# FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board 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, June 3, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Present: | Rex Scott, Chair<br>Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair<br>*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member<br>Steve Christy, Member<br>Andrés Cano, Member |
| Also Present: | Jan Lesher, County Administrator<br>Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:55 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Clean and Beautiful, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Adopt-A-Wash Program, extend contract term to 6/30/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, Flood Control District Fund, contract amount $60,000.00 (CT_23-401)

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

2. **GRANT ACCEPTANCE**

The Department of the Army/United States Army Corps of Engineers, to provide for El Corazon Ecosystem Restoration Continuing Authorities Program Section 206, $1,490,000.00/4 year term (G-FC-82584)

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

3. **SURPLUS PROPERTY**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 31,668 square feet of vacant land located on the south of River Road, north side of the Chuck Huckelberry Loop and west of La Canada Drive, Tax Parcel No. 104-01-0450, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)



DRAFT

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy 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 2:38 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

# LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD

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, June 3, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Present: | Rex Scott, Chair<br>Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair<br>*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member<br>Steve Christy, Member<br>Andrés Cano, Member |
| Also Present: | Jan Lesher, County Administrator<br>Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:55 a.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Wells Fargo Bank, to provide Agreement of Sale (RPS file Acq-1258) for the purchase of property located at 136-150 N. Stone Avenue and 35 E. Alameda Street, Tax Parcel Nos. 117-11-0890, 117-11-0900, 117-11-0910, 117-11-0920 and 117-11-096C, for approximately 61,274 square feet that will be converted into the new downtown main library, FN - Capital Projects Fund, contract amount $6,215,000.00 (PO2500015154)

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

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK



DRAFT

1. **CONTRACT**

Wells Fargo Bank, to provide Agreement of Sale (RPS file Acq-1258) for the purchase of property located at 136-150 N. Stone Avenue and 35 E. Alameda Street, Tax Parcel Nos. 117-11-0890, 117-11-0900, 117-11-0910, 117-11-0920 and 117-11-096C, for approximately 61,274 square feet that will be converted into the new downtown main library, FN - Capital Projects Fund, contract amount $6,215,000.00 (PO2500015154)

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator

---

RS: This is a contract Wells Fargo Bank to provide agreement of sale for the purchase of property located at 136 through 150 N. Stone Avenue and 35 E. Alameda Street. I will move the item.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. Discussion?

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: This is a tough one for me because that particular building is I think one of the jewels of Downtown and it would be, I think, horrible to reimagine it in a setting that was being suggested when it has such a storied and elegant past. That is part of our heritage of Downtown Tucson, which seems to be ever changing and ever being reimagined and this is one of the last vestiges of it. One of the reasons why we are talking about it is because the Valdez Library Downtown is in such disrepair. A lot of that disrepair is because of the type of use that it is getting and it appears that it seems to be a gathering place for homeless people, transients, all sorts of folks that are really not there to use it what its intended purpose was, and that was for a library and meeting rooms. I have also heard stories of the cleaning crew that go into the Valdez Library that are refusing to do that because it is posing a threat and a danger to them when they go into certain areas that are not particularly well lit, and their concern about the safety of their staff. I would hate to see something like that happen to the Wells Fargo building in that same sense, we are looking more



DRAFT

and more at libraries being reinvented from their original purpose. That seems to be including and encompassing more social service agencies, more social services, period, counseling, whatever. And it also seems to be, again, a gathering place for folks that may have mental or addictive issues that really you do not want to have in close proximity with kids who really should be using the library facilities. And I think from that standpoint I can work around that because that is a personal approach as far as how I feel about the Wells Fargo building, but I do have a couple of questions. Are we buying or proposing to buy the Wells Fargo building, as is?

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, yes.

SC: Okay. Do we know what the cost of the tenant improvements would be?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, we do and it is not insignificant, but I am going to ask Mr. DeBonis, I think it is, round numbers, $6 million to purchase, $23 to $24 million to do the renovations, but Mr. DeBonis can provide you with those specifics.

CD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, what Ms. Lesher indicated is correct as far as the current estimate.

SC: Of $6.2 to buy and $24 to renovate?

CD: Approximately yes.

SC: What about abatement and remediation issues? Asbestos, that type of thing. Is that included in that?

CD: Supervisor Scott and Supervisor Christy, our Facilities Management Department and our Project Design and Construction team have been in the building several times. So they have done an overview of that and have factored that into the estimated improvement costs that were just cited.

SC: Has the County considered the former South New Hampshire University building at 97 E. Congress? That is I think inhabited right now by County employees that were moved over there during the renovation of this building but they are due to come back. Would that not suffice as something that, without having, we already own that building, would we have to spend $70 some odd million dollars when we have this building here?

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, we did look at other County owned assets in the Downtown area and that was one of them at 97 E. Congress. The location is inideal where it is situated, parking.

SC: Inideal?

CD: Inideal. Parking is not readily available from a library layout standpoint. A single floor will work ideally for the library type uses, so that is a multi-story building. There is an existing tenant in there that is not a County department or County building. So it was looked at and not felt to meet the square footage requirements, the street frontage requirements, the flow and layout requirements and parking.

SC: It is only a matter of 3,000 or 4,000 difference between the Wells Fargo and 97 E. Congress. Is that a tipping point amount or?

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, so acknowledge that the overall square footage is relatively similar. It is the layout of that square footage and the usable area for the operations and the flow, multi-story layout similar to what we have at the downtown main library. You know, Deputy County Administrator Holmes can speak to some of the operational challenges that the library staff is experiencing. Just with being able to have staffing resources on site to operate the different activities on the multiple floors. So..

SC: Who is the tenant in 97 E. Congress?

CD: I apologize, Supervisor Christy, I am going to take a quick look. I think I can figure that out before we depart this topic.

JL: If I may, one thing that when you are looking at the Wells Fargo building, it is three buildings. It is the Wells Fargo buildings and two adjacent buildings that move to the south. So again, we have a larger footprint flat, and it is the 219 space parking garage that it is immediately adjacent, that I think is going to be a significant element of this as well as we look at the challenges of parking within the area. We looked at the Roy Place building. We looked at 97 E. Congress. We looked at, frankly listening, the Superintendent of Schools building, any of the other buildings that the County owned in the downtown area, because obviously, to repurpose something in the area that we already owned made greater sense. When we looked at the build out costs, ultimately, it was determined that this would be more cost effective, not only in those initial tenant improvements that would be necessary, but in ongoing operations and maintenance of the organization.

SC: Mr. Chair, it seems to me what they are doing with the Valley Bank building that is being repurposed, it is a private equity, it is still a privately owned entity, and it is on the tax rolls, it is generating property tax. We are going to take a similar building with a similar history, spend all that money to make it into a library, removing it from the tax base and changing it dramatically from it was. Where is Rio Nuevo in this?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, they have seen the facility. They have looked at the parking facilities. They are not a partner in this, but one thing I will tell you.

SC: They have no interest in this?

JL: Not that I have heard. There is not a tax revenue to be accommodated through this or to be realized. And I think that is really the greatest purpose of Rio Nuevo is to make sure that there is, as a taxing district, that those taxes in order the benefit of the district in the downtown area. I do want to comment, sir that one of the things that we have been talking about a lot when we look at this entire re-envisioning or reimagining the downtown area, is looking at every property that the County owns and seeing what might be sold. Can we get properties back into the hands of those who are get it back on the tax rolls? And I think that when we can move out of some of these buildings will soon be when we can vacate 97 E. Broadway, other than the one tenant. What can we do with those facilities? And those are things we have been looking at.

SC: Mr. Chair, if Ms. Lesher is suggesting that this would not be a good fit for Rio Nuevo or a good entity for them, why do not we just let it go back to private capital, put it up, let it go up for sale? Do not interfere with taking it off the tax rolls for a library. Let private equity look at it and buy it and do something like they did with the Valley Bank building.

JL: Well, and Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, I keep promoting people and I think our team can meet with him. We met and I know that the property has been on the market for some time, and that has been part of our conversations and discussions with the bank and with the agent. As we have been looking at it, I have not been my understanding that anyone had interest in purchasing the building.

SC: Well, I am not going to be supporting the purchase of this. I think it is a wasteful thing to do, and it is something that really has a lot of potential and I think would keep a great historical continuity downtown. So thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments from Supervisors? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott, I was in this building, along with at least one of my colleagues and staff from, I think, four of the Supervisorial teams at least. I think it is a great opportunity. It makes a lot of sense. It is a, I have recently also with Downtown Tucson Partnership, toured the Treasury, which was the Chase Bank, a beautiful historic building that is now a gorgeous event space. I wish it was open more often, frankly, but it is really quite impressive what they have done with that old bank, former bank. And I think that this opportunity to preserve and protect this historic building, three buildings, actually, the parking is icing on the cake and helps a lot with obviously logistics. And I think that it makes a lot of sense. I forgot to ask where the murals went in that Wells Fargo building. It turns out I applied for a credit card in the Chase building and in the Wells Fargo building personally. So but I remember there being a lot of really nice murals. They are still in the Treasury. They are not in the Wells Fargo building, so before we ink this deal, if someone could figure out where the murals went and have them returned, that would be really important, I think for the historical, I am not kidding at all, actually. So that is very important for the historical, you know if that is what we are trying to do here. So

yeah, I am enthusiastic here. And by the way we can make this or it can be made a space that is not just a place for a bunch of books. Libraries are modernizing, there are cafes, there are even little bar type things. Parents have to have some fun down there too. So I think we can really do a great concept here for the new main library. If this is what my colleagues want to do and I am in support.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor, and I neglected to say before we started talking about this item, and I am surprised you did not catch me, Ms. Manriquez, that we are sitting as the Library District Board. [laughs] Supervisor Cano and then Supervisor Allen.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Given that this property is within District 5, I wanted to take the opportunity to thank the County Administrator and County staff for moving this proposal forward. This new space will replace the aging library infrastructure that we have and give our community a modern, accessible and inspiring downtown hub for learning and connection. Libraries are not just buildings, they are lifelines for students, job seekers, families and elders, and they are where people gather, grow and belong. So this move is smart, it is strategic, and it keeps library services right where they are needed most, which is in the heart of downtown Tucson. So I want to thank the library staff, County staff, and every community member who helped make this possible. I believe that with this action, the future of library services in Pima County just got a whole lot brighter. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Allen and Supervisor Heinz, you had another comment? Okay.

JA: I do not want to belabor the point, but I also support this purchase and largely around well, for a lot of reasons, but I think it just makes a lot more sense than looking at the price tag for renovations to the current space that if we purchase this building at the $6.2 million say there are renovation costs and the $24 million area that is still cheaper than the $80 plus million for renovations to a building that we do not even own. I appreciate all the efforts to keep it downtown, to find a location. I actually think putting the library in an important historic building is a perfect fit. It is a way to ensure that the integrity of the building and that history is valued and lives on. I think it is just a wonderful fit and so appreciated the tour organized and being able to see it and hear about all the great ideas and knowing that we have a 2 year on ramp of renovations where we can continue to solicit ideas from community and from architects about how to make the library be the place that we want it to be. So thank you all.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Oh, yeah, I am sure Scott, this actually Supervisor Allen basically made that point, but I forgot to say that the approximately $90 million to redo the Valdez library that, again, we do not own makes no sense compared to the closer to $30 million in total that we are talking about between the purchase and refit, basically that is being proposed here. So that just makes more financial sense.



DRAFT

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Administrator Lesher, I had a couple of questions. We got a memo from you dated yesterday and attached to it was a memo from the Deputy Director for Project Design and Construction on behalf of the Director. In the middle of that memo, he lists seven bulleted items that helped lead to the recommendation. It is the fourth one that I have some curiosity about. He indicated one of the reasons for the recommendation of purchase is service enhancement opportunities available at the Wells Fargo facility. If you or someone you designate could let us know what those service enhancement opportunities might be.

JL: Certainly, thank you, Chair Scott and I think really highlighted as we were walking through the building the other day and I will ask either gentleman to speak to this, but the ideas were coming fast and furious from the staff about what buildings could be for a children's room. There are models in some communities where people do very specific kinds of clearances, could get access at other times of the day or night to facilities that could be more secure from the others. Just a lot of new opportunity for new programs. Gentlemen?

SH: Chair Scott, Administrator Lesher, just as Administrator Lesher articulated because there are three separate buildings, there is some unique opportunities to separate programming, particularly as we are looking at different entryways and for community access. So we think about enhancing programs, some of the challenges of the current library are after-hours access to some of those buildings. This will allow us to have some of those programming for community that can occur outside without having to open the full building, things that are very difficult to do now. So it is not only just community access points, but looking at creatively about maybe a 24 hour operation for people that have access, just like they have gyms, they could come check in, use facilities. Of course, we would have to kind of work through what that would look like, but those are the innovations and opportunities that lend itself for building that is shaped the way it is and the access points that it provides for us currently.

RS: I appreciate that. In the paragraph right before the conclusion, Mr. Klell says, "The due diligence process will allow for a detailed review of the buildings and the parking structure as well as the completion of the Phase 1 environmental testing. After the process is completed to the satisfaction of the County, the County will close escrow for the acquisition." Can you Ms. Lesher or someone you designate flesh out more of what that due diligence process will involve and what might be concerns that could come up?

JL: Certainly. Mr. DeBonis, if you would. Thank you.

CD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, so the key element of that is going to be that phase one environmental assessment. And so that is a prescribed process that has specific criteria that looks at any environmental risks or hazards within the building. So Supervisor Christy mentioned the presence of asbestos. Are there any other materials like lead based paint or other chemical constituent components of the overall construction? So just saying that the diligence will continue to validate that

there are no issues that are deal breakers for the County, right? Prior to the close of escrow on the sale. And so we will have an independent contractor do that evaluation and provide us a phase one assessment report.

RS: Alright. Thank you very much.

CD: And Chair Scott, if I can just go back one moment. So as I queried with staff, I was incorrect. There is no longer a non-County tenant in 97 E. Congress. So I just wanted to go on the record and clear that up.

RS: Thank you. Mr. DeBonis. Any other questions or comments from my colleagues?

JL: If I may?

RS: Please go ahead.

JL: Thank you for just a moment. I know we are running late, but Chair Scott, really thank the Board for this. I think, as we all know, looking back, that this did not get introduced to the community in the way that we would have liked. And I think that stopping as we did almost a year ago from when an initial discussion began about whether we were going to be moving or tearing it down or what was going to happen, pausing and allowing all of us to work with the Library Advisory Board and with many community stakeholders have allowed us to get to a point where we are really at the beginning of that, that extraordinary process to re-envision this library downtown. As we said a year ago, I will continue to say there will always be a library in downtown Tucson, and it will be critical to the core of the downtown area. It may just not be at the exact location where it is located today. And with this, we will take that important first step and I thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. The item was moved and seconded before we had discussion. Supervisor Cano something else you wanted to say?

AC: Yeah, just really quick Chair Scott, thank you for the indulgence. I just wanted to reiterate to staff in conversations with the City of Tucson that I really encourage us to have a visionary conversation about what the existing parcel can look like. As we all know, it is not a County parcel, but I do believe that a master plan for the entire plaza is not only inspiring, but I think will continue to support that economic growth in the City's core. And we should do everything possible as a County to support the City of Tucson in that shared effort. So I just wanted to throw that in before we vote. Thank you.

RS: I appreciate that, and just wanted to ask a follow up question to the County Administrator, with regard to Supervisor Cano's point, are those conversations that you have had already with Mr. Tamura or anybody else in city government?

JL: Chair Scott, yes, we have. All of us have been talking with various people at the City of Tucson. We do have a letter from the City that indicated that as it is their building,

they would like to be the lead on the envisioning of what the next steps are, and we look forward to working with them on not only the building, but the whole plaza area. So we will follow their lead on the next step.

RS: Thank you. Alright. Item was moved and seconded. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Opposed?

SC: Opposed.

RS: Okay, item passes 4-1, with Supervisor Christy opposed.

DRAFT

## ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD

The Pima County Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 3, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Present: | Rex Scott, Chair<br>Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair<br>*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member<br>Steve Christy, Member<br>Andrés Cano, Member |
| Also Present: | Jan Lesher, County Administrator<br>Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:55 a.m.

1. **FEASIBILITY REPORT RESOLUTION**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - RK1, of the District Board of Rocking K South Community Facilities District, authorizing and ratifying the Giving of Notice of Hearing with Respect to a Feasibility Report for Public Infrastructure to be financed by the district; approving such report; authorizing the sale and issuance of not-to-exceed $2,200,000.00 aggregate principal amount of general obligation bonds, Series 2025A, of the district; prescribing certain terms, conditions and provisions for such bonds; approving the execution and delivery of a bond registrar and paying agent agreement; approving the execution and delivery of other documents relating to such bonds; awarding such bonds to the purchaser thereof; appointing a bond registrar and paying agent for the bonds; authorizing the levy of an ad valorem property tax with respect to such bonds; and authorizing the taking of other actions securing the payment of and relating to the bonds.

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

DRAFT

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:38 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, June 3, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Present: | Rex Scott, Chair<br>Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair<br>*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member<br>Steve Christy, Member<br>Andrés Cano, Member |
| Also Present: | Jan Lesher, County Administrator<br>Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:55 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 Lindsey Curley, Community Engagement, Pima County Public Library.

## 3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

## PRESENTATION

## 4. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Amber Mathewson, Library Director, Pima County Library, for 34 years of service.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, acknowledged Amber Mathewson for her extraordinary 34-year career of dedicated service, rising from customer service clerk to library director. He stated that her leadership greatly impacted Pima County libraries and the community, and that she was also active in local social and literacy organizations. He wished her well in her retirement.

No Board action was taken.



DRAFT

5. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Stella Montiel, Department Personnel Coordinator, Finance and Risk Management Department, for 30 years of service.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, honored Stella Montiel for her 30 years of dedicated service. He praised her reliability, strong work ethic, and key role in the Finance Department, and wished her well in the next chapter of her career.

No Board action was taken.

**PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Jackie Craig, Strategic Communications Manager, Friends of Ironwood Forest; and Kate Hotten, Executive Director, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, proclaiming the day of Monday, June 9, 2025 to be: "IRONWOOD FOREST DAY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Dante Celerio, Executive Director, Fluxx, proclaiming the month of June 2025 to be: "PRIDE MONTH IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Chelsea Peters, National Weather Service; Matthew McClone, Pima County Office of Emergency Management; and Ed Buster, City of Tucson Water Department, proclaiming the week of June 8 through June 14, 2025 to be: "MONSOON SAFETY 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.

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Presiding Judge Michael Butler, Juvenile Court, proclaiming the day of Saturday, June 14, 2025 to be: "PIMA COUNTY FAMILY REUNIFICATION DAY"

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. Chair Scott made the presentation.



DRAFT

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Monica Basurto, Tisha Ronquillo and Alyssa Basurto, Event Organizers, proclaiming the month of June 2025 to be: "MEN'S MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH"

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.

11. Presentation of a proclamation to Ashley La Russa, Founder, Blax Friday; Andre Whittington, Executive Director, Growth Partners AZ; Kristin Tovar, Owner and Angelique Aubrahm Montano, Director of Operations, Why I Love Where I Live; Jessica Barfield, Director of Tucson Business Development, Local First AZ; Moniqua Lane, Board Member, Tucson IDA/Groundswell Capital; and Dr. Shannon Roberts, Chair, African American Legacy Fund, proclaiming the day of Friday, June 6, 2025 to be: "THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLAX FRIDAY "

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

12. Presentation of a proclamation to Patricia Maisch, Representative, Everytown for Gun Safety and Moms Demand Action, proclaiming the day of Friday, June 6, 2025 to be: "NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

13. Presentation of a proclamation to Steve Valencia, Founding Member, Tucson Chapter Jobs with Justice, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, June 3, 2025 to be: "JOBS WITH JUSTICE DAY"

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

14. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding the Democrat leadership who neglected the unsheltered population while aiding asylum seekers. She urged the County to enforce fines or transport vagrants to sanctuary states instead of raising taxes for shelters.

Chris Conniff shared his concerns regarding the Sheriff's Department slow response to a sexual assault that occurred in December 2023. He called for the Attorney General to investigate, and accused internal reviews of being a cover-up.



DRAFT

Cory Stephens shared her concerns regarding encampments in Tucson that exposed local officials' failure to address homelessness, relying on unrealistic self-governance and ineffective responses. She stated that the community faced violence and slow police action, and demanded real solutions without higher taxes.

Robert Reus criticized heavy taxes that were forcing people from their homes and blamed decades of tax breaks for the wealthy for driving up housing costs. He urged for a new strategy to address the root problems, not just symptoms.

Dinah Bear spoke in support of Resolution No. 2025-19, opposing border wall construction, citing harm to wildfire, water, and communities, and its ineffectiveness. She emphasized the San Rafael Valley's significance and thanked the Board for protecting Ironwood Forest.

Mark Kelly addressed the Board regarding his ongoing peace disturbances and property damage, detailing police reports and charges that were dismissed against him.

Grant Kryeger, Tucson restaurateur, expressed his excitement in collaboration between government and private sectors to save the historic Rillito Park, highlighted its cultural importance and recent stalled redevelopment efforts.

Robert Hartman, Chair, Pima County Fair Horse Racing Commission, spoke in support of Rillito Park's future. He noted its historic, cultural and economic importance to Tucson and Arizona.

Carol Kovalik, Parks and Recreation Commissioner for District 1, spoke in opposition to Minute Item No. 15. She noted ongoing community discussions and the development of a 10-year Parks and Recreation master plan.

Mike Storie addressed the Board regarding the authorized representation for the Sheriff's Department. He criticized the exclusion of corrections officers and civilians from voting in the Pima County Sheriff's union election, calling it legally and practically wrong.

Erick Meza spoke in support of Resolution No. 2025-19, opposing the costly San Rafael Valley border wall, which harmed wildlife and communities without improving safety. He stated that they should protect the shared borderland instead.

Kylie McPherson spoke about horse racing, that horse races were 33% more deadly and opposed the border wall for harming people and wildlife. She stressed the urgent need for affordable housing and criticized leaders for ignoring community needs.

Dave Smith expressed his concerns with taxing homeowners to fund affordable housing and supporting asylum seekers, which he felt hurt low-income workers. He

stated that the Board should focus on education and small businesses rather than increasing taxes.

J.P. Salvatierra addressed the Board regarding first-time homebuyers, supporting lower interest rates and sweat equity, praising the Habitat for Humanity's model. He emphasized teaching people to build stability rather than just receiving aid.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that she had conferred with the County Attorney's Office to identify eligible employees for the Sheriff's Department union election and was willing to work with them to schedule it, including holding an executive session if necessary, and planned to brief the Board on the matter.

Chair Scott requested that any further information be provided to the Board.

* * *

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

15. The Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2025, May 6, 2025 and May 20, 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)

At the request of Supervisor Heinz and without objection, this item was removed from the agenda.

16. **Affordable Housing Appropriations for Fiscal Year (FY) 26**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to increase the budget for Affordable Housing for Fiscal Year 2025/26 (FY26) from the current $5M to $8.5M, with the additional $3.5M coming from expenditure savings and/or additional revenues/account balances realized elsewhere in the budget as we close out FY25 and/or expenditure reductions elsewhere in the FY26 Final County Budget. Of note, this is the amount of additional revenue for Affordable Housing ($3.5M) that would have been raised by an additional 3 cents in the Primary Property Tax Rate this coming year, but this proposal keeps the property tax rates exactly where they are as per the Adopted Tentative Budget adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 20, 2025.

The entire $8.5M budget for Affordable Housing for FY26 shall go to the Regional Affordable Housing Commission for their thoughtful deliberation and recommendations as to specific allocations within both Gap Funding for Affordable Housing development/preservation and programs to keep people housed. The Commission's recommendations shall come to the Board of Supervisors for final approval - first, the recommendation regarding how much of the FY26 Appropriation to devote to existing County/partner programs that keep people housed vs. to Gap Funding (by early Fall); and second, the specific recommended projects for Gap Funding awards (by January 31, 2026). (District 2)

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

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

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Christy that the Board of Supervisors, through the County Administrator, arrange to have Countywide listening sessions to the public, particularly to those who are paying mortgages, have paid mortgages and are now paying rent to the County to know all of the details about affordable housing, who is really paying for it, and what it means throughout the County over the next 30 days. It died for lack of a second.

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

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

17. **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.)

Board direction provided to the County Administrator for future updates it would be at her discretion to place the update on an agenda or provide a memorandum to the Board.



DRAFT

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

18. **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.

19. **F.C. Tucson and Pima County Junior Soccer League**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Update on F.C. Tucson and Pima County Junior Soccer League.

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

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

20. **Strategic Planning for Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Acton: Presentation on Strategic Planning for Pima County.

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

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

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

21. **Final Plat With Assurances**

P24FP00014, Agave Ridge, Lots 16, and Common Area "A" Private Street. (District 1)

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

22. **Final Plat Without Assurances**

P25FP00001, Las Campanas, Lots 184 - 187. (District 4)

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

DRAFT

## FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

### 23. Budget Remediation Plan Updates

Staff recommends review and action on the remediation plans submitted by Elected Officials to carry out their programmatic needs through the remainder of this year, Fiscal Year 2024/25.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that the Board had received the remediation plans, excluding the Sheriff's remediation plan, which would be on the June 17, 2025 Agenda.

Supervisor Christy indicated that in the background material it stated that all contracted services were invoiced to the ADE for payment on December 31, 2024 with a revision provided on January 2, 2024. He asked how that worked.

Ms. Lesher asked Supervisor Christy if he was referring to the Superintendent of Schools.

Supervisor Christy responded yes.

Ms. Lesher indicated that it would be for the School Superintendent with their contract from the Department of Education.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that was a typo from the department and it should be January 2, 2025.

Supervisor Christy inquired if it was the same error in the second box.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative and that they most likely carried it through the document.

Supervisor Christy asked if that could be the reason why there was no payment.

Mr. Cuaron responded that he could not speak to that directly. He stated that they worked through the School Superintendent and his understanding was that they requested a remediation through the Board of Supervisors, and were waiting on the outcome.

Ms. Lesher stated that the County Attorney's Office had been involved and that the grant in question was approximately $1.2 million from the Department of Education. She stated that similar to other grants, the Superintendent had continued with the work and through a variety of funding sources, had not yet been reimbursed for the program.

Supervisor Christy asked if they knew why.

Daniel Jurkowitz, Assistant Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that all of the work under the federal grant had been performed by the County School Superintendent, the invoice was submitted to the Arizona Department of Education, and as previously communicated to the Board, it was not immediately paid out. He stated that the federal government, under the U.S. Department of Education, denied paying the federal grant through the State Department of Education, and the State Department of Education filed an appeal with the U.S. Department of Education and was awaiting a response.

Supervisor Christy asked why it had not been paid yet.

Mr. Jurkowitz stated that it was a discretionary matter for the Department of Education because the invoice had been submitted after the closing period. He explained that typically, under those federal grants, jurisdictions could request payment extensions for up to 18 months, therefore, there was no legal reason for the U.S. Department of Education to deny payment on the federal grant. He stated that the Secretary of Education had made a specific decision not to pay on several grants, which included this one, because it involved COVID-related monies.

Supervisor Christy indicated that the School Superintendent's remediation request was specifically for the County to cover that gap that they had not been reimbursed for by either the state or the federal government.

Mr. Jurkowitz responded that was correct.

Supervisor Christy asked what would happen if they got reimbursed.

Mr. Jurkowitz stated that would be a decision for County Administration, but noted that there was still hope that, at some point, they would receive payment from the State Department of Education.

Ms. Lesher responded that the County would be reimbursed from the School Superintendent's Office.

Supervisor Heinz inquired whether a lawsuit had already been filed or not, and it seemed like the County should start exploring additional legal actions.

Mr. Jurkowitz responded that they hoped the U.S. Department of Education approved the already appropriated funds for the grant, paid the State, and then the State would reimburse the County. He noted that the Board had already authorized them to take enforcement action against the State Department of Education, which would require going through arbitration under the contract, so that would be the remedy.

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

Supervisor Heinz asked if there was a remediation plan for the Sheriff's Department.

Chair Scott stated that the County Administrator had indicated it would be on the June 17, 2025 Agenda.

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

**FLEET SERVICES**

24. **Donation of Surplus Property**

Staff recommends approval of the donation of the surplus vehicle to Arivaca Fire District. The vehicle will be used as an adaptive response vehicle, a wildland response vehicle and as a backup vehicle for the Fire Chief when needed.

Chair Scott noted that this item required a unanimous vote of approval by the Board since it was a donation of surplus property.

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

Supervisor Allen indicated that the Board had unanimously supported the development of a wildfire mitigation plan, and the critical challenge faced by some of the rural fire districts was in securing enough funding and tax base to fund basic core services for wildfire prevention and response. She highlighted the disparities in funding and resources among the fire districts, for example, Arivaca Fire District's budget was $369,000.00, San Manuel Fire District's budget was $800,000.00, while Golder Ranch Fire District's budget exceeded $50 million. She indicated that she had been working with County staff to find a water truck for the Arivaca Fire Department, which currently had a water truck that could not exceed 20 miles per hour. She stated that they had yet to find a suitable heavy-duty water truck to fill the gap, and they continued reaching out to other fire districts to see if any additional equipment could be provided to support the more rural fire districts in responding effectively. She acknowledged those individuals who had been especially helpful: Chris Ader at Arivaca Fire District for identifying the need; Leonard Boswell, Director of Fleet Services, and some staff who helped coordinate a donation from Peter Bowers and Leanne Hartin; and County Administrator Jan Lesher.

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

**HEALTH**

25. **Mobile Unit Deployment Plan**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Presentation of the Mobile Unit Deployment Plan for Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) Vaccination in Under-Immunized Schools.

Staff recommends creation of a mobile team to provide on-site vaccinations in schools with the lowest MMR coverage, lowest vaccine exemption rate and highest number of unimmunized students.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to approve the Mobile Unit Deployment Plan, as presented by staff.

**REAL PROPERTY**

26. **Abandonment by Vacation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 18, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of public rights-of-way, as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A0077, within Section 31, T12S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to approve Minute Item No. 26 and adopt the Resolution, approve Minute Item Nos. 27 and 28, and continue Minute Item Nos. 29, 30 and 31 to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 17, 2025. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Scott asked Supervisor Allen to explain why Minutes Item Nos. 29 through 31 were being continued.

Supervisor Allen stated that these items were single family residences and her office had been in discussions with County staff about whether those properties could be used to further their affordable housing goals. She thanked Real Property and the Department of Transportation (DOT) for their willingness to explore that possibility.

Chair Scott stated that Minute Item No. 28 was not included because in the memorandum from the County Administrator, dated May 27, 2025, the tenant at the Sunridge Drive location had expressed interest in bidding on the property.

Supervisor Christy stated that the homes were purchased by DOT because of right-of-way issues related to construction projects and were now putting them up for sale. He questioned they bought them in the first place.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, responded that during the project's design phase, it was identified that a large portion of the property would be taken, making it useless from a residential standpoint, and as a precaution, the County purchased all of those properties. He stated that in the design process the alignment was adjusted, which made those properties viable residential sites. He stated that DOT utilized capital project funding dedicated to its department and if the properties were sold the proceeds would return to that department.



DRAFT

Supervisor Christy inquired whether they were acquired through eminent domain.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that he did not believe so and that they were not condemned. He believed they were purchased voluntarily.

Supervisor Christy stated that he assumed it was market value and when they realized the properties could still be utilized, they decided to put them back on the market.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in the affirmative. He stated that the County no longer had use for the properties since the roadway project had been completed.

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

27. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 12,738 square feet of vacant land located on the south side of River Road and west of La Canada Drive, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on to this item.)

28. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 2,304 square feet of a single family residence located at 1416 W. Sunridge Drive, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on to this item.)

29. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 1,461 square feet of a single family residence located at 5061 N. Kolb Road, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on to this item.)

30. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 2,220 square feet of a single family residence located at 7181 E. Pintail Drive, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on to this item.)

31. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 1,708 square feet of a single family residence located at 7260 E. Cripple Creek Drive, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 26, for discussion and action on to this item.)

**REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION**

32. **Pretreatment Settlement Agreement**

Staff recommends approval of the following proposed Pretreatment Settlement Agreement, RWRD Enterprise Fund:

Busy D Pumping. The proposed settlement amount of $1,500.00 is in accordance with the Industrial Wastewater Enforcement Response Plan.

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**

33. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental cooperative agreement for the Tucson and Pima County Home Consortium for Federal Fiscal Years 2026 - 2028, for affordable housing, no cost/3 year term (SC2500000161)

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

34. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Emergency Eviction Legal Services Emergency Housing - Rehousing Assistance and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_24-468)

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

35. Direct Center for Independence, to provide for the Home Access Program for emergency home repairs, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount $53,000.00 (PO2400012730)

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

36. Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona, to provide for the Emergency Home Repair Program for emergency home repairs, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount $245,000.00 (PO2400012729)

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

**County Attorney**

37. The Center for Community Mediation and Facilitation, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Restorative Justice Program for volunteer training, extend contract term to 5/31/26 and amend contractual language, Vitalyst Health Foundation and Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program Fund, contract amount $60,000.00 (PO2400000317)

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

**Forensic Science Center**

38. La Paz County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for medical examiner services, total contract amount $500,000.00 ($100,000.00 annually) revenue/5 year term (CT_25-32)

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

**Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security**

39. Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management, to provide a cooperative agreement to improve wildland fire management, total contract amount $50,000.00 ($5,000.00 per year) revenue/10 year term (CT2500000023)

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

40. Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management, to provide a cooperative agreement to improve wildland fire management, General Fund, contract amount $50,000.00/10 year term (PO2500014384)

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

41. Southern Arizona Rescue Association, Amendment No. 2, to provide for provision of equipment, supplies and specialized volunteers for Search and Rescue Operations, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount $100,000.00 (CT_23-413)



DRAFT

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

**Procurement**

42. Toshiba America Business Solutions, Inc., to provide a cooperative procurement agreement for support and maintenance of County leased Toshiba multi-function devices, Internal Services Fund, contract amount $2,500,000.00 (SC2500000165) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

**Real Property**

43. Lucian Spataro, Nydia A. Encinas, Marc Peter Kaplan, Robert Weinshilboum, as individuals and general partners under Wilderness Resort 16 Partners, a now dissolved partnership, to provide an Agreement to Donate Real Property and Warranty Deed, consisting of 16 acres of vacant land located in the Tortolita Mountains in Section 34, T10S, R12E, Pinal County, Arizona, Capital Projects Fund, contract amount approximately $1,500.00 for closing costs (PO2500014810)

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

44. Encore Fine Arts Foundation, to provide a lease agreement within the Continental Community Center located at 530 E. Whitehouse Canyon Road, General Fund, contract amount $72,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT2500000031)

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

**Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

45. Arizona Department of Transportation, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Utility Agreement No. 3781-22 PCRWRD Interstate 10 - Ina Road to Ruthrauff Road and amend contractual language, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount $1,703,928.12 (PO2500014632)

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

DRAFT

**Sheriff**

46. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $5,500.00 estimated revenue (CT2500000019)

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

47. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $2,500.00 estimated revenue (CT2500000020)

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

48. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $2,000.00 estimated revenue (CT2500000021)

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

**Transportation**

49. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Twin Peaks Road/Rattlesnake Pass Project, Roadway Development Impact Fees Fund, contract amount $1,594,341.00/5 year term (PO2500014692)

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

**GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

50. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Pima County Voluntary Lawn and Garden Equipment Emissions Reduction Program, $50,000.00 (G-DE-88316)

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

DRAFT

51. **Acceptance - Justice Services**

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, to provide for the Safety and Justice Challenge Focused Racial Equity Cohort Renewal, $242,500.00 (G-JS-89023)

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

**FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

52. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 334356, Samuel Joseph Kroak, Harbottle Brewing Company, 3820 S. Palo Verde Road, No. 102, Tucson, Series 7, Beer and Wine Bar, Location Transfer and Person Transfer.

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

53. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 328148, Willard Capen, Jr., Findley's Restaurant, 190 W. Continental Road, No. 202, Green Valley, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

54. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No.346329, Lucas Riley Hoeferkamp, La Gitana Cantina, 17205 W. Fifth Street, Arivaca, Series 6, Bar, Person Transfer.

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

DRAFT

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

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

**Hearing – Rezoning**

P24RZ00010, RAICA - W. BOUNTIFUL LANE REZONING
Teague and Devra Raica request a rezoning of approximately 3.31 acres from the SR (Suburban Ranch) zone to the SR-2 (Suburban Ranch Estate) zone, located approximately 900 feet east of the T-intersection of W. Bountiful Lane and N. Camino Del Fierro, addressed as 2602 W. Bountiful Lane. The proposed rezoning conforms to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan which designates the property for Low Intensity Urban 1.2. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 5-4 (Commissioners Cook, Gungle, Hanna and Matter voted Nay; Commissioner Lane was absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

At the request of the applicant and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTER**

56. **Hearing - Revised Fee Ordinance**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 12, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to the Pima County Office of the Medical Examiner; amending fees for services.

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

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

57. **Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 - Closing the Gap in Affordable Housing, Tackling Housing Insecurity, and Preventing an Escalation of Homelessness**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposing adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 - Closing the Gap in Affordable Housing, Tackling Housing Insecurity, and Preventing an Escalation of Homelessness, to establish Pima County policy to address housing affordability, reduce housing insecurity, and prevent homelessness by establishing an annual allocation of County funds to support the construction of new and preservation of existing affordable housing units and to fund supportive programs that keep people housed, with a total allocation over 10 years of at least $250 Million to the Pima County “Affordable Housing Fund.” (District 2)

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



DRAFT

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Allen to approve the item. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy voted “Nay.”

58. **Opposition to the Ongoing Militarization of the U.S. - Mexico Border**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 19, of the Board of Supervisors, opposing the ongoing militarization of the U.S. - Mexico Border. (District 3)

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

Supervisor Allen expressed concern over increasing threats to several protected public lands in Pima County, including Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge. She stated that those lands were at risk of being transferred from the U.S. Department of the Interior to the Department of Defense under the creation of what was being called Roosevelt Reservation. She stated that it would change the region into a military base and had already occurred in places like New Mexico and El Paso, where lands fell under the military jurisdiction of Fort Huachuca. She read a letter of support from the Chairman of the Tohono O’odham Nation, “*Without any notification or discussion with the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Gadsden Purchase in 1854 redrew the U.S.-Mexico border and split our people and aboriginal lands in half. Today, we have 17 communities and more than 2,000 enrolled members of the Tohono O'odham Nation living in Mexico. The Nation, Pima County and other agencies have been at the forefront of border security for decades*.” She stated that the letter went into detail in the many ways that the Nation had assisted in the cross-border activities. She further read from the letter, “*We are all doing our part, and these and other deterrents have been working, as crossings are now at an all-time low. The notion that additional border walls or militarization is needed or warranted, makes no sense. Spending billions of dollars that would further desecrate sacred areas and further split our people, makes no sense. Wasting billions of dollars on a problem that does not exist is wrong, particularly when the federal government is actively attempting to make massive cuts to critical programs for our children, elders and many others. The Tohono O'odham Nation is focused on building bridges...not walls. Thank you to the Pima County Board of Supervisors for considering this important Resolution. Your support and opposition to this matter is greatly appreciated. Together we are stronger.*” She explained that the border shared by Pima County, the Tohono O'odham Nation, and Mexico was complex, and while much had already been done to deter drug activity and other illegal activities, there were growing threats to conservation lands and natural areas. She emphasized the importance of standing against those threats and stated that the proposed resolution aimed to call the congressional delegation to protect the borderlands from the transfer into the Roosevelt Reservations and becoming a military base.

Supervisor Cano stated that his colleague from District 3 had mentioned all the points that he was going to make and he called the question.

Chair Scott stated that Supervisor Heinz wanted to comment on the item.

Supervisor Heinz asked if there were any updates regarding any legal challenges related to the issue. He recalled a judge ruling that this was not okay and he sought clarification on whether the Article 3 branch had commented on it.

Supervisor Allen acknowledged ongoing efforts challenging additional aspects, such as the waiving of federal laws like the National Environmental Policy Act, and others that had been done in conjunction, which enabled the Roosevelt Reservation to be established. She stated that she was unfamiliar with any specific legal challenges, but imagined there would be some.

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

59. **Follow Up Request to the Attorney General's Office Regarding Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Investigation, Request for Independent Investigation**

Discussion/Direction/Action: The Pima County Sheriff's Department has completed its Internal Affairs (IA) investigation into the sexual assault that occurred between a Pima County Sheriff's Department sergeant and a deputy in December of 2022. In 2023, the Board of Supervisors asked the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to do an independent investigation into the Department's internal response to the assault, to see if any laws or protocols had been broken. In its response dated August 29, 2024 (included in attached CA memo) the AGO noted that while it did not appear that any laws were broken, there were various Sheriff's Department policies that "may have been violated by command staff". The AGO concluded: "We understand that additional information will be developed during an IA investigation which may provide explanations or justifications for these areas of concern. The AGO would welcome the opportunity to review the IA investigation after it is completed by the Sheriff's Department should this Board continue to have concerns." Now that the Sheriff's Department's IA investigation is complete, directing the County Administrator to ask the AGO to review the Department's IA investigation and any related matters, to ascertain if any laws or protocols were in fact broken. (District 2)

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

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

**REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION**

60. **Clarification of Terms for Arizona Blue Stake, Inc., d.b.a. Arizona 811 Contract**

Staff recommends approval for the automatic renewal feature of the Arizona 811 membership agreement to allow for the County to add funds to the Workday Purchase Order annually without subsequent amendment to the agreement.

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

**CONTRACT AND AWARD**

**FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

61. Valencia Tech Park, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the early termination of the lease agreement for space within 3000 E. Valencia Road, Suite 190, General Fund, contract amount $956,679.98 decrease (PO2400004442)

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

**SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT**

62. Pima County Recorder, to provide for school district elections, no cost/4 year term (SC2500000173)

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

**BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

63. **Planning and Zoning Commission**

Reappointments of Mark Hanna and Dr. Jan Truitt. Term expirations: 6/19/29. (District 1)

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

64. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

DRAFT

* * *

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

1. **Special Event**
   Lance Philip Laber, DeGrazia Foundation, DeGrazia's Gallery in the Sun, 6300 N. Swan Road, Tucson, June 13, 14 and 15, 2025.

**ELECTIONS**

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

   RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY
   Lynne Hudson-149-DEM, Jay Payne-145-REP, Diane Priolo-227-REP

   APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY
   Cedar McGrath-010-DEM, Cynthia Wing-014-DEM, Carter Weeks-017-DEM, Halle Aquino-104-DEM, Kathleen Friend-118-DEM, Deborah Parsons-166-DEM, Rome Robbins-166-DEM, Kyle McCarthy-175-DEM, Maurice Goldman-194-DEM, Donna Cohen-207-DEM, Nancy Koff-238-DEM, Sharon Bale-239-DEM, Cynthia Breitkreitz-009-REP, Madelynn Dickinson-040-REP, Kristopher Machado-094-REP, Olivia Gaxiola-099-REP, Leslie Hansen-109-REP, Andrea Maher-147-REP, Douglas Hance-192-REP, Debra Niwa-192-REP, Heidi Hurst-198-REP, Christopher Amodeo-231-REP

**TREASURER**

3. **Request to Waive Interest**
   Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of $814.41.

4. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**
   Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of $81,639.06.

5. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
   Silver Horse Holdings, L.L.C. $1,357.23

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

6. Warrants: May, 2025

DRAFT

* * *

65. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

16. **Affordable Housing Appropriations for Fiscal Year (FY) 26**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to increase the budget for Affordable Housing for Fiscal Year 2025/26 (FY26) from the current $5M to $8.5M, with the additional $3.5M coming from expenditure savings and/or additional revenues/account balances realized elsewhere in the budget as we close out FY25 and/or expenditure reductions elsewhere in the FY26 Final County Budget. Of note, this is the amount of additional revenue for Affordable Housing ($3.5M) that would have been raised by an additional 3 cents in the Primary Property Tax Rate this coming year, but this proposal keeps the property tax rates exactly where they are as per the Adopted Tentative Budget adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 20, 2025.

The entire $8.5M budget for Affordable Housing for FY26 shall go to the Regional Affordable Housing Commission for their thoughtful deliberation and recommendations as to specific allocations within both Gap Funding for Affordable Housing development/preservation and programs to keep people housed. The Commission's recommendations shall come to the Board of Supervisors for final approval first, the recommendation regarding how much of the FY26 Appropriation to devote to existing County/partner programs that keep people housed vs. to Gap Funding (by early Fall); and second, the specific recommended projects for Gap Funding awards (by January 31, 2026). (District 2)

Verbatim

---

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

---

RS: We are going to go to No. 19, Affordable Housing Appropriations for Fiscal Year '26. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. We have had quite a few discussions about affordable housing and how best to approach this issue. I differ with some of our speakers there, but I do believe that there is a role the County can play, as we have discussed, and after a lot of work with my colleagues, after listening to their concerns and working with their teams, I believe we have a pathway forward and that is broken into two pieces. The first is Item No. 19, this is regarding this fiscal year '26. Pretty simple. This is simply without any change to the property tax rate. I propose that we increase the allocation by $3.5 million that we dedicate to affordable housing, bringing the total to $8.5 million for fiscal year '26. The



DRAFT

administrator has indicated already that she can find savings elsewhere in the fiscal year '26 budget and utilize the more robust ending fund balance of fiscal year 2025, more than was originally forecast to pay for this. Then the second item is a ten-year plan that starts in 2027.

RS: I am sorry Supervisor, we can only talk about Item No. 19 for right now.

MH: My bad. And then I guess in that case I would move the item I just described.

AC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Cano. Further discussion?

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I have let everyone know pretty much my feeling about raising property taxes to pay for affordable housing. How unfair it is for those who have saved all their lives to make sure that their mortgage is paid, their property is taken care of, they have a nest egg, maybe in their retirement years, or some kind of option of what to do with the assets and the equity that is been acquired in their efforts to pay for their homes. What happens after the home is paid off after all these years of hard work and labor and expense, is that the owner of the house is still really not the owner. They are merely paying rent to the County because the County is imposing taxes. Like my colleague, Supervisor Heinz, is proposing. Like any good landlord, if those property taxes are not paid, the house will be taken away from them. This is an unjust and unfair way of doing it. I have said much of this before, so I will not go into a lot of repetition. However, I am old enough to remember that this Board some years ago had several other very controversial issues, if not expensive, issues that dealt with taxes, particularly road improvement, the road repair plan, multi-millions of dollars involved in that, and how we should approach that. It was not necessarily a controversial issue, but a very important issue to many people, the condition of our roads. We also had a situation where a company by the name of Monsanto came into Pima County, and there was a lot of discussion and controversy over that in both cases. In both cases, with this amount of public interest, with this amount of expense being passed on to the public, I would propose that this issue needs to have what we had then. That is County wide listening sessions created and generated by the County Administration and put together in order for the public to have a debate and a discussion on the cost that it is going to be imposed upon taxpayers, and that they have a right to listen to the plan, and they also have the same right to debate the plan and to express their feelings about the plan. This is being really shoved through. Fortunately, we were able to continue the item because I knew I did not have the votes to stop it, but I could continue it, which I felt would give it longer time in the public domain for people to look at and to analyze and for everybody to see it and now we need to take it one more step for the community, for the taxpayer, where they have an opportunity to be heard, where

they have an opportunity to state their feelings that no one seems to be concerned about, that it is the taxpayers that are paying for affordable housing, which means that the taxpayers are going to help the developers, most of them out of state, with incentives to build these apartment complexes and that is really all they are and they will be inhabited by people who are being subsidized with rent assistance by the taxpayers, the same people paying the property taxes. Those people paying the property taxes need to have an opportunity to voice their concerns and to question why this is being done, so Mr. Chair, I would like to make a motion at this time that the Board of Supervisors, through the County Administrator, arrange to have County wide listening sessions to the public, particularly to those who are paying mortgages, have paid mortgages and are now paying rent to the County to know all of the details about affordable housing and who is really paying for it, and what it means throughout the County over the next 30 days.

RS: Supervisor, just to be clear, there is a motion on the floor. You are making your motion as a substitute motion to the one that is on the floor?

SC: That would be correct.

RS: Okay. Alright. That motion dies for lack of a second. Any other discussion or comment from my colleagues? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you. Chair Scott. Supervisor Heinz, I wanted to clarify some comments from the dais. Does this Item No. 19 raise property taxes?

MH: No, it does not.

AC: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Chair Scott, I am going to offer some comments before we go to a vote, if that is okay.

RS: Please.

AC: I want to thank members of the public who have engaged on this issue from all sides, and last Friday, the District 5 office hosted a roundtable with affordable housing advocates that really helped navigate my housing priorities, but most importantly, it gave me a pulse of what community needs. Affordable housing is a human right, and today's action proves that when we work together across districts, Pima County can deliver real solutions for the people who need them most. Too many of our neighbors, seniors on fixed incomes, families with young kids, frontline workers are living one rent increase away from crisis. They are not asking for handouts. They are asking for a fair shot at a stable home, a livable neighborhood, and a future rooted in dignity, and that is exactly what this investment moves us closer to. I want to thank the County Administrator for identifying the funding needed to move this proposal forward, and my colleague from District 2 for bringing this idea to the Board. This proposal was not perfect when introduced, but we strengthened the policy, added some guardrails, and got it done without raising the primary property tax rate. That is a really big deal, especially right now. District 5

insisted on a solution that is regionally grounded, fiscally responsible and shaped by the realities that our residents face. That means making this plan work for tribal communities, rural towns, mobile home residents and urban renters alike. Because housing justice does not belong to one zip code. It belongs to all of us. Now, some may say that government should not play a role in housing, but I believe this, when the State stalls and the federal government is uncertain, local government must step up. Housing is infrastructure, housing is public safety, housing is economic development, and this is how we, as Pima County, invest in people. This policy for the year ahead will set a new bar and we have got more work to do. Combined, this will be an $11 million investment. That is huge and historic, and we should celebrate that investment. Today we are one step closer where Pima County can lead the way on affordable housing and encourage our jurisdictional partners in the region to also do their part so that we can all stay and thrive in the place that we call home, so I want to keep going together, and Supervisor Heinz, I really appreciate the courtesy that you gave me and the District 5 staff as we worked to do this proposal without increasing the primary property tax rate. Thanks.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: You knew before I even reached. I also want to thank Supervisor Heinz and the staff for really digging in and putting this out there to get the ball rolling. I want to underscore that we have been hearing from taxpayers, from our constituents about the absolute urgent need in the substantive investment in affordable housing. It is the number one issue that I hear from folks from the farthest reaches of our district, from Ajo to Arivaca, all across through Midtown areas. The other thing I really want to underscore, and this is why I think it continues to rise as the top issue that folks think that we need to grapple with and really invest in is the fact that the need for affordable housing is not a need that is, for those people. It is indeed, and people feel this right now, the need for affordability, the need for housing stability is something that everybody is feeling. The vast majority of people are feeling, because the reality is that most of us feel like we are on a slippery slope. We are one medical emergency away from not being able to make payments on our homes. We are one car accident away from not being able to make the payments on our homes, or one paycheck away from losing the four walls and the roof that give us the stability to be who we are and who we want to be, and to be able to thrive and be safe and healthy. Last thing that I want to underscore is that the taxpayers are already paying for the lack of affordable housing. We are paying by not investing in affordable housing. We are paying for it through swollen courts, through law enforcement efforts, through our hospitals, by employers. When people lose their jobs, they cannot get to work or when they lose their homes, they do not get to work. Schools or mental health social service agencies, we are already paying for it, and so it is the economic solution is for us to invest big and boldly in affordable housing in Pima County. What we are doing is a step in that direction. It is actually not, as all the research shows, it is not going to solve the problem completely, but it is helping us get on that path to tackle it in the aggressive way that it warrants. So again, my thank you for the leadership and for really helping us move this forward.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor. Any further comments from Supervisors? Alright. I believe that I am going to be able to support this item, as well, but I have some questions that I need to ask of both Supervisor Heinz and the County Administrator, before we move to a vote. I want to point out before I ask those questions, and Supervisor Cano alluded to this with his question to Supervisor Heinz. When this Board passed the tentative adoption of the budget at our last meeting, it set a tax rate that we cannot exceed. The previous item, Item No. 18, was the item that we continued but it is, as you heard during agenda adjustments, Supervisor Heinz asked that it be removed from the agenda and we are taking up Item No. 19 and Item No. 19 does not affect the tax rate at all. Instead, as you see, it increases what we already had in the adopted budget, which we have had in the adopted budget for the last several years, "$5 million to $8.5 million, with the additional $3.5 million coming from expenditure savings and/or additional revenues/account balances realized elsewhere in the budget as we close out FY25 and/or expenditure reductions elsewhere in the FY26 Final County Budget." Now, we had some discussion at the dais about this at our last meeting, but I just wanted to ask both my colleague from District 2 and the County Administrator, could you flesh out where that $3.5 million is likely to come from?

MH: So just based on conversations, Mr. Chair, from the last two meetings where we did discuss this one item and again a lot of this will be, of course, on the County Administrator for some of the more specifics, but I know a large chunk of that could likely come from interest that we collected on particularly ARPA funding, which had not yet been incorporated into the numbers we have seen that I believe was approximately $3 million. So that is not quite the entire amount and I am not trying to obligate her that that has to be where it comes from necessarily but there definitely are some places where that can be found without impacting the primary of the overall tax rate.

RS: And just to be clear, for the public, ARPA funds are American Rescue Plan Act funds that all local governments, including the County, received during the pandemic from the federal government. Administrator Lesher, anything that you wanted to add?

JL: Thank you. Excuse me. Chair Scott, no, we will come back with a memo to the Board before you do final budget adoption, identifying specifically the proposal of how we can come up with the $3.5 million, but as Supervisor Heinz indicated, the majority will be coming from the ARPA interest dollars. We do not program that into the budget initially because we do not know exactly what it is going to be. So it becomes part of our carry forward what we now, as we get closer to the end of the fiscal year, we are able to identify that more accurately and there may be a little bit out of that, we might propose to decrease the contingency funds.

RS: And just to be clear, what we are talking about with regard to Item No. 19, Ms. Lesher does not include any of the funds or the effect on the tax rate with regard to County operations?

JL: Chair Scott no, it does not.

RS: Okay. Thank you very much. Had a follow up question with regard to the item. It says that, "The entire $8.5 million budget for Affordable Housing shall go to the Regional Affordable Housing Commission for their thoughtful deliberation and recommendations as to specific allocations within both Gap Funding for Affordable Housing development/preservation and programs to keep people housed." To go further in the language they are supposed to let us know by January 31st of 2026, not only how much will go to Gap funding and how much will go to County and partner programs that keep people housed, but they will also have specific recommended projects for Gap funding. So both the distinction between Gap funding and other funding will be presented to us by January 31st, and also specific Gap funding projects?

MH: Yes. Chair Scott also, and that is how the $5 million allocation has been addressed by our commission as well to this point.

RS: Okay. And then just to follow up with Administrator Lesher, in terms of all of the items that are noted in the agenda item, being able to come to the Board by January 31st, not just the delineation between the two pots of funding, but also the specific Gap funding projects. We can meet those deadlines?

JL: Chair Scott, I believe we can. At this point, the ECONorthwest study is due back in July, and we are looking to finalize the plan through the commission and staff by the end of November, so I think that will give us a little room and then we come back to the Board in January.

RS: That will also be enough time to put out the request for proposals for specific Gap funding projects?

JL: [Nods in agreement]

RS: Yes? Okay. Alright. Any other questions or comments? Alright. Let us move to a vote then on Item No. 19. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: No.

RS: Okay. Item passes 4 to 1.

DRAFT

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

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

Verbatim

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

RS: We are going to stay on the County Administrator's section of the Regular Agenda and before we go to Item No. 20, which is Update on Federal and State executive, Legislative and Judicial actions that affect Pima County. I wanted to engage my colleagues on this item. After some discussions with the County Administrator leading into this meeting, when this item was added to our agenda, we requested that it be a standing agenda item, that we cover it at every meeting of the Board. Knowing that information is coming out of Washington and Phoenix at different rates. There may not always be new information at every Board meeting. Recognizing that there might be information that comes into the County Administrator and her team in between meetings, it would be essential for the County Administrator to report to us if there is something substantial that comes in from Phoenix or Washington in between meetings. I am wondering if after this presentation, we could change our direction, if you will, and just have the County Administrator put live updates under her section of the agenda when it is necessary, and then update us otherwise as needed. Supervisor Christy?

SC: I think that is a terrific idea, Mr. Chair, and I would carry it one step further to today's meeting and ask if there is anything that has changed since the last meeting that we should be aware of today, rather than go through an entire presentation again.

RS: Just to follow up on that point, Ms. Lesher and Ms. Davis, is there anything in the report that you are going to go through today that with regard to action in either Washington or Phoenix, is substantially different from what you covered last time? Does that summarize your question, Supervisor?

SC: Yes.

JL: Chair Scott, there is nothing significantly different and there is nothing different from when it was submitted to you in writing. Would you have anything to add other than what we have distributed in the report?



DRAFT

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Lesher, no, and what accompanied this PowerPoint slide was a memo which we always provide to the Board, which has a little bit more granular information. The only thing to add to Ms. Lesher's comment is that we are actioning the Board directive from last meeting around more programmatic impact data, and we will be providing that to the Board as a compendium, full impact report.

RS: Perfect, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you. Chair Scott, I am not in favor of any reforms to this particular item at this moment. I feel that sunlight is the best disinfectant and when we have a federal administration that is hampering with our ability to have a healthy quality of life in our region, I would love for the public to continue to be engaged on this issue. We are the second largest County with lots of impacts coming to our jurisdiction with federal cuts and so I look forward to Ms. Davis's future presentations about some of that qualitative impact that I believe Pima County residents need to hear.

RS: And just to be clear, Supervisor, when I was talking with the County Administrator heading into this meeting, we would not discontinue the item, but we would leave it to her discretion as to when she would add it to her part of the agenda. It just would not be a mandate that it be at every meeting. She could utilize that discretion. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I was just going to say, Chair Scott, we could maybe have it agendized in its own right monthly instead of every meeting, that might be somewhere in the middle, and then if there is some additional thing that this Administrator would like to bring up during her particular part of the agenda, if it is not happening, does not happen to be in one that is agendized, that would be fine to.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Allen, any comment or input?

JA: I would be comfortable with the Administrator determining whether it warrants a presentation or memos in between to keep us updated on some of the key actions that are affecting programs in the County.

RS: Okay. All right. So what I am hearing from the Board is that and from Ms. Lesher, is that there is not anything in today's presentation that is substantially different from what we heard at our last meeting. We got the presentation beforehand and moving forward, the Board asks if there is something that needs to be added to an agenda, Ms. Lesher, that you will add it to your section of the agenda, and that if there is something in between meetings that the Board should hear about, that we would get that via memorandum. Alright. Thank you all very much.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

RS: Item No. 21, under the County Administrator, Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and I will turn it over to Ms. Darland for this presentation.

RS: Alright. Ms. Darland, thank you for being here.

JD: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Chair Scott, members of the Board, wait while they pull up this slide deck. Thank you. If you go ahead and go to the next slide, please. So as-is sort of the standard of these updates is to remind the Board of the five grounding priorities that established the office back in December of 2023. Just briefly, it is to inventory the County and partner programming to address at risk and homeless populations, to describe and illustrate how services are accessed and delivered, develop County public facing communications, and to also develop a strategic and continuous improvement plan with the goal of ensuring programming is responsive, sustainable and equitably distributed and finally, to develop a means of tracking the efficacy of our County assistance programs. Today's update will touch on priorities vessel No. 4 and No. 5. Next slide please, so in previous updates to the Board and what is becoming a more consistent cadence with you all is to give you a regional snapshot on the number of reports that are received through the online Homeless Encampment reporting tool that is shared between the County and the City. This is also the tool that is used by 3-1-1 staff in the City of Tucson's Public Safety Communications Department. When individuals dial that number and they want to report an encampment over the phone, that tool is also utilized and so it is the opportunity for when they are reported, it geo locates where that asset may or may not be located, and it sends it out to the appropriate jurisdiction. Presently, that is both the City and the County. For the month of May, the total number of reports received for the region were 782. 91 or roughly 12% of which were located within unincorporated Pima County, or properties under the County's authority and thus assigned to the County. As stated during previous updates to the Board, these totals are not drilled down, meaning that they represent a total of all reports as received, and so similarly for all of the regional reports as well as those assigned to the County, these have not been refined to more accurately represent the actual sites that have been verified, meaning that we have not had staff to go to each of these reports and verify that they are, in fact a homeless encampment, that they

are, in fact under our jurisdictional authority so that is what we have been working on in the background for the last several months. The totals on this slide include duplicates, meaning more than maybe there is a possibility that more than one constituent reported the same site, or a constituent reported the same site more than once. County totals also include reports for sites which are again not under the County's authority, meaning these would be sites that were privately held, or also sites that are under federal or state authority. Next slide please, so just briefly wanted to just touch on reminder of what these, of the background improvements that we have been working on. We have been working on developing tools that will better aid in the drilling down of this data point, so we can more accurately represent to the Board and to the public, the number of reports that we are getting that are actually verified in encampments, and the conditions in which our County staff and personnel are observing when they do inspect this space, so to that end, the month of May was the first time that we used both the Homeless Outreach report as well as a site inspection report. Reporting tools are downloaded to the County's devices, and those are presently being used by Regional Flood Control District staff and the Homeless Services outreach staff of the Community and Workforce Development Department. So the next two slides will show the Board this one here will how the tool actually appears, the data fields and format. This first slide is of the site inspection report and shows essentially gives you the idea of the layout. Each of these snapshots represents a different screen wherein staff can record evidence of campfires, drug paraphernalia, hazardous materials, confirmation as to whether or not the site is active, meaning an individual is residing in the encampment or whether or not it is not an encampment, meaning it could be storm debris or, you know what was commonly referred to as wildcat dumping. And if it is an active encampment where the staff are able to record whether or not that site has been remediated, meaning cleaned within the last 30 days. Next slide please, and this slide here shows the Board what the homeless outreach team is using. They have a separate survey downloaded to their devices. The data from this tool allows for us to collect real time number of individuals who were being encountered during on-site inspections with our regional Flood Control District team, with whom the team is able to engage and offer services. The purpose again of this tool is to capture a real time count of individuals in these spaces, also account for any pets in that space, observe vulnerabilities such as age would be older folks or even children, as well as observed individuals who appear to have another underlying medical need and need for care. It also allows for us to more accurately collect information related to the services that are accepted, as well as when services are declined. If you will recall in previous updates, we have been working in the anecdotal space and not in the real space, meaning that we do not have data to back up what I report out to you all. Data is not identifiable information meaning we are not collecting the names, date of birth or any other personal identifying information from these individuals. This is simply a means for us to just track a number associated with an action, or a number associated with an activity or an observed situation. In terms of that information that is recorded, that is personal identifying information that is utilized by the Homeless Management Information System that the Homeless Outreach Services folks have access to access to. That is the also referred to as HMIS. You may hear folks refer to that from time to time.

Next slide please. So again, these next two slides that I am going to share with the Board are preliminary results from the initial rollout of both of these tools in response to reported encampments. It is important to note that the district meaning the Regional Flood Control District that is a primary lead on the site inspection tool, had already commenced their quarterly maintenance and encampment cleanup process. That quarterly cadence begins through both through the Rillito and the Santa Cruz riverbed, as well as other adjacent washes and that quarterly began prior to the go live date for this tool being utilized by personnel, so therefore this data does not include approximately 85 tents that were observed within these respective channels. So in terms of what was captured in the initial rollout of this tool, you will note that there are 12 site inspection reports that were submitted, four of which were not active encampments, meaning no individuals were observed in that particular space and it was not considered to be an actual encampment. It was considered to be other debris or other or dumping. Eight of the sites were seen as being active encampments, and in those areas and spaces they are finding evidence of campfires, drug paraphernalia and hazards. We are talking food waste, human waste and pet waste and again, other reported debris, and again would just be other trash and items that are not necessarily or commonly referred to or associated with encampments. Regretfully, on this particular slide, I left out another data point, which is of the eight encampments that were recorded as active, four of those were sites that had been previously remediated by the Flood Control District team within the last 30 days. Next slide please, so this slide represents the data as collected during the initial rollout of the outreach report, which also began on the 1st of May. They are playing a little bit of catch up with respect to what Regional Flood Control District team had already collected prior to the tool being released, so there is going to be out of rhythm with each other for a little bit while until they get back into another quarterly cadence, so you are going to see a disproportionate number of outreach reports compared to what we saw from the initial site inspections, so for the month of May, a total of 27 reports were submitted. 19 individuals were encountered, one of whom was observed to be an older person. Typically, according to HUD, they see anybody over the age of 55 as being older. Our staff really looks for folks who are like that age range or older tends to fall within the neighborhood of 60 or beyond. Pets observed were six, and individuals who accepted services were one, so one of the 19 individuals encountered accepted services. The standard service delivery model is we offer connections to emergency shelter, case management, detox, document assistance such as identification. Some folks lose their birth certificates. The outreach team can also record other services as requested. This is intended for us to capture what emerging trends or other opportunities to do some back end care coordination after the initial outreach effort for things that maybe we do not see as a standard request, but is something that comes up and something that we can also prepare for if we are starting to see it come up more commonly. During today's Board meeting the team was out in the field from about 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. this morning, and during that timeframe they visited 14 sites, spoke to 18 individuals. They observed two pets. Three of the 18 individuals accepted services, which were namely to have their housing assessment looked up in the HMIS to see if they have been matched to housing, while the other remaining 15 individuals declined services and I can share that

information with you, because one of the things that we built into the system was that as the reports are being submitted by either the Regional Flood Control District team or the outreach team, those reports are sent back to a set number of folks in real time so we can, real time see that information as it is being submitted. That allows for our staff to be responsive to inquiries that come through from constituents to the Board of Supervisors, to the County Administrator's office. It also allows for us to be more cognizant of the data and what is happening in any trends. Also, for better service coordination between not only the County and our public works and outreach teams, but also in those areas of shared partnership with the City of Tucson and local law enforcement agents. Next slide, please. Thank you, so ongoing activities. On the data side we are going to continue to work on refinement on the back end of these systems. So as these reports are coming back in real time, the goal is going to be that the Regional Flood Control District is going to be inspecting all reports on sites received through this regional tool and while they are on site, if they determine that the asset is actually under another County Department's operational maintenance authority in real time, they will be able to send that report with the documentation directly to that department so they can proceed to the next step, according to their department's operational processes, again, the whole goal is to ensure that we are efficient, effective, and we are saving time for County staff and personnel, but we are also being responsive to the constituents who are making reports on these encampments and these activities in this space. This will also allow us to better drill down on what is verified as an active encampment. When it is verified, where is it falling? Which departments most impacted? I can tell you anecdotally, it is going to be the Regional Flood Control District that is most impacted overall. We have seen that in year over year that that tends to be the department that carries the lion's share of this work. But we will be able to give you again, the goal is always to give more transparency to what we are seeing and what we are doing in this space, and then also to provide that data back to the County Administrator as well as to the Board. Additionally, we will be working with my colleague, Ms. Davis, on pulling together the fiscal year ends totals for the number of households served and homeless programming as either administered directly by the County or through contracts with subrecipient organizations and agencies. Additionally working to finalize what is the update to the County Administrative Procedure, more commonly referred to as the Homeless Encampment Protocol. That comment period closed on May 31st. Comments now will be going to the County Administrator for review and finalization. Following that, we will be putting together a formal training and rollout to County staff. Mid to late June, I will be working with our Facilities Management safety folks as well as Mr. Stuckey for some de-escalation review. Likely reach out to our Health Department as well for some best practices related to any Narcan distribution as requested by County staff. And we will also be walking through what the changes are in this protocol. The other piece is working on the shelter feasibility and work plan, as requested by Chair Scott at the previous meeting of the Board. We are on the early stages of developing this plan, assessing both the present community capacity as well as additional needs to increase the inventory. This also means identifying associated costs or just baseline estimates of what it would be to bridge that delta of difference in the need. I want to also say that there is a real momentum that is

occurring right now in our community. There is a collective discussion that is happening around developing a shared approach and method to engaging folks in services. It is timely and this recognition is supported by dialog that has occurred among our community partners and care coordinators and system partners. Two key discussions were facilitated by the County's Justice Services Department and the Health Department, where folks got together, convened a discussion related to the various different roadblocks in their care strategies, how do we divert people away from justice systems, and how do we more timely connect individuals to programs and services that alleviate the crisis that they are encountering? Any strategy that establishes more shelter capacity or even just addresses effective utilization of what we already have, should be aligned with the strategy to interrupt the crisis that is interrupting the individual's ability to maintain stable housing. Otherwise, we are just going to see folks continue to recidivate through this process. The crisis that folks are facing is significant, and we need to do a better job at connecting folks to services before we can even get them to think about where they may or may not sleep at night. Again, there is momentum, and there is also urgency, which means the development of this strategy it will be working right alongside this conversation to ensure again, that we are looking at this from both a where can folks go? But also how can we start to address the crisis they are facing. This would also include examination of models that we have seen here locally. During the pandemic, we had a shelter care coordination model that worked very well. We also have another service based shelter strategy that is underway with the Craycroft. It is mainly an eviction aligned service strategy, but it is still an example that when you tie a strategy to the shelter and the next thing which is likely housing, you see outcomes that land in the 80s. As far as positive destination rates, you see length of stay somewhere in the neighborhood of an average of 79 shelter days, which is unheard of but that means that there is a service strategy not only in navigating folks to that program, but then navigating folks through and into housing, and so with that, I will take any questions that you may have.

RS: Any questions or comments from Board members? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes, there was a recent ruling in the City of Tucson. A judge ruled that the City could be liable for problems at homeless camps. How is that going to impact or affect the County's approach vis a vis what that ruling stipulated?

RS: I am going to ask the County Administrator to respond to that, if you do not mind Supervisor.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, because I mentioned to Supervisor Scott that I am meeting with the County Attorney's office later this week, and I have asked to talk with them about how they interpret that the ruling and how it may impact us, so I think it is something we have got to look at, and I am happy to get back with you after I have talked with the attorneys. Thank you.

RS: Thanks. Supervisor, any other questions or comments from my colleagues? Alright, Ms. Darland, thank you very much.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

19. **F.C. Tucson and Pima County Junior Soccer League**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Update on F.C. Tucson and Pima County Junior Soccer League.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
TS: Ted Schmidt, President, F.C. Tucson Youth Soccer Club

RS: We are going to Item No. 22, which is under the County Administrator. This is F.C. Tucson and Pima County Junior Soccer League. I will turn it over to Ms. Lesher who will introduce her guest.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and members of the Board. Mr. Ted Schmidt is with F.C. Tucson and has long been involved in youth soccer in the community and was hoping to provide an update to the Board on everything going on. I know that we have had discussions related to this topic actually, primarily as it related to Mosaic Quarter and expansion and availability of fields. Many of the fields today are at Rillito, and so I think it is timely to begin the conversation about how people are enjoying the facilities at Rillito potentially, and others, soccer and then obviously to be tied in with all current and potential future uses of the facility.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. And Mr. Schmidt, thank you so much for waiting through the earlier part of the of the meeting. We look forward to your presentation.

TS: Well, thank you very much, Chairman Scott, members of the Board of Supervisors, Madam County Administrator, good afternoon, and I do appreciate having this opportunity to talk to you on this subject. I want to talk to you about the dire need we have in Pima County for park space, and a marvelous opportunity that you all have, we have to do something about that, a win-win situation, by the way, for all of the stakeholders at Rillito Park. When our community leaders, years ago were planning our community, they did not require developers developing real estate to set aside real estate for parks. We have a very sorry need for more park space, not just for kids and I am talking about over 10,000 kids that are playing soccer right now, 5,000 adults playing but I should also tell you, I have communicated with the other stakeholders out at particularly at Rillito, the rugby players, the flag football players, the lacrosse players and we are all on the same page on this. When our town was being developed, park space was not set aside. Meanwhile, our County has grown and grown and grown. 1970 we had 270,000 people living here, today we have 1,000,080,149 people living here. The Park Trust Foundation places our community in the bottom 25% for park space per capita. At Rillito, we have a gem, we have a park in the center of town, which a third of the real estate is taken up by the racetrack. A third of the real estate has laid unused vacant since 2022 and even



DRAFT

before that it was vacant for 352 days out of the year. We have racing like 12 days out of the year. The prior operators of the track could not meet the demands of this Board to provide you all with proper financial auditing. An RFP went out to try to move forward with the racetrack, and nobody has come forward to say they want to do racing out there. Mother Nature has intervened, about two summers ago, we had a terrible storm that destroyed much of the structures out there, and we have learned that it will cost millions of dollars, taxpayers' dollars, to bring that facility back into working order. It cost half a million just to make it safe enough to run racing for 2 or 3 years. I think our County Administrator came up with a fantastic idea before the RFP went out to come up with a plan for moving the racetrack to an appropriate location and developing the park and that is what I am here on behalf of the patrons of Rillito Park, your constituents, I am here to advocate in favor of you doing that. And it really is a win-win situation. The historic aspects of Rillito Park can certainly be preserved. When it was built, it was built at the end of a dirt road in 1943, out in the middle of nowhere. Now it is right in the center of town and I am not going to get into the specifics of what is going on with horse racing to racing today, other than to say it is a declining industry. Over 35 tracks have closed since 2000, but if it is viable and certainly it could be, the right thing to do would be to move the track to an appropriate location. There is talk that there are individuals, private individuals interested in helping to develop that racetrack out at Marana, it could be moved to the fairgrounds. The historical aspects of it could be preserved. We could continue to have horse racing in southern Arizona for as long as people are still interested in doing that. But in the meantime, we cannot look past the fact that our community has grown rapidly. We have so many folks wanting to recreate, and they do not have a place to do it and I am not advocating here on just on behalf of soccer players or even on behalf of football players and rugby players and the like, I would advocate that all members of our community would like to have a full service park at Rillito, a park with a splash pad for kids, maybe a dog park for dog lovers. Pickleball is becoming so popular, maybe a pickleball court for folks. The opportunities are immense and by the way, I suspect there is some private individuals or entities out there that would be willing to partner with the County to help develop some of this. We have heard about the importance of special events out there. We could actually enhance the park for special events. There is no reason why we would not still want to be doing special events out there, so again, I say it is a win-win situation. We move to find a suitable home for horse racing and develop the park. And at this point, what I would like to do is just show you a three minute video of what I would like to see, what I think most of your constituents, would like to see at Rillito. What you are going to see is a video that juxtaposes what we have at Rillito right now with aspects of Naranja Park out in Oro Valley, which is a newer park to show you the kinds of amenities that people in our community want and are become accustomed to having in other parts of our community, so with that, Melissa, can we show the video? [video starts playing] There is your playground. There is your vacant land. 352 days out of the year and now, since 2022, no racing and no plans on having any racing for another year or two, if ever. [video ends] So in conclusion what I would advocate here is that we work together on the right solution. I have spoken with some of the folks involved with the horse racing. I am willing to rally the forces and work with them to find a suitable place for horse racing. But there is no reason

why we should sit on our hands and do nothing, waiting to see what might happen at Rillito, if ever again, with respect to horse racing. The community deserves services like this, our community deserves a park like I have just shown you. If we added just four more fields out there, we would be eligible for all kinds of soccer tournaments and events that would bring added economic benefit to our community, so with that, I would urge you all to consider that now is the time to do something about this. We have waited long enough. Now is the time to move forward, move the track, and at the same time, let us look at the options, private investment, whatever we need to do to develop our park. Thank you very much.

RS: Thank you very much. Any questions or comments from Board members for either Mr. Schmidt or Administrator Lesher? I would have one request, which is that I know that you have charged Mr. DeBonis and Mr. Pereira with following up on the possibilities of horse racing taking place at other places throughout the County. I know also, and we heard this from Ms. Kovalik when she was here during a Call to the Public that the Parks and Recreation Department is going through its strategic planning process right now. In terms of both of those processes, what you have charged Mr. DeBonis and Mr. Pereira to do, and Parks and Recreation strategic planning process, if there is any further information about potential uses for Rillito Park, if the Board could just be kept apprised of those matters as they move forward. Alright. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Schmidt.

DRAFT

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

20. **Strategic Planning for Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Acton: Presentation on Strategic Planning for Pima County.

Verbatim

RS: Supervisor Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
NC: Nancy Cole, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

RS: We will now go to our final presentation under the County Administrator, Strategic Planning for Pima County. Ms. Lesher, any introductory remarks?

JL: Ms. Cole.

NC: Chair Scott, Board of Supervisors, Administrator Lesher, thank you for the opportunity to present the update and we are just waiting on the slides, which we have seen the front slide like four times now. There we go and let us go to the next one. That is great. This is our agenda, so we are going to start in step set the stage for strategic planning. Then review the process we used, results, and next steps, so next slide, so each outreach planning session that we went through in this past quarter started with a discussion about what is strategic planning to get everyone involved on the same page and orient the team on the purpose of strategic planning, so this diagram is representing the strategic planning process. Starting at the top with the purpose of Pima County, are 'why'. The next is that strategic center are 'what' and the base of the pyramid is our execution or our 'how'. The strategy, the central part of the pyramid has been in place for the past two budget cycles. It is common to focus on the ‘what we do first,’ so we are reporting today about the top of the pyramid, which would provide clarity and a roadmap for staff so that we would know what direction we are heading. Another way to consider this is that the top is sort of long range direction, and it is a strategic ten year horizon, while the center is maybe a five year planning horizon and the bottom is something we do on a yearly basis as an action plan that is tactical. Let us go to the next slide, so we reported on March 18th that we were starting this kickoff of this process, and we were directed to meet with directors and elected officials to gather input, put it together, and then come back today. So this is just really quickly what we did over that time frame. In March, we did some planning and scheduled with all of those staff members, and then in the first half of April, we held 12 virtual sessions. We had 62 attendees and used interactive tools to focus on the values, mission, and vision inputs. The last week of April, we issued a survey back, so we repeated the information we gathered, collated it, and then got confirmation from those who had participated in April and then we took that information to kind of confirm the pillars used and to create a draft mission and vision for Pima County, so let us go over those results.

Next slide, so the strategic planning meetings focused on that top as we have already stated. And we started with values, our fundamental beliefs that form the basis of the vision and mission statements. This is a little bit more tangible. It is easier for people to start with and we used a guiding planning list of 93 words. We used that interactive tool. We let people kind of pick which words resonated. As we went through those 93 words, we were able to distill it down into 26 of the top rated ones. We took that to the survey, and we asked for everyone to go ahead and pick their top five, and so what you are looking at is how we have grouped these values into different areas and as no surprise, our 'We Are Pima County' mission is clearly reflected here with accountable, respectful and ethical being the top areas of word selected, so that is very high. But you can also see that excellence, innovation, sustainability and prosperity or prosperous were equally important, so then what we did is go ahead and draft mission statements using fill in the blank prompts. We had as many as 60 different suggestions. We asked both department directors and elected officials to give us the overall County vision and mission, but with the understanding that they also wear the hat of their department or area and so a lot of the statements that we got might have been through that lens with that specific perspective and then we were able to take those, distill them down and look at eight different statements in that follow up survey, and then those were voted on by the people who participated and you could see a lot of alignment. There was a lot of similarity and you often saw some of the words that were in that value program repeated in those mission statements. We did the same thing with vision again, through that fill in the blank process. At this case, we had a little less, so we had about 38 vision statements, and we distilled those down into six different ones for voting and again, could see a lot of alignment between the people who are voting on this and took that information to create what we are proposing for a draft mission and vision and connect that to our existing framework, so our intent is to take that strategic framework, those pillars we have been using and to understand the plans that we have in place, such as Pima Prospers, The Prosperity Initiatives, Climate Plan and Sustainability Measures, our Economic and Infrastructure Plans and weave those together so that it fits with what staff has been using for the last several years to guide our work and then take it to that next level. Have that vision, mission values on top of it, and then move on from there. So let us go to the next slide, so again 'We Are Pima County' so we are recommending proposed vision, committed to serving residents, and fostering a thriving community guided by accountable, respectful, and ethical leadership. Our mission would be creating a prosperous community through sound stewardship and innovative practices, making a difference in quality of life for all and these are the pillars that we currently operate in, and suggesting slight language changes to just make it more approachable, easier to say and understand and have a little clearer meaning, so those four pillars are Public Service, Quality of Life, Infrastructure and Growth, and Sustainability and Conservation, so within those, Public Service is effectively managing our core functions and providing excellent service. Quality of Life is improving the quality of life for Pima County residents. This is where things such as education, health, public safety is in this and well-being. So this is where you might see a lot of the Prosperity Initiatives falling. Infrastructure and Growth is priorities critical to infrastructure and economic growth. So this is where we are going to be working on

capital plan, asset management, land use planning, balancing land use and conservation. Some of these different areas would all fall here and then Sustainability and Conservation will provide conservation, sustainability and climate resiliency, so this is where we are going to be looking at managing our conservation land system, our Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, our Climate Action Plan and anything else related to those activities. Let us go to the next slide, so what is next? What we have done today is we are presenting that first start of the schedule we have here, which is relating to the current '25/26 strategic plan and our current budget, so we are looking to have that done in this year and then for next year, we are going to be able to take this information and then take it out more broadly, we can get input from Pima staff at all levels. We can start looking at what would Action Plan B for the next year's budget cycle. We can align action, plan and budget. We could get input from the Board however you want to do that, we could get input from the community and then go ahead and have this drafted and aligned with the next year's budget as our guiding light for what areas we should prioritize and fund to reach our goals. So that is all I have in the presentation today. If there is any questions or anything you want to review?

RS: Questions or comments from Board members? Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you for doing the work and really consulting with folks and building this plan out. I have a couple questions, so I am curious about the, so I have spent a lot of time with strategic plans over the years in various nonprofit organizations and oftentimes the strategic plan is built off of a fundamental question, a challenge, what is it that the strategic plan is responding to or answering, what is the challenge or the opportunity that we face right now? So then, therefore, we develop a plan that ensures that we can meet it and so I am wondering what the question is, what is this? What are we trying to do with this plan?

NC: Thank you, Supervisor Allen, Chair Scott and Administrator Lesher, so a lot of times, if you are answering a specific question that might be really specific to a business strategic plan or like you say, an organization, and they have maybe a limited scope, so when you are in a government agency that has the breadth and depth of services that we provide, there is not necessarily a single overarching question and in fact, by getting a mission, what we are trying to do is get some alignment to what is our ultimate purpose? Is our ultimate purpose public service? Is it public safety? There are many different areas that we are going to be approaching for that, so this is the very top of it and our intent is to set some guidelines so that we know, okay and maybe that is very easy. We should be accountable, respectful and ethical, but what are those really going to be, so that is going to be requiring reporting, being transparent so those are actions that are going to happen very far down the bottom of that pyramid in our action plan, so our goal here is very high end, but long term when we get to that we want to have an actionable yearly plan and that is where those questions are going to come in, I believe, so if there is a specific thing relevant to this current year next going forward, and that may be things that we are already seeing with my colleagues Housing Initiatives that are

upcoming that might then guide our action plan for what are the specific steps in that next year that we will take? Does that help?

RS: Let me also call on Administrator Lesher because she asked to add some comments in response to your question.

JL: Thank you. Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen and members of the Board. I think a purpose for the entire exercise, if you will, is that we started a couple of years ago with staff beginning to look at every element of the budget, which really is the broadest governing document that tells us what we do and what we care about, and making sure that as this organization, as many, continues to add things, it does what is really our purpose, you know, what are the things we need to be doing, so we began to develop goals and pillars, tactics, actions that then the Board adopted and looked at when they developed the budget each year, but we wanted to stop for a moment and get back to a practice where we said, rather than having this informed by staff, what is that broad vision of the Board about what it is we need to be doing, where we need to be focusing all of our energies and efforts? And so this is a very broad, you are correct, with a lot of those individual questions as Ms. Cole says, I think we will be getting into but now to go back and say, we have been here since 1864 and we are now looking at a vision or a mission statement, seems very simple, if you will, and not providing the kind of granularity that I think we really need in order to impact what it is we do and how we develop our budget, but I think this is the framework or what we are looking at now are really the very the broadest guardrails within which we can work to develop specificity for each year.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: I see that, I also did not think about the like the Prosperity Initiative, the Climate Plan, Pima Prospers. Departments have their strategic plans and there should be a guiding star and that each of those are developed, whether it is in a ten year cycle, thinking through Pima Prospers, is not really a time frame that I am clear of, for the Prosperity Initiative, but that those are in response to some very specific critical needs and realities that we face in Pima County, so it and maybe it is maybe not that I am not going to push it like we need an underlying question. But then I guess maybe I pivot to thinking about the vision, so committed to serving residents and fostering a thriving community guided by accountable, respectful and ethical leadership to me that does not weave together the guiding light of Prosperity, Pima Prospers, Climate Plan, the department strategic plans. It feels heavy on accountable and maybe it is just they are bolded, accountable, respectful and ethical leadership. The way that the leadership operates, I think is incredibly important but I do not know that that is the vision for Pima County and how those plans weave together. To me, I think about a vision. I think about what does our community look like, feel like, sound like? What are the things that help guide us and answer those questions of, do we do this or do we do that? And I am not sure that committed to serving residents and fostering a thriving community, or that how the leadership operates helps us answer that question of, you know, we are at a crossroads. Do we do this or do we do that? So I think, yeah.



DRAFT

RS: Administrator Lesher anything further? Ms. Cole, anything further?

NC: No, I appreciate the feedback. We are not done with this yet. So it is helpful to hear what your concerns are.

RS: Thank you. Any other questions or comments from Supervisors Cano or Christy? I will just remind my colleagues that you have a communication from the Clerk in terms of when we might schedule a retreat of the Board in which this topic, strategic planning, would be a significant topic of discussion, so if you have not gotten back to the Clerk yet in terms of your availability, please do so. Alright, Ms. Cole, thank you very much.

DRAFT

**HEALTH**

25. **Mobile Unit Deployment Plan**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Presentation of the Mobile Unit Deployment Plan for Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) Vaccination in Under-Immunized Schools. Staff recommends creation of a mobile team to provide onsite vaccinations in schools with the lowest MMR coverage, lowest vaccine exemption rate and highest number of unimmunized students.

Verbatim

---

RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
TC: Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director, Pima County Health Department
CR: Crystal Rambaud, Public Health Nursing Manager, Pima County Health Department

---

RS: No. 28 which is Mobile Unit Deployment Plan, that is with regard to the Mobile Unit Deployment Plan for Measles, Mumps and Rubella Vaccination in Under-Immunized Schools. The Board had asked for a follow up from the County Administrator, and we have our Health Department Director here with us today, Dr. Cullen. Ms. Lesher, do you have any introductory remarks or should we just turn it over to Dr. Cullen?

JL: Turn it over to Dr. Cullen for the report. Thank you.

RS: Dr. Cullen. Thank you so much. Oh, I am sorry, Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Just really quickly, Chair Scott and Dr. Cullen, can you just give us a quick like measles in the state and County update, which hopefully is very fast and is zero cases.

RS: So along with the report on the unit deployment plan, you also would like a report on any current data with regard to measles, mumps and rubella in Pima County. Okay. Thank you. If you can work that in I am sure you just have that right at your fingertips, right, Dr. Cullen?

TC: Yes. Good afternoon. Board members, Chair Scott, Ms. Lesher, my esteemed boss Steve Holmes. Thank you for letting us present. I also want to introduce Crystal Rambaud, who is our Head of Immunization, which is why she is here with me. She has been with me through the last five years and all through COVID, so I am really

grateful for her guidance. At the current time, the great news is there are no cases of measles in Arizona, not only just in Pima County. We know the number throughout the United States is now surpassing 1,000. There have been some recent clusters that have occurred specifically related to some air travel situations. The CDC is actively investigating those cases and working with the states that have individuals that may have been on those flights. There is more to come on that, that is just coming to light in the last two days but we are actively monitoring what is happening and also our EMAP, our Emergency Management and Preparedness group has gone through additional tabletops related to measles, so if and when a case does occur, I feel comfortable that we will be able to respond to it and with that, I am going to go through my slides pretty rapidly. Next slide please, so you will recall that we did have a Board directive from March 18th. We were given three months to come back. We are a little early. We always like to be a little early and we are going to propose the plan that we have developed. Next slide, so the plan objectives and outcomes are consistent with what we were charged by the Board to deploy mobile teams to schools and childcare sites with low immunization rates to really reduce the impact of exemptions and immunization gaps that we can identify, align with the CDC recommendations. It is important to note there has been lots of changes in CDC recommendations coming out. None of them. There have been no changes in CDC recommendations for children for MMR, so the good news is, despite lots of changes that are being promulgated by the administration and by CDC, what we have presented to you in the past still stands today and really, our outcome increased MMR vaccinations, but the true outcome here is to prevent measles in any individual as well as any family member. At the same time, we believe that every opportunity should be modified to also include education and an increase understanding about the value of vaccination, in this case specifically for MMR, so we will be working with that, both the parents and the families as we push out a plan and you are going to see the details of this to ensure that we are providing adequate information and knowledge so that parents and families can make the best decision for themselves. Next slide, about the MMR vaccine. It is called measles, mumps and rubella. We are specifically focusing on measles because that is been the concerned area. Two doses which are given early in life provide 97% of vaccination and immunity against measles. The CDC schedule is here. The first dose is 12 to 15 months. You will hear in certain places throughout the country that that first dose has dropped into the 6 to 12 month period. Those are for areas where there is increased number of cases and concern about transmission and then the second dose is between 4 and 6 years and that is really the focus we are going to have is in that 4 to 6 year period. Long history of safety and efficacy, we do not have that data in here. We can pull that for you. But there is very little concern about this. You are probably aware, however, that the current Health and Human Services secretary has asked for a reevaluation of a relationship between autism and measles. That is being conducted by the CDC and with other people that have been identified by the Secretary. That information and that report is not available at this time. Next slide, so the next slide, you can see how we are going to select and prioritize schools. Remember the goal of this is to ensure that we have mobile access for vaccinations at schools and you can see all Pima County schools, schools with less than 95%. We use 95% because once again, that

DRAFT

is when we are looking for the concept of herd immunity, what that means is, if a case does come into a community that has an immunization rate over 95%, the risk of transmission to another individual who is part of that community decreases significantly and so that is why our goal is 95% prioritize schools with the lowest coverage. Obviously, the schools that are less than 95%, and I do want to let people become aware that that data is published by the State. The States have access to the data, and it is available for public consumption, of which schools are less than 95% and we will be using State data to help us identify schools that have less than 95% coverage. Prioritize the schools with the lowest coverage, so our goal would obviously to be hopefully get to those schools first. If there is an agreement from the administration of the school that we should offer onsite mobile vaccinations and then highest number of students, and then final outreach with the list. Next slide, so the next slide is a site prioritization map. These are the schools that in '23/24 school year and they are not identified by name here were below 95%. I would remind you that many of these schools are small, private or charter schools, so some of these schools are very small. They may have 20 students and so to get to 95%, 19 of those 20 need to be immunized. So just to be cognizant that while this map is a little overwhelming to us, when we look at the absolute number, it is not that overwhelming. Next slide, so the implementation process, which is part of the plan for us here, is to do the initial outreach. The plan is to start that July 1st. That will be done through communication with the schools. We do run a very active schools and youth team as part of the Public Health Department. That group already has contacts for all the schools that are in Pima County, so we have a way to reach out to them. It will be electronic. However, if they do not respond, we will follow up with a phone call and it is really just to see if they are interested that that is the first step that we are not planning on doing mobile vaccinations at any school that does not indicate that there is an interest for us to be on site. However, in that outreach, we will also ensure that we give people appropriate education materials both for themselves and their students. We have done that in the last six months with the schools. We have already sent things out that can be utilized and put on their letterhead to sharing with their community, so at the same time, when we go out looking for, are you interested? We will take that opportunity to do additional education at that time. Follow up with the sites that do not respond two weeks after the survey transmission. Next slide and the one thing that we learned during COVID was, is there a way to do permission for immunizations when a parent cannot be present? So if you think of it, mobile vaccine on site during school will be during school hours when many parents may be working or not, or guardians, and may not have the ability to be there, so we have culturally appropriate vaccine information. We have had this for forever. Crystal's team has developed much of this. We have used it based on best practices, but we also ensure that we adhere to what immunization consent is required from at a federal level, multiple forms of consent will be accepted. We have protocols on this that we can share with you if you are interested, including written and verbal consent. Parents will be encouraged to attend, but as you can see, if for some reason they cannot be there, if consent has been obtained and documented, we will be able to vaccinate the child. Next slide, mobile unit logistics and staffing. Each clinical team will visit two schools to provide mobile vaccination. Obviously there may be some modification of this depending

upon how many children need to get immunized at a specific place. So for instance, if there is only two children at one place, we may perhaps be able to do 3 or 4 mobile visits in one day, but at a minimum there will be two visits a day that we will staff this by doing some closures at our clinics and using the clinic staff to go out. Now, this is consistent with what we do every summer anyway, because in summer we spend a tremendous amount of effort doing back-to-school vaccinations, so this while this looks like it takes away from direct services, these are we are just in a sense changing where the services are being provided as opposed to being in the clinic, they will be mobile. I would also say that we do mobile vaccine clinics throughout the year, so we are well versed in how to do these. We will have 1 to 2 nurses, 1 to 2 administrative staff. Events will be planned, as you can imagine, just to make sure things align and are the most efficient and effective utilization of resources. Next slide. The next slide talks about the data management. The most important thing here is that the families will get a record that the child did have the appropriate immunization. We also have access to the immunization logs that the state maintains, so we will be checking those logs prior to giving an immunization, so it is possible a parent will believe that their child never got an MMR but there is actually documentation that they got the MMR. Obviously we will not give an additional vaccine in that situation, and school staff will retain administrative records of us giving the immunizations. We will also offer technical assistance to the school health officials. Most school health officials, nurses, medical assistants know how to query the state database, but we will be working with them to ensure that they know how to update that and/or identify who maybe most at risk. Next slide, monitoring and reporting will maintain a centralized tracker. For this, we will make it available to those who have a need to know. We will provide written quarterly updates to you, the Board, and we will be able to show regional trends and the impact of this. Next slide, the cost of mobile outreach, obviously, we wanted to share that with you. These are the estimates of doing this; however, we are not asking for additional funds for this. As I noted previously, we will be using some people that are currently at other clinics to provide these services. It is difficult to know what the estimated cost is on this, because we do not know how many facilities will want us to come to them, and we also do not know the impact of the information that we have shared up till now as we go into a new school year. It is very possible that because what we are seeing in other parts of the country is in areas where there has been increased knowledge and concern about measles, that there has been increased uptake of the vaccine in young children. It is possible that is happening in Tucson, too. I mean, we do, we can track the number of immunizations that have been given. We track them from our facility, but it may be that as individual families go back to school, there is more of an emphasis on them obtaining the vaccine. Obviously.

RS: Dr. Cullen, could I briefly interrupt just to ask a clarification question?

TC: Yeah.

RS: When it says 156 events, I am gathering, that is the total number of schools that are below 95%?

DRAFT

TC: Yes. That number is the number that we obtained by looking at the State data that was available.

RS: Recognizing that we are not likely to get to all of those schools, and that there might be a possibility for consolidation, would you update the Board when you are able to on the actual number of events that get scheduled?

TS: Yes, we will do that, Supervisor Scott, I think our belief is that it will be less than half of that.

RS: Got it.

TC: That elect and once again, some of that is we do have the list of the number of students at each location and the number that are not vaccinated. I elected to not share those numbers with you that is publicly available, but I think it is best that we just work with the schools directly.

RS: Agreed.

TC: And let them decide. Yeah, so that I think is my last slide. Crystal, do you want to say anything? No. Okay. Well thank you. And I think this is a comprehensive approach. The really good news is that if we have another situation like this, we can use this as a templated way to approach to be in the community. It also does meet what our needs are, which is to be in the community, and you may be aware, I also just want to thank the Board. We do have a new mobile. We were able to get that with ARPA funding. It is being branded right now on the outside, but that mobile van will also become available for us to do these services.

RS: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. Any questions for Dr. Cullen? Dr., Supervisor Heinz?

MH: All good, thank you. Thank you, Chair, and thank you for doing this. I am always impressed to see your presentations and I am curious I have a couple of questions, but is this sort of similar to responses that other jurisdictions are doing to your knowledge? Not that it matters because we should be doing this anyway, but I am just curious if this is kind of what is happening.

TC: Supervisor Scott, Chair Heinz, members of the Board, I do not know anybody else that is doing this.

MH: Okay. I am sorry. Okay and then with regard to the I did this myself, actually, because as the measles has been kind of becoming more of a thing, I have had patients and just friends and members in the community asking, oh, I should get a booster, right? And my recommendation is actually hold that thought, because the vast majority of us should have lifelong immunity. Maybe check with your PCP, get a test, check to see if you still have immunity before you use up some of our stock, because I know that we do not. Could you talk a little bit about the availability of the

MMR vaccine in terms of where we are at? Because I know sometimes that can be in a little bit short supply?

TC: Yeah. Supervisor Scott, Chair Heinz, members of the Board. No, whatever I did that wrong. We have enough stock. There was a time when we did not have enough stock and Supervisor Heinz, you were well aware of that situation. We do have enough stock right now. There was a limit on the availability of it throughout the United States. However, despite having enough stock, we would still recommend what you have stated that you should check with your PCP. Many people, most people are fully immunized and should be adequate, especially in Arizona. These recommendations might change if all of a sudden we had an outbreak here or if you are internationally traveling the current the CDC recommendation that just came out, if you are internationally traveling in the last week, is that you should ensure you have had two doses of the MMR, so anyone who is doing international travel should check and make sure they have that. Before that, it was based on where you were going. I think because of the recent increase in measles globally, their now recommendation is everyone should make sure they have had two doses.

MH: Great and just two more things, and actually referred to the fact that I actually do get my vaccinations and check things myself at our Pima County health clinics and the last MMR booster, because I was asking if they had any, was given out to a patient just before I was there, so I was like, oh gosh, I should probably know about this, okay. But this is a little more general but are we as the County, are you as a County health department with regard to federal recommendations being promulgated, whether it is regarding MMR or any other vaccination or any other recommendation, are we required to adopt these? I asked that because I am a little concerned, based on what I am hearing, based on the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who is very different from the person I worked for, that in some cases, we have minimal, questionable or just a lack of, total lack of science or data supporting recommendations that seem to be more politically based. I am just stressed that that is even something we have to talk about but this could, though, adopting some of those recommendations could put our community members at risk and I am curious, what do we or you have to do or not have to do with regard to those types of recommendations when they come out? If they are, I guess I would say questionable.

TC: Supervisor Heinz, Chair Scott, members of the Board, we actually had this. I actually had this discussion with our public health lawyer last week to get clarity. The Pima County Health Department is the public health authority for the County. The County can make decisions, recommendations that do not have to align with what comes out federally. However, I think the only situation we will be in when we do something like that will be after a strong reflection of the data. I can give you one example, which is women who are pregnant and the COVID vaccine. Right now, the information is kind of all over the place, and we are actually waiting for ACIP, the Commission on Immunization Practices, which will meet June, the last week in June, to get some more guidance, so as of right now, we have not changed any recommendations we had previously.



DRAFT

MH: Okay, great. Thank you.

RS: Thanks. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, good afternoon, Dr. Cullen. Going back to another time, the discussions you and I had a lot the interchanges we had a lot dealt with the COVID issue and I think it is fair to assume that as a result of the environment around the COVID vaccinations and the issues that encompassed them, there was a lot of mistrust as a result on the community's part, due to issues relating to the COVID vaccinations and I think it is important that we try to clarify, or at least maybe answer some things about this particular vaccination in order to avoid that mistrust that seemed to permeate the environment after COVID and the COVID inoculations and just to reiterate Supervisor Heinz's question, we are the only in the State that is doing this program?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, we are the only County that is putting together a mobile vaccination plan to go out in the community, offering this to schools with less than 95%.

SC: Okay. Thank you. I have just a few questions. First one, it is a MMR required by the state to take place before a child can be enrolled in a school. Is that a requirement?

TC: Supervisor Scott, yes it, Supervisor Christy it is a requirement. However, there is the possibility for exemptions, so a family can choose to document an exemption and all it is a family, a parent or a guardian, documenting the request for an exemption and that is then accepted.

SC: But other than that, it is required?

TC: Yes.

SC: We have these formulas. I guess that we are basing on herd immunity and exemptions and that mathematical equation. How do schools indicate that they are not interested in participating? How do they opt out?

TC: Supervisor Christy, in this case it is will be opting in, so we will send them out information about the potential for us to come do a mobile vaccine at their facility, at their school, their organization, and they will indicate that they are interested in that. If they are, if we do not get a response, we will follow up in two weeks just to make sure that they received this offer but if they say no, then we are done.

SC: So, they can communicate to you their desire to participate as well as indicate their desire to say no.

TC: Yes, and then if they indicate that they are not interested, there is no further engagement.



DRAFT

SC: And of course, not every immunization fits every child and usually that is left to a discussion between the parent and the physician. I do not see any dynamic, including the physician in this.

TC: Supervisor Christy. You are right. You do not you do not see this here. If, however, the consent process itself includes information as well as the ability to talk to one of our providers, if the parent or guardian is interested in that, so no one will be vaccinated without appropriate parental or guardian consent.

SC: And you do not require any consultation with the family's physician or?

TC: Oh, I see your question. Sorry, Supervisor Christy. No we do not and that is not atypical for us. We do back-to-school immunizations routinely for many families that have primary care pediatricians, but their pediatric office is no longer offer immunizations. That is becoming more and more common just because of the cost associated with giving out immunizations, so we do not routinely consult with an individual's pediatrician with the assumption that the parent and/or guardian are acting as the parent or guardian to give consent for the vaccination.

SC: Okay, going to your appendices, just for my own edification on page 11, there are two schools that are on the list. I am just curious. Both of them are entitled the Lehman Virtual Academy. How do you conduct an inoculation program on a at a virtual school?

TS: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, it is going to be a great question and I think what we will do is we will reach out to them, offer it. Our understanding is many virtual schools do provide the opportunity for there to be an organizational place where families can come, for instance, for testing and/or other educational testing and/or other activities, so it will be up to those schools also if that does not exist.

SC: So, they are going to need to organize a like a gathering or something or?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, we would work with them if they do not want to participate at all. Once again that would be fine. In addition, the other option that will be available for them is if they have a small number of children that whose parents are requesting vaccination, they can be referred to one of our clinics, our three clinics that offer vaccinations on a regular basis.

SC: And going back to your appendices again, 95% is the target because it reaches that herd immunity level.

TC: Yes.

SC: And on numerous percentages of vaccinated in the first column, and the percent that are exempted. If you do the math, it reaches as much as 100% the target

100%. Why would we want to do any kind of program with a school that, by your own mathematics, reaches 100%?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, the numbers we looked at were the ones immunized. You are right that there are schools with. If you add the exemption and the number of immunized, you get up to 100%. However, our concern is the number that are vaccinated and so we want to give them the opportunity to share with their family members or their guardians of their students the opportunity to get vaccinated. Obviously, once again, if they choose to not do that, because they may have an exemption rate of 8% or 9%, that is fine. The outreach is not to the parents. The outreach is to the school itself.

SC: And on their immunization consent form, there is several questions about assigned gender preferred pronouns. Are these going to impact any potential vulnerability or exposure from the current federal government that might not allow payment for this? Would this affect any grant money or any monies that would pay for this program?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, none that I know of. We have had this discussion recently with CDC and depending upon any further dialog with them, if something does change with that, we can modify the form based on their guidance. As of now, what is in that consent form is considered acceptable.

SC: And of course, the environment of having a clinic come into a school yard or a school campus and have clinicians administer the vaccine during the school week. And it is very important, I would think, for toddlers and young kids that they would feel better having their parents there rather than a stranger administrating an injection. Parents are working. Why do we have to go to all of this when folks, if they want this immunization, they can go to any one of a number of dozens of CVS or Walgreens? Why? Why can't they not just go to the local area drugstore and get the same thing with their parents on a Saturday or Sunday or after school, rather than having to go into a clinic drive-in situation with strangers?

TC: Yeah, Supervisor Christy, members of the Board. It is a really great comment. We would actually hope that most parents would choose to vaccinate through the available services. Also, our clinics themselves have Saturday clinics as we move back into the back-to-school era. So we are trying as a health department to ensure that we have late afternoon hours, as well as weekend hours for parents that are working. Once again, I just want to reiterate that this is to make it the easiest it can be for individuals to get their children immunized if they choose to do that and it may turn out as Chair Scott asked us to come back and report that at the end of this, we reached out to over 100. We have 20 schools that accept the offer. I think the other part of this is just this reminder that one of the roles of public health is to make sure that we decrease the barriers that exist to services that are important to the community, and that is what this does right now, but I would reiterate what you said to those listening. If you have private insurance or Medicaid, you can get your immunizations at the vast majority of pharmacies that are available right now.

SC: And you mentioned also the HHS report coming out. It is going to be coming out in six months?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, I think it is before that, I think it is September or October, but it is in the fall.

SC: So why don't we wait for the report to come out? Why are we pushing this so quickly now?

TC: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board, from a public health perspective, the MMR is considered a very safe, effective vaccine. It has been used for decades. The numbers of reports that of potential side effects are very minimal. The consent form actually lists a few of them, but I do not feel as the public health director right now that we need to wait. The other thing is that as children go back to school, we want to make sure they are protected from day one or as early in the school season as we can for them.

SC: And finally, Mr. Chair, thank you for your patience. I may need some help from you on responding to a constituent. I would like to just maybe see what your comments would be, that I could pass them on to my constituent. She is an MD. She has written me before on health issues, she says, "Vaccinated people can also transmit measles, people who choose to forgo a medical procedure because they judge risk to be greater than benefit to them, or for other reasons, are perfectly within their rights." How do you react to that?

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, this whole, what we are seeing happening with vaccinations now is something that has happened throughout health care. In the last, I would say, 10 to 15 years, which is about shared decision making and her second comment is really related to if an individual or a family member makes a decision and wants to discuss it with the provider, and then together they make a different decision, that is perfectly acceptable. That is the way that vaccinations are being recommended right now in multiple cases by the CDC and by the Health Department. When we an individual comes in to get vaccinated, we indicate to them what are the recommended shots for that individual based on age and gender and risk factors and underlying disease. However, the final decision to get a vaccine is really rests within that individual and in the case of a minor within their parent and their guardian. I think the comment about if you are vaccinated, you can infect other people is not true for the MMR vaccine. There are cases where individuals have been fully immunized and have gotten measles, and in that case, they do have a low proclivity to infect someone else, but their effectiveness is very low and that maybe what she is referring to. The shot itself does not put you in a position that you will then affect somebody, infect somebody with measles because you have gotten an immunization.

SC: And she finishes by saying, "schools should not be vaccination or clinic sites. Vaccines need to be given in a medical setting with the ability to handle severe

reactions, keep proper medical records, and obtain informed consent, including the right to exemptions."

TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, I would say that our plan addresses all of those. They will be, vaccines will be administered with the ability to respond to any adverse reactions. They will be administered by licensed independent practitioners. We will be tracking medical records appropriately, and individuals who choose to not get a vaccine will not sign a consent form and not show up to get a vaccine at that point. I feel really comfortable with that. Those concerns and that they have been they are being adequately addressed by our plan.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you, Dr. Cullen, for the plan. I think it is very thoughtful and very detailed. I have some questions around exemptions, and there is within your Appendix, there is a few schools, Desert Christian K-8 that has a nearly 42% exempt, Faith Community Academy, 36% exempt, Tanque Verde Lutheran, 36%, Saint Andrews, 33%, Tucson Waldorf also in the 30% exempt. Who could you talk to me a little bit about? So who determines who defines exemptions and how long is that valid? Is it something that a parent needs to kind of renew throughout the educational process of a child? And what are the allowable reasons?

TC: So I am going to give this to Crystal. So she is probably going to mess up the Supervisor Allen and Board.

CR: Supervisor Allen, members of the Board, I do the best I could there, so ADHS defines the types of exemptions that are allowed, so there is medical exemptions, those have to be signed by some kind of medical provider alongside with the parent or guardian, to determine that they are not medically eligible for the vaccine. Those are very rare, especially with MMR vaccines, because they are very well tolerated. True, anaphylactic reactions are incredibly rare, so most of the other exemptions are personal belief exemptions or religious exemptions, so those generally are because people have ideological issues with vaccines, or they have safety concerns that have not been adequately addressed, so those are the exemptions that you see mostly in those schools, medical exemptions are generally less than 1% or lower in schools. Oh, yes, the questions about renewals, so medical exemptions the provider determines how long they last, so say they have had an anaphylactic reaction. They will probably make that a lifetime but then certain situations may change and so those can be shorter term exemptions. As far as the personal and religious exemptions, those do not expire. They can last the entire time that the child is with the school. However, some districts do have policies in place to encourage those being revisited and changed every year, which is generally a kind of considered a best practice because it gives the parents an opportunity to reconsider the vaccination, have that conversation again, and kind of see what how they are feeling about that.



DRAFT

JA: So I know that the plan is focused on the schools that have the highest unvaccination rate and those that have the fewest exemptions. Right, but I am just curious about the ones that have these high exemptions and whether or not, is there is I think like we did a little bit of research around how it is that you sort of change how you address how you have conversations with people that have a belief that, you know, whatever the belief might be, but this is public health, which means that it is less of a and we learned this lesson clearly through the pandemic about this, the tension point between individual decisions and what we think of as an individual right. But then also the community right, and the community need and public health is one of those where we are pushed to think beyond ourselves and to think about the public good, so are is there is there any sort of like compelling research models, case studies that can tackle some of the motivations that drive folks to go for these exemptions? Because there are a number of schools where exemptions are really high, and it seems very unlikely that they are for medical reasons but instead are for religious or personal reasons.

CR: Supervisor Allen, members of the Board, I think right now that really is sort of the million dollar question and immunization practice. I think we are really short on very novel strategies about how to address these kinds of hesitancies and concerns. The things we do know is that there are some strategies that do work. We know that one on one conversations between parents and providers are incredibly important. We know that overwhelmingly, parents do still trust their medical providers, even if some of their feelings may be at odds with the recommendations, so having those opportunity to have those one on one conversations, that really gives them an opportunity in a non-judgmental environment to voice concerns and have them heard is important. I think that is part of the barrier that we are facing, is that it is very difficult to find time and to find the right provider with the right fit to have those one on one conversations and I think there are pieces of the plan that try to address that. That is why we are providing licensed professional staff who are trained to if they want to have those conversations with our teams in the field or call us in the office, those are opportunities for them. We also do ask on the survey that Dr. Cullen referenced, that if you are declining mobile services in your school, what are the reasons that you are declining and what else can we do for you? Even if you are not quite ready for a full immunization clinic, maybe you would want education or some kind of conversation to be happening. But yeah, I think those strategies, they were still hoping they are coming down the pipeline.

JA: Thank you for your work.

RS: Supervisor Cano and then Supervisor Heinz.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. And hello, Dr. Cullen, are we forcing vaccinations on any child in Pima County schools?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, no, we are not forcing immunizations.

AC: Are we entering schools, Dr. Cullen, without permission from administrators or districts?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, no, we will only enter a school if we have been invited by the administration.

AC: Do we vaccinate any child who has not been authorized by a parent, guardian or legal authority?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, no, we do not vaccinate anyone that does not have appropriate consent.

AC: Thank you. I have three more questions. Do schools voluntarily opt-in to host mobile vaccine clinics?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, yes, schools voluntarily opt-in.

AC: Dr. Cullen, is parental consent required before a child receives the MMR vaccine to our mobile unit?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, parental and/or guardian consent is required.

AC: Thank you for that clarification, and my last question is Pima County constitutionally mandated to protect and uphold the region's public health Dr. Cullen?

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, yes, we are mandated.

AC: Thank you.

MH: And Chair Scott, Dr. Cullen, just a couple of extra things. One, I wanted to respond to my colleague's concerns from District 4 that mobile units are, in fact, medically appropriate settings for delivering vaccinations, which you clarified, and I think another member of the Board did, too but I am in my nearly two decades of practicing medicine. I am not aware of a religious like a firmly held, longstanding religious belief based exemption for vaccination and I am just wondering, because you monitor this more than probably better than I do, are you aware of that or what religion does not allow for it? It is not Catholics. Pope Frank was pretty clear on that but I mean, do you know? I am truly, honestly curious because we have the three exemptions. One is medical, which is can be a serious reaction, of course, the second being religious, which I do not know what the basis for that is and the most disturbing exemption, of course, is the personal belief exemption in the state of Arizona, which just says based on nothing whatsoever other than the parent just thinks it is not a good idea. They will just sign something and then the kid does not get vaccinated, which endangers everyone, but we have to abide by those, I guess, but what religion, is there a religion that actually says no to vaccinations, which what is that?

CR: Supervisor Heinz, members of the Board, no, there are no mainstream religions that have issues with vaccination, so when you are in preschool, there is not a personal belief exemption available. It is only religious beliefs exemptions available for and in the state of Arizona, so we believe that people sign the religious exemptions because that is the only option available to them at that age group.

MH: Okay. And then lastly, and this is for Chair Scott and Dr. Cullen, I know that we focus on like the vaccination rates for like enrolling like matriculating kindergartners when these, you know, hopefully all of these schools are inviting folks in. But for the schools that have had several years of less than 95% vaccination rates. So that means there could be first graders and second graders and third graders that are that maybe still have not gotten that MMR will those be offered in those in that kind of situation, or are you only going to be targeting the matriculating kindergartners? And I guess I would hope that it would be open to anyone who still needs a vaccination but I am curious to hear if you have included that in your calculations and strategy.

TC: Yeah. Supervisor Heinz, members of the Board, I think it is important to go back to something Supervisor Christy said that immunizations are available at multiple places throughout the County. Most pharmacies, a significant minority of pediatricians, many pediatricians, like I stated, have stopped doing vaccines. But that is because the health clinics there and the pharmacies are there. So at this point, we do not have a plan to go back in, for instance, to evaluate third grade numbers and immunization rates at that point. However, they are evaluated in sixth grade. So we have sixth grade data. So the State collects that data. That is a report that is required from schools and so once we get through this, we could potentially go to the sixth grade. However, when we have looked at that there is a lot less schools in that situation. Remember at this age we are hitting that 4 to 6 year old. Remember first one, 12 to 15 month old, second 4 to 6 year old, so you can see how you could easily, as a parent get to a six year old and not have immunized because you believe you have this two year span period, so the hope is really that we can, by accelerating the immunization there. By the time everyone is in sixth grade, we will have had adequate catch up from this plan and we will be okay.

MH: Great. Thank you. That is all my questions.

AC: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you. Can I move the item Chair Scott?

RS: You may.

AC: Thank you. I move to approve the mobile unit deployment plan as presented by staff.

MH: Second.



DRAFT

RS: Moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Any further discussion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed?

SC: No.

RS: Item passes 4-1, with Supervisor Christy opposed. Thank you both so much your time.

TC: Thank you very much.

DRAFT

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

57. **Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 - Closing the Gap in Affordable Housing, Tackling Housing Insecurity, and Preventing an Escalation of Homelessness**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Proposing adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 - Closing the Gap in Affordable Housing, Tackling Housing Insecurity, and Preventing an Escalation of Homelessness, to establish Pima County policy to address housing affordability, reduce housing insecurity, and prevent homelessness by establishing an annual allocation of County funds to support the construction of new and preservation of existing affordable housing units and to fund supportive programs that keep people housed, with a total allocation over 10 years of at least $250 Million to the Pima County “Affordable Housing Fund.” (District 2)

Verbatim

RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: We are now going to go to Addendum Item No. 6. This is Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.17 Closing the Gap in Affordable Housing, Tackling Housing Insecurity and Preventing an Escalation of Homelessness. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott and colleagues. This is, as I mentioned, a product of quite a lot of deliberation between a lot of different staff members and also working very closely with our County staff, County Administrator Lesher and others, which and I appreciate everybody's efforts here. This is a ten year plan that begins in fiscal year ‘27. This will not take effect until then so nothing at all impacting fiscal year 2026 and this is a longer term plan. The goal of this plan is to, over that decade, generate at least $200 million more than what we have already been placing, investing in affordable housing over these past several years and it is directly based on the data that came to us in the ECONorthwest Study. It is going to, we estimate based on those numbers, bring in sufficient funds to take care of approximately one third or 12,500 housing units of the 36,000 affordable housing units that we will need in this County over the next decade. It is, as my colleague from District 3 said, it is a step. It is a bold step, but it is not enough. It is not nearly enough, but it is something that the County can become involved in and we really desperately need to as we have heard here the past couple of meetings, in discussing this item, and we heard just from several folks before these items were being discussed, there is continued concern with housing insecurity and that housing insecurity can lead into homelessness and people in their cars, on the streets or sleeping in front of businesses or other things, so it is a public health crisis as we heard, my colleague from District 5 referred to and it is something that I see, frankly, every day when I



DRAFT

am working in the hospital, so it is something that we have to do and right now, people who rent, the people who are renting in our community, 55% of them are spending well over 30% of their income to stay in that house or that apartment or that duplex or whatever. That is not okay. That 30% is at limit, and that is utilities plus whatever it costs to pay your rent and that number is going to go up and up and up and the more that goes up without us doing something, the more people are going to be ending up on the street and that is bad in so many ways, and we pay for it as taxpayers, in so many other ways and I know it is a little unorthodox for me, but I would like to quote from Philippians, 2nd Chapter, Verses 3 and 4, "Do nothing out of selfish ambition or empty pride, but in humility consider others more important than yourselves. Each of you should look not only to your own interests, but also to the interests of others." I think we need to keep that in mind and I will move the item.

JA: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Allen. Any other comments or discussion from Supervisors? Supervisor Christy?

SC: I am still just amazed that we are going to have a ten-year plan here designed to go over that amount of time with no public hearing, no public input, no public discussion. I think that is a grave misjustice to the people that are paying for this whole program and I have one final question that is rhetorical in nature, but to the County Administrator, would instead of saying that this is affordable housing, would it be more accurate to describe it as taxpayer subsidized housing?

RS: Since your question was rhetorical, I am gathering you are not asking for a response. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair. Scott, I just have to respectfully disagree with my colleague from District 4. This is an issue that has been continued for three meetings at this point. We have a responsibility as individual Supervisors to have a pulse of the community. It is why I mentioned earlier that I had a housing roundtable last Friday to inform some of my decisions. Delaying any further action is making the issue that much greater as it relates to housing and security and I think what is super important for the public to recognize is that we are doing this to send a regional commitment to affordable housing. We have to boost supply, and this has to also be celebrated for the level of investment that we are trying to make, to put us back on the right side of history. We have so much opportunity as a County to really influence the lives of our residents, and this is not an idea that just came up out of nowhere. It is based on a needs assessment that our County departments work really hard on, and I just have to give a little bit of voice to that so that we can kind of cut through fact versus fiction on process, and whether this Board came up with the idea sporadically. This policy empowers the Housing Commission, which is a public entity, to be able to come back to the Board for recommendations on the kind of investments that are needed and so the guardrails absolutely put this Board at the decision making table. Supervisor Christy, and thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Anything else from Board members? I am not going to be able to support this item and the reason I am not going to be able to support this item is because in November, as we heard at our last meeting, and as we heard from the County Administrator just a few minutes ago, we are going to get the draft plan from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission, as we have seen in two memoranda from the County Administrator, that draft plan is going to include recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in terms of how to fund that plan, it not only will take into account County funding, but funding from the other jurisdictions who have to play a role in this. It will also take into account what state and federal funding we may be able to leverage. We have now taken care of, because of the passage of an Agenda Item No. 19, which I was pleased to support, we have taken care of this fiscal year. We have taken care of the period from July 1st of this year to June 30th of 2026, and we can in November, right before we start talking about the overall County budget, also talk about how to fund the plan that is going to be presented to us by the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. To go to Supervisor Christy's points that plan will be presented to the Board. We will have the opportunity to discuss it, to revise it. I imagine that will take more than one Board meeting, so now that we have taken care of through Agenda Item No. 19, fiscal year '25/26, I would prefer to wait until we get to the draft plan that is going to be presented to us at the end of November, before we start talking about how to fund that plan. I have great concern for all of the data that my colleague from District 2 put in this item, and I fully anticipate that we are going to be looking at uses of County revenue when that plan is presented to us, but now that we have taken care of this fiscal year, I think it would be prudent to wait until we get the Regional Affordable Housing Commission's recommendations and then talk about funding. Any other questions or comments from Supervisors? Okay. We will do a roll call vote on this one, Ms. Manriquez.

MM: This is for the approval of the Adoption of Board Policy D 22.17. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Aye.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No. Item passes 3 to 2 with Supervisor Christy and myself in opposition. Alright.

DRAFT

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

59. **Follow Up Request to the Attorney General's Office Regarding Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Investigation, Request for Independent Investigation**

Discussion/Direction/Action: The Pima County Sheriff's Department has completed its Internal Affairs (IA) investigation into the sexual assault that occurred between a Pima County Sheriff's Department sergeant and a deputy in December of 2022. In 2023, the Board of Supervisors asked the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to do an independent investigation into the Department's internal response to the assault, to see if any laws or protocols had been broken. In its response dated August 29, 2024 (included in attached CA memo) the AGO noted that while it did not appear that any laws were broken, there were various Sheriff's Department policies that "may have been violated by command staff". The AGO concluded: "We understand that additional information will be developed during an IA investigation which may provide explanations or justifications for these areas of concern. The AGO would welcome the opportunity to review the IA investigation after it is completed by the Sheriff's Department should this Board continue to have concerns." Now that the Sheriff's Department's IA investigation is complete, directing the County Administrator to ask the AGO to review the Department's IA investigation and any related matters, to ascertain if any laws or protocols were in fact broken. (District 2)

Verbatim

---

RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator

---

RS: We are going to go to Addendum Item No. 8. This is Follow Up Request to the Attorney General's Office Regarding Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Investigation, Request for Independent Investigation. This was Supervisor Heinz's item, but he had to step away, but I will let my colleagues know that I was in communication with Supervisor Heinz over the weekend, was also in communication with representatives from the County Attorney's office and also from the County Administrator's office, as my colleagues know, because I asked the Clerk to let you know, I had requested that the Sheriff provide us with a summary of the Internal Affairs investigation. He did respond with much more than a summary. He sent us a document of over 100 pages. That and all of you have received that directly from the Sheriff and Supervisor Heinz had put this item on the Addendum. There was a communication between the time that we got the Sheriff's Report with the County Attorney's office, with the County Administrator's office, so I am going to turn it over to Supervisor Heinz, since he put this item on the Addendum, but then would ask that he follow up with the County Administrator with regard to actions she is intending. Supervisor?



DRAFT

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. And this is an issue of great concern. I mean, we have a duty to make sure that all County employees are safe and protected and in this kind of situation, none of us ever like to see this kind of situation, so concerns were brought forward about this overall circumstance and how things were treated and how things went forward back in 2023. I do not remember the exact date, we did refer this to the Attorney General (AG), we got a response, as people can see. I still have some concerns, but as we heard from the Chair, over 100 pages of interviews, I have not personally been able to read line by line or page by page, all of that material that we received late Friday. I appreciate that we received from the Sheriff and his staff, the internal investigation that was conducted. I still continue to have some concerns. I would like to review this further, but we can have County Administrator Lesher interact with the AG on our behalf, and I would just like to hear from her what the plan is in terms of follow up.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz, members of the Board, I have drafted a letter to the AG asking to take them up on their offer in 2024. The response from their initial investigation we shared with the Board at the time, and there were some internal concerns with some policies, but they said they would be happy to become engaged again once the internal investigation was completed. I have written a letter to the AG, finishing it up last night, wanting to attach to the report and that has taken a brief pause, because I want to make sure before I send something, if it comes out from me and it becomes a public record, have we appropriately redacted any personally identifiable information and that needed to be redacted and/or can the attorneys work with legal counsel through this? But I am optimistic that the letter to the AG will go by the end of business today.

RS: Alright. Thank you, Ms. Lesher. Any follow up questions or comments? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Just quickly, again, this is no longer 18 months ago and this situation has resulted in a criminal case, a criminal conviction. I believe there is appeal ongoing as well, so it is important that we look into this and make sure that everything is proper here, so and I guess are we going to remove the item here or how do we do this?

RS: Let me, Supervisor Christy had something he wanted to say.

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair, just for clarification. So, Ms. Lesher, this letter to the AG, can you give us kind of a synopsis of what it is all about or what.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, the Board voted in 2023 to ask for an investigation from the AG's office. They conducted an investigation, they responded, then about in 2024 with their findings, which we shared with the Board. They said once the internal investigation was completed, they would be happy to become engaged again and review that document, so this is simply saying thank



DRAFT

you very much, reminding them of their communication with us in 2024 and asking that they move forward with that investigation.

SC: In other words, we will take you up on the offer you made back then.

JL: You got it.

SC: Thank you.

MH: Just a quick.

RS: Please go ahead.

MH: To clarify, so the internal investigation for this situation, which I believe occurred in late 2022, I maybe, I am wrong with that, but the internal investigation was conducted in 2025. Is that right? I know I have the document, I just do not have that.

JL: Chair Scott, I am afraid, Supervisor Heinz, I do not have the exact dates with me to delineate the timeline. I am happy to get them to you.

MH: Okay. That is fine. I am just clarifying.

RS: So just to clarify for the public, we did receive over 100 pages of documents from the Sheriff. They were sent directly to Supervisors and all of those documents contain the names of departmental personnel who were involved in this matter. Ms. Lesher is following up with the AG. The AG said that they would investigate further after the Internal Affairs investigation within the Sheriff's Department was completed. It is completed, she just summarized for us the letter that she is going to send. There is just still a question of how much of the report that we got from the Sheriff needs to be redacted or edited in any way before it is sent to the AG, certainly before it is released to the to the public or media in any way, but there is going to be follow up on this matter through the County Administrator with the AG's office.

MH: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Does the report that goes to the AG's office need to be redacted at all? I would request that we do not redact at all and go straight to the AG.

MH: No, sir. I do not believe it needs to be redacted to go to the AG's office, but what the County Administrator was saying is when she writes a letter to the AG, per counsel, that she received from the County Attorney's office, that becomes a public document and if the report is attached to it, then the report could be considered a public document, so we are just being careful about what could be seen because of

DRAFT

all of the names of departmental personnel that are noted in that report. Did I leave anything out, Ms. Lesher?

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and I think, Supervisor Heinz, we would not be redacting information from the AG once they are looking at the review. They will get everything at that point.

MH: Okay, perfect then. That is just thank you.

RS: Alright. Anything else on this? So we would be pulling that item then Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Well we kind of discussed it, so we just do not have to take any action right?

RS: That is correct.

MH: Yeah, I am comfortable with the follow up as we have discussed with the County Administrator, if as long as my colleagues are also comfortable with that I am fine with that.

RS: Alright. Anything from any other Supervisors? Okay. Thank you all very much.

DRAFT