

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

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

Also Present: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:06 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 Supervisor Grijalva and seconded by Chair Scott to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Scott inquired about the review process of the approved plans that were presented to the Board.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that per the County's Code, the plans were reviewed and approved by the District's Chief Engineer and then a quarterly report was created to present to the Board. She stated that the quarterly report was reviewed and approved by County Administration prior to it being presented to the Board.

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

2. CONTRACT

Harold C. Levkowitz, as Successor Trustee of the Levkowitz Family Trust created by Agreement dated March 14, 1994, and Jedd Bogage, as Successor Trustee of the Joe Levkowitz Bypass Trust created by Agreement dated March 27, 2020, to provide Acquisition Agreement Acq-1245 and Warranty Deed for approximately 170 acres of floodprone land located at the SW corner of N. Aguirre Road and W. Manville Road, a portion of Tax Parcel No. 208-43-037A, in Section 20, T13S,

R10E, G&SRM, Pima County, AZ, Flood Control Floodprone Land Acquisition Program Fund, contract amount \$303,800.00 (PO2500002922)

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz 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 2:20 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

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

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

Also Present: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:06 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. Augustine Romero, Director, Pascua Yaqui Department of Education.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

PRESENTATION

4. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Michael Sterner, Library Technical Assistant, Pima County Himmel Library, for 30 years of service.

Amber Mathewson, Director, Library, recognized Mr. Sterner for his 30 years of service with Pima County and presented him with his retirement certificate. She thanked him for always being a welcoming presence at the libraries.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Craig Ivanyi, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, February 18, 2025 to be: "CRAIG IVANYI DAY"

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

Supervisor Allen stated that a tribute fund had been created in Mr. Ivanyi's name to continue to draw support for the incredible education and conservation done by the Desert Museum.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Dr. Cheree Meeks, President, NAACP Tucson Branch; Beverly Elliott, Executive Director, African American Museum of Southern Arizona (AAMSAZ); and Bob Elliott, Chair of the Board, AAMSAZ, proclaiming the month of February 2025 to be: "BLACK HISTORY MONTH IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

7. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding her concern about victims of fentanyl poisoning and that the open Mexico border was the reason there were so many fentanyl overdoses in Pima County.

Robert Reus spoke in opposition of Proposition 414. He stated that he previously ran as a candidate for District 1 and introduced his countywide sales tax plan that he believed would help Pima County.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Allen stated that in her district, there were several ports of entry and 130 miles of U.S.-Mexico border. She indicated that 90% of the drugs apprehended from individuals entering this country came through ports of entry and a similar percentage stated that the drugs had been carried into the country by U.S. citizens. She stated that leadership from both political parties had been supporting the buildup and fortification of U.S. ports of entry because they were an incredibly important infrastructure for the country.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he confronted the fentanyl and opioid crisis every day while working in the hospital and he did his part in trying to decrease the fentanyl deaths. He stated that this Board had also tried to do what they could at the local level including the approval of all Sheriff Deputies to carry Narcan. He stated that this issue also had to be dealt with through the state and federal governments.

* * *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

There were no Board updates.

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

Discussion/Action: Request County Administration to provide an update at each Board of Supervisors' meeting on the federal and state executive, legislative and judicial actions that affect funding for or operations of programs including, but not limited to grants and directives that can impact departments like Health, Sheriff, or County Attorney; also education and immigration policy changes that can impact Pima County residents. (District 5)

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she placed this item on the agenda because she wanted an update and suggested a regular update, either monthly or quarterly, on this topic be provided to the Board. She stated that as heard in an earlier presentation, things were happening fairly quickly and asked how many grants this affected. She added that Administrator Leshner had sent out a communication on the number of grants that might be affected, but as those things arose, asked if there could be a public discussion. She stated that this would be important because people were asking their district offices, and it would be a way to communicate what was happening with the public. She stated it would not be limited specifically to grants, but any directives that could impact departments like Health, Sheriff, County Attorney, any education and immigration policies that could impact Pima County residents and it was not meant to be specifically narrowed to any funding exchange. She stated it would be geared more towards some of the things that were coming down the pike that perhaps other states or local municipalities were being pressured with their police and Sheriff's Departments to be compelled to be of assistance in immigration raids. She reiterated that she wanted to ensure the Board had a regular update on what those things might look like, because she thought there would be a lot of movement almost daily.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that they had been crosswalking all of the executive orders with how it was thought they might impact the County and a regular report would be provided at the Board meetings.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration, stated that as indicated by Supervisor Grijalva, activities were fast and furious, so this update would be on what was known to date, in and around the federal funding impacts, along with some of the data issues, staffing issues, and some of the recent movement that had happened over the past 72 hours. She provided a slideshow presentation and

stated that since January 20th, there were over 60 executive orders issued and signed and it had since grown. She stated that County staff and departments were reviewing these executive orders very closely to determine the applicability of the services and programs that the County provided and any potential impact to federal funding. She stated that on January 28th, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released correspondence to temporarily pause federal funding tied to seven of the executive orders, and since then there had been numerous court injunctions to prevent said federal funding, alongside directives from federal agencies that County departments were receiving, and there was the first reported recruitment of already issued federal grant awards. She went over a high-level timeline directed at the OMB funding pause in and around some of the court activity and injunctions that happened over less than a two-week period, and all County departments were monitoring the impact to the County's grant portfolio. She stated that the slideshow indicated there was 63 lawsuits, but currently there were 75 lawsuits pertaining to the executive orders and the pausing of congressionally approved funds, accessing of sensitive data, and/or removal of such were pending. She stated that the County strategy regarding the potential fiscal impact of the pause would be working closely with the Grants Management & Innovation (GMI) Department to look across all of the potentially affected grants within the County's portfolio. She stated it appeared that over 93% could potentially be impacted, but they were also closely looking at the executive alignment with the court order and whether they were still able to receive funding that had been appropriated. She stated that about 63% of the grants that could potentially be impacted were reimbursement grants, so they needed to ensure those portals were still open and that submission for reimbursement was being made for appropriate and approved scopes of services. She added that it was important to note that there were different types of awards, awards already received and reimbursement funding, and the concept of obligation was going to be critical. She stated they needed to review awards received or the reimbursement modeling of grants funding, and whether they had been obligated, were there grant award agreements in place or contracts in place for these federally or pass through funding opportunities. She reiterated the portals were largely open for reimbursement funding and if that changed, they would update the Board in real time. She added that another component would be to review, over these 90 days, the grants portfolio, the statuses of the grants and whether they would be completed soon, had the scope of services within those grant agreements been completed, or were they in the middle of their performance period, whether they were annual pass through grants or if they had not started yet. She stated that the ones that had not started yet were the most at-risk because grant agreements were not necessarily in place. She stated that they had heard from a few federal agencies correspondence to potentially pause, but those had been rescinded. She stated that some of them had not started scopes of services, so those were temporarily paused. She stated that there was a bit of untangling, but it was being monitored closely. She stated that another component being seen, especially over the last week, was data access and the County's public health space had been impacted on the funding and data side. She stated that there were directives or actions to pull down some of the public data sets they heavily relied on, including Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and Census Bureau data. She stated that there had been court

injunctions to get the data restored and some of them were restored in full form and some were not. She stated there had been access to critical data sets like U.S. Treasury, Department of Education, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the list was growing as some of the work within the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) continued to move forward with their directives. She noted they would continue to update the status of the County's grants portfolio on their regular updates to the Board. She stated that some of them were passed through funds and some State mandated services. She added they would also be closely reviewing the executive order directives and whether the grants tied to some of the work that was State mandated, and work with the Pima County Attorney's Office. She stated they were closely reviewing the considerable amount of hiring freezes and as seen over the past 72 hours, there was a large amount of workforce across federal agencies that was impacted. She stated they would monitor the effects of that and how it fell down to State and county or local governments. She stated that they would update the recoupment of federally issued grant award funding and would continue to monitor whether those dollars were obligated and tied up within contracts. She stated that the recoupment of funding was something that the County would be monitoring closely. She stated that they had already seen an associated impact on County operations and the general fund procurement of services with the recent tariffs.

Supervisor Grijalva asked whether the data that had been modified or deleted and was required by the County's grants to collect data, were federal grants that required data collection from the CDC and other places. She stated that if that information was not available, then the County could be in trouble because they would not be supplying the commitment to provide the information.

Ms. Davis responded that a considerable amount of work was being done in terms of the collection of programmatic data and the population served. She stated that data got reported to federal agencies as a component of the grant award agreement and part two of that was a lot of data was critical infrastructure in how the County served its population. She stated that was how they determined priority areas and vulnerability and it was how a lot of health activities were planned, including clinical services and there was wide-reaching effect.

Supervisor Grijalva asked if Ms. Davis could expand on the tariffs and the impact to the County.

Ms. Davis stated that they received a report recently from a County department that showed some of their services and planned Capital Improvement Projects were going to be affected by the cost of materials.

Supervisor Grijalva questioned if the estimates would increase up to 25% depending on that supply.

Ms. Davis responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva asked whether the County received reimbursement. She stated that there were some other states that said that while there was a block, they could not withhold funds, but they still had not received the funding.

Ms. Davis responded that everything was happening minute by minute, but at the moment, the County's portals were open and available to submit, and they had not seen any tremendous interruption. She stated that they received some correspondence from federal funding agencies that had either modified the times of the portal accessibility or brought forth references to the executive orders to determine the allowability of those grant award agreements, but some of them had been rescinded and they were being monitored very closely. She reiterated staff was working with GMI and at the departmental level that affected over 20 County departments. She stated that two of the County's biggest grant award departments included the Health Department and Community and Workforce Development, which many were formula awards that were annual which they relied on for critical services, so they would continue to monitor if there was interruption to any of those reimbursement models, and updates would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that usually there was about a month delay after submitting deliverables and a request for reimbursement. She asked if the County had received any reimbursement since January 20th.

Ms. Davis replied that they would follow up and get that amount of detail.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she wanted to understand, because every State was different and it seemed that some of the information heard depended on the State. She stated that she was very curious because usually those models were anywhere between 30 to 90-day reimbursement. She stated that if the portal was open and information was being submitted, but no funds were being received, that was when she would be very concerned about the current budget process, because many departments were asking for supplementals and different increases. She stated that her inclination at this time was to state that everyone had to stick within the budget they had until it was clearly understood what was happening at the federal level since it was impacting 20 County departments, 93% of the County's grants. She asked how many millions of dollars could potentially be touched and if it was \$148 million. She stated that the Board was being asked for things by departments, but her instinct was to say no until it was known for certain that the County would be reimbursed for any portion of those grants, because as with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), these cuts were people. She stated that some of these were critical need positions that they needed to figure out from the General Fund, depending on the urgency and how they would float some of those positions for a while. She stated that she was very concerned at what these impacts were, some of them were state mandated, but she did not anticipate that the State had the funding to float the County, since a reverse of \$121 million from what used to be State costs were seen that Pima County would have to cover. She stated that she could not imagine that the County would have that funding from the State. She stated that unless there was an objection from her colleagues, she would like this item to come back every meeting until there was no longer a critical need for it.

It was moved by Supervisor Grijalva, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to make this a recurring item at each Board of Supervisors' meeting until further notice.

Supervisor Heinz commented that the Board should be updated daily or twice daily. He stated that it had been heard really distressingly, and he did not anticipate that the Airport Authority and the military folks would get rid of 400 people, as seen on CNN. He stated that this was a product of the federal government not understanding what certain staff did and getting rid of them because they were a line item. He stated that it would take starting to count planes as they fell out of the sky for them to get a couple hundred of those 400 people back. He stated that this was not the way to run anything, and he did not represent federal government, but he read very concerning stories about the City of New York and others that were seeing tens of millions of dollars being clawed back from the federal government payment quarterly. He stated that this was a two-way thing and having dealt with this with multiple businesses in his personal life, he asked whether they could put a stop to something on the federal government in terms of their ability to take things. He stated that he would like the ability to tell them that they could not take money out of the County's accounts, but they could send it. He stated they could not take it out because those were for grants that were previously approved or money that was passed by Congress, and truly, there was not a monarch for a reason, Congress said something and executive approved it, therefore it was the law. He stated that DOGE, Elon Musk and young staff did not get to destroy these governments like this. He asked if there was a way for the County to protect itself from having an unauthorized transfer out to the federal government because they decided they wanted to get some grant money back.

Ms. Leshner responded that the simple answer was no, but they were watching it very closely and he was right that in New York it was about \$81 million clawed back. She stated that at this point, they had been watching all the accounts to see what had occurred. She asked Legal Counsel if there was a way that the County could block that removal.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the County Attorney's Office could look into that.

Supervisor Christy stated that Ms. Davis was in a difficult position and it was obvious that monitoring was being done. He asked if there was any definitive idea down to the dollars and cents of what was going to be impacted.

Ms. Davis stated they had an idea of expenditures from the last fiscal year and also had a list of total grant awards which she highlighted earlier that they were reviewing which grants within the County's portfolio were almost finished.

Supervisor Christy asked if those had not yet been impacted and if they were the ones deemed vulnerable.

Ms. Davis responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy stated that at this point, a dollar amount could not be provided that was going to be withdrawn from the County.

Ms. Leshar responded that this report was similar to what was provided with any of the other financial reports, and this was their best estimate of what they saw on the horizon from the federal government, but they did not have a number.

Supervisor Christy explained that the reason he brought this up was because he heard a hyperbole from his colleagues over this, because they had no idea how much money was going to be withdrawn from the budget or activities. He stated that currently everything was pure speculation, and it was probably a good opportunity to be able to indicate the sky was falling and all was bad. He stated that he had always wondered why anyone would be against waste and fraud in the government and in taxpayers' money, but apparently that did not matter to his colleagues. He stated that he also heard about tariffs, but did not know where it came from, other than for more speculation, of 25%. He asked if it was known by percentage, what was going to be impacting anything in Pima County.

Ms. Leshar responded they did not have any specific numbers yet; however, they did know what the impact and the vulnerability might be.

Chair Scott stated that what he heard, not only in terms of Supervisor Christy's questions, but also the County Administrator's responses, was the factor of uncertainty. He stated that there were unknowns, and he thought that was why the Board unanimously voted to put regular updates on the agenda as more certainty came to the Board.

Supervisor Christy stated that to his point, there were statements made that actually sounded that they were based on certainty, but there was no certainty or finite numbers. He stated they did not know what was going to be vulnerable other than the speculation of monitoring. He stated that the \$148 million that was pointed out as vulnerable represented 11% of the budget. He stated that it might be a very good time for the Board to review that 11% of the budget and prepare for this kind of situation, but until they had more actual dollars, then it was all pure speculation. He asked for transparency if a description of the portals could be explained to the public.

Ms. Davis explained that the County used various electronic databases that were operated by the federal agencies, and that was the tool that the County used to submit invoices or reimbursement to get paid for the services provided within that grant.

Supervisor Christy commented that if the federal government would be laying off or reducing the workforce in the Federal Aviation Committee, 400 administrative people that wrote grants, he thought it was worthwhile to review it and not leave the air traffic control stranded. He stated that anytime it was top heavy in the

administrative area, it was time to remove that administrative area, and he applauded that effort.

Supervisor Grijalva confirmed that what she was told was there was a 25% increase in tariffs.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the tariffs referred to by Supervisor Grijalva.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that tariffs were the reason why some of those construction costs were going to be increased with the ones with Mexico and Canada which were listed at 25%. She clarified that was what she meant regarding the tariffs. She stated that when they had to estimate that these things might eventually come back that needed to be looked at and she hoped that when the Board was discussing the kind of cuts they would be asking to be done Countywide, that the Board was prepared to do that in their own offices.

Supervisor Christy agreed.

Supervisor Allen stated that this made her think about the importance of public service and having people in roles of public service that cared about the public because fomenting uncertainty caused uncertainty. She stated that it was her understanding that in the State of Arizona, there were about 35,000 people that were federal employees, which possibly included the 400 people from the FAA and many other critical services. She stated that what she thought about, and all the conversations she had with people in the community, was about what the impacts were to the County and the critical services the County provided, but also in thinking about the work that was done was often in partnership with other universities, the community college, K-12, with the University of Arizona, social services, non-profits, the hospitals, water quality, land, a myriad of agencies that were also funded by the federal government. She stated that in thinking about the degree of uncertainty, it was not just the uncertainty of the County itself, but it was the uncertainty that was rippled out through all of the partners that were fundamental to the functioning of the community in profound ways. She stated that at this point, the County may only be able to pinpoint it as uncertainty, but uncertainty was instability, and that caused suffering and struggle from people that were indeed afraid for their lives and for the future of their families, so uncertainty mattered. She asked if County contracts with the federal government were binding.

Mr. Jurkowitz responded yes, they were contracts and they could be enforced, but they would need to review the specific contract to determine the actual provisions.

Supervisor Heinz stated that all of this uncertainty and chaos costed money as such with the length of this discussion. He stated the County had staff dedicated to monitoring the chaos, figuring out what the chaos was going to do to essential services and how it was going to potentially adversely impact the people the Board worked for. He stated that the Board was their employees and so was the President, and he worked for them. He requested staff to track how much staff, time, and resources, was going into this, and it was costing taxpayer dollars just to figure out

what was happening. He stated that there was a process in medicine where you were not supposed to harm the system while trying to figure out how to fix it. He stated that this did not seem like a great way to do things. He suggested that the cost to figure this out be monitored because if there was a duplication of services that was unnecessary at whatever level of government, then they should look at eliminating or streamlining and making that more efficient as long as the data was collected. He stated that they needed to figure out what was going on first, and figure out what those 400 support people did for the FAA and if it was needed or not. He asked, for instance, could the people that controlled nuclear material for the Department of Energy actually put that material into nuclear warheads, when they updated it, because they were just fired and could not be found. He reiterated they needed the information first and then could act on it accordingly and not cause all this inefficiency by trying to supposedly become more efficient, so if it could be kept on track at the County level it would be helpful for the Board to know.

Chair Scott stated that he was very struck by the use of the two terms on the slide that dealt with grant funding, obligated and awarded. He stated that both of them could cause budgetary implications for the County, but especially those in the obligated category. He stated that as the Board received these reports at every board meeting, if those distinctions could be made between obligated and awarded grant funding, as it would be helpful for the Board in terms of considering the budgetary implications. He thanked Supervisor Grijalva for placing this item on the agenda and for his colleagues' approval to add it as a standing agenda item until further notice.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

10. Pima County Climate Action Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding an update of Pima County's Climate Action Plan, as requested by the Board of Supervisors.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administration, provided a slideshow presentation and stated this was an update on Pima Climate Action Now (Pima CAN). She stated that the first slide showed a recap of recent activities which was done every two months, discussed things they had been tackling since inception, including the role of the climate action teams and the climate action effort. She stated that Pima CAN was comprised of the Climate Action Executive team, which started as nine County directors, interdisciplinary directors that had grown to over 24 County departments. She stated that they identified at least 2 to 3 senior leaders within their departments to comprise the Pima County Climate Action Advisory Committee, and they collectively tackled the priorities by which the County would integrate into its comprehensive Climate Action Plan. She stated that alongside them were the Green Stewards, which was the workforce component to bolster workforce capacity and understand what the County was doing and continued to champion the work of the climate efforts. She stated that since inception of the Climate Action Executive team, they prioritized carbon reduction and greenhouse gas emissions reductions goals and strategies by way of the priority Climate Action

Plan. She stated they had prioritized extreme heat last spring and summer, which was also a monumental effort to support the community and access to cooling and respite services, alongside some critical policy initiatives. She stated that the water working group had reengaged and was about to release their strategies and memoranda, probably within the next month, and invasives and wildfire, which the Board had seen a recent memorandum regarding Invasive Species strategies, with a year's worth of critical tasks over the next calendar year to help reduce the risk of invasive species, and in addition, the Board addendum item brought forth by Supervisor Christy regarding the critical wildfire mitigation plan. She stated that over the spring, the Board would see their goals dedicated to energy efficiency across County operations, Transportation and Fleet priorities, and materials. She stated that the previous Climate Action Report was the Sustainable Action Plan for County Operations (SAPCO). She stated that it was completed and updated the Board last October, and they exceeded their goals ahead of schedule. She stated that as directed by this Board through Resolution No. 2022-25, they were set forth to release the Climate Action Plan for 2025-2030, this current fiscal year. She stated that one way to think about this was in alignment with all of the comprehensive planning efforts. She stated that their comprehensive ten-year plan, Pima Prospers, would be released in 2025 and one thing that was recently released to the Board was the climate section. She stated they had a series of mitigation strategies to reduce carbon emissions, but it was really important to identify the role of adaptation in hazard response. She added that had been brought up by their esteemed colleagues with the fire districts, with much of it being brought up every summer. She stated that some of the adaptation and hazard responses were critically identified by leadership across the Climate Action team and those were identical to the climate section of Pima Prospers. She stated this included extreme heat, wildfire risk, drought, and the overarching planning that went with extreme weather and as had been seen in the heat season was longer, wildfire season was longer, and they required year-round planning to ensure that they were addressing adaptation strategies collectively and responding to the needs of the community while complying with mitigation efforts. She added that on that end, it included regional collaboration and feedback from the community and becoming a more resilient community across climate efforts. She stated that another initiative they were cross walking very closely with was the Prosperity Initiative. She stated that environmental justice was a cross-cutting strategy of the Prosperity Initiative, and they were currently focusing on workforce enhancements and workforce capacity building with the Prosperity Initiative and also looking at individual and household impacts such as home weatherization with extreme heat months. She stated that there had already been much discussion on invasives and wildfire on this day, but as highlighted with the fire districts and at the Board's last meeting regarding wildfire risk, there were a few initiatives that would converge under the leadership of Senior Advisor Mari Vasquez and other critical departments working in this space, such as the Office of Emergency Management, Conservation Lands and Resources, Flood Control District and the County Administrator's office. She stated that alongside the Climate Action teams what the Board had already seen was the critical path set forth by the invasives working group to expand the development of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan and data around mitigation efforts. She stated that this was expansive and the need for data in real time was growing so that they could conduct

adequate risk modeling as heard by their fire district partners. She stated that it was known that emergency response knew no bounds and so they needed to ensure they cataloged comprehensively the intensive efforts that were being made across the community to reduce the risk and enhance the response capacity across invasives, and that wildfire risk areas were critical. She stated that it included outreach and prevention in the community to ensure the County became a more resilient community, especially with programs like Firewise and how they could make space more defensible to protect. She stated that the water working group included a team of nine County departments that would be releasing their strategies specific to and in alignment with Pima Prospers around scarcity conservation efforts with water demand and demand management. She added that of the high utilizer demand areas, determine whether they were using innovation and reuse strategies to ensure they aligned with conservation goals and monitored the demand appropriately to meet their measures and that memorandum would be provided to the Board in March. She stated that energy efficiency was currently being tackled and they would create goals aligned with energy efficiency across County facilities. She stated that this was a goal of the Climate Action planning group and it also helped impact real return on investment and general fund impact by looking at County operations and building efficiency, and where they could titrate to reduce demand on certain energy, make buildings more efficient, reduce the cost of the general fund, and define clean energy goals, where they could reduce demand and have alternate energy uses such as solar. She stated that all of this resulted in a plan and these plans had come forth to the Board, the Pima CAN priority Climate Action Plan, the three-year heat response, they would be seeing the invasives 90-day wildfire risk and community wildfire protection plan, and the Water Working Group Plan. She stated that each of these plans had a County component, but more importantly, they had a regional component because they could not do it alone. She added that they had prioritized this as an enterprise-wide approach across County departments and things that they were currently working on, such as renewables and energy efficiency, they would also get into transportation with the Transportation Department, air quality with the Department of Environmental Quality and Fleet services to define those priorities. She stated that the County portion of an obligation and measurement associated with each of those plans would be the Climate Action Plan to ensure they could operationalize it in alignment with other comprehensive plans. She stated that this helped in many ways to establish the budget pillar which had been recently established by the County Administrator and the Board, to determine what it costed to complete these things, and how they would look at the true operational costs of the budget pillars.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Wildfire Mitigation Plan outlined in the presentation was separate and would move forward regardless of the outcome of the other separate projects.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, concurred.

Supervisor Allen stated that she looked forward to learning more about the plan and that she was scheduled to sit down with a number of the directors to discuss this and that her caveat was that she needed to learn more. She stated that given the

earlier conversation about so many grants, federal funding, having such strong degrees of uncertainty, work around climate action, particularly environmental justice and climate justice, were amongst the first executive orders to roll out. She asked how this was specifically going to impact the County's work around confronting climate change in Pima County.

Ms. Davis responded that the Bipartisan Infrastructure Jobs Act and Inflation Reduction Act were called out specifically as being considered to reduce, if not stop, funding. She stated that those were congressionally appropriated funds, however, they had already been obligated. She stated that this tied into the earlier update of the grant portfolio that was under these, and a lot of them had to do with climate and sustainability initiatives. She stated they were reviewing the status of those whether they were on board or if they had not started, which a few had not started yet, but had received some level of notification that there might be a hold. She stated they were closely monitoring it and as directed by the Board, were going to continue setting those goals, as indicated in Resolution No. 2022-25. She stated that they were going to set these priorities and mitigation strategies and assured that they had a document by which they could respond to things like multi-hazards in a comprehensive way that also provided a roadmap for operational budgeting and helped set priorities if and when other grants became available. She reiterated they would continue to monitor, but funding remained a critical issue, and the silver lining was that they would have a comprehensive plan by which to set priorities.

Supervisor Allen stated that she was interested in the regional collaboration across the County and if there were goals or areas of the work in which they worked hand-in-hand with the City of Tucson and whether there were other areas in which they worked by virtue of unincorporated areas or County operations of the work being done more independently, and also with some of the other incorporated areas or the Tohono O'odham Nation.

Ms. Davis replied that they worked closely in the Priority Climate Action Plan and the first document of this group's work by which the team worked on a regional capacity. She stated they had tribal partners and community-based organizations and every voice at the table to create the most comprehensive plan that also aligned with the County's heat response. She stated that heat response had over 40 partners, non-governmental organizations, tribal partners and jurisdictional partners. She stated that was the same with every other effort and the wildfire mitigation plan and they would be bringing all stakeholders to the table for that, because there was the County role and what could be done within that operational function, but they realized that without plugging into the shared priorities of the region, they would be less effective and integrating that, in addition to working with folks in the community to really get critical feedback about what should be prioritized. She stated that was a model that they kept forward because it was critical to do so and the Board would see that regional collaboration throughout all of the climate priorities, in addition to just parsing out the County operational part for its own climate action plan so that it was all aligned.

Chair Scott requested that as the Board moved into the consideration of Pima Prospers, he would appreciate some explicit references to the Climate Action Plan and its connections to the comprehensive Land Use Plan revisions.

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

11. Presentation of Military and General Aviation Shared Airspace Safety

Representatives of the Tucson Airport Authority, Davis Monthan Air Force Base and the Air National Guard will share with the Board of Supervisors all that is done by the military and general aviation in the Pima County region to safely share airspace.

Danette Bewley, A.A.E., President and C.E.O., Tucson Airport Authority (TAA), addressed the Board and stated that the last few weeks had not been the finest in aviation. She stated that they wanted to share what had happened in their airspace with how they managed the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) guidance and direction and what happened on a day-to-day basis. She also wanted to share a few prepared remarks, because it was important to recognize that there was a new Department of Transportation Secretary, and the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) involvement in some of the recent aviation accidents. She stated that everyone was mourning the loss of passengers and crews on American flights 5342 and the Army Black Hawk helicopter in Washington, D.C., the Medjet flight in Philadelphia and the Bering Air Cessna Caravan in Alaska. She added there was an incident that past week in Scottsdale Airport where there was loss of life, and then the prior day the Delta Airlines aircraft that landed, flipped over, and wound up upside down, so the entire aviation community was in grief. She stated that their commitment to taking action to ensure accidents like these never happened. She stated that aviation remained the safest mode of transportation in the world and that nearly 50,000 flights took off and landed safely each day in the United States, and the national airspace system remained the gold standard of safety. She added that according to Transportation Secretary Sean Duffy, they had the safest skies in the world, and traveling by air was the safest mode of transportation. She stated that at a recent press conference, NTSB Chair Jennifer Homendy said that the safest mode of transportation was air travel and it was incredibly safe. She stated that they were confident that the NTSB, working with the FAA, Department of Transportation, Department of Defense, and other parties would identify root causes and issue recommendations for the aviation industry and U.S. military to prevent future accidents. She stated that the work of Chair Homendy, NTSB board member Todd Inman and other NTSB members and staff was critical for responding to these accidents and recommending changes to make the system even safer. She stated that through tragedy, they drew knowledge to improve safety for everyone, and they strongly supported the NTSB going through the steps and phases needed to understand what happened in each incident. She stated that while they came in a series, the root cause could be different from incident to incident, not unlike a car accident. She explained that with the TAA their aviation aerospace system was very complex and had responsibilities that started at ground level and went all the way to the highest altitudes and were heavily regulated. She stated that they did not have many options and very limited wiggle room on what they did and how they did it.

She stated that they had to operate very much inside those guidelines and if the FAA came to them and told them something was not right, they would get written up and it would be a discrepancy that could lead to a suspension of their operating certificate. She stated that it was taken very seriously and that one of the things that was important to recognize was so intertwined with the military, commercial aviation, general aviation and Air Traffic Control (ATC) and was a very synergistic relationship and positive control in the Tucson sector. She stated that meant that when someone was in an airline, they had to back off the gate and ask permission from FAA to back off the gate, they conducted ground control operations, got the airplane safely to the runway, and then they issued the takeoff clearance. She stated that once the airplane took off and got up to about 3,000 or 4,000 feet, they were then transferred to a different sector of the FAA depending on where that aircraft was going. She stated that it was a constant transfer across the country, positive airspace and positive control the entire time. She stated that was something to be assured of in this airspace when it came to Tucson International Airport and another thing they had done at TAA was a complete overhaul of the airfield, which was called the Airfield Safety Enhancement Program, a \$400 million project to improve the geometry of the airfield. She explained that they had parallel runways, but one of the runways was very small and could only be used by general aviation, small aircraft. She stated they demolished it and were relocating the runway and building an exact parallel to the main runway providing a number of benefits. She stated that it would provide a separation between the two runways, if required, and provided redundancy, in case one runway was under maintenance or if there was a problem with the plane, such as a flat tire or something else, and would allow the military to operate very synergistically with the dual parallel runways. She stated that the project was currently in the phase where all of the dirt work was completed on the runway, and they would begin pouring concrete in the summertime. She stated that the overall project for runway commissioning was scheduled for 2027, and the project should be completed around 2028-2029, depending on federal funding. She stated that during this time there were a lot of "what ifs" such as, what if there was an incident, accident and how would it be handled. She explained that anytime there was an incident or an accident in Tucson, they responded with their fire department, Airport Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF), which was a very specialized group of firefighters because they had specialized equipment to operate with aircraft. She added that the Air National Guard would send their equivalent to the ARFF teams, so that there was always a dual response. She stated that they responded to the F-16 and to commercial because it was a partnership, and if something escalated beyond the handling a very quick incident, they would activate their Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and would communicate with Pima County's EOC. She stated that they were National Incident Management System and Incident Command System trained, and they followed all the protocols. She stated that they regularly trained in mass casualty and the FAA conducted inspections, and they had triennial drills every three years. She stated that their next triennial drill would be in 2026. She stated that it would be in combination with a number of stakeholders like the County, the City of Tucson, police, fire, all the mutual aid agencies, including the guard and even some of the State level and hospitals. She stated that it was a full-scale exercise so that they would be ready every single day.

Lt. Col. Paul Sheehy, Commander, 563rd Operations Support Squadron, Davis-Monthan (DM) Air Force Base, addressed the Board and stated that as an H60 Helicopter Pilot and subject matter expert with many years' of experience flying military helicopters out of DM and in the local area, they greatly appreciated the support from the local community and hoped to address any concerns they had. He stated that in his 15 years flying the H60 helicopter, 6 years at DM, he had various assignments and multiple deployments employing rotor and wing combat search and rescue capability to include a significant number of training sorties and even some real-world search and rescue missions locally over the years. He stated that his time in Tucson had provided experience and subsequent familiarity, operating alongside a wide range of aircraft in the area. He stated that constant communication adherence to FAA regulations had always been critical and standard practice for all of their aviators. He stated that DM flying units and base operations worked in close coordination with all local agencies to ensure aviation safety remained the forefront of their operations. He added that all aircraft operating out of DM adhered to FAA and ATC procedures, utilized standardized routing and approved control measures, and regularly coordinated with TIA and other airports to operate in and around the local airspace. He stated that safety was paramount and was a cornerstone of everything they did in aviation, from preflight checks ensuring they had required equipment, to detailed mission planning and mission execution. He stated they were committed to maintaining the highest safety standards for their air crews and the communities they served.

Ret. Lt. Col. Matt Ward, spoke to the Board and stated that he had flown out of the Tucson Morris Air National Guard Base for 25 years and could provide information as a subject matter expert on F-16 local area procedures.

Supervisor Heinz stated that when someone flew in or out of the area, they had to go through District 2 since TIA and DM were in his district. He stated that he had flown a lot recently to care for his father in Michigan and had also worked with the Obama Administration and flew in and out of D.C. 160 times during those two years. He stated that this was close to home for him and for a lot of the people that were in the area. He stated that there was a new administration, but in the previous administration, there were about 3,000 controllers and there was a shortage of air traffic controllers from a national standpoint. He asked if there was a concern or impact on the slew of layoffs or firings that happened, especially if the FAA regarded this as a safety issue.

Ms. Bewley responded that they had recently found out that DOGE worked in concert with the new administration and laid off 400 FAA administrative workers, some of them from Arizona in the airport district office in Phoenix. She stated that they were not exactly sure how this would impact them, but were watching this carefully. She stated that they wanted to understand what the impact was and how they were going to redistribute the workload. She stated that, in her opinion, every position that the FAA had was a safety position and to Supervisor Heinz's point about ATC, they were about 1,000 controllers short. She stated they might complete a rapid hire, but was not sure they would go back to the schools to see who was

certified because they had a list of about a thousand applicants that were ready to go to Aero Center in Oklahoma City, where the FAA trained their air traffic controllers, but something happened along the way within the Biden Administration, and they put a pause on that. She stated that they might try to resurrect it to get people through ATC training as quickly and safely as possible.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that the Board had no authority over the TAA, DM or Air National Guard and that they were here as a courtesy to the community. He asked once they had information regarding the specific support roles and how they might impact operations, if they could inform the Board offices.

Ms. Bewley stated they were taking things day-by-day, and she had spoken to the manager of the Airport's District office that morning and was told it was a very confusing time and it was really difficult for them to speculate, other than they knew about the layoffs.

Supervisor Heinz stated that a lot of the time, things were going well and everyone was talking and communicating, but there was still congested airspace. He asked how civilians would be approached when something landed on the wrong runway, wrong way or on a taxiway. He stated that as a physician, when someone had a seizure while driving a car and had an accident, there were things they could do to ensure that it did not happen again. He stated that in this context, everything was going perfectly well from DM with regard to the Air National Guard wing and commercial aviation was doing exactly what it needed to do, but then a situation occurred, he questioned how would it be mitigated at that time, how would everyone talk to each other, and afterward, how would they ensure anyone that caused the threat to so many other people would never get to pilot an aircraft again.

Ms. Bewley responded those were real concerns and in fact, when they put together their justification for their Airfield Safety Enhancement Program, one of the criteria used to justify the priority of the project was pilot deviations. She stated it involved pilots mostly in general aviation, and that commercial and military were in a different category of professional pilots, but some of the people that were learning to fly were learning and they made mistakes. She stated that they had a lot of them, and it was very concerning to them and the FAA, which raised them on a priority list by their Airfield Safety Enhancement Program and moving along quickly and receiving more federal funding than they normally would. She stated that they were happy about the outcome. She added that this was an FAA matter, and they were the agency that certified a pilot. She stated they went through training and were required to meet all the minimum requirements and also go up for a check ride with their instructor. She stated the result was either a thumbs up or down, even if you were a private pilot or not, and they tried again if not. She stated that as a commercial service airport, as a public airport, they could not discriminate against the type of user, so ATC had to allow general aviation to come and fly the airspace, just like military and commercial aviation. She stated that all they could do was educate and hoped that the pilots were being careful and cautious when looking at the airfield that they were going to take off from or land at, or if there were any changes for them. She stated their airfield was changing a lot due to the construction, so they

were constantly issuing a Notice to Airmen and pilots had to read that so they understood what the conditions they would be operating in were, and if a mistake was made, FAA had a process. She stated that they had what was called a brasher process in which a pilot had to call ATC and could be required to complete retraining, or loss of pilot certification depending on the severity and frequency of the infraction and the pilot. She added it was a series of steps that was handled by the FAA.

Supervisor Heinz stated that military training flights was something at the top of a lot of people's minds. He stated that there was a lot of that here because of the Air Force Base and he recalled that the way folks communicated was by way of different bands or frequencies. He asked for an explanation on that and how in real time, they were interacting with civilian or commercial aviation. He stated that nothing in his life had happened like the D.C. situation, so the record for this area and for the work being done was exemplary and he hoped it was kept that way. He asked how the military, civilian and commercial folks talked to each other or through someone else, and if they were okay with how that system was working.

Mr. Ward responded that pilots communicated directly with all ATC agencies from clearance ground Tower Albuquerque Center, and any ATC agency. He stated they did that primarily for many of the military aircraft through Ultra High Frequency, a different frequency band, whereas civilians primarily communicated on the Very High Frequency band and oftentimes the military did not necessarily hear both sides of the communication between civilians and ATC, however, they did simulcast, so when Tucson Tower, for example, was talking to a military pilot, they would transmit on both of the different frequency bands so that the civilian and the military pilots would hear that transmission. He stated that the military pilots would not hear civilian aircraft calling ATC, so that might be the missing part of the conversation, but certainly listening for the ATC side to build situational awareness of what was going around on the airfield or in or near the airspace they were working with.

Supervisor Christy commented that it was mentioned that there were roughly 400 administrative layoffs. He asked what the difference was between an administrative position and an air traffic controller.

Ms. Bewley clarified that the 400 layoffs were nationwide and the impact to the Airport's District Office in Phoenix was maybe five people, which was manned with 11 people, so it was almost a 50% cut in administrative. She stated that their role included coordinating grants, so for instance, their current project was managed by an Airport Engineer out of the FAA, they also had their own Engineers, but everything was submitted to them including their cost estimates, and what level of funding was needed, or how much grant funding was received. She stated this was the type of communication they had with their district office and the Phoenix office was about 12 years old, and it was required because of the amount of work that Phoenix Sky Harbor and Tucson International were causing to the FAA. She added that both were growing airports and they had infrastructure projects that went into 20-30 years, and the Western Pacific region could not keep up with the demand of the California airports, both small and large. She stated that the difference between

ATC was that it was a very specialized function and they were trained. She stated they first had to go through a certification course test at the training center in Oklahoma City called Aero Center for about a year, then six months for radar and six months for non-radar. She stated they were then put in a tower or an enroute center as a trainee for a certain period of time. She stated that it took about three years from the start of that training to the time they were independently operating as an air traffic controller.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification if the layoffs were folks that were in charge of writing grants and securing them, but that it did not affect the air traffic control element.

Ms. Bewley replied that she was unsure because there were also administrative roles in ATC and the air traffic controllers were essential critical workers so they had to remain, but there might be administrative in different roles, so it was not yet known how that layoff would impact the towers, but they were sifting through the full impact of what the FAA had done.

Supervisor Christy stated that clearly from a civilian standpoint, it was better to know that some folks in charge of writing grants were laid off, rather than air traffic controllers.

Ms. Bewley confirmed no air traffic controllers, but people that worked in air traffic control might have been subjected to it.

Supervisor Grijalva thanked them for being here and it was incredibly timely, considering that it felt like every time the news was on, there was some sort of crisis that happened with a flight. She noted that most of the time, grants equated to people and salaries, and so it might actually be staffing that was negatively impacted by the loss of people that were monitoring to ensure they were receiving funding. She stated that she wanted to make sure this was the case, because sometimes you heard it was just administrative, but did not realize the impact of what those administrative people did until they were gone.

Ms. Bewley stated that they were concerned for that very reason, because when they were in the middle of a multi-million-dollar project, those grants needed to be processed quickly and those reimbursements received.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that it might be different constructions improving different components of the airport. She stated that there were many different grants and recalled attending a briefing at the airport and listening to some of the projects that they had and it was pretty significant, so those funds, monitoring them and ensuring reimbursement for those costs was critical.

Ms. Bewley stated that there were other administrative roles like certification inspectors, and other administrative roles at the FAA and they did not know the full impact of these decisions or if more layoffs were coming within the FAA.

Supervisor Allen stated that District 3 included a large swath of western Pima County, and it had a lot of helicopters and unmanned aerial vehicles from Homeland Security. She asked how the collaboration and communication was amongst the airspace that was utilized in homeland security operations and whether it was TIA or military takeoff.

Mr. Sheehy explained that this would also tie into Supervisor Heinz's concerns. He stated that the communication itself spoke specifically to helicopter operations and they had a very busy helicopter base between the Customs Border Protection mission, as well as the rescue mission at DM. He stated that for the 67 Air Force, they had a lot of radios, and so there was a difference from the guard. He stated that they flew around with five radios and three of them were able to be multi-band, so for the helicopter specifically, they could hear things and pick it up. He stated that they also cross tuned those radios where they were departing so they could build their picture and understanding of the flight environment. He stated that they took off and transferred to TIA's airspace and through TIA's airspace in and out of the local area. He stated that it helped their safety, because they knew what was going on and they did not necessarily have that void. He stated that oftentimes they flew in pairs so that doubled their radios and they were always talking in between the flights. He stated that was another measure of safety that the helicopters brought and they took that out into the western district. He stated that a lot of their flying ranges were out on the western side and they had local monitor multiple bands, they were flying in a training area. He stated they had a general aviation radio that was always tuned up, so that when they were receiving reporting points of their location, it helped build the picture for them as to who was where in the airspace as they were flying around. He added that before they ever took off, at least on the military side, all the Victor routes that were being flown by F-16 and some of the other aircraft out of Luke Airforce Base shared that airspace, and it was published when they were going to be active and what altitude they were flying at. He stated that they deconflicted their flight path in mission planning before takeoff and they had to state where those aircraft were. He stated that they could adjust accordingly or make those common frequency calls out to establish communication deconfliction while they were flying. He stated that every time, much like the commercial aviation, when they passed off different centers in the low altitude environment, helicopters did not necessarily have center control because they did not have line of sight coverage, but they monitored a shared frequency across all players in that space. He stated that when they were in a low altitude training area, there was set frequency for that and when they were operating in and around the Army unit near Marana, there was another frequency for that and they were always being monitored. He stated that even when no one was out, they were communicating their location as they were transiting so that everybody had an idea of where the aircraft were at all times and it built a mental picture that they were familiar with the airspace and where they were at. He stated that if an aircraft called in and they were in a certain vicinity they would know if that would be a factor or not and if they were going to be in the same general area, they would call them and let them know their location to ensure they were deconflicted by altitude airspace.

Supervisor Heinz stated that if there was anything that local government could do from their perspective, in terms of their ability with surrounding land, airspace, to let them know and they would work with them in whatever way possible to ensure that everyone was safe.

Ms. Bewley responded that they were always looking at the airspace in and around the airport because they had to protect it from encroachment and in buildings. She stated that there was an environmental zone and height ordinances and those were coordinated with the City, County, and FAA. She stated that those were always on their mind every time they started a project and they had to verify and validate that they were not penetrating any of the aeronautical services that could affect flight. She added that they monitored radios 24/7 and had a full operation staff and ARFF reports 24/7, their fire department, air site operations and the communications center. She stated they were always listening so that they had situational awareness as to what was happening. She stated that they might not have a visual of the actual environment, but generally where people were or what problems they might experience. She stated that it might be surprising to know they had emergencies nearly daily, and it could be an airline or the military reporting they had a hydraulic issue, and they responded to it as if it was a real crash.

Supervisor Heinz stated that several times he had been on a plane and was called to assist in a medical emergency, which was always a little freaky because there was no idea what was going on. He stated that in his hospital job, the emergency room screened people, so it was known whether it was a heart attack, a GI bleed or hip fracture, but on a plane, it might be that someone passed out in a lavatory and the door could not be opened, which had recently happened to him. He stated that it might not be the same type of emergency for them.

Ms. Bewley responded those were also the type of emergencies that their teams responded to because their fire department was Advanced Life Support and Basic Life Support certified. She stated that they worked very closely with Banner and some of the other hospitals as they came and transported. She stated that they also had a mutual aid with the City of Tucson, Tucson Police Department and Fire Department that was not too far from the airport, and they were usually the first responders they called for that and that it was a synergistic relationship.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he would be taking a flight the following day and it was the same flight he had taken before, but that he had no concerns with regional safety and it was very reassuring to hear that discussions were being had and would continue to have their excellent safety record moving forward.

Chair Scott stated that he had a question that would follow up to some of Supervisor Heinz's questions. He stated that one of the characteristics that the Tucson and Pima County area shared with D.C. was that there was a significant amount of civilian and military air traffic, including sometimes military craft that came out of Luke Airforce Base to use the Goldwater range and it was mentioned regarding the situational awareness that military and civilian pilots had. He asked how frequently leadership of the two organizations met to talk about managing the shared airspace.

Ms. Bewley stated that recently when it came to TIA it was more frequent because part of the airfield geometry changes involved airspace changes. She stated that there was a lot of coordination between the military operators, the civilian operators, and FAA because when the runway was commissioned, it was going to have a new path, they would need to update their standard arrival and departure procedures. She stated that they did not decide on those, but they contributed to the discussion, and she was aware that the Air National Guard and the Office of Emergency Management had been at the table on those discussions because they wanted to refine some things in the airspace that worked best for everyone, so there was some overlapping coordination.

Chair Scott commented that he was aware that Pima County's Office of Emergency Management was also working with both entities on a regular basis.

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

12. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Good Shepherd Presbyterian Church, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022, for Tax Parcel No. 401-13-1520.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

13. Authorization of Designated Staff to Conduct Environmental Review Records for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 3, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing certain staff to serve as the Certifying Officer and the Environmental Officer to execute federally required environmental review records for County's community development, affordable housing, and homeless/special needs populations programs.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the County was a recipient of some federal funds that passed through the Community and Workforce Development (CWD) Department and part of the grant requirements was for the County to identify the responsible entity or department and appoint the certifying officer, which in this case would be the director of that department.

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

Supervisor Christy asked why there were so many designees listed in the background materials as the certifying officer.

Ms. Leshar responded that it listed the individuals within the division in CWD that worked with this specific grant.

Supervisor Christy inquired if they would be authorized to serve as backup to sign documents.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy commented that there was a lot of designees.

Chair Scott asked if that was a federal requirement to have the designees, as outlined.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative. She stated that it was a requirement for the County to have a specific individual who was authorized to sign documents and a designee. She stated that they wanted to ensure that if the director was unavailable, that they would be able to continue to move grants forward.

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

ELECTIONS

14. Election Integrity Commission Annual Report 2024

The Election Integrity Commission recommends acceptance of the 2024 Annual Report.

Chair Scott stated that the Election Integrity Commission was established in 2008 and Pima County was the only county in Arizona's 15 counties that had a commission of this kind. He explained that there were representatives from each one of the political parties, and also a representative from each one of the Supervisors and one from the County Administrator.

Brian Bickel, Chair, Election Integrity Commission (EIC), stated that after the elections there had been significant changes this year for personal reasons. He explained that Misty Atkins resigned as commissioner from District 1 and had been replaced by Lori Cinnamon. He stated that Connie DeLarge was still the commissioner representing District 2 and Commissioner Ryan Maese for District 3 was unsure if he was going to stay on the Commission. He stated that Cheryl Caswell, Commissioner from District 4 was stepping down for personal reasons, and he had not heard if Supervisor Christy was going to appoint someone to replace her. He explained that Commissioner Tilman served for a long time as the commissioner from District 5, and if the information he was given was correct, then Supervisor Grijalva appointed Cam Juarez to be the new District 5 commissioner.

He stated that as far as the Commission was concerned, their focus during the past 12 months was looking at the governor's task force report on election activities. He stated that the Commission had one item that they referred, a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for their support. He stated that Avid was the access voter information database and it was about 40% funded by the individual counties, and all the counties were required by statute to use this to maintain voter information in a statewide database. He stated that the Commission recommended that this become a state budget item, and that was unanimously supported by the EIC. He explained that another item that had brought about a lot of discussion, as far as the conduct of the election was concerned, was the use of a multi-card ballot. He stated that it was discussed quite widely by the members of the EIC during Director Hargrove and Recorder Cazares-Kelly presentation last month. He explained that the biggest challenge the EIC had was referring to cards and ballots and understanding that a ballot was two cards long. He stated that during that presentation, Supervisor Heinz had asked how poll workers kept card two and card one together and the answer to that question was that they did not. He explained that each card had their own cast vote record and it was unique to card one and unique to card two. He stated that there was no reason to keep the cards together and there was no information on card one that required any activity on card two. He stated that a voter did not need to vote on both cards, and there were a number of voters that just returned card one, which basically had the elective offices and a number of voters that just returned card two, which had all of the initiatives and referenda on it. He stated that they were handled as separate and distinct ballots and it created no problems. He stated that things did get interesting when doing the recall count for the Pima County Sheriff. He stated that the EIC had to run all the ballots in the tabulators again, and it separated those ballots. He explained that all of the ballots on card one, which had the sheriff's race on it, went into one bin, and all the card twos went into another bin because they were not needed for the recount. He stated that that process given the uniqueness of it statewide, went very well. He stated that based on what he was seeing at the legislature so far, there would probably be a two card ballot again in 2026. He stated the EIC picked up their first referenda yesterday and believed that it was going to eliminate the opportunity for voters to drop their ballots off at the polling stations on Election Day. He stated that he understood that HCR 2013 was going to be a referendum presented by the legislature on the 2026 ballot. He reiterated that there might be another two card ballot in 2026. He explained that the EIC planned to meet for their February meeting on February 21, 2025. He stated that they had a presentation from John Breaking, who had a 501c3 firm that worked on elections. He stated former Secretary of State Ken Bennett and Bill Reisner, who was the representative of the Pima County Democratic Party, would attend the meeting. He stated that it was a bipartisan presentation, but it was a software program that had been developed for the verification of ballots. He stated that the EIC was not sure how that was going to work, but that was the reason Mr. Bennet and Mr. Reisner were asked to attend the meeting and present it to the EIC. He invited Board members to attend if they were interested in listening to that presentation. He stated that he had previously ran for Supervisor Miller's seat at one point in time, as well as Treasurer Ford's seat and the disappointment in both of those races, aside from the results, was that he did not get to participate in the elections process because it was not allowed in the

area. He stated that none of the board members were on the ballot in 2026 because their election was every four years. He stated that it would be wonderful if Board members went down during the election and looked at how the operation worked, because it was a well-oiled machine. He state that it worked very well, and it would help the Board develop a better understanding of how it functioned if they saw it operate live and in person. He reiterated that the EIC would love to see Board members at the elections, but that was at the approval of Director Hargrove, since she controlled access to that building during the election.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he felt like the two card ballots needed to be paired up even though he knew they did not have to be paired up. He stated that as a former legislator he saw a lot of chaos going on for 6 or 7 days as he served with Governor Napolitano. He stated that after she left the rest of the four years were served with Governor Brewer. He stated that the first substantive thing for the ballot in 2026 was going to be the legislature's idea of the voters wanting to limit their ability to have places to vote and to drop off ballots.

Mr. Bickel responded that was how he understood the concurrent resolution.

Supervisor Christy indicated that Ms. Caswell had been reappointed to the EIC at the last Board meeting.

Supervisor Allen thanked Mr. Bickel for his leadership and service. She stated that the EIC was an important Commission and she had spoken to her district representative, and it was her understanding that he intended on continuing his role on the Commission.

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

15. Monthly Financial Update

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a monthly financial update on the County's financial performance.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slideshow presentation and stated that he was pleased to report the financials through December were forecasted to be better than budget and revenue and was lower in trend in the expenditures, which was a good sign moving forward. He stated that the format of the slide was changed and hoped the Board found it easier to read. He stated that on the revenue side, they were projecting a net increase of \$4.8 million, which was largely driven by a \$3 million increase in the State shared sales tax, as well as a \$3.3 million reimbursement from the Arizona Long Term Care System. He stated that as mentioned in the last report, there were some questions related to some of the variances that were shown on the second page of the memorandum that was included in the background materials. He explained that on the positive variances for Facilities and the Sheriff's Department, Facilities was due to increases in utility reimbursements from lessees and the Sheriff's variance close to

\$950,000.00 was due to an increase in the billable time that an inmate was staying in the facility was up about 8% year over year, which was driving that variance in that line item on this, on the negative side.

Chair Scott asked about Elections since they also had a significant positive variance.

Mr. Cuaron stated that he would save Elections, Justice Court and Superior Court for the end, simply because in the time allotted, he was not able to determine what those were. He asked if he could bring those three back to a future update.

Chair Scott responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Cuaron stated that on the negative variance side, the Clerk of the Superior Court indicated that the State was lagging behind in payments for child support reimbursements and child support incentives, which was causing them to be negative in their departmental revenue. He added that on the Recorder's end, they reported back that it was volume driven that they were not receiving the volume of public records requests and the associated fees that went with that, and that these were the variances that were shown on page two of the memorandum. He explained that on the expenditure side they had seen an overall forecast of \$3.3 million below budget, which was good news even when considering the Sheriff continued to be over budget due to overtime increases, as well as utility costs coming in higher than anticipated. He stated that Public Defense Services (PDS) was projecting to be about \$2.2 million over budget, largely due to the office contracting outside counsel, but they were working with Finance to try and refine that number as they moved through the fiscal year, but the \$3.3 million was taken into account with those two departments. He stated that overall, projected fund balance reserve at the end of the year was expected to be \$112.6 through Period 6. He stated that it would fluctuate as they got into Period 8, which would likely be presented to the Board sometime in April. He explained there was a General Fund reconciliation and the \$112.6 was what they currently had through Period 6, and had the General Fund Reserve Policy of \$104.2, he stated that this was calculated based on 17% of the fiscal year ending '24 expenditures and was currently a hard known number as their audit was complete. He stated that was what they would be required to start the year with in FY26, leaving an excess reserve of \$8.3 million. He stated that his understanding was that the Board had made a commitment for affordable housing from this tranche of money in \$1.4 million, and then they also had a General Fund Contingency of \$4.1 million, leaving \$2.8 million in excess Fund Balance Reserve. He stated that as they moved through the fiscal year, this would be an important number for the Board to remember.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had reviewed a spreadsheet, and it was troubling because all departments in total were asking for \$12 million to get them through June 30th of this year, and a total of \$27 million more into next year's budget, for instance, the Sheriff wanted another \$7.6 million for next year.

Chair Scott asked if Supervisor Christy was referring to another item and clarified that the Board was currently discussing the monthly financial update.

Supervisor Christy concurred.

Supervisor Allen asked how departments went millions of dollars over budget and if there was no stop mechanisms in place so that they were in compliance with budgets. She stated that budgets were said to be moral and value documents and there was a statement of going over budget and it had ramifications on everyone else in the County.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, explained that part of it involved looking throughout the course of the year which direction they were moving, and whether they were over budget at this time and how they would keep watch of it. She stated, for example, Deputy County Administrator Holmes worked closely with the director of PDS as they monitored the outside attorneys' fees, which was driving it, so they could determine how they could work toward truing it up at the end of the year. She stated that as a general statement, there were different opportunities to ensure compliance with the budget for the departments for those organizations that reported directly to them, but for the Sheriff's Department in which, in some parts of the State where it has been litigated, there was some control, but there was still an ability for some elected officials to spend what they believed was needed.

Mr. Cuaron explained that his team conducted monthly forecast check-ins with the departments and the elected officials. He stated they tried forecasting what their expenditures and revenues. He also worked to try and help them understand where they were at in their forecasts and their expenditures to date and advise them. He stated that ultimately, it was up to the department to monitor their costs, some of them were out of their control in some instances, perhaps like outside counsel, certainly the utility costs, and overtime with the Sheriff's Department, excluding utilities could perhaps be controlled. He stated that in their monthly forecasting with them, they tried to help them understand what their position was and what drove those cost indicators, and they put forth that effort and tried to report that to the Board.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that PDS in particular, had many vacancies over the last three years and when you have vacancies, much of that continued support for individual's indigent defense had to be brought into contracted attorneys outside the State. He stated that more than likely, they had been over budget in that area for the past four years and that the prior year they took a different approach and at the end of the year, came to the Board, asked for them to pay out of Contingency to cover the overage, which was about \$2.8 million. He stated that one of the things he worked with Ms. Moulton on at the time was to not necessarily true up the budget, but to keep the budget from the previous years. He stated they were aware they were going to go over which would allow them this year to work on ways they could mitigate sending contracts to outside lawyers. He stated that based upon projections, this year it would probably be about \$1 million less in that area and if you started the year with \$2.8 million in the hole, \$1 million

less in contract attorneys, which was roughly \$1.8 million still in the red, it was better than the prior year. He added that there was also a 2% cut with the department this year that was already in the red which equated to about \$750,000.00 more, this would be roughly the amount they would be over this year. He stated it would give them more confidence that they would be able to increase their budget and be where they really needed to spend versus the prior year, where there were so many unknowns and they were not willing to necessarily true up their budget from the prior year.

Chair Scott stated that Mr. Holmes sent him a very informative email when he raised questions the day prior on this same topic. He asked if that email could be sent to the Clerk so that she could pass it on to the other district offices, because he found it informative and encouraging.

Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that it was mentioned there were legal requirements for the County to cover certain departments and their budgets, and that she understood to an extent the Sheriff's Department. She asked if those expenditures could be highlighted because one of the things he learned when she first came to the County was the Board needed some oversight over elected offices, including the Board offices, but that had been sort of practice that elected officials got to decide their own budgets. She stated that there were some expenditures that it would not be okay for other departments, so it should not be okay for any of the elected offices, including this Board. She wanted to better understand that, because historically the Board continued to adjust budgets, paying out of Contingency and carried forward whatever was over. She stated she had not seen any incentive for a department to stay within their budget and she was looking ahead at some of the requests that came for supplementals. She stated that it was concerning that the Board was going to be asked to approve some of the supplemental costs when there were departments already in the red. She stated that if there were requirements or there were things that had not moved, or were ongoing versus one time, than maybe those could be discussed occasionally, but the idea that these would not be. She asked why some of these expenditures, if they were ongoing, why they were not moved to the budget, as opposed to on a supplemental.

Ms. Leshner explained that the areas of the greatest concern that had potential impacts, for example the Sheriff's Department, she had asked legal counsel about Sheriffs in other counties that litigated the fact that the Sheriff needed to be able to do their job in other areas, and there were occasions in which that had endured to the benefit that litigation helped that elected official, the Sheriff. She stated that she would get back to the Board after they worked with the attorneys to ensure they had all the parameters. She stated that another area that was questionable was with the courts because they were actually part of the Administrative Office of the Courts. She reminded the Board that they was one of the officers that was elected at a different cycle than everyone else because Mr. Harrison, the Clerk of the Superior Court was actually an officer of the court and so what was seen was that many of the rules that related to the Human Resources rules governing employees, and

compensation was established by the State for Probation and some of those areas. She stated that was where the County had less flexibility, but she was happy provide the exact parameters for those positions.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she continued to have concerns, but she understood paying for overtime and it did not seem to historically have any oversight. She stated that they would pay for new vehicles, and in any department, where those were going. She stated that there had to be a check and balance. She stated that she understood salary and wages, which made sense to her, but some of the other expenditures that came up, there was no accountability for those. She stated that in light of the fact that every year, certain departments had been over, they should be able to say, they had to make a decision that they would not be able to do something, for example a fleet cost of \$721,000.00 and who would be receiving those vehicles, if it were for Deputies on the street, that made sense, but if it was for refreshing, she saw some of the vehicles that were driven around and those did not look new. She felt there needed to be some sort of pushback or a mechanism to say they would have to change something or some of the administrative positions would be changed to 32 hours per week. She stated that there needed to be a balance, but she was unsure how to do it, and she was not suggesting to remove deputies from the streets or at the Sheriff's Department, but there might be some wiggle room in order to incentivize departments to stay within their budgets.

Ms. Leshar stated that Supervisor Grijalva was talking to a broader issue and they would be happy to respond, but they were currently having an issue this year with the receipt of vehicles for fleet. She stated that it was seen in the Sheriff's Department and some other areas that the funding was carried forward to this year because it was not spent, so at this point, they needed to put asterisks on some of those items for the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that would be very helpful to her, if it showed it was a carry forward from last year, already budgeted and was not spent. She stated that just by looking at a list of requests and then looking at the total overage, it made it difficult for her. She stated that it was easy to talk about the Sheriff's Department because they were usually the ones over budget, but in general all of the offices, including elected offices, should have to stay within a budget.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he did not necessarily understand the overtime in the Sheriff's budget and that it was about \$6 to \$7 million over what it was supposed to be. He stated that he understood not having enough staff during COVID, but that had been the same amount of overtime overage since he got on this Board. He stated that did not feel okay and recalled that the Sheriff had addressed the Board and stated there were 2 to 3 different classes of Correctional Officers in training to address the inadequate staffing, because inadequate staffing led to more overtime. He stated that it was his understanding that it was currently adequately staffed and there were no massive vacancies. He stated there were some vacancies, but they seemed to be the standard churn when people went and found another job and then they had to end up hiring again. He stated that he did not believe the Board should be approving this because it did not seem to matter what number was approved

because the following year it would come up again. He stated that he agreed with Supervisor Grijalva that something needed to be done and the courts made it clear that the Board, as the budget authority had the right to do so.

Chair Scott stated he wanted to follow up on some of the points made by Supervisors Grijalva and Heinz and that additional information might be needed. He had mentioned earlier an email that would be sent by Mr. Holmes regarding PDS and what they did to address their use of contract counsel, which was encouraging. He stated that with regard to the Sheriff's Department, several months ago, the Board received a thoughtful memorandum that Sheriff Nanos had sent out to his command staff, that dealt with overtime and how he was pretty much putting his foot down with regards to overtime costs within the department. He stated that on a prior financial forecast from Ms. Moulton, initial appearance pay showed up as a reason for overtime. He asked when talking about overtime forecast to exceed the budget by \$2.6 million, primarily related to jail operations, how much of that was connected with initial appearance pay and how much of that was connected with overtime costs that the Sheriff had tried to address in his direction to his staff. He stated that would be really helpful for the Board to have that broken out, because if it was primarily related to jail operations and initial appearance pay happened in the jail, but there were other overtime costs that perhaps were not being addressed by that direction that he gave to staff, then Supervisor Allen's question, as indicated on the second bullet of the financial forecast, the Sheriff was required to take a 2% cut in their budget. He stated that it appeared unlikely they would be able to achieve this reduction, but every department in the County was required to take a 2% cut and that was the only one noted in the financial forecast more than once that they would not be able to achieve that reduction. He stated that the Finance team and the Sheriff's Finance team had been working together and perhaps the Board needed some more information to get into the granularity of this.

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

16. Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Requested Budget Supplemental Overview

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the supplemental requests submitted by County departments and elected offices for inclusion in the FY 2025/26 County Administrator's Recommended Budget.

Chair Scott stated that Board offices had received a copy of an email that he asked the Clerk to send out to the elected officials. He stated that there were requests from at least three elected officials to address the Board on this item regarding their supplemental requests. He stated that he wanted Board members to have time to consider the supplemental requests and some big picture issues related to the budget, before elected officials were present to lobby the Board. He stated that he had asked them not to come to this meeting, but that they would be allotted some time on March 4th to address the Board.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that they had never brought these supplemental requests to the Board in the past, but it was part of how they built a budget and receiving the Board's feedback as they processed this had been very helpful. She provided a slideshow presentation and stated it would show how they got to where they were and what the budget looked like. She stated they wanted to set the stage as they began to look at some of the pressures being built upon, and in the last couple of years, they took on some additional debt service for reasons that made very good sense, they were able to finance some of the debt to the public employee's retirement system. She stated that it was pre-funded and they frontloaded about \$150 million plus in roads, things that needed to be done and were currently looking at some of that debt service as it hit each budget. She stated that in the past two years, the reserve policy had run at a fund balance each year around \$40 to \$42 million, which they realized was not what it needed to be, so they added the fund balance policy, which had taken out about \$50 million from the conversation. She stated that they also implemented the compensation study, which was significant to keeping employees. She added that they looked at the affordable housing piece, and open space and \$7 million was added in that area. She stated that there were inflationary costs and would look at the entire criminal justice, public safety that would be up about \$36 million, and an additional \$31.6 million in the last two years in State cost shifts. She stated that they looked at balancing the budget in the prior two years they began to review vacant positions and what that meant for possible reductions. She stated that when it was first explored, they were able to save about \$5.1 million, increased up to over \$9 million and the current year was about \$300,000.00. She stated that the significance of that meant that any of those vacant positions that were not being actively recruited that might have been in a budget, for whatever reason, had been eliminated. She stated that they were currently looking at those vacant positions that were generally being actively recruited. She stated that for the current year they asked for a 3% cut mid-year, and then another 2% from the General Fund, resulting in \$11.5 million in savings. She stated that in the last couple of years, they had the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), which the Board was aware of, as well as the interest that came in from those. She stated other steps taken as they begun to look at what needed to be done to balance the budget, was looking at the policy direction of the Board and ensure that they were recognizing the exact cost each year as it impacted the property tax of additional State cost shifts, understanding the PAYGO formula and what that meant, and how that allowed them funding each year for critical infrastructure, maintaining that General Fund Reserve and regularly reviewing vacant positions. She stated that they also moved towards monthly financial reports and placed the information online with the hope to receive feedback from the Board on where they were and how they would get there. She went over the budget priorities as they looked over the four key pillars, and what it meant as they began to look at the budget, they hoped to increase compensation for employees because of the significant work with the Class/Comp Study, because if they did not continue to keep up with market, they would backslide and certainly did not want to do that again. She stated that they established General Fund Contingency at about \$5 million, and they also kept \$3 million for Grant Contingency and needed that capacity if they were to receive grants. She stated that as mentioned earlier some of the grant dollars were in question, as they had said earlier in question, the

Emergency Eviction Legal Services Program was started during the pandemic, and it allowed them to take advantage of those federal dollars provided by the APRA funds. She stated that most had indicated a significant positive response to the EELS Program. She stated they were looking to move that into ongoing budgets and then maintaining the Pima Early Education Program Scholarships (PEEPs) at \$10 million. She stated they continued using PAYGO as they looked at critical infrastructure for some \$25 million and conservation, sustainability and climate resiliency with open space at \$2 million. She also pointed out that the other thing that occurred in the last couple of years was they started looking at the current year's budget as simply the base budget, and any request over that were considered supplementals. She stated that this was a way of budgeting and to work with the Board and understand, and evaluate as they went into the next year, every penny over a supplemental. She stated that there were items that the Board had approved as one-time, but might in year 3 or 4 be considered part of that base budget, such as affordable housing \$5 million, conservation \$2 million and PEEP was another one that was not necessarily built into the base automatically, even though it continued to be a program. She stated they needed to determine what it was they wanted done as supplementals were evaluated. She stated that they started this about a year ago with everyone having an opportunity to see what was in the current year's budget and determine if more would be needed for the following year and looked forward to making a better process for the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that she noticed that in the supplemental, the Board might be able to establish a policy because she did not want any of those departments that happened to house open space or affordable housing to be sort of dinged and their budget grew so much when it was specifically earmarked and she was unsure if it made sense for it to be. She stated that she was unsure how it would be classified, but in a way it was understood for instance, EELS was a program, PEEP, affordable housing, open space, which were all Board approved. She stated that they were supplemental, but it had been a number of years and she would hate for any of these departments when those cuts were implemented they would have looked at the rest of their budget to cut, as opposed to, not being able to touch certain areas. She stated that maybe they could be highlighted of being common knowledge that it was housed there, but not necessarily any that would be subjected to cuts unless the Board discussed it.

Ms. Leshar stated that as the Board considered the supplementals, they would notice that Community and Workforce Development had two supplemental requests, one to maintain the EELS Program and one for affordable housing. She stated that those were really continuations of some programs and that as the Board began to look at the supplemental requests, it was the first time it had been brought to the Board and budget items that not only indicated which of the four pillars they impacted, which started last year, but the Board would also see how it lined up with one of the prosperity initiatives.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that he was pleased to be able to address the Board and discuss the General Fund projection for FY26 and the supplemental requests. He thanked the Finance team for all the work that went

into helping the departments craft and submit their supplemental requests. He explained that the slide showed base revenues of \$794.5 million, which was an increase over the year of about \$37 million. He stated that what drove it was an increase to State shared sales tax, and as he had mentioned in the forecast, they were projecting a \$5 million increase going into 2026. He stated that they also had the Net Asset Value increase, which drove the property tax revenue increase without actually changing the property tax rate and was about a \$21.5 million increase. He stated that they also had the State cost shifts as mentioned during the last budget update in January, which was about 9.5 cents per policy that generated about \$10.8 million. He stated they had an additional \$1.4 million of PAYGO that was built into those numbers, so included of the transfers into the General Fund from other departments, they had a total of \$798.8 million. He explained that on the expenditure side, there was \$687 million for the base expenditures, which included benefit cost increases across the spectrum of the County's health, dental, vision and all insurance products. He stated that they had an increase of about \$4.5 million in the Internal Service Fund rates, which were rates that the General Fund paid for and there was a slight uptick in transfers out of \$127 million, primarily driven by PAYGO for the Enterprise Resource Planning, and then the corresponding \$1.4 million in additional PAYGO. He added that on the revenue side, that the starting net deficit position was \$12.5 million, however, if they went back to the forecast of that \$2.8 million and the difference between the \$814 and \$798, that came to \$15.4 million, so they would use that \$2.8 million to reduce the deficit starting at the beginning of the fiscal year and it was an important number in the forecast. He stated that there was a fund balance projection of \$107.1 million and when reduced by \$2.8 million, the Fund Balance Reserve requirement was actually \$104.3 million and as mentioned in the forecast that was what was needed to start the fiscal year based on the reserve policy that the Board adopted a few years ago. He stated that as they moved into the supplemental budget request, he would highlight some totals included in the memorandum. He stated that the total supplemental request between all funds was \$72.6 million, \$39 million was in General Fund, and \$33.6 million in non-general funds. He referred to the slide and stated it included the General Fund supplementals that had been initially recommended by the County Administrator, which came out to \$27.6 million, \$8.9 million were one-time expenditures and \$18.7 million recurring. He stated that the Clerk had passed out a large sheet that included all of the supplementals that were submitted, but that he would go through each of the categories and try to highlight things, so the Board had an idea about what was requested. He explained that in General Government Services, the one-time expenditures of over \$1 million, the Recorder being about \$400,000.00 of this, and the Assessor made up the difference. He added that with the ongoing side, Facilities Management was at \$1.4 million, largely driven by new buildings and the need to maintain and operate utilities in those buildings, and the Assessor was at \$662,000.00 for staffing, which drove that \$2.5 million. He stated that with the Community and Economic Opportunities and pointed out by Ms. Leshner, the \$5 million was for affordable housing which he believed was from PAYGO and they had over \$3 million for the EELS Program.

Ms. Leshar noted that Detainee and Crisis Services (DCS) was fairly large and it was attributed to NaphCare, the cost of medical care in the jail in accordance with the revised contracts that the Board had approved.

Mr. Cuaron stated that DCS was at \$2.7 million of that \$2.9 million shown for Environmental and Public Health, Department of Environmental Quality at about \$196,000.00 and Pima Animal Control at about \$113,000.00 for Animal Protection Service Officers. He stated that Conservation and Recreational Resources was entirely for Parks and Recreation utilizing their park renewal funds of \$1.9 million. He indicated that on the Infrastructure Resources line, the \$2 million was for open space and they also showed where they identified the supplementals that the Board had previously approved. He stated that Justice and Public Safety on the ongoing portion was for the Sheriff at about \$3.85 million of a total of \$7.6 million that was submitted, and they also had Public Defense Services, as Mr. Holmes had provided some clarity earlier, was at \$3 million. He stated that they had the Transition Center as initially being approved at about \$419,270.00. He stated with one-time expenditures it included mostly the courts with Juvenile Court at about \$191,000.00, Justice Court at \$383,000.00, and Superior Court of about \$38,000.00, which got them to \$613,000.00.

Ms. Leshar clarified that their initial recommendations included weekly meetings with the Deputy County Administrators (DCAs) and the Finance team to review all of the information, but that everything at this point was still in a very preliminary phase and if taken into consideration, the initial recommendations and add it to where they currently stood, it was still upside down. She stated that these were the things looked at as initial recommendations and things that had made it through the first cut, but there remained no guarantees at this point and recommendations had not been finalized. She added that at this point, there were some things reviewed that they would not be able to get to this year and would be a no. She stated that the Board would notice that many of them needed more information and were the ones that they continued to evaluate and would be weighed against those which had received initial recommendations, but reiterated that nothing at this point was in concrete.

Chair Scott stated that it was conceivable that by the time this was taken up again on March 4th, that some of those further discussion items could be moved into the yes or no category.

Ms. Leshar responded yes.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that a previous slide listed a \$12.6 million deficit projected for next year. She stated that she was concerned with the supplemental budget request, and she knew they had to deduct certain amounts that were Board of Supervisors driven and asked how many of the supplemental requests were for new staff positions that were enhancements to what they already had in their Full Time Equivalents and if any of those positions might be able to work within the budget that each department already had. She stated that she also had some concerns about individual elected offices presenting to the Board on March 4th,

without providing the same opportunity to all of the departments to be able to advocate for their positions and what they needed. She stated in the past year or two, Supervisors were encouraged to meet with those individual offices and those departments and be able to ask questions because she felt there could be an instance of inherent equity issue if the Board only heard from some of them about their supplementals.

Chair Scott stated that they had received requests from three of the elected officials to attend this meeting, but he had asked them to wait until March 4th. He stated that it was possible that they could have others that asked to come before the Board, but that in regards to department directors, they had already made their cases, with either the County Administrator or the DCAs, and if there were some requests for additional information for any departmental requests, that those would be fielded either by Ms. Leshner or the DCAs.

Supervisor Grijalva commented that another issue for her was that elected offices should also be working through Administrator Leshner. She stated that they could ask the Board individual things, but in general, if it was not a recommendation from the County Administrator she was unlikely to support any of the supplemental requests because of the financial situation the County was in and it was very clear the budget would be in the red this upcoming fiscal year. She stated that she had concerns with them in general, because as they were having this public discussion about the financial situation they would also be mandated with state cost shifts, and flat taxes at the State. She stated the County would be impacted by those and it did not factor in some of the federal cuts, so she felt that unless Administrator Leshner could look at the budget holistically and that it made sense, she did not want an individual from an elected office to come and ask the Board for something, unless Board members were willing to start deducting and calculating at that time. She stated that it would put the Board in a position to try to budget on the fly, if it was not already part of the recommendation.

Chair Scott asked specifically to the elected officials, how they had been and hopefully were continuing to work with County Administration on their budget requests.

Ms. Leshner responded that she had met with elected officials to go through their budgets and they had as many no's as others. She pointed out and provided more granularity for the next time this was looked at, that there were very few requests for additional positions recommended, and when you looked at a base like this, more of an explanation was needed. She confirmed that they were looking at over \$600,000.00 in additional staffing for the Assessor's Office in the movement of folks from Tax Assembly, from one department to another, and ensured they had budget authority and it was not a plus up. She stated that the granularity for that was not there, but explained that there was a yes to some and not to others. She stated that she would be meeting with the Clerk of the Superior Court later in the week but had met with the elected officials. She stated that Mr. Holmes had met with the Superintendent of Schools and they would continue those discussions of impact to her recommendation.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that if they had already gone through that process, there would be no reason for them to appeal to the Board. She stated that given this budget situation she was about 99% sure that she would vote against any additional requests that did not come with the whole package, because she did not want to be put in the position where they had to start deducting. She stated she felt that would be her responsibility and if she said yes to an individual that came to the Board she felt incumbent upon herself or pass the buck to Administrator Leshner to have to come up with the savings somewhere else, because she did not feel comfortable using Contingency or carry forward for any of these.

Chair Scott stated that the Board had received written requests from the elected officials with regards to their supplementals and when he considered allowing them to come on March 4th, per their request, it was really aligned with where things stood. He stated that for example, with the vacancy policy, they could appeal directly to the Board if they had any concerns about how the vacancy policy was set up. He stated that when it came to the budget supplemental request, even though they had conversations with Ms. Leshner and they made an explicit request to address the Board on it, it did not automatically mean he would say yes, but also did not want to automatically tell them they already had a chance to make their case to the Administrator and her team and they could not talk with the Board.

Supervisor Grijalva agreed and stated that they could come and speak to all Board members individually, but was concerned since they already had meetings and some elected offices came directly to the Board even after having a conversation with Administrator Leshner. She stated that there was a budget process in place that made sense, and that DCAs and Finance reviewed them, and this was what the impact could have across the County. She added that she had some concerns about individual requests coming without the Board having the resources in their individual budgets to be able to determine if it made sense. She stated that she thought that Board members should meet with anyone individually so that they would be able to ask questions and she was concerned with having presentations by a handful of them that were requesting funds.

Supervisor Christy recalled in an earlier conversation of another item that was fairly comprehensive about potential liability exposure to roughly \$148 million, or 11% of the budget being stopped, withdrawn or otherwise ended. He asked if that element was taken into consideration in all of these factors.

Ms. Leshner responded that it was something they started to look at and implement.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification if it had not been taken into consideration.

Ms. Leshner confirmed it had not been and stated that as the Board reviewed the two elements combined, they were within the current budget and any of those requests for General Fund were \$40 million upside down. She stated that clearly a lot more work needed to go into that and get more granularity of what grants might be impacted and that did not look at whether that had to come off.

Supervisor Christy commented that it was a bit premature to be that deep diving into when the status of \$148 million potential dollars was unknown.

Ms. Leshar stated that they welcomed feedback from the Board at any time about what the items were and how they felt about the budget or how it would be built. She stated the March 18th meeting was when they would bring capital budget to the Board for feedback and then at the end of April with a tentative budget.

Supervisor Christy questioned if this was reflective of the 2% reduction in each department before or after, and what the status was of that 2% cut and if it had been incurred.

Ms. Leshar confirmed that it was implemented and was reflected in this, with the exception of the Ajo Justice Court since they were exempted by the Board from that cut.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the Board would consider this line-by-line or something else. He stated that he was confused about the process and asked if Supervisors should start discussing different things they noticed, like whether they agreed or disagreed with recommendations or had concerns. He stated that he loved seeing this and it was great because when the Supervisors all came onto this Board, they had a very different situation where the Board had not really been informed with much of anything previously.

Chair Scott stated that his understanding was that these supplemental requests were reflective of ongoing dialog since the budget process started between either department directors or elected officials, Ms. Leshar, the DCAs, the Finance team, and if there was a yes, then it was a supplemental request above and beyond the base budget that the County Administrator and her team decided to move forward with and if it said no, then for reasons that the Board could inquire into, felt like it should not be granted. He added if it said further discussion was needed, then conversations were ongoing, either with the director or the elected official and in some cases, it might be an instance where the Board could decide that was a priority and to move forward with it and that was where they might get into these line-by-line items.

Ms. Leshar stated that the Board had the data and suggested that they could explain what some of the categories were and went through a couple more slides to read what the budget requests were, either yes or no, and looked at the potential budget-balancing options slide which showed where the County currently was, the need to cut 1% or \$6.8 million, if PAYGO modifications could be made, they had 17% of last fiscal year's audited General fund expenditures and could they move from that. She stated that for every penny increased for the property tax rate was about \$1.1 million. She stated that those were some of the things they could start to review as they looked at budget balance and options. She explained that PAYGO was developed as a mechanism to provide funding for some County infrastructure, primarily roads. She stated that when the County was unsuccessful with bonds in

the past, it was 60% of the cumulative decrease in the secondary tax rate for debt service and 60% of the increase in the primary property tax base. She stated that the 60/60 formula had been in place since the adoption of the budget. She stated that they could start to look at pay at 50/50, 70/70 and if that could be tweaked in some way and these were some things they began to explore as they determined if they needed more revenue or less expenditures and that was what they had begun to evaluate.

Supervisor Heinz stated that part of his job as a Supervisor was to figure what needed to be done, what the government program should be, what essential services needed to care for folks and then figuring out how to pay for it. He stated that he did not think it was only cuts, they could tweak some of these algorithms. He added that the State had already raised property taxes 9.5 cents, the County had talked about that and would probably do it too. He stated that the Libraries were supposed to get a \$0.01 bump to the Library District tax rate every time they built a library and they had not received it three times, so that \$0.03 needed to go to the libraries. He stated that was never done, unsure why, but two new libraries were built in the past, but there was never a commensurate increase to staff more libraries and not get them to fund. He stated that tax rates could be bumped where it was necessary or the need to look at PAYGO. He asked regarding the 17% and if it had to be that amount, if it could be 15% and what was the basis for that.

Ms. Leshar stated that was something recommended by bond counsel and was the number they needed to ensure they were successfully able to borrow money at a rate and was unsure how they got to the 17%, but would provide that information to the Board.

Mr. Cuaron stated that 15% was right around the standard benchmark for most municipalities and it was what the rating agencies would recommend as a healthy fund balance, considered a healthy fund balance as they evaluated the County's credit worthiness when they issued the County's debt. He stated that the County chose to be on the forefront of that number at 17%.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that 17% represented two months of expenditures.

Supervisor Heinz commented that he recalled discussing that and asked if the County would not get dinged by the bond rating agencies if they made 15%. He stated that the Board would feel less stressed because they would not have to vote for as much of an assessment increase, but he liked having multiple ideas. He asked if there were enough epidemiologists in the Health Department. He stated that they should have 19 for a County of this size and Clinical Disease Investigators, and he did not believe that some of those were approved. He asked if the Board would be receiving more detailed information and discussions on March 4th.

Chair Scott confirmed that the Board would receive more information as to these items that still indicated further discussion was needed. He stated that as the Chair, he felt that if an elected official asked to address the Board, he was loathe to tell

them no, just like he would not tell a department director if they asked Mr. Holmes, Mr. DeBonis, or Ms. Leshar to make their case to the Board, he would not want to tell them not to do that, but some of the further discussion needed could move into the yes or no category by March 4th.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he wanted to hear from the Board's elected official colleagues since to him it was like going to a different parent to see if you got a different answer, and he wanted to know why they thought it was so urgent that they needed to bypass staff and come to the Board. He stated that he did not want that to happen with every single one of these items, but that was what the Board was here for. He stated that he would love to have a conversation with County Attorney Conover because he wanted to know why for four years, even though they had the Class/Comp Study, there were still a lot of vacancies in her office which impacted how much money went out of that office to find outside counsel, which was incredibly expensive. He asked why that was still an issue and how they could help the Sheriff. He stated that the budget from Fiscal Year '25 went from \$172 to \$180 million. He stated that he felt that the Board gave up and would never get that entity to do what the Board wanted, so they would be increased, but it was \$4.7 million over what was increased. He stated that the Board could not give the Sheriff \$3.4 million, which showed yes, he asked for 30 FTEs or 30 Position Control Numbers, but they would get 20, and he did not agree with that. He stated that maybe that should go to the Fire Districts and that he would very much like to have elected officials address the Board on this because there were some questions that only they could answer.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of March 4, 2025. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Grijalva requested that there be a time limit placed on presentations because that would be very helpful.

Chair Scott replied that it would be done.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board would know in advance what departments were going to be presenting so that Board members could have questions prepared for them.

Chair Scott stated that it could also be done and with regards to elected officials, they would let the Clerk know if they planned on attending that meeting.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that it would only be elected officials.

Chair Scott stated that if there were questions from Board members about departments, then that would be fielded by Ms. Leshar or the DCAs, depending on who oversaw that department.

Supervisor Christy stated that he thought that the Board could compile their questions for the individual departments that planned to speak at that meeting.

Chair Scott clarified that it would not be individual departments, but there may be row officers that made a request, and the Board would know before the meeting if a request was made.

Supervisor Christy stated that the departments could be handled internally at this point, but it was the row officers, if known in advance, the Board could prepare questions for them.

Chair Scott concurred and clarified that the Board was discussing the motion to continue.

Supervisor Allen stated that she wanted to add that the Board discuss and get into different departments or row officers and their budgets. She stated that what she felt was missing, especially given that there was potentially a \$148 million cut, was the question around priorities. She stated that it felt like the Board needed an in-depth conversation around what the priorities were, given this landscape of tremendous uncertainty and knowing that they were in a position where they were trying to slice the pie smaller and smaller, which was a horrible position.

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

TRANSPORTATION

17. Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions Report and Infrastructure Improvement Plan

Staff recommends approval of the final Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions Report and Infrastructure Improvement Plan.

Kathryn Skinner, Director, Transportation Department (DOT), stated that there was no formal presentation, but she had presented at the January 7th meeting, which was the public hearing for this item. She explained that since that time, DOT had made some minor updates to the infrastructure improvement plan based on traffic counts that had been taken. She stated that some of the traffic counts on these corridors predated the pandemic or were taken during the pandemic, which was not a great time to sample the way traffic was moving in the community. She stated that based on some of those changes, they eliminated a few projects and substituted in projects to take up that funding capacity that they anticipated collecting. She explained that the projects that were removed were covered in the memorandum dated February 12, 2025, that was provided to the Board.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

18. Tucson Center for Women and Children, Inc., d.b.a. Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse, to provide for safe, green and healthy energy-efficient facility improvements emergency shelter for women and children, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$68,339.07 (PO2400006968)

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

Pima Animal Care Center

19. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, to provide a Donor Recognition Agreement for the John McLean Donor Recognition, no cost/20 year term (SC2500000024)

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

Procurement

20. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Amendment No. 1 terminates Supplier Contract Nos. SC2400001894 (Group 4) and SC2400001895 (Group 5) with Robbins Equipment Company, Inc., effective 2/18/25, and awards replacement contracts to JANCO FS 2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti, to provide for janitorial services. The replacement contracts will commence on 2/18/25 and terminate on 8/12/25, with four (4) one-year renewal options. This action is in accordance with Section 1.1 of the Contract, which states, "The County reserves the right to add additional contractors, at the County's sole discretion, in cases where the awarded contractors are providing insufficient service and/or do not have adequate staffing to support the Scope of Work defined herein." Funding Source: General (88%) and FEMA SSP (12%) Funds. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

Groups/Supplier Contract No./Annual Award Amount

Group 4: Outlying East "OE" JANCO FS 2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/SC2500000025/
\$300,000.00

Group 5: Outlying South "OS" JANCO FS 2, L.L.C., d.b.a. Velociti/SC2500000026/
\$250,000.00

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

21. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 6, to provide for computer software and related items and for the renewal of Qlik software, Enterprise and General (50%) Funds, contract amount \$1,750,000.00 (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the Enterprise Fund.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, responded that the Enterprise Fund was similar to Wastewater where they had fees that they issued and collected in order to generate revenue.

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

22. SHI International Corp., to provide for computer software and related items, Internal Service and General (50%) Funds, not-to-exceed contract amount \$50,000,000.00/3 year term (\$16,500,000.00 per year) (SC2400002398) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the Internal Service Fund.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, responded that this fund was set up to charge departments for specific services that the department may be providing to other departments. He explained that the revenues came into the Internal Service Fund to help support that endeavor and in ITD's case, they may charge out to those departments that paid into the Internal Service Fund and then ITD paid for the replacement of computers, laptops or related items.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was for funding new software.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that it was to distinguish the internal revenue funds versus the general funds because the County had departments, like flood control and wastewater, that were not general fund and they paid a larger portion for the services that were provided, like ITD services.

Supervisor Christy commented that it was similar to an administrative fee.

Ms. Leshner concurred.

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

23. Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for Design-Build Services - Continental Ranch Regional Pump Station Force Main Augmentation (3CFS15), extend contract term to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2500002315) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

24. Progressive Services, Inc., d.b.a. Progressive Roofing, to provide for main jail roof replacement, SD Capital Projects (62%) and FM Renewal (38%) Funds, contract amount \$1,213,700.00 (PO2500001905) Administering Department: Facilities Management

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

25. Sprayfoam Southwest, Inc., d.b.a. Global Roofing Group, to provide for 33 N. Stone Avenue roof replacement, FM Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$427,000.00 (PO2500002702) Administering Department: Facilities Management

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

Recorder

26. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide election services for the 2025 Special, Primary and General elections, extend contract term to 12/31/25, amend contractual language and scope of services, contract amount \$210,000.00 revenue (CTN-RE-24-1)

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

Supervisor Christy commented that in the background materials, it showed the reflection of work done began on January 17th and asked how the work could be performed before it was approved. He stated that on the first page of the Agenda Item Report it indicated this contract was not retroactive and asked what the impact would be if the Board voted against approval of this item.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that it was legally acceptable to retroactively approve a contract for work already performed in anticipation that this was a service the County had regularly provided to the City of Tucson for many years where they would be hosting their elections.

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

School Superintendent

27. Pima County Elections Department, to provide for conducting school district elections July 1, 2024 through December 31, 2028, General Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (PO2500003654)

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

Supervisor Christy asked how the School Superintendent knew how many elections would take place in that time span.

Supervisor Grijalva indicated that school districts had alternating cycles and they were not elected at the same time. She stated that term expirations could be searched and then could predict which school district would have an election for that expiring seat. She stated that the school districts were staggered in their elections.

Chair Scott stated that in one cycle school districts elected two members and then in the next cycle they elected three members.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that depending on the school districts it would be 2 and 1 in each election cycle.

Supervisor Christy commented that it was a predictable election cycle for the school districts.

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the H-1B One Workforce Grant, extend grant term to 6/30/25 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-CWD-65907)

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

29. **Acceptance - Health**

Resolve to Save Lives, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the 7-1-7 Alliance Project to use laboratory data to improve timeliness of detection, notification, and early response to disease outbreaks, extend grant term to 10/31/25 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-HD-74210)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the 7-1-7 Alliance Project and why Pima County was involved in it.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated that this was a grant to specifically track disease outbreak and whether there was a way to improve disease outbreak notification through just standard laboratory data versus public health partners.

Supervisor Christy asked where the information was gathered from.

Mr. Holmes responded that it was gathered from school districts that were reporting the outbreaks.

Supervisor Christy asked if it was an international issue or was in affiliation with other countries.

Mr. Holmes responded that this was a very specific grant that was being conducted for a study with the vendor and to his knowledge, there was no international connection with this study.

Supervisor Christy recalled that he saw something that stated it was subnational and asked what that meant.

Mr. Holmes responded that information would be provided to the Board.

Chair Scott stated that was his understanding based on the background information, that there were two ways of determining an outbreak, either the County got reports from their partners in the public health field or the County used laboratory methods to determine that outbreak. He stated that this study was looking at the differences in terms of whether to use the one method for determining outbreaks versus the other.

Mr. Holmes concurred.

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

30. **Acceptance - Justice Services**

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Safety and Justice Challenge and extend grant term to 6/30/25, no cost (GA-JS-66212)

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

31. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**

State of Arizona Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the FFY2023 Pima County Community Resiliency Initiative Project, \$7,964.00 (G-OEM-82813)

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

32. **Acceptance - Project Design and Construction**

Stratford Art Works, Inc., to provide a Sub-award Agreement for the Teatro Carmen Rehabilitation, \$300,000.00/26 months term (approximately \$140,000.00 per year) (G-PDC-75380)

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

33. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

Department of Justice, to provide for the BJA FY2024 State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, \$122,437.00 (G-SD-83442)

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

Supervisor Christy pointed out that Sheriff Nanos made it very clear that he was not going to be cooperating with any immigration enforcement action yet. He explained that this particular item was related to immigration enforcement, as the corrections officers would be dealing with criminal aliens, so he assumed that the Sheriff who withdrew grants from the previous meeting that were related to this issue, found no problem with this item. He stated that there was inconsistency, particularly when the County was reimbursed on these items.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program was for individuals who were undocumented, but who had committed a crime, had either been arrested for a felony or two misdemeanors and were placed in the jail. She explained that it was responsibility of the County that people that had been arrested be kept for up to four days before there could be a transition. She stated that this item reimbursed the Sheriff from the federal government for the cost of those federal individuals who were in the jail. She explained that their status was under undocumented, but they had been arrested for a different effort.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Sheriff would be cooperating by incarcerating those individuals.

Ms. Leshner responded that he would be incarcerating someone who had been arrested for a crime.

Supervisor Christy asked if the arrests had anything to do with a person's legal status.

Ms. Leshar answered no. She explained that what was related to their status was the ability to be refunded the funds for the cost of the jail days by the federal government.

Supervisor Heinz stated that in reading the background material, it sounded like it required the County to ask inmates at their intake to the jail specifically about their immigration status in order to get reimbursement.

Supervisor Grijalva believed the jails always asked for immigration status at intake. She explained that this was an extension of a grant and did not like the name of this grant. She stated that if the Board voted against this item, the Sheriff would still be responsible for detaining people regardless of their immigration status, but it would be without federal reimbursement.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was her understanding that there was no correlation between this funding and any sort of ICE detainer or collaboration with immigration enforcement. She stated that it was data that was collected by anyone who got brought into the intake process in the jail. She expressed her concern about this item possibly incentivizing the Sheriff's Department to bring people into the jail who did not have legal status in the country in order to get some additional reimbursement. She stated that she looked at what other counties similar in size to Pima County or larger, were getting in this funding and Pima County was getting an insignificant amount compared to those other counties.

Chair Scott stated that it was his understanding from the background material that this grant had been in place for many years and the grant award letter was signed by the Attorney General from the previous administration.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

34. Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 2, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Indigent Health Care; amending the Pima County Code, Chapter 4.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that it had been brought to her attention that in February 2021, the Board voted to direct staff to return to the Board with a code text amendment ordinance to replace the word "citizen" or "alien" with the word "person" but it had never been done. She explained that the proposed amendments were related to indigent health care and there were two sections in Chapter 4 that would be amended.

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

Supervisor Christy asked if the removal of the word “alien” and replacing it with the word “person” would jeopardize grants that referred to criminal aliens from federal government. He asked if the County would not receive grants or be removed from the list of consideration because they were not consistent in the use of wordage and nomenclature which was used by the federal government.

Chair Scott stated that he believed since this was language within the County Code, it would not have any effect on those kinds of federal grants. He asked Legal Counsel if that was an accurate assessment.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, agreed with Chair Scott’s assessment.

Supervisor Christy asked if the proposed modifications to the language would lead to further modifications to terms like diversity, equity and inclusion, and if that would trigger the rejection of grants from the federal government.

Chair Scott stated that he did not know if it was necessarily germane to this item and it might be going beyond the scope of the item.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern that by modifying other languages it could hinder the County from getting grants.

Supervisor Grijalva stated that on February 2, 2021, the Board had directed staff to make these changes to the County Code and staff realized the code text amendment had never been brought back to the Board, which was the reason for this item.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

35. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 321483, Jesus Graciela Garcia Valle, Hacienda Azul Breakfast and Lunch, 3220 W. Valencia Road, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

36. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 309839, Andrea Dahlman Lewkowitz, Hacienda at the Canyon, 3900 N. Sabino Canyon Road, No. 2L, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

37. Fire District Funding Needs

Discussion/Direction: While Tucson Fire Department serves the urban center of our county, numerous other fire districts provide critical services to rural, suburban and unincorporated areas. These districts face unique challenges, including limited budgets, aging equipment, and growing service demands. Ensuring they are adequately equipped and staffed is essential for the safety and well-being of all Pima County residents.

Today we will hear from Chief Bradley of Northwest Fire District (FD), Chief Wunder of Santa Rita FD (formerly Green Valley FD), and Chief Delfs of Avra Valley FD, as well as from firefighter Ryan Ward, who serves on the Southern AZ Firefighters Association, regarding current service levels across fire districts of different sizes serving rural vs. urban vs. suburban areas, and what more is needed to achieve target service levels across all communities, regardless of property tax base. This discussion will build off the information we received in the 12/16/24 memo from Administrator Leshar titled, "Fire and Emergency Medical Service Response Times in Pima County." (District 2)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

38. Approval of the Consent Calendar

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Grijalva to approve the Consent Calendar in its entirety. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that Consent Calendar Item No. 8 included a payment to Jot Properties. He explained that Jot Properties was instrumental in accommodating the asylum seeking process that the County embarked upon and asked if this was the final payment.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that this was a list of duplicate checks that were being replaced because they had been lost or misplaced by the vendors.

She stated that she was unsure where that particular check might have been in the order of checks provided to the vendor when the County paid rent during the asylum seeking process. She believed it was the last one and no other funding was owed to the vendor at this time.

Supervisor Christy requested verification.

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. Metropolitan Education Commission

- Appointment of Karla Silva, representing At-Large, Historically Marginalized and Excluded Communities, to fill a vacancy created by Dr. Treya Allen. Term expiration: 1/17/27. (MEC Board of Directors recommendation)
- Appointment of Jennifer Vasquez, representing Educator for Youth Ages 14-18. Term expiration: 1/31/27. (Superintendent of Schools recommendation)

2. Fair Horse Racing Commission

Appointment of Toni Richardson, to fill a vacancy created by Tim Kelly. Term expiration: 1/18/27. (District 1)

3. Community Action Agency Board

Reappointment of John Vasquez Bedoy. Term expiration: 12/31/25. (District 5)

4. State Board of Equalization

Reappointment of Peter E. Pearman. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 5)

5. Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission

Reappointment of Annie Sykes. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 5)

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

6. Special Event

- Barbara J. Peck, Friends of Western Art, Inc., The Casitas at Smokey Springs, 1451 N. Smokey Springs Road, Tucson, April 26, 2025.
- John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 18, 2025.

7. **Temporary Extension**

14103017, Kevin Arnold Kramber, AMVETS Post, No. 770, 3015 S. Kinney Road, Tucson, April 12, 2025.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

8. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

Raquel Leon \$13.40; Raquel Leon \$7.86; Victor Acosta Acosta \$109.13; The 5H's, L.L.C. \$450.00; The 5H's, L.L.C. \$1,935.00; David Miner \$1,800.00; Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing \$989.41; Sam Duong \$1,700.00; Parklane Mobile Estates \$485.00; Lakeside Casitas \$3,042.00; Pacifica Brentwood, L.L.C. \$1,847.06; Debora K. Moore \$1,251.60; DH Pace Company, Inc. \$217.40; Tucson Electric Power, Co. \$71,911.09; Ser-Jobs For Progress Of Southern Arizona, Inc. \$68,794.58; Jot Comfort Properties, L.L.C. \$119,392.00; Brioso \$4,943.00; Palomino Crossing Apartments \$2,470.42; Pacifica Brentwood, L.L.C. \$1,847.06; Lakeside Casitas \$3,042.00; Empire Southwest, L.L.C. \$1,243.71; Empire Southwest, L.L.C. \$176.09; Carmen Alicia Noriega \$310.00; Owayo, Inc. \$9,498.00; Mr. Cooper \$1,540.43; Monique Garcia \$470.39; Curgliano Law, P.L.L.C. \$33,282.80; Patrick Steven Riesgo \$184.94; Waxies Enterprises, Inc. \$3,169.87; Mission Creek Apartments \$4,065.65; AAA Landscape \$19,574.68; Lisa Coyle \$566.82; El Dorado Place \$4,818.58; Katie L. Filous \$18,745.20; Idexx Distribution, Inc. \$7,088.32.

SUPERIOR COURT

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

Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of January 1, 2025 through June 30, 2025: Christopher Holguin

10. **Court Commissioner Appointment**

Appointment of Court Commissioner:

Superior Court and Juvenile Court Commissioner

Marie Kagie-Shutey

TREASURER

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

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$23,602.85.

12. **Request to Waive Interest**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$700.92.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

13. Minutes: November 19, 2024

* * *

39. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

40. Fire District Funding Needs

Discussion/Direction: While Tucson Fire Department serves the urban center of our county, numerous other fire districts provide critical services to rural, suburban and unincorporated areas. These districts face unique challenges, including limited budgets, aging equipment, and growing service demands. Ensuring they are adequately equipped and staffed is essential for the safety and well-being of all Pima County residents.

Today we will hear from Chief Bradley of Northwest Fire District (FD), Chief Wunder of Santa Rita FD (formerly Green Valley FD), and Chief Delfs of Avra Valley FD, as well as from firefighter Ryan Ward, who serves on the Southern AZ Firefighters Association, regarding current service levels across fire districts of different sizes serving rural vs. urban vs. suburban areas, and what more is needed to achieve target service levels across all communities, regardless of property tax base. This discussion will build off the information we received in the 12/16/24 memo from Administrator Leshar titled, "Fire and Emergency Medical Service Response Times in Pima County." (District 2)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AG: Supervisor Grijalva
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
RW: Ryan Ward, Firefighter, Southern AZ Firefighters Association
BB: Brad Bradley, Fire Chief, Northwest Fire District,
CW: Chuck Wunder, Fire Chief, Santa Rita Fire District
BD: Brian Delfs, Fire Chief, Avra Valley Fire District

RS: I would like to thank our colleague from District 2, Supervisor Heinz, for putting this item on the addendum and inviting some guests that we can hear from with regard to the dire situation, and I do not think that is an exaggeration that some of our local fire districts are facing with regard to their funding situation. So, I will turn it over to Supervisor Heinz, and then we will hear from our guests. Supervisor.

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. Obviously we have been seeing a lot of disturbing news coming out of Southern California, but we are living in a place that is fire prone. We are in a desert, right? So that makes a lot of sense that we do everything possible to make sure to do everything that we can to mitigate any kind of disaster like this occurring here locally. We have multiple fire districts,

I think it is over 20 in Pima County, and many are not adequately being funded, which can lead to an increased amount of time for response to an incident and also can impact the quality or reliability of equipment, fire trucks, that kind of thing. So I do not want to just talk at everyone. I want the experts who are here who have dedicated, you know, multiple hours of their time to be here to help us understand which districts are the most vulnerable and which are most likely to have issues and what we can do about that. So I will invite, however you want to get up here and present and however you want to do it, please.

RS: Supervisor, would you introduce who our guests are.

MH: I will actually have Ryan, if you come up and you can. Is that okay?

RS: That is perfectly fine. Thank you sir.

RW: To start off, we are going to have Fire Chief Brad Bradley from Northwest Fire District. Chief Chuck Wunder from Santa Rita Fire District, so in your district, sir. And then last of the fire chiefs will be Chief Brian Delfs from Avra Valley and Three Points Fire District, which I think has a large swath from across the Board. And then I will kind of give a little bit of a perspective. My name is Ryan Ward. I represent a lot of firefighters in Southern Arizona and Tucson, and I will kind of give a little bit more of a perspective, as they can kind of showcase some of the issues that they are having from the financial portion and how it is affecting the firefighters on the streets, as well. So, thank you.

BB: Mr. Chair, Supervisors, thank you very much for having us all here. For the record, Brad Bradley, Fire Chief for the Northwest Fire District. I am going to start off by giving you a huge thanks, not only for having us here, but for recognizing the gravity of the situation that we are all faced with, relative to shrinking streams of revenue and increasing demands throughout the entirety of Pima County, and truthfully, throughout the entirety of the state of Arizona, I want to walk you through, just briefly, some of those challenges that have occurred over the years that have put us all in difficult circumstances, that we have been doing the best that we can to navigate through, again, while call volume continues to increase, risks within the community continues to increase and kind of highlight the differences really between the districts. Noting that there are so many within Pima County, some of them very, very large, some of them medium sized and some of them very small, and we have a reflection of that today. So with that, fire districts in general are authorized to operate under ARS Title 48 and Title 48 establishes fire districts as special taxing districts, special taxing jurisdictions of the state. So essentially, they are excluded from any City or County government. Right. So we are a standalone. All of our organizations are standalone governmental entities that are overseen by nonpartisan elected board members. Depending upon the size of the organizations, they can be either 3 or 5 governing board members. Based on the statute fire districts are

able to provide fire protection services, emergency medical services up to the level of providing ambulance transportation, and if you choose to provide ambulance transportation, then ARS Title 36 kicks in. So that is the oversight and governance of the Department of Health Services through the state of Arizona. They regulate ambulance transportation throughout the entirety of the State. And so we are allowed to enforce fire codes adopted by each individual district and that creates its own challenges, particularly when the County has to deal with if every fire district adopted their own individual fire code, now you have 20 to 30 different fire codes that are all in place within the County. And so we operate off of a secondary property tax that is levied. It is our primary source of revenue for all districts, grant funding supplements that both state and federal grants for revenue and ambulance transportation. Again, if agencies choose to provide ambulance transportation, there is revenue associated with that. And for some organizations, it is up to half of their annual budgets are generated through the provisions of ambulance transportation services. So those are the things that in statute you are allowed to do. There is another caveat in the statute that says and allowed to provide other services as necessary or as deemed appropriate, which would be outside of fire suppression and emergency medical response, special operations or swift water rescue, technical rescue, things of that nature. Not all districts do them, but many do. Wildland fire response, again, not all fire districts do, but most do. Community assistance programs, some districts have the ability to provide higher levels of community assistance, some do not. Fire prevention services again, you will keep hearing this, there are plenty of districts that are not able necessarily to provide their own fire prevention services. They will contract with others or they will sign mutual aid agreements or intergovernmental agreements to provide those services and public education. Now assessed values. If we can go to that, if we can go to that slide, this will give you a real good look at the variances between districts. In terms of that first column is your commercial assess. Those are your class one and class two properties and the associated values. The next is your residential which is your Class 3 through 6. Then you have your total limited net assessed value. Huge range in disparity between organizations and where that becomes incredibly important is we all tax the same way, right? We all generate a tax rate through the same mathematical formula, and it is based upon that assessed value and applying a tax rate. And in statute today, that tax rate is set at 3.75. So when you look at and that rate is nothing more than a function of the value in the community. It is not a measurement. A lot of folks like to take a look at tax rates and say, well, this organization has a lower tax rate than this organization, so they must be better managed, they must be more efficient, they must be all those things. None of that is true. It just means that the organization that has a lower tax rate likely has a higher property value that they are protecting. And so when you look at the differences between just the three agencies here between Santa Rita, Avra Valley and Northwest, for every penny on the tax rate for the Northwest Fire District, it raises roughly about \$170,000 in new revenue. That is a considerable amount of money and it is something, you know, it is actionable money. It is things that we can, it is enough money to be able to

do things with to benefit the community. One penny in Santa Rita is worth about \$74,000, whereas one penny in Avra Valley Fire District, despite its enormous size and geographical area it covers, it is \$4,000, one penny increase is \$4,000. And what you see as a result of that is most of the smaller organizations have the highest tax rates because they have to just to be able to function. Does that make sense? So when you look at how did we get into this situation, a lot of legislative challenges that all of the fire districts throughout the state of Arizona has faced. You go back to 1992, and the tax rate cap initially was established at \$3.00, it was raised to 3.25 in 2005, in 2021, it was raised. Escalating overtime from 3.25 to 3.75. Now in exchange for that was another Senate Bill that occurred in in the same time period, which took the tax assessment for Class 1, which is your commercial property, and reduced it from 18% all the way down to 15% today. So if you look back and we will just use Avra Valley and Northwest Fire as the example to extremes. Northwest fire has the highest amount of commercial property of any fire district in the state. And so, but we are not tax capped. We still have plenty of room in our tax cap, whereas Avra Valley has very little commercial property, but they are at the time they were tax capped, but they just picked up an additional \$0.25 of taxing ability. They did not lose anything as the commercial assessment dropped from 18 to 15 on the commercial side because they did not have any. Whereas the Northwest Fire District lost considerable amounts of money, 3% reduction. And we will talk through exactly what that is in exchange for the ability to raise our rate, which we had plenty of room to be able to move. And so and unfortunately, what you see is that kind of decompresses that out, that liability throughout the entirety of the district where we know as commercial assessments are going down, in order for us to even stay status quo, the rates are going to have to come up. And so the burden is shifted a little bit. And so when you go all the way back to the '70s, where commercial assessment was at 50%, and it has been reduced over time down to its current level, which is which is 15 today. So the most I would say the most significant change in in legislation that has occurred over the years, it has been most impactful to us is Prop 117. Prop 117 occurred in 2012. And essentially it established a single limited property value as the basis for determining all property taxes back to basically reset everybody's property values from tax in perspective back to 2015 limits, 2015 levels. So as you move forward and take a look at the slide that shows NWFD assessed value, we will just show you what the impact is on the large scale, right on the most extreme side of things, since that proposition went into effect from the date that it went into effect to today, the cumulative loss to the Northwest Fire District is just short of \$100 million. That is a staggering amount. And so, you know, with that said, we have been blessed. We have been fortunate that we have had a lot of growth. We have had a lot of growth in the Northwest Fire District, and that has helped. But there are a number of years where we did not have the ability to do the things that we necessarily needed to do. We had to push all of our apparatus replacement way down the road, extend, try and extend the life of trucks, try and extend the life of properties. And it took us until last year and again when this went into effect, it reset our values to 2015. It was last year that we got back to what the value

was before it changed in 2015. So there is a huge gap in time where costs continue to go up, but revenue to the organization increasingly with that. So that same issue occurs with every fire district in the state of Arizona. I just use Northwest Fire as the example because it is a fairly extreme example, but it is equivalent but on a proportional level to every other fire district in the state of Arizona, Avra Valley included in Santa Rita included. So with that, when you look at that Class 1 reduction in particular, and you look at the chart that shows in order for us to at the Northwest Fire District, in order for us to maintain, to mitigate that loss. If you look at it from a cumulative perspective, all the way out to fiscal year 27-28, the estimated cumulative revenue loss will be over \$7 million. We would not be here having this conversation about assistance through Prop 310, which, while it passed in Pima County, failed on a statewide which Prop 310 was intended to mitigate these effects of all these legislative changes that have occurred over the years. And so with that, when you look at the equivalent increase to tax rate, you can see every year, just to make up for that loss, we are going to have to go up \$0.02 a year, \$0.02 every year. And if you pencil that out, it is not going to be very long before we hit the tax cap. And then we are going to be in real trouble. And so and you have agencies out there by and by in large, the majority of your smaller agencies are already at that level. They are already capped. There is nothing else to be done. And so without some other form of assistance and, I tell you, you know, as part of Pima County Fire Chiefs, there is not a Pima County Chiefs meeting that does not go by what we are constantly looking at efficiency. How do we gain efficiency without losing effectiveness? And more importantly, how do we gain effectiveness when we have such a disparity between capabilities of districts throughout the state? And we are blessed that we all get along incredibly well. And there are not any agencies out there that, you know, when they say, we need help, everybody else says, yeah, no, we are not coming, it just does not work that way. And so, but there are challenges associated with that disparate levels of staffing and deployment and things of that nature. And that creates issues as it relates to outcomes for our patients throughout the County, outcomes as it relates to lives being saved, property being protected, and the community being cared for to the degree that it deserves and expects. Truthfully, and so Ryan can certainly speak to that. With that being said, I would tell you just thank you. Hopefully this provides a little better background for you in terms of fire districts, why we are here, what we exist to do, the challenges that we faced and leading up to the full support that we see coming from, from you all, not only in recognizing the challenges that we face throughout our community, but actively pursuing opportunities to assist us where you can and we are incredibly thankful for that. Any questions of me before I turn it over to Chief Wunder?

RS: Any questions?

BB: Thank you sir.

CW: Thank you Chair Scott, members of the Board, thank you again for having us here. My name is Chuck Wunder and I am the Fire Chief for the Santa Rita Fire District, formerly known as the Green Valley Fire District. We represent District 2 and District 4, and we cover the entire town of Sahuarita and the community of Green Valley. So that is our service area. I do want to thank Chief Bradley for the great job he did, highlighting the financial challenges and the constraints that are being placed on districts. He really did a wonderful job, and I want to stress, as the Vice Chair of the Pima County Fire Chiefs Association, we all feel that. I also just want to highlight a comment he made in there. We are blessed to have an awesome working relationship amongst all the Chiefs. We are fortunate to have a group of professionals who work collaboratively on a lot of issues, and that is how we have survived a lot of things over the years based on those relationships. So I am grateful for that and grateful for my peers that are here today. So with that, there are actually 18 fire districts in Pima County, and they vary from very large size districts like Chief Bradley highlighted, the Northwest Fire District being one of the largest, if not the largest in the state, I believe. Correct? They will run upwards of 20,000 calls to smaller, tiny districts that are less complex that may only run a couple hundred calls a year. And that and those challenges, I would like to highlight how they look differently based on the constraints that Chief Bradley highlighted. So I think that was a specific request from Supervisor Heinz that let's hear those very specific challenges. So with all fire departments across the United States, staffing levels is a challenge for us. You look at that recruitment, retention, our big time challenges, just the number of people that are simply coming out. If you look at the city and the initiative they are running right now, one of the top things they are highlighting is the need for more firefighters. Correct? And so that is the same issue that we face. I think what I want to highlight from the funding perspective, though, is the disparity that occurs between districts. And that because our larger districts have the ability to perhaps compensate more and offer more benefits, and therefore they're the more attractive. And they typically those larger districts sit in an urban/suburban environment, so they have a larger pool to pull from. When we step out and we look at other areas, perhaps up on the mountain, like Chief Gunia, or you look down at an Arivaca or someplace in our smaller districts, they are fighting that they have constant turnover because of those kind of things like that. Their staffing is not consistent and their people are leaving to get a better job, you know, good on them for that kind of thing, but it makes it a challenge to provide a consistent level of service in smaller districts like that. So I think it is important to highlight that and that the inconsistencies and when you have it inconsistent or no workforce in sometimes because staffing level is so minimal, your ability to respond appropriately and manage emergencies is diminished. You look at a small district and they face a wildfire. Can they deploy enough resources quickly to get around that? They may not have the ability to get out there quickly. Maybe their area is so large that the response time takes them too long because they are not geographically deployed appropriately, just because they do not have those resources. So I think staffing is a very specific, targeted item that is important to us, and that we

are going to need some relief with. Speaking of the wildfire response, I would venture to say that all of our fire districts have some sort of wildland issue that we contend with, some of our more urban and suburban areas up here in this area have what we call WUI. You may have heard that term, our Wildland Urban Interface Issues. These risks are where development and people come and meet natural resources and the environment, and those create unique challenges. The firefighting is different in that environment. The specialty in the training and education and resources needed to mitigate that are definitely different. I know it was a hot topic here for a little while when we chatted about the Bighorn Fire. That was a fire here that went across the Catalina Foothills and the Oro Valley area, significant fire and required a ton of resources. And granted, we have other collaborative partners. We work with the forest and the state, etc. But at the local level, the ability to get out with those and have appropriate staffing to mitigate those is hugely important. And I think transversely, if you look at a rural fire department and the wildland areas they protect, they often protect hundreds if not thousands of acres of wildland area with very few resources. They may have two people on duty that is protecting an area specifically in my area, we protect the entire Santa Rita experimental range. And you may be familiar. A few years back, there was just a small 58,000 acre fire that occurred out there. Then we have areas outside that I will highlight a little bit that not in our district, but we are the closest jurisdictional fire or closest fire department to protect them. And so it is important that we be able to deploy enough resources to control those kind of things. In addition, specifically training, the financial constraints that have been placed on us cause challenges with training. If you look at a small district and let's say their budget is only \$300,000, they are really looking at the choice of putting fuel in the ambulance or repairing a fire truck, versus sending somebody to paramedic school or to a specialty school. They have to balance that. That is a very difficult thing. How are you increasing your skill set or even just minimally keeping your employees trained when you are fighting that realistic battle at a minimal budget? And so that is again, a disparity we see across the board that we could use some relief on. But that does not always just apply to a smaller fire district. We are a midsize fire district in the Santa Rita Fire District, and we experience that. And we may be able to afford \$10,000 to send a paramedic to training, but now we are six months with them off the truck. What is that doing to our service levels? Are we going to reduce our service levels to have that happen? Can we backfill that? Where are we in our recruitment and retention cycle, you know, and what is that going to do back to our taxpayer to have to compensate for that. So again I think training is one of those things that is a very specific example of something we are struggling with. I also think aging equipment and infrastructure with limited with limited budgets, some of our districts are forced to operate with outdated equipment. This equipment could be fire trucks, it could be ambulances or personal protective gear, such as turnout gear. Just for a little bit of perspective, turnout gear alone costs about \$5,000 per set of turnout for every new firefighter you bring on. That is a pretty price tag. This is a hurdle. Some of our smaller fire districts really struggle with, and even larger districts experience the sticker shock on a

regular basis. For example, I am in need of replacing 15 cardiac monitors in my district. These monitors are \$40,000 each. I am a simple fire chief, and my simple math says that's \$600,000 at \$40,000 each. I could have got a car from Supervisor Christy with that kind of money. So anyway, you can also expect, if you are looking at these costs, routine fire trucks now are between \$700,000 and \$900,000, and that is a standard model. That is not a Cadillac model, you know. And so and I do not even want to get into discussing prices of ladder trucks, which go well above \$1 million per unit. So you can see how a smaller fire district just does not just have the capability to make an investment like that. And so their trucks age out. We have districts running trucks that are 25 and 30 years old. There is safety issues related with that truck. There is operational issues that are just simply keeping the pump running on them. So those can be challenges. So again, all districts struggle with that ability with their equipment, but also their infrastructure. I do not know how a small fire district has the ability to add a fire station, I really do not. If you start looking at the restrictions that have been placed on us with our ability to grow, as Chief Bradley highlighted, it could take 15 to 18 years for a small fire district to save enough money to build a fire station. What has occurred during that timeframe? Now, of course, you can go out to bond, but smaller districts, their bonding capacity is significantly reduced. So a fire station, you are looking at \$5 or \$6 million. Again, for a simple fire station. How does a small district put in infrastructure like that? We are blessed to be a stronger district in the Santa Rita Fire District. And I need to add two fire stations and some support facilities. We have already bonded and that is gone well. We see tremendous support, but again, that is a significant cost to ask back. So looking at some sort of additional support is definitely needed in our industry. And I think the last thing I just wanted to highlight that was specific and kind of unanticipated is the service demand and expectation is the word I will use to they continue to increase. Chief Bradley highlighted service demand, call volume certainly goes up and we wrestle with those with limited resources. But I think some of the things that we are experiencing are also the expectations that occur. You look at the Arivaca Fire District, when they started their district, they were not planning on incurring the issues that are related to the border and the responses that they have to make up and down that section for transport. That is not part of that, but there is nobody else there to do it. And our fire department and Supervisor Christy, your office has contacted me with a specifically with the dissolving of the Elephant Head Volunteer Fire Department in that area. By default, we are the next fire provider in that area. There is nobody else to respond out there. And I do not default or, you know, begrudge the volunteers set up at all. It is very difficult with the increased training requirements we have and the funding restrictions, how can any of them stay in business? I really do not know. I do not know how they stay alive like that. My hat is off to any of those and those that are dedicated to doing that profession, but with their dissolving now you have people calling consistently. Just yesterday we ran a critical cardiac call out in that area, and we were a 17-minute response time, in our world and we joke amongst my peers that is like same day service. You know, it is 17 minutes. That is just unacceptable for our

standards and our district boundaries. So we struggle with that. And so again, the ability to get some additional funding to help alleviate that same kind of idea, if we had to respond to that same area and we do have a wild land issue out there, that is a risk. And so we could argue that, well, it is not your district do not go well, what happens if we do not go? What happens to that wildfire when we do not go? Wait till it burns to our boundary? Of course not. I mean, those are ethical dilemmas for another time, but those are significant challenges we are up against. And by default, we ended up in that scenario. So again, service demand and those expectations are another challenge that we are facing that is trying to be a specific example. So with that I think there are tons of other challenges that we can discuss. We are happy to work that with staff and come back at a different time. But I just want to say that we are grateful for you allowing us this time and the support and interest that you have shown in helping us solve this issue.

MH: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes, sir.

MH: Real quick clarification. The 17-minute response time, would that apply also to a paramedic, or is that just specific to a firetruck?

CW: That was our paramedic and our fire truck going together based on the nature of the critical call. And again, I want to emphasize that is not within our district boundaries. That is not our standard but responding outside to support that because there was nobody else to go. Yeah. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Chief Wunder. Chief Delfs.

BD: Chair Scott and other supervisors, thank you for allowing us to be here today. Supervisor Christy said that I had an hour and a half to speak. I will try and keep it to that. Honestly, I just want to kind of tag on to a little bit of what Chief Bradley and Chief Wunder have already said and I represent the small districts, and that is 85% of the districts that are in southern Arizona. I am also the Chair of the Fire Chiefs Association right now. And so I am speaking on behalf of the group. But I want to speak anecdotally about Avra Valley in Three Points, because those are the districts that I am the most familiar with combined I have 48 years of service in the fire service, and for the last 15 years I have been blessed to be part of the Avra Valley Fire District. Just three years ago, the Three Points Fire District was having so many issues, financially and otherwise, that we entered into a management and resource sharing agreement with Three Points. So now the administration of Avra Valley and the mechanics for Avra Valley and the personnel are sharing resources back and forth with Three Points. We effectively manage both districts and our personnel can work in each other's districts. And we share vehicles and we share turnouts, and we share cardiac monitors, and we share all these other things that these guys have alluded to. Just trying to get by, you know, every community is going to decide what level of public safety

protection they are willing to pay for. On one hand, you could have a fire truck or an ambulance at every Circle K or every street corner, and that would be the safest type of a model, very expensive. On the other hand, you could have no protection and that is the cheapest. So every community has to decide what are they willing to pay for? What are they willing? What level of risk are they willing to adopt? How much insurance do they want to buy? And so that is where there a lot of these different issues come into play. I can tell you that from a small district perspective, we are struggling. And I have been accused of fear mongering. I have been accused of whining, if you will. But the fact of the matter is, we are barely scraping by and that is, I think, the message that I want to give you guys, I so appreciate the fact that you are pushing this legislation at the state and you are trying to get us some assistance that is so important to us. But we also need some other help in other areas and I would really like to have the opportunity to sit down and discuss what some of those might be between the Avra Valley and Three Point Fire District. You know, Chief Bradley talked about being the largest fire district in the state of Arizona as far as density, population, budget, all those kinds of things and he is struggling. But at Avra Valley and Three Points, we are the largest geographically. We do not have the density and we do not have the population, but they still expect good response times. And they still expect that when they have a fire or they have a urgent call that the A-team is going to show up. We cover the collectively 890 square miles. I have 14 firefighters on duty at Avra Valley, and I have six on duty at Three Points to cover 890 square miles. By comparison sake, the City of Tucson, the entire city of Tucson is 277 square miles. So that gives you an idea of the geographical area that we have to try and cover, and that the response times that we are going to have, not to mention the condition of the roads and the locked gates and the, you know, there are areas that we cannot get to if it rains, we just cannot get there. And so we have a lot of these types of kinds of challenges. And yet with that limited staffing, we also protect a lot of critical infrastructure, the Asarco Mine, where we had one of those monstrous dump trucks roll over with the driver trapped. We have had incidents on the interstate, a 21 car pileup in a dust storm where we had 23 patients, 6 of them critical and 10 of them trapped. Two years later, we had another accident with 19 vehicles, 21 patients, 23 or excuse me, 20-19 cars, 21 patients, eight of them critical, some dead. And I could put 12 firefighters on that scene. Two patients for every firefighter, not to mention the transport capability and landing helicopters and all of the other things that have to go into that. So we have to rely heavily on mutual aid. Northwest and others are willing to come in and help us with some of those types of things. But, you know, if I respond outside my area to go help Eloy or to go help somebody else, how can I expect other fire districts to backfill my district? You know, if I send my crews out to a wildland assignment somewhere, how can I expect Northwest to release their units out of their district to come help my district? You know, we do work well together, but there are limits to how much we can do from Three Points. I used to respond from the Ajo station, the border to help Arivaca. I have 6 firefighters in that fire district. I cannot do that anymore because if I leave my district to go to the border to help Arivaca, there is

nobody in my district to cover the area. We talked a little bit about property tax and how our primary funding is property tax. The County, the state, and the City of Tucson are the largest property owners in both my district. Those entities do not pay property tax. We protect critical infrastructure from regional airports to correctional facilities to water treatment plants, to 36 inch pipelines that carry 75% of Mexico's fuel right through Three Points Fire District. You know, all of these different, and many more types of infrastructure that we are not compensated for. Old Tucson is in our district. The Desert Museum is in our district. We have a lot of these places that we are providing protection for, that we get no revenue for. I will say that the City of Tucson did step up about 12 years ago, and they have been they entered into a subscription agreement with Avra Valley to cover the areas out there, because most of the City's water comes from Avra valley. And so they pay us every year in a subscription agreement to cover their area, those areas. It is a small amount, but it helps. We talked about, Chief Bradley talked about the amount of time that it took to recover after the financial downturn. And Avra Valley in 2023, our tax revenue equaled what it was in 2011 over that period of time, everything else, the cost of staffing, the cost of insurance, the cost of benefits, the cost of turnouts, the cost of trucks, the cost of fire stations, everything more than tripled. And so our costs went up exponentially, but our revenues stayed flat. And so it has only been in the last two years that we saw some increases in revenue. And those have been minor. We have taken a lot of actions to sustain our budgets. We have applied for and received some grants, but those cannot be used for staffing because those are one time revenues. And staffing is 90% of my budget. My firefighters are some of the most dedicated individuals. You will see some of the best people on the planet. And yet my starting firefighter make \$2.40 per hour over state minimum wage. People at McDonald's make more per hour than my firefighters do. So that gives you an idea where we are at. Those staffing shortfalls that we talked about affect our fire responses. If you look at wildland fire, and that was part of the auspices for this entire discussion, we have had a dozen fires that were between 5 acres and 385 acres within our district boundaries over the last five years. It is interesting that even some of those are on state land, but a state land sends resources to come and battle those fires, they bill me for it. The National Fire Protection Association says that I should be able to put 16 firefighters at a structural fire within eight minutes, 90% of the time, and I am covering 895 square miles. I am down to two stations at Three Points, because last week we had to abandon station 301. That station has severe problems with its water well, its water storage systems, its fire alarm system, its electrical system. We had to abandon the station and move our crews to another place. So now we are covering that entire district of two stations, and yet we are supposed to put 16 firefighters. I have 6 in that district. I am supposed to put 16 at structure fire within eight minutes. You can see that that just does not happen. So I will wrap this up. I know I am starting to whine a little bit maybe. But you know, when we hire new firefighters, we bring them in and we pin a badge on their shirt. We tell them you are accepting an obligation. We know it is an obligation because when things really go south, they cannot leave and the first responder cannot

call 911. First responder does not have anybody there to back them up. So they have an obligation to stay there and to see it through. But I also tell that same firefighter when they are giving him his badge, that we also have an obligation to him or her. And our obligation is to make sure that they have the equipment and the training and the support to do their job and to do it safely, to make sure that they have the cancer prevention things in place, to make sure that they have the mental health resources available to them, to make sure that they have enough pay and benefits to make sure that they can feed their families. That is our obligation. Frankly, we are not meeting it. So anything that the Board of Supervisors can do to benefit the small districts or any fire district in addition to what you are already doing. And I so appreciate what you are already doing. Anything else that we can do, we would love to sit down and discuss with you. And hopefully we've got some really sharp, sharp minds here. Maybe we can come up with something. I appreciate your time. If there are any questions, I think I will take them.

MH: Chair Scott?

RS: Thank you. And Supervisor Heinz, were we also going to hear from firefighter Ward, or was the presentations being done by just the Chiefs?

MH: Yes. Okay. Yes, I can hold it until everybody stops.

RS: And I will just say to my colleagues with the Chiefs and firefighter Ward, just like with the presentation that we had earlier this morning from the Airport Authority and the Air National Guard and DM, we did not put any time limits on these speakers, as we have with previous speakers who come before the Board. And I think that that is important because when it comes to the public health and safety issues that we have addressed, I did not feel comfortable putting time limits on them like we have for previous speakers. So I appreciate the Board's understanding and indulgence. Go ahead. firefighter Ward.

RW: Thank you.

RS: Am I using the appropriate title for you?

RW: Sure. I have been called worse. Chairman Scott, supervisors, thank you for having this issue brought to you today. I think it is a very important issue because this issue affects every person in Pima County. I have been a firefighter for over 16 years, and I have worked in different parts of the County. But everything that these chiefs are saying is an absolute, it is absolute holiness, absolute truth. There are issues. There are holes that are happening on a daily basis in the County, in these fire districts across the state. And one of the points that I think was brought up twice and Chief Delfs brought it up was the Desert Museum. And I think it is fitting that we that I talked about that today because of the gentleman earlier that was getting his distinction, is that the people that go to the Desert Museum do not live at the

Desert Museum. So there is I do not know what the amount of visitors that go there every year, but none of them are paying taxes in that area. But they are still relied upon by the fire district and the firefighters that are in that area for emergency when it does happen. And that same thing happens. I think I have used it a couple times. Supervisor Christy with Mt. Lemmon, very limited amount of residents on Mt. Lemmon, but everybody knows in the summertime, everybody goes up there, everybody goes up there in the wintertime. But and all those people up there, they do not live up there. But they fall under the same expectation of a response if they call 911. And that fire district is hurting, just like the rest of them are. And they talked a little bit about some of the fire trucks that are out there. These fire trucks are getting worn down on a daily basis because our call volume is increasing. The firefighters are not complaining about the calls. That is what we do. We love running calls. But when we cannot run a call if our truck is broke, right. That is probably the second most important piece of apparatus that we have outside of outside of the firefighters and the turnaround times on getting these trucks now was upwards of two years. You put an order for a truck, it could be up to two years to get it back. And the other part of that is that if your front line truck does go down, you gotta have a backup truck for it. And that is so we are kind of, we are having that built in redundancy for it. And I think that those are some of the parts of the equipment aging in place is essentially that is what is happening daily for it. So, Supervisor Christy, you did a great job at the last meeting talking about the wildfires that have happened in the County over the last, I think it was like decade or so, and they are only getting bigger. They are only getting stronger. They are only getting, they are only growing. Right? We saw what is going on in Southern California with their wildland urban interface and what they are facing. That same thing can happen in Pima County. Pretty easy. Bighorn fire, the wind shift Catalina Foothills Oro Valley. There is a lot of houses in that area that can go under. These firefighters can make headway, start to curb some of these fires when they are happening. But if, like these chiefs are saying, if they do not have the resources to do it, then it cannot be done. If they do not have the apparatus to make it down the wash to get there, they do not have the hose packs to get there. It is just not going to happen. And if you call for state resources, sometimes it takes hours. I am talking tens of hours for them to show up. And you are sitting there watching a fire for ten hours burn. And what that is doing is that is causing insurance rates to go up on every property owner in those in those areas. And everybody's feeling it. And I think a lot of times what they are basing that off of is frequency. And then also the Southwest Fire Science Consortium did a study on the Bighorn fire about two years ago. They kind of came to some conclusions, the grass ratings. So when an area burns and the growth that comes back after it, most of the time it is that grass, Buffelgrass and some of the other ones. Right? The previous rating was GR 2. The new rating is 4. GR 2. You will get flame lengths of 1 to 2ft. GR 4 you get flame lengths and height of 4 to 8ft. So we are talking about 4 to 8 foot high flame. That is with no wind. Now if you get wind involved on it, 20% slope. Like let's say it is going up to Catalinas. It burns four times as fast, so that is four times faster than it is going to burn if it is just sitting there

and we have to get ahead of it, we have to. We have to start getting our arms around it. But a lot of times if we are on calls, we do not have the equipment. Our truck cannot make it there, that is an issue that we suffer and we take it personal as firefighters because our job is to protect the community. And if we cannot do it, we take it pretty, pretty hard on that. So. I will kind of wrap it up with this, because I know these guys have said a lot and I do not want to take anything away from it, and they took a lot of my points as well. I am just kidding. But firefighting is a dangerous job, and everybody that has signed up for it knows it. And I do not think anybody that got on the job and was like, too dangerous, right? Anybody who has been on the job for 2 or 3 more years know that this has inherent dangers with it. The number one killer of firefighters right now is cancer. 75% of line of duty deaths is cancer related. The International Agency on Research on Cancer has given firefighting a group one carcinogen level, which means and that is the same thing as radiation and every other known carcinogen out there. The job firefighter is a Group one carcinogen, which means that if you are doing it long enough, you will get cancer. That is just the short, long of it. We have guys at our department right now that are battling cancer and they are still on the truck. We have guys that have gone that have that have had cancer and beat it, and they are back on the truck because these guys love being firefighters, these people that are getting cancer, they love being firefighters. And if they can beat it, they are coming back on the truck. But what is also hurting our districts and our funding is that these are workman's comp claims. So and I am they can probably speak to it a lot more than I could, but I think it was about three years ago, the workman's comp insurance, we just got done talking about property insurance going up because of the risks. Workman's comp insurance either dropped some districts and departments or substantially increased it. And with that being said, workman's comp insurance is one of those bills that you got to pay, right as an employer. Like it is just one of those bills, like we all have bills sometimes. I do not, you know, I do not get this this month because I am, because I got to pay this workman's comp is one of that. And that directly affects overall budgets that that we have. And a lot of times that budget that it is taken from is cancer reduction, that the districts or departments want to do, but necessarily cannot. So you talk about turnouts, you go to a fire and your turnouts are covered in carcinogens. You do a lot of stuff for post Defcon, which is a great step, but we also need to wash those turnouts. But if I have 22 hours left in my shift, I cannot just take my turn off and throw them in the washer. I need a second set of turnouts, which, as you heard, they are upwards of \$5,000 each. So getting a second set of turnouts for firefighters is a big deal. But at the same time, it is a big deal to reduce cancer for these firefighters that are out there putting their lives on the line every day for their communities, knowing that they are dealing with carcinogens and still getting on the truck and still going down the road answering the call. You have heard a lot of stuff from these. These guys are smarter than me, from these chiefs. And the issues that we are facing and the obstacles that have been placed in front of us at the state level. But I am hopeful and I am glad to be here today to speak to it. And I thank Supervisor Heinz for bringing this forward as well, is

that this is an issue, and we need to start to address it sooner than later, because if not, it will be a bigger issue that will be coming across your desk that I do not think anybody wants. I am proud to be here today. I think that we are moving forward, and when legislation like this or issues like this get fixed and passed, I think it is going to everybody in this room here today that is going to be proud to say that they were there when they did it. So thank you.

RS: Thank you sir. Questions? Comments from board members? Supervisor Heinz then Supervisor Christy.

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. And thank you for those really incredibly moving remarks. So sorry. So I am also in the hospital on not quite as much of a frontline as you, but I get it. Everybody I work with, incredibly dedicated, that includes the folks coming in and dropping off patients to the ER that includes the nurses that I am working with all day or all night. And they are not going to say no if someone is in need, they are not going to ever say no, even if it hurts themselves. So thank you.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Christy and then Supervisor Allen. Did you have your hand up as well? All right. Thank you.

SC: As I have said before to this Board, in light of what happened in LA and other wildfire prone communities and the damage and the devastation, I think all of us at this Board would feel absolutely horrible and gut wrenched if we knew or it came to pass, that there was an incident of wildfires or some other natural disaster like this that could have been prevented or could have been dealt with on a much more efficient basis. If we had acted prior. We were hearing the saying, which I think is so poignant, "What is predictable is preventable." I think it is incumbent upon this Board to analyze what is needed in order to make sure that we are now predicting a very heavy wildfire season. What can we do as a Board to prevent it, or minimize it or deal with it? We can all point fingers and in different ways at what happened in Los Angeles. What I would like to see this Board try to do is prevent an occurrence like Los Angeles from happening here in Pima County. As I said before, we know it can happen because it has. We have seen the straining of resources, firefighting, emergency law enforcement, all of our first responders are strained to the max because of various reasons either staffing, equipment, lack of training, all of those areas that need to be addressed. But a lot of them are long term projects that are probably, you know, months, if not years in the making. What our concern is, or my office is concerned is because we have such a high propensity of wildfires in my district, all the way from Mt. Lemmon to south to the Santa Cruz line is the wildfire issue. And I again, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague, Supervisor Heinz, for bringing this issue up and having the frontliners respond to it with their presentations. But at this point, what I would like to just throw out to the Board and the County Administrator and the chiefs and the associations and the districts is to kind of dig deep into the whole situation of funding, because we are hearing how drastically

underfunded most districts are and that the as far as the cash flow and the operation of a fire district is being hampered because of lack of funding or inadequate funding. So what I am hoping is we can determine short term to bring everybody up to speed what it is going to take. But the problem, of course, with short term funding is that once that runs out, we are right back to where we are. So we need to try to establish some sort of a stable in place, institutionalized funding source that can prevent the inhibition of the fire districts to do their job as a result of lack of funding. So I did ask Supervisor Heinz at the last meeting to look into that or the County Administrator, but I am hoping we can come up with a dollar amount that would keep the fire districts operating so they can concentrate on fighting fires and meeting the calls and then a long term approach. So, where the fire districts are not in a situation six, eight months, a year from now, saying we have run out of money again. So it is a two-pronged thing. And then we need to prioritize where this money is going to be spent. Is it going to be on equipment? Is it going to be on training? Is it going to be on staffing, or is it going to be a combination of all of that? So I think there is a lot of analytical elements that we have to look at in order to make sure that the funding is adequate. But my concern right now is what we need to do as we come into this fire wildfire season. It is historically this time of year and on where we have these emergencies, what is it going to take to prevent a Los Angeles from happening here in Pima County? Thank you.

RS Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Allen.

JA: So thank you all for coming. And your thoughtful comments and your experience and leadership, for that matter. I guess my question is, what the mechanism is to ensure that we can equitably distribute resources out to the under-resourced areas that do not have enough of a property base such that if we increase property tax, how does that reach out to Arivaca, which is not going, you know, which is an obviously different property tax base than Golder or Northwest or other places? And then and then layered on that and I think this was touched on, we have places that are incredibly important to us within Pima County from Saguaro National Park, our national monuments, our wildlife refuges, those are federal lands. There is also state parks. And so how do we ensure while they are incredibly important to us, they are also vulnerabilities in terms of wildfire vulnerabilities for all of our communities. So how do we, what is the mechanism? Because if property tax is not going to, you know, there is not property to tax in many of these places. So what could that look like?

BB: Well, excellent question. Incredibly complex. No question about that. It is a conversation that we have had regularly with Pima chiefs. And if you go all the way back to Proposition 310, the proposition established a statewide sales tax with a disbursement model that was predicated upon net assessed values. Right? But it set a cap and in the theory was your larger organizations will hit that cap quickly. And once they hit the cap, there will be a trickledown effect for all of the other agencies. And so once this issue with

310, once, 310 failed, certainly had a conversation with Supervisor Scott, Chair Scott and others looking at, is there an opportunity to do something similar, similar to 310 at a County level? But what I did not like about the 310 model was the cap in that from a statewide perspective, that cap was considerably high. And I felt like even though the largest districts still need help, still need support, all of the things that Firefighter Ryan was talking about in terms of needs for, for second turnout gear for cancer, we do not have second sets of turnout gear. We cannot afford that. And so, but with that said, I looked at it from the perspective of not setting a cap but setting a floor where every agency would get a significant portion as a floor looking at and the way I modeled that was based upon needs that I am aware of for agencies looking at common staffing models. Consistent application and deployment of services throughout the County. Based upon risk modeling done in the County, there are plenty of agencies, myself included, that we endeavor and do what is called a standards of response cover. So we do a risk assessment of the entirety of the Northwest Fire District. We do risk assessments in every first, do around every fire station. So every station knows. Here are our target assets. Here are our risks. Here is how we are going to deploy. And we have deployment models and plans for all of that. I would recommend the County endeavor to do a standards of response coverage for itself. Obviously, we would participate in that. And let's really do a good thorough risk assessment and develop a deployment model that provides greater levels of standardization and consistency in terms of staffing, training, deployment and response throughout the County. And so when I looked at setting that floor. It was based on what I know about Mt. Lemmon. What do we need to do to get Mt. Lemmon to a staffing level that meets a national standard or something along those lines? Now we have there are agencies in place, myself, Northwest Fire, rather Golder Ranch, Tucson Fire participate in what is called an automatic seamless response, no boundaries whatsoever. The closest, most appropriate truck goes. The way we are able to do that is common staffing, common training, common deployment, common terminology, and common incident command system. That way, we can work together without jeopardizing the lives of our firefighters because of, you know, the expectation is if you are if all of your training, your background, your deployment, your philosophy is predicated upon x number of people climbing off that truck, in our case, four people, all four people have a job to do. But in the case of other agencies and I use Ryan as an example, he is going to show up with two people. That throws a kink in in our plan. Right? Because we are prepared for four is going to show up. And here is what all four are going to do. But four do not show up. And if we do not have common terminology on the radio, if we do not even have common radio frequencies that is a problem. So there are any number of things I, I look at this from a very holistic perspective. Supervisor Christy, you were talking about, we just really need to look at this and see what those needs are. They might be this, they might, and they are everything. That is what I would tell you. And looking at where really strongly carefully looking at where our risk hazards throughout the County but being realistic in the sense that because Pima County is so diverse, it is so geographically diverse. And

we have to be realistic in those terms. Right? There are going to be areas that we know it is going to take us a little bit of time to get there, but as long as we have recognized that, we know it is a target hazard, maybe we are sending more units on the initial call out than we would in other areas. Does that make sense? So it is a lot easier to tell them to go back than to get them started. You know, and when you need them there fast, you need them there fast. And so it is all about deployment modeling and risk hazard and risk assessment. And I think that is probably what is needed in Pima County, is a standards of response coverage, which will drive, I think when you see what the disparities are, that will allow us to prioritize staffing, equipment, apparatus, things of that nature.

RS: Thank you, chief.

SC: Chair Scott?

RS: Hold on just one second. I just wanted to ask Supervisor Allen if she had any follow up to the response. And then Supervisor Grijalva had sought recognition before I go back to either of you two gentlemen.

JA: I did thank you. The other piece that I think about, I have been thinking about the totality of the County is the, the Tohono O'odham and the degree to which there is kind of the, as you call it, sort of the automatic aid deployment and that that degree of collaboration with the nation. And I am curious kind of what that what that looks like.

BB: They are fully on board, fully part of the mutual aid. Right now, all agencies participate in statewide mutual aid. And so where we all agree that if we have the capacity to deploy outside of our boundaries and go assist somebody, we certainly will. The nation is part of the Pima County Fire Chiefs Association and we work hand in hand with those folks in my district. I have a small, I have got the pueblo that we provide coverage to much like areas of the County, the County owned properties. We do not get any revenue from that, but we are the closest, most appropriate agency. So we go and we go do our job right.

CW: If I could start on Supervisor Allen in our particular jurisdiction, we actually work under an agreement with the Tohono O'odham Nation. So we automatically dispatch them and they cover for us automatically. It is not even mutually set up. So we engage with them frequently and they are good partners.

RS: Thank you, Chief Wunder. Anything else Supervisor Allen? Supervisor Grijalva.

AG: Thank you all for being here. A lot of what you have discussed with the standards of response time. I had a meeting with firefighter Ward, like seven months ago or something where we were talking about how different it is

depending on where you are? Some of the concerns with the City of South Tucson and some of our other little areas, like the overlap, I imagine that because I remember when I went to high school a million years ago, that if firefighters were hiring, there was like this line of, I mean, thousands of applications that you guys talked about. And I am assuming that perhaps that has dropped some, as it has with a lot of other first responders, really critical positions in our community because of the salary, because I know that, you know, you can do some stuff online at home and make \$25.00 an hour. It makes it really difficult. And really, I do see firefighters, law enforcement, medical staff, teachers, you are all, there is a calling there that you just it is like this. This is what fulfills you. But it should also, you should not have to have a second job in order to do, you know, provide public service. And so I am wondering if you have had a class in comp study recently, and if there is the sort of thing that happens with our law enforcement where one fire district maybe bubbles up and causes people to maybe leave one to go to the other, or that kind of competition amongst you all, if that is an issue.

BB: Yes, to all the above. Okay, the comp class study, we do a pay scale assessment for Pima County fire chiefs on an annual basis.

AG: Okay.

BB: And recruitment and retention is a huge issue for the fire service, not just here in the state of Arizona, but across the entirety of the nation. And so it used to be, and I will use my agency as an example. When we would go out to hire, we would post and we had to put a cap on the number of applicants that we would accept. We would put a cap at, say, a thousand, and we would hit that cap inside of a few weeks, and we would have to shut the process down because we could not process any more than a thousand applicants through. I will tell you, we are doing really, really good. If we hit 350 with no cap. And I would tell you our process right now, we have an academy in place. And this is true for all organizations to, 21 degrees or another. And that of the 350 that applied and went through the process we were going to hire, we had funding for 25. We have 21 and 21 qualified applicants. And so you have got there are agencies in southern Arizona that have as turnover in their academy as high as 50%. It is just not for everybody. And not all agencies are alike. In fact we are all a little bit different, right? We do the same job, but we do it a little differently. And philosophically, culturally, we are all a little bit different. Where we align is at our level. Right? We all understand what the needs are, and we work cooperatively together. And recruitment and retention is going to be an issue. It is an issue. It will continue to be an issue. Challenges are, you know, because of our limited funding, if we throw everything at just pay and benefits, everybody's chasing each other because there is a finite pool of resources. And if Chuck is stealing from me and I am stealing from Ryan and we are just recycling the same firefighters throughout the community and they are chasing a dollar, then it becomes a race. But it is a race to the bottom and it is just not sustainable. And so we have got to look at other ways, other opportunities. And depending on, you know, in Brian's

case, Brian's at Oro Valley. And Three Points, he is hiring fully credentialed certified employees and putting them right on the truck. Chief wonder, he is hiring folks that at a minimum, I think have an EMT certification. In my scenario, you have a GED. We are going to give you everything in the academy. And that is why, you know, we look at that from the perspective of we are blessed that we are able to do that, provide that EMT certification. And but that allows us to open up so many more applicants that might be interested. And so, but it also trends towards higher turnover in the academy because you know, there is at least some peace and comfort for Chuck knowing that if they have at least got the EMT certification, they have an idea of what the job's about. Brian, on the other hand, he is getting fully trained and certified firefighters. He just has to bring them up to speed with how they do things at our valley. And so he has a reasonable, you know, consideration that he is not going to lose those folks unless there is another hiring opportunity that occurs where somebody is hiring and they are paying more, in which case they are going to go. And so we kind of have a standing agreement, certainly through Pima Chiefs, that whenever anybody has a hiring process, if somebody lands on our list that is from another fire department, we pick up the phone and call and say, hey, heads up, start prepping. Yeah, we have got, you know, and I have done that with Brian, I have done it with Chuck. And, you know, because here is the thing. We talk about this turnout gear and you have heard it from all of us. Now those are custom fitted. You cannot just give those to somebody else when they are done. They are custom fitted. And so, you know, we have talked about if I am going to hire one of Chuck's guys, Chuck calls and says will you at least buy the turnout gear from me so I can get my money back on? Those are the conversations that are happening that are real. And or, you know, somebody hires somebody that Chuck puts somebody through paramedic school and I hire them and they happen to have, you know, paramedic cert. Chuck's going to call me and say, can you pay me back for that paramedic class because I need the money? Yeah, those are real, right? And those are the relationships that we have.

AG: And so of the 21, what would you say the retention is?

BB: If we can keep them past five years? Okay. Very good. Greater than 90% okay. If we are going to lose them, we are going to lose them within the first five years.

AG: Yeah. Teachers it is three. Yeah. Like let's hold on to them for three and then we are good okay. So I am wondering in a bigger conversation what Pima County can do. Well I think I mean obviously there is General Fund, I mean, we can chit chat about that, but I do not know that you were here for the conversation of some of the concerns we have with federal and state funding. So I am just trying to figure out what else is in our wheelhouse of things we can do.

BB: Well, I heard a little bit of a conversation out in the lobby share those same concerns. We are in the same boat, right? You know, we have my organization. We budget each year to receive roughly \$10 to \$12 million in grant revenue for various things. And everything's in limbo right now. Right? It is not a moment where I think we are not in panic mode by any stretch of the imagination, but we are eyes wide open and we will see what the future brings. We won't know what that is going to be until we know it. You know, until the smoke clears a little bit and, and we get a little more clarity. And so what can the County do? It starts with the conversation. The fact that we are sitting here talking about this, the fact that you all brought Supervisor Heinz's motion forward to look at the opportunity to, to pursue enabling legislation. You know, I think Brian touches on some really important points in that every one of us is providing service to governmental entities that are tax exempt. Some of the because of that, infrastructure requires different levels of training, different levels of apparatus and equipment to deal with different levels of deployment. For. And we are burdened by the entire cost of it, without any for sharing. And so that is why I think this tax initiative is such an important thing for us. You know, one thing I wanted to touch on as it relates to, you know, Prop 310, there was a lot of detractors with 310 that felt that it was, you know, some type of subsidy. And it was subsidization. And I looked at it from the perspective that, you know, the number of tens of thousands of folks travel I-10. We have got the largest stretch of I-10 of any of the districts, high speed I-10. We have got multiple resorts, folks from out of the country. I look at our mountain rescues that we are doing. The majority of those are people that do not live in this community. They do not even live in the state. Right. And so you can make an argument that if they live in the state, they are paying towards fire district assistance tax. But much of what we see, which is, you know, FDAT is something that has not been touched in decades and decades and has not accounted for, you know, inflationary challenges. But a lot of the services that we provide, folks that are going to Madera Canyon, folks that are going to Mt. Lemmon, these are folks from outside of the state. And so when we looked at, you know, the fact that they would be spending some dollars in Pima County while they are here, you cannot pass through Pima County on I-10 without touching at least five districts.

RS: Pardon me for interrupting, Chief Bradley, just because I am cognizant of the time. Let's go back to Supervisor Heinz and then Supervisor Christy, and then I have a couple of requests of the County Administrator that I feel are aligned with the item and also aligned with the question that Supervisor Grijalva just posed, which is, what can Pima County do? So Supervisor Heinz and then Supervisor Christy.

MH: Thank you. And it is just more the more we hear from you, the more I hear from you. You know, this is you should be worried about fighting fires and picking up people who are having strokes and heart attacks, and not about struggling to have the sufficient resources to do your job. That is just that keeps kind of coming back to me pretty clearly. Also, any gap in coverage

anywhere on the fire side of things, if somebody in the foothills is evacuating because of fires started, you know, however many miles away because of a district that did not have adequate resources, it does not matter where the fire started, it is affecting that person's house. Right? So anywhere there is, you know, a breakdown or inefficient or inadequate response time that puts all of us at risk. So this is truly like the whole community needs to be really concerned about this. And another thing that I am more in the hospital medical side of things, but like, you are right, fires do not happen all that frequently. We are super high risk. But the paramedic and EMS response that you do, that is all the time. And that is what I see all the time in hospitals. And so having 17 minutes response time, I mean in trauma it is called the golden hour. You have 60 minutes to get someone who is a trauma, hopefully survivor to a trauma center. Right? And during that time you have to be doing fluid resuscitation, stabilization, all that kind of stuff. I do not need to lecture you about this, but for the public and in heart attacks, certain type of heart attacks or stemi, like you, we monitor this in the hospital and we are graded on it by the government. Right? You have 30 minutes from door to table. I mean the door of the ER to the Cath lab table before. That is how quickly we need to get you in there and have a cardiologist unplugging the coronary artery. So because time is heart, right. Heart cells die and they do not come back. They are not like muscles and other cells. So and the same thing time is brain as you know somebody having a stroke. You have at the most 4.5 hours to administer a clot busting medication to potentially reverse the effect of that stroke. The left side of the body is not working. Five minutes later, I have seen people get fibrinolytic therapy and then they are moving their left side again, but not six hours later, right? So time is incredibly important. And I yeah, we need a short term and a long term solution. I am open and willing to look at anything. I am on the just quickly on the long term solution side. Clearly the voters of Pima County, though, I think the way the money was distributed was flawed. As we discussed from Prop 310, they voted for it. We voted for this by 54% or 55% approval rate in 2022. I think that our voters, if given an opportunity to have a County level measure, referred to them to help with the long term funding solution, I strongly believe they will vote for it once again. And I know that Michael Rossi is working hard. It is difficult this late in the legislative session. I was a legislator for four years myself. Anything is possible. But he is even. Even before we passed this unanimously, he was already looking at ways to find some kind of language consensus to get something through committee and potentially voted on this session. So that is an ongoing process that we are engaging in right now. So thank you.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz. Supervisor Christy.

SC: Very quickly, just Three Points. I think we are going to come up with some more ideas or some more scenarios as the County Administrator and her program to bring a wildfire mitigation plan can encompass a lot of what we are doing. So we have that ability to utilize whatever the County Administrator is finding in her report. Secondly, just to be clear, just from my

own mind, Pima County Attractions does not pay for any subscription services on its facilities?

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy I believe not. Yeah, I am not aware of any.

SC: And my final question to all of you and your association, are all fire districts committed to the Firewise certification program?

BB: I think in terms of, I will tell you that we follow it. What level of commitment I could not speak to, has it gone all the way through board approval and, you know, official resolution and things of that nature. But I think that every one of us, when we are looking at our risk assessments and our risk modeling, but we are limited in certain things, that there are certain things that we can do.

SC: And well, we have in our district, we have several districts that are committed to it and actually have assigned personnel to assist neighborhoods, HOAs, and just general residents to subscribe and to follow the fire certification. I think Chief Wunder would be one of the first people, along with Chief Gunia, up in Mt. Lemmon, to say how effective it is. And I would just hope that through your association, you would encourage all districts to subscribe and support the Firewise certification system as part of the mitigation problem that the County Administrator is going through. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy and one statement and then a couple of requests for the County Administrator, the statement and Supervisor Christy just alluded to, it is that we passed also unanimously a request that there be a report to the Board on what we can do locally in terms of wildfire mitigation. The first request, and that is going to happen within 90 days of the passage of the Board's item. The first request is that we collected some data under the leadership of the previous director of the Office of Emergency Management, and it was continued by his successor. Chief Delfs was helpful in terms of setting parameters for the collection of that data. I am wondering, Ms. Lesher, if you could report back to the Board after talking with the fire chiefs about how we might make use of that data to come up with some kind of standards for response along the lines of what Chief Bradley was talking about. And then the second request, and it is along the lines of what Supervisor Heinz was referring to and has been referred to numerous times since we unanimously called on our lobbyists to pursue legislation that would enable counties the ability to put something on the ballot, similar to Prop 310 to benefit our local fire districts. Could the Board get updates as we are going through this legislative session as to Mr. Rossi's successes and what may be achievable in this session? Supervisor Heinz is correct that we might have acted late in this session, but it is a commitment for the Board beyond 2025 if it is not something we are able to achieve this time. But I just think I would appreciate if we could get updates to our offices. As you are hearing from him, was there anything further from any of my colleagues on this topic?

SC: Other than thanks.

RS: Yes, absolutely. Thank you all. Thank you and Supervisor Heinz, thank you for putting this item on. All right. Okay. So before and thank you, gentlemen again for taking time out of your days. I hope work did not pile up for you while this was coming up. Thank you.

DRAFT