA Board of Directors.

SC: Oh okay.

MH: I apologize, I did not specifically say that. So under Item 7 it is highlighted. It is just that A, B, C or 1, 2, those are the three scenarios that we directed staff to develop for us to kind of select from on July 31st and to give direction to PAG RTA as to how we want to move forward. But that is just but this is from the..

SC: So the defining feature is there will be no vote, it will just be for discussion?

MH: This is only a discussion. That is it.

SC: Thank you.

MH: That is it.

RS: Thank you Supervisors. Ms. Leshner?

JL: Thank you and Chair Scott and members of the Board, the Technical Management Committee has been working for quite some time looking at not only RTA and where we are with all of those projects, but looking at all the projections for what will be in RTA Next. And as was mentioned, I serve on the Committee, as does Deputy County Administrator DeBonis. There are also five individuals that are representing the community, if you will, on the TMC, one of whom is John Bernal. Some of you may remember John when he was Deputy County Administrator, excuse me, before Mr. DeBonis. So we have some good representation on that committee. One of the things that occurred recently, I think, with the new set of eyes, one, we had been looking at data as a Technical Management Committee and as a RTA in a format for a period of time, and knew that there were projects that needed to be finished. And we are looking at how we might accomplish that goal. I think having Mr. Ortega stepping in, as happens sometimes, you begin to look at things a little bit differently and in crunching and laying out the data, it became clear, as you have heard today, that we were off in our estimates of what might be available throughout the 20-year period of RTA by about \$1 billion. And for so many reasons have been delineated, but here is where we are. The Technical Management Committee has been focused and our almost single desire over the last several years has been to find something that we can recommend to the Board as a package representing not only all the jurisdictions from a roadway perspective, but also what we look at in the plan as other elements. There is safety, which is sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, I am sorry, wildlife crossings, a variety of other elements, if you will, in addition simply to roads. Our committee began to look at it and felt, first of all, once we saw that we were off by that much in the revenues, it concerned us as a TMC of what that meant going forward that we have provided to the RTA our best recommendation of what the full package would look like for the \$2.4 billion approximately. We did evaluate that. Looking at pessimistic and optimistic possibilities of revenue, but seeing how far the numbers were wrong as well as the population in the first batch, it gave us a moment's pause of are we as confident in the recommendations we made as staff on all of the projects on a go forward basis? So we wanted a little time to look at that. And as Mr. Ortega may comment, each of the jurisdictions has been asked to come back with a little tweak. Everything we put in, does it still remain accurate?

What do we need to do to look at that? But we felt as a management committee that our goal is success for additional 20 years of funding, and that our recommendation was that the greatest path for success, the best path for success, was we did not think was a March election, not saying no to a 2026 election or one in the future. Simply, would we have all the information compiled with the advantage of the new set of eyes of Mr. Ortega in time to come to you all? And when you do a tick tock backwards, this Board would need to call the election about 180 days out, given our current schedule. Unless the Board convenes a special meeting, it would be bringing material to this Board for a vote on September 2nd, which would mean our normal way of getting packages to you is on or about the 26th of August. There is another RTA meeting on the 25th. We felt looking at 20 years that March was not a good date, but we remain committed to continuing to work the problem. The TMC has been meeting every Wednesday. We will continue to do so, and we will actually have some of the managers and I have been having meetings in addition to that regular meeting and the TMC, I am sorry, the Regional Transportation Authority has also increased its meeting schedule, as well. So I think the bottom line is we could not be more committed to seeing success and to getting the additional funding for transportation in this region for another 20 years and are working with the RTA Board and staff to put that package together to accomplish that goal.

MH: I just want to add one more thing. If I may, Chair Scott?

RS: Please.

MH: Kind of two. If somehow and again, it feels a little bit like a coin flip, I cannot predict anything, but based on the electorate, how they have been kind of doing things recently, I do not know that this would pass in March, and that is a really big gamble, right? Because if this goes to March, it is voted down and then how am I supposed to get you all to vote unanimously to reverse what the voters just voted down? That just looks really bad. And it is just not a great way to do things, but because we are so behind if it did pass in March, the first three or so years of RTA Next will be cannibalized by figuring out how to do the projects that we still have yet to do from RTA One anyway. Right? So this, you know, and this brings more transportation funds to these areas that I think need them. And, you know, the way it would work is it would simply start on July 1st of '26, assuming all of us said, okay, and it would simply sunset and dovetail precisely with when the next RTA program is approved by the voters. So we are not, it will never increase the taxes at all. But that is how this scenario two or scenario three would require that. And I would like to have Mike Ortega come up and also hear if there are any questions from my colleagues as well. But if Mike Ortega could come up and field questions or say a few words about this as well.

RS: Any questions from Supervisors for either Supervisor Heinz or Ms. Leshar before we call Mr. Ortega up?

MH: Oh, one other thing. You cannot uncall an election we found out. Because like that was a thought like, well, let us just throw down the March 10th date, get that on the

books so we do not miss that deadline and then, oof, no, you know what? Let us just forget about it. Let us cancel that in January. No, we cannot uncall an election. So the election would go forward no matter what, which is not great.

RS: Thank you for all that background information Supervisor and Ms. Leshner. Mr. Ortega? Glad your fan club president came with you.

MO: Yeah. Thank you, thank you I appreciate that. So good morning and thank you for having me. I really appreciate it. It is nice to see you all. What I thought I would do is go over the materials that I understand were distributed to you just very quickly, just to let you know how at least my approach and how I presented this to both the Technical Management Committee, as well as the RTA Board. So the first sheet, it is this one, it is marked Exhibit 1 in my handwriting. It gives an opportunity to really look at where we are as a region in terms of delivery, because we have spent so much energy and effort focusing on what has not been accomplished. I think it is important to see the bigger picture. It is like, okay, what have we finished up to this point and what percent complete are we on the magnitude of the program as a whole? And so you can go through that. It is pretty self-explanatory, but that is the purpose of this. Now I will tell you that there are still 17 projects that need to be completed, 21 if you add those that were included in RTA Next. Okay. But keep in mind that those were part of other projects, other corridors. That is why the numbers do not jive, if you will. But if you look at the detail they do, they are exactly correct. And basically what that tells us is there is still work to be done, but we also have to take a look back and realize what we have seen to this point. The second one is probably my favorite. It is the big spreadsheet. As a numbers geek, I really wanted to understand what does the revenue look like for our region and what has happened over the course of the last 19 years. And so when you compare what those projections were from Eller. At the time, and by the way, I am not throwing Eller under the bus here at all. I think, you know, anybody had a crystal ball and we could certainly we could certainly buy that crystal ball and use it. So excuse me, I apologize, and so the reality is that they did not hit the mark. And as I believe Supervisor Heinz mentioned, if you go back through the years, you will see that they did not hit it at all, variety of reasons. But when you look at simplistically a revenue projection of about \$2.7 billion compared to an actual of \$1.7 billion, it does not matter how good you are, you are going to have a problem trying to make that up. So to the Regional Council's credit and the RTA Board's credit, they put regional money over the last several years and you can see those in those columns. They put hundreds of millions of dollars towards that effort to try to make up that gap in funding. But as you can see, it is just not enough. And so I wanted to paint that picture because I think it is important for everyone to understand what it has done to us, really as a program in terms of those dollars. The third exhibit is really the snapshot of, okay, so what do we do? Right? We are short all this money. And I basically like to get to the bottom line. Right. So what does this mean? Well if we stay on the same track as we are on today, which is basically putting all the regional money that comes to the region to PAG into the RTA program, we are looking at 10 to 15 years of basically soaking up all that money to complete and deliver RTA One. So there is been conversation about, well, you are not going to deliver RTA One and

that is not true. There is a game plan for how we deliver it. Now it is not ideal, right. Because we are talking about regional money that is used for other things like safety improvements, intersection improvements, Hawks, you know, all of the other things that the region needs in favor of the RTA One program. But this gives you the snapshot, this outlines for you how that works and how those numbers actually match over time. And you can see that I have projected out to '36, 2036. And so what that basically says is as a minimum, we are looking at 2036 just to finish the roadway element. The fifth exhibit, which is marked number five, although it is number four, that exhibit outlines the impact to transit should the RTA Next not go into effect and at the end of RTA One, what happens to the regional transit dollars? And what I did is I broke that down by entity, by jurisdiction and actually allocated. Now, I will tell you, I should have marked this draft because we are still working with our partners to make sure that this is what, in fact they have on their books. But it is I am going to say it is in the general ballpark, but it gives a snapshot of the challenge for the region should a funding source not be available on July 1st of '26. And so, in essence, that is basically the bottom line, right? How do we deal with that? So if you remember from the other exhibit, I have given a strategy for completing the roadway element, okay. The roadway element can be completed using HURF dollars that come to the region, okay. That can be done. Unfortunately, we cannot use those HURF dollars for transit. So there has to be a different funding source for that. So I am exploring different ways to do that. I am exploring different ways to fund that in a stopgap measure. Supervisor Heinz handed out a document which basically my marching orders for the RTA Board in preparation for the July 31st meeting. So first is basically how do we get to the ballot? What are the steps to getting to the ballot? I believe Administrator Leshner mentioned September 2nd is your date the date that you would need to call the election, and at that point, that means the ballot language is complete 100%. The plan is complete 100%, and you are ready to go at least to consider it. In my world, that tells me I have to have a plan to you for the materials on August 26th. We have to have that information before you get it, obviously, so you can consider it. Well, the RTA Board meets August 25th, so if you do the math very simplistically, I have one day shy of seven weeks. And so that package has to be ready to go, 100% ready to go when it is presented to you. So that is option one that basically is outlined on that piece of paper. The second option is what are the strategies for moving that election date to later in March or later than March of '26? So there is two other opportunities there, generally. One would be in May, one would be in November. Okay. My suggestion is that my recommendation to the Board will be let us not think about May because it is too close to March. So if we are going to delay it into '26, let us talk about doing it into November. It gives us more of a runway, gives us more time. Unfortunately, even if it is approved in November, the monies are not able to be collected until the following April. So the gap then becomes from July 1st to April 1st or March 30th. So that becomes the challenge there, okay. So how do we deal with the gap now from a roadway element standpoint, we can still put dollars towards this during that gap time, but remember that is soaking up all of the regional dollars that are coming in for all the other improvements that I mentioned. The third scenario is what happens if we delay past '26, which would be into the following '27 or '28, etc. However long it takes us to get to a point where we want to go to the voter, well, all you have to do

is extend that right. And so now the gap funding for that transit piece, those ongoing operations, those costs are going to have to be extended. It is kind of that simple. So there is a lot more to that and we will be preparing a full report for the RTA Board for the 31st. I am sure that will be available to be shared. Mr. Chair, I am happy to turn it back over to whoever is appropriate to answer any questions.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. And good morning, Mr. Ortega. First off, let me congratulate you on your new appointment to lead the Regional Transit Authority. You are trusted, Mr. Ortega, and I trust you, especially throughout this process. Can you tell us a bit more about the projects that have not been completed? Give us a summary of what your goals are moving forward. And I am also curious if you might be able to tell us how many of those unmet projects are within the City of Tucson.

MO: So I will refer back to...Mr. Chair, if that is okay?

RS: It is fine, please.

MO: Thank you, I apologize.

RS: Not at all.

MO: I am a little rusty. Okay, I was retired for a whole year, so.

RS: You are good.

MO: So if you go back to this exhibit, this exhibit really outlines and answers most of your questions, Supervisor Cano. So if you go down to Houghton Road, for example, you will see that there is a component that is 25% complete. That is section or segment seven, which is Irvington to 22nd. What that 25% basically means is the design is complete or close to being complete. There is right of way that is already been in process of being acquired, but the construction has not occurred yet. But then you go to the next segment, segment eight, which is Broadway to Tanque Verde. That is at 5%, which basically means we have just done some very preliminary planning. So that segment has yet to be completed. So that gives you an idea of how to read this, if you will, so that those percentages make sense in terms of those that are, that are yet to be completed, and you go down the line. Now, the ones that I will tell you caused me concern are those that have, there is three of them on the back, if you will, of the page there that are zero, and the reason that those are zero is because there was a strategy many years ago, probably 4 or 5 years ago, to move some of those projects into RTA Next, which is a great strategy, you know, because if you think about it, it gives you a chance to chat with the voter and say, hey, we would like to get these projects accomplished, and we are going to go back to the voter and have a conversation around that. Part of that is we need more money, but also it is an opportunity to look at the scopes, because remember, these scopes were prepared and accomplished 20 something years ago. And so that gives us an

opportunity. However, because my charge today is how do we get RTA One finished? I took those from RTA Next for this conversation and calculation and put them on this piece of paper. Well, those three is highly unlikely we are going to be able to accomplish before the end of '26, the fiscal year '26. So the second part of your question was where are they? Vast majority are within the City of Tucson, vast majority.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and Mr. Ortega. I want to for the purposes of this item, I want to express my support for a stopgap measure should we not proceed with a special election in March. I believe that the questions that were raised at your last meeting last week, I watched the entirety of the meeting. We are a bit tone deaf, Mr. Ortega, in terms of what the Board was saying and what the Technical Management Committee was saying, which is March is perhaps not a realistic time frame for us to move forward. Now, I recognize the task that you have in front of you, which is to ask us to fly the plane and build it at the same time. So I am just curious what kind of compromise plan you would like to have, move forward with the understanding that the experts on your Technical Management Committee, if I am getting the term right, have suggested a pause, and the full RTA Board is saying go full speed ahead.

MO: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Cano, I am not sure I understand the question entirely, so, but I think I do, and if I do not hit it, maybe you can redirect me help me out here. So clearly there is a difference of opinion. How is that? From what the Technical Management Committee has recommended or suggested and the process that I just outlined for you in terms of going to the March election. What I have suggested to the Board is I am okay with either one, but because the time is so compressed, I need to keep marching down this path to an election to make sure that the plan that is developed is ready to go. Now, that does not mean that it is perfect. It does not mean any of those things other than the logistics to getting it on the ballot have been met. In other words, I have given them a path for that. Now, what is an ideal plan? In my opinion, an ideal plan is one everyone supports, and that is kind of the bottom line here, right? So if you think through that for a minute, whether it is a stopgap measure or it is a long term 20-year transportation plan, the best plan will be supported by all the electeds across the region, not just a unanimous vote, as Supervisor Heinz outlined in his earlier comments, but that means support from every entity, including the Tribe, the Nation and those municipalities within the region. That is ideally the plan. Now, getting there is another story. I hope I answered your question, Supervisor.

AC: Yeah and I would just say Chair Scott and MR. Ortega, you did answer my question. And what I am focused on is ensuring that our region has a plan that we can absorb, and most importantly, that we can build public support for. I do think, representing District 5, that given the realities of a lot of the projects that are left being Tucson voters, I am going to be mindful of RTA Next paying close attention to the needs of Tucson residents. I think it is a travesty that we have had so much of a roller coaster over the last several years, with the imbalance that has existed in the decision making coming out of the Regional Transit Authority. And so, I guess, you

know, my perspective is that it does no good to our economy, to our region, if we stop the brakes. So I am supportive of RTA Next. I am supportive of this Board demonstrating leadership and ensuring that there is not unmet need. The only thing I need help with, Mr. Ortega, is figuring out, in the context of asking voters again, for an authorization of a long term plan, what kind of accountability we are going to have to ensure that \$500 million or \$1 billion left, and what I mean, those costs are only going to continue to grow the way our market is right now. I hope you are following my track there, to indicate that I want to support this. I am going to support this however it comes our way, but we need a little bit more public engagement. And I see that Supervisor Heinz, acting as our representative on the Board, has asked for that outward public facing process, as well. So can you just tell us a bit more about that and what your response is to somebody who is supportive of a plan, but who is frustrated with an entity that has not delivered on the original promises that we make?

MO: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would say thank you. But secondarily, there is two parts to your question. First, you mentioned the, we will call it accountability or the delivery and the second is the public engagement for the development of the plan. And those are very related and overlap, but they are different and distinct. I think that I will start off with delivery. And I was asked this question by the Board, by the RTA Board. What does it look like going forward so that we do not get ourselves into this kind of a situation in the future? This conversation really needs to happen five years or ten years before the end of the tax. If we have this kind of a shortfall, these kinds of issues, but the conversation is not just RTA Board, how are we going to solve this? This is an open conversation with the voter up to and including potentially going back to them and saying, hey, these were the assumptions we made and they were not accurate. They are different today okay. That is a guardrail, used a transportation term. It is a guardrail that we can include and say, look, if going forward something like this starts to happen, pick it, recession, I mean, all the things that Supervisor Heinz mentioned, we should have a stopgap measure that says time out. We are going to go and have a conversation. We are going to have a discussion about this so that the accountability is clear. And I think part of the challenge has been, where is the accountability? Is the accountability with the individual partner or the accountability with the RTA directly? My opinion, it is in both. This is not a man that is too bad for you because you are not able to or you should have given me this. This is really about how do we work together to deliver this for the region. If this is not delivered, we all lose. I think that is the first message. And the guardrails, what they look like. I think that is a conversation we can have both in terms of the logistics of getting things accomplished and getting them out the door, as well as public feedback, as well as suggestions and comments on that side of it. The other piece you mentioned was the public engagement. This RTA Next plan has gone through exhaustive public engagement. Is there always room for more? Absolutely. There is no doubt about that. There is always an opportunity to go out and have more discussion. I think that the key pieces to that are presentations and language people understand. We cannot have conversations that are legalese, no offense, or technical conversations that people are not going to understand. We have to make it very simple in terms of the

language people use every day and those that are either using our transportation system as a whole or those that benefit from the system. And I think that is really the connection that I think going forward, we have to make sure we are making. And it is not to imply we have not. I just think we could probably do a little better going forward, that is all.

MH: Chair Scott, just to, I heard Mr. Ortega, I actually kind of heard maybe a third question and I we did talk about this. How do we make sure that when we go to the voters again, at whatever point that we are not in \$1 billion hole, right. Not just the potential for like five year hard looks with adjustments and that kind of thing. But we this is the middle tier. I think Eller used the moderate sort of projections in terms of their assumptions. We are already using the pessimistic. But can you talk more about like how we hopefully protect against, I mean we cannot predict the future obviously, but I kind of heard that question too.

MO: Maybe I did not answer, Mr. Chair, maybe I did not answer because I do not know. But I think there is a piece there that is important to have a conversation around, which is what do those projections look like? And really dissecting them and really getting a second set of eyes. We have done that, I know, update because there is two parts to that. It is not just on the revenue side, it is also on the delivery side. Right. Those costs. And you know who can truly predict those costs. But if we put metrics in place whereby we challenge ourselves every 3 to 5 years to look at those and make sure we update them so we have accurate numbers as the program evolves, as opposed to we just, oh my, we have got this huge problem and it is on the revenue side. Well, there is that cost side too, because what I believe Administrator Leshner mentioned is when you fall short, that is one thing, but that budget is also an expenditure budget, which is the increases in costs and some of the challenges that we have all experienced in our construction costs. And so I think it is really that robust conversation that happens in the public in a public eye. And we are out very open and very transparent about it.

RS: Supervisor Cano, did you have any other questions?

AC: Yeah, you know, I am looking forward to a more extensive briefing, but I am still trying to figure out Mr. Ortega and Chair Scott. So for Tucson, for a Tucsonan who is going to be asked to renew a transit levy, how is RTA Next going to be prioritizing those projects that are not completed in RTA One? Are they going to, is the new levy going to be inclusive of those projects that are not completed, and do they get priority, for instance, in RTA Next? Work me through, work us through that a bit because I am not sure I understand the spreadsheet gymnastics quite yet.

MO: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Cano, great question. So the direction from the Board to this point has been to take four projects from RTA One and put them into RTA Next. In addition, its direction was to rescope them to more appropriate configurations today and prioritize them in the first period of the new plan, so that is direction that has already been given to the staff in terms of moving this forward. And, Mr. Chair, I did think as you started your conversation or your question Supervisor, you mentioned

as a voter of the City, how do you have this conversation right? I think first and foremost, it is confidence that we have a game plan for completion. And so as I started my commentary, I think there is a rumor, a conversation out in the community that we are not going to finish these projects. We have to get away from that and demonstrate how we are going to finish them. And what I have done for the Board so far, the RTA Board so far has given them two tracks. Here is the track of no RTA Next, here is the track with an RTA Next, and that way you as a voter can be confident that the projects that were voted on and approved will be delivered one way or the other. There is opportunity for those to be delivered with confidence.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you.

MO: You are welcome.

JA: So I think you have said this, but I just need it just really clear for me. How do we ensure that we have fixed the problem that resulted in the estimations, the projections being off? So what? Yeah. So what do we do?

MO: Okay. Mr. Chair, Supervisor Allen, again I think there is two pieces to that. One of them is specific to the revenues. And so we have asked for updates of our revenue projections from Eller College of Business and those are fairly recent, a couple of years old. But we have also as an RTA picked the pessimistic level, and that is really important because if you do the math on those and the probability, the probability of hitting the pessimistic level today with all that we know and see is about 20%, that tells me that it is 80% probability that it will be greater than that. But the RTA Board, to their credit, has said, no, we are going to stay at the pessimistic level for now. So that is I think, one piece. The second piece is I am going to call it even more tricky than that, which are the cost side. And that is ensuring that we are very clear on, we will say, challenges that might be out there cost of steel, concrete, wood, things that are out there that could cause us some challenges in the future. Well, no one can really predict that, so we build in contingencies. We have to be careful that we do not build such a contingency, that then projects are almost not able to be completed because there is so much buffer, if you will. But those contingencies have to be looked at, at least every 3 to 5 years. And I think we have to put that in place. The last thing is kind of an umbrella. I am going to call it role potentially for the RTA, which is the RTA today is basically the funder, right. The monies come in. We distribute it through intergovernmental agreements to our partners. They get their projects accomplished however it is that they do that. We help some more than others. My gut is that in the future, it makes sense for us to have more of an assistance role in delivery of those projects, understanding what those roadblocks are, again the use of a transportation term, what are the roadblocks that are keeping us from delivering those, and then immediately escalating those to make sure that everybody understands this is what we are facing and why we are not able to start that project. There is no reason for us to be sitting back and saying, "Well, we are just an impasse." That is the policy

conversation with the RTA Board. And today that process is not formalized and so part of what I am going to recommend to the Board is to formalize that process so that it is in place and we can escalate these types of issues quickly.

RS: Any other questions Supervisor?

JA: Yes.

RS: Please.

JA: Well, I guess it is just a real fundamental level. And maybe this is what the sort of take back give us some direction after this discussion. But it is just a question of can we do this? I have heard that there might be some obstacles around the County collecting funds that are then utilized in incorporated areas around incorporated transportation expenditures and so I guess just a question of whether that, is that an issue? Is that not an issue?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen, it is one of the things we have been evaluating, and I actually started by going back and looking at documents in 2018, I think was the last time this Board began to look at it. And there was, there are ways to get to that, I believe, and we will be talking to the County Attorney's Office. There are questions. Could we just collect the money and give it out to the jurisdictions proportionally? There may be some other guardrails involved with that, but we are continuing to explore with the County Attorney's Office exactly what would need to occur in order to make sure that it is possible.

JA: And then I am trying to just get clear on what the amount of the gap, both from the revenue side and if you do not mind, sort of showing me on the spreadsheet on the so the gap, both on the revenue side and then also if it is detailed, on the cost side and making sure those things add up, are aligned.

MO: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Allen, I am going to call your attention to the exhibit, looks like this. It is number three. It has got the three in the circle. So this is the snapshot that you are asking about. That top block is the shortfall as of June 30th of 2026. So right now today quick snapshot, we are looking at about a \$550 million shortfall on June 30th of '26. Now I am going to put a little asterisk on that. It does not include money for transit going forward because the program is finished at that point, nor does it include all of the, I will say some of the categoricals, some sidewalks, bike lanes and some other pieces. They are not as big. The numbers are not as big. But I am still scrubbing those and going through those numbers. But the shortfall right now that I can identify is about \$550 million. Okay. That is the cost side. Down below is how we basically solve that. So I will quickly walk you through that. The first is if there is no RTA Next election, then we actually benefit by \$40 million because we collect an extra three months of revenue. So that is that \$40 million. The \$15 and the \$22, those are interests that we are earning on cash in the bank. So one of the conversations has been, "Well we have money in the bank." That is true. But it is all been put forth and what I did is I scrubbed, we scrubbed the interest

and said, okay, what is interest look like going through that? The next line, that \$140 million, that is revenue that is already been pledged through '29 by the Regional Council, by the PAG Regional Council to the RTA for completion. So when you hear of the TIP that the Transportation Improvement Program, those dollars are all the region's money, basically through '29 so that is \$140, that decision is already made. So that \$332 million that is left is the regional money beyond '29. And the reason I am a little bit I will use the term evasive, but I am not going to say with absolute certainty it is '36 is because of the categorical and the potential increases in costs over time. So I have said it is a range of between 2036 and 2040 is how long we will have to put those regional monies in. So your question is spot on. And you can see as you go down all of those resources add up to those so they balance.

RS: Anything else Supervisor Allen?

JA: So how long, so if we started if we started collection, approve the tax. When would it sunset? When would it stop?

MO: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Allen that really is a policy decision that you all would have to. Are you talking about RTA Next or the County Board of Supervisors?

JA: County Board of Supervisors.

MO: That would be a policy decision that you all have to make.

MH: And if I may?

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you and Supervisor Allen, that the idea for the bridge funding is simply to take over July 1st of 2026 and to go until the assessment begins again, when the voters get an RTA Next package that they then approve. So it would never, like, double it or increase or do anything other than maintain what is in place right now and depending on which scenario PAG RTA decides to move forward with. So just to clarify that.

RS: Thank you. Anything else Supervisor Allen? Alright, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Ortega, it is always a pleasure to see you.

MO: Good to see you sir.

SC: Thank you for being here.

MO: Thank you.

SC: Ideally, in order for this whole process to proceed as planned, there needs to be a plan given to this Board by a certain date for the original structure of dates to go into

effect. I believe that date to have a plan here is somewhere around August 31st or 30th. Is that correct?

MO: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Christy, the date that is currently scheduled, the last possible date would be September 2nd.

SC: September 2nd.

MO: Yes, sir.

SC: Coming up. And I have it on good authority that this has been the directive of staff in RTA to proceed with that plan, and that there is every indication on their part that there will be a plan presented here by that date. Is that correct?

MO: Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Christy, the direction, the policy direction from the RTA Board at this point is for that election to occur.

SC: So that plan is going forward with the staff?

MO: Supervisor. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, Supervisor Christy, yes, sir. That is the current direction.

SC: Thank you. So, Mr. Chair, I think I can speak with some history and authority on the RTA serving on the original Citizens Advisory Committee back in 2005 and '06, having served as the former Chair of the RTA. It is a system very near and dear to my heart, and I fully believe in regional transportation collaboration, and I have worked diligently in those capacities as well as since then, to ensure that we continue a collaborative effort in our region to provide an infrastructure and transportation system. When we have, at this particular point, really the only viable issue, I think, out of the ones presented here to discuss is the bridge tax to cover that area. What is it nine months where there potentially will be no income tax? In order to enact that it would and I am a little hazy on the statute, so forgive me, and we can provide them later. But I believe in Arizona Title 11 and something with Statute 42-6103, and we can verify those, it gives a very flimsy description of how a County can impose a sales tax, flimsy in terms of very open ended, lack of guardrails, lack of safety, lack of any accountability, and basically what it entails is a unanimous vote by this Board. It does not require any sunset. It does not require any set in stone recommendations as far as priorities. In fact, at any point after it is agreed to by this Board to insert or enact that sales tax, priorities, directions, amounts brought in, a whole host of things can be changed at any time after that, merely by a Board's majority vote, not a unanimous vote. So one of the founding things that was so attractive to the community back in 2006 with the RTA was there were very stringent guardrails put into effect, particularly the fact that there were going to be members of the RTA that were represented by all the jurisdictions, one vote, one jurisdiction, that the Auditor General was going to do a complete audit of the funds and the projects every five years. That there is a Citizen's Oversight Committee that provides, that would provide and has provided an annual report to

the public for the accountability of the projects being completed. And most importantly, the fundamental issue is that once the public, the voters voted and approved on the original RTA plan, it could not be changed. And the reason for that was a complete lack of trust by the public in elected officials in delivering any type of projects like this, because the public had been burned in the past with past issues about promises made, about certain projects that never got completed or were changed or transferred, the RTA ensured that that would never happen. And to the best of my ability and knowledge, fundamentally, that has not happened. However, if we vote to impose a sales tax for transportation, there is nothing that says that this Board at any time, by a mere majority, could change the direction of the plan, the amount collected and where that amount goes to. And I can tell you right now that that issue is the most troubling to me. This Board's majority, along with their collaborators and partners in the City of Tucson, cannot be trusted with a revenue stream in the amount of a half cent or full cent sales tax over the next how many years, with no guarantees of a sunset, no guarantees that the priorities could be changed and no guarantees that things could be manipulated that in such a manner that three years from now, four years from now, this Board's majority or the next one who is probably going to be comprised in a mirror-like image of this one can say, you know, we do not need infrastructure or transportation as much as we thought, let us redirect this sales tax that we have enacted to some other pet project like public housing or climate resiliency or climate change..

AC: Point of order?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to stay focused on the substance of this item, which is focused on transportation.

SC: I am using that as an example, Mr. Chair. So the issue that I have is there are no guardrails with this bridge tax. There are no backstops to prevent this Board's majority or another Board's majority coming up in the future, or a collaboration of the City Council to prevent misuse of those funds and divert them away from transportation issues. So, Supervisor Heinz, I am afraid you can return to the RTA Board and say that as far as a countywide sales tax being imposed on this Board, I will never vote for it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. If none of my colleagues have any further questions or comments, I had some clarification questions I wanted to ask, but Supervisor Cano, did you have something else?

AC: Yes, I do, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you. Go right ahead.

AC: You know, look, I want to tone down the temperature a bit because this is a very important regional issue and I take great offense at any suggestion that this Board,

whether it is a Board majority or any one individual Board member, would be trying to mislead the public with our commitment to a long term plan for our region. We are here to have a discussion about how we are going to move our region forward. And it is perplexing to me to try to understand the criticisms that we just received from one of our colleagues, when what is fact is that voters in the City of Tucson have not received the assurances from the plan that they voted on 20 years ago. If there are unfunded projects that have yet to be completed, I think it is a worthwhile discussion for us to figure out how we are going to ensure that those projects get priority. I have heard that from Mr. Ortega, that what we have to do sitting on this dais and as regional leaders is also celebrate the successes and the wins of this plan. And I truly believe that if we continue working together on a solution, whether that is March, whether that is May, whether that is November, we are headed in that same direction. But I take great offense at personal attacks directed at this Board, which is what I believe we just heard.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Just to clarify, some of these things. These questions in terms of guardrails have come up in discussion with members of the PAG RTA Board. And in my discussions with Administrator Leshner, this is important to ensure that we retain this is not a replacement for RTA. This is a bridge funding to get to the next one. And this is not something where we are going to have this entity, our Board here, doing the day to day management of projects and completing things and that is not what we are discussing in any way, shape or form. It is simply to continue the same revenue funding stream that the current TPT is bringing in. It can be drafted that way in the ordinance that we would be considering to vote on unanimously if we wanted to, it would be again, funds going to PAG RTA to do what they are continuing to do. Not for us to manage ourselves here and also to make sure that those funds can only be used for the purposes of furthering the completion of the RTA One Project. All of that can be written into the ordinance that we would be considering, which I think takes care of a lot of the concerns that, frankly, I myself even shared in some cases. So, Supervisor Christy, I think that, you know, those questions are important but can be answered.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I just want to add in the importance, and this is something that I think District 4 and District 3 that we share, which is the absolute essentialness of RTA success and that we have rural communities whose main sort of connection to doctor visits, to you know, getting meetings with Social Security, getting to important critical appointments is transportation that is provided through the RTA. This funding is essential for making sure that seniors or people with disabilities, for young people, for all of our residents who live in rural areas, to get the connections that are needed. So I think it is on us to be creative, to be bold, and also to trust that it is our responsibility to come up with those solutions. So it just, I think for the purposes of our rural communities and all of our districts overall. But this is essential. We have

to figure this out or our folks are isolated. And that is simply a risk that I do not think any of us should, you know, knowingly take on. So I just wanted to layer that.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Allen. Anything else from my colleagues? Mr. Ortega, I did have some clarification questions if I could ask you to come back up. With regard to the documents that have been attached to this item, the document that says RTA, (current financial overview 2007 to 2029). I was the Board's representative to the RTA Board before Supervisor Heinz, was in that role for four years. I have never seen a document like this before. Has this document been presented to the entire RTA Board and is it something that is going to be shared with the public in some kind of explanatory way.

MO: Mr. Chairman, yes, it has been shared both with the Technical Management Committee and the RTA Board. It is posted online as part of the materials for the RTA Board meeting. So it is available. Please note it does say draft on it because we are really, really trying hard to scrub all aspects of it. I do not want there to be any question on any aspect of it, but I am very confident with this after sitting for hours and hours, really pouring through both on the revenue and the expenditure side.

RS: I just think that it is going to be very important in terms of public education, regardless of what happens next, to walk people through this document, because the forecast, those first three columns, forecast actuals and then expenditures, have never been seen together. And I think that is going to land pretty hard with the community. So I just I wanted to ask that and prevail upon my colleague and the other eight members of the RTA Board to walk the public through that, regardless of what is going to happen next. Then I also just wanted to ask again for clarification with regard to the item that has number three on top of it, the RTA projected resources and expenditures through fiscal year 2036. That is going to be your recommendation and the TMC's recommendation? But that is not yet been approved by the RTA Board?

MO: Mr. Chairman, this is not my recommendation yet. This is information on how to accomplish and deliver RTA One. So what I was asked to do is really look at RTA One as it feeds into RTA Next. And so the first order of business was to get that foundational understanding of RTA One. And that is what this does, it gives a path for accomplishing our goal.

RS: Then Ms. Leshner will the substance of this document be a recommendation to the RTA Board from the TMC?

JL: Chair Scott, I do not know. We are using that as the foundational piece to develop the recommendations. The TMC has given to the RTA a plan. We are in the process of reevaluating that if need be. Mr. Ortega has reached out to all of the jurisdictions involved and the Tribal Nation and asked for tweaks. See how we, if anybody has to look at what we have proposed over the last several years that then went to the Board and out for public comment, to see if there is any modification, scope

changes, what we can do with that, and I believe we will be looking at that tomorrow. We are meeting tomorrow morning.

MO: Mr. Chair, just because I have heard that a couple times now, just to let you know, at the last Board meeting I asked the Board members to respond by giving me tweaks. And I use that term very, very deliberately because they are not wholesale changes, but tweaks to the existing plan that they have been considering over the last several years by today at noon. So hopefully here pretty quick. Everybody has got their minor changes. Then tomorrow morning the Technical Management Committee will actually dissect those and start to develop a recommendation back to the RTA Board for the 31st. So that is the process to go through.

RS: Thank you. And then two other clarification questions. The item that has number five in the upper right hand corner. This has to do with transit. And you are still putting together a recommendation to the RTA Board on how to deal with transit expenses. That is in process?

MO: Mr. Chairman, yes. Beyond June 30, 2026. And that will that has not been decided or even recommended yet. We just have identified the challenge and so I am looking for the solutions.

RS: Okay. And then the last clarification question if I could is Supervisor Heinz gave us this page from the RTA Board Agenda with three scenarios. My understanding, based on something you said earlier, is that your recommendation is going to be the second scenario, which is a new 20-year plan, goes to the voters in November. Is that correct?

MO: Mr. Chairman, no, that is not. I have not made a determination on a recommendation. The request was to provide information on all three of those.

RS: I am sorry. I thought you had said earlier that November seemed more palatable.

MO: Great question. So on Item 2, which is an election in '26, there is two options. There is May and November. I will recommend that we look at November, not May under that scenario.

RS: Thank you for clarifying that.

MO: You are welcome.

RS: No I appreciate it. Alright. And then in terms of my own comments, one of the concerns that I have always had and is the message that we send not just to the community, if there is a gap in collection of this tax, but also what it might mean for our prospects for economic development if it looks to site selectors, prospective employers, that we cannot come together as a region on infrastructure issues, that is a significant concern. So I would be interested in hearing from Supervisor Heinz what more work is going to be accomplished at the RTA Board level. But I think it is

very important that Pima County, all of its jurisdictions, come together with regard to the importance of assuring that this means for moving our infrastructure forward does not have any kind of lapse. If it does, as General Maxwell was fond of saying when I was a member of the RTA Board, and I am sure he is still fond of saying, as our representative, the State Transportation Board, there is not any additional state or federal money coming into this region for anything other than maintenance. You have probably heard that a few times from him. So I am just going to say to be continued, because it sounds like the TMC has a lot more discussion to have. The RTA Board has a lot more discussion to have. I am very grateful to Ms. Leshner and Mr. DeBonis for devoting their Wednesdays, as she looks really excited about it, for the next..

JL: The rest of time.

RS: The rest of time. And I am also, again to finish where we started. Mr. Ortega, very grateful to you for coming out of retirement to help our community deal with this. And Supervisor Heinz, thank you for giving us the opportunity to discuss this. Did you have any closing comments before we moved on?

MH: No. I appreciate the discussion and I think to be continued is accurate. We will pick one of these scenarios on July 31st, and there is a very real possibility it will not be a March election and we will be talking more with the Board. So thank you.

RS: Thank you very much, Mr. Ortega. Thank you so much.