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, May 6, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, 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 9:10 a.m.

1. **EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY**

Pima County and the Regional Flood Control District, to provide for the exchange of property to split and exchange real property assets for more efficient management of the land, pursuant to the 2017 Agreement between the two entities.

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

Supervisor Christy asked about the reasoning for this item since it seemed like it was being shifted between the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) and the County.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that this item was for an exchange of property between the RFCD and Pima County and they were two different legal entities. He explained that the County may have lands adjacent to water courses that should be more appropriately owned and managed by the RFCD, and that the RFCD may have acquired pieces of property that were not needed for flood control infrastructure that the overall maintenance and operation functions could be provided by the County.

Supervisor Christy inquired if the properties were acquired prior to no longer needing the land.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded yes. He stated that the Real Property Department looked at the relative value of those properties and made sure there was an equal or similar value of exchange prior to the request being brought before the Board.

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

2. **CONTRACT**

Jud Co, L.L.C., to provide for El Vado Road storm drain (5ELVSS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Community Block Grant (73.25%) and Flood Control District Tax Levy (26.75%) Funds, contract amount $1,638,225.00 (PO2500010048) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

3. **CONTRACT**

Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for Brawley Wash Watershed Plan, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2500010114)

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 6, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, 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 9:10 a.m.

1. **AWARD**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000113, Enterprise Networks Solutions, Inc. (Headquarters: Mesa, AZ), Logicalis, Inc. (Headquarters: Tempe, AZ), and Sentinel Technologies (Headquarters: Downers Grove, IL), to provide for network equipment -E-Rate Category 2. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year commencing on 5/6/25 and terminating on 5/5/26, with a shared annual award amount of $600,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: Library District Ops Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Library

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

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, May 6, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, 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 9:10 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 Elsa Quijada, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Manager, Pima County Human Resources Department.

3. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

4. **POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Chair Scott acknowledged the passing of Don Riegger, a valued leader, proud supporter of the Boys Scouts of America and District 1 constituent. He stated that Mr. Riegger served as a volunteer for many years, was the former president of the Scouts Catalina Council, and had been a member of the Arizona Theater Company Board and the Tucson Optimist Club Board. He requested a moment of silence be observed in his honor.

Supervisor Christy acknowledged Mica Mountain High School and Andrada Polytechnic High School for receiving an A+ rating as a School of Excellence by the Arizona Educational Foundation. He stated this was the fourth year in a row that both schools had received this honor and they were located in the Vail School District in District 4.

DRAFT

Supervisor Cano offered his condolences to Supervisor Heinz and his family for the passing of his father. He also acknowledged the passing of Clarence Boykins, a valued leader in the community who worked diligently to ensure that the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday was brought to Arizona and fought for the advancement of many African Americans in Pima County.

PRESENTATION

5. **Recognition of the "We A.R.E. Gems" Quarterly Recipients**

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

- Eduardo Puig - Assessor's Office
- Chiara Bautista Carpena - Communications
- Mathew Roberts - Conservation Lands & Resources
- Karen Wilhelmsen - Department of Environmental Quality
- Lisa Matthews - Facilities Management
- Daniela Aguirre - Health Department
- Britt Nigon - Health Department
- Jack Haney - Parks & Recreation
- Troy McMaster - Procurement
- Martha Guzman - Regional Flood Control District

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

Recognition

6. Recognition of the retirement of Pete Kimble, Buyer I, Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, for 23 years of service.

Jackson Jenkins, Director, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, acknowledged Mr. Kimble's 23 years of service and for his outstanding job processing contracts for the department. He expressed appreciation for his dedication to the department and to the County.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Tiffany Wilhelm, Corrections Lieutenant, proclaiming the week of May 5 through May 9, 2025 to be: "CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK"

DRAFT

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.

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Margaret Estrada, Director of Nursing, RN, proclaiming the week of May 5 through May 9, 2025 to be: "NURSES WEEK"

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

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Elsa Quijada, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Manager, Human Resources Department, and the Employee Recognition Committee, proclaiming the week of May 4 through May 10, 2025 to be: "PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Kerwin Dewberry, Coronado Forest Supervisor; Rick Moreno, Coronado Forest Deputy Fire Staff Officer; Lathe Evans, Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management South Division Fire Chief; Chuck Wunder, Santa Rita Fire Chief; Steve Lunde, Corona De Tucson Fire Chief; and Joe Gunia, Mt. Lemmon Fire Chief, proclaiming the month of May 2025 to be: "WILDFIRE AWARENESS MONTH"

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

11. Presentation of a proclamation to Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Frank Dillon, Deputy Director, and Kelle Maslyn, Administrative Services Manager, Economic Development Department, proclaiming the week of May 11 through May 17, 2025 to be: "PIMA COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WEEK"

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

12. Presentation of a proclamation to Carlos Ruiz, owner, HT Metals and former Chair of, and District 4 representative, Small Business Commission, proclaiming the week of May 4 through May 10, 2025 to be: "NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

13. Presentation of a proclamation to Alexis Padilla, Vice President, and Dan Turrentine, Food Drive Coordinator, National Association of Letter Carriers Branch 704, proclaiming the day of Saturday, May 10, 2025 to be: "NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS FOOD DRIVE DAY"

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

14. Presentation of a proclamation to Amanda Anderson, Division Manager, Health Department, proclaiming the week of May 5 through May 9, 2025 to be: "HEAT AWARENESS WEEK"

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

Supervisor Cano stated that as the County commemorated Heat Awareness Week, 101 heat related deaths occurred in Pima County last year and this was not just a public safety issue, it was a humanitarian issue. He provided some heat safety tips that were important with the summer nearing.

Supervisor Allen stated that in last year's report that the Board received, it highlighted the effects of the work that the County did around heat awareness. She explained that the County and their regional partners, which included over 20 governmental organizations, nonprofit organizations and faith-based shelter providers, deployed a cooling center at over 40 different sites, including 23 County public libraries, serving thousands of people over the summer months. She stated that the report also highlighted the website that was created to provide people with information in times of emergencies and there were thousands of hits to the website which indicated people were looking at the cooling center map and were trying to locate available cooling centers in their areas. She stated that the County's 2025 cooling center network was going to deploy an updated website, and once the County's partner list was finalized, the County would activate their heat partner response.

Chair Scott encouraged everyone in Pima County, especially contractors who worked with the County and any business that was interested in putting together a heat emergency plan, to view the County's Beat the Heat portal.

PRESENTATION

15. **Firewise USA**

Presentation of Certificates of Recognition to representatives from the following homeowners associations and communities for achieving or maintaining site status in Firewise USA, the nation's premier wildfire risk-reduction program: Peggy

DRAFT

Storniolo and David Krueger-Duncan - Canoa Hills Townhomes, Denise Pape - Canoa Estates, Larry Myslicki - Desert Hills 2, Donna Collins - Portillo Hills II, Bonnie Myers and Jay Kenton - La Canada Desert Homes 1, Bruce Grieshaber - The Springs at Santa Rita, and Sally Crum and Joe Gunia - Mt. Lemmon. (District 4)

Supervisor Christy presented the Certificates of Recognition to representatives from the homeowners associations and communities for their achievement in the Firewise USA Program.

No Board action was taken.

16. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding her concerns with wasteful spending by the Democratic Party, open borders, child trafficking and the lack of education in Pima County.

Shirley Requard expressed her opposition to Climate Change and the concerns raised by Americans regarding the changing climate. She inquired about the County Administrator's response to another constituent's concerns regarding the County's $51 million shortfall.

Keith Bentele, representing the Tucson Alliance for Housing Justice, Lead for TPCH Assistance Performance and Evaluation Committee and Research Professor at University of Arizona, expressed his support for Minute Item No. 23 and the need for affordable housing in order to mitigate Pima County's growing homeless population.

Cory Stephens expressed her concerns regarding the homeless population and how it has become more dangerous in Pima County. She stated that the primarily Democratic Board was the reason the County was getting worse and there were more homeless individuals.

Joel Strabala, Chairman of LD17 for the Republican Party and a member of the Pima County Election Integrity Commission (EIC), stated that he was speaking on his own opinion and not the opinion of the EIC. He congratulated the Elections Department for winning the Clearinghouse Award for its election training program and for an honorable mention for their use of new and innovative tools. He expressed his concerns regarding the Recorder's Office procuring four ballot drop boxes for unattended ballot drop boxes in Pima County and the plan to consolidate the mailing envelope and the affidavit envelope into a single envelope for future elections.

Dawn Lushin spoke in opposition to the City rezoned floodplain property near La Mariposa that was rezoned for the development of 121 luxury rental casitas. She explained that the 16 million gallon basin would cause more damage and danger to the area and would affect the taxpayers in order to mend the issues.

Jane Rojas addressed the Board regarding her opposition to the development of the Casita Village at La Mariposa. She stated that the proposed detention and recharge basin located on the flood plain of Agua Caliente Wash, the Tanque Verde Wash and the Mariposa Polo Grounds, was not a solution but a liability once flooding occurred it would fill up in minutes, requiring costly maintenance while exposing the County to future legal and financial risks.

Anne Miskey, President and CEO, Social Venture Partners (SVP) Tucson, expressed support for the Prosperity Initiative and its policies. She explained that SVP Tucson made the decision to become the backbone organization and lead the Community Coalition for Prosperity.

Jennie Grable, Chief Program Officer, SVP Tucson, stated that the Community Coalition for Prosperity would work across all sectors to build collaborative alignment with the Prosperity Initiative, work in meaningful partnerships with local government, and hold everyone accountable to the commitments made to the families in the community through the policies of the Prosperity Initiative.

Kelly Griffith, Executive Director, Center for Economic Integrity, congratulated Supervisor Cano on his appointment as District 5 Supervisor, and thanked the Board for their support of the Pima Early Education Program (PEEPs) for scholarships. She also expressed her support for PEEPs and the work that was being done to offer high quality early education to the community.

Mark Weigel spoke in opposition to the proposed development known as Casita Village at La Mariposa. He stated that the proposed construction of an 11 acre detention basin would lead to costly maintenance and mosquito breeding issues.

Dave Smith addressed the Board regarding a Systems Management Theory class he had taken and stated that Pima County was a complex system.

Keith Van Heyningen stated that the County looked like a third world country in a time where the budget had doubled in the last five years and he expressed opposition to Non-Governmental Organizations.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Christy requested that the Flood Control District issue a statement addressing the numerous concerns made by several speakers regarding the flood control issue at the Casitas at La Mariposa, and that they provide a conclusion as to what they found versus what was stated by the speakers. He asked that the memorandum be provided to the Board.

17. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 12:26 p.m.

18. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 2:09 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

19. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding Tort Litigation at the Pima County Adult Detention Center.

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

20. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding federal funding and potential legal action.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

21. The Board of Supervisors on April 1, 2025, continued the following:

Elections Operations Report

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

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

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

22. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, continued the following:

Differential Water Rates

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – 10, of the Board of Supervisors, reaffirming support of jurisdictional rate parity for Tucson Water customers. (District 1)

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to adopt the Resolution. Upon the vote, the motion failed 2-3, Supervisors Allen, Cano and Heinz voted “Nay.”

23. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, continued the following:

Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 – General Fund, Three Cents for Affordable Housing

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposing adoption of a new Board of Supervisors Policy, D 22.17 - General Fund, Three Cents for Affordable Housing, to raise $207,000,000.00 over the next decade for the construction and preservation of affordable housing in Pima County, as well as potentially the expansion of initiatives and programs that reduce homelessness and keep people housed.

The initial findings from ECOnorthwest point to the need for an additional 38,584 housing units in Pima County over the next decade that are affordable to families earning 60% or below of the Area Median Income ($48,720.00 for a family of four, 2023). This policy, if enacted as proposed, would allow us to expand our Affordable Housing Gap Funding program and other programs that preserve affordable housing units and keep people housed, in a meaningful way over the next decade. Additionally, it would give us a head start as we further develop and implement a Regional Housing Strategy and Funding Plan, as per the County Administrator’s memo to the Board dated March 20, 2025. (District 2)

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that staff had been asked for information regarding the impact of the $0.03 and her office had sent a memorandum, that had incorrect information, and she wanted to ensure that the Board had received the corrected information.

Supervisor Heinz stated that the Board had done a lot of work on affordable housing and were able to dedicate $17 million in Gap funding from the County and other jurisdictions were also committed to addressing this issue and it was an incredibly important issue for the entire region. He stated that housing insecurity continued to increase and people were paying 50%, 60% and 70% of their income for housing which was not sustainable. He stated that the County had a role in this and much like the County had done with road repair, PAYGO or Capital Improvements, they had other steady funding streams to make an impact like this. He stated that the $0.03 proposal was designed to create, over a decade, a $207 million funding amount to significantly decrease the number of affordable housing units needed in Pima County. He stated that was based off of the latest available data from the study that the Board had commissioned that showed exactly what the next two decades brought in and that over this time 116,000 housing units were needed over 10 years and of that 72,000 units over 20 years needed to be classified as affordable housing. He stated that to help deal with it, 1/3 or 12,500 units would be needed for that first decade and $207 million. He read the following quote from the Arizona State University, Morrison Institute for Public Policy’s 2021 Building Arizona

Constructing a Rental Market that Meets Demand and Serves All Arizonans Report, "The consequences of failing to establish widespread access to affordable housing have been linked with long-term negative effects on health, children, the environment and jobs. Hence, lack of affordable housing is not only an individual problem but has negative collective consequences." He stated that it was important to keep this in mind as they discussed the policy because what they had already done was a smaller scale pilot type program utilizing $17 million to date for Gap funding. He referred to the County Administrator's memorandum dated May 5, 2025, and stated that the previous investments had done a good job in terms of leveraging taxpayer dollars and had tracked the impact of these investments. He stated for example, the first $11 million of annual Gap funding investment leveraged $422.5 million towards development, for a leverage ratio of over 38 to 1, which was incredibly impactful. He stated that as they discussed the update on homelessness there was a distressing report from the federal government potentially proposing to get rid of some helpful, consequential things like State Rental Assistance Block Grants, Community Development Block Grants, Home Investment Partnership Programs, Homeless Assistance Programs, and Pathways to Removing Obstacles. He stated that these were for the proposed federal budget, not necessarily the one that would be passed and enacted by Congress. He stated that the Board was in a position, unlike most jurisdictions in the nation, of being able to commit to this and establish this dedicated amount of funding to be able to take care of a third of the problem and other jurisdictional partners that could help with other things too. He stated that this made sense and that the impact to the average household was $7.10. He stated that it was not a regressive assessment, rather it was a progressive assessment that the County could do since it had control over this particular tax rate. He stated that unlike sales taxes, this was going to impact people differently, for example, if someone had a $1.5 million home in the foothills, they would pay several times more than that $7.10 over the course of the year, but if someone had a fixer upper on the south side, they would pay way less. He stated that this was exactly what he preferred and it was incredibly important that this was looked at very seriously. He read some excerpts from letters the Board had received in support, which was something he had not seen since Pima Early Education Program Scholarships (PEEPs) was initially approved or Emergency Eviction Legal Services (EELS). He added that the Prosperity Initiative was an amazing set of policies approved by the Board and the $0.03 proposal perfectly dovetailed with that initiative. He stated that there was also some inaccurate information that the Board and public had received, so he was happy to hear from his colleagues and was willing to continue the item, if needed.

Supervisor Allen thanked Supervisor Heinz for continuing forward with this proposal and stated that every time Ms. Darland provided her presentation regarding homelessness and what the County had done to address it, it weighed on her because they were building it along with the City and there were these heavy labyrinths of services, bureaucracies, procedures and processes to find the folks that were unhoused, potentially criminalizing folks for being in washes, and trying to match people with criteria around certain types of housing. She stated that it always left her feeling as though they needed to address the root cause, the need to

DRAFT

provide housing and treatment and that people were struggling. She stated that Supervisor Cano previously brought up that folks needed treatment for substance abuse and mental health. She stated that those three things were some of the fundamental services the County needed to be invested in and that anything short of that was spending more money and avoiding what needed to be done. She stated that she did not like contemplating property tax increases for anyone, but as she thought about adding the $0.03 cost and compared it to other costs the County incurred by not investing in housing was greater. She stated these costs included law enforcement, the jail, nonprofit organizations providing services, the County's own services, the courts, and schools when students are absent. She stated that her office tried to quantify what the cost of not digging into the root causes was, but it became complex and large. She supported this proposal because it was an upstream effort and while it could not get them all the way upstream to the level needed, it was leaps and bounds farther than they were able to do without it. She stated that she knew there was a commitment through the commission working on creating a regional housing strategy and funding plan, and while that was being worked on, by taking action at this time for a bold, substantive investment in affordable housing would set the County up with the funds to address the conclusions of that plan. She stated that out of all the tools available for any municipality, property tax was the most progressive tool to take money where there was capacity and less money where there was less capacity and there was no other means to achieve it at the level needed. She reiterated her support of the proposal and stated that given these times of economic uncertainty, it was difficult because they were just starting to see the tip of the iceberg of the ramifications of what the Trump Administration was doing and it was a reason why the Board needed to act to combat the greater housing instability and economic crisis forthcoming.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Heinz for his proposal and stated that it had garnered the support of housing advocates, developers, low-income housing tax credit, and investors that he had spoken to over the last week. He stated that he firmly believed that it was a pro-business, pro-growth, and pro-housing affordability proposal. He stated that the truth was they had faced a real and growing housing supply crisis in the region and families, workers and older adults across Pima County were being priced out of stable housing, and the Board had a responsibility to meet that challenge head on. He stated that the updated fiscal analysis from the County Administrator offered important context, and he was encouraged that they had a clearer picture of the potential impact. He stated that any path forward must be thoughtful and grounded in collaboration and they needed to continue engaging their nonprofit housing partners, local home builders, business leaders and homeowners that would be directly affected by changes to the tax rate. He stated that he would like this conversation continued and that he was interested in exploring how the intent behind the proposal could be aligned with broader efficiencies across County government. He stated that they should be asking themselves where existing dollars could be stretched further, and how to create sustainable investments in housing over the long-term. He stated that this called for creativity and discipline, and he was committed to working with his colleagues and their community partners to ensure they moved forward with solutions that were

ambitious. He stated that this proposal was responsible and rooted in the real needs of the people the County served, and it was a very important issue to the Board. He clarified that his request for continuation of this discussion was not a lack of his desire be in a supportive position. He stated that he was raised in Section 8 housing, and he had firmly seen the need before them with the housing study. He stated that there was 30,000 plus units that needed to be built and the Trump Administration decimated the housing and community workforce at the U.S. Housing and Urban Development. He added that the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, had been used by way of a bipartisan idea at the State and Federal level, but MAGA Republicans could not seem to talk about low-income housing tax credits being positive, even though it was good for developers. He stated that the County would have to focus on what it could do to build supply, and it was one part of the solution.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Christy and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 20, 2025.

24. **Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6**

Appointment of the Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6.

Supervisor Allen stated that much of Justice of the Peace (JP), Precinct 6 was in District 3 and her office had spent a great deal of time speaking with some of the current JPs, and spent time looking at the justice court system to try to understand what the needs were and what some of the priorities were with the system as a whole. She stated that this position was incredibly important, and one of the applicants had pointed out that there were about 140,000 cases that were heard every year within the justice court system, which emphasized the importance of this position. She explained that it was important for the Board to appoint someone who had knowledge of the system and the area and who had a lot of compassion as well as understood flexibility. She stated that this was the system that had the greatest caseload and that the greatest number of people from the communities were stepping into on some of their worst days and worst times possible. She stated that the previous JP for Precinct 6, Judge Ball, was an attorney and one of the things that she had consistently heard was the importance of an attorney filling this role, both because of the need to hit the ground running, and because an attorney was someone who was looked to from the other JPs, who may not have had the legal background, and the importance of an attorney became clear because of those reasons.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen to appoint John Robert Granger as Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6. The motion died for lack of a second.

Supervisor Cano thanked all of the candidates who he had met with individually and had great conversations about the direction of the court, the experience that each candidate would bring and he believed all of them were experienced.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano to appoint David Miller as Justice of the Peace, Precinct 6. He stated that Mr. Miller brought more than legal experience, he brought heart from serving as a law clerk to advocating for children and for his work as a juvenile prosecutor, where he had shown a deep commitment to fairness, dignity and real solutions that centered people, not punishment. He stated that Mr. Miller understood that justice did not happen in isolation, it required collaboration, consistency and trust as they navigated a new chapter for the Justice Courts, and he was ready to lead with a steady hand and a clear vision.

The motion was seconded by Supervisor Allen. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz stated that upon review of the update from the Human Resources Department regarding background checks, he noticed they were not completed. He stated that the criminal background check and employment verification appeared to be ongoing or incomplete and asked if that impacted the timeline to make the appointment on this day.

Chair Scott stated that the Board had did directed Human Resources to conduct criminal background checks and all other background checks, and that if anything were to come up that was of concern to the Board as a result of someone they appointed then someone on the prevailing side could call for the reconsideration of the appointment. He stated that he wanted to thank each of the other four applicants for putting their name forth and that each one of them made compelling and credible arguments as to why they were the best person for the job. He gave a special thanks to his longtime friend Steve Farley, who he believed had always exemplified in every role he had filled, the attributes of a truly dedicated public servant. He expressed his support for Mr. Miller and stated that it was based primarily on his belief that his experience, training and the way he said he would conduct himself in office offered the best fit for what Precinct 6 and Justice Court needed right now. He stated that during his interview with Mr. Miller and during the the League of Women Voters forum, he was impressed with how Mr. Miller said he would meld what he had learned as a professional with his understanding of the role of a JP. He stated that Mr. Miller told him that he felt challenged and somewhat daunted by the prospect of being a political candidate, but was willing to be one because of the importance of Justice Court's duties and its responsibilities to the public, and he was proud to support him.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

25. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, continued the following:

Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28. **Climate and Sustainability Action Planning for 2025 - 2030**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 11, of the Board of Supervisors, to further Pima County's commitments to address the risks of climate change by adopting a Climate Action Plan that aligns with current national and international standards and efforts.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator, stated that the resolution was representative of approximately 20 years of commitment from the Board towards the climate and sustainability efforts. She explained that the County completed all of the directives that had been included in Resolution No. 2022-25, and that this Resolution served as an opportunity to set forth and solidify the County's 2025-2030 planning. She explained that in the April 15, 2025, presentation, she described the kind of framework by which they were doing that, and that they were still connected to the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, to ensure that the County was adequately meeting their carbon reduction greenhouse gas emissions goals. She stated that those were moved up to 60% to the region, and the County would align accordingly for their County operations plan. She stated that they would expand this plan to include adaptation measures such as how the County would address extreme heat and resource it accordingly and how to meet the biggest climate related risks to the region. She explained that they had a climate chapter in their ten year comprehensive plan, Pima Prospers, which underscored that extreme heat, wildfire, floods and drought were the County's biggest climate related risks that needed to be planned for, and they would include adaptation measures such as that in this climate plan. She stated that each priority area had its own kind of regional capacity building, and it had been a wonderful collaboration across the community, area partners, other jurisdictions, and nonprofits. She explained that heat was a good example of that as well as the County's Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions Plan, Pima Climate Action Now and the Wildfire Mitigation Plan. She stated that they would take the County operations portion and make that their County operations

plan for 2025-2030. She explained that the County continued to be a leader in this space and also wanted to ensure and have dedicated language that the County would continue to weave in resilience measures and really tie their climate based work to those that were disproportionately affected, vulnerable, and tied to public health impact, workforce and economic development. She stated that would be done by looking at the true costs and how the County was planning for this in one of their critical area budget pillars that the Board had set forth. She explained that this was an evaluative plan for the Board's consideration and staff would move forward with quarterly updates to ensure that the County, in a data driven way, were meeting those goals.

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

Supervisor Allen thanked Ms. Davis and the other County departments for their work on this plan. She stated that she was excited to see the commitment and energy around it and expressed her support for the item.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

29. **Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.11, Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan Pension Funding.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

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

Staff recommends $1,405,812.00 in budget authority from Non-General Fund Contingency be allocated to the Finance and Risk Management Self Insurance Trust - Internal Service Fund.

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

DRAFT

REAL PROPERTY

31. **Exchange of Property**

Pima County and the Regional Flood Control District, to provide for the exchange of property and to split exchange real property assets for more efficient management of the land, pursuant to the 2017 Agreement between the two entities.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

32. Rincon Manor, L.P., to provide an Affordable Housing Gap Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for Rincon Manor Project, General Fund, contract amount $1,000,000.00 (PO2500009684)

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

Supervisor Christy indicated that the project was located in the City of Tucson and inquired about their contribution.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded there was no funding from the City of Tucson. She stated that it was a County project and the County's affordable housing dollars were being allocated for this project.

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

33. Tucson Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $4,666,356.00/3 year term (PO2500008371)

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

Chair Scott shared the following comments, "These are the two goals of our Pima Early Education Program (PEEPs) Scholarships; to increase the number of 3 to 5 year old children from low income families attending high quality preschools in Pima County, and to increase the number of high quality preschools in Pima County. We are and have been addressing both those goals in a stellar fashion with important support from their local partners, support by the way, that needs to continue. More importantly we are helping children and their families to enhance their potential and well-being and as a result, these expenditures were among the most vital and necessary in our budget. When we invest in one child, what that means to them and

their family cannot be summed up merely by the per child cost, and when we invest in thousands of our children, as we have done since this program started in 2021, the benefits to the future and potential of our community are incalculable. The Board received a memo yesterday from the County Administrator that is attached to each one of these items. The memo lays out the different types of funding agreements and contracts the Board is considering today and it also lays out a clear and compelling rationale for why our partners in the City of Tucson should continue their support of the program. Ms. Lesher also describes in her memorandum how the transition from funding the program through pandemic relief grants to library district funding is both sustainable and not a burden on library operations. She makes brief reference to a change in library district statutes, which enabled the library to fund early education and literacy program like PEEPs, but it is important for the community to know how these statutory changes came about which was through the legislature. Prior to this Board taking office in 2019, the County joined by its partners in the business, childcare and education communities, prevailed upon state government to allow counties to use the secondary tax that funds library districts to help pay for efforts to increase access to quality early childhood education. State government responded in a bipartisan fashion, a Republican state representative sponsored the necessary legislation, and it passed in both houses of the legislature with large majorities, and was signed into law by Republican Governor Doug Ducey. As a result, any Arizona County could do what Pima has proudly done since 2021, and many of the County's colleagues in the other 14 counties have expressed interest in how we have built our highly successful program. Investing in our children is clearly a priority for this Board and the people of Pima County. The program is meeting its goals and we must keep moving forward." He asked for his colleagues' support.

Supervisor Christy stated that it was apparent the City of Tucson was going to be cutting back or was looking to cut back on its contribution, if not eliminate it completely. He stated that there may be situations where other jurisdictions were facing similar budget cuts and asked how all of these shortfalls would be made up.

Chair Scott stated that what Supervisor Christy referred to was in the recommended budget from the City Manager, but that did not necessarily mean it would be included in the final budget. He stated that he had conversations with the Mayor and members of the Council, and he believed there was a very good chance that they would not go along with the City Manager's recommendation.

Supervisor Christy asked when that would be determined.

Chair Scott stated that the City of Tucson's meeting was going to take place this evening, but he did not believe their budget would be finalized at that meeting and would most likely be finalized in June.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he also had conversations about this with the Mayor and a couple members of the City Council. He explained that the County had a different situation with the Library District compared to the City of Tucson, where it

was entirely federal dollars. He stated that the City was going to have to make some room in their general fund, since they did not have another place where they could readily find funds to help make this work.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was not that long ago when she had a child in childcare and she was astounded by how expensive it was, and costs were now estimated at $12,600.00 for a child to get quality childcare. She explained that the implications of providing quality childcare, not just for the child or the family, but for a community overall, were profound in what it foretold for their life ahead. She stated that it was great to see the list of other governments, municipalities, the school districts, organizations and partners who understood the value of early childhood care education. She stated that it was critical to the communities and society to get kids on the right track and she was proud of PEEPs and of the County's commitment to it and hoped that the County continued to see that kind of commitment from everyone else who shared that stake.

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

34. Marana Unified School District No. 6, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $1,503,603.60/3 year term (PO2500008364)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

35. State of Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board, d.b.a. First Things First, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $11,109,903.00/3 year term (PO2500011165)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

36. Amphitheater Public Schools, d.b.a. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $4,666,356.00/3 year term (PO2500009251)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

37. Sahuarita Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $518,484.00/3 year term (PO2500007952)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

38. Flowing Wells Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $1,451,755.20/3 year term (PO2500007946)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

39. Sunnyside Unified School District 12, d.b.a. Sunnyside Unified School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $1,399,906.80/3 year term (PO2500008368)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

40. Child-Parent Centers, Inc., to provide for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, contract amount $1,180,848.00/3 year term (PO2500008464)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

41. Child-Parent Centers, Inc., to provide for the Pima Early Education Program (PEEP), CWD PEEP Special Revenue Fund, $2,812,785.00/3 year term (PO2500007656)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

DRAFT

42. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 9/1/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount $750,000.00 revenue (CTN-CR-21-126)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

43. Marana Public School District, d.b.a. Marana Unified School District No. 6, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 5/31/26 and amend contractual language, Town of Marana Fund, contract amount $139,545.20 (CT-21-489)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

44. Pima County Amphitheater Schools, d.b.a. Amphitheater Public Schools, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, City of Tucson Fund, contract amount $466,635.60 (CT-24-448)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

45. Sunnyside Unified School District 12, d.b.a. Sunnyside Unified School District, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 5/31/26 and amend contractual language, City of Tucson Fund, contract amount $311,090.40 (CT-21-430)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

46. Town of Marana, Amendment No. 4, to provide for the Pima Early Education Program, extend contract term to 9/1/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount $139,545.20 revenue (CTN-CR-21-128)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 33, for discussion related to this item.)

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

DRAFT

Project Design and Construction

47. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for historic preservation services for Fort Lowell historic structures and other properties related to the City of Tucson Proposition 407 for Parks and Connections Bond approved by voters in 2018 and amend contractual language, contract amount $1,870,000.00 revenue (CTN-SUS-23-112)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this was a City of Tucson (COT) park and asked why the County was taking over the repair and maintenance of that park.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded that this related to the historic structures at the Fort Lowell Park, not the park itself, and the COT paid the County to be the experts that dealt with those historic the buildings.

Supervisor Christy pointed out that on Minute Item 50, it seemed like the County was getting money from the COT and then the County was turning around and developing it. He expressed confusion as to why the County was involved in this matter.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that this item and Minute Item 50 were related and Minute Item No. 50 was the contract for the improvements to the historic structures, which was a COT owned facility. He stated that the COT and the County entered into an intergovernmental agreement and the County would lead project management on this project because of their expertise in the historic restoration space, and it was being funded entirely by COT parks bond dollars.

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

Procurement

48. Staples Contract & Commercial, L.L.C., to provide for office supplies, Various Department Funds, contract amount $5,000,000.00/4 year term (SC2500000108) Administering Department: Procurement

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

Supervisor Allen stated it was important that the County kept their money local instead of giving it to large box stores and she supported the use of local businesses because they generated a lot of local economic activity. She indicated that she had spoken with County Administration about how the County could

support local businesses and hoped that in the future, the County could move towards utilizing local businesses for items like this contract.

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

49. Claflin Service Company, d.b.a. CME Corp, McKesson Medical-Surgical Government Solutions, L.L.C., Medline Industries, Inc., and School Health Corporation, to provide medical supplies and equipment, Health Special Revenue (50%) and General (50%) Funds, contract amount $1,200,000.00 (SC2500000131) Administering Department: Health

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

50. MW Morrissey Construction, L.L.C., to provide for Fort Lowell Donaldson House and Commissary rehabilitation of historic structures, Conservation Lands and Resources Capital Project Fund, contract amount $3,582,972.00 (PO2500010930) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

    (Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 47, for discussion related to this item.)

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

Real Property

51. Rillito Park Foundation, Amendment No. 4, to provide an operating agreement for the Historic Jelks House, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount $24,000.00 revenue (CT2400000014)

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

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

52. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 4, to provide for wastewater billing and collection services, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount $450,000.00 (CT-21-367)

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

Sheriff

53. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), to provide a DEA Cooperative Agreement for a special agent to monitor the use and abuse of controlled substances, no cost (SC2500000144)

DRAFT

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

Arizona Community Action Association, d.b.a. Wildfire, to provide a Memorandum of Understanding for the diaper distribution demonstration and research pilot, $34,375.00 (G-CWD-87135)

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 12, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of "Amendment No. 1 to the Continuum of Care Grant Agreement" for Fiscal Year 2024-2025 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for Coalition Assisting Self-Sufficiency Attainment, no cost (GA-CWD-65882)

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

56. **Acceptance - Elections**

Arizona Secretary of State, to provide for the 2023 Help America Vote Act Election Security Grant, $180,722.37/3 years, 6 months term (G-EL-87513)

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

57. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Pima County DEQ Voluntary No Drive Day/Clean Air Program, $257,272.00 (G-DE-82522)

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

58. **Acceptance - Health**

The National Environmental Health Association - FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program, to provide for the Sustaining Food Safety Standards through continuous Improvement and Data Driven Solutions Project, $66,500.00/3 year term (G-HD-79504)

DRAFT

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

59. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for CAViTY FREE AZ Preventative Dental Services Pima County, amend grant language and scope of work, $10,271.00 (GA-HD-85931)

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

60. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for CAViTY FREE AZ Preventative Dental Services Pima County, amend grant language and scope of work, $129,998.00 (GA-HD-69946)

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

61. **Acceptance - Health**

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Pima County - SPRING Initiative for an Equitable and Healthy Community and amend grant language, $1,076,426.00 (GA-HD-66118)

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

Supervisor Heinz asked if the county should accept the grant since there was uncertainty if the County would receive the funds.

Chair Scott stated that Supervisor Christy had asked if there were any items on the agenda that Administrator Lesher identified as threatened and she indicated no, and that the County would continue to monitor any federal grant funding that may be paused or terminated.

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

DRAFT

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

62. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, postponed consideration of this item due to a tie vote:

Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, May 21, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

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

Supervisor Allen indicated that it was her understanding the Board would be considering a fireworks policy at a forthcoming meeting and expressed excitement for that, but until then, she would continue to vote against fireworks permit requests. She stated that she enjoyed fireworks, but had concerns regarding fireworks as they related to wildfires and heat awareness.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Allen and Heinz voted "Nay."

63. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Heather Anderson, Mountain View High School, 3901 W. Linda Vista Boulevard, Tucson, May 20, 2025 at 8:00 p.m.

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

64. **Hearing - Agent Change/Acquisition of Control/Restructure**

Job No. 334462, Sergio Ivan Pinon Reyes, RedBird Scratch Kitchen + Bar, 6444 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Acquisition of Control.

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

DRAFT

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

65. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Specific Plan**

P24SP00003, BLACK ANGUS MINE, L.L.C., ET AL. - E. VALENCIA ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

Black Angus Mine, L.L.C., et al., represented by Paradigm Land Design request a comprehensive plan amendment and specific plan rezoning for approximately 62 acres (Parcel Codes 205-71-002G, 205-71-002H, 205-71-002J, 205-81-007P, 205-81-007Q and a portion of 205-67-006G) from the Low Intensity Urban 0.3 (LIU - 0.3) and the Low Intensity Urban 0.5 (LIU - 0.5) to the Planned Development Community (PDC) land use designation and from the SR (Suburban Ranch) to the SP (Specific Plan) zone, located north and south of E. Valencia Road, northwest of the T-intersection of S. Old Spanish Trail and E. Valencia Road, in Sections 17 and 18, T15S, R16E, in the Rincon Valley Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8-2 (Commissioners Gungle and Cook voted NAY) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

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

1. Not more than 60 days after the Board of Supervisors approves the specific plan, the owner(s) shall submit to the Planning Director the specific plan document, including the following conditions and any necessary revisions of the specific plan document reflecting the final actions of the Board of Supervisors, and the specific plan text and exhibits in an electronic and written format acceptable to the Planning Division.
2. In the event of a conflict between two or more requirements in this specific plan, or conflicts between the requirements of this specific plan and the Pima County Zoning Code, the specific plan shall apply. The specific plan does not regulate Building Codes.
3. This specific plan shall adhere to all applicable Pima County regulations that are not explicitly addressed within this specific plan. The specific plan's development regulations shall be interpreted to implement the specific plan or relevant Pima County regulations.
4. Transportation conditions:
   A. A Master Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be provided with the first phase of the development submittal and shall be updated with each subsequent development phase(s). The Master TIS and subsequent updates shall evaluate, but is not limited to, traffic current conditions, roadway capacity, previous phase submittals, projected site traffic impacts, and mitigation. Off-site improvements determined necessary, as a result of the TIS, shall be provided by the property owner(s).
   B. The existing right-of-way width of Old Spanish Trail is irregular, but it meets the future right-of-way width of the Major Streets Plan. If additional right-of-way to accommodate for any development related off-site improvements on Old Spanish Trail is needed, it shall be determined at the time of permitting and dedicated by the property owner.
   C. The final design, location and functionality of each access point shown in the Preliminary Development Plans (PDPs) shall be reviewed at the time of permit submittal, once a detailed site plan is provided.
   D. The access point servicing residential and commercial uses shall be built with bicycle and pedestrian connectivity as required to meet the Subdivision and Development Street Standards or as determined by the Department of Transportation at the time of permit submittal.

DRAFT

E. A paved multi-use path shall be built to Pima County standards along the Valencia Road and Old Spanish Trail right-of-way property frontage. Connectivity shall be provided to driveways and greenway trails access points. The multi-use path shall connect to the Valencia Road/Old Spanish Trail intersection northwest quadrant ramps and sidewalks. The location, design and phasing of the multi-use trail shall be determined at the time of permit submittal.

F. Prior to the first phase of the development approval and each subsequent development phase approval, written proof of coordination with the City of Tucson is required regarding any traffic impacts to their roadway system.

5. Flood Control District conditions:

A. A Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) are required. The CLOMR shall be approved by FEMA prior to issuance of grading permit.

B. If the Erosion Hazard Setback analysis of the Pantano Wash shows that additional width is required, the site layout shall be modified to provide the necessary area to mitigate flood and erosion risk and impacts to the development and adjacent properties.

C. Dedication to the Regional Flood Control District of the Pantano Wash and Rincon Creek floodway is required prior to issuance of a permit authorizing grading. A 50-foot maintenance access measured from the top of bank for both the Pantano Wash and Rincon Creek shall be provided.

D. The proposed erosion protection along Rincon Creek shown on the Preliminary Development Plan shall be constructed at the same time through one permit.

E. Encroachment into mapped Regulated Riparian Habitat and the FEMA floodplain not shown on the approved PDP is prohibited.

F. The 50-foot Restoration Buffer Area shall be located outside the sewer easement, native species found in the applicable RRH classification shall be used and the restoration area will mimic natural desert conditions.

G. The required riparian habitat mitigation shall be, at the minimum, the required vegetative density for each classification disturbed. Inert groundcover or decomposed granite is prohibited within the mitigation areas. Pervious pavers or pavement will be allowable only for pedestrian circulation up to 4 feet in width. Trails greater than 4 feet wide in Riparian Mitigation areas are prohibited.

H. If the Detention Waiver is not allowable, the project will revise the site layout to provide above ground detention.

I. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development practices distributed throughout the site and when possible, shall be directed to Riparian Mitigation areas and the 50-foot restored open space.

J. At the time of development, the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.

6. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:

A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.

B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.

C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.

D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.

E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

7. Environmental Planning conditions:

A. The property owner/developer shall provide 50-foot open space buffers along the entire east and west boundaries of the project area and shall restore these areas with native vegetation, as depicted on the Preliminary Development Plan.

B. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance, the owner(s)/developer(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove invasive non-native species from the property, including those listed below. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner.

<u>Invasive Non-Native Plant Species Subject to Control:</u>

Ailanthus altissima	Tree of Heaven
Alhagi pseudalhagi	Camelthorn
Arundo donax	Giant reed
Brassica tournefortii	Sahara mustard
Bromus rubens	Red brome
Bromus tectorum	Cheatgrass
Centaurea melitensis	Malta starthistle
Centaurea solstitalis	Yellow starthistle
Cortaderia spp.	Pampas grass
Cynodon dactylon	Bermuda grass (excluding sod hybrid)
Digitaria spp.	Crabgrass
Elaeagnus angustifolia	Russian olive
Eragrostis spp.	Lovegrass (excluding E. intermedia, plains lovegrass)
Melinis repens	Natal grass
Mesembryanthemum spp.	Iceplant
Oncosiphon pilulifer	Stinknet
Peganum harmala	African rue
Pennisetum ciliare	Buffelgrass
Pennisetum setaceum	Fountain grass
Rhus lancea	African sumac
Salsola spp.	Russian thistle
Schinus spp.	Pepper tree
Schismus arabicus	Arabian grass
Schismus barbatus	Mediterranean grass
Sorghum halepense	Johnson grass
Tamarix spp.	Tamarisk

8. Cultural Resources condition: In the event that human remains, including human skeletal remains, cremations, and/or ceremonial objects and funerary objects are found during excavation or construction, ground disturbing activities must cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. State laws ARS 41-865 and ARS 41-844, require that the Arizona State Museum be notified of the discovery at (520) 621-4795 so that cultural groups who claim cultural or religious affinity to them can make appropriate arrangements for the repatriation and reburial of the remains. The human remains will be removed from the site by a professional archaeologist pending consultation and review by the Arizona State Museum and the concerned cultural groups.
9. Adherence to the specific plan document as approved at the Board of Supervisor's public hearing.
10. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
11. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

Dr. Denise Bowls, President, Greater Vail Area Chamber of Commerce, expressed support for the item. She stated that the southeast part of the County was experiencing rapid growth and the project transformed a portion of the mining site into a mixed use development with housing, retail and services, meeting the real needs in the community. She stated that the project supported major employers like Raytheon, the Air National Guard, U of A Tech Park, and Vail School by providing nearby housing and daily amenities for their workforce. She explained that the site benefited from existing infrastructures, recent developments and improvements and supported future transits for pedestrians, bikes and SunTran planning. She stated that water would be provided by Spanish Trail Water Company and ADWR design provider with a proven 100 year supply, expanding services at system redundancy, where it was currently lacking. She reiterated that this development brought essential services like groceries and restaurants closer to families and reduced long commutes while also restoring open spaces and improved access to Pantano Wash and Rincon Creek, preserving the area's natural character. She explained that this site was buffered from residential areas and aligned with the Pima Prospers Comprehensive Plan by repurposing distributed land and encouraging compact, walkable growth. She stated that this was a reasonable development that added lasting value to the region.

Supervisor Christy read the following letter from the Rincon Valley Fire District, "Dear Chair Scott and Supervisors, as Fire Chief of the Rincon Valley Fire District RFVD, I am writing to express our strong support for the Black Angus specific plan. This mixed use redevelopment project represents a forward thinking, well-planned effort to meet the growing needs of southeast Pima County." He explained that the letter expressed more support for the project.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Chair Scott to close the public hearing and approve P24SP00003, subject to standard and special conditions. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz asked what the land was previously used for by the mine. He stated that he wanted to know if there was environmental mitigation necessary and how that specifically had been determined.

Chris Poirier, Director, Development Services, it was currently being operated as an aggregate mine and he believed the mine was taking up soil and dirt to use to manufacture concrete and other fill. He stated that it was currently active, and it was currently private property, so it was not under the same scrutiny as the proposed Rosemont Mine being located on federal land. He reiterated that this was a private mine with minimal restoration requirements. He explained that staff looked at this repurposing as a huge step towards a more meaningful restoration to the site. He stated that what was a giant hole would now offer viable commercial and housing opportunities for people in that region.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he wanted to ensure that before the Board voted that there were no toxins or chemicals that were involved with this process, which could impact the lives and health of the people that would be living there.

Mr. Poirier stated that it was his understanding that this was primarily an area of which resources were being extracted from, not necessarily application or the use of chemicals to convert anything into anything else. He stated that it was taking dirt out of the ground in this situation.

Supervisor Christy stated after discussion with the developers, they were in the process of discussions to retain two different environmental mitigation groups to address the situation and to return the properties to its former self prior to its use as a mine.

Chair Scott pointed out that the coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection had supported this project and encouraged the Board to approve it.

Supervisor Allen stated that she was encouraged by the support from the Coalition, and also encouraged by this use of this plan, converting a mine into mixed use development. She explained that it was exactly what the County needed to be doing and investing in, given their housing crisis, and the air quality issues that mining could contribute to. She thanked the developer and the community for moving this forward and also thanked the Development Services staff on their work to make this happen.

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

66. **Hearing - Conditional Use Permit**

P25CU00001, JUAREZ - W. AJO HIGHWAY

Jaime and Cherie Juarez request a Type II Conditional Use Permit for a mailbox store in accordance with Section 18.14.030.B.6 of the Pima County Zoning Code in the GR-1 (Rural Residential) zone, addressed as 15895 W. Ajo Highway. Staff and the Hearing Administrator recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 3)

Standard Conditions & Requirements pre the Pima County Zoning Code

1. A mail servicers store is allowed in the GR-1 zone as a conditional use per Section 18.14.030.B.6.

Special Conditions – Hearing Administrator

The following Special Conditions incorporate detailed input provided by the Development Services Department, the Department of Transportation, Department of Conservation Lands and Resources, and the Regional Flood Control District.

1. This conditional use permit approval is for a mailbox and mail-services store and its customary related activities only. No other non-residential or commercial uses are authorized by this approval.
2. Development of the property shall proceed in substantial conformance with the updated site plan submitted in conjunction with this conditional use permit. A full Development Plan/Site Construction Permit shall be submitted for review and approval.
3. Regional Flood Control District review and approval is required at the time of permitting.
4. Department of Transportation's Subdivision Development and Street Standards (SDSS) clearly stipulate a paved connection to W. Doyle Street. The physical connection of the project to Doyle Street shall be in accordance with all SDSS requirements for safety, maneuverability, sight visibility, etc.
5. The property owner shall achieve compliance with the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System (CLS) Guidelines by limiting onsite disturbance to no more than 15,360 square feet in total, in conformance with the approximate location and configuration shown on the submitted site plan.

Cherie Juarez, Applicant, stated that when she and her husband originally filed for the mailbox store, they put that they would like to have some small retail shops inside with the post office. She explained that per the special conditions that were given, it was for the mailbox only and no other commercial uses. She stated that they were being held in the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Lands System. She explained that they purchased the 2.35 acres of property and were allowed to use 15,360 square feet or 20% of their property, that they were not allowed to make other disturbances, but the Board was talking about fire risks, and her property was covered in grass and dead trees. She explained that when purchasing the property they were not aware that it was on County Conservation Land and if they would have known that they would not had purchased it knowing they could only use 20% of the land. She stated that her portion of the property was very small compared to the rest of the property that was owned by the State of Arizona. She explained that as the Board talked about fire hazards, they needed to keep in mind that the property the State of Arizona owned was vacant. She stated that there had been multiple fires that started in the Three Points area just from lightning striking the ground. She stated that it did not appear that any of the other businesses on Ajo Highway were held to this compliance for not clearing all of their property, and that

there were multiple properties that had cleared almost 90% of their property. She explained that another issue she and her husband were running into was the special condition requiring them to pave a portion of the road and the cost estimate they received to pave that small portion was $14,000.00. She stated that the area was labeled as unincorporated Pima County and on their conditional use permit they needed to abide by this condition of paving that little piece of road.

Supervisor Allen asked staff to explain the requirements on this land and how it related to the requested permit.

Thomas Drzazgowski, Deputy Planning Official, Development Services, stated that this was the second hearing of a two-part hearing process that went to the Pima County Hearing Administrator on March 12, 2025. He explained that in the lead up to that hearing, the applicant worked with Development Services staff on the environmental planning issues in regards to the conservation land systems. He stated that this did require 80% of the property to be set aside in regards to what existed on site. He explained that invasive species that were not native to the property could be removed without issue and that included buffelgrass and other non-native plants. He stated that there was also a discussion about the types of retail use that were occurring and anything that was incidental or minor to the use of the mailbox store was not an issue. He explained that if the applicant had different uses such as restaurants or uses that were not incidental to the primary use, that would be different than what was presented at the last hearing, and his office would want to work with the applicant before proceeding.

Supervisor Allen asked the applicant if knowing that invasive species could be cleared from the property addressed their concerns.

Ms. Jaurez responded in the affirmative. She stated that the only other type of retail that they were going to try to add to the mailbox store would be a tax preparation service for the community, because there was not one in the community. She explained that a lot of residents in the area did not have vehicles or the ability to drive into town. She stated that the way the postal service worked was if the house was not on a paved street within a half mile of their mailbox their packages would be left at the post office and that could be a 36 mile round trip. She reiterated that she wanted to have income tax services or accounting type services available to the residents in that area

Supervisor Allen asked if staff could respond to the applicant’s response.

Mr. Drzazgowski responded that something like tax preparation services which were only for a couple of months of the year would be considered incidental and something that would be allowed based on the conditions that were included in the Hearing Administrator’s recommendation. He explained that in regards to the species of plants that were on site, if the applicants took photographs of them and sent them to the Development Services Department, staff would work with them to

help identify if there were invasive species and whether or not they could be removed to the best of their ability.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and approve P25CU00001, subject to standard and special conditions.

67. **Hearing - Rezoning Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 10, P24RZ00007, Ybarra - S. Butts Road Rezoning. Owner: John and Denise Ybarra. (District 3)

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

TRANSPORTATION

68. **Hearing - Street Facilities Development Fee Study - Draft Report**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-1102, conduct a public hearing on proposed new street facilities development fees, as presented in the draft Fee Study. Fee study may be approved no sooner than 30 days after this meeting.

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

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

69. **Federal Funding and Potential Legal Action**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding federal funding and potential legal action up to and including initiating/joining a lawsuit against the federal government.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to direct the Pima County Attorney's Office to file a lawsuit, as discussed in Executive Session.

70. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

* * *

DRAFT

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Public Safety Personnel Retirement Board**
   Election of Ryan Pretti, to replace Costaki Manoleas. Term expiration: 12/31/29.

2. **Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission Membership and By-Laws**
   Approval of the revised Commission membership/by-laws to include representatives from the Tohono O'odham Nation and Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

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

3. **Special Event**
   Jose M. Alday, Our Lady of Fatima Parish, 1950 W. Irvington Place, Tucson, May 17 and 18, 2025.

4. **Temporary Extension**
   012100028641, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Three Canyon Beer and Wine Garden, 4999 N. Sabino Canyon Road, Tucson, May 3, 2025.

ELECTIONS

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

   RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:
   Teresa Zimmerman-061-DEM, Carol Workman-145-REP

   APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:
   Autumn Luepke-009-DEM, Loretta Loomer-016-DEM, Deja Operana-Foxx-045-DEM, Lee Ziesche-047-DEM, Rebecca Tingley-057-DEM, Christopher DeYoung-058-DEM, Ann Wollin-074-DEM, Christopher Elsner-082-DEM, Kimberly Cartwright-105-DEM, Brad Voirin-108-DEM, Joellen Madru Campbell-127-DEM, Andrew Becerra-134-DEM, Anna Sanchez-157-DEM, Angela R. Castro-159-DEM, George Hunt, Jr.-164-DEM, Heidi Snow-178-DEM, Colton Annibel-199-DEM, Valerie Bridges-207-DEM, Angelo Robinson-224-DEM, Janessah Yazzie De La Cruz-235-DEM, Gene Einfrank-245-DEM, Nathan Davis-252-DEM, Gracie Rodriguez-272-DEM, Francine Brinkley-Burke-016-REP, Raoul Garza-036-REP, Andrew Altwegg-042-REP, Shuron Harvey-048-REP, Arturo Messina Garcia-053-REP, Robert Martin-055-REP, Linda Mattern-060-REP, Efecan Ozkol-062-REP, Rohan Sahay-062-REP, Carmen Lyon-120-REP,

DRAFT

Juan Ciscomani-142-REP, Laura Ciscomani-142-REP, Rebecca Freeman-162-REP, Suzanne Kane-172-REP, Fernando Ledezma-172-REP, Patricia Hanson-262-REP

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

6. Minutes: February 4, 2025
Warrants: April 2025

* * *

71. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

21. The Board of Supervisors on April 1, 2025, continued the following:

Elections Operations Report

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
CH: Constance Hargrove, Director, Pima County Elections Department
GCK: Gabriella Cázarez-Kelly, Pima County Recorder

RS: We will turn it over to Item No. 23, Unfinished Business, Elections Operations Report, Administrator Lesher?

JL: I will turn it over to Elections Director Hargrove. Thank you.

RS: Thank you very much, Ms. Hargrove? And also want to point out that we have with us our County Recorder Gabriella Cázares-Kelly.

CH: Good afternoon, Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Lesher. We are pulling up the PowerPoint presentation now. So, when I recognized that this item was on the agenda and that was not quite sure what the item entailed, but I did put together a presentation and some numbers to try to address maybe some of the questions that may have come up about cause for transitioning from precincts to vote centers and so, on this first slide that you are seeing, of course, elections, there are always two major costs, it is people and ballots, right? And so, anytime you have people, the cost is going to fluctuate per election and the same thing with ballots, those ballot costs fluctuate per election. We have temporary workers, we have warehouse workers, front-end workers, tech workers, ballot process workers, which is the early board and the receiving board, and the early board kind of struggled through during the last election based on the fact that we had a two-card ballot, which we will probably see more of that in the future with the legislature and their ballot initiatives. Ballot referrals, we have already seen a couple come through, so it was possible that we will have a two-card ballot in the future, so whereas those

DRAFT

costs could have gone down, they will fluctuate and probably go up some with those ballots. Ballot cost is affected by the type of election that we hold as well. We have primary elections where we have to have a ballot style for each political party and then that breaks down into precincts as well. We have at least over 3,000 ballot styles per primary election, and that number goes down a little bit for general elections, because we are not producing a ballot for each political party. Then you have the different types of ballots, you have federal-only ballots and so that multiplies the number of ballots that we actually see. But the good news is that we are not printing ballots in the Elections Department, preprinted ballots the way that we were before. Since we moved to vote centers, we now have ballot-on-demand printers, and with ballot-on-demand printers, that allows us to print ballots for the individuals when they come in, as opposed to ordering hundreds of thousands of ballots that may never be used and we just shred them and put them in the trash bin, so they just get shredded where they are never used, but ballot-on-demand printers are saving us a lot of money. The E-Poll books and printers also allow poll workers to be more efficient in their job. The voter comes in, they scan their ballot, they scan their ID, they issued in their ballot, they mark it, and then they can leave, it was more efficient than having a paper roster. So, even though the initial cost, which we get to of implementing vote centers with the equipment that we need to use it is saving us money and making things more efficient, and those costs will continue to go down. Next slide please. So, the estimated cost that was presented, I believe, early in 2022, if not late in 2021, and then the board adopted vote centers in 2022, the projected cost savings for before implementation was $289,484.00. The initial number of vote centers that were presented to the Board of Supervisors was 100, and by the time we ended when I got here in April, by the time we ended going into the August 2022 primary election, we were at 129 vote centers, and we used 126 vote centers in the 2024 election. Next slide please. So, as we look at those one-time costs that are associated with the implementation of the vote center, a lot of this was in the implementation plan that was presented to the Board of Supervisors as the proposed cost. I will not read all of them, but the total startup cost was $1,199,234.00, that was the proposed startup cost for both Elections and the Recorder's Office, but the actual cost was $1,207,521.00, and so there was some additional one-time costs that fed into that in addition to the increased cost of the printers when those printers were changed out before the election. There you can see that there was a little bit more cost to implementing the vote center for one time cost and then there was, of course, the HAVA grant that was used for implementation to purchase the voting equipment with a net cost to total one year cost is $504,796.00, and the actual cost for the implementation was $597,652.00, which actually is not bad with all of the additional changes that we had to go through to implement that. Next slide please. So, this is where we get into the ongoing cost of conducting elections with vote centers, as opposed to precincts. The proposed cost for the Recorder's Office was $55,000.00 for Precinct Central, which is the licensing for the electronic poll books that we use on Election Day. The cost for the Elections Department proposed cost was $207,900.00 for licensing fee but included in that cost were other programs that we do not actually use just for vote centers. We would use them if we had precincts, we would use them anyway. So that was $192,000.00, in addition to the actual $50,000.00 that we would actually pay for

licensing fees for the election. And then, consumables, we have printer toner costs, thermal paper and so, the annual proposed cost was $354,600.00. The actual cost for ongoing costs, the Recorder will still pay $50,000.00 for licensing fee, we will pay $15,625.00 for licensing fee because we did purchase some additional electronic poll books after the initial purchase and the Verizon fee, the data plan is what we use, the cradle points that we use, basically a hotspot to run the vote centers on Election Day so that the electronic poll books can communicate across the County to update each poll book so that no one is actually voting twice. And then the consumables, as we broke that down by election, that cost would be half and the total actual cost is $148,175.00 to actually run the vote center with the equipment that we purchased. And so, the ongoing cost is lower than the proposed cost because it included an inflated cost for inventory management, poll worker management, online training, and all of those different items that actually are not specifically associated with the vote center. Next slide please. Oh, I will say from the previous slide, the Recorder pays the licensing fee for the electronic poll books because they actually own the electronic poll books. We utilize them on Election Day with the voter file from the Recorder's Office and so that is why that is the way that it is, even though it was split, we work together to ensure that those poll books are updated properly. So, what effects the cost of elections? Well, of course polling places affect the cost of elections. Prior to going to vote centers, we were beginning to lose schools as polling places and that continues even till today. Libraries, there was no charge for libraries. We use libraries, we use park facilities, we use churches, community centers, hotels and other facilities to conduct elections and all of that factors into the cost of running an election. So, post 2020 we know there are fewer schools, many churches declined to be vote centers, or even polling places at all, and then we were required to move into hotels, which is very costly to run an election as a polling place. Next slide please. So, in August of ‘22, we had approved locations, there were 12 schools, 8 libraries, 42 churches, 10 hotels and 52 other types of facilities, and in November of ’22, we had 18 schools, 10 libraries, 45 churches, 8 hotels and other facilities. So, you can see that there was a little bit of fluctuation between the hotels, where we reduced that by at least two hotels, and the churches, we picked up a few more churches that were willing to host us as vote centers. Next slide please. So, in 2024, there were 10 schools, 10 libraries, 46 churches, 4 hotels and 56 other facilities. And you see the bulk of our polling places are housed in churches and in other facilities, not necessarily schools. We use as many libraries as we can, but some of the libraries are smaller and we are unable to use those as a polling place. And here is where we get into the actual cost of the election. So, what I tried to do is pull together as much information as I could to crosswalk it, even though 2012 through 2020 were precinct based voting, 2022 and 2024 are vote centers, and so I was able to pull the information for these years where temporary workers as you can see, 2024, there were $604,000.00 spent on temporary workers but we also had three elections in 2024. Whereas, if we look back at 2020, there was $396,000.00 rounded up, $397,000.00 spent on temporary workers. 2020 is one of those anomaly years where they were using less temporary workers because of COVID and so they were trying to have less people actually in the building. So, the 2024 temporary workers also speaks to the two-card ballot that we actually had to deal with in the General Election. So, we had to staff up and

DRAFT

ensure that we had more people in 2024. So that is not showing a cost savings, overtime is comparable with 2018 and 2020, where we were in the $200,000.00 range. Election pay and mileage very comparable across all elections, 2016 was actually higher than 2024. 2016 was roughly $944,000.00, whereas 2024 was $808,000.00, so that number is staying level but beginning to go down a little bit but ballot cost is where you see the huge difference. If we would look at 2012 because that was a long time ago, we had $1 million that we spent on ballots in 2012, then we also spent $1.1 million in 2020. The Elections Department spent $474,000.00 on ballots in 2024, and that covers the elections in 2024, which is a significant cost savings. Hotels for classes, we did increase the number of hotels we use for classes because we did increase our classes. We have a simulation class, which is one of the reasons we won a Clearies Award from the Elections Assistance Commission. We use our online training class, as well as the simulation classes that we put together, where poll workers can go in and actually walk through an election day and some would be voters, some are Inspectors, some are Marshals. So, they actually role-play the entire class, and they changed positions at least three times so that they can understand what was going on. So, while that cost has increased, it does actually benefit Pima County to have those trainings. The cost for polling place rent actually has decreased from most of the elections, 2014 is a midterm election so, not a Presidential, but all of the Presidential election years 2012, 2016, 2020 were higher than 2024. So, 2024 we spent $76,000.00 roughly, in 2022 we actually spent $83,000.00 and that was precinct based. Equipment delivery, the cost of labor and trucks has increased, so the cost of that also increased. Next slide please. And for election pay there has been a decrease from previous election cycles of at least $136,000.00, I spoke about 2020 being kind of an anomaly because of COVID. Ballot cost has significantly decreased, the County saved $653,000.00 during the 2024 Primary and General elections. Polling place cost has decreased by $7,400.00 and overall election cost has decreased for the Elections Department by $295,000.00, really kind of keeping in line with what was expected in the beginning. Next slide please. So, we do anticipate additional cost savings with vote centers as we refine the processes, as we understand better who is voting at which vote center, how many vote centers will need more resources and those, some of those vote centers will need fewer resources because the turnout does not warrant them having as many poll books or as many workers as they have, so with the reallocating and realignment of the vote centers, there will still be more cost savings that we will see. Cost is also, we have been talking about legislation depending on the legislature, so it really depends on what the legislature does, whether or not we will save money. And coming up in 2026, is an additional cost, because we now have to receive early ballots from individuals. We receive early ballots anyway, they can drop off their early ballots, but this is separate from that. If the individual comes into a vote center and they want to show their identification, we have to have a separate section where we keep those separate, we stamp them ID verified, they go in a separate box. So that adds for us another check-in station where we can keep track of who has come in and actually dropped off a ballot so that they are not actually going to another vote center and maybe, possibly, trying to vote again. So, we have the ability to do that, which is great, they drop those off, they are ID verified. The legislature, their intent is that they do not go through signature

DRAFT

verification, so Recorder Cázares-Kelly and I have to still work through that process of how we are going to handle this new process of early ballots being dropped off that will not be signature verified and dealing with the voter credits but that was one additional thing that the legislature has added for the 2026 election cycle. Next slide please. And it was very obvious looking at the graph, that 2024, we did save money in 2024, operating vote centers is not really costing the County more money, but there are other outside factors that factor into how much we spend on running an election, preparing for an election, and actually counting the ballots. Next slide please. You see 2024 at the top and it was a little shorter than the others because it was a graph but you can also see where the cost has decreased, and ballots is the yellow, 2012 was huge. The cost for ballots in 2012 was huge, that cost fluctuates, in 2022, we spent more money in ballots, I spent more money in ballots creating a contingency plan in the event that possibly the equipment did not work but that was not the case and we were able to not do that in future elections, which saved us a lot of money and did not plan to use the express vote ballot marking devices when we do not have two-card ballots as our contingency until we can get things up and running again and the ballot printers printing. Next slide. That is kind of an overview of the cost, the savings and maybe where they may increase. Are there any questions?

RS: Any questions from Board members?

MH: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the presentation and congratulations on the recognition, I think that was well deserved. So, why, you referred earlier in the presentation to certain polling locations deciding that they did not want to be polling locations anymore. What was there, is there like a theme for some reason or what were you finding in that?

CH: So, there are different reasons. I am sorry, Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, there are different reasons for that. In 2022, the main reason was because we were still reeling from the 2020 elections, some of the churches decided they did not want to have anything political in their buildings at all, so they opted out. Of course, schools, it was a safety issue for schools, they did not want individuals in the school that did not need to be there but that was 2022. And then we fast tracked to ‘24 for the schools, it was more of parents threatening board members at their board meetings, and the Superintendent Dustin Williams, he actually told me a story about one board meeting where the board members had to be escorted out through a back door because the meeting was so rowdy. They were concerned about not just the students, but about the administrative staff and maybe even the teachers, because we may not be able to control where voters go on Election Day when they come into the building because we do not know if they are all coming in to vote, they may be coming in to do something with the school and the office. So, they were concerned about that, and they did not want to have anything to do with elections at all.

RS: And Supervisor Heinz, just to add to that, as a former principal, I asked that my school not be used as a precinct because on voting days we had more of a challenge of making sure that students were staying where they were supposed to

be, and students were sometimes taking advantage of the relaxed security around the perimeter to leave campus.

MH: Well, okay, one more quick question. I know the legislature made some changes, but it sounds like if it was going to complicate things on your end a bit, but that should, I would hope, greatly decrease, like processing and verification and like time to be able to tabulate the ballots, right?

CH: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, yes, that is actually the intent, absolutely.

MH: Okay. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Director Hargrove, back in 2022, you presented a cost analysis of what it would be to go from precincts to vote centers, and in the last page of your presentation, you provided the Board with a cost and savings of a vote center model and this is a copy of that and it has various titles, headings of costs and annual costs and savings. Could I ask a favor? Could you give this to the director for me and take a look, so, remember make sure I am saying the right thing here. Do you recall that?

CH: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy I recall seeing it, but I was not here when it was presented. The Board adopted vote centers in January, and I started working here in April.

SC: Okay, using that as a model that was presented to the Board on this, may I make a suggestion, and may I also request that on your time, if it is possible to do, that it be provided to the Board, and that was basically to take that page that shows the proposed costs, then show the last elections' actual costs under those same headings, and then a third column with a variance?

JL: I am happy to. Chair Scott, if I may, thank you Supervisor Christy, I think I am understanding your questions, and we will try to get a response back to you. Thank you, but it is my understanding that today's item was to understand what we anticipated to be the cost of the elections when it changed the vote centers and what it is. So, is there information that we have not presented that would be helpful?

SC: I am just trying to compare apples to apples from what we…

JL: We have not done that?

SC: From what the proposal was.

JL: And so.

DRAFT

SC: In the same manner that it was presented. So quite honestly, there was a lot of facts and figures here and to try to add them all up, sometimes it did not work right and did you actually print 10 million ballots?

CH: No. Chair Scott. No, that is why you have the revised documents, because there was a math error in there. No, I did not print 10 million ballots.

SC: So basically I am just looking for apples to apples.

JL: I would be glad to get back to you, thank you.

SC: What we were proposed, so that at your convenience, that would be very helpful. Just two quick questions. You mentioned the amount of vote centers, initially, I think they were proposed from 126 down. No, I am sorry, from 100 to 126, our office insisted that we add Kirk Bear Canyon Library, which by the way happened to end up being the busiest vote center of them all in the last election, but from 100 to 126, how did we get from 100 to 126?

CH: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, just so you know, I did present the information it was just in a different format. So, it is on one of the slides, it would be fairly easy for me to provide that information to you. How did we get from 100 to 129, initially, in August of 2022. I believe it was a request from the Board of Supervisors.

JL: Chair Scott, if I may. I believe that each of these vote centers that were added came at the request and direction of the Board. If it was helpful, we are happy to go back and pull together a quick report, the 120 we started with and the various Board action that moved it up to 129, and then what was finally agreed to when we went to 126.

RS: Ms., if I could interject, I also remember that we sought input from the cities and towns and also from the political parties, and that also, I believe, led to some of the increases.

SC: Okay, so this was a matter of jurisdictional and Board input, and requesting that those be included or added to?

RS: And the political parties.

CH: Yes, sir.

SC: And the political parties. Okay, also, what we were able to glean from the staffing element, it looks like there has been probably a 25% increase to a third increase in staffing from year over year. Is there a particular rationale for that or purpose for that?

CH: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, which item are you looking, is that temporary workers or election day workers?

DRAFT

SC: Election workers in general.

Ch: In totality?

SC: Yes.

CH: I really cannot speak to that but I know that we did use a lot more workers last year preparing for and actually conducting counting ballots for the General election. Yes, we did have more workers in general there, but I cannot speak to whether it is a 25% increase, I was not counting heads, I was only looking at the cost.

SC: Okay. Alright.

CH: But I would be glad to go back and take a look at that. And I know overall that pay has increased a couple of times, especially for the intermittent employees, so that the cost has increased. We did give a little small pay bump to the poll workers, and so that may be contributing to some of the costs, but 25%, I am not sure.

SC: Any new positions created?

CH: For poll workers? The only position was a clerk position, Equipment Specialist.

SC: Tech support?

CH: That would be my permanent staff, and then the intermittents that actually would work with them preparing for any election.

SC: Alright, thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Supervisor, are member to member exchanges allowed on this dais?

RS: Absolutely.

AC: Okay, thank you. Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, I was just hoping that you might help me understand your placement of this item on the agenda, and if there was any additional information that you think would be helpful. I have heard concerns, inquiries about increased employees, the rationale behind why we are having more polling centers. To my knowledge, we saved the County taxpayers money through this transition to the voting centers. Can you help me understand if there was something that we are not answering?

SC: No, I think those are legitimate questions. My whole purpose was to follow up with what was presented to the Board, that by going to voting centers, it would actually

DRAFT

achieve cost savings, and I just wanted to see the proof of that. The one way I wanted to see it was something that I thought might be helpful, at least in my case, to compare apples to apples from when the first proposal was presented to the Board based on the proposed costs and how those same costs are reflective today. That was my whole motivation for this.

RS: Thank you Supervisors. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you and thank you Director Hargrove for the presentation and for the analysis. I am glad to see that the model and the change is saving taxpayer money and also just that it was a model that I continue to hear feedback, positive feedback around. That it provides people the flexibility and convenience to be able to participate effectively in our elections, that people can stop by and vote on their way to work, on their way home to work, on their way for lunch, and that is the way that we can bolster a much more participatory democracy, so thank you.

RS: Thank you. Any other comments or questions from supervisors? All right, we are now going to go. Did you have something you wanted to add, I am sorry Ms. Hargrove, please go ahead.

CH: I am sorry, Chair Scott, but for the cost savings, the apples to apples comparison. Early on in ’22, and 2023, and my first quarter report, I did provide that. And then again in March of ’24, I provided that but these would be the final numbers after we have had all of the elections that I will now provide the same information.

SC: Okay. Thank you very much.

[The Board returned to this item after approval of Minute Item No. 56.]

RS: I just wanted to ask before I move to our next presentation because the Recorder was kind enough to be here today. Anything that you wanted to share with us, ma'am?

GCK: Thank you, Chair Scott, Board. I just wanted to say that when we originally had these conversations about cost and savings, not cost savings, this was never proposed as simply a means to reduce that cost per taxpayers. What this whole initiative for vote centers was intended was to make it more accessible for voting. We were seeing outrageous numbers of provisional ballots being issued to our voters. More than 27% of voters were being issued provisional ballots, which, number one, is time consuming for them to be processed, it was scaring a lot of people, they were thinking that their vote did not matter, which ultimately leads to disenfranchisement. And if they were issued a ballot that was out of precinct, even if that ballot completely matched what they should have been given, that ballot was wholly discarded in an attempt to provide… It was a Supreme Court ruling, basically, that says that we had to wholly discard those that means that many people's votes were not counting. By instituting the vote center model, the very first year that we implemented in 2022, which of course is not a Presidential election

year, but we went to 3.6% of provisional ballots, meaning instead of issuing 21,000 or 18,000, we went to delivering 2,500. In this, 2024, we had 6,800, which was only 9%, so going from 27% of provisional ballots to 9% means more people's votes counted, that more people were confident in the system, that it was working and so, again, when we continue to ask for these improvements in elections, it is to make it easier for people to participate, it is to restore the confidence in voters, it is to ensure the security. And we are closely working with our legislators, we are closely discussing these best practices and these policies with the other County Recorders and with the other elections directors throughout the State. And so, the more that we demand of elections, the more that we are going to have to invest in that security for our voters. I want us really to move away from this concept of really thinking about the savings, but really to, overall, think about the investment in the integrity of our election system. Thank you.

RS: Thank you and to that point, I know that we not only saw in the presentation, the savings we had in ballot costs, but one of the points that was made when we shifted from precinct based voting to vote centers was that when we had precinct based voting, we had to print as many ballots as there were voters in that precinct, and so we would have thousands of blank ballots in these precincts that then had to be accounted for after the precinct was shut down. To speak to your point about security, that was one that I thought of when we also saw the cost savings in ballot costs since moving to vote centers. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Oh, I am sorry, the Clerk is reminding me that I did not announce that we had gone back to Item No. 23.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Hi, Recorder Cázares-Kelly, good to see you. I really appreciate you being here today because I think that one of the issues that has come up with election integrity over the last several years is, really two things. Number one, the need for quicker ballot processing, even a proposal that was vetoed by our Governor that would require a same-day processing of these ballots. I was hoping that you might be able to walk us through some of the logistical challenges that would pose if, I do not know, 30,000 people dropped off their ballots on one night and kind of counter, from your perspective, this notion that it is an easy process. Every ballot, if I am mistaken, let me know, is verified by a human and we have guardrails in place to ensure that the transparency, and of our elections are there, right? With that, if, for instance, there were a ballot initiative, one of the many that this Republican legislature put directly on the ballot to require this, would we then expect as a County to have increased costs for staffing and for the administration of these ballots for same-day processing?

GCK: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Yes. I was very much against this concept of eliminating the drop off on Election Day for what we call late earlies. There are so many locations in Pima County that even with early voting, even as accessible as my office attempts to be, we only have 18 locations in a Presidential

DRAFT

election year, and that is us pushing ourselves to the very max of what we can provide to the voters. We try to place those in strategic areas, however, many people will still be driving half an hour, an hour, to an early voting site and so, eliminating that opportunity for people to drop off ballots on Election Day at the 129 different locations, which are often closer to one's home than the 18 locations in Pima County, that is a tremendous burden for voters. We are in a very rural, we have a mix of metro and rural and urban areas, however, it would be devastating for those voters. I think there was often this conception that we mail out the ballots on one day, and that was the only time we mail ballots, and so the voter has 29 days to return that ballot, when in fact, we are constantly mailing ballots throughout the entire early voting time frame, and different people are running into different situations and it was not just people within Pima County, it was also people in Ohio or people trying to make it back the day before Election Day and they want to be here on Election Day to drop off their mail ballot, that they needed to have in their hands. Director Hargrove continues to talk about these two-card ballots, these long, very confusing ballots for people. People are now requesting them more often so that they can sit in front of a computer and they can research their answers. They are trying to be civically engaged and trying to be informed voters and being able to have that opportunity to drop off a ballot on Election Day is so beneficial because we have so many locations here in Pima County where the mail does take ten days. And if there was any issue, many times people do not even know that they have an issue with their addresses until their ballot does not show up. So, if a husband's shows up but their wife's does not, that is when they know to call "Hey, there is something wrong here. I did not receive my ballot, and I do not know what is on the ballot now," and that is when they start calling our office and we work through whatever administrative issue we need to, in order to make sure that person gets a ballot. So again, something like that proposal would disenfranchise voters and it would make it more difficult for people to participate. Thank you.

RS: Anything else Supervisor? Alright. Any other questions or comments for the Recorder? Alright. Thank you so much and thank you to you and Ms. Hargrove for being here throughout the morning. I hope you got to have a nice long lunch while we were in executive session. Thank you.

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

22. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, continued the following:

Differential Water Rates

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 10, of the Board of Supervisors, reaffirming support of jurisdictional rate parity for Tucson Water customers. (District 1)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator

RS: Alright, now we are going to go further back in the regular agenda and I believe we are on Item No. 24, Unfinished Business, Differential Water Rates, this is Resolution No. 2025 - 10. I will move the item.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. Because I put this item on the agenda, I am going to go ahead and start our discussion. We continued this item from our last meeting because there was some thought that members of the Board might have amended language to offer to call for a broader conversation about how we use water in the region. I was and continue to be very willing to have those discussions. What I am unwilling to do is change any of the language in this resolution that points out how inherently discriminatory and unfair it is for the City of Tucson to target one set of their ratepayers. Tucson Water receives the lion's share of our residential and industrial allocation of Central Arizona Project Water. The reason for that is because the utility set a service area many years ago that ranges from Corona de Tucson to Catalina. A third of their ratepayers live in the unincorporated County, a third, and they are represented in each one of the five Supervisor districts. Most of these folks have been Tucson Water customers for decades. While it is true that municipal utilities around the State sometimes charge higher rates to those who live outside City limits, it would be unprecedented for those higher rates to be levied on longtime ratepayers representing such a sizable chunk of the customer base. Let me use the composition of District 1 to point out the contrived and purposeful nature of Tucson Water's proposal. The people I represent live mostly in portions of the unincorporated County but my district also includes parts of Marana, Tucson, and all of Oro Valley. If a holistic study of the costs of delivering water and maintaining the utilities infrastructure were done, it is likely that it would be found that it costs more to serve some of the customers in

DRAFT

those incorporated areas than it does to serve those in the unincorporated areas. However, customers in all incorporated areas are exempt from these higher rates. Tucson Water's proposed rate hike is not based on a comprehensive cost of service study, instead, as can be seen from reading comments from City staff and the local media, they began with an end in mind, jacking up rates solely on their customers in the unincorporated County. With that goal initially thwarted by our successful lawsuit, they cobbled together a methodology as a means to justify their end. It may ultimately pass legal muster, which is why they had both the City Attorney's Office and their paid consultants working on it but that will not make it right. The ratepayers we represent in the unincorporated County have been disparagingly referred to as non-owners of the utility, because they live outside the boundaries of the City, that is an insulting term to apply to your customers who have been helping the utility to grow and prosper for decades. It is equally insulting to infer that these higher rates mostly target the affluent. Again, the customers targeted for these higher rates represent a third of the people served by Tucson Water, they live and work in each one of our districts, and they represent our entire population. The City exempted the County as a ratepayer from their initial rate proposal in a cynical attempt to get the court to dismiss our lawsuit, the court saw what they were trying to do, allowed the lawsuit to continue, and the County ultimately prevailed. We are also exempt from the higher rates in this proposal, and the court did not allow us to represent our constituents as a class last time, so our direct legal options may be more limited. However, this resolution will call on staff to support any other legal challenges to the new proposal and explore, “all things necessary to support jurisdictional rate parity for Tucson Water customers”. Part of the resolution our office has submitted for our consideration notes that by adopting differential water rates, the City of Tucson will end its commitment to serve as a regional water provider but continue to maintain a monopolistic market for its unincorporated water customers, who lack political representation through either the City of Tucson, Mayor and Council or the Arizona Corporation Commission. The people who live in unincorporated Pima County, who make up a third of Tucson Water's ratepayers and who are over a third of the County's population, have only one advocate, only one voice, the Board of Supervisors, and we need to continue to stand up for them, so I encourage my colleagues to pass this resolution. We will entertain any other discussion or comments from Board members. Supervisor Christy?

SC: I noticed from my colleagues, some certain silence that is deafening, and I am disappointed because we are the Board of Supervisors representing Pima County, and we have constituents in the County that, as our Chair so eloquently described, are being discriminated in this really ridiculous and unfair battle for some sort of a control over a utility that is everybody's property. And I also would wonder what it would be like to wake up one day after you get your first water bill living in unincorporated Pima County, knowing that the increase that the City is charging the unincorporated users is not going to maintain, or improve, or enhance the City of Tucson's water system or Tucson Water, but instead it is being used for social services and social means to subsidize City residents in various capacities, such as providing high energy, or high efficient toilets, and washing machines, and other fixtures that deal with water. How would it feel if you were on a fixed income and

you received a substantial increase in your water rate, knowing that it was going to subsidize someone else in the City of Tucson, that the City of Tucson is imposed upon this water rate? Chair Scott, you have done a terrific job of articulating the situation, your delivery on it was eloquent, I think you hit all of the major points, and I support your resolution completely.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much. Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, I want to say that I heard your comments loud and clear, and I take them into consideration with deep respect. My lack of supporting this resolution today is in no way a reflection of my commitment to continue learning how to be an advocate for the people in your district. I want to say to a comment by my colleague from District 4, that Tucson Water is organized as an enterprise, and so when I hear rhetoric that suggests that there are social programs that are benefiting one person or another, that may not be of value to the people, to the taxpayers, I would ask that you understand Tucson Water's financing a bit more to be able to understand this issue. And the water efficiency programs are good, we live in a time of drought, and any kind of energy efficiency technologies, or water efficiency technologies are not only smart, they are economical, and they are wise. And those programs, by the way, I know about this because I helped negotiate them as a legislator for Farmers and for rural Arizona as well. So going back to the issue Chair Scott, a significant majority of District 5 lies within the City of Tucson. Tucson Water has provided service for decades to City residents and across the region, and while I understand the frustration surrounding recent court orders, I do not believe that further litigation is the path forward. It is a fact that delivering water to unincorporated areas costs more. Tucson Water's effort to rebalance rates under the guidance of a cost-of-service study and in compliance with court orders, is not about exclusion, it is about sustainability. Our focus should be on regional collaboration, not courtroom conflict, and County taxpayers should not be footing the bill for legal disputes that strain relationships between our local governments, especially when the path forward lies in negotiation and shared planning. I respectfully oppose this resolution and urge our legal teams and staff to pursue dialog, not division. We are one region, and it is time we start governing like it.

RS: Supervisor Allen? Go ahead.

JA: Yes. So, I think for District 3, about nearly 60% of our constituents live in incorporated areas, about 45-49% of that is the within the City of Tucson, the others are unincorporated areas from Sahuarita and Marana. In thinking about the impact of Tucson Water and City of Tucson's proposal for differential rates, it caused us to sort of take a step back and look at water utilities throughout our district and then also throughout the County. We were surprised to learn and realize that there are now at least 50 different water utilities providing water services in Pima County, and so then we wanted to look at what the water utility rates are that providers are using out in the unincorporated areas or in the areas that are outside the City of Tucson. We have been working with City staff who have been incredibly helpful in trying to

get a good sense of who those utilities are, and what the rates are that they are charging, and exactly kind of where they are in those service areas. This is not information that we already had, so it has been taking a while to be able to pull that together. From the initial look at how those rates are tearing out across the different providers, and we still have to dig in a little bit deeper, but they were all over the place, the rates are absolutely all over the place. From what I am hearing, and what I believe in, is that I do not support the resolution, for I think two things. One is that I think that the tone, and I think that is really similar to Supervisor Cano's take of how we need to be leading through this. I think that the tone is one that is far more confrontational and much less about place of how we do some regional governance and how do we ensure, and particularly that the water rates, I want to make sure that Tucson Water, that for the folks who are low income, that are their clients and customers have access to rebates and supports. I want to make sure that Tucson Water is invested in conservation, like those are some of the things that we think regionally about the work and their operations, I think we need to be a critical part of how Tucson Water operates. So, I feel like the tone of the resolution does not get us to a place of sitting down and talking about how we do the right sort of protections and conservation for our region.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you. So taking a huge step back, I was actually in Michigan with family recently and looking at water rates there in Midland, Michigan versus here in Tucson, and they are almost the same, and so just like forest for the trees, like that feels weird and okay, I am not going to be very popular. Are we paying what we should be for water in a desert? I do not know that we are, because Midland, Michigan is in the middle of like a bazillion lakes, pretty big ones too, and their rate is within just, it was off like by about a nickel or something in terms of, it is based on 1,000, I am going to mess up the units, but it is about the same as what we are paying here, which I find fascinating and a little strange is because we struggle with water here much more than we do with, of course, in Michigan, just overarching observation. I too represent in District 2, like the vast majority of City of Tucson, but I also represent Littletown that is a lower income area that is in unincorporated Pima County and I have concerns. I do not like the fact that folks in Littletown are getting charged or I think now a higher rate because of a jurisdictional boundary. They are not up in the foothills, not that it means that people cannot necessarily afford it but they certainly, I don't know. I have my concerns as well as to how this was done, it is obviously not our direct authority here. I do not support the legal action and wasting dollars but I do support meaningful dialog and I think looking at, how this rolls out for three, five, six months or something, accumulating the data and really looking at that, and then putting together that information and presenting it with some of our suggestions for a policy direction change to the City Mayor and Council would be, I know it is not want you want, it is not in this resolution, but it could be very helpful. I know that is not what you want to hear, but I think I would like that for my own constituents, again I have a small amount of them in unincorporated Pima County, and I think I would like to see how they are being impacted and then present that to the City of Tucson and the Mayor and Council and see, if based on some

accumulated data, that we can maybe get a different policy moving forward before we were to do anything else, like in terms of like a legal challenge. So that is my position.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. I will just say, I absolutely agree in the need for regionalism and increased collaboration, not just between the City and the County, but with all of the local jurisdictions in terms of how we are making use of this most precious resource, but I think when we are talking about what foments division, what causes division. It is not the County that is proposing to jack up rates on a third of our users of the sewer system, it is not the County that undertook this methodology to justify those rates without any consultation with anybody else. I think if you look at the wording of this resolution, it gave staff the ability to enter into dialog with City officials about how we have been handling our role as the regional sewer provider and their role as the regional water provider since 1979. I think we have indicated a willingness to engage in dialog, whereas I think the course that Mayor and Council have set is the one that is more likely to promote division. It is certainly promoting a lot of concerns among my constituents and people around the County who are part of that third of their ratepayer base but I understand everybody's position. I know that this matter divided the board the first time, it will again, but I do not think it is the intent of anybody on the board to sow division. Frankly, I think it is this proposal that has come to Mayor and Council that is sowing division. Supervisor Christy?

SC: You have outlined all of the very good and fine reasons about regionalism and working together and I listened to my colleagues who are talking about taking leadership in a regional role in this matter. It is really hard to take that stance when it is been very clear and made very obvious, overtly obvious, that the City of Tucson is using the leverage of higher water rates for unincorporated residents and users of Tucson Water as a means to blackmail them into getting along with annexation. You do not like high water rates, there is a cure for that, allow the City of Tucson to annex you. This is an undermining, underhanded way of utilizing a very valuable asset that this community has. We have had a terrific working relationship with both the County and the City since 1979, it was denoted that the County will handle the sewer rates, and the City will handle the water rates, and that end of the bargain among other instances that one could cite with the City of Tucson has been used in a nefarious way, and it is very difficult to have any sense of a feeling of working together, of collaboration, of trying to come to a common ground when these types of underhanded methodologies are being utilized by the City of Tucson, so they can enjoy the fruits of other people's money, and to use the money from other people for their own social causes and their own narratives. This is probably one of the most underhanded ways I have ever seen a utility ever be used, and to try to massage it into let us work with the City of Tucson, let us go back to the Mayor and Council. They are not willing to do that because they know that they are in the catbird seat, so I strongly urge our County to take the stance that it has and to continue it, and that is to explore every legal means possible to fight this tactic that the City is using. I have been swamped in my office for many months for my constituents complaining about this, and I know I am going to get much more letters of protest now that my colleagues appear to want to vote this resolution down and I do not see any other

end to it other than some legal remedy that is going to be expensive, it is going to be ongoing, it is going to take a long time, and it certainly will not complete any kind of regional unity. Thank you.

RS: Thank you Supervisor. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Just one quick thing. Please, Administrator Lesher, has there been any dialog on this particular topic? I know there is still ongoing litigation or something, right, so but I mean, can there be any kind of dialog at the staff level without passing this particular resolution? I would like to hear your thoughts.

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz and members of the Board. There has not been a great deal of dialog because we have been in litigation, and so simply not able to talk about some of the underlying issues related to the 1979 agreement, based on that. I think that has been suggested, I think we are all concerned about both constituents, the people we serve, and the resource that is water. We have an agreement that divided the region in 1979, and what is the region looks very different today than it did in 1979 and so I think be more than happy to reach out to the City and to see what is possible in terms of any willingness, but from the City and the County and some of our other partners as well, to take a look at the valley again and say, who is responsible for wastewater, who is responsible for the water resource and how we can perhaps just take another look at 1979 and see what works today. Happy to begin those dialog.

MH: And Mr. Chair, I would just like to do what we can before we look at, you know, lawyers, sometimes it is better to speak more directly, at least at the staff level maybe. Thank you.

RS: Well, Supervisor Heinz, I will just point out that, and I said this in my remarks, it is unlikely that we will be able to mount any kind of direct legal challenge to these rates because the City has exempted us, the County, from these rates. That is what they did during the last lawsuit, and they did that to try and cause us to lose standing in the last lawsuit, the judge saw what they were doing, allowed the lawsuit to continue. But in this new proposal, they have exempted us right out of the gate, so it was unlikely that we will be able to mount any direct legal challenge. The resolution says that we would support any other legal challenges to the new proposal, for example, if there were a collection of ratepayers or homeowners associations, we would be directing County Administration to support those legal challenges, but it is unlikely that we would be able to do the same thing we did last time because of how they have exempted us from the get-go from these rates. Were you going to say something, Administrator Lesher, I am sorry.

JL: [Inaudible] [shakes head “no”]

RS: Okay, alright, let us go for a vote. All those in favor indicate by saying aye? Aye.

DRAFT

SC: Aye.

RS: Opposed?

AC: No.

JA: No.

MH: No.

RS: All right. Item fails, 2-3 with Supervisor Christy and myself in favor. Alright now let us go to other unfinished business.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

25. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, continued the following:

Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
MV: Mari Vasquez, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator
CS: Cory Stephens, Constituent
DS: Dave Smith, Constituent

RS: We do have a time certain item at 10:30, and we are a little bit late for that. The presentation of the Wildfire Mitigation Plan. So, I am now going to turn that to Ms. Lesher and just want to say to our friends who are here for Call to the Public that we will come to Call to the Public as soon as we are done with this time certain item but Supervisor Christy had requested that this item be at 10:30, because he has some members of the audience who are interested in the presentation. So, I will turn it now to Administrator Lesher.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Christy, and in February...

RS: You got promoted.

JL: I am sorry, well. Thank you, my apologies, Chair Scott. In February of this year, it was Supervisor Christy, who I think, leadership began to work with the Board, directing the staff to come back in 90 days with the Wildfire Mitigation Plan, and at that point, Mari Vasquez from our office began to work with a variety of departments, staff within the County, and partners throughout outside of County government to make sure that we could develop a plan that we believe is responsive to the needs of the community, and with that, I know that she has a presentation, and I would like to turn it over to Ms. Vasquez. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Administrator Lesher. Ms. Vasquez, please proceed when you are ready and thank you so much for being here.

MV: Thank you, Chair Scott, members of the Board, today's briefing provides an introduction to the proposed Wildfire Mitigation Plan. We attempted to create a practical and results driven plan, which addressed your concerns from the February

DRAFT

4th meeting that is tailored to our regional capabilities. The initial inventory of resources showed that many internal and external stakeholders in Pima County were already actively working on efforts in response to invasive species and wildfire, and this plan intends to build on those community efforts. Next slide please. According to data from the National Weather Service, Southern Arizona faces a heightened wildfire risk due to severe D2 and extreme D3 drought. May through July temperatures are trending at 50 to 70% above normal, and forecasts show that Southeast Arizona has an elevated likelihood of significant wildfire activity this season. Next slide. Pima County's vast topographical regions create unique wildfire challenges, Rural Interface fires occur where large blocks of wildland vegetation, border homes, and the structures that are next to this, what is called the Wildfire and the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), often have the fine fuels spread the fire. While Urban Intermix fires occur in areas with a high density of homes mixed together with dried vegetation like washes. These fires can jump between vegetation and structures, where the structure can then become the fuel for the fire to spread. Different landscapes require firefighting strategies to adapt between these settings, but prevention efforts focus on defensible space, and mitigation of vegetation can help in both scenarios. Next slide please. Many times, after a wildfire disaster, neighbors ask themselves what they can do to help. The Wildfire Mitigation Plan is anchored in three strategic areas which outline practical actions that we can take now, rather than later. Those three goals are Prevention and Public Education, reducing ignition risk before it begins, and helping residents act early to prepare and stay safe in the event of wildfires. Two, Mitigation, addressing the fuels and vulnerabilities that worsen wildfire severity and spread mainly based on the gasification of our Sonoran Desert by invasive species, and, three, Emergency Response, clarifying the process for response and recovery to wildland events to make sure resources are rapidly deployed and well-coordinated. Next slide. This graphic depicts the specific County lanes of effort that can be identified under each task for the strategic goals of the Wildfire Mitigation Plan. We have Land Use, Fuel Reduction, Emergency Preparation, Public Education, Infrastructure and Enforcement, but embedded through each of these is a consistent element of coordination and collaboration with other agencies. Next slide. Some of the sample tasks under the prevention goal, which is the most cost effective line of defense, include developing a shared calendar to coordinate regional fire safety campaigns, promoting Firewise principles that will help property owners reduce hazards, creating a centralized digital repository that will house prevention guides, tools and maps for community use, and boosting enrollment in MyAlerts and improving evacuation readiness through outreach and drills. Next slide. With Mitigation, the focus will be on increasing vegetation management and invasive species control, with tasks that help to address fuel reduction and structure resilience, piloting innovative approaches to controlling invasive species like Buffelgrass through activities such as targeted grazing, providing better data on where invasives are found and treated will also allow us to allocate resources more effectively, and then encouraging defensible space around homes and promoting home hardening retrofits that reduce the chance that homes could ignite from embers or radiant heat. Next slide. Last, but not least, is Emergency Response, including cross-agency training to further opportunities to collaborate, organizing tabletop exercises

to rehearse, initial attack for firefighting, evacuation and recovery, as well as identifying gaps in services, pre-identifying water sources, evacuation routes and possible utility shutoff situations which will streamline on-the-ground decisions, and a regional task force workshop that could allow us to fine tune multi-agency coordination. All of this, while documenting response roles, so that in the heat of the moment, there is no question who does what and when. Next slide. This slide shows the Wildfire Mitigation Plan collaborators who we consulted through interviews or workshops to develop this first draft. A huge thank you to the Pima County Fire Chiefs Association, who quickly put together a working group to help us guide this plan. But as you can see, it does not rely just on one single department to carry the burden, it requires coordinated efforts and constituent support. Each partner brings their own unique capabilities; by working as one regional team, we can increase our agility, effectiveness and impact, which helps us be prepared and lead with solutions. Next slide. This concludes the presentation for now, we look forward to working together on this community risk-reduction Wildfire Mitigation Plan that helps us build a more resilient Pima County and your continued support ensures that we stay proactive and aligned in our mission. Happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Vasquez. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, thank you, Ms. Vasquez, thank you County Administrator Lesher. This, I think, is a very significant start in a very important factor in our community and outlines the fact that everybody involved is very aware of the dangers of wildfire mitigation and the necessity that we all share in trying to find a solution and how to deal with it when it happens. So, I commend all the efforts that were put together in this preliminary report. I have several questions and a couple of statements, and instead of stopping after each one, let me just briefly list them and you can answer them accordingly to the shortness of the question. I like the idea about the wildfire depository center issue, so if we could get slightly a little more detail about what that all entails that would be great. One of the things in the original memorandum dated back on January 30th of this year that we presented to initiate the Wildfire Danger Mitigation Plan from our office. One of the bullet points that I did not see fully addressed, or really addressed at all, that I think is essential in the overall plan, and that is bullet point number two of the memorandum that states, that we are asking the County to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all County property, particularly road right of ways, parks and conservation lands in wildfire prone areas for opportunities to apply regular and additional clearing. As we know, the County owns extensive lands, much of the land is vulnerable to wildfires. I do not see any kind of addressing or suggestions regarding the County land and how those lands need to be prepared just as much as any lands in any kind of Wildfire Mitigation Plan. So, if we could get some evaluation of all County properties and how we are going to mitigate the wildfire dangers. I have an interesting letter from a constituent, it says, “I am writing about a problem I have encountered in my own HOA that is prevalent in many HOAs throughout our County and State. The HOA governing documents prohibit the fire mitigation best practices recommended by the NFPA and DFFM and other agencies. We formed a Firewise Committee and spent

months fighting for members of our community to be able to do the basic mitigation needed to create a defensible space without violating our HOA requirements. We have succeeded in getting approval but still face implementation issues in a hostile environment. I bring this to your attention because we are one of many HOA's in the area with well-intentioned but outdated governing documents that are putting our community at risk. We need something at the County, or preferably the State level, that overrides these potentially dangerous HOA guidelines." And this is on Creosote Canyon in zip code 85749. This is concerning that there are HOA regulations and stipulations that prevent an HOA from involving itself in the mitigation of wildfire danger and implementing the Firewise plan and I am hoping that the County can either look at a local County regulation that could override this or some type of relief, or at the State legislature, but it is something that cannot go on and on in the next sessions, it needs to be addressed immediately, I am very concerned about that. From the Green Valley Council, they state, "Green Valley Council has in the past administered grant money to our member HOA for Buffelgrass invasive species mitigation. This fund zeroed out two years ago. The mechanism is in place for re-engaging this initiative. Our members applied for assistance through the Council. Applications and member budgets were reviewed before disbursement was made to the Council." And they believe that $50,000.00 was underlined in the plan would be a good starting point for mitigation assistance for the 25,000 residents and 100 plus HOAs in Green Valley. They also went on to state that they think that "the projected cost range is insufficient for the needs of the County. I could spend a good portion beyond the $50,000.00 seed money in Green Valley." They have a significant Buffelgrass issue and they have been taking very proactive steps in trying to combat that and I think their position needs to be addressed as well. From the Southeast Area Council, that is the Vail area and Corona de Tucson and points south and west, and they state that if they had to sum up by feedback into a concise statement, "this is a well-crafted document that checks a lot of boxes. It is, however, a base level plan that doesn't provide a lot of details." They want to ensure that this mitigation plan is crafted and the intention of providing more funding and resources to the fire districts in Pima County, and that we need to ensure that they have the funding and resources to respond. As we know, our colleague Dr. Heinz is very concerned about the financial stability of many district fire agencies and the need for them to be supported. So, this is part and parcel to what we are trying to accomplish here. And then from Mt. Lemmon, their statements are that they need what they call, "the updating of the CWPP," that I believe is the County Wildfire Preparation Plan that is supposed to be updated every ten years, it has expired that. Excuse me, they feel needs to be brought to the present situation. It mentioned that the cost was to be absorbed by that department, and they also are concerned that any kind of grants that they may be able to write for or apply for will be hindered by the fact that the CWPP is not up to date. So, for them to try to seek outside funding, non-Pima County money for these types of things, we need to get the CWPP updated so they can do that as well as for our own edification, and that is from the Summerhaven, Mt. Lemmon community. And finally, I want to note that Chief Jim Tucker of the Rincon Valley Fire Department is expressing support for the Pima County Wildfire Mitigation Plan, and he, "commends the County's proactive leadership in developing this thoughtful, collaborative approach to wildfire risk

reduction." I echo his words, and I am hoping that we can get some concise answers from my questions and add them to a much more significant and effective Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy, Administrator Lesher, that was a lot.

SC: I am sorry to interrupt. Could I ask if there are any members of the audience that might be able to speak to this?

RS: Certainly.

SC: Do we have anyone that wants to make any comments regarding the Wildfire Mitigation Plan?

CS: Corey Stevens, District 2. I would also ask that in addressing this issue, you also address the issue of residents having their insurance policies being dropped. I think that is a critical aspect of this issue because we have had numerous residents, both in District 4 and in District 2. I addressed this issue last year with the Board in a speech, and I think it is a critical issue because of addressing that aspect of wildfire mitigation. We have seen this issue in California, and it is happening here in Arizona, it is happening currently in the Phoenix metro area. The issue was being, last year with the State, and then rezoning the areas, I brought this up with you guys last year and rezoning the fire districts, you had somebody from the State come down and talk about that issue. So, what is happening is the insurance policies are being dropped, so out in District 2, Matt, with a rezoning issue, it is out to Elephant Head, it is out in my area. I am fortunate in my residence because I have a fire suspension system in my house that will not be an issue for me. Chief Wunder is out here, we ran into that issue out in Sahuarita because we had an issue with the fire department Rural Metro leaving. So, this is a huge issue, and you guys need to look into this because it is going to happen here where the insurance companies are going to back out. If we do not get this under control with fire mitigation, the insurance companies are going to back out. Homeowners are going to be left in the dark, and we are not going to have any means to protect ourselves. So, there is that aspect of it, and so you need to look heavily into that issue. With the HOA's not allowing people to be taking care of that mitigation process, it is a huge piece. So, take this extremely seriously, because once a homeowner loses that insurance and being able to protect themselves in that regard, very huge issue and it is happening from Elephant Head all the way down into Sahuarita and then the Vail area, that is a huge piece, so, look at it very carefully. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Stevens. You might remember this because I know you are a frequent attendee at our meetings, the Board did put forth an item that was made part of the County Supervisors Association legislative program for this year and the Governor moved forward with a special task force led by the Department of Insurance and Financial Institutions and we are pleased that Carmine DeBonis, one of our Deputy County Administrators, is the only local County official to serve on that task force that is going to make recommendations to the Governor and the

legislature as to how to address this issue. I thank Supervisor Christy because it was at his behest that we added that to our legislative program and then it was added by the State County Supervisors Association, because it is a concern in all 14 Counties.

SC: Mr. Chairman, is there anyone else?

DS: I would just like to add my two cents to this because this is a critical issue. As you know, we have had fire warnings for the last month. We have been in a drought, although, it is raining and cold today, ironically, but the thing that we have to say, those of us who have actually fought brushfires, perhaps people in this room do not understand. You can certainly talk to our fire professionals. It is toxic in nature, it races, it killed two of my crew members a year after I went over to tankers up in the Coconino, they went to California. California is notorious for the brush fire, well Tucson is too, the Coronado is something we used to talk about all the time. I am so glad you guys are addressing this, this is absolutely a universal. There is no party involved, you know, as the doctor will tell you, this is for all of our people. This is a critical issue and one of the problems you have to understand is, you talk again to the fire professionals, is that the fuel itself is toxic, it is horrible when you fight it and in a wind situation. We all just saw what happened in California, all of it. Do you think we are immune to that? We are not and this is the thing, I live right at the base of the national park here, you know, Saguaro right there in Continental Reserve, and I think to myself, as I look at the brush that we have our little green belt going through our community, no one is thinning that, on one is controlling that, and that brush, literally, will explode. I have sat on the top of Bradshaw Mountain protecting Prescott in a fire, we were watching it go and it is amazing. It is literally like a living creature. No one wants to see that, we saw this on the Catalinas a couple of years ago, and yet, folks, that can be right in our community. So, I really appreciate you looking at this idea and I support you guys helping support the fact that we need to get the HOAs on board. I know, I understand they are worried about aesthetics, this is about safety. So, thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I want to, before I call on my colleagues, just want to see Administrator Lesher, Supervisor Christy had a number of requests for additional information. Anything that you wanted to respond to today, or is that something that you and your team need some more time to compile information?

JL: I think Chair Scott, to provide a comprehensive response, we will do so in writing later but I do think part of what I have heard is there is a variety of things that continue to need to be pulled together not only Carmine's work with the insurance, but also Emergency Management’s work with the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) and get that moving up. We will get ahold of our legislative folks today to see what we can continue to do with HOA, but we will provide a regular update on all elements of this, respond to these six questions and get you additional information about the insurance piece as well.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. Is there any other individuals that want to address this issue while we have the opportunity? Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you Supervisor. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you. So, I have just two questions, and things that I hope maybe we can think about. One is, the MyAlerts system, it is an opt-in system. I like many people, I get the alerts about the blue sedan that might be speeding down I-10 in Maricopa County. So, it seems like maybe there should be a means at which we could do an opt-out or just make it just an alert that we get that fire is barreling down in our County. The second is, a question around how some of the smaller, all volunteer or close to volunteer fire departments out in the rural areas are going to be adequately equipped to be able to engage fully and respond as needed, given the limited resources, because that seems like it is a real crux in the plan, is that we got some small tucked away fire departments that are operating on shoestring budgets and are all volunteers and struggling to get water trucks and some of the basic amenities to be able to be responsive, and so what can we do then, to balance out some of those resource imbalances?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen, if I may, we have since the last time we had many of the fire chiefs with us, we began some initial conversations, but one piece that we looked at immediately that we have asked Mari to dig into a little bit deeper right now, we went through and looked at all of the County owned properties. Old Tucson, Desert Museum, some of the different just rural areas and working with the Assessor's Office looked at what the assessed valuation was, and as a government, we do not pay tax, if we did, what would be the commitment on behalf of the County to that fire district that serves the area? You look at, again, out by Old Tucson and Desert Museum, and they are supported in large part by small volunteer rural fire districts and the largest entity that might be providing a tax base would be us, and we do not. So, we started with looking at, what would add up, to we think initially, maybe, $900,000.00, that would be simply a way that we can value what we would be paying into the fire district as a County and we are going to noodle through that one a little bit more, we can report back. But I think that is one of the ways that we thought, how do we work with the Chiefs, and figure out how do we find a way that makes sense to establish a dollar amount to work with the fire district? Many of the districts have mutual aid agreements, no, all of the districts have mutual aid agreements. We need to make sure that both sides of those agreements have the tools and the information they need to be able to adequately partner.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I was just going to add, in a little bit, to echo what the Administrator said, we are working on some long-term funding solutions with some of the Fire Chiefs that we had here presenting with us to get something passed at the legislature, probably not until next year, potentially. But given the urgency, I would be hopeful, and also this should be very bipartisan, this was never a partisan issue. When I was in the

DRAFT

legislature, this is the kind of thing that, to allow counties to refer things to the ballot so that we can support the fire districts the way we need to long-term. I would hope that kind of solution, Maricopa can do one thing, Pima can do another, Yuma can do a different thing, if that is something that we can get passed through our work at the legislature, I think that would be incredibly helpful for, in terms of long-term solutions as well.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments from my colleagues? Alright, well Ms. Vasquez, thank you very much and I imagine we will be seeing you back here before too long. Alright, thank you.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

RS: We will now go to Item No. 28, which is Update on Federal and State Executive, Legislative and Judicial Actions that affect Pima County. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and I will turn this over to Senior Advisor, Sarah Davis, who will walk us through today's slide presentation. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Davis?

SD: Thank you, Chair Scott, members of the Board, County Administrator Lesher. As we all know, the proposed federal Fiscal Year 2026 budget was released on Friday morning, and so I would be remiss if I did not dedicate my time today to combing through what those impacts look like at a local level across our County program services and grant funding portfolios. So please let this serve as the first pass at that fiscal impact, in cross-walking the 2026 budget. Things we will talk about today is the current barriers to County grant program funding that we have seen through executive orders or actual termination notices or stop funding. We will review the 2026 budget implication and then the State level. This update will largely be tied to fiscal impact thereof. Let me say that in the first 100 days in office, there have been over 143 executive orders issued, the 225 legal actions is now 227, that is roughly 1.6 legal or court actions tied to an executive directive. I want to underscore that only seven of these are closed, these have direct impacts to some of our program funding as they get tied up. So next slide please. The three core ways that we have been monitoring this is through the policy directives that are within the executive orders, a series of those are within some level of court or judicial action. We have been looking across our grant portfolio programing and determining whether it is appropriate or how to modify, based on the executive orders. Of note, we have gotten actual directives from our federal funding agencies or State pass-through agencies to pause, terminate or stop work. Those terminations are on an abridged timeline, typically, a grant closeout can be anywhere from 90 days to 120, these were abridged timelines to terminate work within 30 days. Specifically, the pause from Office of Management and Budget (OMB), original issue, was tied up with New York, albeit Trump, and there is another series of litigative efforts around the reorganization of Health and Human Services and associated grant terminations.

DRAFT

The third way in which we are seeing this manifest, and again this is just a disruption to local funding and programing, is through these massive reductions in federal agencies. We are seeing program staff, key program officers with our federal agencies that are, or programs being closed, and so there is a deep uncertainty of that work going forward and the existence of that funding going forward. In each of these three priority areas, we are seeing enhanced scrutiny on reimbursements, either through added justification within our grant portals, where we submit for reimbursements, or actual non payments, which we will talk about with our Shelter Services Program. Next slide please. So what we have gotten notice of from our federal funding agencies, the board has been updated on our Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) grant terminations. As you know, 90% of the grants received by Pima County Health Department are sourced from DHHS agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and these deal with immunization support, maternal child health and a series of other critical programing such as Opioid work. That reorganization eliminated over 20,000 positions, and there is substantial changes in the fiscal ‘26 budget that will reflect more of that. Pertaining to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), FEMA has withheld reimbursement for our shelter and service programing. We have gotten memorandum and executive orders to define sanctuary jurisdictions, and there will be enhanced scrutiny on all of the grant funding that comes out of FEMA, this includes our disaster response and emergency management planning. We recently received notice from the Department of Transportation, as you know, we have a temporary pause of one of our Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) grants that was received via email from Department of Transportation, but they did issue a memorandum of directives to align specifically with the executive orders around Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and collaboration with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) for immigration priorities. We knew that Housing and Urban Development is going to be the fourth largest agency by which will affect county funding, and that is being realized in the proposed fiscal ‘26 budget. Next slide please. I will go over the overview, and then we will go into the detail of what the contents are of the proposed fiscal 2026 budget. Please know this is proposed, this has to go through the legislature, so we will likely see some substantial changes but we have reported to the board against our fiscal year 2024 spending. Why did we do that? Because fiscal 2024 has some of the larger allocations of federal funding, such as the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Emergency Food and Shelter Programing (EFSP), Shelter and Services Programing (SSP) and Emergency Rental Assistance Programing (ERAP). The fiscal ‘24 funding year also includes grants that are within the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and IIJA and Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). Those were once in a lifetime level Federal funding allocations that were provided to jurisdictions. As we close out fiscal ‘25 expenditures, we will also report that to the Board, but we really wanted to understand what the dollar amount and the proportionality of the funding that would be impacted by the federal government's executive orders or activities and now being realized in the federal ‘26 budget proposal. So, as the Board has been updated, we anticipate that we will not be reimbursed for just about $12 million in SSP. The IIJA was called out in one of our executive orders, and in the budget is

reflected as potentially eliminated, that represents $69 million in County grant awards. It is unclear if we have grant agreements in place, if that funding is still at risk, or if it is completely eliminated but what we really want to focus on is that $52 million balance. So not the big funding from ARPA or SSP, but our block grants, our regular established programing. We got some clarity in the fiscal '26 budget proposal of what the impact would be to those awards, and we think a conservative estimate is that 50% of that, $26 million are slated for absolute elimination or significant cuts. We anticipate this will be higher because some of this is reflected in direct program reflection, but it is also tied up to the reorganization of critical Federal agencies. So next slide please. We will go quickly through this, the DHHS is one of our biggest Federal funding agencies in 2024, it represented over $11 million in grant spending. Proposed elimination exists for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Programing (LIHEAP) and Community Service Block Grants (CSBG) for our Community Action agencies, HRSA, CDC and SAMHSA are all Federal agencies within the DHHS that have substantial consolidation or reorganization. We get grants for maternal and child health, immunization, opioid grant funding, and HIV services. Again, all of these tied together represent over $1 million between Community and Workforce Development (CWD) and our Pima County Health Department. For the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), it represents $1 million in fiscal '24 Federal spending, not just for Environmental Justice, but clean air programing, air quality monitoring and other programmatic work that is essential to our Department of Environmental Quality. As said before, the Department of Homeland Security represents roughly $500,000.00 in fiscal year '24 grant spending but for our FEMA Non-disaster Grant Program, which funds are a lot of critical work within our Office of Emergency Management, they anticipate over $1 million annually, and then we have the $12 million potentially owed for SSP. Next slide please. The Department of Justice (DOJ) wants to reduce State and local grant programing. We had $1.8 million in federal grant spending from DOJ grant programing across multiple departments. Our Department of Energy represents the IIJA elimination that would be $69 million if our current awarded grants will not continue. This also includes to some level, weatherization programs, which seem to be redirected, and we are unsure of what that will mean. The Department of Education, CWD has substantial programing here, a significant portion of their One-Stop customers use adult education at Pima Community College. Our Department of Labor, we knew to some level that the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Programing would be cut, but it represents $4 million in fiscal '24 grant spending, and it is anticipated that the Make America Skilled Again reauthorization would continue to cut that further. Job Corps also has effects not just with our CWD, but our AmeriCorps Programming with our Conservation Lands and Resources. Next slide please. And finally, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) represented over $6.7 million in fiscal '24 grant spending. HUD is, just like DHHS, one of our biggest federal funding agencies and this shows substantial cuts to, not just Community Development Block Grants, which the County has been receiving since 1978 for Housing and Public Service Program and Neighborhood Revitalization but State Rental Assistance Block Grants, which is our consortium, we go into with the City, who is the administrator on Section 8 vouchers. We are seeing substantial reorganization and cuts to our Homeless Assistance Programs, which I think my

colleague might hit on in just a bit with our homelessness update, but our Continuum of Care, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, Emergency Solutions Grants and Homeless Emergency Assistance Programs are substantially cut. That is a lot of our housing opportunity grant work that we partner with the City very closely and that we operate within our CWD programing. Next slide please. For the State legislative update, as you saw, the State was able to pass House Bill 2945, which was a compromise that covered the budget shortfall of $122 million for Developmental Disabilities. I think it is important to note that a lot of the fiscal year '26 proposed budget does pass along, or propose to pass along, some substantial programmatic opportunities to States and local jurisdictions, and whether or not that comes with funding, is unclear. The budget discussions are still happening with the Finance Advisory Committee indicating that there is a slight downturn in State revenues. Although the budget detail has not been released yet, I think there is some potential impact from the Federal budget to pass some costs along to States, so, we will update the board as we get more on that. Next slide please. We are going to close out in a few weeks, our fiscal '25 spending, and we will report to the Board and as the proposed budget moves through the legislature, and I will underscore, we did not talk anything about cuts to Medicaid, cuts to research, this is just strictly the County grant portfolio. We will see more impact from these other agencies, Department of Education, the State level impact, so, we will keep the board apprised of that and if we have a different cost estimate as we finalize our fiscal '25 grant spending, we will update the Board on what that will look like to reduce these programs. And with that, I will take questions.

RS: Questions for Ms. Davis? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: So, tariffs, like looking at the April 30th Arizona Republic, references the Yale Budget Lab prediction that the average household, I guess that is kind of nationwide, but the average household will be looking to pay an additional $3,800.00. That is actually for 2025, but we can project that into the future, assuming that the tariffs remain, I am not quite sure which tariffs are even in existence but there are a bunch right now, especially ones on like food and clothing and household items like that. I guess maybe this is not your, is that plus like where the five-year low of consumer confidence right now, and of course, a lot of our State shared revenue depends on sales tax. I am just wondering, is that something that you factor into the projections? Am I asking the wrong person these questions?

JL: If I may?

RS: Administrator Lesher.

JL: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz, I think what we have been, Sarah's reports have focused on the grants. If Mr. Cuaron does not have it at the top of his mind, he may not. What we can do is simply supplement this with an expansion of the economic indicators that we have been doing as part of the financial report, and look at any of the potentials of the tariffs, but there is information really that we have been

providing related to these issues. Are there not, Mr. Cuaron, related in the economic decision guide?

[Mr. Cuaron was inaudible.]

MH: Okay, and then more to your presentation then, if I may. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, people do not cook to death in their houses if they cannot afford their TEP bill, right? That is what they are proposing to cut, and these are proposed cuts, this is not passed by Congress and enacted, correct?

SD: Chair Scott, Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Heinz, yes, the LIHEAP program provides essential home weatherization, appliance repair…

MH: Got it.

SD: Potentially, connect-to-bill support, but yes, it does really help weatherization, in specifically adverse households that, that contributes to our housing inventory and keeping people in their homes and keeping them safe.

MH: Right, okay yeah, this is pretty remarkable. Thank you.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes, I know… Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know you got a lot on your plate following these things, and I know there is a lot of information that you have to keep track of. Just as a question, do you have any idea about how many of the grants that we are considering on today's agenda may possibly be affected by any of these cuts? Or have you, I know you had a lot to look at, probably this is included, is it?

SD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. I can do a quick pass through. I do not think any of them are at risk. I think the funding is secure in these, but we can look closely and respond back to the Board.

SC: So, Mr. Chair, County Administrator Lesher. Maybe just as a helpful addition to the report we just heard, and we are going to be hearing this on a meeting-by-meeting basis, that we could have a list of potential grants that we will be considering that could be affected by any kind of claw backs, or…

JL: Certainly.

SC: cuts or things, just to…

JL: Yes sir, thank you.

SC: keep the Board on board. Thank you.

RS: And Administrator Lesher to follow up on that point, I know that one of the programs that is proposed for elimination in the 2026 budget from the Trump Administration is the Community Development Block Grant program and we approved our CDBG program at the last meeting. Perhaps another thing that could be added to the reports, is if there are previous actions of the Board that we are hearing are going to be affected.

JL: Might be jeopardized.

RS: Yes. Any other questions or comments from Board members? Okay, thank you very much, Ms. Davis.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: We will now go to Item No. 29. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety. Administrator Lesher?

JL: I will turn this over to Senior Advisor Darland. Thank you very much.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Darland?

JD: Thank you. County Administrator Lesher, Chair Scott, members of the Board. I will wait while the PowerPoint slides begin. Thank you so much. You can go ahead and go to the next slide please. Thank you. Chair Scott, members of the Board, as you are familiar by now, we always begin these monthly updates by just reminding you all that these will always be grounded on activities as aligned with the five priorities that were established by the County Administrator when the office was established in December of 2023. Just real briefly, these priorities include the inventory of existing County and partner programming for at-risk and homeless households, describing and illustrating how services are accessed and delivered to constituents throughout the region, developing County and public-facing communications, as well as developing a strategic and continuous improvement plan with the goal of ensuring programming is responsive, sustainable, and equitably distributed, and finally, developing a means for tracking the efficacy of the County assistance programs to make sure that we and our departments and our partner agencies are always working toward that goal of attainable measures of success. Today's update will touch on topics of activities best aligned with Priorities No. 2, describing and illustrating the response system and care coordination, and No. 3, which is the efforts aligned with the County and public communications. Next slide please.

AC: Mr. Chair? Sorry to interrupt.

RS: Not at all, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Is there a way to get this presentation emailed, if it has not already been sent our way?

RS: I think typically these items are emailed to Board members after the meeting. Is that correct, Mr. Manriquez?

MM: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, it will be sent out as additional material after today's Board meeting.

AC: Thank you.

JD: In terms of what we are doing to ensure both County and public-facing communications are kept up to date and are responsive to the inquiries that we are consistently hearing from both our departments and from constituents at large, a focus in building out this communications effort has been in the establishment of a web page specifically dedicated to the centralized information related to housing for at-risk and homeless individuals, there is a web page dedicated to this. The Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions (OHOHS), and an ongoing priority is, again, to make sure that the links and the resources available are always up to date and informed based off of the complexity of the crisis and the current need, as expressed both by the people experiencing homelessness as well as the constituents in the community at large who are also being impacted by the challenges. As you will note in the Frequently Asked Questions section, County Communications built out a link that you can access on the left-side navigation bar of the page. Each of these inquiries will drop down into specific responses and do include links back to the information, or back to where you can make the reports. For example, answering a question, “What is an encampment?” “How do you report an encampment?” “What happens?” “What does the County do after an encampment has been reported?” “How do you report trespassing?” and “When is it appropriate to call or to dial 911?” Which would be a threats to person or property, violent behavior, trespassing, or when you observe someone who appears to be experiencing some level of medical duress. Next slide please. OHOHS is already a pretty lengthy title, so County Communications created an abbreviated pathway simply by going to a tiny or a short URL. Constituents can get to this page by typing in pima.gov/housing, and that will go directly to this page, where we have predominantly displayed information specific to: “How do I access resources if I or someone I know is experiencing homelessness?” As well as predominantly displaying: “How do I report a homeless encampment?” You will see in the yellow dialog box that there is an underscore signifying a link that goes to a shared reporting tool that the County and the City both uniformly use. This ensures that we have one universal pathway for individuals to report an encampment. When the site is within the incorporated jurisdiction of the City of Tucson, the report stays with the City of Tucson. When those reports fall outside of the City's jurisdictional boundary, they are sent automatically to the County, and the County reviews to determine if it is indeed on an asset that is under the County's maintenance authority and ownership, or if it is actually under the maintenance or authority of another jurisdiction, including the State as we previously discussed in previous updates to the board. Again, these are based off of locations. If constituents cannot access the link, they can always dial 311, and they will be able to talk to someone who can take the report that way. Again, wherever the reported encampment is situated, it will be

sent to the appropriate jurisdiction to address. Next slide please. So, in the last, I believe it was the March presentation to the board, I provided some information related to the annual performance with respect to the regional reports and how many had come in for the region, and what portion or share were those that were assigned to Pima County. Since the beginning of this calendar year, 2025 is already on track to be trending a little bit higher than the prior calendar year, with an average of 945 reports for the region, and the County receiving 96, or roughly 10% of those being locations within the unincorporated jurisdiction. This is not drilled-down data, meaning that the data includes all reports as received by the County or assigned to the County. This does not represent what is actually verified by our County departments. This does not represent the number of people who have been actually outreached to by our outreach services department. So what we are presently doing right now is, and we have some operational tools, and I will get to that in a moment, that are used in the field right now that are going to be adding some clarity. That clarity is going to provide some additional information to ensure, again, that we are aligning ourselves with Priority No. 4 and Priority No. 5 of the OHOHS, which is, again, to develop that strategic and continuous improvement plan and to also make sure that we are tracking the efficacy of our efforts. And we cannot get there with just general data, we have got to get there with a little bit more detail in what our teams are seeing out in the field. I think it is also important to note that, as my colleague Ms. Davis indicated, with a significant potential reduction to the funding, largely to the Continuum of Care funding, and potentially to Emergency Solution Grant funds and even Community Development Block Grant funds. We can see this number only go up because, again, the chance to get people connected to those types of resources for at-risk or homeless households are largely funneled through the Federal government, and it is not yet clear what exactly the impacts will be for our local Continuum of Care. I have a meeting with the City staff person who staffs directly the Tucson-Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness later this week, and this is going to be a priority for our discussion to see how the Continuum of Care is preparing in advance of potential reduction in, and elimination of, these very important programming dollars. Next slide please. So in closing, real quickly I want to talk about the efforts that are underway and developing at present. Not necessarily ready for prime time with respect to the monthly update, but on May 1st, County staff, including staff at the board, were advised that the update to the County Administrative Procedure, the Homeless Protocol, which is presently 50.02 under the County Administrator's page, is out for comment and review with respect to updates to the procedure. This has been a lengthy process involving many stakeholders, including our Regional Flood Control District, Department of Environmental Quality, as well as our Department of Transportation teams and colleagues, our Outreach Services folks, and also in close coordination and review of the processes and procedures of our jurisdictional partners at the City of Tucson. This update includes many recommended improvements, including clarification on the response, coordination and operations, and requirements related to data reporting and ongoing monitoring. Following the 30-day review period, there will be a formal rollout for County staff to review these changes, review both the site and the outreach reporting tools that our wonderful team over at the Geographic Information Systems Division of IT put together quickly, and also to have a high-

DRAFT

level review of some of the best practices related to safety and consultation with our Risk Management folks and our training department and Facilities Management. Date and location details are still to be determined, but again, I want to emphasize that one of the key improvements with these recommendations is a requirement in the data collection to ensure that we are getting the granular level of data to have a meaningful evaluation on the efficacy of our programming and to ensure that we are making data-driven decisions in any sort of improvements. To that end, we will be using the data as collected by the site inspection and outreach reporting tools. These are surveys that have been downloaded to County devices that allow staff to, while they are in the field, geolocate and drop a pin where they are, collect information about the number of individuals observed in the space, and observe information related to the environment. We have also been working with my colleague Ms. Vasquez and making sure that this is informed by her efforts related to wildfire issues and areas that are prone and susceptible to challenges. If an encampment poses a significant risk to the community, these will start to tell us. I am very much looking forward to the next update that I provide you all. It will be to provide how many encampments are being verified as being active encampments. If they are active, how many individuals are being encountered, to get more specific about the services that are being accepted, and if not accepted, why they are being denied. We have been working with the outreach staff to start to pick up more of that data and that information from folks they encounter, and more information related to the general site conditions. We absolutely understand the impacts to County lands and County assets. It is anticipated that these data will be more robust by the time of the June update to the board, and it is also anticipated that the June update to the board will include a walk-through of the final, commented-on update to the protocol, so the board has an understanding of what the County response will be when we receive a regional report of an encampment on a County-owned asset. With that, I am happy to take any questions.

JL: And, Chair Scott, if I may?

RS: Yes.

JL: I can appreciate the concern when there is a lot of very useful information that is very difficult to see and we will ensure that from this point forward, all of these slide decks will be provided to the board in advance of the meeting so that you can have a moment to look at them and actually see the data on your screens as well, so thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. And questions, comments from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and hi Ms. Darland, it is good to see you and thank you for your incredible presentation and your work to the County. I do not know if this is a question for Mr. Holmes or if it is for the County Administrator, but something that is related to this item of homelessness and public safety is a discussion that I have had with your offices in recent days about the implementation of a sobering center

or regional sobering center. Wanted to see if we can perhaps have the County Administrator or the Assistant County Administrator provide us with a quick update on how those discussions are going with our jurisdiction across the hall, what do we call this? The…

SC: [inaudible—microphone off]

AC: …the Plaza? Thank you, Supervisor Christy, it is clearly 3:30 p.m. Because this was a big discussion at Mayor and Council, and it was also, Dr. Cullen was at the last Mayor and Council meeting where this came up and so I am just curious what the County Administrator's commitment is to the sobering center.

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano and members of the Board. That is part of the package that came forward to the Board as part of the recommendations of the Opioid Advisory Committee, and in accordance with our intergovernmental agreements between the City of Tucson and Pima County, and the other jurisdictions as well, have one commission that makes those recommendations. We had been reviewing those recommendations, this Board passed the recommendations, they were not passed by the City of Tucson, and I understand that there is going to be a request for us to look at that again, I have not heard back, but we will be following up. I think that sobering centers and phraseology used about a variety of different kinds of facilities as being almost used interchangeably, we look daily at what can be done to ensure that we have facilities for people to detox. I think one of the main things we look at is, particularly for those who are justice involved, how do we find a way to provide for significant behavioral health as well as substance abuse and issues, rather than taking care of those individuals in the jail? We have been looking at what we need to do as part of our discussions about expansion, and or modifications to the jail, the Opioid program, and all of those dollars coming back. We do not have today a plan to say, here is going to be the sobering center. What we have still just been looking at is the recommendation that came from the advisory committee to begin the analysis of that, and we can continue to update the board on all of the elements of that plan.

RS: Supervisor?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, Administrator Lesher. I would like for there to be a response to the discussion that Dr. Cullen had at Mayor and Council, because I am wondering if perhaps we are not talking about the same thing, but what I heard at the Mayor and Council meeting for the sobering center is that we have a plan in this $8 million that was approved by the board at our last meeting to be able to have a timeline in the next several months. I heard from Dr. Cullen as quickly as possible to have this assessment, perhaps even by the fall figured out. And with that, in a follow up question, that Mayor and Council asked and got some answers to is that we are interested in a pilot project, a smaller amount to make sure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and wisely, and that the commitment that I heard in that Mayor and

Council meeting was that that would happen in this coming calendar year. I do not know if you can review that and if you can provide us with a written summary of your discussion as you are recommending.

RS Can I suggest that, I think we are moving off of this agenda item and starting to talk about how we are making use of the funds for the Opioid settlement.

AC: Well, Chair Scott, I am willing to entertain another discussion, but it is factual that there is a correlation between homelessness and public safety and substance abuse. I believe that they are interconnected, and we will save money with additional treatment instead of doing other things, right? I am with you and I am willing to end it here but I do believe that they are correlated.

RS: I absolutely agree that they are correlated. I think what was proposed by specifically Mayor Romero was a reconsideration of a vote that we took on this dais, and I do not see that vote as connected with this agenda item.

AC: Chair Scott, respectfully, I did not ask for a reconsideration, we are not having that conversation.

RS: No, no no…I know, but I am saying, that is what she was asking for, and that is what I thought you were referring to.

AC: No, no, no, not at all. I think what I am asking for is how does the sobering center generally relate to Item 29, Homelessness and Public Safety, I believe they are there and so perhaps that is a little bit more defined.

JL: Thank you, I can provide a report on what we…

RS: Now I get it, alright, thank you sir. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Happy to provide a report on what my understanding is of what our Health Department has communicated with County Administration about the sobering center. Thank you.

RS: Anything else Supervisor? Okay, Supervisor Christy?

SC: First of all, I appreciate the County Administrator's agreeing that we need, I think all of the Supervisors need this kind of information or this report before today's meeting. There is a lot of information, a lot of good information, we need time to review it, so I am appreciative of that. Over the last several meetings that we have had, it is been made clear to me that there is a distinct delineation between Pima County's efforts and the City of Tucson's efforts. In fact, when I have inquired about certain things involved in this whole issue, you have been unable to answer them because, as you tell me, quote, you “Can't speak for the City of Tucson.” Have we established at this juncture, is there a counterpart to our Pima County staff member who is in the City of Tucson? Any kind of interface that you work with on this issue?

DRAFT

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: With whom do you work, Jen? The most or, I am sorry, Ms. Darland, Mr. Holmes?

JD: Chair Scott, County Administrator. Since Ms. Vasquez came to the County, I believe that there is only one and only Mari Vasquez, you have not even seen the beginning of her but there has been an individual who has been assigned with some of her tasks, in addition to tasks that the individual already has. There has not been, in terms of having someone with which I can liaise on a regular basis to get more information at the policy level of what the City is doing in response to many of the questions that you inquired about with respect to the what they have been spending, the performance on their programming, that is yet to be a position that I have been made aware, that has been filled and tasked with so that I can go and find those answers for you. Thank you.

SC: I would submit that that is a very important factor because this is not just a County problem or a City problem. It is all of our problem, and quite frankly, I also would submit that I am of the feeling that the homeless encampments and the homeless situation, for the most part, is located in the City of Tucson and for you to be able to do your function and your job and your mission, you are going to need to have that element of where most of the homeless encampments are, and where most of the homeless problem exists, and that is in the City of Tucson. Along those same lines, when we talked about these encampments in your report, do you have any idea or any sense as to the percentage of the homeless camps location? Are they in the City of Tucson or are they in Pima County?

JD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Just before I answer that point, I would like to just comment that the individual who does own the day-to-day operations of what Ms. Vasquez did when she was previously with the City, I do speak to him regularly as far as the daily operations of encountering individuals and problem solving when constituents have called my desk or his desk and reported an encampment. On the boots on the ground level, we do have an open dialog with that individual, it is more at the policy level that there has not yet been a replacement for Ms. Vasquez.

SC: I will come back to that comment after that question about the percentage of the homeless.

JD: Sure. I would say there are areas in which there are proximity to resources, right. City of Tucson is the urban core of our County. There are a number of resources that are available to individuals experiencing homelessness, our shelters are namely geographically located here but I would say on the whole, most of the encampment reports, when you drill down to it, are going to be more or less in the urban core, yes.

SC: In the City of Tucson?

JD: Correct.

SC: Madam County Administrator, I would suggest that this relationship that you have established with a similar counterpart in the City, that that relationship be nurtured and more formalized so there could be a more even exchange of information because, obviously, if she cannot speak to what the City of Tucson is doing, the vast majority of the homeless situation and the homeless encampments cannot even be addressed at our level. So, if there is some way we could institutionalize that relationship between the City and the County, your office and this gentleman that you deal with. I think even having him come to attend our meetings, I think it would prove to be much more efficient and much more effective if we have where the core problem really is and that is in the City of Tucson. Thank you.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, if I may. And I do communicate regularly with the City Manager, and I think we can just continue our dialog to ensure that we have a formalized way that we are dealing with this issue and see who might as you know, in the past, Mr. Ortega has been there, we have had representatives of the City. I will continue the conversation with their Manager.

SC: Great. Mr. Chair and Ms. Lesher. What I am trying to avoid is when I submit questions on this issue that my response is, I cannot speak to the City of Tucson.

JL: Thank you.

SC: Thank you.

RS: Any other questions or comments from my colleagues? Alright. I had a question, Ms. Darland, and your response is going to help me to frame a request to the County Administrator. Could you remind us what was the approximate need for additional shelter beds in Pima County that she shared with us in a previous report? You do not need to be exact, but just I think it was around 1,300.

JD: Chair Scott, that is about accurate. I would want to add a little bit of an asterisk next to this. Presently, we are aware that there are beds that are going unfilled in the evenings. I do not have that specific information in front of me right now but what I am hearing, anecdotally, there are shelter beds that are out there that are not being utilized by individuals. We have had this conversation before as you may recall, there are programmatic barriers, there are people, their partners, pets, programmatic requirements, possessions that cannot go into the shelter. So, I say that, yes, I think the number was somewhere in the neighborhood of about 1,200, but I would also caution to say that our current system and the way in which it is utilized, were underutilized. We have not found ways to, and I would say that given the federal forecast, that it would be really important for us to figure out what we could do to strengthen the programming in the existing shelters we already have. That is an opportunity for a discussion with those partners, because I know that those beds going unfilled feels for them to be an opportunity as well, but maybe that is a conversation for what type of programming do they need to ensure that they

DRAFT

can help reduce those, lower those barriers even further to make sure more folks can be served inside.

RS: Well, I think the requests that I am about to make to the County Administrator can certainly incorporate underutilized or unutilized existing shelter beds. But by way of direction, I am asking the County Administrator to report back to the Board with a feasibility study and work plan as to how the County, both on its own and working with our local partners, will meet that need for both additional shelter beds and utilization of existing shelter beds. The feasibility study and work plan should include how we will address the different types of shelter required to meet the needs of various segments of the unhoused community, and also include timelines for completion. In addition, the study and plan should clearly delineate areas where the County can act on its own and where it may need to partner with other entities, especially other jurisdictions. I can email this to you, Ms. Lesher, but your notes are always really good. Alright, and then I also had a request, Mr. Jurkowitz, for the County Attorney, because this is a matter that, as we all know from following local media, has been discussed by Mayor and Council and my understanding from looking at Phoenix Media, is that it is also being discussed by our colleagues on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. I would like the County Attorney to advise the Board as to whether or not we should consider ordinances banning camping in washes, other waterways and other County owned properties. I am taking into account not just safety and the need for people to be in shelter and services, but I am also considering what I understand to be the costs to the County when we are clearing encampments in our washes. I have been part of emails with Ms. Darland and Mr. Shepp with the Flood Control District. My understanding is when we clear an encampment in one of the washes that are the responsibility of the County, we have to work with a contractor to do that, correct? And, so, I think I am not saying I think we should go this route, but I think we need to have the discussion, and this board has not had that discussion, and so I would like that discussion to be framed by your office, and my understanding is those discussions began in executive session in Maricopa County and they can certainly begin in executive session for us as well. But I think we need to have the discussion.

JL: [nods in the affirmative]

RS: So having made those two requests, the County Administrator requested that before we go back to the regular agenda that we move on to the next item under her part of the agenda, which is Item No. 30.

DRAFT

TRANSPORTATION

68. **Hearing – Street Facilities Development Fee Study – Draft Report**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-1102, conduct a public hearing on proposed new street facilities development fees, as presented in the draft Fee Study. Fee study may be approved no sooner than 30 days after this meeting.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
KS: Kathryn Skinner, Director, Pima County Department of Transportation
BL: Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs, Southern Arizona Home Builders Association

---

RS: We will now move to item number 70, which is a hearing, Street Facilities Development Fee Study - Draft Report. I understand that we do have a presentation, and we also have somebody who filled out a speaker card. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much Chair Scott and I will go ahead and turn it over to Director Skinner, who does have a brief presentation. Thank you.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Before we go to the presentation can I ask a quick question?

RS: Absolutely.

SC: Maybe I could get just a thumbnail response or Reader's Digest version. What is the difference between impact fees and street facilities development fees?

JL: Kathryn, do you want to handle that?

KS: Sure.

RS: Ms. Skinner?

KS: Thank you, Chair Scott, members of the Board, Supervisor Christy, there really is not a difference.

DRAFT

SC: Then let me just stop. Why are we changing the title?

KS: Right, so the State statute allows impact fees to be applied to many different types of improvements, Wastewater, Parks, Sheriff's Department. In the County, we use them for transportation, and transportation only, and so these reports pertain to streets, hence the naming convention.

SC: So again, the difference being?

KS: The difference being that the street fees, why we are calling it the street fees, is because at Pima County we only use them for streets. They are not a broader impact fee that might be applied for other public services.

SC: Are we going to be using this term in all these instances now that were formerly impact fee nomenclated?

KS: No, this is actually the same title for the Fee Study that was used five years ago. In the regular jargon, we are going to continue to call them impact fees, developer impact fees.

SC: Okay, thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Ms. Skinner, please proceed with your presentation.

KS: Sure, well thank you, Chair Scott and members of the Board. While they are bringing up the slides, I will say this is the required every five-year update to our Impact Fee Program, which in the County, we use solely for transportation purposes. This is our third visit to the board, there are four in total required by statute to do the update. I was here in January and then February with the first two reports, which were the Land Use Assumptions and the Infrastructure Improvement Plan. Today is the actual fee study that calculates the proposed fee structure for the program. Next slide. So as I mentioned, we began this update last July, we have already progressed through the public posting of the Land Use Assumptions and the project list. We were here in January; we were here in February. Next slide. We are nearing the finish line here, today is the initial hearing for the Impact Fee Study. This is, as you may remember, just a hearing, we will not be asking for approval today, we will be coming back somewhere between 30 days and 60 days to ask for approval of the fees, that gives us time to address any comments that have been received recently or may be received today. Next slide. Again, a reminder, we have seven impact fee areas. This was approved in the Land Use Assumptions and over the course of the last five years of the program, we have collected approximately $42 million. So, it is around a little less than $10 million a year, variable, on how housing permits are going. That is our primary source, although, we do assess fees to all uses, commercial as well as residential. Next slide. The other item that we discussed already was the Infrastructure Improvement Program and I would like to draw your attention to the table that is shown there. That is an indicator of the

construction cost index produced by ADOT for roadway construction. Since we did this assessment five years ago, there has been an 80% increase in the cost of building roadways. We knew that going into this update, and we took that into account when we were considering which projects to include in the project list, and also how to balance that with the increase in fees but there will be an increase in fees because of this severe increase in costs over the past five years. Next slide. So now let us get into the fees and I am not going to do a slide-by-slide on how we actually calculate it with all of the math. A simplified version is that we use a consumption method. There is two methodologies you can look at when determining fees. One is, you determine how many projects you need to do, the cost of those projects, and divide it by the amount of permits you expect in whatever that impact fee area is. That could create variable fees depending where you are in the County. It also can be unconstrained, there is a lot of needs related to the type of improvements for the type of growth we see here. We instead go with a consumption calculation, so that is really specifically looking at how many trips and how much travel does a typical single family residence produce. How much capacity can a single lane of a road take, and how much does it cost to build that roadway. We use many different national standards that look at the number of trips per house, which is about ten trips per house per day, and how many vehicles a single lane of traffic can take in one hour period and that is about 1,000 vehicles. Fast forward, we also look at the cost of projects, right now, it is about $4.5 million per lane mile to build a project. That is all in the construction costs, the design, the planning, the right of way acquisition, the environmental permitting or mitigation that may be required to go along with that project and the construction management, so, inspecting this project, that is $4.5 million just for a single lane for one mile. So typically, we are looking at a four-lane road, a six-lane road, it gets rather expensive rather quickly. Point of comparison, right now we are working on West Valencia Road from Mission to Camino de la Tierra, that is being widened to a six-lane facility, and we are looking at upwards of $4.5 to $5 million per lane mile for that roadway so it is very comparable to a current project. We take that math of $4.5 million per lane mile, we divide it by how many trips or how much of that mile each house is going to use in the peak hour and we come up with a fee. The next slide. We have got a whole host of different fee structures depending on what the use is for that type of permit, as I said, there is residential fees, there is commercial fees. The single family residential is basically our base fee and it is looking at a typical unit and then using trip generation tables that, again, are nationally used. It is what is used when we are doing traffic impact studies. We determine what the increase or decrease from that single family unit would be and have a whole host of fee structures. Now a couple of things I want to mention with this, is we are very aware of the affordability of housing right now, the Prosperity Initiative, and how do we balance what we know is an increase in fees that are being recommended with some of the other needs of the community. Our team at the Transportation Department has worked with Nicole Fyffe from the County Administrator's Office, as well as Sofia Blue and others from Community and Workforce Development (CWD), to look at how we can implement some sort of a subsidy program for eligible affordable housing builders to try to offset some of the burden of this part of a permitting expense, we are still working through that. The previous statute, more

than six years ago, allowed us to waive the impact fees for low-income housing or whatever purpose we wanted to do that waiver for. We can no longer waive fees, so that fee needs to be made whole. If we are not going to apply it to the purchaser of that property, it needs to be made whole from another funding source and hence our working with CWD. With that, I think I have covered most of the items with the program. Happy to take any questions.

RS: Any questions from Board members for Ms. Skinner? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much, Chair Scott and Director, good afternoon. I am going to make a request to the County Administrator and I have a question for the Director. In this helpful information that you have about the geographic areas, I would like to respectfully request that we break down by district in future materials so that I can have a better grasp of what this geographic map looks like for the people of District 5. Certainly, looking at some of the names of the roads, I know which ones are there, but just hoping to have that in future reports delineated. Director, my question is about the impact fee waivers. Can you tell us a bit more about what you just said about us not being able to do it? Is that State law? How would we be able to move a waiver discussion forward?

KS: Sure, thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. So it is State statute that we cannot waive it. We cannot make that fee disappear and just not apply it at all. We can create subsidies that would make it so it is not the burden of whoever is pulling the permit for that house, or that commercial structure, and have a different entity make that be whole. But if it is a $8,500.00 fee, it needs to be paid from some source.

AC: And Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Director, so will there be any kind of plan in the next meeting to set up a program that would allow the subsidies? Is that currently under discussion? I am sure you are aware of some concerns by stakeholders about the total cost. And while we are at it, I think it is important for you to also talk about the phased-in approach that County Administration has committed to with this increase.

KS: Sure, thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. We have already begun conversations with CWD, and those have been going on for over six months now on how we can structure a subsidy program, looking at what is the threshold for those incomes that it would apply to, what is the maximum value that can be afforded for that. And so in future correspondence, we will provide more information on the status of that program. As you may have seen on my slides, it is 90 days after the approval of the fee program when these would be initiated. So, we do not see that happening earlier than September of this year. There is still time to continue that conversation with CWD. As to your second question on the phased-in approach, five years ago when we adopted this, it was during the pandemic, we were having some similar uncertainty about what the economy was doing, concerns from all

sides in terms of what an increase to this fee might do to development in our area and because of that uncertainty, we had decided on a multiyear approach to phasing in this fee. And we sit in a similar state of uncertainty with many things around our economy right now, and similarly, the recommendation has been a multiyear approach to phasing in this fee. One thing to keep in mind is that fee that will be in full effect in three years is based on the numbers today, the cost estimates today. So, we know that in three years, we will be a bit behind in what that fee structure could have been. Again, the statute does not allow us to do an annual construction cost increase based on inflation for this program. So, the fees we calculate based on today's dollars will stick until we do this update again in five years.

RS: Anything else Supervisor?

AC: I just want to clarify something Chair Scott, if that is okay director. I want to reinforce that this is a methodology that has taken a lot of different sets of data to be able to come up with the recommendations. We did not just make this number up, and most importantly, right, the private sector always wants to talk about a market rate. What you are proposing is in alignment with projecting growth and needs, and roads are a crucial part of any kind of increased density moving forward, right?

KS: Sure, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. This methodology is acceptable. It is the identical methodology that we used five years ago. There is a lot of math to it, a lot of actual data that we are pulling either from regional numbers or studies that have been done by Pima Association of Governments. We are happy, staff, our consultant team, are happy to meet with any of you to go into the details of how that fee is calculated.

AC: [nods in the affirmative, gives a thumb’s up]

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes, one of the major stakeholders has a representative here. Would it be advisable or permissible or allowable for the gentleman if he so desires to address?

RS: And he has filled out a speaker card Supervisor, and we are definitely going to call on Mr. Lyons. We just were doing the staff presentation to start the hearing, but thank you. Any other questions or comments for Ms. Skinner? Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you. I am curious about the map of the region. It is not all of the County, the sort of the western end is not reflected in the map and I have a few guesses why, but I am wondering kind of what the, is it that we do not have County roads along the Nation, Ajo?

KS: Sure, Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. That is a great question. So, the map is essentially more of the metro Pima County area. We do not assess those fees in any of the tribal nations and we do not assess them in Ajo. There is not enough growth there to support it and one of the requirements is that you have a nexus

between where these fees are being assessed and where the improvements are going to be built. It is primarily concentrated, again, in the metro area of Pima County. And then the maps themselves, we tried to build areas that had some natural geographic features or roadway geometries that made sense that it was grouped together. I-10 is a natural dividing line, some of the mountain ranges are natural dividing lines and so we tried to build, again, those areas within where we would have a nexus with the roadway improvements.

JA: Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments for Ms. Skinner from members of the Board? All right, if not, I am going to call on Brendan Lyons, who is here representing the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association. Mr. Lyons is also communicated with the board in writing, and his letter to the board is attached to this item, Mr. Lyons? Thank you for sharing your morning with us.

BL: It is my pleasure, thank you, Mr. Chair, and members of the Board. My name is Brendan Lyons, Director of Government Affairs for the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA), located at 2840 N. Country Club Road. I want to begin by thanking you, and County staff. It has been a pleasure to continue to work through ongoing dialog throughout this process, and we appreciate the opportunity to continue to work together in good faith. We heard throughout this morning's presentations and previous weeks, months and years of the ongoing and urgent housing crisis that plagues us today. Housing affordability remains one of the most urgent issues facing our community. The County's own housing needs assessment shows that we need approximately 116,000 homes by 2045, yet studies continue to show that the current regulatory environment already adds 24%, or nearly $94,000.00 to the cost of an average $400,000.00 home. Now the proposed 37% increase in streets facilities impact fees would add over $3,100.00 more, placing even greater strain on working families. We recognize that impact fees are a necessary tool for funding infrastructure, but they must be used with precision. According to the National Association of Home Builders, for every $1,000.00 added to the cost of a new home, prices out 444 families right here in Southern Arizona. The proposal alone could disqualify over 1,200 local households, to that end, we respectfully urge the board to consider three key actions. One, adopt a fee lower than the proposed amount to help preserve affordability. Two, implement a longer phase-in period. I understand that it is currently three years, but ideally five years, to give the market time to adapt. It has been addressed, we also encourage the board to seek out ways to create incentive programs, including impact fee waivers for mixed use, missing middle and below median income housing. Lastly, we continue to have legal and procedural concerns, including cost allocations, particularly to non-construction costs, service level increases, and administrative expenses, which we believe warrant further review and clarification. We share the County's goal of investing in smart infrastructure, but that must go hand in hand with addressing our housing crisis. We urge the Board to delay final action and direct staff to continue work with stakeholders such as SAHBA, to find a balanced solution. Thank you for your time and for your thoughtful consideration.

DRAFT

RS: Thank you, Mr. Lyons. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, hi Mr. Lyons. I have a question, I am curious how SAHBA suggests that we balance the need for infrastructure investment with affordability and the market rate housing sector, particularly given that impact fees directly support road capacity as central to new developments.

BL: Absolutely. We understand that impact fees, 37% increase is very significant. We encourage looking for additional ways, I mean across the board, 37% increase is just way too much, whether it is through property taxes, whether it is through the General Fund, just looking at additional ways to improve.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott, I do not think I got an answer to my question. What is the role, Mr. Lyons, of the private sector in transit, if we are building new houses?

BL: I mean, the role of the private sector is to continue to build new houses, but again, the 24% increase on government fees and regulation just continues to add to this growing crisis.

AC: Chair Scott? You recommended, Mr. Lyons, a phased-in approach, you have that in three years, but you are also asking for a lower amount. So, I want to understand, is there an amount that you would be supportive of that you can present to the Board today?

BL: Sure, well, we continue to have ongoing discussions regarding costs with staff but there is a non-construction cost element to this that includes environmental permitting and other administrative costs where we believe could see a lower reduction of these overall costs.

AC: Okay, thank you Mr. Lyons.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. I wanted to follow up with a request to staff based on Supervisor Cano's questions, and also the recommendations in Mr. Lyons's letter. Before the next hearing, could we get a report on the implications of adopting the recommendations that Mr. Lyons and his organization are proposing? I think that would be consistent with the questions that my colleague had, and also with the request from the organization. It would certainly be informative for the Board. Alright, any other questions or comments? Supervisor Christy?

SC: So, it is the will of the Board and of the Chair that this issue be continued into a next meeting and the items that were outlined in the SAHBA's background letter be addressed in that process?

RS: Supervisor, thank you. This was just the initial hearing as we heard from Ms. Skinner and her presentation. There is another hearing before the Board in June, correct? And I requested that we get some input from staff as to the recommendations from Mr. Lyons's organization prior to that hearing and given the

DRAFT

dialog between him and Supervisor Cano, I think we have some more specificity as to the recommendation that we adopt a fee below the proposed amount. I am just wanting to get some input from staff as to the implications of the recommendations from SAHBA but I also point out that both staff and Mr. Lyons have said that the dialog between staff and all stakeholders, not just SAHBA, continues. And could I ask beyond Mr. Lyons's organization, what other stakeholders are part of this dialog with staff, Ms. Skinner?

KS: Our primary meetings have been with the Metropolitan Pima Alliance (MPA), and with SAHBA, sometimes as joint meetings, sometimes individual. We also in early stages, reached out to many of the developers and the community, sent out mass emails that go out when we put out any of our draft reports. We have not had a lot of feedback from some of those other entities, though.

RS: Okay, alright. Any other questions or comments from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to thank our Transportation Department for their diligent work on this, and I am hopeful for the conversations that can happen with these stakeholders. I do believe that there are many more that need to be a part of this discussion and what I ask of the Home Builders Alliance, since they testified today, is that you really come to these negotiations with the County with an open door and with a willingness to compromise. I do not want this to be a situation where the business community is going to point fingers at us. We hold the public sector accountable by following market rates, by using data driven analysis and this board is going to be tasked with putting a recommendation that can be digestible, and that is going to be able to invest in the long-term planning of our roads and our infrastructure and I just firmly believe that for this to move forward, Chair Scott, it cannot be one of those situations where we are pointing fingers at one another. We are growing as a region and impact fees are a universal tool used in every community to be able to get us to where we need to be. I have deep concerns about affordability, and I want to ensure that that is a key part of the discussion moving forward as well but this is also the cost of doing business and that is my message to the Home Builders.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments? Alright, well if that is the case, I think the only action that we need to take here is to close the public hearing, correct Ms. Manriquez? We do not have to any further action?

[Ms. Manriquez, inaudible, shakes head ‘no’]

RS: Right, I will move to close the public hearing. [inaudible discussion on dais] You do not even need to do that? Okay, Alright, Ms. Skinner, thank you for spending your morning with us.

DRAFT