# FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Flood Control District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Flood Control District Tentative Budget in the amount of $18,379,495.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.3289. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **CONTRACT**

B&C Contractors, Incorporated, Breinholt Contracting Co., Inc. and T B Contractors, Inc., to provide a job order contract: demolition services, Flood Control District and Various Department Funds, contract amount $750,000.00 (SC2500000143)

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

3. **WA:K COMMUNITY PARK**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - FC2, of the Pima County Board of Directors of the Regional Flood Control District, to support the design and construction of a Wa:k Community Park in the San Xavier District of the Tohono O'Odham Nation.



DRAFT

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

Supervisor Allen acknowledged and thanked staff for their exemplary work on this project. She stated that staff worked with the San Xavier District and the Tohono O'odham Nation to design the park to fit the community's desires, and through this collaboration were able to leverage a $1.5 million additional state park grant for the project. She highlighted the project as a great example of a deeply rooted and meaningful investment into the community by the partnership between the County and the Nation.

4. **STAGE II FIRE RESTRICTIONS AND DECLARATION OF FIRE EMERGENCY**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – FC3, of the Pima County Board of Supervisors and the Pima County Regional Flood Control District Board of Directors, imposing Stage II Fire Restrictions on land owned by Pima County and the Regional Flood Control District in unincorporated areas of Pima County.

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

Supervisor Allen stated that she was glad protective measures were being put into place and that they were trying to introduce protective factors around fire risk, but requested the resolution be amended in a way that made it consistent with the State Forester since her understanding was that this was an implementation of a designation and criteria developed by the State Forester. She explained that the State Forester's Stage II Risk had a prohibition on discharging a firearm, including target shooting, with an exception if an individual was engaged in a lawful hunt pursuant to State, Federal, or tribal laws and regulations. She stated that discharging a firearm was a significant contribution to wildfire risk and a vast majority of fires were human caused. She added that while fires caused by firearms were underreported, 92% of those caused by shooting were from target practice. She stated that most public lands were closed seasonally for target shooting when conditions were very dry and recalled the local Sawmill Fire that was caused by firearm discharge, burned almost 50,000 acres, and costed over $8 million to contain. She stated that as the County further committed to keeping the community safe from wildfires amending the resolution would be advantageous to the County's policy.

Chair Scott asked if Supervisor Allen had made a motion.

Supervisor Allen responded in the affirmative and clarified that the motion was to make the Board's resolution consistent with the State Forester's prohibition of discharging a firearm and other specific language as stated.

Chair Scott pointed out that the second part of the Board's resolution indicated the State Forester had authority, per the cited statutes, to coordinate wildfire suppression and prevention efforts and impose fire restrictions on State managed

lands, and that effective May 12, 2025, recommended the implementation of Stage II Fire Restrictions. He asked for clarification on whether Supervisor Allen's concerns would be addressed if the Board approved the resolution based on the State Forester's recommendation.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, clarified there were two other items that the State Forester included that were not in the County's recommendation that dealt with the use of firearms and consumer fireworks, not the public displays previously discussed. She explained that they decided in the initial stages that it be potentially minimally invasive and that this only included the unincorporated lands currently owned by the County. She stated that if the Board wished, the two additional clauses used by the State could easily be added as amendments.

Chair Scott asked why those two items were not included in the County's resolution.

Ms. Lesher reiterated that at this point it was to be minimally invasive. She explained they thought those items might slow the initial implementation of this program, but there was no objection to the addition of them.

Chair Scott asked if Supervisor Allen wanted to amend her motion to include both of those restrictions not included by staff, or just the one concern she mentioned.

Supervisor Allen confirmed she wanted to add both restrictions.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, stated there was a motion on the floor and asked for clarification if what was being discussed was a substitute motion or a friendly amendment to the motion.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was a friendly amendment.

Ms. Manriquez asked whether Chair Scott, the maker of the motion, and Supervisor Christy, the seconder, accepted the friendly amendment.

Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy responded yes.

Supervisor Christy stated that since this focused on Pima County owned land it would include the Sheriff's gun range. He asked if that would be shut down and what other County properties were included, such as Colossal Cave.

Ms. Lesher noted uncertainty regarding the exact language of the firearms, but a facility such as a gun range and for law enforcement purposes was not the intent, rather for recreational shooting, but staff could look at that specific language. She clarified this would be for County land such as Colossal Cave, Old Tucson, some parks that are in unincorporated Pima County, and some Flood Control.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that this conversation was important to distinguish County operated shooting facilities. He stated that outside of those operations, discharging of firearms was not permitted within County

owned land. He stated that with that distinction, they could craft the language to ensure those County facilities that hosted shooting sports or shooting activities could be operated.

Supervisor Christy asked if a list of County owned properties impacted by the resolution could be provided to the Board.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded they could identify those properties and attach it.

Chair Scott restated that the Board was voting on the resolution with the addition of the two restrictions, as discussed.

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

# IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the following County Improvement District Tentative Budgets for Fiscal Year 2025/2026:

| **IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT** | **FY 25-26 PROPERTY TAX LEVY** |
|---|---|
| **Other Improvement District** | |
| HAYHOOK RANCH | $40,000 |
| **Street Lighting Improvement District** | |
| CARDINAL ESTATES | $15,340 |
| CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1 | $ 8,874 |
| CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3 | $ 2,988 |
| DESERT STEPPES | $ 5,220 |
| HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES | $ 4,472 |
| LAKESIDE NO. 1 | $ 6,960 |
| LITTLETOWN | $27,140 |
| LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1 | $ 9,444 |
| LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2 | $11,155 |
| MAÑANA GRANDE B | $ 7,456 |
| MAÑANA GRANDE C | $12,180 |
| MIDVALE PARK | $15,752 |
| MORTIMORE ADDITION | $36,773 |
| OAKTREE NO. 1 | $26,524 |
| OAKTREE NO. 2 | $20,800 |
| OAKTREE NO. 3 | $27,272 |
| ORANGE GROVE VALLEY | $ 7,608 |
| PEACH VALLEY | $ 4,406 |
| PEPPERTREE RANCH | $11,476 |
| ROLLING HILLS | $20,044 |
| SALIDA DEL SOL | $16,932 |

DRAFT

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Improvement District Tentative Budgets, as presented. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

# LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Library District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Library District Tentative Budget in the amount of $58,700,101.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.5579. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay.”

2. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Unified School District No. 1, Amendment No. 5, to provide for a Southwest Library lease located at 6855 S. Mark Road, extend contract term to 4/30/30 and amend contractual language, Library District Fund, contract amount $148,435.36 (CT_12-871)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this appeared to be a Pima County library located in a Tucson Unified School District school that was being paid for by the County, and that the County was also renting the cafeteria to provide food services. He requested clarification of this item.



DRAFT

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, stated this was a standard lease agreement that had been in place for a number of years for the library. He stated that it was located in the old Lawrence Building, which also served as a community center and food services were offered to students during certain hours, which mainly took place in the summer.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

# ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

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, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and adopt the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Tentative Budget in the amount of $4,694,564.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK



DRAFT

# STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Stadium District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Stadium District Tentative Budget in the amount of $9,875,827.00. Upon roll call 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 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK



DRAFT

# WILDFLOWER COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Wildflower 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, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

Review and adoption of the Wildflower Community Facilities District Tentative Budget for Fiscal year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Wildflower Community Facilities District Tentative Budget in the amount of $0.00. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz asked why the Board had to vote on this item since its tentative budget amount was zero.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management Department, stated that it was a requirement to establish the district before they could establish any budget.

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

DRAFT

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

# BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, 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>Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney<br>Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board<br>John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms |

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:36 a.m.
**Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Matt O'Connor, Classification and Compensation Manager, Pima County Human Resources Department.

3. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

4. **POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Supervisor Cano wished Recorder Cázares-Kelly, a Happy Birthday.

**PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Nancy Cole, Senior Advisor, Pima County Administration; Deirdre LaRochelle, Engineering and Landscape Architecture Division Manager, Nanda Srinivasamurthy, Engineer I, Matthew Lutheran and Nichole Casebeer, Landscape Architecture Project Managers, Luke Heinzelman, Public Works Manager II, and Martha Guzman, Administrative Services Manager I,

DRAFT

Regional Flood Control District, proclaiming the week of May 18 through May 24, 2025 to be: "PUBLIC WORKS 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. Supervisor Allen made the presentation.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Daniel Sullivan, Director, and Manira Cervantes, Division Manager, Erina Delic, Manager II, Patricia Fierros, Esther Cortez and Elaine Corral, Coordinators, Community and Workforce Development, proclaiming the month of May 2025 to be: "COMMUNITY ACTION 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.

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Kenyon Victor addressed the Board and expressed his opposition to Minute Item No. 43, and asked that the Board oppose it. He felt that it would strain resources for companies and the community.

Chris Conniff voiced his concern over leadership at the Sheriff's Department. He stated that current leadership was failing to uphold its deputies accountable and suggested that the Board find leadership outside the current command staff.

David Lutz expressed his opposition to the Board of Supervisors Policy D22.17. He acknowledged that affordable housing was necessary, but his property taxes were already unmanageable. He also voiced his support of Minute Item No. 23.

Tom Hannagan, Member, Friends of Ironwood Forest, spoke in support of Minute Item No. 23 and explained that they offer educational experiences to children and college students at the monument.

April Putney spoke regarding her support of Minute Item No. 16. She stated that she understood the impact raising property taxes would have and urged the Board to approve the item and do more for the community.

Glenda Avalos expressed her support for affordable housing and for the approval of Minute Item No. 16. She believed it would strengthen the community and help people who were experiencing poverty.

Keith Bentele spoke in support of the Minute Item No. 16. He cited one statistic from the Gap Analysis Report and stated that the proposal was a modest response to the housing affordability issue.

Willie Blake shared his appreciation for the work that Supervisor Christy did for District 4.

Zion Alderete spoke in support of affordable housing and urged the Board to approve Minute Item No. 16. He shared that he had experienced being unhoused and believed the proposal would help reduce the number of unsheltered individuals.

Mike Quigley, AZ Director for the Wilderness Society, addressed the Board and voiced his support for the Resolution No. 2025 - 13. He noted that the Ironwood Forest was a place of ecological importance and offered the community respite from the monotony of daily life.

Danielle Meirhofer expressed her concerns regarding the criminal activity that was happening in the alley behind her home and asked the Board for their assistance. She reported that the Department of Transportation stopped them from putting up signage that forbade trespassers because there was an obscure law against that.

Sherry Wilson reiterated Ms. Meirhofer's points and stated that she had a signed petition which detailed the neighborhood's wants and needs for the alley. She asked the Board for their help to protect their property and their family.

Faffs Riederer expressed his support for affordable housing and Minute Item No. 16. He shared his belief that while individuals alone could not address the homelessness issue, the community could work together to help the unhoused.

Kate Hotton, Co-Executive Director, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, spoke in support of Minute Item No. 23. She stated that diminishing the monument would threaten cultural and natural resources and thanked the Board for their commitment to preserving the Ironwood National Forest Monument.

Kylie McPherson expressed her support for the affordable housing and Minute Item No. 16. She stated that she wrote several papers discussing the issues within Pima County's homeless community and believed the proposal would help those who were suffering from poverty.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Heinz requested that staff follow up with Ms. Meirhofer and Ms. Wilson regarding their issues with the alley behind their house.

Chair Scott pointed out that there was a scrivener's error in Section A of the fireworks code amendment ordinance and that the correct language should read as follows, "Each applicant must notify any neighbors within 1,000 feet of the site by any effective means of notification, including but not limited to, direct mail, door flyers, signs or communication through homeowners or neighborhood associations,

the means of the notice shall be specified on the application for a permit." He stated that it was an oversight and that the corrected version would be considered by the Board during the meeting.

Supervisor Cano asked the Clerk of the Board to provide the contact information for any speakers who were District 5 residents to his office so that they could follow up with them.

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:59 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:37 p.m. All members were present.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

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

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

11. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in the Differential Water Rate Case.

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

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding encampments on Pima County properties.

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

13. **TENTATIVE BUDGET HEARING**

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board regarding the Tentative Budgets for FY 2025/2026. The following speakers addressed the Board.

The Honorable Ray Carroll, Justice of the Peace, Green Valley Justice Court, addressed the Board regarding the Green Valley Justice Court's proposed Budget. He reviewed recent accomplishments in the justice precinct, including the 2022 agreement to absorb half of Precinct 5 and support continuity of operations. He noted DUI Court Administrator Margarita Valle's favorable recognition by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, a 35% increase in case volume in 2024, and an 81% five-year growth with judicial credits rising from 180 to 300 annually. He reported program successes, praised staff efforts, and addressed staffing challenges

following losing their Probation Officer and suggested a hybrid Community Officer as a solution.

Melissa Tuccio spoke about her concerns regarding affordable housing and broader systemic issues, referencing immigration policy, oversight failures, and foreign influence over local priorities. She criticized disparities in housing values, questioned the integrity of decision-makers, and linked local industry to global conflict, including the ongoing war in Palestine. She expressed her frustration with perceived hypocrisy and the lack of tangible solutions despite Tucson's reputation for innovation.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

14. Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz, to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026 in the amount of $1,753,877,142.00 at an effective tax rate of $5.2317. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-1, Chair Scott voted "Nay," and Supervisor Christy was not present for the vote.

15. Review and adoption of the Debt Service Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Services Tentative Budget in the amount of $105,877,442.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.1150. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was not present for the vote.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

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

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to continue the item until the report from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission was received. Upon the vote, the motion failed 2-3, Supervisors Allen, Cano and Heinz voted "Nay."

It was then moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Allen to approve the original proposal submitted by Supervisor Heinz on Friday, May 16, 2025. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano made a substitute motion and he read the amendments to the policy. The motion died for lack of a second.

A substitute motion was then moved by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Supervisor Allen to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 3, 2025. Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

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

Chair Scott stated that the Legislative Policy Committee of the County Supervisors' Association had canceled its Friday meetings due to lack of legislative action. He encouraged his colleagues to join him in attending the Legislative Policy Summit in Yuma from October 28th through October 30th. Additionally, he reminded the Board that he was their liaison for the Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC) and that Rocque Perez, the Executive Director, was appointed to serve as the Ward 5 City Council member for the duration of Council member Fimbres's term. He stated that it was to his knowledge that Mr. Perez was on unpaid leave from MEC but was still consulting and working with MEC staff. He stated that Mr. Perez intended to introduce a proposal to transform the MEC into the Southern Arizona Education Council, in partnership with Santa Cruz County and the City of Nogales, and he planned to meet with Mr. Perez to discuss that proposal.

Supervisor Heinz asked why Mr. Perez had to be on unpaid leave and if that decision was based off of legal counsel from the City of Tucson.

Chair Scott stated that Mr. Perez made the decision after discussion with the City attorney and members in the City after his appointment because it was a joint City/County Commission.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he attended his first Pima Association of Governments (PAG)/Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) meeting and he also visited another jurisdiction's version of PAG/RTA, on his own expense, because he did not believe Pima's PAG/RTA was functioning correctly and he wanted the visit to help him form an opinion. He attended the joint PAG/RTA meeting on April 21, 2025, and they discussed when to place the next RTA tax proposal on the ballot. He stated that they did not believe it would be ready for the November 2025 election, so they aimed to have it prepared for the March 2026 election. He stated that the Commission chose March 2026 as this would avoid the April Fools Clause, which would delay the collection of tax revenue until April 2027, a 9-month gap in funding when the Commission was already behind on projects. He noted that the RTA Board directed staff to convene the RTA and Technical Management Committee (TMC) to devise a plan that would deal with the 13 to 17 uncompleted projects that lacked about $144 million in funding, due to shortfalls dating back to the Great Recession. He indicated that County Administrator Lesher was the Chair of this committee. He stated that the RTA Board asked TMC to develop a strategy on how to address the shortfalls within 60 days. He commented that the TMC had met, but that the Executive Director was adamant that any type of scope changes, even ones that reduced costs, would have to go to voters for approval. He asked Ms. Lesher if she wanted to provide her own version of the TMC report.

Ms. Lesher concurred that the RTA Board asked the TMC to identify next steps for the uncompleted projects and they reviewed their revenues and identified certain areas where RTA might have extra and sent a letter to the Board inquiring about how much was available in those buckets. She stated that the TMC then looked at expenditures and found a couple projects they felt were unnecessary and recommended that the RTA Board reassess with legal counsel whether they needed to work on roads that were functioning well and following road law. She stated that the TMC felt there were opportunities, particularly in projects presented by the City of Tucson that could pair down the County's work and adhere to the desire of the voters, and those would be reassessed at the next meeting in May.

Supervisor Heinz added that on the PAG Regional Council side, he proposed that they conduct a performance review on the current Executive Director and that it be added to the April 21st agenda. He stated that it was difficult to get the item on the agenda and because of repeated errors, they could not add the item to the executive session because legal counsel felt uncomfortable doing so. He stated that there was discussion and approval to review the Executive Director's contract, employment, etcetera and he had proposed an amendment to review the legal services contract and it passed 6-2. He indicated that motion specifically stated that they would have a joint PAG/RTA meeting in 7 to 10 days to review the leadership and it had been 30 days and that meeting had still not occurred because RTA's counsel resigned after 19 years. He stated that there was an upcoming joint

RTA/PAG special meeting on May 22, 2025, to address the procurement process to hire new legal counsel which would be overseen by the Executive Director, which he was concerned about and that process would take 6 to 8 weeks and would leave the Board without legal counsel for two months. He stated that when he was in Colorado he visited another RTA Board and was fascinated that their jurisdiction did not have permanent legal counsel like the County, but a retained legal counsel. He speculated that RTA Board did not need legal counsel and could use interim counsel so that they could be prepared to discuss budgets at the next RTA/PAG meetings. He stated that he would propose this with the RTA Board when they met to discuss the process of getting permanent counsel. He highlighted that there were only two more RTA meetings where they could finalize budget items, and believed it was strange that they had received 2,000 comments from constituents but none of that feedback was incorporated into the plans. He also noted that the cities of Oro Valley and Sahuarita were in opposition to the RTA plan, and he felt meant there was a need to coordinate more with all jurisdictions involved. He stated that it was important they continued to coordinate a well-planned infrastructure program for Southern Arizona because it would have a positive impact on public health, the economy, and securing the business community's support.

Supervisor Allen reported that the Arizona Border Counties Coalition had a meeting scheduled on May 29th that she would be participating in with the other border counties. She indicated that at the Board of Health meeting there had been discussions about the impact of potential Medicaid cuts on the County and they also spoke about the Regional Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee's (ROSAC) recommendation for the utilization of $8 million and approved the allotment and allocation of funds. She suggested that Board members reach out to their representatives sitting on the ROSAC and check in on the discussions happening there. She added that they had also discussed the upcoming heat season and the efforts that were underway by the Health Department to prepare for them.

Chair Scott stated that he was unaware of who their appointees were on ROSAC since they were not appointments made by individual Supervisors, rather were made by the Board on recommendation from the Health Department.

Supervisor Cano shared that he sat on his first meeting with the Visit Tucson Board and he recognized their leadership and CEO, Felipe Garcia, for keeping Pima County on the map. He reported that it was the second time within the last year that Tucson and Pima County were mentioned in the New York Times and was very proud that the most recent article included a majority of District 5 tourist destinations. He highlighted the regional importance of supporting Visit Tucson, and that a member from Visit Tucson invited him to view the upgrades at the Tucson Airport Authority.

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

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

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

Chair Scott stated that this item would be heard prior to the Budget presentations so that it could inform the Board of the upcoming budget decisions.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, acknowledged there was interest in understanding details of federal funding proposals but clarified that Ms. Davis may not have access to specific grant information at the time. She stated that she would take note of any questions and provide future updates, and emphasized that the situation remained fluid.

Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administrator, provided a slideshow presentation and stated they were closely watching the Federal fiscal year 2026 budget, which was currently in deep division at Congress. She stated that she would try to provide the Board with real-time information regarding the quantitative and qualitative impact of those budget cuts or potential reorder of substantial portions of Federal agencies. She stated that as a barometer, they used the fiscal year 2024 audited financial spending and would continue to use that as the landscape by which might inform the ongoing budget conversations. She stated that they worked hand in hand with Finance and Risk Management to understand what risks and costs were realized from the Federal budget, by way of subsequent pass down to State, and the implications it would have on the counties. She stated this presentation was also a follow up to the May 6th presentation and the early released version of the so-called Federal skinny budget for the 2026 fiscal year. She added there would also be discussion on why they were monitoring the courts and the subsequent implications, including the two previous requests by the Board around economic impacts and what the Board had approved since January 7th by way of grant funding opportunities that were potentially at risk this year. She went over the information regarding the courts and that 151 executive orders had stayed steady since the release of this presentation to the Board last week. She stated that there were 244 legal actions with 8 closed. She stated that some of these court cases tied to two subject matter areas, temporary restraining orders and/or blocks to funding terminations, workforce cuts or substantial reorganizations around Federal agencies that would block local jurisdictions or State jurisdiction's ability to do the grant funded work or ongoing program work that were already existing under programmatic portfolios. She added the other area was the allowability of the policy directives set forth in the executive orders, and both of those existed together and how they were monitoring this by determination of the size of impact and obligated versus unobligated funds. She explained that if obligated funds remained intact, there was additional Federal directives from some of their Federal agencies in and around those recipients would have to follow the laws set forth in the executive orders. She stated they were monitoring them closely, a lot were unresolved, but they had seen injunctions and restraining orders on some of the grant terminations that they received to date. She stated they were looking for ways to reinvigorate

those and get those dollars spent and would continue to update the Board as relevant court cases came to fruition and how they would impact the County funds. She went over the two requests by the Board stating that Supervisor Heinz had specifically asked about the economic decision guide and the overall impact to Pima County, how these cuts, inflations, or tariffs would affect them using that as a barometer, how would it affect the County, not only as an operational function and their portfolio and programs, but also the region and the people served. She stated that as highlighted in that economic decision guide, inflation, housing, consumer confidence and federal fund rates were all considered unfavorable for the region. She stated that inflation and tariffs would very much have a considerable amount of impact on County operations and the current project list. She stated that it also affected residents and what they are able to afford, how they put their dollars out into the community and this went into a bigger conversation around the budget implication and cuts to housing, health and safety net services. She stated that as realized by the fiscal 2026 budget, there were considerable cuts proposed to all of those, some of the block grant funding and Community Action Agency funding. She stated that if the region continued with economic or unfavorable economic indicators in the upcoming fiscal years, it would be realized that the cuts to housing, health and safety net services would be duly impactful for residents. She stated that Supervisor Christy requested a count of how many grant award agreements or specific scopes the Board had accepted since January 7th, and by their count, there were 22 grant awards, amendments or no cost extensions for services that were implicated in the fiscal year 2026 budget. She stated they were tied to block funding across County Health and Human Services, Pima County Health Department, and Community Workforce Development (CWD). She added some were no cost extensions, and obligated or unobligated funds would continue to be monitored. She stated there were a lot of proposed cuts and unobligated funds would be swept, but there was enhanced scrutiny on obligated bonds or funds. She explained that for the Federal fiscal year proposed budget and the General Budget Fund discussion, for any additional funds to be set aside potentially as contingency, they would continue to update the Board in real time with actual dollar amounts and what that meant for the community. She stated that it was known that the County was owed money for the Shelter and Services Program, in the amount of $12 million. She stated that for the Community Services Block grant, the State had not received their second tranche of money, roughly about $3 million, which impacted the County by $1.7 million for Community Action Agency services, critical resources distributed to the community through CWD. She stated that they also knew there was substantial reorganization of the Department of Health and Human Services and had seen a considerable amount of programmatic impact in fiscal ‘24 audited financials with the County spending $11.7 million in Health and Human Services funding. She stated this included Centers for Disease Control, Substance Abuse and Mental Health resources. She added this included immunizations, maternal and child family care, HIV services, substance misuse grants and other safety net services, low-income, energy, home assistance and repair, weatherization, and community service block grants from the Department of Health and Human Services. She stated that this number might be realized as a larger number because of the substantial reorganization to the Federal agencies. She stated that Housing and Urban

Development was the second largest grant funding agency the County had, with almost $7 million in expenditures that were tied to a consortium the County had with the City for Section 8 vouchers, the continuum of care and homeless services, and Community Development Block Grants for neighborhood revitalization. She stated that for many of these programs, the County received annual funds for more than 40 years. She stated that for the Department of Homeland Security, the Shelter and Services Program, the County had not been reimbursed but there were greater risks to emergency response grants in general. She stated that based on fiscal year 2024 spending, at least $26 million or 50% of ongoing grants were implicated in either directly highlighted as program elimination or would be rolled up into a substantial reorganization with a Federal agency. She stated they saw some movement on tax exempt municipal bonds, but Medicaid remained a mixed discussion and workforce requirements continued to be discussed. She added that there would be considerable cost shifts to States and Counties as they moved forward in the upcoming weeks and anticipated that the Federal budget would be semi finalized in the upcoming weeks but would see that when it happened and subsequent impacts to the State. She stated that as discussed at the prior meeting the $122 million deficit was resolved in House Bill 2945 and $10 million of that came from the Arizona Commerce Authority Compete funds, $38 million from the Housing Trust Fund, $74 million from the Prescription Drug Rebate Fund, which was State and Federal share. She reiterated that budget discussions were ongoing, and they had little granularity on how they were going or what the impact to the County would be. She stated they were aware that the previously estimated surplus at the State was currently at zero and there were a series of bills that were vetoed very recently by the Governor that would have negatively impacted housing vulnerability, DEI programming and school policies, elections and others. She stated they would update the Board when more information was known about the State fiscal budget development and subsequent implications from the Federal budget.

Supervisor Christy asked if the 22 grants mentioned that would potentially be impacted by the Administration's efforts were part of the current day's grant requests or if they were in addition to them.

Ms. Davis responded that most were block grants the County received annually and the number would be reflected in the $26 million, although, they were unsure if the amount was anticipated to be higher.

Ms. Lesher stated that she did not believe any of them were currently on the agenda for Board consideration.

Supervisor Christy asked to what extent the impact of the tariffs would contribute to this.

Ms. Davis replied that tariffs had changed substantially and were being monitored, but it was more of a downstream impact to overall costs of goods and services.

Supervisor Christy asked how this could be negatively impacted if the extent of it was unknown.

Ms. Lesher explained that the exact tariff amounts were difficult to determine due to their variability across countries. She suggested providing a list showing tariff levels by country, such as China and others, that the numbers had changed daily but had seen, across the board, an understanding of at least 10%.

Supervisor Christy asked for an example of the products that could impact the County's grants.

Ms. Lesher responded that there were two aspects of how tariffs impacted the grants, what was spent on services and goods and purchases such as tires, cars or concrete for infrastructure.

Supervisor Christy asked how much of that had increased.

Ms. Lesher replied that she was unaware.

Supervisor Christy expressed frustration that it was unknown what the impact was however it kept on being mentioned.

Ms. Lesher stated that the intent of this report was to show the Board that there was a variety of uncertainty the County faced as the year progressed.

Supervisor Cano recalled that most of the Board had recently attended a chamber presentation, where the business community expressed concern about the significant effects of tariffs. He stated that his colleagues needed to be informed about the role of regional ports that were responsible for goods, that might not impact County operations directly, but it certainly impacted the region. He stated that he would be very curious to find out if those empty ports on the County's coasts were translating to less freight delivery and on railroads. He stated that what he interpreted Supervisor Christy requesting was data that informed them how this current Federal administration was negatively impacting communities like Pima County. He requested that future reports include a greater description of what the impact of 22 grant awards meant, such as, how many people received assistance from a CDBG grant last year, how many homes were supported, what the average income was. He stated that what was missing in a lot of the debate was the impact on people and that everything in this presentation indicated to him that they were headed toward a cliff that would require a lot of wraparound services, that someone was going be responsible for and urged a broader view of the impact on County departments and constituents.

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

## CLERK OF THE BOARD

19. **Petition for Relief of Taxes**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Ajo Calvary Baptist Church has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2020 and 2021, for Tax Parcel Nos. 401-18-0130, 401-18-0140, 401-24-0710, 401-24-0720, 401-24-0730, 401-24-0740 and 401-24-0750.

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

20. **Petition for Relief of Taxes**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11109(E), Iglesia Bautista de Sahuarita has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2012 through 2024, for Personal Property Account No. 165136.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried 5-0, to approve tax years 2014 through 2023, as indicated in the Assessor's review.

## CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

21. **Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §12-284.01, staff requests approval to expend $35,427.15 (tax included) from the Document and Digital Evidence and Retrieval Conversion Fund, to purchase scanning equipment, printers, and upgrade the alarm system.

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

## COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

22. **Revised Outside Agency Committee Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2024/2025**

**Youth, Young Adult, and Family Support Category**
**Agency/Program/Contract/Current Award/Revised Recommendation**
Arizona Diaper Bank/Potty Training and Cloth Diapers for Infants, Children and Families/PO2400009009/$15,000.00/$8,923.00
Tu Nidito Children and Family Services/Children to Children Grief Support Program/PO2400015984/$26,196.00/$32,273.00

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

## CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES

23. **Ironwood Forest National Monument**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 13, of the Board of Supervisors, opposing the reduction of Ironwood Forest National Monument boundaries for resource extraction.

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

Supervisor Allen stated that the Ironwood Forest National Monument was one of several incredible treasures within District 3 and that residents and organizations have fought for it to be recognized for many years. She explained that Ironwood Trees could live to be 800 years old and the monument was the Arizona equivalent of an old growth forest. She encouraged residents to visit the Ironwood Forest National Monument as the trees were currently in bloom, and residents would join nearly 100,000 tourists who visited the site each year. She expressed her concern over the attempts to shrink the monument and open it up for resource extraction. She asked her colleagues to support the Resolution.

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

## ELECTIONS

24. **Vote Centers**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-411(B)(4), designation of vote centers for the 2025 Congressional District 7 - Special Primary Election on July 15, 2025.

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

## GRANTS MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

25. **Designation of Agent Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 14, of the Board of Supervisors, to designate the agent for applications made to State and Federal agencies.

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

DRAFT

## HUMAN RESOURCES

26. **Classification/Compensation**

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

**Class Code/Class Title/ Grade Code (Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code**
2101/ Chief of Operations-Medical Examiner's Office/ 19 ($102,213-$153,320)/1/E**
2102/ Voter Unit Operations Manager/ 16 ($73,189-$102,465)/ 2/ E**
**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

## REAL PROPERTY

27. **Abandonment by Vacation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 15, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of a portion of Edwin Road, a public roadway as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0082, within Section 4, T11S, R14E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 1)

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

28. **Access Easement**

Staff recommends approval of an access easement to Curley School Housing Partners, for property located within Tax Parcel No. 401-23-170F that would benefit Curley's School Gym, located at 341 W. Esperanza Avenue, Ajo, Arizona. (District 3)

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

## CONTRACT AND AWARD

### Community and Workforce Development

29. St. Luke's in the Desert, Inc., d.b.a. St. Luke's Home, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Quality Energy Project, extend contract term to 2/28/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (CT_24-188)

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



DRAFT

**Procurement**

30. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 8, to provide for computer software and related items, extend contract term to 7/31/25 and amend contractual language, General (50%) and Enterprise Funds, contract amount $875,000.00 (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

31. Sundt Construction, Inc., Amendment No. 11, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: 130 W. Congress Façade Upgrades and Tenant Improvements, extend contract term to 12/31/25 and amend contractual language, no cost, (PO2400012496) Administering Department: Project Design & Construction

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

32. Veregy West, L.L.C., to provide for guaranteed energy cost savings services for the Corona de Tucson Wastewater Reclamation Facility, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount $7,000,000.00/2 year term (PO2500012265) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

33. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., to provide Program Management Services: Sahuarita Wastewater Reclamation Facility Program Implementation, RWRD Capital Projects Fund, contract amount $4,994,459.85/5 years, 7 months term (PO2500009744) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

34. Hunter Contracting Co., to provide Construction Manager at Risk Services for West Valencia Road: Mission Road to Camino de la Tierra (4VALMR), Transportation West Impact Fees Fund, contract amount $524,424.55/3 year term (PO2500010830) Administering Department: Project Design & Construction

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

35. Achen-Gardner Construction, L.L.C., Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Ellison-Mills Contracting, L.L.C., and Hunter Contracting Co., Amendment No. 9, to provide a job order contract: wastewater conveyance system and related facilities repair, rehabilitation and construction services and amend contractual language,

various funds, contract amount $6,000,000.00 (SC2400001280) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

36. Westland Resources, Inc., Amendment No. 6, to provide for the Southeast Employment & Logistics Center Well Improvement Project, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2500010130) Administering Department: Project Design & Construction

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

37. Waxie Enterprises, Inc., d.b.a. Waxie Sanitary Supply, to provide for janitorial supplies, General Fund, contract amount $1,200,000.00 (SC2500000157) Administering Department: Sheriff's Department

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

**Real Property**

38. Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, to provide a lease agreement for Continental Community Center located at 530 E. Whitehouse Canyon Road, contract amount $21,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT2500000022)

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

**Regional Wastewater Reclamation**

39. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement wastewater billing and collection services, RWRD Enterprise Fund, contract amount $2,500,000.00/5 year term (PO2500011868)

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

**Transportation**

40. The State of Arizona, Department of Transportation, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Ruthrauff Road and Courtney Drive, for scoping services, HURF Fund, contract amount $2,280.00/2 year term (PO2500012999)

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



DRAFT

41. The State of Arizona, Department of Transportation, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Ina Road, Canada Drive to Oracle Road, for scoping services, HURF Fund, contract amount $2,280.00/2 year term (PO2500012994)

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

**GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

42. **Acceptance - Health**

Arizona Family Health Partnership, d.b.a. Affirm Sexual and Reproductive Health, Amendment No. 2, to provide for reproductive health services, extend grant term to 8/31/25 and amend grant language, $221,354.00/$21,958.00 Health Special Revenue Fund match (GA-HD-69993)

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

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

43. **Hearing – Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 – 11, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to the public display of fireworks; amending the Pima County Code, Chapter 9.04.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to amend Section 9.04.050 A. by adding, "Each applicant must notify any neighbors within 1000 feet of the site by any effective means of notification, including but not limited to, direct mail, door flyers, signs or communication through homeowners or neighborhood associations. The means of notice shall be specified on the application for a permit." Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was not present for the vote.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to amend Section 9.04.050 C. by deleting, ""No single location shall be the site of public displays of fireworks more than five times during any calendar year." Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Allen voted "Nay," and Supervisor Christy was not present for the vote.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance, as amended. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Christy was not present for the vote.

**FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

44. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

John Lashley, Tucson Speedway, 11955 S. Harrison Road, Tucson, June 28, 2025 at 9:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to close the public hearing and approve the fireworks permits for Minute Item Nos. 44 through 47. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen stated that the code text amendment ordinance the Board approved would not go into effect until 30 days, and that she would be inclined to vote in support of the fireworks permits if they included some of the conditions that were included within the ordinance.

Chair Scott asked Legal Counsel if they could apply the ordinance conditions to the fireworks permits or if these permits fell under the existing Code.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that the permits fell under the existing Code, but that they could try to have compliance with some of the new conditions. He indicated that it may not practical to expect the insurance condition to be accommodated so quickly, but the Board could add conditions to be included as part of the approval of the permits. He expressed concern regarding the practicality of the conditions and whether the requesters would accept the proposed conditions and felt there could be push back since they had applied for the permits before the new ordinance existed.

Chair Scott expressed his concern because the individuals had applied for the permits with the previous requirements in place, not knowing what the Board's action would be or if they would take action on the new Fireworks Code Text Amendment Ordinance.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was the Board's responsibility to deliberate on topics and suggest conditions, if they were needed.

Chair Scott asked if Supervisor Allen would be making a substitute motion on this item.

Supervisor Allen responded yes.

Mr. Brown stated that the conditions should be specific conditions that they wanted to apply with the approval of the permits.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to close the public hearing and approve the fireworks permits with the following five conditions:

1. The applicant must secured $10 million in liability insurance.
2. There will be no fireworks displays if the fire restrictions are at Stage III conditions.
3. Fireworks displays do not exceed 30 minutes.
4. Fireworks displays will not occur if the wind speed exceeded 10 mph.
5. Fireworks displays cannot go past 10:00 p.m.

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

45. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Chris Klok, Forty Niner Country Club, 12000 E. Tanque Verde Road, Tucson, June 28, 2025 at 8:45 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 44, for discussion and action on to this item.)

46. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Jennifer Flores, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. St. Andrews Drive, Tucson, July 4, 2025 at 8:30 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 44, for discussion and action on to this item.)

47. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Troy Finley, Tucson Country Club, 2950 N. Camino Principal, Tucson, July 4, 2025 at 9:00 p.m.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 44, for discussion and action on to this item.)

48. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 330049, Teresa Cheung, Teaspoon, 5605 E. River Road, No. 121, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

49. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 334017, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Ciao Down Culinary Studio, No. D and E, 3230 N. Dodge Boulevard, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

**COUNTY ATTORNEY**

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

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

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

51. **Differential Water Rate Case**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in the Differential Water Rate case.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5 0 vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

**OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY**

52. **Stage II Fire Restrictions and Declaration of Fire Emergency**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 16, of the Pima County Board of Supervisors and the Pima County Regional Flood Control District Board of Directors, imposing Stage II Fire Restrictions on land owned by Pima County and the Regional Flood Control District in unincorporated areas of Pima County.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to adopt the Resolution, as amended, to add the two amendments included in Resolution No. 2025-FC3, that included the two additional restrictions used by the State Forester. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Cano remarked that these resolutions called for enactment within or after 30 days and asked how they were going to be mindful about those deadlines and upcoming fireworks permit requests for the 4th of July.



DRAFT

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded that the resolutions included an emergency clause, like a fire emergency, to enact emergency powers and they would be effective immediately.

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

**RECORDER**

53. **2025 Congressional District 7 Special Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Site and Emergency Voting Locations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 17, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2025 Congressional District 7 Special Primary Election.

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

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

**CONTRACT AND AWARD**

**REAL PROPERTY**

54. Conterra Ultra Broadband, L.L.C., Amendment No. 2, to provide a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for a communications system (Lic-0269) to assign the license to Wyyerd Connect, L.L.C., amend term date from 3/6/27 to 6/30/25 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT2500000030)

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

**BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

55. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**

Reappointment of Craig Cannizzaro. Term expiration: 3/1/29. (District 2)

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

56. **Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission**

Reappointment of Enrique Serna. Term expiration: 1/31/30. (District 2)



DRAFT

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

57. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

**BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

1. **Pima Animal Care Advisory Committee**
   Appointment of Dr. Noble Jackson, representing the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association, to fill a vacancy created by Erin O'Donnell. Term expiration: 6/30/29. (Organizational recommendation)

**FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

2. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
   Brenda Sparrold $625.00; Irvington Meadows, L.L.C. $2,745.15; Dagostino Private Investigations $3,000.50; Therese Marie Lewallen $212.97; Alvernon Optical $1,409.00; Demco, Inc. $684.49; Dessie Moran $488.80; HDS Truck Driving Institute $4,000.00; Center of Hope, L.P. $3,297.87; El Guero Canelo, L.L.C. $1,026.00; Empire Management, L.L.C. $3,095.00; Partners in Health $4,167.21; AMI Expeditionary Healthcare, L.L.C. $217,100.73; Palo Verde Estates MHP, L.L.C. $3,452.20; Jody Proscia $401.00; Sponsored Projects Services/Bursar's Office $17,416.44; Sahuarita Water Company, L.L.C. $299.68; Christopher Daniel Carreon $60.00; Fleetistics $3,742.00; Canon Solutions America, Inc. $529.76; ReadyCap Holdings, L.L.C. $5,000.00; Monica Nichols $20.77; University Area Rentals, L.L.C. $5,000.00; City of Tucson $1,000.00; Offsite Sweeping, L.L.C. $750.00; Offsite Sweeping, L.L.C. $16,225.00; Parkside Terrace Apartments $2,389.00; Anixter $454.27; John Chavez $260.00; Elliott Electronic Supply $158.22; Sedona Springs AZ, L.L.C. $6,938.00; Bikeep, Inc. $1,656.00; Casa Bella Apartments $4,282.33; Irvington Meadows, L.L.C. $6,804.35; Peaks at Redington $1,477.66; Frontier Towing, Inc. $146.92; Tucson Electric Power $260,511.54; Dr. Heather De Soler, P.L.L.C. $650.00; Midwest Tape, L.L.C. $752.25; Kevin Kendrick $720.00.

**SUPERIOR COURT**

3. **Judge Pro Tempore Appointments**
   Appointments of Judges Pro Tempore of the Superior Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026:



DRAFT

**Judges Pro Tempore (Voluntary Attorneys/Without Pay)**

John Aboud; Laura Belleau; Elisabeth Inger Benavidez; Lee L. Blackman; Mark Bockel; John J. Brady; Suzanne Brei; Heidi Rib Brent; Caleb N. Brown; Luke E. Brown; Dan Cavett; Douglas H. Clark, Jr.; Peter Collins, Jr.; Roger H. Contreras; Katrina M. Conway; Roger J. Curigliano; Suzanne L. Diaz; Melissa Errico; Erin K. Fox; Roberto C. Garcia; Abbe M. Goncharsky; Phoebe L. Harris; Gary (Todd) Jackson; Michael A. Johnson; Daniel Jurkowitz; Leonard Karp; Brian Keith Kimminau; Kevin F. Kinghorn; Russell Everett Krone; Reagen A. Kulseth; Zelma Letarte; Robert G. Lewis; Jennifer Manzi; Annalisa Moore Masunas; Lisa C. McNorton; Timothy M. Medcoff; Andrew P. Meshel; Rudy Padilla; Uri Gai Palmer; Natalie Ann Evans Parkman; J.C. Patrascioiu; Karen R. Pollins; Annie M. Rolfe; Michael Rusing; Dee-Dee Samet; Susan Marie Schauf; Ted Schmidt; Dev K. Sethi; Denice Shepard; Russell B. Stowers; Grant Lamond Stratton; Colleen Theone; Evan Thompson; Tiffany Tom; Stanley Jon Trachta; Merle Joy Turchik; David Burr Udall; Nanette Warner; James A. Whitehill; Paul E. Willman; Jeffrey S. Wohlford; Sara A. Wright; Sarah L. Wright; Dawn Deann Wyland; Kaytlyn Yrun-Duffy; Ronald Zack

**Court Commissioners to serve as Judges Pro Tempore (With Pay)**

Lisa Bibbens; Julia Connors; Jennifer Espino; Geoffrey Ferlan; Patricia Green; Daniel Robert Huff; Marie Kagie-Shutley; Nicholas Knauer; Derek Koltunovich; Jennifer Langford; Lisa Schriner Lewis; Michelle Metzger; Bunkye Olson; Gilbert Rosales; Kristin Schriner; Helena Seymour; Michael Vampotic; Dawn Walton

**Judges Pro Tempore/Hearing Officer (With Pay)**

Soo Conatser; Howard Fell; Renee Hampson; Teresa (Tracy) Miller; Catherine Monro

4. **Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointments**

Appointments of Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Jerry Landau and Ronald L. Newman

5. **Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointments**

Appointments of Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Vera ~~Bell~~ **Beil**, Darlene Chavez, John Davis, Daniel Deibel, Maria Felix, Sherwood Johnston, William Parven and Virjinya Torrez

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

Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Christopher Holguin

7. **Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointment**
Appointment of Justice of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Ajo Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Frederick S. Klein

8. **Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore Appointments**
Appointments of Justices of the Peace Pro Tempore of the Green Valley Justice Court for the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026: Erika Acle, Frederick S. Klein and Jerry Landau

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

9. Minutes: February 18, 2025

* * *

58. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

14. **Review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026.**

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management

RS: Now I think we are ready to go to the tentative budget presentations. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much. We have some slides we want to walk through, but I will point out having with us today, Director Art Cuaron, Andy Welch and Xavier Rendon, who have been the leaders on this extraordinary effort to put the County Budget together, so I am sure I will be referring many questions to them. But if we can, just to give you an overview of the budget, reminder of how we got here and what is involved. Thank you, next slide please. I mentioned earlier and we will start looking at it next year, as we go through a process that begins in September, when we begin the reach out and the communication with all of our departments. Budgets start coming together in November and January, and the team you see at the back of the room with the Deputy County Administrators and I, meet weekly at a minimum, starting in January. You received the last Friday in April, the tentative budget. We moved through the hearings, moving towards final adoption in June. Next slide please. Reminder of where the money comes from. We have the primary property taxes that funds most of our County services. We do have our secondary property taxes, some of the different districts you see, the Library, Flood Control and then we have debt as well. Enterprise funds, Wastewater, Development Services, where we have fees and then we do have State shared revenues that come in mostly for our roads. We have some grants, and we have some fee-for-services. Thank you, next slide please. We look at the proposed tax rate, and any modifications in next year. First of all, when we put aside any of the Board policies and the State cost shifts, what we are looking at this point is a recommendation of just under 4 cents, $0.03560 on your primary tax rate, an increase of about 6/10 of a cent at the Library District and Flood Control. And I will just note that if you take all of the proposed tax increase for the year, it means that since 2020, in the last five years, this would result in an overall decrease of $0.33. We have been down low enough that even if we increase this year, we still remain down over the last five years, a total of $0.33. Next slide please. To give you an idea of what the next budget looks like when you look at revenues and expenditures, it is revenues of a



DRAFT

little over $2,073,951,794 with expenditures of about $1.75 billion. Again, looking at the sources of our revenue, property taxes, intergovernmental exchanges, and memorandums of understanding, governmental agreements. We do have the fund balances. I want to point that out, and you will see us break that down with a little more granularity. In previous years, we refer to that as the fund balance and I frequently had people ask why we were looking to cut services if we had a half billion dollars, and you will see that is made up of a variety of funds, not just the General Fund budgets. And then we tried to do a quick evaluation of where do we see the buckets of expenditures, obviously, Justice and Public Safety, really leading the charge. Our General Government Services making up a large share with Infrastructure, Community and Economic Development, Environmental, Public Health, Conservation and Recreational Resources rounding it out. Next slide please. What our budget looks like when you look at how we break down the revenues as the General Fund at $806 million, Special Revenue Funds, etcetera, I do not need to read them to you, but you get a sense of all the different funds that make up the revenues and then where we are looking at those expenditures as well. I have had people ask why we are spending more than is coming in, that is made up in a variety of budget and transfers in and out. And by that you may see an enterprise fund, for example, that is not funded off the General Fund or the primary tax rate that has transfers out to pay central administration for the services from which they benefit, such as Finance, Human Resources, some of the central administrative services, those are those transfers in and out. Next page please. Looking at our revenue, General Fund is really the discretionary account that the Board of Supervisors use to fund most of our County services and gives you an idea of where we are seeing that revenue come into the General Fund, property taxes, State, other tax revenues, some of the fees. Again, we mentioned this early on at a very high level, this provides some of the granularity of how those dollars combined together. Thank you, next slide. Again, a little more granularity on how we look at the expenditures and let you see what are the categories or the major categories that bring us to that $817 million General Fund looking at the fund balances. Next slide please. As I have mentioned, we are looking at the different, the General Fund balance is $117 million at this point under your Board Policy 22.14 we are required to have a $92 million reserve, so you do see that currently at a little bit to the good. The capital projects funds that have been restricted for capital projects. You will see some of the special revenue funds and I think it is important for us to really note these because people believe we have some $600 million that might be available, they have actually been used for very specific purposes and restricted for those uses. As you might see, $109 million for the Opioid Abatement, various funds that have come in through grants, all identified there as well. Thank you, next slide please. As we look at what some of the restricted funds and taxing districts, how those dollars come together for the expenditures. Again, we have some of the grant funds, restricted funds that we have delineated a bit here at about $511 million for those expenditures in six of the basic categories in which we develop things. Thank you, next slide please. The budget focus area that you will see, we have developed this, historically, looking at four critical pillars and some of the goals under them. Core functions and excellent services, improving the quality of life in our community, making sure that the critical infrastructure and economic

DRAFT

growth is maintained and that we preserve the conservation, sustainability and climate issues. You will see continually, as you saw the crosswalk and drafts of our budgets and all of the items, they crosswalk through to any one of the very specific pillar's goals. And in some cases, we are able to actually drill down into the various specifics of real tactics and activities for the year. This is something new we have added in the last couple of years, and as we have mentioned in the past, we are not only seeing the budget line up with our pillars and goals but also lining up with each element of the Prosperity Initiative so that we can ensure how we are actually funding the key policy areas presented by the Board and directed by the Board. Next slide please. What to expect in 2026, a lot of belt tightening, the key to that. Now this is Supervisor Heinz's favorite slide. Next one please. I want to explain this a little bit. We have assured that we will look at how we can do a better job making sure that people understand what is ahead of us, but by this, when we look at the various economic indicators, the current stage is what I think of as the look backwards. If we look at where we are now and where we have been, we might be at a good rate with Federal fund rates, for example, looking historically, we are at a 3 but when we look at where we believe it is trending in the future, we look at an unfavorable. So that is how we really look at these indicators and we are going to look to tweak these a little bit this year and look at the feedback from the Board. But if you recall, we began looking at this about two and a half years ago as a way that all of our directors, as well as our policymakers, can look at what we are seeing at the economy, what the current stage might be, what we think is lying ahead so that it helps us make some decisions about the future. If you think of the Economic Indicators Report, we provide to the Board, each of these areas helps us get a sense of where we are in other metrics. Are we recommending that there be a freeze in hiring? Are we recommending layoffs? What draconian steps might be required at different steps, but it helps everyone, we hope, get a sense of our best look at the crystal ball and what the future might be for Pima County. Next slide please. As we look at the budget concerns for 2026, obviously you have heard us talk about it at every meeting. Federal government actions and some of the State budget uncertainties. You get regular reports from us of what might be happening with the various funds, the grants that we have relied on from the Federal government or that may be coming through from the State are areas of concern. There is some economic turbulence, inflation, what those revenues might be, what it means to some of our supply, the chain shortages are concerns that we review.

RS: Pardon me.

JL: Yeah.

RS: Could I just ask a quick question?

JL: Certainly.

RS: With regard to the cost shifts, I understand how they impact the primary property tax. What I am not entirely clear on is how they impact the secondary tax that affects the Library District.

JL: Mr. Cuaron, if you can explain this a little more clarity. Thank you.

ART: Sure, thank you, Mr. Chair. My understanding is that the cost shifts are split out across all of the taxing districts. So, it is not just the primary, it is also the Flood Control District, the Library District, it has a cascading effect. Each taxing district gets assessed their representative portion of the State cost share.

JL: And that is in accordance with the policy.

RS: Right, but I thought for this year, it was just the primary property tax, and the Library District, I do not recall the Flood Control District being impacted.

ART: Mr. Chair. The Flood Control is the Class 1 change in the assessment ratio.

RS: So all three of them were impacted?

JL: Chair Scott, the impact to the Flood Control District is projected to be $0.00180, about 2/10 of a cent, less than that. Thank you.

RS: Thank you. Sorry to interrupt your presentation.

JL: Thank you. We are also looking at some of our concerns with Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) funding. I know that Supervisor Heinz may be speaking later to any updates on RTA Next and what may be occurring. As we all know, we are ending the 20-year cycle of the first RTA. What does that mean? And then we begin to look at what is happening with major bonds and concerns here in Pima County. As you know, in 2014, we did have a $22 million bond to build the new Animal Care Center but other than that, we had bonds in 2004 and 2006 providing additional infrastructure. Prior to that, every so often the Board went out and Pima County went out to voters and were able to successfully pass bonds to impact critical infrastructure. We are at 19 years as we are approaching the last time we had any real significant impact allowing for that as a funding source for infrastructure, meaning we are relying on PAYGO, and we grow concerned about their long-term future strategies for that as well. Next slide please. Online resources, just a reminder to anybody who might be watching. We put a lot of information about the budget up at the Pima County website, which is Pima.gov/budget and hopefully provide all of the different you will find not only all of the documents that began as the departments were asking their requests early on, every working document, every one of the supplemental requests, all the different iterations along the way can be found at that site. So that is a very quick presentation overview of the budget and happy to answer questions now or as we deal with each of the various areas, whichever you prefer.

RS: Any questions? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: And back to that slide that I do not love. I just want to explain that a little bit because I do not disagree with a lot of the economic indicator, current state. It would be great to have…

JL: Thirteen please, page thirteen.

MH: I do not understand what the ones, zeros and threes are. I get what you want to say, okay here is what is going on right now based on the current condition that is whatever—housing inflation, federal funds rate, unemployment, etcetera, maybe they should both be stable, unfavorable or favorable that is confusing to me. But for me inflation, are you anticipating inflation going up? Because inflation has actually been drifting lower and is actually in a good place. So that is why I do not understand why it says the trend is unfavorable for inflation because we are doing kind of okay there. Housing, I agree, consumer confidence, in the toilet, totally agree, retail sales is weirdly good, it is, I would say stable. I mean again, this is the trend, the recent trend at least, despite consumer confidence being kind of in the toilet compared to the past five years at least, at the lowest level, since I think 2020 Retail sales, at least in the U.S., are still strong and stable. I do not know, gasoline sales, fine, Federal funds rate, okay, unemployment, I agree with that because that is pretty low still. But I am just trying to figure out who decides how…?

JL: Who determines?

MH: …I am not fully sure exactly. What does the trending one mean? Because under inflation and retail sales, those kind of seem like they are okay-ish. So, I just…

JL: Thank you.

MH: Is that you? Or is that…?

JL: No.

MH: Okay. No, it is okay. I do not really care…

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. I do not make that determination but we look at it a variety of sources and maybe Mr. Cuaron if you can help? Well, first of all, we hear you about the current stage and the trending. We spent some time Monday afternoon, but this has already been compiled looking at how we can do a much better job explaining what we are trying to get to with this. But to give you an idea of the sources and who is involved in making those determinations.

ART: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. The source data behind our quarterly economic indicator reports is the University of Arizona Eller College. They put out a variety of economic indicators of which we basically use their data and plug in to the report that gets submitted to the Board each quarter. That is the source data for our report. To answer your specific question related to trending as far as inflation, that is really due to the to the unknown tariffs and what that is going to do to consumer



DRAFT

confidence, not knowing what the future might hold in that regard. We have talked about it earlier but that is the reason that it is trending unfavorably is just the unknown of what that may or may not do as we look out into the summer and the fall.

MH: Okay, that makes more sense. This is on page eight, and this is just kind of a commentary on our expenditures back to what we were talking about before, that what we spend money on as a government is a statement of our beliefs. If you look at this big pie chart, the blue, the Justice and Public Safety $370 million out of the $817 million, about 45% or so, is Justice and Public Safety. That's the jail, the Sheriff, the County Attorney, Public Defense Services, etcetera, and I am not saying that we should not be doing that, but that is 45% of what we can do anything with, which is this General Fund, approximately $817 million. And Community and Economic Opportunity, a statutory directive to this Board, $22 million, Conservation and Recreational Resources, which I guess gets to some tourism in there too, $26 million and Environmental and Public Health, $55 million. So those three categories, which I think are tremendously important, and again, not options, these are directives from the statutes that we do these things totals about just slightly over $100 million, which is one eighth of that pie chart. So just kind of making a general, overarching, taking a step back to look at what we do, I think we could, as we move forward together as a Board, I would hope that we can continue to bolster that, not just on affordable housing, but on public health and on other things that the community really does need us to be doing. Just as much as justice, public safety, running a jail and having deputies and all that. So and I would like to move to your memo if I can. I have a lot of papers here, but your memo, which is the May 20, 2025, mem, the Tentative Budget Adoption for Fiscal Year 2025/26. On page four of that memo, under alternative options. Skip over the first bullet and go to the second one. I am talking now for just fiscal year '26, not for any sort of long-term anything, but you very helpfully put in here the option to add funding for affordable housing in the amount of $3.5 million approximately, which would be about the equivalent of a a three-cent increase in private property tax rate, and then absorb that increase through expenditure reductions and other available funding sources. I am curious because I think one of them might be this, how much money are we pulling in from earned interest on our bank accounts at Bank of America? It is more than $800 million, but even if it is half a cent or whatever it is, 1%, 2%, I do not know what the rate is that we are getting. When you are working with hundreds of millions of dollars hanging out in bank accounts, that becomes a big number and if that number is anywhere near, if just the interest on the money sitting around, if we can throw that at affordable housing just for '26 and just do that one time bump that you have in there as an option. I would really love to see if my colleagues would be interested in doing that and I would like to hear from you a little bit about those interest funds. Do we know how much that is or where we track that?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. The interest that we have received in the last year has already been baked into that.

MH: Oh okay, it is kind of in everything?

JL: Not cooked, but yes…

MH: Sure.

JL: …Is in it. We consider it as we develop the budget but I will say that, we do not always know what it is. It is one of those, we know it is going to be coming but hard to get that specific number. I will tell you now that we are looking at one of the areas where we can make an accommodation. We believe that we have about $3 million in interest on the ARPA funds that we have not allocated. That is one of the buckets that we would be looking at should the Board decide to take these taxes down. Mr. Cuaron, additional information?

ART: Mr. Chair, Supervisor Heinz. The investment earnings in the General Fund in the Tentative Budget is $6.3 million in investment earnings for '25/26.

JL: And they are considered in that as well. Thank you.

MH: It sounds to me like between that, and also what Administrator Lesher just said, I think that we should consider making a down payment on whatever it is we are going to do on affordable housing. I would like to move that we adopt that second bullet point and allocate for one time in Fiscal Year '26, that $3.5 million number that is equivalent to the three-cent property tax increase, without the property tax increase to be found and absorbed elsewhere, for affordable housing.

RS: Supervisor Heinz, we…?

MH: We cannot do that?

RS: …we cannot do that at this point because…

MH: Oh, why?

RS: Well, because right now we are on Tentative Budget presentations.

MH: Oh, it is not the adoption?

RS: No, we are not at the hearing yet.

MH: Okay, that is fine.

RS: We are not at the hearing yet.

MH: I will put a bookmark in that, and we will hear that again momentarily.

DRAFT

JL: Thank you. Chair Scott, if I could, and Supervisor Heinz. The $6.3 million in interest we have already considered. It would be the $3 million dollars in the ARPA that would be new and interesting, is that? Thank you.

RS: Alright, so anything else? Any other questions for County Administrator Lesher and Mr. Cuaron?

JL: And may I ask if there is something I missed during that, that we would like to highlight Mr. Cuaron?

ART: Mr. Chair, members of the Board. The only thing I think that it is important to note is the changes from the recommended budget to the tentative budget, which are outlined in Administrator Lesher's memo on May 20. The tentative budget is $1,753,877,142, with the General Fund being $817,656,515. That is a difference of $500,000.00 from what was on the slide. That is for wildfire mitigation. I also want to point out that funding for Old Spanish Trail is also included in the '26 budget in the CIP. So those are the only changes from the recommended to the tentative that you will be taking action on later this afternoon.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott. That was action taken by the Board after we distributed the budget. Thank you.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I am just wondering, perhaps if we went through the hearings, 8 all the way through 16 and then save maybe No. 15, as an opportunity to make statements or discuss the budget and tentative.

RS: So you are suggesting that we go through the other hearings and come back to No. 15?

SC: Yes, well, stop at 15.

RS: Yeah, that is absolutely what I was going to do since they are in that order. Let us go on then to item number nine. This is a hearing, it is on review and adoption of the Flood Control District Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/26. And just to let everybody know, this will be a reminder for Supervisor Christy and Supervisor Heinz, and it will be an introduction for Supervisor Allen and Supervisor Cano. We are required to do a roll call vote on each one of these items.

MM: Chair Scott, excuse me, are you going to hear your speakers first before we do those?

RS: I was, yeah but I thought that was when we got to their hearings because Ms. Tuccio is here to talk about the Wildflower…



DRAFT

MM: Judge Carroll indicated item No. 8.

RS: But those are tentative budget presentations?

MM: Yeah, and usually after the presentation, in the past, the Board has taken the speakers right after that.

RS: Oh, well I thought that we were going to do it during the hearings?

MM: We are in public hearings now, with item number 8 we went into public hearings.

RS: We do the speakers before we go into each of the individual hearings?

MM: You could.

RS: It is fine with me, I just wanted to call them both up when we were talking about their specific items, but we can do that now.

* * *

RS: Now we are moving on to back at sitting as the Board of Supervisors, and we are on to Item 15, which is review and adoption of the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year '25/26. And Supervisor Cano, you had a question?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. By my count, I might have 4 or 5. Administrator Lesher, I wanted to first thank you, and your staff for your incredible work on putting together this budget, a month's long process, and I certainly am appreciative of the long hours that have been spent to get us to today so congratulations to you and your team. Can you please tell us a bit more about how your recommended budget, Administrator Lesher, invests in the County's 7,000 employees, specifically related to compensation? And our office has talked with yours about any potential savings on health care benefits and I am curious if you or the Director can provide us with a summary of what the anticipated increase will be to our health care premiums this calendar year that is coming and just how that is all going to match up with the total compensation package that you have recommended? So there is two questions.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. The budget as submitted includes a total of a 5% increase for all County employees. It would be a 3.6% increase across the Board on July 1, and then a 1.4% increase on January 1st across the Board, and that is for all employees. As some of the Board knows, and Supervisor Cano, you joined us at the end of about a 4- or 5-year process for the classification/compensation study where we tried to ensure that every position was appropriate with the market and it took several years and multi-millions to make sure that we had that right spacing. We believed, working with our consultant, that if we do not continue with regular increases for the staff and for all of our employees, we will slide backwards and will have to start that process over. And I think it is

important for us to continue to adhere to one of our real goals, which is to be an employer of choice and make sure that employees want to be here at Pima County. Compensation is a big piece of that. We have continued and included in this budget is a list, and Supervisor Cano I will hit the high points, but I would like to follow up with a memorandum, make sure I have hit it all. But we have included over the last several years, the Board has approved funding for educational opportunities, loan programs, supplement ability to provide some employees access to some additional funding for parking. There is a variety of services that we have been providing to increase interest in Pima County, and I hope that all of that is continued in the budget and I am happy to give you a full list of that. One of the things that we have talked about, Supervisor, is the recognition that while every employee at whatever spot they are in the County, needs to maintain a spot against market. That the percent that occurs for individuals who earn less, is less impactful, potentially than those at the higher end. What we have said we would like to take another look at, at some point and come back to the Board at a future date, is what does that mean for employees under $100 or $150,000 a year? Could we look at the ability to offset some of the insurance premiums? What would that look like, as an example? What we might do? And we would return at another time to see if there might be potential adjustments. I am going to see if staff has it, about in the last couple of months we did approve all of the benefit package. The Board did approve that, and I do not have those fees with me right now. Mr. Cuaron, do we have all of the fees for the benefits package? Thank you.

ART: Ms. Lesher, Mr. Chair, Supervisor Cano. If we go from employee only down to employee plus family. I will read you the differences between the current rates versus the rates that are going to be in effect beginning in July. For employee only, it is $12.48, employee plus spouse is $11.68, employee plus children is $11.75 and employee plus families $10.52. That is the difference between the ‘24/25 rates, which employees are paying now versus the ‘25/26 rates, which will begin July 1.

JL: And if I may, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. We do have a program that allows for employees to be able to benefit certain opportunities and wellness and get some extra points for that. Not smoking, my recollection is about $20.00 a pay period that one can get, going through some quizzes, some time to indicate participation in a wellness plan can see a reduction of up to $50.00 per pay period for employees. So we do offer some opportunities that way as well. And I am sorry, were there other questions not answered?

AC: Administrator Lesher, no, thank you. You and the director did answer the substance of my questions. I am just curious Director or Administrator Lesher, the $12.48 and the $11.68, the $11.75, this is the new rate or it will be an additional $12.48 for coverage?

ART: It is the difference between the 24/25 rates and the ‘25/26 rates. So it will be an additional $12.48 for an employee only…

AC: Per pay period?

ART: [Off-camera question] Is that? [responds to Supervisor Cano] I believe so.

AC: Okay. Chair Scott and Administrator Lesher. I am doing the math on the spot right now. $12.48 of an increase to our Aetna health care plan equates to about $324.00 annually. You times it by 26. For an employee making $35,000.00, 5% of an increase is being recommended by the Administrator is about $1,750.00. So the point that I am trying to make is that we have an obligation to provide a high standard of compensation for our employees, and we have to also, as a Board, recognize that when we are celebrating these 5% increases for those at the lower end of the spectrum for compensation, they are going to be paying upwards of a fourth or nearly half of this 5% increase in insurance rate increases for health care. Health care is a very complicated matter. These examples are one employee. I am sure that there are lots of County employees that have several dependents on their health care coverage and so I do really encourage us to figure out, especially because we are self-insured, meaning that we get to work with the private sector, in this case, Aetna, to be able to provide any kind of offsets. I just think there is a strong case to be made for our 7,000 employees. I have asked for additional information about what it would mean to set a cap for the 5%, and for those earning more than $150,000.00. And I can understand where, if we get into that amount of detail, the savings perhaps might not be worthwhile to the overall picture. Because what I am hearing from our County Administrator is that for this study to proceed, we have to go at the 5% rate. So will you, Administrator Lesher, commit to figuring out how we can find additional benefits and offsets on the health care portion? Is that commitment for the current year that we are about to enter as part of this recommended budget? How is it going to happen, and what is your timeline for presenting that to the Board?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Yes, we absolutely will commit to looking at what we can do for the employees. As you see, it is one of the reasons we have provided some other opportunities to ensure that people do have access to health care, even when these costs are going up. I am looking at the back, I would like to say I could get you back some information on June 3rd, if I cannot, we will bring it back for final adoption to see how we might be able to provide some additional information, recommendations, to make sure that we are covering, or at least taking a better step at covering the benefit cost for those who are earning less at the County.

AC: Got it. Chair Scott, I have two more questions.

RS: Please.

AC: Administrator Lesher, what is the long-term plan to fund some of these future wage increases, given the expiration of Federal ARPA funds and reduced reliance on some of these onetime grants? I saw that there is a strong recommendation on your part to figure out how contingencies will support some of this work in these uncharted territories so I just wanted to ask a bit more about that.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. When we begin the deliberations each year, the first thing we talk about is the compensation and the package and how we take care of our employees, because as Pima County, there is nothing we do that does not rely on our employees, whether we are fixing the streets or providing health care. We are as good as our employees, and that is why that has to remain at the forefront of our commitment. When we began the budget deliberations, we looked at what will it mean to make sure that we are continuing to keep our employees at market, and that was number one, and then we began to look at the additional programs. What you have seen in the last couple of years, is that we began to look at the pillars, and the goals, and the tasks, and the Prosperity Initiative items because we are looking at the long-term need to respond to exactly. What I believe you are looking at. There will be less dollars. When there are less dollars, we need to look at our overall expenditures, and I think our way to do that is to align our key goals, to make sure are there things we are doing that are that have been moving us off of mission and are not some of that core value of this Board and the direction of the Board to deal with our employees and the services we provide to the community. I think another part of the commitment is not only putting our employees at the forefront, looking at the key services we provide, and then our desire to come back with this Board in a strategic planning session, to allow the Board to help us determine what are those key policy issues. And final analysis, if there is less dollars, there are some things we are doing today that we will not be doing in the future. And what we have said as we move through classification and compensation is that we may have better compensated employees, but we may have less of them. And that is what we look at every day as we review the entire budget and look forward to working with the Board as we take that next step of really focusing on those critical services that we think must be provided by this Board to the community and how we fund those.

AC: Thank you, Administrator Lesher and Chair Scott. My final question, and first, a quick comment. I think what the Administrator just shared about the impact of the Federal uncertainties and the State uncertainties, I applaud this Board for looking at all of the ways that we can look at efficiencies that our vacancy policy has allowed us to really be able to trim a bit so that we can be protective of the taxpayers. My question now, Administrator Lesher, I am supportive of your recommendations. I am the new kid on the block, and I do feel that the Finance Department was a little too generous with the supplementals and I recognize that ultimately, you are the person who recommended the implementation of these recommendations should the Board proceed. But we said yes to a majority of these really critical needs and I think that what has made things even more complicated, and this is my question, Administrator Lesher, what has been the impact of State cost shifts now totaling about $125 million on our ability to fund core programs like housing, like eviction relief, like any kind of those issues that really are super important that perhaps Federal and State funding has supported in the past, that now we are going to have to take a second look? How are you combing through supplementals coming in next year, Federal cuts coming in? An uncertain legislative landscape. I think it is important for us to share that with the public.

JL: Thank you.

AC: Your $125 million was out the door already, because of our legislature.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. I think, first of all, you have an extraordinary group of department directors. I hope that you are very proud of them, as you should be, as well as your Deputy County Administrators and the Finance team. We work very closely with departments, and to be perfectly candid, most of the departments recognize the financial situation the County was facing and did not necessarily put in every supplemental that they might have thought they wanted because they recognized the times that we are facing. Some of those initial requests maybe just did not even hit the door. So the things that we had in front of us were down to already, I think, a narrower pool of needs from which we then had to choose. It was very difficult. I will tell you that the issues that you are addressing are what we meet on, some of us every day, are talking through what does this future look like and that is the concern. We talk regularly about, we are an enterprise. We have two opportunities. We increase revenues or we decrease expenditures and we cannot just continue to increase the revenue side. We may be looking at fees. We may be looking at different enterprises, creative ways, as you know, with one department, as an example, at Animal Care, we created a philanthropic arm, and we rely on charitable contributions to provide some of those services. We are seeing a lot of ways that we can envision revenues, but ultimately then it is to decrease expenditures and that comes back to the continued vision and mission of what is it we do? And as a Board and your leadership team, looked at each year, what are the goals, what are the pillars, what is our vision, what is the mission, what do we need to be doing as a government? And some of the things that have not come up today but are critical, we do not talk much about wastewater. We do not talk as much about transportation, but they are critical elements of what we provide, is critical infrastructure for this community. Emergency Management was here today, and we have had all the increased work with wildfire, but they are here preparing for those emergencies and need to be here hoping that we do not need them, as we have dealt with the Flood Control District and such. We provide Parks and Recreation and those additional services. And then we also have the unique opportunity at Pima County, we have some 25 elected officials between the five of you and seven countywide officers, nine Justices of the Peace, nine Constables, and then I believe, 53 or 54 judges, that are actually elected. But there is a lot of individuals pulling on all those different needs. I am very excited, as I think I have talked with you all about that opportunity to meet, to have those study sessions, the retreats, whatever it might be, to really share together. What is the vision? We cannot do it all. What are those things at which we will excel, where do we develop our partnerships, how do we rely heavily on those so that we complement the other governments in this valley? And rather than compete and make sure that we are seeing where one can help the other, and how do we how do we share? Just as an aside, since we were talking about compensation, we meet regularly, as you know, with all the managers in the region. We are always talking about, just had a conversation yesterday, again, we do not serve the valley well when we are competing with each other, in saying, well if it is Sheriff or law



DRAFT

enforcement that we will pay, we will beat everybody in the Valley by 10%, and everyone gets into that mode. It becomes very difficult for the Valley. How do we share those resources and recognize the extraordinary pool of talent we have here and work together? So that is what I see as the vision and the thing that is a real concern to me, is we said for a while we thought I was referring to the ARPA cliff, but we really realized, it is not the cliff in that we were fortunate enough to see it coming. So we began, the after COVID recovery plan, and we began to implement the change in stepping away from some $350 million that came to the County. We saw that coming. What we may be seeing from the Federal and the State level in the next year or two, may be the cliff, because we have not been able to see as clearly what exactly those dollars are, but we need to prepare for it. So I think we are going to need to be continuing to sharpen the pencil and focus on those things that we decide we do and do them well.

AC: Thank you, and my final comment, Chair Scott, thank you, Administrator Lesher, is. The point that I heard you make that I want to be a little bit more succinct about Administrator. Is that 1 in 4 of our General Fund tax obligations, this County Board of five, has no say in because that is direction handed from the State legislature. So when we are talking about a shrinking pie and unfunded mandates and a desire to try to provide core services to our residents, out the door, we are already in a position where we are having to make tough decisions based on that trickle-down economics from our Republican legislature, who loves to not take accountability for the cost shifts that they shift to County taxpayers. And I just encourage this Board and this administration to figure out how we can do that on our property tax statements so that we can remind our residents and our taxpayers of the financial situation of our region that is then forced down from our legislature. Having spent almost six years there, took great pride in the work that we do at the State, but I found it always very difficult to figure out what that meant for County taxpayers, if this Board has no say in it. Thank you, Chair Scott, for allowing me to ask those questions.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I have got to go. I have an appointment that I have had on the books. Any possibility we could move up to 15 and 16, and then anybody that wants to discuss any of them?

RS: We are on 15.

SC: Okay.

RS: We are on 15 right now, but is there anything specific to 15 that you wanted to talk about?

SC: I will save my comments for the June meeting.

RS: Okay, sir. Alright, and I apologize, I thought when you showed me your appointment card earlier that we would be good to go by this point. I am sorry that we are not.

SC: Nonsense. [Supervisor Christy left the meeting at 2:58 p.m.]

RS: Any other questions or comments? Because there was something that I wanted to suggest with regard to a point that Supervisor Heinz made earlier. And it is this, Supervisor Heinz, you were kind enough to take us to page four on Ms. Lesher's memo from May 20th, today, the Tentative Budget Adoption. And if you go to page four under alternative option, you directed our attention to the second bullet. But I would like to direct everyone's attention to the first bullet. Because what it says there, is that if we want to keep our County tax rate at a level where it is just affected by the impacts of Board policy, such as the State cost shifts policy, that Supervisor Cano just spoke to, the PAYGO Policy, the General Fund Reserve Policy, that the increase intended for County operations in the recommended budget can be trimmed back, and then we would direct the County Administrator to find cuts equal to $4,127,789. That we can do today. On June 3rd, depending on what decision we make with regard to the revised affordable housing item that we continued until June 3rd, we could also on June 3rd, direct the County Administrator to keep the tax rate at the level that we set today, but come up with cuts equal to that 1.5 for affordable housing if we go in that direction. So what I was going to propose, is that I make an alternate motion to close the public hearing that incorporates that reduction of $0.0356, and then direct the County Administrator to look at those cuts of a little over $4.1 million. Because when I was talking with the County Administrator during a break, she indicated that herself, and Mr. Cuaron, and Mr. Welch, and Mr. Rendon, if they have that time starting now, to look at those cuts, that is going to be very helpful to the work that they have to do, and then we can circle back on June 3rd with whatever we want to do, depending on the outcome of the housing discussion. So wonder how my colleagues feel about that? If that is something you are comfortable with, I do have a motion that I can make for closing this hearing and taking that cut into account.

MH: [points to self silently]

RS: Please go right ahead, sir.

MH: Thank you, Chair. So we could kind of do both, right? If the staff and County Administrator, as you said, is confident that we can find the $4.1 million to do, A., and minus the policies you cited, leave the rate flat. My thought, just because we know that the ARPA dollars and interest is $3 million, I just want to throw that one-time additional allocation for fiscal year ‘26 and then on June 3rd for the remaining, we could do the whole decade-long policy and maybe not even start it until Fiscal Year ‘27. That is kind of what I was thinking since there is a pay for, that we literally just discovered, for a one-time bump, just to give a little bit extra right now with this

cycle to our commission, then we can talk about the ten-year program and how we want to kind of design that in the next time. And again, it would not affect the tax rate at all for Fiscal Year ‘26. Would that be okay since we know where the money is coming from?

RS: Yeah, I am just going with what we know now, and what we can do now, and giving the Finance team and Ms. Lesher a head start on making those cuts that are outlined in that part of the memorandum. I am not sure, the ARPA interest that Supervisor Heinz was referring to, is not referenced in the memo, and I thought you had said earlier that that is kind of baked into our calculations.

MH: It was not the ARPA she was talking about. She separated the ARPA interest from the $800 million. I said, what is the interest on that stuff? But that is…

JL: That is the $6.3 million.

MH: …that is the $6.3 million, I believe that our staff said. That interest is actually all factored in but she identified that the ARPA fund interest was approximately $3 million. We could also frame it as, not the number $3 million, but the ARPA Fund interest so in case it is $2.6, or $3.2, whatever that number is, I am happy to do whatever the staff suggests.

RS: I am just trying to go with the numbers that are in the recommended budget, and in the recommended budget there is that $0.0356 for County Operations. There is a figure that they say they can cut, if we want to reduce the recommended rate at that point. So I am just going with what is written here. If there are new numbers that we need to consider.

JL: No, Chair Scott. I think if the Board's direction is to adjust the tax rate down, the $0.0356 and instruct staff to find $4.1 million in cuts, we will do so and I am going to guess that the $3 million in ARPA interest is going to be a piece that we use to get to that number.

RS: Okay, alright.

MH: In that case, I cannot support the first bullet.

RS: Well, but she is saying that they are going to come up with that $4,127,000.00, she is saying that the $3 million in ARPA interest may be a big chunk of that.

MH: Right, but I want that to go to additional affordable housing in Fiscal Year ‘26.

RS: Well, I understand, but I think we are going to get to that point on June 3rd. But I am going to go ahead and make that motion. Unless there are other questions or comments on the Tentative County Budget. Go ahead, Supervisor Allen?

JA: I am restating, I think, things that have been said. I have been reading through, and trying to legend around this binder book and it was clear in every single department narrative and budget, that our departments are struggling. And some of them, it was palpable in their narratives, that they are frustrated with the lack of resources that they have to do with what they know what they need to do, and what they want to do. We have deferred maintenance. People are struggling with staffing, both for salary levels, but also just in the effort of recruiting and retaining people. They have increased costs, and folks are also recognizing, in every single department, that there is increased need for what they are going to do, and they are already facing with this, limited and stretched, as thin as possible. We have supplemental requests, the original supplemental requests was like $70 million, and it got down to $17. So we have been making cuts. It was also clear from the budgets and the narratives from department directors that they were minimalist in what they put forward in the supplementals. A lot of those supplementals, I would not, in my realm and past work in organizations, I would not have even called those supplementals. A lot of those were just increased costs that were out of their control. It was not shiny new projects. It was just trying to deal with increased costs for things that we are already doing and need to do. So it is hard for me to think about, given all these pressures from the Feds, from the States, from tariffs, from, you list it, to not look internally and say, we have a tool and that tool is property tax. It is the most progressive taxation tool there is. It charges more from those who have more and takes less from those who have less. And so to think that in this time of great need and great strain, that we are not going to use our internal tools to help cover the needs of our community. And those needs are growing, and our departments are already stretched thin. It is really hard for me to think about directing staff to go back and make another $4 million worth of cuts. And given that we are kind of punting down the field around affordable housing, it just makes me incredibly uncomfortable. The position that we are putting ourselves in for the care of our community and our obligations towards our community. So I am not loving the first option of that bullet of going back and taking more cuts.

AC: [inaudible]

RS: Please.

AC: Thank you. Chair Scott. I appreciate my colleague from District 3's comments and I do feel that what our Chair is trying to do is really invite the conversation for the Board to provide a set direction to staff on next steps. I think the uncertainty over the last several weeks, as we have tried to negotiate a $3 million item when our County operations is close to $2 billion. I think it has forced us to really have a discussion that I look forward to having after this current budget cycle. And I do believe that there is a fundamental shift happening right now in our region, where the City of Tucson is facing upwards of $30 million in a deficit, the University of Arizona are making cuts as well. Do not for one second think that my desire for us to look internally is asking us to make easy decisions, these are difficult. I think our Contingency Funds are a place for us to continue to look for opportunities where we can provide as little impact to the taxpayers, while also recognizing that the



DRAFT

taxpayers have gotten over the last two budget cycles, a neutral recommendation from the County Administrator. And so that has to be a part of the discussion as well, in that, perhaps it is time to ask for additional resources. I think what I am hearing, is that we are going to figure out the housing situation at our next meeting. And what I think is super important, is that staff now have the ability to be able to proceed with the Administrator's recommendation, and the good thing about setting a limit today, is that we just cannot go above it. But if we come back with any reductions as recommended by the Chair or Administrator, if we make bullet one happen, if we use ARPA funds for housing, however that happens, it is too important for the entirety of the region for us to stall this decision and I feel like we can accomplish both things. We can have option one and option two, be considered in some form but today, I think my request is that we let the budget cap proceed as originally intended, and we can provide a plan moving forward on any additional cuts.

MH: Is that a motion to adopt the Administrator's recommended budget and tax rate?

AC: Yes.

MH: I second.

RS: Well, I have to read it the way it is written.

MH: Oh, I am sorry.

RS: But I…

AC: I will withdraw my motion so that the Chair can offer it.

RS: I have to read it the way it is written. So just to understand, we can come back to that. We can come back to that on June 3rd, we cannot come back to it on June 17th. We have to be definitive on June 17th. So what I hear is my colleagues are not interested at this time in looking at any primary property tax rate adjustment or any additional cuts. So what I will do is, move to close the public hearing and adopt the Tentative County Budget for Fiscal Year 25/26, in the amount of $1,753,877,142.00, at an effective tax rate of $5.2317.

MH: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Now we need to do a roll call vote.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

DRAFT

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: No.

* * *

[Inaudible discussion with Chair Scott]

RS: Mr. Cuaron, there was a point you wanted to make about employee benefit costs.

AC: Thank you, Ms. Lesher, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. In my haste to provide information on the delta between the ‘25/26 rates, and the ‘24/25 rates, I did provide inaccurate information. Rather than try and get you that information today, I request that you give me an opportunity to go back and actually provide a memo to Ms. Lesher, which will then be sent out to the Board, with the accurate information. I just wanted to get it on the record.

RS: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

DRAFT

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

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

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy Deputy County Attorney

---

RS: Supervisor Heinz you had requested that Item No. 21 be moved up when you submitted a revised version of it. When we did Agenda Adjustments at the beginning of the meeting, we indicated that we would be doing that. So we will now go to Item No. 21, which is Unfinished Business – Board of Supervisors Policy D22.17 General Fund 3 Cents for Affordable Housing. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, and I know that my colleagues from District 1 and 4 still have to make some comments, that we continued the item before they could do that so I look forward to hearing from my colleagues again. You have heard from a lot of folks in Call to the Public, which is great to have community response like that. There is more letters that came in, which I would like to read into the record. I will not read every letter because I read a few of those letters last time. The modified proposal in



DRAFT

hearing and listening to my colleagues the last meeting, I submitted on Friday, would actually initiate this policy with a short ramp up in the first year, and a short ramp down in the 10th year. So instead of 3 cents for every one of the ten years, it would start at one and a half cents the first year, 8 years at the 3-cent level, and then a one and a half cent ramp down, toward the end. With updated numbers from our staff, we included those, it is not $207 million, even with that reduction, it is actually going to bring in approximately $225 million to be dedicated to affordable housing over that decade-long period. It is really great to listen to all these folks coming forward and to have the professor here again and he reminded me of the incredible drop-in affordability from the year 2020 to present, that is half of 70 to 38%, that is really remarkable and he also pointed out that while this is a bold step that the County can make, and I hope that we do. It is not something that fixes the entire problem, it gets at about a third of the need for the next decade. So, I understand that we of course have our limitations as well and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. Before I read some additional letters of support that I think really highlight some important points, I would like to hear from my colleagues first though because I know that not everyone had a chance to participate in the conversation last time.

RS: Any other comments from Supervisors? Supervisor Christy?

SC: You know words mean everything and they mean something. We have been bantering these words around of ‘affordable housing’. If you lined up or gathered people in any shopping center, parking lot, or along the sidewalks and you got a substantial amount of people and you asked them, in their mind, what does affordable housing mean? I would venture to say that the vast majority of the citizens and taxpayers, not only in Pima County, but probably anywhere, they would say affordable housing is the process by which one saves up money, goes to a private lender, arranges for a mortgage, purchases a home in that mortgage’s limits, and owns that home as private ownership, and then equity builds up in that home which allows that person to buy another home, maybe a larger home, a newer home. But ‘affordable housing’, means the affordability of being able to buy a house. What we are dealing with in these instances, is anything but that. It is not even near it, because this should be called public housing. Because on one hand we have the government lending developers the capital for the rental housing project, most of them out of State developers by the way, I think. I recall seeing some of them from Omaha that were the primary developers. So, we have the government providing the capital to the developers for the rental housing that they are going to build rental housing and then it is going to be occupied by renters receiving taxpayer or government funded subsidies to pay for the rent. So, it is on both sides. That distinction needs to be disclosed. This is not what most people think of when they hear the phrase affordable housing. This taxpayer money that is going to the developers, is probably going to be tied up for multiple years that could be going…

[construction activity interrupts discussion]

RS: Sorry for this Supervisor. I think Mr. Stuckey is trying to take care of this.

SC: I am sure Supervisor Heinz planned that.

MH: Check is in the mail.

[inaudible]

SC: They are building a house? That distinction needs to be disclosed because, as I say, this is not what most people come to mind with when we hear the phrase affordable housing. So, this taxpayer money is going to the developer, and it is tied up for multiple years that could be going to, I do not know, fulfilling the County's promise to fix the roads in unincorporated Pima County. So, what does affordable housing really mean? We further have public housing that is going to compete with the private sector. We have got the government subsidizing the renter. We have got the government subsidizing the builder and private development, private sector is left out of it. We hear other talk about, this is a cure for homelessness. That is no guarantee of homelessness. There is nobody that can guarantee that publicly funded, taxpayer subsidized rental money, is going to prevent homelessness. I did hear one of my colleagues mention at the last meeting that it was felt by my colleague that this was the fairest form of taxation, because you would be taking from those who can afford it the most, and giving it to those who cannot afford it at all. I find it interesting, too, that no one seems to be standing up for the actual taxpayer, the individuals who are actually going to be bearing the burden of this tax. Where is their voice? When homeowners…

RS: Pardon me? We cannot have reactions in the audience, please.

SC: When homeowners receive their property tax bill, how justified and happy are they going to feel and be when they retire after maintaining a privately owned residence, arranging for the loan, paying the mortgage, being responsible owners, having the equity build up, finally paying off the mortgage and they realize when they open up their property tax bill, that they are now renting from the government? They paid off their mortgage, all that is left is the property tax bill, which is a rental payment to the government, and they are going to be thinking, this increase of my property taxes, which represents all that I have left, of all of the hard work I have done, this is going to subsidize renters, in subsidized taxpayer funded housing built by out-of-town developers. Affordable housing means able to buy a house and it is not, in this instance, what it is intended to be, which is publicly funded rentals. Seniors in my district, and I have a lot, from Green Valley to Tanque Verde Valley, Vail, are really renting their free and clear homes from the government, and they are now paying for public housing, while the roads in front of their houses are still not getting fixed, still. I read one interesting letter to the editor in the local paper about the proposed then three-cent tax hike. “The Board of Supervisors is currently reviewing a plan to implement a tax increase for affordable housing.” Goes on to describe the plan, “As your property values go up, so will the cost of that $0.03 each year. Now this has been adjusted. To create a funding source with no specific plan that increases taxes

automatically for the next ten years is not fair or right for the taxpayers of Pima County. Tell the Supervisors to vote down this compounding tax." Mr. Chair, if I may, we did a little research under Arizona Revised Statutes 11-251, which stipulate and identified the powers of the Board of Supervisors as enacted by the State legislature and the opening sentence says, "The Board of Supervisors, under such limitations and restrictions, as are prescribed by law, may…" and it goes on to list 67 powers that the Board of Supervisors may enact. Not once does it ever talk about providing affordable housing, unaffordable housing or housing of any kind. It is shocking how quickly off our mission as a Board we are delving into this very unjust way of taking from those who can afford it the most and giving it to those who can afford it the least, after a lifetime of building up equity in a home, being responsible homeowners and now when they get their tax bill, they are going to be paying for government subsidized renters living in government subsidized rentals. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Any other Board member wish to address this topic?

MH: I have a lot more, but I can. Do you want to?

RS: I did have something that I wanted to read into the record, but I generally try to wait as the Chair until my colleagues have said everything.

MH: I just do not want to be accused of filibustering.

RS: Not at all.

MH: Okay, alright. A couple of other important points to discuss. The business community response to this proposal has been different than previous tax proposals, at least in my experience as a legislator, and as a Supervisor. And by that, there really is not one. You probably saw the response to Prop 414, which recently went down. Very vocal opposition from the chambers and from organized business communities, and in this case, neutrality, silence, and I think I know why. Because at the time, the Metropolitan Chamber, did a listening tour of Small Business owners in the community, and the top two items that were presented to them by business owners, not our tax rate, not anything like I would kind of expect. Number one, was a lack of affordable housing in the community, and number two, was the ongoing crisis of street living homeless and the impact that it causes for their businesses. These are two issues that are directly and indirectly going to be helped by this proposal. I think it is important to talk about what the developers and what those who we want to encourage to use these funds, the ones that will be used for gap funding, especially for projects to encourage more affordable housing units to be developed and built. It does not work so well if it is one year at a time, or even 2 or 3, they need to see certainty, a commitment from this Board and our community to do this for a while, which is why this is a ten-year plan and not a 2 or 3 year plan. You know, businesses need five, ten, 25-year plans, so that is why it is important to show them that this commitment from us is there. Also, this is truly, as I have said before, a statement of beliefs of this Board. Anytime we do a budget, whether as the legislature, or the Congress, or right here in Pima County, when you



DRAFT

commit the public dollars to a cause, whatever that is, you are making a statement of beliefs. And we have made a lot of statements about infrastructure, and I have supported that. We have accelerated road programs, I supported that as well, to the tune of, I think, $150 million or something in the first few years I have been here. But it is equally important that we have roads and infrastructure that can get us from one place to another, which is also important for our economy, public health and the business community. But we also have to have, I would say, place at least the same amount of importance, on making sure that our residents can have safe, stable, secure housing and affordable housing. I want to also respond a little bit to my colleague from District 4. These funds, which they may not all be used for gap funding for projects, but I think many of them could be, these are not just going to be thrown around randomly. These are going to be handled, and specifically, for projects that are specifically discussed by the Affordable Housing Commission, that this Board has impaneled to do this exact work, as they have been for the past three years now. I believe that our mission has to be responsive to the needs of the community. It can adapt. It can change over time and early childhood education, we heard from my former colleague Sharon Bronson, and others on this Board, that was not part of our mission, and yet we are doing it, and it is successful, it is so important for this community, and I love the fact that we are. Eviction prevention, that started with ARPA funds, three plus years ago, that came out of my office as well but that was something that was not talked about before, it had been done before as a County. That is something now in office, and that is helping people every day. We can adapt our mission. It is really important that we do that. I am going to read a few—I am not going to read a few letters, I am going to read eight, but I think it is important to hear from a few. These are not ones that I have read before because that would be rude. But from the Pima Council on Aging, "May 16th, through regular community-led needs assessments in the day to day delivery of services and programs, we maintain a deep understanding of the evolving needs of the older adult community" These, by the way, are the patients I see all the time at the hospital. "With this earned perspective, PCOA strongly supports the adoption of Policy D22.17, to establish a dedicated funding stream for affordable housing in Pima County. We believe this initiative is a critical step toward addressing the rising housing instability facing older adults. In the past five years, PCOA has seen a sharp increase in older adults unable to find or keep housing they can afford. Many of the people we serve pay 85% or more of their monthly income toward housing and amount well above sustainable thresholds. According to the MAP AZ Dashboard, over 31,000 older adults' households in the Tucson MSA, earn at or below 50% of the area median income, yet only about 4,500 subsidized units across all housing support programs are occupied by older adults. Stable, affordable housing is essential to aging well. It prevents premature nursing home placement, supports community health, and allows people to remain engaged and independent. We urge the Board to move forward with this initiative as a sound investment in Pima County's aging population." So, I think that is an important perspective. This is kind of a new one for me. I have not regularly seen people writing in asking to be taxed. We heard some of that in Call to the Public, but here is Jane Prescott Smith, "As a property owner in the Catalina Foothills, I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisors to pass the property tax increase that has been put forward by

Supervisor Heinz. People like me can easily absorb this cost and want to address the lack of affordable housing stock in our community. I would also argue that this is a progressive tax because wealth and property assessment are highly correlated. Thank you for your consideration." I initially, when I started reading that letter, thought it was going to go a very different way. I did truly. Another letter about taxation, "My name is David Ross. I am a resident and homeowner in District 4. Given the ongoing housing crisis in Tucson, and across the nation, I cannot think of a better way to spend my tax dollars, than to provide affordable housing for our community. Please vote yes on this proposition." And then we have from Randy Peterson, "I think its passage would have…" I am not reading every part of the letter because we would be here for like eight hours. "I think its passage would have a quantifiable impact on housing in Pima County and help alleviate some of the impacts of poverty that I see daily in my three nonprofit organizations. As a homeowner, I think projected costs to me in a property tax increase is well worth…" Those were all caps, "…the return our community would see with this funding. I encourage all members of the Board to support this proposal and vote for its passage." We heard from Kylie McPherson already, so I am not going to repeat that, but thank you for being here. Tamika Moreno, "My name is Tamika Moreno. I live at…" I won't say that out loud, "…in District 5, and I support an increase of $0.03 in property taxes to generate the funds to be used for affordable housing. I feel while it may cost us a little more each year, it will benefit our community as a whole and that is what we need now more than ever. There are so many unhoused people in Tucson already, and with rising costs for food and rent, many more could be in danger. Please vote yes on the proposed tax increase." Aguirre Wilson, "There are many issues, challenges and situations all over the nation, but nothing is as important as housing. Having the ability to have some place to feel secure, warm, loved and out of the weather and elements cannot be emphasized enough, especially as we head towards summer months, which no doubt will be hotter than usual." From Anne Miski, "As someone who has worked for many years on the issue of housing and homelessness, I urge the Board to vote yes on that $0.03 for affordable housing. I personally witnessed the positive results in other communities of increased funding for housing. We know that this has been identified as a number one need/issue for our neighbors living in poverty, for those who are housing insecure and those who are experiencing homelessness. I thank this Board for having taken a bold, courageous step of passing the Prosperity Initiative. However, without adequate funding, it will be impossible to move our County toward increased prosperity. Housing is a foundation for health, stability and economic mobility. Without housing, we cannot make a true impact in other areas of need in our County. I urge you to take another bold step and vote yes to the $0.03 for affordable housing proposition." And just a couple more, promise. From Brooke Gilliam, "I am writing to express my support as a Pima County property owner, represented by Rex Scott, for the $0.03 of affordable housing policy. Besides the obvious need for affordable housing to keep Tucson citizens and families housed and stable, more affordable housing will drive economic growth by attracting businesses to invest in Pima County. Investing in affordable housing will positively affect people today and generations to come and ensures Pima County remains a family friendly and community, a win-win for its people and businesses looking to invest. $0.03 is a

small investment with a very big return for all of us. It is not just the right thing to do, it is also the right economic thing to do and I urge all Supervisors to vote yes on the proposal." From Ben Elias, "I am a seventh generation Tucsonan, Pima County resident and homeowner, public servant, and I want to state my unequivocal support for the proposed three cent annual property tax increase for affordable housing. I was only able to purchase a home, as my wife had a decent credit score. We had a family member co-sign on the home loan, and a friend provided us with some money as a down payment. Unfortunately, this is becoming a more common story, as so many of our neighbors face countless roadblocks and seeking and securing stable housing, whether they rent or own." Another from District 5, from April Putney, "I am a Pima County District 5 resident and homeowner, I want to say unequivocal support for the proposed three cent annual property tax increase and for affordable housing. I would like to see the estimated $200 million plus generated go toward the stated purposes of construction and preservation of affordable housing in Pima County, but especially toward the expansion of initiatives and programs that reduce homelessness and keep people housed as well. Please follow through on this excellent start to addressing local housing needs as identified in the ECONorthwest Housing Needs Assessment." These letters are really good, they make the points better than sometimes I think I can. And alright, well, I think you get the idea. Here is another one from District 1, Lubna Govindarajan. I have no idea if I said that right, and I apologize. "I am writing to express my support as a Pima County property owner for the three-cent affordable housing policy. This is not just the right thing to do, but the right economic thing to do as well. I urge all Supervisors to vote yes." From the director of the United Way, "Good afternoon, my name is Lisa Florin. I am the resident of District 5. My background is in public health and community development, and I serve on multiple boards and coalitions related to homelessness and eviction prevention. I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed Board of Supervisors Policy of D22.17 $0.03 for affordable housing. Every day, community members call, email and stop by my office to inquire about housing options, rental assistance, and emergency shelters. Housing is far and away the leading request we receive and is also the one that prompts the most urgency and desperation. Unfortunately, the demand is far outpacing the resources at our system, which includes nonprofits, government, mutual aid and faith-based groups can offer. And we are too often forced to let people know that nothing is available to help them maintain their precarious unit or move them off the street. I am deeply appreciative of the steps taken by the Board of Supervisors in recent years to address our housing crisis, particularly your adoption of the Prosperity Initiative and support for the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. That said, a top takeaway from both the Prosperity Initiatives housing policy briefs and the commission's recommendations has been that Pima County simply needs more housing. Report after report has concluded that housing production and preservation, particularly of affordable units, must be supercharged in order to make up ground, lost since 2008, and ultimately make any sort of dent in affordability and homelessness. And with increasing numbers of residents newly engaging with their homelessness system, TPCH data suggest jumps of 46 to 53% in the past few years alone and federal funding under threat, programs and resources to intervene with those who have already lost housing are more important than ever. Pima

County residents have been unified in their call for elected officials to take concrete action on housing and homelessness. With D22.17, I applaud the Board's willingness to put forth a policy that responds to these requests, while incorporating the most up-to-date research and recommendations into a pragmatic, effective and non-regressive plan. A vote for Policy D22.17 is a vote that reiterates Pima County's commitment to establish pathways to prosperity and opportunity, particularly for our lowest income residents and I urge the Supervisors to vote yes." There are several others but the point here is, this is not going to fix everything, but it is going to make a big dent. It is smart for economic reasons, and it is great for public health reasons, and it responds to the need of the community. This Board has taken bold steps before with eviction prevention, with early childhood development and I truly believe that this is the best way to move forward. I would encourage my colleagues to support this proposal, which we at any time, can modify in the future, just like PAYGO or anything else that we have passed previously.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Cano? I am sorry, were you seeking recognition?

AC: [shook head, no]

RS: Okay. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I spoke about this when it came up at the last meeting, but I wanted to just kind of respond to, I think a little bit about this overarching question, and not to spend a whole lot of time around the high-level role of government but I just want to be really clear that providing for affordable housing is squarely in our wheelhouse. It is the expectation and role of us. There is I think, sort of going off of the ARS provision that Supervisor Christy was quoting. It includes additional language that states, that counties should, quote, "Do and perform all acts necessary to enable the County to participate in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, which calls for facilitating education, health, employment and general welfare for impoverished Americans." It is our job, as defined by statute, to ensure for the care and protection of our community, the full breadth of our community. Thinking about what we could do that this long-term investment, an upstream investment, in affordable housing and thinking about that of both just the idea of incentivizing affordability, the idea of preserving existing homes and preventing homelessness, and trying to lump that into something that is, you know, stated almost pejoratively around public housing, does a great disservice to what we are talking about. But incentivizing affordability, this is not something that is foreign to us, as a body, as government. We do something very similar through economic development, and yet we do not call, we do not talk about public business, but yet we provide incentives. We do cuts, to encourage industry to come and set up here but yet we do not call that public business. Incentivizing, trying to correct for the market, a market that is just askew, to ensure that we can have well-being, safety, health, peace of mind and stability in our community. That is what we do, and this is how we do it. I have heard over and over from every corner of District 3, from the farthest reaches of rural communities, suburban communities, urban communities, indigenous communities that we need to invest in housing. We need to tackle the crisis of the folks who are unhoused.

That is the common thread. It looks different in all of our communities, but it is a common thread of something that is so important and critical for us to do right now. I think the other key point, and apologies because I know I made this point last time, we are already paying for this, but we are paying for it in a way that does nothing really, to tackle the problem in a long-term, substantive way. We are paying for the lack of affordability in our housing, through our jails, through our swollen, bloated courts, through law enforcement pushing people from location to location, through our 911 dispatchers, through businesses, through flood control, pushing folks out of washes, transportation, as one of our speakers mentioned, and trying to prevent people from setting up in certain places, our hospitals, our public health, our education, on and on. We are paying for not doing this and tackling this in the long-term, substantive way that the problem demands. So, for me, and what I hear, and what I see, we need to take a bold investment, an upstream investment. What we are doing with $5 million a year is great. What we are doing with looking at our buildings and our lands and trying to support housing is great, and it is important, and we have done a lot of great work but the problem demands more. It is one of our statutory obligations. It is one of our moral commitments, and it is what we do to ensure the well-being of our community. I think we just we need to support this and I think we also have, and one of the things that our office has been doing, is going around and talking with folks from the other departments and other agencies to really get a handle on what some of the programs are, to help and support folks who are on fixed incomes, who will feel some strain and stress and discomfort from this. And we have programs from our Assessor's Office, there are discounts that we want to be pushing and expanding and promoting out for all of the utilities, from water and electric and gas, to help those who are at the tightest end of the spectrum who will feel this on their property tax bill, and they will, but we are there because that is our statutory requirement, and it is our moral duty to help folks out, and we can do that and should do that. I am encouraging and really hope that all of my colleagues will help us go upstream and invest in housing in our communities. Thank you.

RS: Supervisor, now you want me to call you?

AC: Yeah.

RS: Alright, go ahead.

AC: Well, thank you, Chair Scott. I want to thank my colleague from District 2 for introducing this item. I have enjoyed our conversations over the last several weeks. I want to begin by acknowledging the many advocates, residents, and community leaders here today. Your dedication to housing affordability is powerful and deeply appreciated. I share your commitment and I am grateful for the work you continue to do to push us forward and hold this Board of Supervisors accountable. We can all agree that every person in Pima County deserves a safe, stable place to call home. Whether you are a renter facing rising costs, a senior trying to age in place, or a working family searching for stability, housing is at the heart of community well-being. This is a regional challenge and one we must meet with urgency but urgency



DRAFT

alone is not enough. We also have a responsibility to act thoughtfully, grounded in our values, responsive to economic realities, and always mindful of public trust. Since this item was introduced in April, I have worked with my fellow colleagues and staff to explore how we can make meaningful investments without placing the full burden on taxpayers. That is why we have looked closely at what can be done to use existing dollars within the County's recommended budget. Before we ask our residents to give more, we must show that we have done everything we can with what we already have. We are not talking about $0.03 today, Supervisor Heinz has refined his recommendation to one and a half cents. So, the one and a half cent proposal that was submitted on Friday, reflects that commitment to advance affordable housing, and I support it. We can increase our total housing investment to approximately $10 million through targeted internal adjustments in this current fiscal year. We can do that, but it is going to involve cuts, and so I appreciate the community holding us, and me, accountable on this issue but recognize that the moment that we say yes to a 1.5 cent adjustment, that means we are going to have to look elsewhere within our county operations. That process has happened for more than six months at this point, and I am open for that conversation. I am wanting to have it because I think we can do more with existing resources. So how we deploy these funds matters just as much as the total, and to be effective, our policy must prioritize, not just building, but also preserving and rehabilitating existing housing. We must support density where infrastructure already exists and ensure that these investments reach rural, tribal and urban neighborhoods where the need is greatest. That is how we make this funding count and how we advance the findings of the ECONorthwest proposal. And I want to acknowledge that this process has not been perfect. The first time this was introduced it was my first Board meeting as a County Supervisor, and the original financial memo provided to the Board, a day before our last meeting, overstated the tax impact of this proposal by a factor of ten. That error has since been corrected, but the confusion it caused highlights just how important it is that we are precise, transparent and careful in how we communicate with the public. And so, I ask our County staff to uphold that same standard that the Board is held to. Even with that, I believe we are in a strong position to move ahead, between the County Administrator's proposed $5 million for affordable housing, and $3.1 million that is being proposed and being voted on today, tentatively for emergency eviction legal services. We are already committing the equivalent of $0.08 of the property tax rate to housing efforts. The 1.5 cent addition helps us build on that momentum without raising the overall tax rate. I believe that is a good step in the right direction, and that is why I have submitted to Supervisor Heinz, a framework that reflects our shared goals and helps guide how these funds are used, ensuring long term impact, flexibility and fairness. This proposal, versions one and two, lacked specific funding criteria, leaving decisions about the use of these funds undefined beyond general language around gap financing. It does not establish guardrails or performance benchmarks for how the funds would be distributed across housing types or geographic areas, and it also asks taxpayers to contribute more without first demonstrating internal budget discipline. And that is a concern, especially right now at a time of economic uncertainty at both the Federal and the State levels. So, this is not about whether we act, and about whether I support the efforts, it is about how we act, and I believe

that we are on the right path. This budget process goes into the summer, it goes into June, and I want to make thoughtful decisions as a County Supervisor, as somebody who was raised by a single mom in Section 8 Housing, do not believe for one second that I am not trying to get us to the point where we can get there. The framework that I have submitted, and the framework that Supervisor Heinz has submitted, is getting us to the same direction. What we all want is more housing, more stability, and a stronger future for every County resident and if we keep staying focused, and keep working together, I know we will get this right. Supervisor Heinz, I am curious to hear what our colleague from District 1 has to say now that we have all had the opportunity to speak. I think the real question is, are we open to continuing this conversation so that we do it right? And I think we are speaking the same language, Supervisor Heinz, and so those are my comments for now.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. I do, as the Chair, like to wait to be the last person to speak. I am grateful to Supervisor Heinz for thinking long-term. There is little doubt that we will ultimately need additional revenue to help address our housing needs. Having said that, the majority of Supervisors have acted in concert since the creation of the Regional Affordable Housing Commission as to how we would move forward. This measure upsets that consensus by prioritizing funding over planning. The Board has received two memoranda from the County Administrator in recent weeks describing how the Regional Affordable Housing Commission is working on a strategy to increase the amount of affordable workforce and market rate housing in our region. The March 20 memorandum, culminated with a section describing the process for the development of a regional housing strategy and funding plan. Some of the steps in the process were to review City, Town and County housing needs assessments. Draft each plan element based on commission input, and obtain commission approval on each element, and prepare a draft plan to include preliminary strategies and cost table. The April 22 memorandum, followed up on the first one by laying out a timeline for the commission's work, with the goal of a draft plan being finished by late November. A list of guiding principles was included in the memorandum. Those principles included, focus on 3 to 5 strategies proven to be most effective locally at developing or preserving the highest number of housing units at the income levels needed. Based on these strategies, identify the cost to reduce the housing shortage, how much is currently being spent and a targeted reduction. Another principle, identify strategies that can be scaled up or down based on funding commitments and the average cost per unit, total cost and local cost. And the last principle, that I will cite, include measurable targets tied to annual funding commitments. Given these guiding principles and the regional nature of our commission, the draft plan we receive in November will speak to expected funding, not just from the County, but from the other local jurisdictions who are represented on that commission. It will also, doubtless, seek to leverage use of any available State and Federal funding and given the timeline as to when we are going to get the draft plan, we can begin to consider the County's funding at roughly the same time that planning for our next budgetary cycle will start. Prudence and our duties to taxpayers dictate that we should not be talking about funding until we have reviewed the draft plan, revised it as needed, and adopted it. This proposal is certainly thoughtful and well-intended, but I do not feel it is the right time to consider it. This

Board has and will continue to address the pressing need to increase housing stock in our region but we are putting the cart before the horse if we talk about funding a plan before we have one. I would agree with the sentiments just expressed by Supervisor Cano, which is that I think we all have the same priorities. We all have the same pressing need to address this issue. We have been doing that since we formed this commission. I voted for every single recommendation for the use of gap funding that has come before this Board, and I am very willing to consider any form of local funding when we have a plan and after we have had a chance to consider it, revise it and adopt it. But I do not want to start talking about funding until that plan is before us. So having heard all of that, and I wanted to make sure that all of my colleagues had a chance to...

AC: [inaudible]

RS: I am sorry?

AC: I have a question for the County Administrator.

RS: Oh, please go ahead. Supervisor?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Administrator Lesher, can you give us a timeline of the budget process and the decisions that we are making today? Just kind of explain that. There is opportunity to continue this discussion that would not affect the overall budget implications. Correct?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Today, you will be establishing the ceiling. Whatever the Board adopts today, as a tax rate, and a budget, is the ceiling. Between now and final budget adoption on June 17th. What you approve on June 17th can go down, it just cannot go up. So whatever you approve today, is simply the cap. There can be modifications between now and the 17th.

AC: Thank you. Administrator Lesher, Chair Scott. I have one more question for our Administrator.

RS: Please.

AC: Can you please tell us, Supervisor Heinz mentioned in his updated memo sent out on Friday, as you are aware that there are some internal efficiencies that we can be looking at, can you kind of describe that process? Because we have also had that discussion from the District 5 side, to be able to try to make this proposal a reality. Can you guide us on what those conversations can look like, should the Board proceed?

JA: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. We have been talking through what modifications we need. Should the Board decide to adopt either the three cent, or penny and a half, or whatever the Board does today, where we might look at efficiencies. We have begun to look at what could be done with the Contingency



DRAFT

Fund. We are looking at what interest might be available or interest? We have been reviewing all the supplementals, and looking at, because we look at where is our base budget for now, which is the initial budget. Then all the supplementals, could any of those be modified slightly to accommodate any possible decrease. Lots of conversations beginning looking across the operations to see how we could get to the number you need.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I just want to reiterate the point that the Administrator just made, that cost savings means, cuts in other areas.

JL: Yes.

AC: And so, to be able to accommodate for a one and a half proposal, we are going to do what I believe is the right thing, to look internally to figure out how to spread those existing resources in a meaningful way. Administrator Lesher, I want to thank you for having a budget that, as I mentioned in my remarks, totals a mere eight cent proposal already allocated toward dedicated housing. I personally believe that number does need to go up over many years, and so I am curious how that fits in with your plan, as our County Administrator.

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. I think this will be the fourth year, or a total of $20 million to go to the affordable housing managed by the commission. I think what I have talked with the Board about, is what we look forward to is a new process or a new timeline by which the Board can meet in July or August and define priorities from the Board's perspective that we then use as we begin to assemble the budget. We start in October with departments, and then the Board sees it really after we have begun to cook the budget. If we can look at the new format where you all can let us know from a policy perspective, what are the goals of this Board and how do we then implement that as we pull the budget together and bring you the draft next fall?

RS: Thank you,

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I just want to note that I think the County Administrator could use better terminology than cooking the budget. Probably not a good one at this particular point, but to Chair Scott's point. Even though maybe in principle he agrees with my colleagues on the affordable housing issue but I think he has expressed most articulately that there is a lot of details that need to be addressed and need to be looked into, i.e. the cart before the horse analogy. I am thinking also, my colleague Supervisor Cano, is also wanting to explore further development of the details of such a plan. If Chair Scott would be interested in making a motion to continue this discussion, I would support that.

RS: Are you suggesting that it be continued until we receive the draft of the Regional Affordable Housing Plan?

SC: Any kind of information that you think is being left out that is needed to make a decisive resolution to this, is fine with me. If that is what you would like to include your motion in, it would be acceptable to me.

RS: Well, that is clearly my preference based on the statement that I made that we continue this item until we receive the report from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. So I would make that motion.

SC: And I will second.

RS: It is moved and seconded. Discussion on the motion? Now remember this is discussion on continuance.

MH: I have no interest in continuance. I was still discussing the…

RS: But we have to, by parliamentary procedure, we have to address our comments now to the motion, and the motion now is, to continue this item until we receive the report from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission.

MH: Okay, that is ridiculous. I mean, we heard from our own Housing Commission desperately, that they need funding and we are ignoring them. They voted overwhelmingly to ask us for funding. We did PEEPs with no plan, $10 million for early childhood education, which I willingly, and am so glad I supported and continue to do so, and the plan kind of figured itself out after a year or two. I just think it makes no sense to continue this when we know what the urgent need is now and remember, the timeline is incredibly important in discussing a continuance, because when we give the $5 million to our commission, it is 14, 16, 18 months before that money turns into actual units. We have the housing study, it gives us the top line numbers. Everything in this proposal was based on data and I know you all like that, I like it too, I am a scientist after all, but we know that the need is there. We pass the Prosperity Initiative, and it is kind of starting to look like a joke if we do not actually take some action. We appointed people to our Affordable Housing Commission, and they voted, I think only two people opposed this. Overwhelmingly, they are begging us to give them funding stream and resources to do the work we have charged them to do for our community, and now we are going to ignore that. I strongly would urge that we not continue the item for another six months and hope people can find a way to stay out of the elements in the meantime.

RS: The only thing I would challenge, Supervisor Heinz, is your statement that this motion is ignoring the problem. Again, I have voted the same as you on every affordable housing measure that has come before this Board. All I have said, is that I would prefer to have a plan in place before I start talking about how to fund it. I recognize the vote that was made by the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. I also recognize how that item came before them, which was the insistence by a

member of the commission who was offended that we were talking about it at this dais before it was discussed at the commission. She insisted that it be put on the agenda, and the Chair of the Commission acceded to her request. I feel that both you and I have the same interests and the same priorities. We are just talking about timing, and I am asking that we talk about planning and having a plan in place before we talk about how to fund it. That is the the only reason for this motion. Any further discussion on the motion, which is to continue the item. Supervisor Allen?

JA: We know the problem, right? We feel the problem, we see the problem and I think we are only seeing right now, given the economic uncertainty of the moment that we are in. We are just seeing the tip of the iceberg and things are going to just get worse, we know that. We can and should do the planning process that will define the parameters and what the affordable housing plan will look like, but delaying the funding component will just delay us even farther. A plan will outline what to do with it, and as my colleague said, it is going to take a year before we can even collect the funding by the way that the tax collection process works and for it to get back into distribution. To me, this timing is the right time to approve the funding mechanism now so that we can then time in the planning process, which would culminate in 5 or 6 months into the new fiscal year, and then the funding would be available six months after that already. So, if we push this down into the next budget year, we are looking like two years down before we can have a significant investment in something in a condition that is only going to get worse. I feel like it is an obligation that we have to tackle this now. The responsible action is to vote on something now for immediate action. The planning needs to happen, and it will happen, and it will be a great plan. Our commission is strong and solid and committed. I have no doubt about a good plan.

RS: Any other comments on the motion to continue? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I will not be supporting the delay of this action item. I do believe that we have existing resources, and a framework provided to my colleague from District 2 that I will support that gets us to the same destination that he is trying to go in. We have an obligation to ensure that this money is planned and that we give clarity to our County departments about the framework that is going to ensure that these dollars are going where they need them most. I cannot support the revised Friday memo for one and a half cents today, as I mentioned earlier, because it lacks spending criteria. It does not establish guardrails or performance benchmarks. It does not set the process for how the Board is going to be reviewing these items. Why would I vote yes for something that still needs some more work? I think we can accomplish this work, and we could have accomplished this work last week when I gave very specific instructions about where I was going to go to be supportive of this issue. Unfortunately, that was not a part of the submittal on Friday afternoon. I am not going to allow this space to be one of picking winners and losers. We are all losing when affordability is not at the top of mind, and I think right now, after a legislature that does not yet have its budget in order, I have some experience working at that place. We have no idea what uncertainties are going to come our way. We have DC in stalemate right now in terms of their funding

structures. So, let us get to the same place, let us calm the narrative down and let us keep going to be able to do this this year. I believe we can do that in the coming year, and I believe we can do it with the existing resources. The County Administrator has already said that we would look for ways to make the one and a half possible. I hope that the conversation coming after this, is one of how we move forward, not how we are making roadblocks. You have a Board majority here, is the message to the community, so let us get there.

RS: Let us vote on the motion to continue until we have a report from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission. All those in favor signify by saying Aye? Aye.

SC: Aye.

RS: All those opposed?

JA: No.

AC: No.

MH: No.

RS: Item fails 2-3.

MH: I move the original proposal, as submitted on Friday.

SC: Mr. Chair, for clarity, this is the reduced, from 3, to 1 and a half?

RS: To be clear, and correct me if I am wrong, Supervisor Heinz, what you are moving is the revised proposal that is outlined in your memorandum dated May 16th?

MH: That is correct. The short ramp up, short ramp down, 1.5 cents, first and 10th year.

RS: Thank you, is there a…?

JA: Second.

RS: Okay, that is moved and seconded by Supervisor Allen. Discussion?

AC: Yes.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, I really appreciate it. Supervisor Heinz, I am curious what you believe to be the roadblocks in accommodating the framework and the guardrails that I have put forth.

MH: None whatsoever. I appreciate them and I think they should be included.



DRAFT

AC: So unfortunately, your motion would not incorporate my feedback, if this vote were to be continued today.

MH: It can be incorporated simply as a friendly amendment to my motion, which I am happy to accept.

RS: Well, let me, hold on just one second. Because I need to ask a question of Mr. Brown as our Parliamentarian. I am familiar with what Supervisor Cano is discussing, but these are not items that are agendized as I understand it, they are not attached to this item. So how would we go about discussing them?

AC: To that point, Chair Scott?

RS: Please.

AC: I think the simpler question is, are verbal amendments allowed?

RS: Thank you that is probably the simpler question.

SB: Yes, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Depending on the complexity of the amendment, if it is simple enough to be articulated and understood by the public from the dais, then they can be made from the dais.

RS: Alright, thank you, Mr. Brown. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you. I would like to make a substitute motion.

RS: Okay, go ahead.

AC: Board of Supervisors Policy Draft, Subject: General Fund Allocation for Affordable Housing. Purpose: to establish Pima County policy for annually determining a general fund allocation recommended by the County Administrator to support housing affordability, preservation, and community reinvestment efforts. All annual allocations shall be subject to Board review and approval. The community need and justification. According to the Pima County Housing Needs Assessment conducted by ECONorthwest, over 59,000 Pima County households are currently cost burdened, with more than half of renters paying over 30% of their income toward housing. The shortage of deeply affordable units, particularly those accessible to residents earning 50% of the area median income or less, has resulted in rising housing insecurity, increased displacement, and the deterioration of older housing stock. Pima County's housing challenges are felt Countywide. In urban areas like Tucson, families face rising rents and limited ownership opportunities. In rural communities, aging manufactured homes are falling into disrepair and investment is scarce. Tribal nations and historically underserved neighborhoods lack access to quality, affordable units. This policy framework supports both new housing supply and preservation, offering a flexible, equity focused tool to respond to these



DRAFT

intersecting challenges without increasing the property tax burden in fiscal year ‘26. It provides a structured, accountable path forward that reflects the scale of need while respecting County taxpayers and the County's fiscal outlook. The policy: the County Administrator shall recommend an annual allocation as part of the tentative recommended budget. The Board of Supervisors shall approve specific funding levels, considering both community housing needs and overall fiscal health. Annual allocations shall not exceed $0.03 of the primary property tax levy. Oversight and administration: The Regional Affordable Housing Commission shall review and prioritize project proposals and submit recommendations to the Board of Supervisors no later than November 1st each year. Final awards require Board approval. Eligible recipients, regional nonprofit housing developers and community land trusts, affordable housing focused private sector partners. Public or hybrid partnerships advancing long-term affordability, local jurisdictions and tribal governments. Project priority criteria: Projects in high stress, low-income census tracts, urban and rural deeply affordable housing units 50% AMI or lower preservation or rehabilitation of aging housing stock projects leveraging low-income housing tax credit dollars, HOME funds, CDBG funds or land trust models, support for manufactured housing improvements and conversions, and lastly, homeownership and downpayment assistance with targeted allocations. 10% for manufactured housing repairs and upgrades, 10% for rural and unincorporated Pima County housing needs and 7% for tribal community housing initiatives on the Tohono O’Odham Nation and Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Well, let us see if he has a second to the motion.

SB: Chair Scott?

SC: Is this…?

RS: This is…

SC: …is overly complex?

SB: Chair Scott, Supervisors. I do think that rises to the level of complexity that may require…

SC: Possible Notice?

SB: …adding it, notice to the public, articulation in writing and maybe consideration at a future meeting.

SC: Mr. Chair? As I think Supervisor Heinz has revised his motion to, I think the public needs time to digest and matriculate both of these items. These are not the simple dais amendments. These are very complex, with a lot of details and a lot of information, and I, for one, got lost after a couple of the taxes that you were



DRAFT

imposing. I honestly feel that this really does not meet the criteria set forth by our parliamentarian.

RS: Okay, so having heard Mr. Brown's ruling as our parliamentarian, we cannot accept the substitute motion. We still have a motion on the floor, which was the original motion that Supervisor Heinz put forth and was seconded by Supervisor Allen. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I would just say again, that because everything that we are talking about in this proposal, is going to be determined by our own Affordable Housing Commission. They have many of these criteria are already there and incorporated into how they do things, and again, not every dollar is going to be, this is not supposed to be hyper prescriptive, we are not telling them exactly how to do stuff. We are telling them, here are your assets and the priorities for the community, and here is what you need. Some of this is going to be used for gap funding, some of it is going to be used for preserving existing housing units and affordability of those housing units and other ways to prevent people from going from housing insecure to on the streets. The reason we have that commission, is to do exactly what my colleague from District 5 is outlining very well, and that is to use these priorities to analyze what is best, including the data that will be coming in October. Additional data and recommendations in October and November from the housing study. So, empowering them to actually take action by having funds is what my proposal is trying to do but the framework that is there, that exists in the Affordable Housing Commission that is already in place. Every project that they determine is going to be granted funding, and to Mr. Cano's point, that has to be approved by this Board already. We see those projects come back and we have to say, yes, give this $400,000 to this project because that is the recommendation of the Commission for the funding. So much of that structure is already in place, which is why I said I am happy to accept that as an amendment to my proposal, because it is there. We already have a commission that does that. So, I think we are safe in moving forward but if that is not the will of this Board, that is fine, and we can have a vote.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: We keep talking about the commission, about the commission, that everything is. How about the public? The public needs to have an opportunity to digest what is being put forth here and the complexity therein. The commission, they are already involved in it and they are in the weeds. The public has no clue. This is the first time we have heard most of these proposals today, and I think the public has a right to take its time and find out what is going on with their tax dollars. Very clear, very easy.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Alright, we are going to move...Oh, I am sorry, Supervisor Allen?

DRAFT

JA: I just want to note that the Housing Commission is a public facing body and does have members of the public who attend. They comply with open meeting law. The agendas are made public. And so, it is actually a space in which there is ongoing feedback and transparency around the use of our Affordable Housing Gap Funding, as well as there would be in letting that entity do their job of establishing and implementing because they do the framework around the implementation, whereas, we determine the funding, right? The how we will get them the money, and they determine that we have selected people from each of our districts to represent us on that body to flesh out the implementation. And thus far, they have done a phenomenal job, particularly, in leveraging our money, to then turn our $5 million a year, into nearly almost a what is it, $500 million? I think that is right. So anyway, all that is to say, there is lots of public input.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Cano?

AC: I have talked to my commissioners on the Housing Commission who are supportive of this proposal, and I want to reinforce, as am I, they want some more language to what is being proposed. If we can have consensus that there is a Board majority heading toward a 1.5 cent allotment that is near $0.10, as I reiterated earlier. I do not see why it hurts to do this in one more meeting, the right way. I appreciate Supervisor Heinz's ability to accommodate this. I am doing my due diligence as well, and none of the conversation that has happened on this dais amongst the members should have been a surprise. Either from me as somebody who is wanting to get to a path forward, and I believe we can continue to do that, but we also have a budget that we need to start moving on, and I feel like I would like to make a substitute motion, at our next meeting, to be able to consider this. I will send to the Clerk, my framework, that I believe can get us all to the same destination. I am sorry, my long verbal amendment was not allowed. I do believe the public could have some input into this, and most importantly, I want the community to know that we are looking at existing resources to be able to make this near $10 million investment in affordable housing a reality. Fourteen days is not a long time to figure that all out. So, I am making a substitute motion to delay to our next meeting, with final action coming from the Board.

SC: Mr. Chair, is that not a continuation?

AC: You were asking, Chair Scott, until November.

SC: I cannot…oh, alright so…

RS: Well, so what I understand Supervisor Cano's motion to be, is that there is a motion on the floor to approve the item, as outlined by Supervisor Heinz in his memo of May 16th that is seconded by Supervisor Allen. What Supervisor Cano is moving is that the item be continued until our next meeting. My motion was to continue the item until we got the report from the Regional Affordable Housing Commission, that

motion was defeated. Supervisor Cano is moving that the item be continued until our next meeting. Is that correct, sir?

AC: That is correct.

RS: Alright.

MH: Can I ask a clarifying question of the staff?

RS: Well, we have to first see if his substitute motion has a second.

SC: I will.

MH: I…that is why actually.

SC: To move everything to the next meeting?

RS: Yes, sir.

SC: I will second.

RS: Okay, alright. Now you can ask your question, Supervisor?

MH: Administrator Lesher will this, because of the way the revised proposal on Friday is worded, it should not impact the tax rate that we approved today? Would consideration of this proposal at the next meeting be something that will be okay as far as you are concerned?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. As long as there is not an increase in the tax rate, which your plan does not provide at this point, we can accommodate it if you have this conversation on June 3rd.

MH: Okay, thank you.

RS: Alright.

SB: Chair Scott.

RS: Mr. Brown.

SB: Just for clarification, that this item is being continued with the proposal that is on today's agenda but may be informed, modified, changed through the addition of additional information that will be posted with the new item and further discussion? I just want to make sure that is clear on the record.

RS: That is correct, is it not, Supervisor?

DRAFT

AC: That is correct.

SC: That would be what my second would be based upon.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Alright everybody get that? All those in favor of continuing this item until our June 3rd meeting, with the proviso that there will be additional material added to the item from Supervisor Cano, indicate by saying aye…

SC: And properly posted.

RS: Absolutely. I mean, come on, look who I got sitting next to me. All those in favor of that motion indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

SC: Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Okay, that carries. Alright, thank you.

DRAFT

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

43. **Hearing – Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 – 11, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to the public display of fireworks; amending the Pima County Code, Chapter 9.04.

Verbatim

---

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
KW: Kerry Welty, President, Fireworks Productions of Arizona

---

RS: Let us go to Item No. 48. This is a hearing on a Code Text Amendment, Ordinance No. 2025 - 11 of the Board of Supervisors, relating to the public display of fireworks. Just a quick clarification question, the amendment that we need to make, do we make that after the hearing?

JL: Yes, let us do that.

RS: Okay, alright. So, for the hearing, I have one speaker card and that is Kerry Welty. Mr. Welty, thank you so much for your patience. Not the first time that you have had to spend a day in our hearing room.

KW: Supervisors of the Board, Mr. Scott. My name is Kerry Welty. I am President of Fireworks Productions. Sorry, let me go over here to the speaker. First, I want to thank you for allowing our company to be part of the code amendments and working with Administrator Lesher, to help get this passed through. I think you already…amended one of the questions that we had, which you are going to do.

RS: We are…

JL: That is the section…

KW: With the notifications?

RS: We are going to…

KW: The notifications?

RS: Yeah, we tried to chalk it up as a scrivener's error, but our parliamentarian wants us to do an amendment, doggone it.



DRAFT

KW: Okay. Well and then when it comes to the fire restrictions, we know how important that is. But I also want to reassure you that all the fireworks sites that we work at are on heavily watered golf courses, baseball fields, soccer fields, and each fireworks display has a standby truck present at the time of the fireworks display. There is only one concern that I still have, well, it is many concerns, but one of them that I still have is, “No single location shall be the site of public displays of fireworks more than five times in any calendar year.” I think we spoke, Mr. Scott, about Caterpillar being not necessarily a problem because it is not in a residential area. They currently have anywhere from 5 to 10 shows a year, so I do not know if that means anything, as far as, you are making a blanket policy here. And I get it with the resorts, Skyline, some of the other ones, that you guys can deny permits at any time once you think it is exceeded a level. But if you go ahead and blanket in five times a year, it pretty much handcuffs my ability to work at Caterpillar. So I was wondering if that is something that can be reconsidered before this is, technically, put into amendment or into the code. Other than that, I want to thank you very much for everything you do for us and approving all our permits, and we have got a big 4th of July season ahead and looking forward to it. So, thank you very much for your time.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Welty.

KW: Appreciate it.

RS: Appreciate you.

JL: Chair Scott, would it be helpful if I highlighted what were the changes?

RS: Would you please? Yes, ma'am.

JL: Thank you. And thank you to Mr. Welty and the company. We did meet and go through the concerns. The changes from when you saw this last week, which with the amendment you may be offering, we looked at the notification to make it much broader and say simply, you can use all available tools pretty much to communicate, whether it is signage, posters, email, direct mail, a lot of different opportunities, but that whatever an applicant would choose, would delineate what they propose to use as their public notification when they apply for a permit. So the notification piece was changed. We looked at narrowing, limiting, what you had before you would end fireworks at 10:00 p.m. Other than New Year's Eve, which they can go till 1:00 a.m., but would end at 10:00 p.m. We have the information about no single location could have more than five times during the year. Added a liability insurance requirement of $10 million as a minimum for any applicant, limited any fireworks display for no longer than 30 minutes, and then, if you recall, the previous documents, tied the work to the drought. This now moves through and really ties it to all of our Fire Service fire restrictions. Again, consistent with some of the other information we have been looking at today, saying that if you hit Stage 3 or 4, Stage 3 will not allow fireworks, Stage 2 there are restrictions, those are delineated. And then we explained there was a new section added that talks about



DRAFT

appropriate notification to the fire districts, the clearing of the area, making sure that everything has been watered, make sure that any display has to be canceled if we are in addition to ten miles per hour wind speed, and then must ensure that they remediated any potential property damage that might have occurred as a result of the fireworks. So those were the pieces we heard coming from the Board at the last meeting, met with the industry, and this has been the result of the work in those areas.

RS: I just want to say, Ms. Lesher, I genuinely appreciate the work you and your team did on this. Our office had advanced an ordinance, and it was clearly not going to earn support from the majority of the Board. It certainly had some concerns with the fireworks industry as well, and I feel that you and your team took the foundation of what we tried to develop in District 1 and made it stronger, and I just really appreciate the work. I am going to go ahead and do the amendment that we thought was a scrivener's error initially, and that is on Section 9.04.050 A., should say, “Each applicant must notify any neighbors within 1000 feet of the site by any effective means of notification, including but not limited to, direct mail, door flyers, signs or communication through homeowners or neighborhood associations. The means of notice shall be specified on the application for a permit.” And Mr. Brown, you want me to make that as a formal motion to amend?

SB: [inaudible response]

RS: Okay, so I will make that motion.

MH: [inaudible]

RS: Yes. Moved and seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Any discussion? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I have a question about an additional amendment.

RS: Oh, well, we will get to that one.

JA: Okay.

RS: I just need to do this one.

JA: Gotta wrap up one.

RS: Yes, ma'am, please. Any discussion on this amendment? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.



DRAFT

RS: That passes 4-0. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I am excited that the ordinance is coming together as I have been voting against permits for several months in anticipation of a framework that takes into consideration our needs in Pima County and some of our realities. I think the things that I have, the reasons that I voted against them have been around fire risk, air quality, concerns for neighbors, and then also the impact on pets. I feel like the policy, the proposal addresses three of those four and my question is around animals and pets. My understanding from talking with the Director of our PACC is that there is always an uptick of animals that come into the shelter after 4th of July, after New Year's. My understanding is that the permits are no cost permits. Are we able to add a fee to the permits, and that fee could be an animal care-related fee?

SB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. It depends. The fee or a charge cannot exceed the cost of the product or service. I am not exactly sure what the product or service here is. I think what you are suggesting is that the impacts of fireworks affects animals and could we therefore use a fee from Fireworks Permits to address impacts to animals?

JA: Well, it impacts our department…

SB: Specifically?

JA: …that takes in strays. We could strive to monetize what that impact is. Looking back, I do not know, with the data about animals that have come in after the 4th and after New Year's and try to monetize that through PACC and then therefore draw so that there is a through line from impact to fee.

SB: Sitting here, Supervisor Allen, I think it may be a bit of a stretch. I think it is something we could work on into the future. I do not think sitting here, that we would recommend approving that kind of amendment without further research.

KW: [inaudible]

RS: Well, we have already closed the public hearing. Well, what I was going to say, Mr. Welty, and this might be along the lines of what you were going to say. This code deals with fireworks shows but what I understand Supervisor Allen to be proposing is a separate policy dealing with the impact on Pima Animal Care Center and I think that is likely something that should be pursued through a separate item then trying to figure out a fee associated with permitting for public fireworks shows. Because what I would understand, Mr. Kozachik, our Director, to say is that it is not just public fireworks shows that cause the influx of pets into PACC, it is all the fireworks that are happening on the 4th of July, and probably mostly the ones that are being set off by just individuals. But I would be very open to discussing that, but I think with regard to the restrictions on public fireworks shows, I think we would only be considering one aspect of fireworks that are causing animals to go into that facility.



DRAFT

JA: What I am hearing, is that this is a policy and so what I am suggesting would be around the permit and so it would be considered related to the permit as opposed to the policy.

RS: Conceivably. But I think what I would like to hear more of from staff, specifically, Mr. Kozachik, is where he is seeing that impact, because there is a lot of fireworks that are set off on the 4th of July and on New Year's Day, and they are not all by commercial operators. They are largely by people in the general public and I think those are probably having just as much of an impact on pets going into our animal care center.

SB: If I may, Chair Scott?

RS: Please.

SB: One risk of adding an amendment like this, there is an initial purpose for bringing this item that could be in jeopardy. There is a questionable amendment added to it that we have not had the time to research and so I would hate for the Board to have to come back to this because of this sort of fee issue. I think separating the issues is probably advisable.

RS: Ms. Manriquez?

MM: Chair Scott. There is also a statutory requirement, if there is going to be a fee enacted, it has to be posted on the County webpage for 60 days, which we have not done.

RS: Okay, thank you. That I did not recall, and I appreciate that. Anything else, Supervisor Allen?

JA: No, if anyone else has any comments?

MH: If I may, Chair and staff. This was my confusion before and if we could clarify this for everyone publicly, with whom does the buck stop? There was wind speeds, who exactly? It is two hours before the show, gusts go to 16 miles per hour. Who stops the show?

RS: The local fire district and that was the case, Supervisor Heinz, not just under these revisions, but on the existing policy. Even if we approve a show, the local fire district or local Fire Marshal can cancel that show based on climatic conditions.

MH: I just want them to do it because that last time it did not happen once, and we had some problems. I just want to make sure that we know exactly who has that responsibility and that they will exercise it with fidelity.

RS: I believe that is set in statute. It is not, Ms. Lesher?



DRAFT

JL: I believe that to be true, but what I am hearing is…excuse me, Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz, an educational component of that, that we are sure that we are working with the Fire Districts and perhaps more looking through the permit process to ensure that…

MH: Do they know? I don't know…

JL: …they are…how are we looping back with the fire districts to making sure that they are there and doing it, which we can do.

MH: Yeah.

RS: And I wonder if that is something that Ms. Espinoza, through the Office of Emergency Management, could check into, especially because what I hear Supervisor Heinz saying is, is there consistency amongst the Fire Districts?

MH: Right.

RS: And remember that we are only talking about the Fire Districts in the unincorporated County. The shows that happen in the City or the Towns go through their City councils and Town councils. Is that all right with you, Supervisor?

MH: Yeah, that is fine.

RS: Alright, okay.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Please, Supervisor Cano?

AC: Is there already a motion on this item?

RS: No, because, and the reason there is not, is because I was going to raise the point that Mr. Welty made because I think it is specific to Caterpillar out in Green Valley. They are not in a residential area, that we have not had any issues reported with their shows so I was going to propose that we remove item 9.04.050 C., which says that, “No single location shall be the site of public displays of fireworks more than five times during any calendar year.” I would make that motion to amend it in that fashion.

AC: Where? Sorry, can you explain?

RS: Sure. If you go, Supervisor Cano, to 9.04.050 C. That is the part that Mr. Welty referred to, that says, “No single location shall be the site of public displays of fireworks more than five times during any calendar year.” I am proposing that we remove that.



DRAFT

SB: Chair Scott, just a note. You all can decide on a set of amendments and then approve them all at once.

RS: But we already did one, so that is why I was doing this one.

SB: But if this is the last one, yeah. I am just saying

RS: This is the last one.

SB: Okay.

RS: As far as I know.

AC: I will second.

RS: Moved and seconded. Any discussion on that amendment? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Opposed?

JA: Opposed.

RS: Okay, that is amended 3-1, with Supervisor Allen opposed.

AC: Chair Scott, there is still time for discussion?

RS: Yes sir, absolutely.

AC: Is there an opportunity to have Pima Animal Care, send to the Board, through the County Administrator, perhaps in 60 days? I think Supervisor Allen is on to something in that we see a majority of our pet shelter occupancy just totally go through the roof throughout these holiday seasons. What that ends up meaning is that we have uncompensated care in our animal care delivery and have to rely on private dollars to be able to handle the mass amounts of pets coming in our way and I want to be mindful of the fact that there is a difference between commercial and private, but more importantly, the Fireworks industry makes millions of dollars, every single year, and in Arizona, have a legislature that is very friendly. Nobody is losing money in this situation, and I think I would like to see that cost analysis just to see what that means. I think the issue is regional parity when it comes to, what about the hour, I think it is now cut back 30 minutes? On “A” Mountain, City of Tucson versus the Weston La Paloma that we would be in charge of. That is going to be an issue but I would like to look into it.



DRAFT

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other comments or questions on this policy as submitted? Alright, well then, I am going to go ahead and move approval of Ordinance No. 2025 – 11, as amended and…

MM: [inaudible]

RS: …thank you, I thought I already did that? I apologize and close the public hearing.

JA: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded. Now we are voting on the ordinance, accept as amended with the change to 9.04.050 A., and the deletion of part C. of that same section. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? That passes 4-0. Alright, thank you very much.

DRAFT

**RECORDER**

53. **2025 Congressional District 7 Special Primary Election - Early Ballot Drop-Off Site and Emergency Voting Locations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 17, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Elections; approving the early ballot drop-off sites and authorizing emergency voting locations for the 2025 Congressional District 7 Special Primary Election.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
JG: Jeremy George, Deputy Director, Elections Department
GCK: Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Now we wlll go to the Addendum which is under the Recorder, 2025 Congressional District 7 Special Primary Election, Early Ballot Drop-Off Site and Emergency Voting Locations. I will move the item.

JA: Second.

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

SC: Thank you. Help me with this, if you would, it is Exhibit A.

JL: If I may, Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Mr. George will try to answer your questions. These deal with the early vote sites and areas that are under the Recorder. If we do not have the answer, we can communicate with the Recorder and get it back.

SC: Well, this is a simple question.

JL: Okay, then we may know it. Thank you.

SC: Exhibit A to resolution that was provided, yesterday morning. I am trying to figure this out under a category. It says, “24-hour drop box”. You follow me on that? And right below that, and all the way down at the bottom, in that same category, it says, “24-hour drop box until 7:00 p.m.” How could it be a 24-hour drop box if it is not available after 7:00 p.m.?



DRAFT

JG: [inaudible response]

RS: Pardon me, Mr. George, is your mic on?

JG: It is now.

RS: Thank you, sir.

JG: Supervisor Christy. Unfortunately, I cannot speak for the Recorder on that matter. This is their item.

SC: Okay and again, you look down at the bottom, it says again, “Drop box until 7:00 p.m.” And then underneath at the very bottom under the asterisk, at the 24-hour drop box category, it restipulates that it secured 24-hour ballot drop box located outside. So, these are going to be outside, but not available after 7:00 p.m.?

JG: Supervisor Christy that may be the case. Again, this is a Recorder’s item. They handle all of early voting and any drop boxes like that. So unfortunately, I just cannot speak to that.

SC: Mr. Chair? Maybe it is just me, I am sorry, but it seems that this is not giving a great deal of security when it says it is a 24-hour drop box outside, but after 7:00 p.m., it is not available.

JL: Mr. Chairman, can I ask that this item be, not continued, but perhaps just postponed for right now? And let us see what we can, we will contact the Recorder's Office and get an answer prior to the end of the meeting, so that you can have that before we…

SC: That would be great. Thank you.

RS: It is fine with me, the Administrator's suggestion. Is that fine with you Supervisor Allen, as the seconder?

JA: It is.

RS: Alright, thank you very much.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: So just to be clear, we will revisit the item later today?

RS: Yes.



DRAFT

JA: Yes.

AC: While we get some more information.

RS: Yes, sir.

[Supervisor Cano made a point of personal privilege]

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. We also have staff here. Are we asking, Administrator Lesher, if Mr. George is going to get that information for us?

JL: I am asking Mr. George. Thank you.

RS: It looks like you are still stuck here, buddy.

JG: Yes, I will try to get that information.

* * *

JL: May I ask, excuse me, I am sorry, Supervisor Scott. Is it possible to do the Recorder's item?

RS: You know what, and I apologize. It has been a while since we were on that item, and I had an "X" through No. 9, but that was before we had gotten the questions. So yes, let us return to Item No. 9 on the addendum, because not only do we have Mr. George, who is here in the morning, but we also have our Recorder, Gabriella Cázares-Kelly. Supervisor Cano already outed you for your birthday, so we will just wish you a happy birthday. There were some questions about that item, and you have the answers for us. Please.

GCK: Correct. Actually, I have a handout for you. Am I able to share that?

RS: Where is that? Okay, I thought it was already up here. Sorry.

[Materials handed out to Board members]

GCK: Chair Scott, members of the Board. I apologize for confusion on the draft of the early voting sites. We had prepared this prior to actually receiving in person the ballot drop boxes. At the time that we had submitted the Board item, we had not yet fully received confirmation that we would have a ballot drop box at the east side location. We have since. We are working currently with Facilities Maintenance, with Director Cisneros, to have placement for a drop box by the Recorder's Main Office and one by the East Side Office, which will negate our need to have the east side location have hours, which includes lunch, and all of that, because we will simply have a ballot drop box. Prior to that, it was an in-person drop off only, meaning we would not be issuing ballots at that location. We would simply be accepting them, but that would be inside the building, staff would be required. And again, now that

we have confirmation of those ballot drop boxes, we will no longer need to have those open hours. We will simply have an open ballot drop box. I believe there was also a question about the time. The ballot drop box will open at 8:00 a.m. on June 18th, and we will close it on July 15th at 7:00 p.m., on the dot.

RS: Alright, thank you. Questions for the Recorder?

SC: Excuse me. Just for clarity, there is going to be no 24-hour drop off box?

GCK: The 24-hour drop box…I am sorry, Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. The two 24-hour drop boxes will be located, one will be located at the 240 N. Stone, Downtown location outdoors, and the east side office at 6920 E. Broadway, again located outdoors.

SC: And they are accessible 24 hours a day?

GCK: Yes.

SC: Are they going to be manned?

GCK: No.

SC: They are going to be, just out there 24 hours a day?

GCK: They are made of galvanized steel, they have anti-pry door jambs, they have waterless fire suppressant, they have an opening only large enough for a ballot to go through, they will be on camera, they are bolted into cement into the ground. We are very confident about the security of these boxes, and we will be sharing more information about the security about those boxes, as we get a little closer to Election Day. We are preparing those materials currently within my office.

SC: Mr. Chair, Madam Recorder. Are there, any time on those 24-hour boxes will there be personnel watching them, or completely for the 24 hours, no personnel?

GCK: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Again, these are unstaffed ballot drop boxes. They are intended so that they can be secured without the need to have folks staffing them. If we think about the United States Postal Service and the drop boxes that they have throughout the County, we already have this type of technology. But those USPS boxes have a much wider opening. They are accustomed to receiving packages and large letters and oddly shaped things. Our ballot drop boxes will only have an opening wide enough for a ballot to fit in them and because they are bolted down to the ground, they are made of a galvanized steel, they are intentional, allowed to be unstaffed, and it is important to know that we are the last County in the entire State to deploy them. We are the only County in the entire State that does not currently have ballot drop boxes and so this is an attempt to make the voting process more accessible. This is really important for people, especially those who

DRAFT

are working non-standard hours, who cannot get to a ballot drop box between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

SC: Final question, Mr. Chair. Madam Recorder. You have full faith and confidence in their security?

GCK: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Yes, we do have full confidence in this technology. The boxes that we have procured do meet these requirements and are specifically designed for election services. We have seen great success with the rest of the State and again, we are late to adopt this technology and this service. We have been working with our colleagues across the State who have full confidence in this, particularly, Yavapai, Pinal, other Counties have been sharing what their processes are, and we have full confidence that this will be a benefit to Pima County residents.

SC: Well, thank you, Madam Recorder. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. And welcome, happy birthday.

GCK: Thank you.

MH: These boxes, obviously, are not going to be…there is not going to be personnel there, that is the whole point but with what regularity or frequency are they going to be…is it going to be twice daily or how often will one of your staff be checking on them and emptying them on a daily basis?

GCK: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, we are working on determining our pickup schedule at the moment. I can assure you that it will be a bipartisan pickup team. We will have couriers in clearly marked vehicles with clearly marked badges. Bipartisan, always, who will empty those receptacles, and it really depends on the amount that we see. The boxes that we have currently are designed to hold up to 1,500 ballots at a time. We do not know if they will fill up at midday. We do not know if we are going to have to empty them out twice in a day, or what, but the intention currently is for daily, and we again, are going to be working on our pickup schedule. It is important for us to make sure that we are keeping that randomized so that people are not…sometimes people want to come out and observe and interact with our couriers and we want to make sure that that information is on a need-to-know basis.

MH: Great. So at least daily, which is great. And just my last comment, is the fact that you need to put fire retardant in the ballot drop box is really distressing. I mean, where are we? You do not have to comment, but you are welcome to.

RS: Any other questions? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Happy birthday, Madam Recorder. I am sorry I outed you.

GCK: Thank you.

AC: It happens. Can you just provide a high-level summary of the ballot verification process that happens when we receive ballot? So, if I were somebody who used this 24-hour drop box, I work at 11:00, is there an opportunity for me to vote twice in this election or to confirm that my ballot was received? Can you just tell us a little bit more about some of the protections that you have with signature verification of these ballots?

GCK: Absolutely. First, it is important to know that one that a person should only receive one singular ballot, unless there is a situation which calls for them to receive a second. Either way, upon receipt by the Recorder's Office, that notification would be within our system, and we are not able to accept more than one ballot per person within our voter system. Another thing that is available to all Pima County residents is they are able to visit the Voter Dashboard at, recorder.pima.gov, and they can verify not only their information before a ballot is sent, which is strongly recommended, but also that that ballot has been received. We also have a text and email alert system that will allow them. Once we pick up that ballot, let us say someone dropped it off at 11:00 p.m., and the next morning we are emptying that receptacle and we take that to our facility. It will be immediately scanned as soon as it enters the building. Once it is scanned, it will show up within our system and that person would, if they have already signed up for an alert, receive a text message or an email alert. If not, if they are unable to do that, and they want to visit our website, or simply call our office, we would be able to say, yes, we have received your ballot affidavit, and it is in our possession at this time. They would then get additional notifications as it goes through the verification process, all the way until it is turned over to the Elections Department, where it is then finally, the ballot removed from the ballot affidavit, and then it becomes an anonymous ballot.

AC: Thank you, Madam Recorder and Mr. Chair, just a quick comment. I just want to thank our Election staff and our County Recorder for working in tandem to be able to have a successful Special Primary Election for the voters in Congressional District 7. This is a multi-County effort, and I am really proud of Pima County's role in ensuring that we provide safe and secure elections to the people of Pima County. I am saddened, and excited at the same time, that we are the 15th County to have these drop boxes. They really make a huge difference for folks in District 5 who are taking care of a lot of other things, but who still want to be able to vote. And this step is a step in the right direction, so I appreciate the hard work that you do year-round.

[inaudible discussion]

RS: We already have a motion, but do we know if this attachment is different than the one attached to the item, or is it the same?

GCK: Chair Scott. This is an updated version. It has the same information with the clarification for the East Side Office. The prior document had specific hours listed for

the east side, with the information that it was a 24-hour ballot drop box. This simply lists this as the 24-hour information.

RS: Alright then, I will move the item as amended. Then we will attach this. That is what the Clerk thinks the direction should be. Who was the second on this back when we…?

MM: Supervisor Allen.

RS: Supervisor Allen, are you alright with that?

JA: I am.

RS: Okay, alright. Item is moved and seconded as amended. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

JA: Aye.

MH: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Item carries. Thank you both very much. And, Mr. George, I know you had to spend the preponderance of your day here. Sorry about that.

DRAFT