FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

1. **Truth in Taxation Hearing**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-254, conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and the District's intent to raise the secondary property taxes over last year's level.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **Final Budget Hearing**

Flood Control District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - FC4

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, approve the Flood Control District Final Budget in the amount of $18,379,495.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.3289, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - FC4. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

DRAFT

3. **HEARING – CODE TEXT AMENDMENT**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - FC3, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Flood Control District, amending the Floodplain Management Ordinance Chapter 16.04 (General Provisions) Section 16.04.020 (authority), Chapter 16.08 (definitions) Sections 16.08.010 (Application of Definitions and General Usage), 16.08.270 (Flood Insurance Study), 16.08.390 (Hardship), 16.08.480 (Market Value), 16.08.670 (Structure), 16.08.690 (Substantial Improvement), Chapter 16.12 (Exemptions and Nonconforming Uses) Sections 16.12.010 (Exemptions from Title 16 Regulations), 16.12.020 (Review of Plans - Uses Authorized without Permit), 16.12.050 (Improvements to Nonconforming Uses), Chapter 16.16 (Floodplain Maps and Boundaries) Sections 16.16.020 (Studies and Maps Adopted by Reference), 16.16.030 (Areas Subject to Revision), Chapter 16.20 (Use Permits - General Provisions) Sections 16.20.015 (Floodplain use Permit - Exemptions), 16.20.020 (Permit Information Requirements), Chapter 16.34 (Manufactured Homes and Manufactured Home Parks and Subdivisions) Section 16.34.010 (Permit Requirements and Exemptions), Chapter 16.44 (Vehicular Access) Section 16.44.030 (Access Requirements - Property Owner Duties), Chapter 16.56 (Appeals and Variances) Sections 16.56.020 (Variances), 16.56.040 (Issuance of Variances - Required Findings) and to repeal Sections 16.08.130 (Critical or Balanced Drainage Basin Management Plan), 16.08.140 (Cumulative Substantial Damage), 16.08.200 (dry well), 16.08.730 (Waiver by the Chief Engineer), 16.08.750 (Watercourse Master Plan) to correct minor deficiencies identified by the Arizona Department of Water Resources.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Cano was not present for the vote, to close the public hearing and adopt the Ordinance.

* * *

4. **CONTRACT**

Tyler Martin and Molly Elizabeth Martin as Trustees of Tyler Martin and Molly Elizabeth Martin Living Trust, to provide an Acquisition Agreement Acq-1149 to acquire 0.94 acres of flood prone land and residential improvements located at 6640 N. Placita Aquilla in the Coronado Foothills Estates subdivision, located in Section 3, T13S, R14E, USDHS, FEMA, AZDEMA, 20010FD Special Revenue and General ($194,750.00) Funds, contract amount $779,000.00 (PO2500016040)

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

Supervisor Christy indicated that this was another acquisition regarding homes in the floodplain area on the north part of the County and the County had already purchased a number of homes in that area that were still existing. He inquired about

the end result plan of the surrounding homes in the area from where the one in question was being purchased. He explained that there did not seem to be a problem with the flood control issue until post-Bighorn Fire and the difference between what those homes had before the Bighorn Fire versus now was the flooding issue from Bighorn. He asked when the vegetation was remediated and put back to its natural state what would happen to the area and when would that occur. He stated that the County had purchased at least six homes in the area, asked if they planned to purchase more and if there was a plan to mitigate the flooding.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that numerous homes had been purchased and that the Bighorn Fire denuded vegetation on the mountain that led to erosion which led to more rapid runoff of stormwater following those severe rain events. He stated that the rain had not gotten more significant, it was the landscape that had been altered which caused risks there, and the homes that had been purchased were repetitive flood risk homes. He stated that it was not the first time those homes had been in risk of severe flooding but with the conditions post-Bighorn Fire, they had significant damage. He stated that the plan by the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) was to purchase those homes and demolish them, and this additional request was 75% funded by a grant. He reiterated that the intent was to demolish that home and as previously indicated those houses were built at a time that predated any modern flood control requirements for setbacks from water courses. He stated that this was a circumstance that could not be mitigated other than to remove those structures from the flood hazard or flood risk that was present there.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was regarding the revegetation and the revitalization of where there was no vegetation that was now causing the flooding.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., explained that over time the mountain revegetated and the burnt area would revegetate, but those lands were not controlled by Pima County, they were public lands with growth of vegetation over time. He stated that the RFCD was not undertaking any efforts to accelerate that natural process for revegetation.

Supervisor Christy inquired whether there was a plan to purchase more of the surrounding homes.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that he believed they were at the tail end of these acquisitions, but he would verify that and provide an update to the Board.

Chair Scott stated that the County had a flood prone land acquisition program and at times there was not sufficient revenues within that program, so they relied on federal funds and other funds within the RFCD. He asked if that was done with this particular item.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that the RCFD applied for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funding to assist with the acquisition of this residence. He stated that Pima County replenished the fund for the flood prone land acquisition program on an annual basis with the RFCD's budget monies. He explained that the

County attempted to leverage those dollars wherever there was applicable grant funding sources available and staff was watchful for dollars that were outside of the RCFD that could assist with remediating or mitigating these flood prone lands.

Chair Scott stated that with all of these purchases the County had been able to use the allocation to the flood prone land acquisition program and federal funds, and had not used funds from other parts of the RFCD's Budget.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that was correct.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

5. **CONTRACT**

Bridle Bit Ranch, L.L.C., to provide an exchange agreement to acquire 6.5 acres of land near W. Trico Marana Road and the Santa Cruz River in Section 24, T11S, R10E, in exchange for a 10-year Grazing License across nearby District owned parcels along the Santa Cruz River, Flood Control-Floodprone Land Acquisition Program Fund, contract amount $2,000.00 (for escrow closing costs) (PO2500016035)

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

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Improvement District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. FINAL BUDGET HEARINGS

Improvement District Final Budgets for Fiscal Year 2025/2026, as follows.

If approved, pass and adopt:
Resolution No. 25 in the amount of $40,000.00 for Hayhook Ranch.
Resolution No. 29 in the amount of $36,773.00 for Mortimore Addition.
Resolution No. 32 for the following districts:

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
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, approve the Improvement District Final Budgets and adopt the Resolutions. 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 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

1. **Truth in Taxation Hearing**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §48-254, conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and the District's intent to raise the secondary property taxes over last year's level.

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 Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

2. **Final Budget Hearing**

Library District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - LD1

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

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, approve the Library District Final Budget in the amount of $58,700,101.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.5579, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - LD1. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

* * *

DRAFT

3. **CONTRACT**

Heartfelt Workforce, L.L.C., to provide for organizational EQ Leadership Development Program, Library District Fund, contract amount $65,000.00 (PO2500015718)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the item.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

2. **Final Budget Hearing**

Library District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - LD1

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
MH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

RS: Now we're on Item No. 15, which is the final budget for the following fiscal year for the Library District. I will move to close the public hearing, approve the Library District Final budget in the amount of $58,700,101.00 at an effective tax rate of 0.5579, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 – LD1.

JA: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Allen. Supervisor Cano, discussion?

AC: Thank you Chair Scott. Administrator Lesher I wanted to follow up on this particular item and see if there was clarity from our partners at the City of Tucson on the PEEPS Program and the total allocation that will go toward the program itself and more specifically, it is my understanding that whatever that amount is going to be, Administrator Lesher, it is a reduced amount that the City is going to be making toward the PEEPS Program. And I am wondering what kind of cuts we are going to have to make to some of the enrollment in the PEEPS Program, if needed, and if there is any budget capacity to hold District 5 and City of Tucson residents harmless.

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. I am faltering at the exact number that I know that the City of Tucson is continuing to fund. I do not recall the number. I am going to phone a friend.

SH: Chair Scott. Supervisor Cano, it is roughly I believe, they are going to vote today, about $325,000.00, I believe, which it represents a little bit less than half of what the original allocation. The implications right now is we are looking at reallocation of scholarships are about 62 less scholarships being distributed across the County. When in reference to District 5 residents and we have worked to keep the school districts whole, but it is going to have an impact on the individual private scholarships that are actually regional scholarships. But for example, Sunnyside

and Amphi, which are impacted directly, we are working directly with them to maintain their current programming and not expand their programming. That is, I think, where the cutbacks are happening there, along with just regional scholarships across the Board.

JL: And if I may, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, I think initially we had thought we would be cutting classes in their entirety in Sunnyside and Amphi Districts. We are going to be keeping all the classes. We just may have a couple a fewer number of students in those classes, but we will not be eliminating the opportunities in Sunnyside and Amphi. And the specific question, sir, about how many we would be down and what we would need to increase, I am afraid I do not know that exact number.

SH: I think. Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, it is about 62 scholarships that we are cutting across the region to make up the difference that the City is not funding for.

JL: So if I understand the question, if there was a desire to increase the Library District rate in order to cover that, we would be, it is about $300,000.00, I just do not have that number.

SH: The math, we would have to run the math.

JL: Certainly.

AC: Yeah. Chair Scott, if I may, and Administrator Lesher, I appreciate your verbal affirmation about the numbers that are at play right here. I will be supporting the Library District Board at the existing rate that is proposed by the Administrator. I do believe that we owe it to kids in our region to do a deeper dive on this 62 amount, and what it would mean for us to work with existing resources or our private partners to ensure that that impact is not something that is going to disproportionately affect low income Pima County residents. I believe that will already happen with a reduction of 62 families not receiving a scholarship. And so, you know, I am not at liberty right now to offer that as staff direction, because I do not want to complicate the tax rate. But I do think that we need to provide that kind of assurance and I am specifically wondering about what that impact would mean to some of our PEEPS locations within District 5 boundaries. I do believe that the families in District 5 will be disproportionately impacted by the City of Tucson's reduced amount, and given the state of the County's finances and those of our partners across the lawn, I just I would like to be asking how we can do more, not how we can do less. So thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano and in response to your question, Mr. Holmes, you said that at this point we are able to hold the school districts harmless, but that other scholarships might be impacted. So it does not sound like our K-12 partners are the ones that are going to be impacted. It did I hear that correctly?

SH: Chair Scott, let me make sure I am saying this correctly. There were some intent from the school districts to expand their programming, so I would not say hold

completely harmless. We are just not going to be able to expand where they had plans to do so.

RS: Alright. Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. Well go ahead sir, please.

MH: Chair Scott. I am..Walgreens calm down, prescription is ready, anyway. Yes. Okay. So it would be one, what, one fifth of a penny. We cannot bump rates, though, because that was what we had set before.

JL: No. We will figure it out.

MH: Okay. Alright, But it is super, super de minimis. Just to answer your question, It is about $700,000.00 and that is, we get, what, $3.52 million for one penny. So it would be literally like one fifth of a penny.

AC: Chair Scott to that point, I do believe that there could be a precedent and this could come in the memo that, you know, the grants contingency is meant to be there for when the sky is falling or we are waiting for a check and in this instance, if an entity came to the County and said, we do not have funding, I just feel like there is an existing way to take care of this to ensure that families, kids are held harmless. But I think we have made the point. And I if you are open to it, Chair Scott, would be happy to proceed with Item No. 15 at the call the question.

RS: Thank you. Alright. Go ahead, Ms. Manriquez.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: No.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. That passes 4 to 1.

DRAFT

ROCKING K SOUTH COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Rocking K South Community Facilities District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. **FINAL BUDGET HEARING**

Rocking K South Community Facilities District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – RK2

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, approve the Rocking K South Community Facilities District Final Budget in the amount of $4,694,564.00 and adopt Resolution No. 2025 – RK2. 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 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. **FINAL BUDGET HEARING**

Stadium District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - SD1

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, approve the Stadium District Final Budget in the amount of $9,875,827.00, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - SD1. 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 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

WILDFLOWER COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Wildflower Community Facilities District Board met in special session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. **FINAL BUDGET HEARING**

Wildflower Community Facilities District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - WCFD2

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, approve the Wildflower Community Facilities District Final Budget in the amount of $0.00, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - WCFD2. 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 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in special and regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Rex Scott, Chair Jennifer Allen, Vice Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement was delivered by Patty Short, Program Manager, Community and Workforce Development.

3. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

4. **POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

Chair Scott expressed concern regarding the violent acts against politicians and their families. He stated that on June 14th, former speaker of the Minnesota House of Representatives, Melissa Hortman, and her husband, Mark, were shot and killed in their home, and Minnesota State Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette, were also shot, but survived. He explained that there had been assassination attempts against the President and other politicians. He offered a moment of silence, to recognize the suffering that the Hortmans' children were going through having lost both of their parents the day before Father's Day and in remembrance of all victims of violence. He indicated that he was proud to represent Pima County at the 55th annual Juneteenth Festival, which was held on June 14th at the Kino Sports Complex and that everyone in attendance was proud to have Arizona Governor, Katie Hobbs kick off the event with other County representatives that were also in

DRAFT

attendance. He asked Larry Starks if he would like to provide a few comments about the event.

Larry Starks, President, Tucson Juneteenth Board, stated that they held their 55th annual Tucson Juneteenth Festival and thousands of people attended, coming together in harmony, love and culture in celebration of that day. He stated that it was a holiday that celebrated reliance in the community. He indicated that many more upcoming events were planned and he encouraged the Board and the community to attend them.

PRESENTATION

5. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Keith Bagwell, Senior Advisor, Board of Supervisors, District 5, for 23 years of service.

Supervisor Cano acknowledged Mr. Bagwell for his dedicated service within the District 5 office and how he had worked closely with each Supervisor that had taken that office throughout his time with Pima County. He expressed his appreciation for the impact Mr. Bagwell made in the County and throughout the community.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Mateo Otero and Angela Palma Otero, Owners, Rollies Mexican Patio, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, June 17, 2025 to be: "ROLLIES MEXICAN PATIO DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Keith Bagwell, Senior Advisor, Board of Supervisors, District 5, recognizing and commending him for his unwavering dedication, exemplary leadership and enduring contribution to the residents of Pima County and District 5.

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Lourdes Garino and Sharon Hendrickson, Program Coordinators; Marianna Martinez, Crystal Varelas, Rhonda Murray, Virgina McCormick and Victoria Martinez, United Cerebral Palsy of Southern Arizona, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, June 17, 2025 to be: "YO SÍ PUEDO/UCPSA AUGMENTATIVE ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION DAY"

DRAFT

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.

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Robert Reus addressed the Board in opposition of Minute Item No. 55 and stated that Pima County did not have the water capacity to have a data center and could not afford to work with out-of-state companies. He stated that Tucson Electric Power had been telling their customers that they needed to pay more for electricity since Pima County did not have enough capacity, and employees who would move to Pima County to work at the data center would out price the locals in housing and that would take housing away from the community which was in need of affordable housing.

J.P. Salvatierra spoke about his cousin who was struck and killed walking home from a bus stop due to poor lighting in the area. He thanked the Sheriff's Department for their effort to find the vehicle in question and arrest the person that was involved in that incident, and that it was time for Pima County and the City of Tucson to come together and get rid of Tucson Electric Power.

Phineas Anderson spoke about the protests he and his wife had organized against the current presidential administration and the current events that were taking place. He explained that they organized the No King Protest, there were over 5,000 vehicles present, over 3,000 people who stood in the protest and between 12,000 and 15,000 people who participated in the protest against President Trump. He encouraged the Board to take the proclamation he created and add it to agenda for consideration.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

10. **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 2:02 p.m.

11. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 2:35 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding the election of an authorized representative for the Pima County Sheriff's Department.

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

* * *

TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND FINAL BUDGET HEARING

13. **Truth in Taxation Hearing**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-17104 and §42-17107, the Board of Supervisors will conduct a public hearing on proposed expenditures and Pima County's intent to raise the primary property taxes over last year's level.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that slides were prepared but it was at the pleasure of the Board to go over them or answer questions.

Chair Scott stated she could proceed with answering questions.

Ms. Lesher stated the slides would be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Cano asked for clarification whether all the budget hearings were open, and if he could ask a specific question he had for the Library District

Chair Scott clarified that he would go through each item separately and that Ms. Lesher had indicated that staff did not have to go through the slides, unless the Board requested they do so.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to close the Truth in Taxation public hearing. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

14. **Final Budget Hearing**

Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – 20.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to reduce the contribution to the Chamber of Southern Arizona by $300,000.00 and invest the difference of $250,000.00 to the Pima County Economic Development Department. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen withdrew her motion.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Cano to reduce the tax rate by $3.56 cents and direct the County Administrator to reduce the overall budget

by $4,127,789.00. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Allen and Heinz voted “Nay.”

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 Final Budget in the amount of $1,749,291,565.00, at an effective tax rate of $5.1961, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - 20. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

15. **Adopt Debt Service Final 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 Service Final Budget in the amount of $105,877,442.00 at an effective tax rate of $0.1150. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that the Pima Association of Government (PAG) and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) held at least 6 meetings since the last Board of Supervisors meeting. He explained that on June 16, 2025, there were three meetings, one for each and then one joint meeting to discuss personnel issues. He stated that by a 5-4 vote, they decided to terminate the contract of the Executive Director and all other votes were almost unanimous. He explained that they established a process to appoint an Interim Executive Director and appointed a working group for four members which included the County representative, State Representative Ted Maxwell, and both Chairs of PAG and RTA. He stated that the group met and very effectively interviewed three candidates for Interim Executive Director and that the group had chosen Mike Ortega, the former City of Tucson Manager to possibly serve through April 2026. He explained that Mr. Ortega would be assisting PAG and RTA with a national search for a permanent Executive Director. He stated that they had also appointed an Interim Counsel because the previous Counsel left in April and they had been without an attorney since then. He stated that they appointed the Law Firm of DeConcini McDonald and as soon as they appointed that firm, they convened into executive session because there were items they needed to discuss. He explained that the RTA budget was approved for Fiscal Year 2026 and the OWP was approved at the previous meeting. He stated that the RTA/PAG business continued even with the different transitions in members and council, and that for the public’s knowledge the group was focused on having a clear understanding of the funding for the remaining projects. He stated that there was some discussion as to whether that would include the four projects that were deferred, but the other 13 projects appeared to have funding shortfalls and there

was still not enough clarity on the complete cost to finish said projects. He explained that with that lack of clarity there were concerns expressed by the County team, the City of Tucson and other jurisdictions. He explained that Chair Winfield expressed concerns regarding the $143 million dollars needed to complete the remaining projects because that amount was established in 2006 and he believed that total was much less. He stated that there was a commitment to ensure that RTA and PAG had long term coordinated and consistently funded transportation infrastructure programs for the County. He explained that everything within the groups had been unanimous except for the termination vote.

Chair Scott stated that the previous Board had requested that the previous Executive Director use a format that showed cost to complete that had been developed by Jim Degrood when he was working with PAG/RTA and Mr. Ortega had worked with Mr. Degrood and suggested that they speak with each about that preferred format.

Supervisor Heinz stated that Mr. Degrood was one of the three candidates that PAG/RTA had interviewed and they also liked him for the position, but decided on Mr. Ortega. He stated that the group heard some numbers, but Mr. Degrood did share some data with them in terms of his own calculations when they were having that closed door session which differed greatly from the ones they had seen publicly. He explained that the group hoped to have Mr. Degrood as a deputy but at the time they did not have the authority because it was not noticed for them and the Executive Director should appoint a deputy. He expressed his support in working with both Mr. Ortega and Mr. Degrood if given the opportunity

Supervisor Cano expressed appreciation to the County Administrator and specifically the Attractions and Tourism outside agency team because they approved about $400,000.00 in support via their outside agency funding for some high profile events that brought people to Pima County. He stated that with the Board’s support he served as the Board's liaison on Visit Tucson and looked forward to working with the County Administrator and department leadership on how the County’s Office of Attractions and Tourism would set goals and metrics with Visit Tucson in the next several weeks. He stated that Visit Tucson was making changes to their marketing and the Board would be seeing that soon with the public following after. He explained that he continued to be inspired by the work that Visit Tucson and its leadership via Felipe Garcia and their members were doing.

Supervisor Allen stated that she represented the Board of Supervisors on the Arizona Border Counties Coalition with the significant staffing support of the Economic Development Department. She explained that the most recent meeting had representation from all of the border counties and everyone shared what the current needs were and what the opportunities were. She stated that the two larger ports of entry in Nogales and San Luis were currently undergoing some investments and improvements. She explained that Douglas, Arizona, was in need of improvements for a very long time. She stated that the coalition discussed the importance of ports of entry for the economic vitality of both regions and the

interconnectedness between Arizona and Sonora. She explained that the border was misrepresented outside of the border region, it was undervalued and portrayed as a vacant zone that needed to be militarized instead of being used as an economic engine for the community and the state. She stated that she spoke with Chairman Jose from the Tohono O'odham Nation about the committees they were interested in having a seat at. She stated that the Tohono O'odham had shared expansive border lands with the County and their communities and culture was important to lift up and protect as they spoke about the importance of the border region. She stated that the Board of Health had received a presentation from the Department of Health's Tribal Liaison, Marcelino Flores, about some work that he was involved in around data sovereignty. She explained that they discussed the opioid settlement and got an update on the refocusing of that funding. She added that there was also a presentation about the conclusion of work done by members of the Department of Health regarding the ethical considerations of providing treatment and services to the unhoused and ways of ensuring that was done in an ethical manner.

Chair Scott stated that Pima County should be receiving their new contract with the Metropolitan Education Commission (MEC) at the July 1, 2025, Board meeting. He explained that he, the County Administrator and Economic Development Director had a meeting with the former Executive Director of the MEC, who was now the City of Tucson's Ward 5 Council Member and he would continue working with the MEC on a consulting basis. He explained that the Legislative Policy Committee of the County Supervisors Association had not met in 6 weeks while they were trying to finalize the budget. He stated that there was a division between the House Republican caucus and everyone else. He explained that the Democrats in both Houses and the Governor were working on the budget and the House Republicans were working on their own. He stated that there may be a Legislative Policy Committee meeting next week, but that was dependent on when the budget got sorted out. He indicated that they needed to get the budget finalized by June 30, 2025, because there was not continuing resolution on the State of Arizona and if the budget was not finalized the State would shut down.

Supervisor Heinz indicated that the legislature would work on the budget on the day of the deadline. He asked if the former Executive Director who was now the consultant for the MEC was going to return.

Chair Scott responded that the former Executive Director was told that he had to take a leave of absence by the City of Tucson's attorney, but he believed it was his intention to return after he served out the rest of the former council member's term.

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

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

17. **Pima County Climate Action Update**

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

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

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

18. **Public Safety in Remote Areas of Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding public safety in remote areas of Pima County.

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

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

ATTRACTIONS AND TOURISM

19. **Attractions and Tourism Outside Agency Funding Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2025/2026**

FY 25/26 Funding Available: $427,500.00

Agency/Program/FY25-26 Recommendation
African American Museum of Southern AZ/History Is On The Move!/$10,000.00
Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum/Programs and Exhibits at the Desert Museum/$10,000.00
International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Spark! Places of Innovation in the Sonoran Desert Biosphere Region/$11,875.00
Jazz in January d.b.a. Tucson Jazz Festival/Tucson Jazz Festival 25-26/$21,500.00
La Frontera Mariachi Conference, Inc./La Frontera Tucson International Mariachi Conference/$20,000.00
Light Up Lives Charity Foundation d.b.a. Rockin' 4 Heroes/ Light Up Lives Charity Foundation d.b.a. Rockin' 4 Heroes/$10,000.00
Living Streets Alliance/Cyclovia Tucson/$10,000.00
Many Mouths One Stomach/MMOS/The 36th All Souls Procession Weekend/$10,000.00
Perimeter Bicycling Association of America, Inc./El Tour de Tucson/$37,155.00
Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc./Enhanced Marketing for the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area/$14,875.00
Southern Arizona Arts and Cultural Alliance/Oro Valley Holiday Festival of the Arts & Tree Lighting Celebration/$10,000.00
Southern Arizona Blues Heritage Foundation, Inc./Blues Heritage Festival/$5,000.00
Southwest Folklife Alliance, Inc./Tucson Meet Yourself 2025/$30,000.00
TD4Tucson/Snoop Dogg Arizona Bowl/$28,842.00
Tucson Bird Alliance/Southeast Arizona Birding Festival/$10,000.00
Tucson Botanical Gardens/FY25-26 Programs & Exhibits at the Tucson Botanical Gardens/$45,333.00
Tucson Children's Museum/Support All Kids Play Discovery Nights and Community Events/$42,667.00
Tucson City of Gastronomy/Pueblos de Maiz Fiesta/$15,920.00

Tucson Jewish Community Center, Inc./JCC Maccabi Games/$10,000.00
Tucson Juneteenth Festival Committee/Juneteenth Festival/$10,000.00
Tucson Kitchen Musicians Association/Tucson Folk Festival/$10,000.00
Tucson Presidio Trust d.b.a. The Presidio Museum/Tucson Living History and Cultural Event Series/$30,000.00
Tucson Rodeo Parade Committee, Inc./2025 TRPC/$14,333.00
Tucson Symphony Society/TSO Special Concerts: Dia de los Muertos, Holidays in Tucson, Pink Martini/$10,000.00
GRAND TOTAL: $427,500.00

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

CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES

20. **Pima County Cooperative Extension (PCCE) Appropriation of Funds for FY 2025/26**

Staff recommends approval of the appropriation of funds in the amount of $151,400.00, to allow PCCE to enhance county services provided to the public.

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

ELECTIONS

21. **Election Board Worker Appointments**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-531(A), appointment of election board workers recruited and on file in the Elections Department for the July 15, 2025 Special Primary Election.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

22. **Budget Remediation Plan Updates**

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

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, explained that the remediation plans for consideration were for the Sheriff's Department, with over $3 million and for Public Defense Services (PDS), with under $2 million. He stated that the two departments had continued to show the monthly forecast and currently represented the formal request from the departments to essentially true up their budget for Fiscal Year (FY) ’25. He stated that the driver for the Sheriff, much like it had been for the

last few months, continued to be utility costs, electricity costs, food at the jail, and for PDS it was largely due to outside counsel.

Chair Scott asked whether the recommendation listed on the Agenda Item Report was a recommendation for approval by the Finance and Risk Management Department and by County Administration and the reasoning for it.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded yes and that these were the last two departments' staff had been working closely with and through the course of the year with both, had started out with the potential for greater deficits and continued to work diligently towards close of the year to get folks more within budget.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that last year they had a similar discussion regarding PDS and their overage related to their outside counsel. He stated that they made a concerted effort and a decision last year to not increase their budget and instead work with them to try to reduce outside counsel by helping them hire attorneys. He added they had done a great job and what was seen represented roughly a $500,000.00 to $750,000.00 decrease in what they were over from last year because of the way they had operated and had worked through their outside counsel oversight. He stated their supplemental for the '26 budget would true them up and it was not done the prior year because they wanted to wait to see if they could get an OAC expenditures line. He stated they had done so and the supplemental request before the Board as final budget adoption was their way of truing them since it was not done before and this was the reason they remained over, as they anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Supervisor Christy stated that as an observation, this seemed to be an annual issue with both of these departments that were chronically over budgeted. He asked if there was an issue with how the budgeting process was implemented because in the public sector, if this was continuing year after year, it would not be more than a year that they would have to deal with this problem. He asked why they could not get a handle on this and if the Board would be dealing with this again in the upcoming years. He stated that it was interesting to note that other than the difference in what was pointed out, the over budgeting had been roughly the same amount each year. He asked if there was a better, more efficient, effective way to proceed on budgeting, to make allowances, or at least to address the chronically over budgeted issues.

Mr. Holmes responded that an easy way would have been to approve a supplemental last year for the current year and that the reason they did not proceed was because they believed from a management standpoint, they could actually have greater oversight in how they used outside counsel. He stated they had the current full year to actually work towards that and that they accomplished that goal which was why the supplemental had come now. He stated that, ideally, they would true them every year, but that was not efficient. He stated they worked with them diligently to work on that and did that to come in at a lower dollar amount than what they were previously over budget. He indicated that Supervisor Christy was correct,

that they had consistently been there, but they worked with management to get that under control and were requesting approval of the supplemental for the final budget.

Ms. Lesher explained that in conversations with the Sheriff, and recalled the prior year the County had a 3% cut across the board, and the Sheriff's Department's budget was cute by about $3.4 million, which he had indicated at the time, he felt he needed those dollars in his budget. She stated that he was currently looking to be about $3 million over budget and if the Sheriff was present he would tell the Board that he was not over budget, but had not been funded adequately to provide the services he needed. She stated that they usually started at over $7 million in the red, and it was worked down more closely as they had been scrubbing the overtime dollars.

Chair Scott recalled in a conversation with the Sheriff, he was going to get something to the Board from the member of his staff who was documenting overtime. He stated that there was someone on his staff who was specifically designated to work with the staff on minimizing the use of overtime. He also stated there was a memorandum from the Sheriff to the staff on the need to minimize the use of overtime. He stated that it would be helpful and instructive to the Board to get a report from the Sheriff based on the work of that employee.

Mr. Cuaron stated that in Period 4, the Sheriff was $5.7 million over and slowly they worked within their team to reduce the budget to what it was for the remediation plan. He stated they demonstrated tightening of the belt, if you will, in those programmatic areas.

Chair Scott asked if Mr. Cuaron's relationship with the Sheriff's Finance team was a good working relationship as it had been with his predecessor.

Mr. Cuaron stated that had also been his experience and they continued that relationship through him and members of his budget team.

Supervisor Heinz appreciated that PDS appeared to have gone over every discretionary expense and were working to find greater efficiency, but the Sheriff appeared to whine about not getting enough money when they had 27% of the $800 million the Board had discretion over. He stated that was not a remediation plan, and acknowledged there was improvement, but it was not the $9 million, it was the fifth year that the Sheriff has been over by seven figures and it was almost always for overtime and other items. He stated that complaining about the price of fuel when it was $0.40 lower than the previous year, showed no serious effort on their part and more excuses that he would like conveyed to them.

Supervisor Allen stated that the last time she had spoken to the Sheriff about the budget overages, he conveyed that by the end of the fiscal year he would be back in the black. She stated that one of the reasons this bothered her was because it meant that the Sheriff went over $3 million, the department was effectively making decisions about $3 million worth of cuts in other parts of the County. She stated that it was just simply unfair and it was not the Sheriff's Department's role to be making

decisions about where else in the County money should not go. She added that was the consequence of this repeated action and she did not have great suggestions as to what should be done, but it was fundamentally, a huge disservice to the rest of the County and an overreach of his role.

Chair Scott requested that in addition to the report he had requested regarding overtime it would be helpful if the Board could hear about any other reforms or measures that were in place in the department with regard to staying within the budget and then based on that, what the Board had heard first from Ms. Moulton, and now from Mr. Cuaron, about the good relationship between both Finance teams, the Board needed to hear from both departments in terms of how they were crafting budget recommendations to the Board that the Sheriff and his staff could stay within.

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

Supervisor Cano stated that he echoed some of the comments about trying to figure out where they could have some guardrails with all County departments. He requested a similar graph, like the attached materials for PDS that went back historically to FY18/19, also be provided for the Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Cuaron responded that additional information could be provided and suggested to the department when filling out their remediation plan.

Supervisor Cano clarified that the historical background information could be handled by the central Finance team.

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

23. **Quarterly Report on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending March 31, 2025.

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

HEALTH

24. **Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions**

Staff recommends approval of the use of $8,000,000.00 in opioid settlement funding for the procurement of services and Pima County Health Department staff positions to provide substance use prevention and response interventions in Pima County.

Staff recommends approval of the use of $8,000,000.00 in opioid settlement funding for the procurement of services and Pima County Health Department staff positions to provide substance use prevention and response interventions in Pima County.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that the allocation of $8 million had been approved by the Board. She stated that other partners were involved in this and there were recommendations by the other partners and through the Regional Opioid Advisory Settlement Committee (ROSAC) asked for modifications.

Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director, Pima County Health Department, provided a slideshow presentation that included an update on advisory spending led by the ROSAC, which continued to meet following its April presentation. She stated that a June 12th memorandum to Administrator Lesher detailed the committee's background and the ROSAC membership included representatives from Pima County, the City of Tucson, the Town of Marana, and South Tucson. She stated that at their most recent meeting, Chief Roberto Jimenez was elected Chair and Jesse Losoya, as Co-Chair. She stated that their spending priorities had previously been developed from community input, listening sessions, surveys and the Health Department, serving as ROSAC's secretariat, supported the committee by providing guidance and research. She stated identified strategies were evaluated using a defined rubric. She explained that the original recommendation totaling $8 million had received Board approval and feedback from both the Board and the City of Tucson prompted changes, including a reduction in a funding category and the incorporation of evaluation plans into future Request for Proposals (RFPs). She stated that law enforcement response strategies were consolidated into the Sobering Alternative for Recovery (SAFR) Center, which shifted from an evaluation phase to a combined pilot and evaluation phase. She stated that current recommendations included youth prevention, peer navigation, transitional wraparound support, law enforcement co-response, Mobile MAT, SAFR development, and continued Health Department staffing. She stated that they sought approval to implement these recommendations, with plans to release two RFPs, one that excluded SAFR and one specific to SAFR, by late next week. She added that responses would be accepted for 3 to 4 weeks, with awards anticipated by fall 2026. She also noted that there had been a projected increase in overdoses exceeding 500 for the year and emphasized the importance of monitoring Medicaid trends that could impact services for substance use disorder populations.

Supervisor Christy asked how much of the $8 million went toward staffing, and how much would towards the interdiction of the issues and how the one-time funding for the ongoing initiatives and staff would work out.

Dr. Cullen stated that the $8 million supplemental shown on the slide would be contracts for one year with the belief that they could be re-awarded for a second and third year. She stated that currently, the County had received approximately $27 million, of which approximately $500,000.00 had been spent. She stated that the staff shown for $400,000.00 was for County staff to support the Opioid response, which was an ongoing cost for Pima County staff. She added that the other components of this would be awarded as RFPs with a one, plus two, that the

decision to spend that $8 million was predicated on the fact that they knew they had $27 million in the coffers, and if they had done $8 million a year for three years, they would have spent $24 million. She stated that at the same time, they were continuing to receive additional funding from the Opioid settlement dollars. She stated that the original estimate was approximately $100 million, because some of the people that were in the settlement themselves, the organizations had gone bankrupt and the current estimate was in the $80 million range. She stated they would continue to receive those dollars for up to an 18-year cycle, each of the defendants in that agreement were on a different payout cycle that had been negotiated at the Federal level, and then at the State level with what was called the One Arizona Agreement.

Supervisor Christy asked if the staff shown for $400,000.00 would be institutionalized at the Health Department and be members on the payroll for the entire length of the term described.

Dr. Cullen responded that she could not answer that yet, but believed they would and the assumption was that it would last for at least the three year period that these awards were made and the reason for that was because of the oversight and the contract requirements for these awards.

Supervisor Heinz inquired about the response from the City of Tucson Mayor and Council.

Ms. Lesher responded that the modifications to incorporate specifics of the SAFR program had come from the City of Tucson.

Dr. Cullen concurred it occurred when they went to the City Council for a study session and a concern about the more immediate need to start the SAFR center. She stated that the SAFR center had always been on the agenda and had been approved by the committee, it was approved for a study phase. She stated that the City of Tucson had recommended that the County include extension of that pilot phase. She added that the ROSAC committee heard that feedback, along with the feedback from the Board members and made the decision to allocate that and decrease one of the other categories, with the belief that the SAFR Center would be able to accommodate part of that need in the pilot phase. She added that the SAFR center was designed for approximately 15 to 30 people to have the choice of going there for deflection and the immediate initiation of Medication Opioid Use Disorder treatment.

Supervisor Cano commended the team’s effort and stated that this conversation had taken a lot of different stages over the last several weeks. He stated that this was one of the first contracts he voted on recommendations in his first meeting. He stated that he believed that the proposal of the revisions were representative of the County and the City of Tucson working together on a critical issue and that it would take a lot of resources to provide that kind of intervention that they were talking about in this pilot project. He stated that to him, it signaled the need to do something different to tackle substance misuse head on and he appreciated the flexibility to

figure out what the commission was also going to be recommending in this process and the recommendations were representative of that work.

Supervisor Allen stated that in reworking and integrating in some feedback from the last time, she expressed then that the funding was so valuable and it was so limited. She stated that it was going to go quickly and the crisis was so great, so figuring out how the County could ensure they had done the absolute best. She stated that Dr. Cullen had always ensured they had done the absolute best and having the greatest and deepest impact with the funds they had in the community to combat the Opioid crisis. She stated that in terms of the SAFR center, given the limited money available, her preference would be to not look at building brick and mortar, but instead, identify some of the existing services out there and to build off the strengths they already had to maximize, stretch money farther, and that they focus at the RFP process. She stated they would focus on those that had demonstrated success and then also understanding that for folks to get treatment, it required, not 36 or 72 hours, but meaningful long-term treatment. She added it was a significant investment and offering time for people to get healthy and well and understanding that folks needed stability underneath that. She stated they needed housing, wraparound, other services, and that those were the key pieces to build and make folks whole again, healthy and strong in the community. She expressed excitement on how this would roll out.

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

REAL PROPERTY

25. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was continued until staff can meet with county departments and outside non-profit agencies to discuss options.

26. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was continued until staff can meet with county departments and outside non-profit agencies to discuss options.

27. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was continued until staff can meet with county departments and outside non-profit agencies to discuss options.

28. **Abandonment by Vacation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 21, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of all that portion of Musket Road, as Pima County Road Abandonment No. A-0076, within Section 28, T11S, R10E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

29. Pima County Community College District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Pima County Aviation Alliance, General Fund, contract amount $35,000.00 (PO2500015316)

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

30. SER Jobs for Progress of Southern Arizona, Inc., to provide for SER facility improvements, HUD CDBG Fund, contract amount $58,000.00 (PO2400012784)

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

31. Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc. d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for facility improvement project, extend contract term to 4/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT-24-415)

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

DRAFT

32. Tucson Clean & Beautiful, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for growing climate resilient communities, extend contract term to 3/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2500014282)

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

33. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Home Investment Partnership Program, no cost/3 year term (SC2500000160)

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

Health

34. Helping Ourselves Pursue Enrichment, Inc., to provide for crisis cooperative for opioid misuse/abuse and prevention, SAMHSA Fund, contract amount $275,000.00 (PO2500009108)

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

Pima Animal Care Center

35. Town of Oro Valley, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for animal care and control services and extend contract term to 6/30/26, no cost (SC2500000094)

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

36. Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, to provide for community spay/neuter and vaccination services, General Fund, contract amount $240,000.00 (PO2500005940)

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

Procurement

37. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000005, Amendment No. 1, AZ Wastewater Industries, Inc., to provide for sewer truck parts and services. This amendment increases the annual award amount by $210,000.00 from $237,000.00 to $447,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of $447,000.00. The contact increase is needed to cover unexpected major repairs to specialized equipment, which are essential to restore full operational capability for critical sewer

DRAFT

and drain cleaning tasks. Funding Source: Fleet Services and Regional Wastewater Reclamation Funds. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

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

38. **Award**

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002211, Amendment No. 1, Multiple Suppliers, to provide for backcountry invasive plant inventory and treatment. This amendment increases the shared annual award amount by $250,000.00 from $200,000.00 to $450,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of $450,000.00. The additional funding capacity is necessary to support compliance with the recently approved Wildfire Mitigation Plan by the Board of Supervisors. Funding Source: Conservation Lands & Resources Grant Fund. Administering Department: Conservation Lands & Resources.

Group 1:
Pesticide Treatment Services
Underwood Brothers, Inc.
Envirosystems Management, Inc.
Recon Environmental, Inc.
Rocky Mountain Ecology, L.L.C.
Tucson Audubon Society

Group 2:
Non-Pesticide Treatment Services (manual/mechanical)
Underwood Brothers, Inc.
Recon Environmental, Inc
Rocky Mountain Ecology, L.L.C.
Tucson Audubon Society

Group 3:
Inventory and Monitoring Services only (no treatments)
Underwood Brothers, Inc.
Baselineshift, L.L.C.
Envirosystems Management, Inc
Rocky Mountain Ecology, L.L.C.
Tucson Audubon Society

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

39. Borderland Construction Company, Inc., Hunter Contracting Co., KE & G Construction, Inc., and SMS Construction, L.L.C., to provide a job order contract: wastewater reclamation facility construction services, RWRD Obligations Fund, contract amount $15,000,000.00 (SC2500000153) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

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

DRAFT

40. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 9, to provide for computer software and related items and amend contractual language, General (50%) and Enterprise Funds, contract amount $74,000.00 (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

41. Carahsoft Technology Corp., Amendment No. 10, to provide for computer software and related items and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400001726) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

42. Desert Archaeology, Inc., to provide for cultural resources services for Pima County Tres Rios Wastewater Reclamation Facility Digester, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Capital Projects Fund, contract amount $731,968.49 (PO2500014586) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

43. CaremarkPCS Health, L.L.C., d.b.a., CVS Health, Amendment No. 4, to provide for pharmacy benefits administrative services, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Health Benefits Self-Insurance Fund, contract amount $500,000.00 (SC2400000860) Administering Department: Human Resources

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

44. PSOMAS, Inc., to provide for design engineering services for: Campbell extension - Santa Cruz Impact Benefit Area (4SCIFP), Santa Cruz Impact Fees Fund, contract amount $896,983.00 (PO2500015307) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Sheriff

45. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $297,222.99 revenue (CT2500000025)

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

46. City of South Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $126,049.86 revenue (CT2500000026)

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that he wanted to request a reconsideration of the prior approved motion in order to discuss the item and include his comments.

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

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

Supervisor Heinz stated that he represented the City of South Tucson and was aware of their financial struggles with their fire department and other essential needs. He explained that he hoped the County could find ways to not charge that jurisdiction for services, and the cost for this contract could be revised to have no amount or to be reduced significantly because that would help the City of South Tucson contract with the City of Tucson to receive stable fire services.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that she understood the need to help the City of South Tucson but encouraged the Board to recognize that as the County had moved through the budget and had reallocated contingency funds and interest in things, that any time the County looked to eliminate revenue or increase expenditures, those changes would need to be presented to the Board in order to accommodate that expenditure.

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

47. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $6,577,239.00 revenue (CT2500000024)

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

48. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $121,539.60 revenue (CT2500000027)

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

49. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $172,444.32 revenue (CT2500000028)

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

50. Pima County Community College District, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Adult Basic Education and Career Program at Pima County Adult Detention Complex, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Special Revenue - Sheriff Inmate Welfare Fund, contract amount $160,000.00 (CT-24-455)

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

Transportation

51. Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, Amendment No. 12, to provide for regionalization of public transit and special needs transportation service and maintenance of effort, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Non-HURF Transportation Fund, contract amount $7,817,224.00 (PO2400010883)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 22, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the City of Tucson “Community Development Block Program (CDBG) - People, Communities, and Homes Investment Plan (P-CHIP)” grant agreement, $41,033.00/$41,033.00 General Fund match (G-CWD-81563)

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

53. **Acceptance - Sheriff**

U.S. Department of Agriculture - U.S. Forest Service, Amendment No. 2, to provide a Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreement between the Pima County Sheriff's Department and the USDA, Forest Service Coronado National Forest and 2023-2027 Operating and Financial Plan and amend grant language, $49,000.00 (GA-SD-66356)

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

54. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Natasha Bassi, Westin La Paloma, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, June 28, 2025 at 8:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Natasha Bassi, Applicant, addressed the Board and requested approval of the fireworks permit. She stated that the fireworks display was a long standing tradition at the La Paloma Country Club that they held for the July 4th holiday. She stated that due to scheduling challenges the Country Club moved the event up a week to ensure they delivered their annual tradition. She explained that she had worked closely with the surrounding Homeowners Associations' leadership to ensure clear communication and understanding of the new conditions that were set in place this year. She stated that the La Paloma Country Club was fully committed to following the new conditions that the Board approved and appreciated their consideration of her permit request.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was to her understanding that the Fireworks Production Company was no longer going to be holding fireworks shows at the Westin La Paloma.

Chair Scott clarified that the Fireworks Production Company was no longer going to do their commercial shows, which had been shows that the Board had not permitted recently. He asked if this was the same company that Supervisor Allen and he were referring to.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, responded in the affirmative and clarified that it was Fireworks Production of Arizona.

Chair Scott stated that Fireworks Production of Arizona had a representative present at a previous Board meeting when they discussed the code amendments.

Supervisor Christy asked if this was a private in-house event as opposed to a commercial enterprise.

Chair Scott responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and approve the permit with conditions. No vote was taken at this time. He asked the Clerk to read the conditions.

Ms. Manriquez read the following five conditions:

1. The applicant must secure $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 exceeds 10 mph.
5. Fireworks displays cannot go past 10:00 p.m.

Supervisor Christy asked if the applicant confirmed that they would accept and abide by the five new conditions.

Ms. Manriquez responded that Ms. Bassi was notified about the conditions and that there was a possibility the Board may include those conditions with the approval of the permit.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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

P25SP00002, PIMA COUNTY - S. HARRISON ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

Pima County requests a comprehensive plan amendment and specific plan rezoning for approximately 290.3 acres from the Military Airport (MA) and the Resource Sensitive (RS) to the Planned Development Community (PDC) land use designation and from the RH (AE) (Rural Homestead - Airport Environs) and the RH (Rural Homestead) to the SP (AE) (Specific Plan - Airport Environs) and the SP (Specific Plan) zones. The site is located approximately one-half mile south of I-10 located between S. Harrison Road and S. Houghton Road, addressed as 11295 S. Harrison Road, in Section 11, T16S, R15E in the Southeast Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8 - 0 (Commissioners Cook and Lane were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

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

1. Not more than 60 days after the Board of Supervisors approves the specific plan, the owner(s) shall submit to the Planning Director the specific plan document, including the following conditions and any necessary revisions of the specific plan document reflecting the final actions of the Board of Supervisors, and the specific plan text and exhibits in an electronic and written format acceptable to the Planning Division.
2. In the event of a conflict between two or more requirements in this specific plan, or conflicts between the requirements of this specific plan and the Pima County Zoning Code, the specific plan shall apply. The specific plan does not regulate Building Codes.
3. This specific plan shall adhere to all applicable Pima County regulations that are not explicitly addressed within this specific plan. The specific plan's development regulations shall be interpreted to implement the specific plan or relevant Pima County regulations.
4. Transportation conditions:
   A. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Transportation (DOT) at time of permit submittal. The TIS shall include a revised roadway capacity evaluation. Offsite improvements determined necessary as a result of the TIS shall be provided by the property owner(s).

B. Prior to development plan or subdivision plat approval, written proof of coordination with the City of Tucson and the Arizona Department of Transportation is required.
C. The design, location and number of access points shall be determined and approved at the time of permit submittal.
D. Brekke Road and Harrison Road are under a roadway state lease. The site analysis and ALTA survey indicate dedication of right-of-way at time of permitting. Any right-of-way dedication shall be approved by the DOT and the Arizona State Land Department prior to dedication.

5. Flood Control District conditions:
A. Offsite hydrology shall be based on the best available data at the time development and shall be approved by the District prior to issuance of a permit.
B. First flush retention shall be provided in Low Impact Development (LID) practices distributed throughout the site.
C. Curb cuts in appropriate locations within the project's access roads and parking area shall be utilized to optimize LID Practices.
D. The Regulated Riparian Habitat located within the Flood Control Resource Area shall be protected during construction, will remain undisturbed in perpetuity.
E. Encroachment into mapped Regulated Riparian Habitat not shown on the concept plan(s) is prohibited.
F. The required riparian habitat mitigation shall provide, at a minimum, the vegetative density equivalent to the classification of the disturbed riparian habitat.
G. At the time of development, the developer shall be required to select a combination of Water Conservation Measures from Table B such that the point total equals or exceeds 15 points and includes a combination of indoor and outdoor measures.

6. Regional Wastewater Reclamation conditions:
A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.
B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) stating that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.
C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.
D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.
E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.
F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

7. Cultural Resources condition: Prior to ground modifying activities, an on-the-ground archaeological and historic sites survey shall be conducted on the subject property. A cultural resources mitigation plan for any identified archaeological and historic sites on the subject property shall be submitted at the time of, or prior to, the submittal of any tentative plan or development plan. All work shall be conducted by an archaeologist permitted by the Arizona State Museum, or a registered architect, as appropriate. Following rezoning approval, any subsequent development requiring a Type II grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with Pima County's cultural resources requirements under Chapter 18.81 of the Pima County Zoning Code.
8. Adherence to the specific plan document including the desert earthtone color requirements and maximum 40% lot coverage (except covered parking) as approved at the Board of Supervisor's public hearing.
9. All uses are subject to adherence and/or approval from the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base for conformance with the Approach/Departure Corridor-3.
10. In the event the subject property is annexed, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.
11. The property owner shall execute the following disclaimer regarding the Private Property Rights Protection Act rights: "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

The following speakers addressed the Board in opposition:

- Emily Arbaugh
- Andrew Shipley
- Jessica Collazo
- Morgan Bernal
- Emma Stahl-Wert, Representative, Rainwater Harvesting Community
- Sophia Taggart
- Ed Hendel, President, Tucson Mountains Association; Tucson Citizens Water Advisory Committee Member; Sky Island AI Co-Founder
- Colter Pauley
- Jacob Davis
- Aysia Arias
- Dr. Chantelle Khambholja
- Lauren Renteria
- Vivek Bharathan, Small Business Owner
- Shea Lambert
- Stefanie Gershon
- Marisol Winfrey Herrera
- David Quiñones
- Matt Andrews
- Brandon Olander
- KT Bolger
- Emma Schraner
- Kaitlynn Eberhardt

DRAFT

They provided the following comments:

- Concern with ongoing challenges in water management and the need to prioritize environmental preservation over economic gain, water's irreplaceable value and called for morally grounded leadership.
- The Central Arizona Project was no longer secure, the reclaimed water's potential for future potable use and the lack of transparency around agreements with Tucson Electric Power (TEP) and Tucson Water.
- The unreliability of non-potable water commitments, Arizona's vulnerability to drought-related cuts, unsuitable for the region's climate, concerns with heat pollution from discharge water, and urged protection of local ecosystems and resources.
- Environmental concerns over water contamination associated with data centers, what the usefulness of applying reclaimed water only to pollute it again was, and skepticism about the project's commitments and accountability measures if standards were not met.
- Concerns about the limited scope of reclaimed water usage in Phase I, if future expansion could even be supported and that increased conservation would shrink the future reclaimed water supply, challenging assumptions behind the project's sustainability claims.
- The community's water resources should be prioritized for public use and the unknown about the project's economic benefits outweighing the significant water loss associated with data center operations.
- Concern with the project's feasibility in Tucson's hot, arid climate, their claims of water neutrality, over 5 billion gallons used annually with other data centers and it could strain the City's water resources and called for enforceable commitments, not unverifiable assurances.
- Concern over transparency, the $20 million land deal yielded only 180 permanent jobs, a poor return on investment, data collection practices, potential outsourcing of contracts, and whether the project truly benefitted local residents.
- It would be hasty and economically driven at the expense of environmental and community values, other data centers have reportedly caused water pollution and strained local resources, prioritizing profit over preservation and urged the Board to caution regarding resident displacement near Sabino Canyon, the claim about low residential impact and whether relocation or compensation would be provided, the reliance on artificial intelligence, noting that the 180 promised jobs must be weighed against AI-driven job losses and potential societal risks.
- Concern of drought and fragile condition of the Colorado River basin, lack of transparency, the long-term environmental tradeoffs of building large-scale data centers in a desert ecosystem, the need to prioritize ecological preservation over limited short-term economic gains, and responsible stewardship of dwindling resources in the face of climate change.
- Water, energy, and land usage was fragile in the Sonoran Desert, the need for environmental stewardship and development must honor the limits and value of the desert landscape.

- Concern with rising energy rates tied to data centers, the lack of independent environmental and economic studies.
- Data centers offer minimal job creation and strain critical water resources and these facilities were increasingly automated and unlikely to deliver the high-paying tech jobs often promised.
- There would be energy grid strain following a neighborhood brownout and concern over the project's secrecy and potential risks to public infrastructure.
- Concern over resource extraction, corporate accountability, and the misuse of community infrastructure, the potential harm to future generations and opposed investing water and energy in technologies that contribute to surveillance and social inequity.
- There was distrust in water and energy pledges and advocating for reinvestment in local infrastructure over supporting external corporate interests and the need to prioritize physical communities and small businesses.
- Lack of clear data about the project's water use, the need to demand firmer commitments, and warned about the risks of vague promises.
- Uncertainty around water and energy use, and insufficient details on reclaimed water infrastructure, the need to prioritize an environmental assessment before approving a project with potentially serious long-term resource impacts.
- This was misaligned with climate goals, heavy reliance on fossil fuels, and insufficient public awareness, questioned the sustainability of reclaimed water and 180 jobs did not justify the environmental cost.
- The environmentally conscious community had already made significant daily sacrifices to mitigate climate impact and approving the project would undermine these efforts.
- There was limited public notice given for the largest water project in TEP’s history and the environmental risks outweighed potential economic benefits and the need for more meaningful community input.

The following speakers addressed the Board in support:

- Dr. Tomás Díaz de la Rubia, Senior Vice President, Research and Partnerships, University of Arizona (U of A)
- Dr. Denise Bowls, Greater Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Dr. Jeffrey Nasse, Chancellor, Pima Community College (PCC)
- Susan Hyatt Dumon, Chief Economic Development Officer, Chamber of Southern Arizona
- Conrad Carrasco, Tucson Carpenters Local 1912
- Fabian Sandez, Regional Manager, Western States Regional Council of Carpenters
- Richard Garcia, Representative, Operating Engineers Local 12
- Alberto Villalpando, Representative, Smart Local 359 Sheet Metal Workers
- Mark Cardenas, Representative, IBEW Local 570, Sheet Metal Workers Local 359, Laborers Local 1184, Operating Engineers Local 12 and Carpenters Local 1912

- Erica Yrigve, Small Business Owner; Chamber of Southern Arizona Public Policy Committee Member
- Ian McDowell, Vice President, Regional Manager, Sundt
- Taylor Fulkerson, DPR Construction Tucson

They provided the following comments:

- The project aligned with the U of A's strategic goals of student success, forward-shaping research, and community engagement with opportunities for students in high-tech industries, the importance of artificial intelligence and data science, and reaffirmed the university's commitment to being an active economic and civic partner in Southern Arizona.
- It would bring a $3.6 billion investment, $64K average salaries, and $250M in projected tax revenue over 10 years, including infrastructure upgrades, a reclaimed water pipeline, and a 30-acre Aquifer Recharge facility to support sustainability.
- PCC's role in workforce development and economic opportunity would allow alignment of degree and certificate programs with employer needs, and they aimed to prepare students for jobs created by the project, and as a long-term investment in Southern Arizona's future, they reaffirmed the college's readiness to support regional talent and growth.
- The investment was unprecedented, they had an extensive infrastructure plan, including 18 miles of reclaimed water lines and a 30-acre aquifer recharge facility, noting its potential to spark further development and attract strategic industries and provided an opportunity to fund essential public services and promote long-term regional prosperity.
- The potential to create quality union jobs and drove long-term economic growth, offered real opportunities for contractors, suppliers, and apprentices to build both infrastructure and sustainable middle-class careers, strengthening Tucson's workforce and future.
- It would create 3,000 local construction jobs and reduce long commutes to Phoenix and the union endorsed the project's economic impact on Tucson communities.
- It would boost construction, support apprenticeship programs, and benefit future workers and a major opportunity to strengthen the community and generate long-term resources.
- It would create well-paying, long-term construction jobs for trained union members, it would strengthen families and the local middle class, and it was a key investment in Tucson's future.
- Union workers in Tucson and Pima County needed stable, local jobs to reduce long commutes and support family life and a key step in keeping skilled workers employed in their community.
- It would position Tucson competitively in the tech sector, bringing jobs, investment, infrastructure, and economic growth and urged accountability to ensure delivery on promises like job creation, salary levels, and reclaimed water infrastructure, a vital step toward Pima County's future prosperity.
- It would potentially stabilize the local construction industry amid economic uncertainty, with 1 in 25 Americans that worked in construction or related

fields, and declining architectural billings signaled future risk, and broader economic ripple effect, including support roles, small businesses, and suppliers.

- There would be strong collaboration with local agencies and its potential to strengthen community and economic ties, stable, local opportunities and alignment with workforce development efforts by JTED, PCC, and local unions, framing Project Blue as a catalyst that could spark future development and help position Tucson as a leader in innovative construction.

Carolyn Campbell, Board Member, Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, emphasized the urgent need for transparency regarding Project Blue, expressed frustration over the lack of new or detailed information, concern that approval would limit further County oversight. She urged caution and requested more time for public understanding and stressed that Tucson's limited water resources—potable, reclaimed, and wastewater—we not truly renewable, reinforcing the importance of careful stewardship.

Nick Arnold, Arizona State Director for Climate Cabinet Action, urged transparency on Project Blue's energy demands, citing the lack of data from TEP. He estimated the project could consume 876 gigawatt hours annually—over 9% of TEP's 2024 output and more than all privately generated solar and while he had concerns with climate and water, called for a delay on the vote until more energy data was shared.

JJ Lamb, Co-Founder and CEO, Vail Preservation Society, raised concerns about livability and sustainability, acknowledging the alignment of the project with broader regional goals but emphasized that job creation alone was not enough—housing, transportation, and water resources must be considered. She highlighted congestion on I-10, gaps in infrastructure planning, and the ecological sensitivity of the Cienega Creek Preserve, and praised the 18-mile purple pipe extension, but urged greater public education and outreach, so residents fully understood the project's impact on their community.

Justin Risley spoke to the Board regarding the lack of transparency around energy usage and expressed deep concern over the region's water crisis. He stated the Santa Cruz River was one of the country's most endangered and warned that water resources were on "life support" amid climate change. He added that the project's investment was potentially indifferent to financial accountability, and if promised agreements were unmet who was burdened and called for environmental responsibility over economic promises, that Tucson's identity was tied to its watershed, and urged that the community and its future must come first.

Jared McKinley, Representative, Spadefoot Nursery, questioned why Arizona was selected given its limited water and hot climate. He criticized the extractive nature of out-of-state companies and urged the Board to prioritize economic development that benefitted local residents and respected regional resources.

Christina McVie urged the Board to delay voting on this project, warning that generative AI data centers could consume significantly more water and energy than expected and emphasized the lack of transparency and planning. She called for firm conservation commitments and greater public disclosure before moving forward.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing and approve P25SP00002, subject to standard and special conditions. Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Allen and Cano voted "Nay."

PROCUREMENT

56. **Hearing - Solicitation No. IFB-2500005800, Plumbing Fixtures, Pipe and Fittings, Equipment and Supplies**

A. **Appeal of Procurement Director's Decision**

Pursuant to Pima County Code 11.20.010(H), Tucson Winsupply, appeals the decision by the Procurement Director regarding Solicitation No. IFB-2500005800, Plumbing Fixtures, Pipe and Fittings, Equipment and Supplies.

B. **Award**

Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000170, Ferguson Enterprises, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson AZ), to provide for plumbing fixtures, pipe and fittings, equipment and supplies. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of $1,543,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

Bruce Collins, Director, Procurement, stated it was his decision to deem a bid non-responsive and no longer consider it for award. He explained that the procurement method was the lowest bid and there were approximately 450 line items. He stated that one of the key requirements was that the bidder had to be able to provide all of the items that were to be considered and have the ability to source these items from the manufacturer directly so that Pima County could have benefit of the manufacturer's warranty. He explained at the time that the bid was open, both bidders acknowledged that they could provide the items from the manufacturer and upon going through the protest process it was discovered that the lowest bidder could not provide all of the items with a manufacturer's warranty. He stated that in the bidder's protest, they acknowledged in the information that was submitted that their relationship with the manufacturer had changed in such that they could no longer provide a manufacturer's warranty. He explained that as a result and in accordance with the Pima County Procurement Code, it directed the Procurement Director to deem a bidder non-responsive if they could not meet all of the

specifications. He requested that the Board approve the Procurement Director's decision to deem the bid non-responsive and no longer eligible for consideration.

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

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

57. **Hearing - Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 13, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to wastewater sanitary sewer construction, connections and fees; amending the Pima County Code, Title 13, Chapter 20, Sanitary Sewer Construction, Connections and Fees, amending Ordinance No. 2019-20.

Chair Scott stated that Minute Item Nos. 57 and 58 were hearings on code text amendments related to Wastewater, one for sanitary sewer construction and the other for Wastewater sanitary sewer user fees.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated a presentation was prepared for the items, and staff could either go through the slideshow, if the Board requested or answer questions.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had spoken with some of the home building associations on this particular issue and indicated they were currently in discussions with Wastewater, which would be forthcoming, with some type of notice. He stated that he was unaware of the discussion or a resolution and would be amenable to continue these items, if necessary. He asked if a status update could be provided to the Board.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that the questions that were raised by the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA) had to do with the discount program, they continued discussions and in the letter submitted this week by Brendan Lyons, he asked that the department continue those conversations and sought opportunities to provide alternate paths for the home building industry. He stated they received credits granted currently under the ordinance and they were not being removed. He stated that the discount applied when they built sewer lines across other private development projects, which was information that was included in a memorandum to the Board through the County Administrator. He stated that was the program, but there was plenty of opportunities for them to leverage the credit program, as well as to enter into project specific sewer service agreements. He stated that would address, similarly, the same thing that the discounts were intended to do.

Jaime Rivera, Deputy Director, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department, clarified that they had some additional conversations with SAHBA and there was

DRAFT

some misunderstanding of the difference between discounts and credits and that credits were a win-win for everyone. He stated that if the developer was installing a line and the County saw a benefit in increasing the size, or extending the line, those costs would be shared to achieve that. He explained that discounts was a one-sided, old system, where they reimbursed a developer that was installing a line through a private property that was not theirs and it was kind of a help at that point. He stated that it was a one-sided help because the County was helping the developer and it was not from a department of the requested extension or augmentation. He stated that this was explained to SAHBA and he believed, overall, that they understood the difference. He reiterated there was a misunderstanding that they were going to sunset the credits, which was untrue, rather, were aiming to sunset the discounts. He stated that there were other opportunities with sewer agreements to where they could help each other to the benefit of the County in installing lines or extending lines.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was prepared to make a motion to continue the item until the discussions were memorialized in a new code text amendment. He asked if it could be memorialized in a new code text amendment and brought back before the Board for approval.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., clarified that the process for credits was already in the program and as Deputy Director Rivera pointed out, the replacement for the discount program, which was being recommended for sunsetting, was to utilize the credit program, which currently existed in the ordinance. He added that the same held true for the process for entering into sewer service agreements. He reiterated those provisions already existed in the Code and could be utilized by the development community. He stated that he would offer to the Board that the sunsetting of the discounts was just one piece of the overall amendments to the two different chapters that were being considered. He stated that they could finalize a correspondence to the industry outlining what those available options were under the Code and if they were to identify other desired approaches, then they could certainly work with them, and if necessary, come back to the Board. He stated that he was comfortable that the provisions that were replacements for that discount program currently existed, and the industry would be able to utilize them well based on that.

Supervisor Christy stated that if further clarification was going to be provided that might have existed regarding not advertising the discounts properly, he could support the items.

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

DRAFT

58. **Hearing - Code Text Amendment**

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 14, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to wastewater sanitary sewer user fees; amending the Pima County Code, Title 13, Chapter 24, Sanitary Sewer User Fees, amending Ordinance No. 2016-29.

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 57, for discussion and action on this item.)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

59. **Plan for South Tucson Fire & EMS Response**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to come back to the Board of Supervisors at the July 15, 2025, Board Meeting with a plan for how Pima County will help financially support the City of South Tucson such that it can contract with Tucson Fire Department to provide full-time fire and EMS services to the City of South Tucson. The citizens of South Tucson need to be able to count on reliable fire and EMS services 24/7. Such a plan may include time limits or other parameters agreeable to both Pima County and the City of South Tucson. (District2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that he had previously brought forward an item to help the City of South Tucson secure Fire coverage. He explained that they currently worked with nearby jurisdictions to get individual contracted firefighters, but unfortunately, nearby jurisdictions restricted their Firefighters from continuing to do that kind of work. He stated that within weeks, there would potentially be no Fire service for the City of South Tucson, and as the Board had talked about Fire Districts in general, it did not matter where the fire started. He stated there had been multiple fires in South Tucson related to the Spanish Trail property and other areas and was not a place they wanted to have a lack of fire coverage. He stated the proposal he brought forth the prior year was to assist them monetarily with up to $400,000.00, but that had not passed. He stated that the newly elected council had went to their own voters and requested a bond, to get the City of Tucson, to simply put in a substation with 12 Firefighters, a water truck, and other supplies. He stated the voters passed a bond for the $400,000.00, but currently there was a transition of the City Manager at the City of Tucson, so the numbers changed a bit. He stated they needed several hundred thousand more and the County needed to ensure they had fire coverage and it was in the interest of all constituents. He stated that he was hopeful that they could direct staff to figure out a way that the County could help get this across the finish line and whatever it entailed.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Allen to direct staff to work with the City of South Tucson and the City of Tucson to figure out some creative solutions, not just cutting a check, but a way to help facilitate this so the County could ensure that this population had proper fire service. No vote was taken at this time.

DRAFT

Supervisor Allen stated that she noticed that the City of Tucson had an agenda item on their meeting to provide structure fire calls in South Tucson for $25,000.00 per month and asked whether this was duplicative efforts.

Supervisor Heinz responded that his understanding was that it sounded like a case-by-case basis. He stated that he was not exactly sure but was aware that the City of Tucson had already committed to many concessions, an additional $300,000.00 to this effort, in addition to the $400,000.00 that they had bonded for, but they needed another $250,000.00 to $300,000.00 to seal the deal. He stated that the item Supervisor Allen mentioned was separate and it might be the $300,000.00 they had already committed to.

Supervisor Christy suggested that a motion might not be needed, other than to direct the County Administrator to explore what the City of Tucson had done and what efforts were available, what funding was available for this enterprise from the Board and to come back with findings.

Chair Scott asked if there were any discussions prior to today with both cities regarding these issues.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that she had not had a conversation with South Tucson, specifically, about this item, however, she spoke very briefly with the City of Tucson Manager, on what this might look like. She stated that she believed there would be forthcoming information that had the City of South Tucson looking to provide some of the infrastructure. She stated that she was unsure of the numbers and what she had heard last was that it appeared that the delta could be at or about $900,000.00, and the request was if the City of South Tucson put up about $300,000.00 and City of Tucson had in-kind services or some services in that amount, if Pima County would be able to assist at the rate of $300,000.00. She stated that this was very rudimentary, for a four-year period of time and perhaps, the motion, was simply for her to begin to work with staff of both cities on what might be possible and come back together to offer assistance to the community. She stated that they could certainly do that and come back at the second meeting in July.

Supervisor Heinz stated that staff direction was adequate and that the Board did not need to vote on it.

Supervisor Christy asked if Supervisor Heinz was withdrawing his motion and asking for direction.

Supervisor Heinz concurred.

Chair Scott clarified that the motion was withdrawn and direction to the County Administrator was clear.

DRAFT

COUNTY ATTORNEY

60. **Election of Authorized Representative for Pima County Sheriff's Department**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the election of an authorized representative for the Pima County Sheriff's Department.

No Board action was taken.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

REAL PROPERTY

61. Humphrey's Peak Properties, L.L.C., to provide an Acquisition Agreement for the sale property of designated for economic development purposes located at the Pima County Southeast Employment and Logistics Center, FNN-Non Departmental General Fund, contract amount $20,875,000.00 (CT2500000038)

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

Supervisor Cano stated that he wanted to request a reconsideration of the prior approved motion for the record.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 3-2 vote, Supervisors Allen and Cano voted "Nay," to approve the item.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

62. Pima Accommodation School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for administrative and financial services, contract amount $500,000.00 revenue/4 year term (CT2500000039)

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

63. **Board of Health**

Reappointment of Carolyn Trowbridge. Term expiration: 6/30/29. (District 5)

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

DRAFT

64. **Library Advisory Board**

- Appointment of Scott Lukomski, to replace Maria Iannone. Term expiration: 6/30/29. (District 1)
- Reappointment of Anna Sanchez. Term expiration: 6/30/29. (District 5)

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

65. **Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee**

Appointment of Liane Hernandez, to fill a vacancy created by Rosalva Bullock. No term expiration. (District 5)

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

66. **Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission**

Reappointment of Victor Rivera. Term expiration: 6/30/31. (District 5)

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

67. **Planning and Zoning Commission**

Reappointment of Robert Cook. Term expiration: ~~6/30/29~~**6/19/29**. (District 5)

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

FRANCHISES/LICENSES/PERMITS

68. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

David Tibbitt, Ajo-Gibson Volunteer Fire Department, Freeport Slag Dump, 400 Taladro Avenue, Ajo, July 4, 2025 at 8:00 p.m.

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

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, read the following five conditions:

1. The applicant must secure $10 million in liability insurance.

DRAFT

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 exceeds 10 mph.
5. Fireworks displays cannot go past 10:00 p.m.

Chair Scott stated that those were the same conditions that were part of the new Code Text Amendment Ordinance that the Board adopted on May 20th but that code language would not go into effect until 60 days after Board approval.

Ms. Manriquez clarified that it was 30 days after Board approval.

Supervisor Christy asked if the applicant was able to comply with the conditions without them affecting the actual event.

Ms. Manriquez responded that the applicant was aware of the conditions and that there was a possibility the Board may include those conditions with the approval of the fireworks permit. She stated that she did not get confirmation from the applicant whether they could comply with them, but if it this item was approved with the conditions she would notify them.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

69. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

1. **Pima County Healthcare Benefits Trust Board**
   Reappointment of Monica Perez. Term expiration: 8/15/28. (County Administrator recommendation)

2. **Fair Horse Racing Commission**
   Reappointment of Robert Hartman. Term expiration: 1/18/27. (District 4)

3. **Library Advisory Board**
   Appointment of Camy Juarez, to fill a vacancy created by Rebecca Peralta. Term expiration: 6/30/27. (District 5)

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

4. **Special Event**
   - Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Church Parish - Tucson, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, June 21. 2025.
   - Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Gym and Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, August 9, 2025.
   - Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc. - Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, July 4, 2025.

TREASURER

5. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**
   Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of $1,193,268.62.

6. **Request to Waive Interest**
   Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of $741.65

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

7. Minutes: March 4, 2025

* * *

70. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

_____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

_____
CLERK

DRAFT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

14. **Final Budget Hearing**

Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026. If approved, pass and adopt: RESOLUTION NO. 2025 – 20

Verbatim

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

RS: This is the hearing on final adoption of the County budget. Before I make the motion to close the public hearing, I wanted to ask with regard to the Community Share Program in the County School Superintendent's Office. It is an excellent program. It was started by someone who I worked with closely when I was in Tucson Unified School District. It has been taken under the wing of the County School Superintendent, really provides a lot of opportunities for teachers to bring guest speakers and guest instructors into their classrooms to broaden the knowledge base of their students. My understanding is that supplemental request put in by the County School Superintendent was not made part of the final budget, but I would like to ask the County Administrator and Deputy County Administrator to speak to us about where the program is moving forward and how they are working with the County School Superintendent to make sure that it remains viable.

JL: Chair Scott, it was not one of the programs recommended for funding in a supplemental request. Mr. Holmes has been communicating with the School Superintendent, and we believe two things. One, that there will be at least funding through the rest of this calendar year to keep the program going, and that we can revisit it as we get closer to the end of the year. Second, as I believe we have discussed in the past, I believe it was a $1.2 million that the School Superintendent was anticipating receiving from the State of Arizona, which he has not received, and we have been in communication with the Superintendent about the possible need to allocate that $1.2 million. We are hoping that if we can offset that potential deficit, he would have some flexibility to fund the Community Share Program. Deputy County Administrator Holmes can elaborate, if I have missed something. We do believe he can fund the program, at least through the remainder of this calendar year.

DRAFT

SH: Chair Scott, Administrator Lesher. That is correct. There is two portions of the funding, one is the licenses for actually running the Community Share Program, that there are stipends for teachers. That desire to actually continue that program up through to December is about all the funding that our School Superintendent has, because it is a yearlong program. I think this is where there is a desire to revisit this, that pending $1.2 million of reimbursement is really kind of what is clouding a lot of that ability to have flexibility in funding that project for the year.

RS: And I might have missed it, but when is he supposed to get some more clarity on that reimbursement, or is that difficult to say at this point?

JL: The County Attorney's Office, I think in those conversations, it is hard to say.

RS: Okay, alright. Well, if the Board can be kept updated on this, I know that there are other members of the Board who have expressed interest about the viability of Community Share.

JL: Thank you.

RS: Supervisor Allen, something you wanted to add?

JA: No, I was going to say something very similar, but I have another budget line item question. I wanted to inquire around our contribution to the Chamber of Southern Arizona, which now, in its new incarnation, which we are a part. It is a membership-based organization that responds to its members. Its members are a lot of local businesses. Our seat there, I understand is, you contribute to have a seat. I have some questions around our interests not being solely the interest of businesses and sort of the economic development, but also our interests reflecting the greater complexity of Pima County and our residents, both in rural communities, some of the suburban communities, and so on. I would like to make a motion that we reduce our contribution to $300,000.00 and invest that difference, that is $250,000.00, to our own Economic Development Department, which I think advocates, I think more effectively and with greater clarity around the priorities, the realities and the economic development needs of Pima County. Our Economic Development Department is very small, and I think utilize could show up more broadly and effectively with some more additional resources.

RS: Supervisor Allen, if I may, and Ms. Lesher, Mr. DeBonis can correct me if I am mistaken, but the item dealing with the contract with the Chamber of Southern Arizona is set to come before us at the July 1st meeting, and along with whatever recommendation the County Administrator makes for our level of support. We can certainly have that discussion at that time. Is that still the plan for that to come forth on July 1st?

JL: Chair Scott, yes. The contract would be coming at that time.

JA: Does that prohibit a budget action at this time, though? Are those things mutually exclusive?

RS: My understanding is that we will get a recommendation for our contract amount at that time from the County Administrator, and we can either accept that recommendation or adjust it downward or upward. Am I misstating things, Mr. Brown?

SB: [Inaudible, shakes head “no”]

RS: Alright, Ms. Lesher, Mr. DeBonis, anything that you wanted to…?

JL: That is what we have done historically, and we would do again.

RS: Okay.

JA: And can we…?

MH: For the record, I would second that only for discussion purposes but if we are going to talk about this exact thing on July 1st, I am happy to do that then too.

RS: My understanding is that the contract with the Chamber of Southern Arizona, the Metropolitan Education Commission, is JobPath also set for July 1st?

JL: Yes.

RS: Okay. So all of those contracts will come before us at that meeting.

JA: And in that discussion, with the contract in hand, are we also able to then make the budget shift…

RS: Yes.

JA: …that there is additional, the decrease that we can reallocate at that time?

RS: If that was the action of the Board. Yes, but because when we get the contracts, we get a recommendation from the County Administrator as to what she is suggesting for the County's contribution to those three contracts. We can accept it, or we can go down with it, or we can go up with it.

MH: This was $650,000.00 or $700,000.00 and then we dropped it by $150,000.00 to like $550,000.00 and/or $500,000.00?

RS: It was $650,000.00 for many years. Last year it went down to $550,000.00.

MH: Okay, thank you.

RS: That is correct, is it not?

JL: Yes, and it is currently in at $550,000.00 at the same amount.

DRAFT

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: The contract was already made and accepted and fulfilled a year ago, and it is due to be looked at in July?

RS: Correct.

SC: So that would be the proper time to discuss any variances in the contribution, correct?

RS: That is what I am suggesting.

SC: Furthermore, before you go in and make a contractual deletion of something that has already been established. I think we do deserve at least to hear from the entities that we will be cutting from, rather than arbitrarily doing it right here and now, which we cannot do.

RS: No. Certainly that was why I suggested that if we are going to have this discussion that we have it on July 1st, because that…

SC: That would be the appropriate time.

RS: …That is historically when we have had these discussions. To that point, last year, we had an extensive discussion about the recommendation from the County Administrator for that particular contract, as well as for the other two.

JA: Happy to wait until July 1st.

MM: [Inaudible, off mic question to Supervisor Allen]

JA: I am withdrawing my motion.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. With regard to Item No. 19, back when we tentatively adopted the budget, we set a tax rate and we cannot go above that, but we can go below it. When the County Administrator laid out for us the different factors that went into the tentative tax rate, probably the most significant factor was State cost shifts. I think it is something like, what, 25% or 26% of what we are requesting under the primary property tax. But there was also a point made by the County Administrator that there is $3.56 cents of that tax rate that are devoted to County operations. She also indicated in a memo to us that if it was the pleasure of the Board to cut that $3.56 cents and direct her to reduce the overall budget, that there was capacity for doing that. It seems to me that if we are going to do our due diligence to the taxpayers of Pima County, that if we have the County Administrator and her team saying that there is the ability to reduce the tax rate, that we ought to

take advantage of that. So, I am going to move to reduce the tax rate by $3.56 cents and direct the County Administrator to reduce the overall budget by $4,127,789.00.

AC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Cano. Discussion?

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: This is one of the issues that we have so often every year about the disparity between the rising assessed value and the property tax rate, that it does not reflect a revenue neutral level of the property tax rate to counterbalance the rising assessment. So, it gives the Board the ability to say, look, we either have not moved to raise the property tax rate and the assessed value is not our control, we have no control about doing this. What would this do as far as providing a revenue neutral tax rate situation for the primary tax rate?

RS: Well, if we were going to do that, we would not have to have a Truth in Taxation hearing. What this does, is reduce the amount of the tax rate that we adopted when we tentatively adopted the budget that is attributable solely to County operations. It is that $3.56 cents. It would reduce the overall tax rate that property owners in Pima County would be charged. It would actually reduce it from what we adopted when we tentatively adopted the budget from $5.2317 per $100 of assessed valuation to $5.1961.

SC: Mr. Chair. How would this impact the County operations? It seems to me if we are reducing the primary property tax rate, that there is room to do that, would it or would it not affect County operations and the County operations in particular, such as road repair? What would the impact of County operations with a reduced property primary property tax rate due to road repair?

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. The $3.56 cents equates to $4,127,789.00. I believe, then what we would come back and recommend to the Board that the way we would find the $4.1 million is out of some Contingency dollars, some carry forward, and it would take a reduction in actual services of about little over $1 million, which we would recommend we go back and take a quick look at the supplementals and maybe, 5% across supplementals, or something like that, or look at specific programs. I would not at this point plan on any of that million dollars coming out of Transportation.

SC: Mr. Chair. We are looking basically at a budget reduction of $1 million?

RS: No, it would be a budget reduction of slightly over $4.1.

SC: And do we know what County services that this would be coming from to accommodate that?

JL: That is what I indicated. We do not right now but if you pass this, I know that we have to find the $4.1 million and we have begun to look at some of those numbers. Believe that, as I say, we can find Contingency and carry forward that are not currently dedicated to a specific County program. We would be a little over $1 million short and would need to take another look at County programs totaling approximately $1 million. I do not believe we would be making any recommendation related to Transportation, but we can certainly provide options for the Board's final approval of how we would cut the $4.1 million.

SC: So if we voted for this motion today, it would not go into effect until you came back with the recommendations and would be voted upon at the next meeting?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, what I understand is you would be voting today to lower the budget by $4.1 million and directing me to bring back to the Board options for that. You would have the effect and the impact of lowering the tax rate and cutting the budget. The way in which we get to that number would be up for the Board's final recommendation and approval at a subsequent meeting, but it does not stop you from taking the action today.

RS: The amount would be set, the cut in the tax rate would be set, but the Administrator would come back to us with some options to consider in terms of how to achieve that amount. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: So I have just heard, well first of all, our Contingency for this next budget cycle is below the $5 million where we really want it to be, significantly. We just heard, let us find $600,000.00 for PEEPs, $60,000.00 for Community Share. The Sheriff does his own budget, that is $2 million right there, $300,000.00 that I desperately think we need to help out in some way, either, not charge or give them funds for, City of South Tucson to not have parts of our Town burn down. I do not think it makes sense to reduce the amount that is coming in when we have…the Sheriff is $2 to $5 million over and then all those other numbers add up to over a million bucks. I think we should go with what the staff recommended. That is my point of view.

RS: Supervisor Allen?

JA: First, I will just say as a matter of process, we are discussing at 4:15 p.m. a $4.1 million cut, for the first time. I think that is a little problematic. Secondly, our community is in a state of crisis, services are being cut, people have a ton of anxiety. That is not the time to cut taxes. We are such a major service provider for our community, especially in the rural areas, to have to continue to make do with less is not acceptable. I think that we can do better than that. We continue in the District 3 office to make the rounds, to meeting with all the departments and some of the big divisions, and the thing that is so consistent in sitting down with the directors and the staff, they are all wearing multiple hats. They are already stretched thin, and that we have already got facilities that are not meeting the needs, and people are

smooshed up and around. I feel like the County is making do with such little and stretching things out in so many different directions, that at this particular moment, when there is such high level of financial uncertainty, it just feels irresponsible for me to be taking a cut of $4.1 million. I would also just note that Pima County's 2023 effective tax rate was 0.7835%, the National average 0.87%, so we were lower than the National average. Our Fiscal Year '26 effective rate approximately 0.81%, still well below the National average, and the maximum allowable by the State. Over the last ten fiscal years, the Board has lowered the tax rate seven times. Even with this proposed tax increase for the year, the overall tax rate will still be about $0.37 per $100 of assessed value, less than it was five years ago. So that is hundreds of millions of dollars in avoided taxes over that period of time. We have done due diligence. It is a time of a lot of uncertainty, and I think we need to rise to that occasion and not cut.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you so much, Chair Scott. I want to echo the belief that what is most important in this discussion is that we thank our County Finance team and the Administrator for an impeccable job trying to do a lot with less. I am supportive of Chair Scott's motion, because I do believe that what we have to be doing at this point is talk to your taxpayers about the ways that we are trying to do more with less. I believe that our County departments are in a position to be able to absorb any additional modifications, the same way that the District 5 office was supportive of an additional near $4 million to support affordable housing without increasing the primary property tax rate. I think what is important that we do from this dais is look at all of the ways in which we are supporting core, vital services, asking ourselves, can we look at existing resources to be able to lessen that load on County taxpayers as a whole. And most importantly, to keep the conversation going. We have an opportunity in the next year to figure out what those core priorities are. I believe that my office worked diligently to make a lot of magic happen over the last several weeks, and that was an important issue to this Board. Part of us needing to figure out how we are going to work together is figuring out how we can look at what we are asking of the taxpayers. And I appreciate my colleague from District 1 offering a creative solution that our County Administrator has already suggested. Let me put it this way, if the alarms were ringing, I believe that the alarms would be ringing from the Administration side right now. Every jurisdiction in our region at this point, whether it is the City of Tucson, whether it is the University of Arizona, are having tough conversations at this point about how to be able to navigate these uncertain times. And we have contingencies that are able and Capital projects that can be phased in to where I do not believe that the impact, the direct impact is something that is going to be so detrimental that we cannot seek consensus on something to preserve the primary property tax rate in a way that is neutral, and that respects the economic times and the conditions that we are in. So that is me asking for consideration of your motion.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Christy?

SC: You will have to forgive me. I am not quite used to discussing on this Board cutting primary property tax, so I am a little bit surprised. For clarity, would you just for one last time, express exactly what is in your motion to do what from what?

RS: Supervisor Christy. I appreciate you asking the question because I floated this idea at the time of tentative budget adoption. That was the day that you had to leave early from the meeting, but there was a memo that was attached to tentative budget adoption, in which the County Administrator indicated that there was an ability to cut that $3.56 cents that was devoted to County operations and make those cuts a little bit more than $4.1 million to achieve that. There was not, at that time, the willingness to go in that direction. And for that reason, I voted against tentative adoption of the budget. Now I have made the same motion that I was hoping to make that day, have gotten a second, but I am just going to go back and reference the memo from the County Administrator, which Supervisor Cano just referred to implicitly, which is that, if there was some belief that this was going to impact essential services, or if these cuts could not be made, I think we would be hearing that from the County Administrator and her team.

SC: Mr. Chair, if you could just specify what the tax rate is.

RS: Yes.

SC: And then the reduction.

RS: I will. Thank you, sir. When we tentatively adopted the budget, we set the tax rate at $5.2317. If we adopt this motion, then we will, then I would be making a motion to adopt the final budget with a tax rate of $5.1961. Did that answer your question?

SC: It did. And you have a motion and a second?

RS: Yes.

SC: I would like to call the question.

RS: Alright.

MH: Hold on a minute. Can we divide the question, so I do not have to vote no on the budget?

RS: Oh.

MH: Can the rate be different than the rest of it?

RS: Right now, what we are voting on, Supervisor, is lowering the tax rate. We are not voting on the budget yet.

MH: Oh, I guess I will just…[inaudible]

DRAFT

RS: Right now, we are voting on the tax rate.

MH: Got it.

RS: I apologize if I was not clear about that. Alright, Supervisor Christy has called the question. All those in favor indicate by saying aye?

AC: Aye.

RS: Do we have to do a roll call on this one?

MM: [Inaudible]

RS: We can do one. Alright, go ahead.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

JA: No.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Aye.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: No.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. Alright, that passes 3-2 with Supervisors Allen and Heinz opposed. Now we are moving to the vote on the final budget and…

SC: 19?

RS: Yes, sir. I move to close the public hearing, approve the final budget for Fiscal Year 2025/2026, in the amount of $1,749,291,565.00 at an effective tax rate of $5.1961, and adopt Resolution No. 2025 - 20.

AC: Second.

Rs: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Cano. This, we also need a roll call vote on.

MM: Supervisor Allen?

DRAFT

JA: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. Item passes 5-0.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

17. **Pima County Climate Action Update**

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor, County Administrator

RS: Another person who has had to sit in the back row all day with us, is Ms. Davis who is here with the Update on the County Climate Action Plan. Ms. Lesher, any introductory comments? Alright.

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, Administrator Lesher, thank you for the opportunity to come visit today and give you an update on Pima Climate Action Now, I will keep this update brief because timely per another agenda item on your agenda today, our focus areas today are on carbon reduction goals and strategies and water conservation, supply, demand, etc. So, I will go over our County operations component and our regional commitment. Once again to the Board, these will also be provided as separate memos for you to consider, one about water and one about carbon, because they are two of the most robust components of our County Climate Action Plan, and we have an entire regional, oh, perfect, thank you, an entire regional plan dedicated to our carbon emissions reductions and our goals and strategies So, without further ado, I will get started. As you know, and as Board directed on May 6th, through the approval of the County's new climate resolution, setting forth the 2025 to 2030 Climate Action Plan for County operations, we seek to really identify strategies that address our most pressing climate risks. So, those risks are outlined in the climate chapter of Pima Prosper's 2025, but I would be remiss to say that all of these plans build on a huge foundation and commitment from our Pima County Board of Supervisors through previous resolutions, conservation plans, and our sustainability plans that came before this one and so what we are building off of and while I am going to connect a lot of what our strategies are to Pima Prosper's, our integrated infrastructure plans and plans that are being laid forth right now, I would be remiss in not saying that they come from a long standing commitment to this work. So, as highlighted in the Board resolution that was adopted on May 6th, our greenhouse gases and our carbon reduction strategies are one of our biggest areas, and we bolstered the metrics by which we are measuring them similarly and this is all validated through public feedback and work that has been done from the priority Climate Action Plan and our County operations, water priorities and our energy efficiency remain pivotal priorities to the groups that are working in this space and our County operational footprint, and

DRAFT

positioning ourselves as leaders in this work. Next slide please. So, I will bring up this slide just to kind of crosswalk the nuances between the Regional Plan and the County Operations Plan, which has come up a few times and in developing I will start on the right side in developing the Regional Priority Climate Action Plan, which was through pivotal funding from the EPA to work across the region to develop new climate action priorities and carbon emissions reduction, and through alignment with the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives Protocol, the County is a region needed to update its science targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 60% below 2021. If you look at the right side, that is the composition of our most recent greenhouse gas emission inventory. So as you see, transportation emissions make up 48%, residential energy 23%, industrial energy 14%, commercial energy 12% and then followed up by wastewater reclamation and solid waste. If you look at the left side, this is our County operations Climate Action Plan, by which our biggest footprint lives within our Pima County facilities, and within that, our Pima County Regional Wastewater and Reclamation. Following that, we have always included our fleet, which is under 10%, and we have done a ton of work in the Sustainable Action Plan for County Operations and have reached a good amount of saturation with electric vehicles. What we have never measured and are going to have to create a new baseline is in Pima County commuter emissions to tie with some of the transportation priorities set forth in our regional work, and through some of the work that is happening at the Pima Association of Governments and with the City and our other jurisdictional partners. So, that is a new input, and we will be looking at our travel reduction survey data to create new baseline metrics, of which we will update the Board on what all of these inputs start to look like as we set forth our next five year goals. Next slide please. So, what we will talk about today is our County operations carbon footprint and our strategy for our facilities and our regional wastewater of which will be again incorporated in a larger memo, but we really are positioned to do a baseline audit and inventory of our County facilities portfolio and utilization and be forthcoming in that reporting on our energy efficiency across our footprint. We want to measure and report and create performance metrics by which we report those publicly and determine our energy efficiency standards, is it lead? Is it energy star efficient? And what are building on all of that data, good return on investment strategies? What are investments to improve the performance of our buildings, and what are our strategic investments that are potentially lower cost and net a greater benefit to tie into our energy efficiency priorities and renewables? And we really want to be better about return on investment and cost savings, to reinvest in continued work in this space and resilience. One thing this will invariably create is a cost savings against our utility usage, and what we are spending in our general fund for our energy efficiency across our portfolio. This directly connects to Pima Prospers elements and land use chapters and our building codes, and it also is easily incorporated into our integrated infrastructure plan. Next slide please. The other consideration is the Water Working group, and yes, while this set of priorities connects with Pima Prospers elements and our Integrated Infrastructure Plan, one thing I did not write on here is that we also have a Floodplain Management Plan adopted by the Board, March 18th of 2025, and our Pima County Drought Response Plan and so all of these priorities are interconnected, and they start with water supply and

DRAFT

augmentation through investments, projects and priorities that bolster the water supply through augmentation of stormwater detention through detention basins, storm water parks, wash and floodplain collection sites. There is a huge water demand component to this and this is why I said earlier we have our County operations side of this, but we are intrinsically linked to the region and the overall utilization and demand on both our water and our energy. So, understanding how we can incorporate economic development into things like water consumption or energy use, and creating standards around that to incorporate in our Climate Plan and are there incentives we can explore to reduce demand, and where can we use effluent or reuse strategies to continue to innovate in this space? All of this will bolster the innovation and conservation and multi-use planning that we have been doing for years in terms of how we think strategically about our spaces. The Water Working group is comprised of over six County departments, and next slide.

RS: Can I ask a quick question?

SD: Yes.

RS: Going back on that slide, Mr. Shepp, Mr. DeBonis and I have had a discussion about private golf courses that still use groundwater for irrigation and although in many instances, in fact, I think most instances you can correct me if I am wrong Mr. DeBonis, they have the rights to that water. There was some discussion by Mr. Shepp in one of his quarterly meetings with our office that there might be incentives to some of those private users and I think there is even one course where we are looking to purchase, actually purchase the course the Flood Control District is, I think, but I would like to hear more about that, because all of the public courses, as I understand it, are on reclaimed water. The City courses, the County courses are all on reclaimed water. The only ones that are still on groundwater are private courses and although we do not really have any leverage, we might have incentives. So I would like to know some more about that.

CD: So, Chair Scott, as you mentioned, the users of groundwater to irrigate golf courses have a right to do that, legally and so correctly, you have noted that we are exploring options for incentivizing the transition from groundwater use to non-groundwater non-potable use. So, we can ask our Flood Control District to give you a specific update on those efforts I think they still remain in the nascent stages. So, we may not have much to offer to you by way of an update right now, but we will go ahead and put that on the roadmap of things to bring back to the Board.

RS: I appreciate that and another thing that we have talked about in those meetings is on the other side of the screen, which is the enhanced recharge in storm water parks and detention basins and I think there is a pilot project that is underway, it is out in the Vail area, correct?

CD: So, Chair Scott, you are correct. We are advancing efforts for greater recharge projects and what you will be seeing, likely in the next weeks' time, is an update on

the Water Working Group's efforts, and it includes a component that addresses those ongoing initiatives for greater recharge projects.

RS: And correct me if I am wrong, but the CURP project out at the Kino Sports Complex is an inspiration for some of these enhanced recharge projects in other areas of the County.

CD: Supervisor Scott, that is correct. That is on quite a large scale and what we find is that there are not readily available tracts of land at that size to be able to, to do similar projects. But that does not mean that we are not pursuing other opportunities to develop groundwater recharge projects and so we have been working closely with the City of Tucson, Tucson Water will continue to do so, working also with the Regional Flood Control District. So, this is all hands on deck approach for finding those opportunities for enhancing recharge.

RS: Wonderful. Supervisor Allen, did you, did I see turn your mic on?

JA: Well, I do have questions, but I just do not know whether we should keep going through and come back with questions or just interrupt as we go along.

RS: This is the last slide or the next one is the last slide?

SD: Chair Scott, members of the Board, I have one more.

RS: Okay. Alright, go ahead please.

SD: I will be brief about the last one, next slide please. So, just to build on what has been said before, you know, there is a lot of opportunity on things that will weave through our Climate Plan, specifically landscapes and our canopy inventory, tree inventory and what we are doing and planned use space with this to enhance our carbon sink opportunities, where we will reduce the carbon in the atmosphere by doing planned multi use conservation spaces. We are also going to be incorporating materials and waste and renewable materials across all of our strategies, not just its own category, which it will be, but really plugging that into all sorts of things and then connected to the Prosperity Initiative. Every single strategy that we are going to be building is going to have a cross-cutting focus around public health impact, disproportionately affected community members, and how we can build in workforce and economic components to help support continued investment in this work and with that, I will open it up for questions.

RS: Thank you. Ms. Davis. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you. So, my understanding and I might add, please correct me if I am wrong, that we have County parks that still use potable water, groundwater. Is that still the case and if so, what is the plan to get them off potable water?

DRAFT

CD: Yeah. Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, that is correct and so this topic has come up previously by the Board and we have prepared information to show which parks are using either potable or non-potable water. So, we can pull that out, we can refresh it and get it back to the Board. We continually look for opportunities to transition, so we are in the project of, in the process of doing a project to convert the Arthur Park Golf Course from potable water to reclaimed water and so that project is ongoing today. In many instances, it is access to or proximity to a reclaimed water source that is a barrier, if you have long stretches of extension to the system that need to happen, it may be somewhat cost prohibitive, but we can certainly come back to the board and give you a baseline update on which water source is being used, and then what those efforts entail to go ahead and find opportunities to convert.

JA: Another question is about, under the slide with the pie chart water demand management and so it says incorporate economic development, water consumption into Pima Prospers 2025. Where does that currently exist?

CD: Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, so there has not been a formal documentation of a strategy for economic development in regards to water utilization. So, generally, we are asking for information around the volume of water use for economic development projects and so trying to be mindful of the topics that were discussed earlier today by the public and by the Board relative to our economic development projects. So, we have in the past, and I believe it was several iterations of an update ago from the Water Working Group, put together a draft framework for how we would evaluate water usage as part of economic development. What that slide is identifying is then the finalization and incorporation of that into Pima Prospers or into our Economic Development Strategic Plan, which we are going to be starting the process to update so that.

JA: So that, so just to be clear so by next year we will have well, I guess I just want to make sure that our climate goals and particularly related to well, water demand management, but in other capacities as well, is showing up and helping to guide the Pima Prospers Comprehensive Plan, that it shows up at the level of zoning decisions as well and that shows up in economic development goals, right, and priorities. I was wondering how it is, how that is sort of currently in the works, is this a piece of strategic planning or, you know, how are we going to percolate down the or over or up from the climate goals to these other critically important facets, and where key decisions are making about finite resources?

CD: Yeah. Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, I took note earlier when you made a comment about alignment or seemingly lack thereof, right? When the Project Blue discussion was taking place and so as it relates to private development projects, there is a program of process in place where the development has to provide us utilization and show how they are going to do offsets to water consumption and so we can go ahead and provide that information for the Board. And then very much as you have indicated, formalizing the various strategies that go into the County's comprehensive plan, the County's overall strategic plan, our economic development

strategic plan, and our land use entitlement processes, I think is an important step for us to complete.

RS: Any other questions, Supervisor Allen?

JA: Not right now.

RS: Any other questions from any of the other supervisors? Alright. Ms. Davis, thank you for sharing your day with us.

DRAFT

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

18. **Public Safety in Remote Areas of Pima County**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding public safety in remote areas of Pima County.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
JS: John Stuckey, III, Facility Safety and Security Manager, County Administrator
CC: Christina Clifford, Constituent

RS: Item No. 28 is Public Safety in Remote Areas of Pima County. We have a presentation and then although this is not slated as a public hearing, as the Chair, I am going to use my discretion and allow a speaker during that time who is a constituent of Supervisor Christy's, who we have heard before and is very interested in this item. So, Supervisor Christy, do you want us to do that before the presentation?

SC: Why do not we go ahead with the presentation first and then…

RS: Okay.

SC: Then our guest can speak to that.

RS: Yes, sir. Alright. Administrator Lesher?

JL: Thank you very much, Chair Scott and members of the Board, Mr. John Stuckey is with us today. He is our Facilities Safety and Security Manager, and he will present the slide deck and give you some information on what has been going on in the topic of public safety in the remote areas. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher. Mr. Stuckey?

JS: Good morning, Chair Scott, Board members. We okay hear, loud enough? You should have all received a memo from Administrator Lesher that has a bit more detail, my role here today is just to summarize the study that was conducted since Supervisor Christy brought this item back in March. It should be noted that the study was done in coordination with Office of Emergency Management and also in communication with the Sheriff's Department. I certainly do not speak for the Sheriff's Department or the Sheriff, but you will see that some of these items that were brought for consideration definitely require there, at the discretion of the

DRAFT

Sheriff. There were a communication with residents and public safety partners to get their input as well and the focus area for this particular study was on Redington, Arivaca, Sasabe, and Sonoita. However, that is not to downplay any other rural areas, of course, you know, we have got New Tucson, we have got Alta Valley, we have got J6 and other areas that, you know, not to dismiss those folks of course. They have similar concerns I am sure, but rather the focus on the most extremely remote areas, the furthest away with the most challenges. What we found in the study is that the primary challenges or the primary concerns are proximity to resources, i.e. Sheriff's Department and fire, of course, and then communication, their ability to contact 9-1-1 and so that will be the focus of the items for consideration. I would like to note that since the implementation of this study or this study began, the Sheriff's Department has already modified patrol patterns in the Redington area to get a deputy there a little bit more frequently, and also response strategy specifically to the Redington area, to make sure that they are dispatching the closest resources and I will skip ahead to public safety partnerships. Actually, you want to move to the next slide for me, please. I will skip ahead to public safety partnerships and I will just suggest that expansion of that response strategy to include our neighbors, such as Santa Cruz County, Cochise County and Pinal County to be incorporated into that plan so that the nearest resources, particularly so for those instances where life is at risk, that we find the closest resources and send them first. So, also it is worth noting that again, proximity to resources, where are the resources coming from and how quickly can they get there? It is worth noting that the Vail district is not new, but newish to serve those in Southeast Pima County again, moving those resources that were formerly based out of the Rincon substation at the base of Mount Lemmon, so, moving those resources closer to those that need it. Also recently opening up a new Sheriff's Department substation, the San Xavier Substation out to the west of I-19 again, where a greater number of calls and resources are needed, so, a proximity to resources. So, some items to consider and again several of these are at the discretion of the Sheriff, what I found in discussion with our County partners is that they have or currently do have what they call a ranch or a range deputy program, and this is a deputy or deputies specifically assigned to remote areas or ranches specifically and the goal here is to facilitate communication with these remote residences or ranches that they are more familiar with some of these remote areas, because travel time is important, and knowing where you are going and how to get there can facilitate that. And so Pinal County, in particular has found great success with their Range deputy program, in fact, they are looking to expand it. So again for consideration this would require allocation of Sheriff's Department resources specifically to this function. Connectivity is an issue of course and in these remote areas cell phone signals can be spotty at best and so consideration of, worked with Director Simon at the Office of Digital Inclusion, in regards to our efforts to identify where connectivity can be better served and what we found is that there are federal grant funds allocated to move resources or move connectivity into these more rural areas, but no movement has been made at this point. And so there are service providers in some of these areas, specifically Arivaca, and MTE in the Redington area, but more work can be done, perhaps in the form of lobbying to get these companies that have accepted federal grant funds to move forward on these projects. The challenge, of course, is

that they are not obligated to do any infrastructure and can release those federal funds in the future. So, that is a challenge that perhaps lobbying could assist with to get these companies to move forward. Connectivity, in regards to, of course, there is Starlink or satellite services. There is a cost associated with that and so creating connectivity for these residents so that not only do they have the flow of information that we all enjoy in the more urban areas, but voice over internet protocol is a technology that would allow them to make phone calls via their internet. Again, there is additional costs involved that can be approximately $50 to $100 per month, that can be cost prohibitive to some. So, consideration could be given or additional study could be given to subsidies in those areas where we have folks in need of that. I think probably one of the easiest or maybe not easy, but cost effective ways, I guess is the best way to describe it is community organization, and this can be done by any neighborhood, any community that wishes to organize, to communicate amongst themselves so that they can identify problem areas or what looks out of place, what should we be concerned about, what suspicious behavior, what should be reported to the Sheriff's Department, but also they collectively have a voice to the Sheriff's Department. So this is the neighborhood watch program, it is generally administrated by the Sheriff's Auxiliary volunteers. There is a website on the Sheriff's Department website that any citizen can go to and learn how to create a neighborhood watch. Again, it is virtually no cost, it gives them a voice to speak to the Sheriff's Department about what their needs are and what they would like to see from the Sheriff's Department and more importantly, it allows them to talk to each other. Perhaps you are familiar with the name escapes me, the app that that they will use for within neighborhoods that Nextdoor. Yes. Thank you, Supervisor Allen. The Nextdoor app, which again it requires connectivity, so it comes back to that ability to communicate via that methodology but it allows neighbors to talk to neighbors about what they see, what their concerns are and what should be addressed. I mentioned briefly about public safety partnerships, perhaps formalizing that in an SOP or an IGA. The Sheriff's Department is confident in their relationships, which is great but let us consider, of course, our Bureau of Land Management folks, our United States Forest Service folks, they have law enforcement representatives in the area as well. Again, just to solidify, let us send the closest, most available resources to those emergencies that are where lives are at risk. Technology, the Sheriff mentioned his desire to create a real time crime center, which is essentially a physical location where there is connection to public and private surveillance camera systems. Again, connectivity is a challenge because if you do not have connectivity to camera systems back to a real time crime center, there is difficulty there. There are ways around that, Cochise County uses what is called the Buckeye camera system. It is similar to a game camera, but they use it for border enforcement type activities. These are options, again, they cost money but the challenge, of course, in a real time crime center is it requires people to actively monitor and that still does not put a deputy sheriff or a firefighter into the area immediately, it just gives us some better awareness so that perhaps that chain of moving people into the right place at the right time can happen sooner. We discussed with the Sheriff about UAVs or drones, they do have a drone program, but again, the technology is not quite there for these remote areas, battery life, range, etc., for most drones is limited such that it would be very difficult to have

DRAFT

an ongoing patrol program with a drone. The technology exists, but it is largely at the military level, the DOD, and so again, as technology develops, this could be used to again, get eyes on into these remote spaces that allow our public safety folks to know when and where they need to be. But again, response time is still a challenge, resources in the places. Lastly, real quick discussion on roadway improvement specifically, so Redington Road, it is a challenge, it is not just the length, but it is the condition of the road that makes response times greater and in discussion with Director Skinner at the Department of Transportation, this particular road and others are not part of the current Roadway Management Program and is cost prohibitive at this time So, it just needs to be a long term planning, if that is a plan to assist our public safety partners to get into these spaces a bit better, that it would require money and time to plan that out and with that, I will leave it to your questions.

RS: Questions for Mr. Stuckey? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, I appreciate that presentation and I know this is going to sound a little, is there a way that we can do the connectivity without engaging a company that is run by Elon Musk?

JS: I am not aware of a satellite based internet company, Starlink is the one that most people think of. So, I suppose additional research could be done to determine that.

MH: Please.

JS: And so we will look at that and find out if there is another option. Again cost is an issue, but that could be addressed as well.

RS: Supervisor Allen, oh I am sorry did your, I know your speaker, I just was going to try and entertain questions from some of our colleagues before we called on her.

SC: Well, I was going to suggest that at your discretion that we have our speaker come and make a statement addressing what we have just heard and she can ask or she can address those questions and then at the end of her statement, we could have Mr. Stuckey remain and ask questions from the Board as a response to her statement, if that would..

RS: That is fine Supervisor, thank you very much. Would you like to introduce your guest?

SC: Sure, Mr. Stuckey, if you could just…

JS: I am not going far.

SC: Hang tight. We are very lucky to have Christina Clifford here, who tragically lost her husband as you all recall, on Christmas Eve out in the Redington area. Her home was approached by strangers, basically presenting themselves as stranded

motorists and they were anything but and her husband, out of the goodness of his heart on Christmas Eve, left his family, left his home and went to help these alleged folks who were stranded. He did not return that night, and two days later they found him deceased some miles from his house. Ms. Clifford has been a catalyst and a leader in the Redington area as a result of this tragedy. She has been a kind of a igniter of the community and a leader in this area, and I do not know of anybody who can speak to this issue more eloquently or effectively than Ms. Clifford, and we have been keeping her posted with all of the memorandum and all of the findings that County Administration has put together, and particularly Mr. Stuckey's presentation at this time. I would like Ms. Clifford to address what she just heard, have any comments you would like to make and then at the termination of your comments, we could ask Mr. Stuckey to come back and address some of the issues and take questions from the Board, if that meets your approval?

RS: It does Supervisor, thank you very much.

SC: Thank you, Ms. Clifford?

CC: Thank you, good morning.

RS: You might want to move the microphone down Ms. Clifford, thank you so much.

CC: Good morning, Board of Supervisors, thank you so much. It was three months ago that I came to you and asked for you to put your thinking caps on, and I want to commend Administrator Lesher and Mr. Stuckey for the amount of hard work and effort that went into creating this memorandum, the amount of research in discussing what a remote area truly is. I truly appreciate that, I want to hit on yes, Range Patrol, we would love a Range Patrol officer. I know Pinal County has a couple of them, and it is a very successful program with so many rural lands. I believe it is up in the 90% range that Pima County is rural. This is not just for Redington, this is for all rural areas that I will really hope that you would consider thinking about a range deputy. Connectivity, that is our key, if we are looking at finances and budgeting and what is going to be the most cost effective connectivity, connectivity, connectivity. That is what led my husband to do what he did was lack of connectivity, knowing that these people have no way of contacting anybody for help has pushed the residents of Redington to step up, to not only be there for one another the best we can, but to be there for any visitors in our area and that leaves us as unsafe. So, we want people coming into our area to feel safe, we want them to have the connectivity to be able to call a tow truck or call if they need help themselves without relying on our residents, which I might add is becoming quite elderly which leads me into the work of a neighborhood watch program. It is functioning as best as it can in our rural, remote area. Our neighbors are miles from one another, this is not, let us peek out the door and see what is going on,' this is everyone's house is far back away, secluded. People move to these rural areas for that privacy. Our neighborhood watch functions in the 'hey, I am going away. Can you come over and take care of my plants or my animals and keep an eye on the place?' and that functions and has for decades, along with the if you need help but

DRAFT

honestly, I am not going to call my neighbors in the middle of the night if somebody comes and knocks on my door, I would not want to put any of them in jeopardy. So again, this comes back to connectivity, I need to know that when I call 9-1-1 that my call is going to be routed to the closest facility to be able to help me, whether that is Pinal County or Cochise County. So again, connectivity, we need to connect our communities. We need to connect our counties, we need to work together to function in these rural areas and I am really eager to see an implementable program for this, and I am excited to see what the Board is going to come up with and I will offer my help, my voice in any way. I do not know how to lobby, but I will lobby if that is what it takes and that is, that is what I what I have with the information that I have.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Could I ask Ms. Clifford just a couple of quick comments on some questions? Or could you address briefly two items that I think are imperative in this whole discussion? One is the formation of a zip code in your area and the second one is what they call phone booth areas. I found that intriguing. Can you describe them and address and speak to them?

CC: As I for, phone booth since I that is the littlest I know there was one phone booth in Redington at the Carlink Ranch. I believe it is still functioning, but you do have to travel down some dirt roads and across a wash to get to it. There are some small pockets of cellular activity known to residents, like if you go through this certain wash and Peck Canyon and you hold your phone just so you are going to get enough bars to maybe send out a text message and there are a few spots like that on the road, again, only known to residents or people who frequent the area. My next, the next question on the zip code, this is something that Supervisor Christy's office has been helping me with. Right now Redington's zip code is 85602, which is Cochise County, Benson, Arizona, 50 miles down a primitive road from us. So, we get mail three days out of the week if the washes are not running, if the washes are running, mail may be delayed even further. We cannot get things sent to us UPS, they get routed to Sierra Vista or other places, they are delayed, sometimes a week at a time or sent back to the company. FedEx has stepped it up a little bit more and they are a little bit more reliable but key is that zip code in mail delivery. Well, zip codes also are what tells what County you are in, what property taxes you pay. So, when you go and you apply for any type of assistance, they want to know why you are in Pima County because your zip code, your address says that you are in Cochise County. If you go to get a library card, you cannot get a cultural pass because your zip code says 85602 and puts you in Cochise County, not in Pima County. I have heard from several of our first responders addresses make or break minutes of their response time. If they can find us, then they can help us a lot easier and when you give them that zip code, that is the first thing you and you tell 9-1-1 where you are calling from then they think you are in Benson. So we have contacted Juan Ciscomani's office, they did some congressional research for us, and we are going to write a letter and we are going to ask the United States Postal

Service to please review our boundaries and our zones and we are really hoping, fingers crossed, that they will see that Redington needs its own zip code to tell us where we are, to tell everyone where we are.

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

SC: I think that her presentation speaks for itself, I think if there is anybody who is qualified to have an input and an opinion of the situation, it is. Ms. Clifford. We thank you for making the trek up here, just to confirm, in the area you live, if you go in a circle in the radius of less than a mile, you actually cover three different counties?

CC: I am not sure if it is in circumference of less than a mile within, I would say about ten miles, we have Pinal, we have Graham and we have Cochise, and we are that little corner of Pima right there, we are that corner.

SC: Well, we certainly, certainly thank you for coming up for this hearing and for your comments. If Mr. Stuckey might come back and speak to some of the issues that Ms. Clifford rose, I think that would be helpful to, with your permission.

RS: Yes, sir. Thank you Supervisor. Mr. Stuckey?

JS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, Board members, I will agree with you, I think the Range Deputy is a good option and for a couple of reasons again, it puts resources in a place more frequently, but also when it comes to the routing part, that is often a challenge and many times deputies in these assignments, they rotate around, they move assignments they promote, etc., and so to develop deputies where their focus is remote areas, rural areas where they are familiar with the best ways to get there. There is no guarantees, of course, that a Deputy Sheriff is going to be close when an emergency happens but we are increasing the odds, and the knowledge of these areas is something that it just has to be learned over time and experience. So, I think there is great value there. One of the things that we did not really attack in this study is cellular providers, because that, of course, requires the input of those companies that wish to build a tower and increase their service in the area. We certainly could expand that but understand that we are now dealing with vendors and their desire to make money in the area and what is it worth it to them to provide a cell tower that would provide better connectivity for these residents in this area So, that is challenging, of course but I think with the ability to get internet to these areas, as the Office of Digital Inclusion is, that is their focus with those vendors that have been selected for grant funding to push for that. So that, again, voice over internet protocol is a viable option. There is some challenge with that as well, because when you call 9-1-1 on a voice over internet protocol, it does not guarantee give you your location. So, folks need to understand that they might need to be a little bit more descriptive of where they are and where they need services, but it is a way to create that connectivity that is important to those residents.

SC: Mr. Chair?

DRAFT

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just a couple of quick, please I am sorry, Thank you. Roughly how many people would you say there are populating the remote areas in Pima County?

JS: Oh, I do not know. I do not know.

SC: That would be helpful if we could get some kind of feeling for that.

JS: Yes sir.

SC: And this issue of the cell phone service, it we hear it would take lobbying or pressure to get the attention of the cell phone companies to look into implementing some sort of service, who could be doing that lobbying and who could be applying that pressure, particularly from Pima County's level?

JL: Mr. Chair, if I may?

RS: Administrator Lesher?

JL: Supervisor Christy, two topics I think that will require some lobbying, the zip code issue and as well as…

SC: That was my next question…

JL: Thank you and what I would like to do is suggest that we will engage with our federal lobbying team to, first of all, begin to work with Ciscomani's office, with Congressman Ciscomani's office to look at that zip code and report back and then we can put I think we just need to put a little meat on the bones. Who are the possible providers? How can we best contact them and then follow up with the Board of a resolution provided by the Board that will allow us to work with them more closely?

SC: And I, too, want to share my thanks for your efforts and for the county's work on this and one final comment or question, Mr. Chair, to our County Administrator, what is the next step? What goes on from here from today?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, Mr. Stuckey and his team will continue to meet, we will do follow up with the area residents the first. The immediate steps are to look at that connectivity issue, what can be provided? How can we work with providers? How can we use our grants management team to begin to look at federal dollars and other sources that might be available? And then also we will start a parallel path to engage with the Board and our team to get the zip code moving. So, I think what I am hearing, those are the first the next two things that we will do. Another element of this is after the report was released, we began to hear from others, particularly the J6 area, folks who believe, who are in rural parts of Pima County and did not see themselves reflected in this report. So, I

DRAFT

think we will be reaching out to them as well and we can just continue to update the Board.

RS: And then just to follow up on Supervisor Christy's question, Administrator Lesher, Mr. Stuckey said that there were some items that were at the discretion of the Sheriff. If you could get a report to us from the Sheriff as to the items that are at his discretion, and how he might be proceeding with those. Supervisor Christy, was that it for you?

SC: I just want to make sure, Ms. Clifford, do you have any more comments or statements that you want to make?

CC: No I do not well, actually, I am sorry, I can speak a little bit to what the Sheriff's Department has been doing for us already, and I just I feel I would be remiss in not thanking them. They have upped the amount of random patrols out in our area, which has definitely made the residents all feel so much safer. They are stepping up communication, they have attended community meetings with us, and I am very excited about their efforts and them, the different ways that they are trying to think of to help provide safety in rural areas. So I do want to say that.

RS: Thank you Ms. Clifford.

CC: Thank you all.

RS: Thank you, thank you, Supervisor and Supervisor Allen, thank you for your patience, I know you have a significant number of rural areas in District 3 as well.

JA: I do and so I guess my question is for the areas that were prioritized from Arivaca Sasabe, SR83, Redington, all of them are really close to the boundaries of other counties.

JS: Yes, ma'am.

JA: From Santa Cruz or Cochise and what is what is the degree of cooperation and how do we facilitate that cooperation quickly and expeditiously when there are when needs arise? I am wondering what is already in place and what could be done better?

JS: Again, I think this would be at the discretion of the Sheriff and in our conversation with the Sheriff, he is confident that the relationships exist with state, federal and our County partners to the neighbors and so I would suggest consideration is just formalize that in a way and because, you know, the philosophy behind a deployment strategy is important, but if that is not relayed in a consistent fashion to those that execute the job, i.e. your dispatchers and your responding deputies, then I find it has been my experience that if we memorialize that in an SOP or a practice that has longevity so that it does not get forgotten. So that, you know, as a matter of practice, when we have a call that is nearing a neighboring border, Redington or

State Route 83, etc., knowing that maybe deputies are 45 minutes to an hour away to make an additional phone call as a matter of practice, as a matter of SOP to say, 'hey, do you have anybody in the area?' San Manuel is a great example, in Reddington, they often have deputies that are rather close, but the call has to be made. So again, this would be this would be an operations issue for the Sheriff to explore and to implement any kind of SOPs that he sees, he sees fit.

JA: Okay, thank you.

RS: Anything else Supervisor Allen? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just my sincerest thanks to Ms. Clifford for attending today and for you, Mr. Stuckey, for your presentation.

JS: Yes, sir.

SC: And to the County Administrator for preparing the memorandum and for continuing on with the next steps. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you Supervisor.

DRAFT

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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

P25SP00002, PIMA COUNTY - S. HARRISON ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

Pima County requests a comprehensive plan amendment and specific plan rezoning for approximately 290.3 acres from the Military Airport (MA) and the Resource Sensitive (RS) to the Planned Development Community (PDC) land use designation and from the RH (AE) (Rural Homestead - Airport Environs) and the RH (Rural Homestead) to the SP (AE) (Specific Plan - Airport Environs) and the SP (Specific Plan) zones. The site is located approximately one-half mile south of I-10 located between S. Harrison Road and S. Houghton Road, addressed as 11295 S. Harrison Road, in Section 11, T16S, R15E in the Southeast Planning Area. On motion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted 8 - 0 (Commissioners Cook and Lane were absent) to recommend APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. Staff recommends APPROVAL SUBJECT TO STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 4)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
HVC: Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Pima County Economic Development Department
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
KS: Keri Silvyn, Representative for Applicant, Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C.
LC: Logan Craig, Vice President of Development, Beale Infrastructure
CC: Christina Casler, Director of Water, Beale Infrastructure
EB: Erik Bakken, Senior Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, Tucson Electric Power
SS: Scott Schladweiler, Deputy Director, Tucson Water

RS: Item No. 65, it is a hearing on a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Specific Plan, S. Harrison Road Specific Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendment. What we are going to do, is we are going to hear a presentation from the representative from the applicant, then we are going to hear a presentation from the County's Economic Development Director, then we are going to open up the public hearing. Now get ready for this, we have 43 speakers for the public hearing and consistent with the policies that we follow with Call to the Public, when we have 20 or more speakers, each speaker has two minutes but we will get through all of these. We have a time certain item at 12:30 p.m., but we can push that back to 1:00 p.m. Let us say we get to 1:00 p.m., and we are still not done, then we will probably have to

DRAFT

reconvene after our time certain item at 1:00 p.m., but everybody who wants to speak will have an opportunity to speak. And again, I just ask you not to talk with anybody else who is talking, and you are also going to take up more time if you applaud after people talk. I understand the desire to do that, but this is a public hearing, not a rally. So let us go with our presentation from the representative for the applicant. Ms. Silvyn?

KS: Thank you, Chair Scott and members of the Board. Keri Silvyn, with Lazarus & Silvyn, representing Beale Infrastructure. I would like to introduce a few of the folks who are here with us this morning, it is still morning. Logan Craig, Vice President of Development, Christina Casler, Director of Water, and then we also have a couple of folks from Tucson Water and Tucson Electric Power (TEP), because we know there may be some questions for the utilities, who we have been working with.

RS: And just for the record, who is here from Tucson Water and TEP?

KS: Scott Schladweiler is here, Deputy Director of Tucson Water and Eric Bakken is here, Vice President of Energy Resources for TEP. Next slide. I like everybody to know what we are going to be talking about and when. I am going to do a little bit of an introduction of Beale, talk a little bit about data centers, the project details the economic impact study. I am going to highlight some high-level numbers, and then, I know the two big issues are energy and water. My goal is going to be to try and answer all of the questions that have both been in the press, and that I know you all have forwarded some questions, and I know you have been getting questions from constituents. Our goal is to answer as many of them as I can. There may be some questions that I cannot answer for various reasons, in which case you will also get an explanation as to why I cannot answer that question so we can hopefully get through today. Next slide. In the introduction of Beale Infrastructure, Beale Infrastructure partners with some of the world's leading technology companies to develop data centers and infrastructure that support economic growth. Beale is an incredibly well capitalized organization with a project team of industry veterans with deep experience in delivering infrastructure projects. The Beale team has collective experience in data center development, energy, water sustainability and delivery, and has worked together in the industry for many years. One of the things that really sets Beale apart from others, really a lot of other industrial users, period, but also in the data center world, is the top priority and focus on sustainability, community investment and health and safety and you are going to hear a lot about how and why that is the case in just a minute. Beale works closely with communities to understand local resource constraints and develop responsible, sustainable roadmap for growth. Beale has been working very closely as some of you may know, with both TEP and Tucson Water for the past number of months to really understand who has been studying our sustainability programs for both the County and the City and really working to try and help resolve some of our community issues, as well as develop the project. Next slide. What is a data center? Data centers are critical infrastructure. They typically consist of a building that has servers. It is the physical backbone of the internet. They drive our modern economy and make and have become essential to our daily lives. Every time you swipe a

credit card, check social media, check your medical records, maybe check-in for a doctor's appointment ahead of time, so in theory, you are not waiting as long, check online status of anything, buy tickets. That is all happening through a data center, so they are critically important. They also support all of Tucson's major industries, many of whom are here today, enabling both day-to-day operations and long-term innovation in aerospace and defense, bioscience and healthcare, advanced manufacturing, financial services, education and research, tourism, and all levels of government. Not all data centers are created equal. You have seen some press on different types of data centers. The one proposed today is especially focused on sustainability and efficiency. Next slide. Let me talk a little bit about the actual zoning issue that is in front of you, as the zoning attorney, and then we will go to energy and water, and then people smarter than me will answer questions if you have any, after I try to present on those two topics. The site we are discussing today is 290 acres at Houghton and I-10, immediately north of the Pima County Fairgrounds. This is an area that has been targeted by, or planned by Pima County, City of Tucson, and there is a lot of State land in the area for future growth in particularly industrial, light industrial and employment uses. There is not a lot of residential in the area, which is part of the reason that has been the plan for the area. Houghton and I-10 improvements are completed, this is one of those where ADOT and all of the local jurisdictions are ahead of the growth when it comes to transportation planning, at least for that interchange. Power infrastructure is also available in the area. The specific plan zoning that is before you today, along with the comprehensive plan amendment, permit industrial mix of industrial zoning. Data centers, is one of those. What you see on the screen is a site plan for the data center. The first phase of the project is what is outlined in yellow and kind of the upper right of that plan. Phase I can support four data center buildings, with the full property potentially supporting up to ten buildings. The first building could be operational as soon as 2027. The use as a data center does not generate much traffic, and for the employees who are on the site, the shifts can be modified so that it is not during our peak times of traffic. The specific plan requires compliance with the Pima County Scenic Corridor for Houghton Road. It provides landscape buffers along the edges, conformance to the native plant protection preservation ordinance, on-site water harvesting for landscape areas, to name a few. This area is in the Davis-Monthan Overlay Zone. It is in the ADC3, in conjunction with Pima County, we have worked with Davis-Monthan, and right around the time that the Planning Commission considered the specific plan, Davis-Monthan sent a letter of concurrence with all of the items that are in the specific plan, so they are comfortable with the specific plan. We will be complying with all County lighting code, noise ordinances and air quality requirements and I do want to point out that we did a noise study of this design of the data center with the walls and the other noise mitigation and we are well below any of the noise ordinance requirements, which we will comply with. I also want to point out what I did before, which is, this is an area where there are not a lot of residential directly adjacent, so a lot of the data centers that you see in the news that have issues with noise, have located directly adjacent to residential uses, and that is not the case here. The property is not in the conservation land system, and there are no protected species on site. Next slide. Now we are going to get into some of the economic numbers. This project is in

alignment with the Pima County Economic Strategic Plan, as well as, City of Tucson's Economic Strategic Plan. An independent economic study was done with a third-party study, it is in your materials. I think it was attached to your June 10th memorandum. I am going to highlight just a few of the numbers, I will say, having done this type of work for the last almost 30 years, this investment in infrastructure and commitment to sustainability is something that I have never seen before in a company coming into a community and really trying to understand the community so high level, and we can answer any questions after the public hearing if needed. There is an unprecedented $3.6 billion of total Capital investment over the multiyear and this is for Phase I. This includes $1.2 billion in construction and $2.4 in equipment over a three-year time period. This project is going to generate for the first ten years, $250 million in total tax revenue to our local governments and State government. It is $97 million to the City of Tucson, $60 million to Pima County, and $93 million to the State of Arizona. This project is going to generate approximately 3,000 direct construction jobs. I do want to point out that in the economic analysis, indirect construction jobs, as well as, indirect economic impact is also in that. That is not in these numbers, these numbers are the direct impacts. The 3,000 direct construction jobs are created during the multiyear construction period, which is anticipated to be 2026 to 2028. At the end, this will create again the first phase, 180 new, and I want to say this a couple times, full-time, permanent jobs. There is a lot of information out there that those are jobs that are created, and then they go away. These are 180 full-time, permanent jobs, created by the third year of operations. These positions are on site, include engineers, technicians, operations and security, with an average salary of $64,000.00 a year. You will see some slightly different numbers in the purchase and sale agreement commitments, to I think it is 74 employees that is at $75,000.00. I meant to look at that right before I came up here, and I forgot to. If that number is incorrect, I will be happy to be corrected. Those are direct jobs from that company that will be operating. The numbers that are in the economic impact statement are larger. There will be some specialized things going on in those buildings that the company has to hire contractors, but those are still full-time jobs. So, the 180, is all full-time jobs, $64,000.00 per year, covering both direct employees from the end user as well as the contractors and the commitment in the PSA is related to the end user. All right, next slide. Now let us talk about energy and grid reliability. Project Blue has been working very closely with TEP to develop long-term power supply partnerships. This arrangement has been structured to do three primary things that we are going to talk about. The first is to protect or benefit existing ratepayers or residents. The second is promote system reliability, and the third is to contribute to the growth of renewable generation portfolio. Some of the questions that have been asked are in our talking points. They have been reiterated in memorandum and it has been a question of, how are you going to do that. So, I am going to try and explain it, and then when I mess it up, TEP will get up and fix whatever it is I mess up. So let us start with benefiting existing residents. Project Blue is an industrial large load customer of TEP that will be integrated into the utility system in a way that benefits existing customers. Large industrial customers like Project Blue pay for the new infrastructure needed to connect to TEP’s transmission and distribution system. It is based on an analysis and load forecast that determines the upfront cost required for the customer. TEP

DRAFT

and Project Blue, Beale have been working on that study for quite some time now. Project Blue will be paying those upfront costs, and I am going to say this twice, it is not getting economic discounts in its rates. So, it is going to be an industrial large load customer, which is a different rate structure, a higher rate structure. They are paying for the infrastructure that they need and they are not requesting or getting any economic incentives in their rates. TEP is a volume-based business. What does that mean? It means the more kilowatt hours sold, the more fixed costs from new infrastructure is spread out per customer, which reduces the rate pressure on an individual basis. In addition, large industrial customers like Project Blue, pay rates that cover a larger share of utility system costs than other customers, in this way, they assist with affordability for other customers, particularly the residential customers. As you are all aware, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) is the regulatory authority for utilities in Arizona. All power agreements have to go through the ACC, which has a mandate to balance customer and company benefits in their decision making. The second pillar, in the three pillars, is promoting system wide reliability. TEP will construct and again Project Blue will fund the new electrical infrastructure to safely connect Project Blue to its electric transmission system. This is going to include an oversize substation that allows for additional economic growth in the region. TEP has conducted rigorous and comprehensive studies of the electrical network to identify a specific plan to safely integrate Project Blue's electric demands over time, in a manner that ensures reliability and continuity of service for all TEP customers. Overall, the large industrial customers typically use energy more efficiently than other customers, making them easier for utilities to serve because their usage is both predictable and consistent, it allows the energy providers to better plan for their needs and right size infrastructure that is efficiently utilized throughout the system. Last pillar, is contributing to the growth of renewable generation portfolio. This is what sets Beale apart from a lot of other industrial users, data center users, and really potentially sets a new bar for welcoming companies into our region. TEP has an ambitious long-term energy transition strategy that will see the utility adding 2.2gw of wind and solar generation and 1.3gw of new energy storage over the next 15 years. This strategy aligns with Beale Infrastructure sustainability principles. Project Blue will contribute to and benefit from this renewable energy build out over time, and TEP benefits from aligning with companies that have an ethos of sustainability and renewable energy. In the near term, TEP will serve the project's energy needs, in part through capacity from new solar and battery storage projects coming online into TEP’s network over the next few years. Project Blue will support deployment of renewable energy sources that align with TEP’s net zero target and our region's various climate action plans. Now we are going to talk two slides on water, and then we will take some questions. We all know that water is an integral part of life here in southern Arizona. I have been here for well over 30 years and been involved in development and projects throughout most of that time as a professional. Project Blue has been studying our regional sustainability plans and the importance of water and has developed a multifaceted, regionally specific approach and really partnered with Tucson Water to be a responsible development and water steward. Project Blue not only will ultimately utilize 100% renewable water resources and bring that resource into an area of the region, that I will explain in just a minute, that does not have access to

DRAFT

renewables or reclaimed water, primarily for industrial purposes, but is committed to replenishing all consumptive water losses for the project. I am going to repeat that again, because it is really important, and try to explain it as well, which is replenishing all consumptive water losses for the project. Again, this is the spot where I think we are setting a new precedent for welcoming industrial users into our community. Project Blue's approach to water stewardship has these three main elements. We apparently like three pillars, three main elements, so there is three for water also, and that includes sourcing, renewable water resources, optimizing operational efficiency, and investing in water replenishment, renewable resources. All industrial water will come from Tucson Water's reclaimed water system as a part of the project. Beale is fully funding and executing the design and construction of a significant infrastructure extension, and I am going to go through that more in the next slide because I have a map. The second pillar is operational efficiency. The intended cooling system for the project is among the most energy and water efficient in the industry. It is designed to use water only during the hottest parts of the days and the hottest months and using a lower amount of energy than entirely air-based cooling systems water replenishment. This is the one that I keep repeating but finally, Project Blue has committed to replenishing all consumptive water losses generated by the project. Ongoing annual water use will be replenished through projects that provide measurable savings in water use elsewhere in the water system by restoring lost capacity, improving water quality for public or environmental benefit in the region, or possibly increasing opportunities for increased conservation. The total volume of water provided by projects funded by Project Blue will meet or exceed the consumptive water usage. There are a number of things that Tucson Water and Beale have been talking about, and they are working to identify the project or the suite of projects that will appropriately supplement Tucson's water supply. This goal and the commitment is going to be solidified in a development agreement, which is our next stage after this stage in working with Tucson Water. So a lot of questions have been, where are the teeth to that commitment? Those teeth are coming in a development agreement with Tucson Water that the entity that will be enforcing and benefitting from these commitments. Next slide. Last slide, you will be happy to know, as mentioned, Beale is funding significant new reclaimed water infrastructure that will be gifted back to the City and to Tucson Water. Remember, at the start of this presentation, I reminded you that the City, County, and State land have worked together to acknowledge the southeast area as important for industrial and employment. What it does not have right now, is access to renewable or reclaimed water, it is all potable water in the area. So what this does, and what Beale is committing to, is an 18-mile purple pipe, that would be the purple line on the map and a 30-acre aquifer recharge facility. The 18 miles of purple pipe have been intentionally aligned in conjunction with Tucson Water to provide reclaimed water to the maximum number of customers. This line is oversize beyond the project needs, and it is going to provide an opportunity for existing customers currently along the line to use to come off of potable water if they choose, and use the reclaimed water, as well as allow others to connect. One example of an existing user along this route that could transition to known non-potable, is the Los Reales Landfill, which is estimated to use up to 100 million gallons per year of potable water right now, and this opens up

DRAFT

the ability to use the reclaimed water system. Tucson Water's current system ends at Mission Manor Pump Station, which is that red dot in the corner of the map. So this project would extend access to reclaimed water to this area that currently only has potable water and eventually provide the opportunity in the future to loop up, which is if you go, if you follow, take the red dot, follow the purple pipe down to Project Blue, which is the purpley blue square, and then you will see the connection up to the turquoise dot, the turquoise dot is Tucson's Sharpe facility, so there is an opportunity in the future to loop that all the way through, which really helps Tucson manage the this portion of the reclaimed water system effectively. I want to talk for a minute about the triangle in the middle of the purple pipe, which is the aquifer recharge and recovery facility, it is modeled after that facility that is up in the turquoise up in the corner. Like Sharpe, the recharge facility will also provide a community recreation area, and Beale has committed to again constructing that. The water piece will come back to Tucson Water, and it will also be constructed and act as a community recreation area. The way this works is that during the winter months, when reclaimed water demand is low, water will be sent to the recharge facility to supplement the groundwater, recovery wells will allow water to be recovered to meet demand during summer months. The Project Blue Team has been working in concert with Tucson Water to make sure the project continues to align with the Tucson One Water 2100 Long Term Water Supply Plan by expanding the renewable water service for the area. It is also important to note that reclaimed water supply for this project is allocated for projects like Project Blue. So one of the questions has been adverse effects to other reclaimed water customers, such as Sharpe and the Santa Cruz River Heritage Project and we have worked with Tucson Water to make sure that those projects will not be affected by this extension of the reclaimed water line. The team has also been working closely with Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department to ensure compliance with all permit requirements and quality standards related to discharge into the system, which is another question that has come up in the last week or so. This project team has taken water stewardship very seriously, is working closely to both be good stewards and build capacity for the region and as I can attest to, I have really never seen this level of commitment to public infrastructure and really aligning with our goals in this region that Project Blue and the Beale team brings to the table. So we are happy to answer any questions, it can wait till after staff presentation and or the public hearing and if we have not already answered the questions again, TEP and Tucson Water are here, if you have questions for those utility partners. We do respectfully request your approval today of the Purchase of Sale Agreement and the Comprehensive Plan and Specific Plan. At this time, I believe I am turning this over to County Economic Development Director Heath Vescovi-Chiordi.

RS: Just to check in with my colleagues real quick. Would you like to pose questions to Ms. Silvyn and the representatives from Tucson Water and TEP at this point or do you want to wait until after we hear presentation from Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I could wait until after.

DRAFT

RS: Okay. Supervisor Christy?

SC: To be clear, in addition to our Economic Development Director, who else do you have in line for a presentation?

RS: The two presentations are just from Ms. Silvyn and Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, but we can pose questions, we can pose questions to them, yes, sir.

SC: They are not actually presenting?

RS: No.

SC: I would be glad to wait as well.

RS: Okay. Alright. Thank you, Ms. Silvyn. Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi?

HVC: We have got that second presentation, please. Everybody see it okay? Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, Supervisors, thank you very much for allowing me to speak and present on this item. I will be giving a brief, not as attractive looking presentation, mine's mainly words with no pictures about the purchase sale agreement, which is the item number five on the addendum agenda, which is accompanying the other item that Ms. Silvyn just spoke about. Next slide please. So very quickly, what I wanted to do is begin with reminder of what the authority is for this Board of Supervisors to engage in these types of agreements. So A.R.S. § 11-254.04, I am not going to read it out loud because it is up there on the screen but effectively, what I wanted to reiterate in addition to that statute is that based off of the economic impact analysis summary, which takes into account the anticipated employment and salary levels for the project, among many other factors, the Pima County Board of Supervisors has determined that buyers improvements and future operations, and hence this agreement, may have significant impact on economic welfare of Pima County, Arizona inhabitants and may enter into a purchase sale agreement if desired per this statute. Next slide please, so very quickly, as Ms. Silvyn alluded to multiple times, this project is aligned with many of the regional strategic planning documents that exist within the County. I am not going to read every single one of them, but of importance to me, the Pima County Economic Development Strategic Plan, as well as the City of Tucson's Economic Initiative Strategic Plan, the City of Tucson, One Water 2100 Plan, and many, many others in the region. So this gave us a really great opportunity and put us in a very beneficial position for negotiations of this purchase sale agreement as we all approach this discussion from a position of alignment to begin with when we entered into negotiations. Next slide please. So we will touch on pieces of the PSA and I will stick around for questions thereafter so we can get into more specific details but within this purchase sale agreement there are a few things that we do want to start off highlighting. Number one, first and foremost, upon approval, if approved, it would be effective for a one year duration and that would be effective today, June 17th, 2025. It would be for the sale of 290.31 acres located at the county's owned Southeast Employment Logistics Center, or the SELC, and there is a third party appraisal associated with that sale of

DRAFT

$20.875 million. There is also an inclusion of $500,000.00 in earnest money which would be paid to the County. There are also provisions within that agreement that would address the trap and skeet facility relocation that would need to take effect for the third phase of development in that area. There also are included reversionary options for land based, for land on construction timing and also employment requirements and reporting, with endorsements related to economic performance as well. Next slide please. Some of the milestones that are included in the PSA, number one is mentioned, the effective date being today, the construction start date would be no more than 24 months after the closing date. Construction completion date would be no more than 60 months after the closing date, and then new position satisfaction date, which I will touch on just a little bit later, is within 84 months of the closing date of the actual transaction. Next slide please. Just as a bit of a reiteration for everybody to, and I think is of importance, the construction phases contained within the purchase agreement itself. There are effectively three phases of construction across two different parcels of land on one entire site of 290.31 acres. That first one is 1 to 2 industrial buildings of approximately 225,000 square feet, potentially up to 450,000 square feet. Phase II would be 2 to 4 additional industrial buildings at the same square footage each up to 900,000 square feet additional, and Phase III would be 2 to 4 additional of 225,000 square feet, yielding up to another 900,000 square feet additional. Phases I through III, if coming to fruition, could be up to 2.25 million square feet at total build out on the 290.31 acres. Next slide please. Of importance and ability for us to enter in these types of agreements, we do want to talk about performance reversion and enforcement. Two key things here to take away, number one, economic performance is effectively one of the underpinnings that also allows us to enter into these agreements because it demonstrates economic development and economic impact. So, what we would be looking for here under economic performance is that they create 75 jobs at an average of $75,000.00 a year, as the average salary, all of those positions, as Ms. Silvyn mentioned, would be on site, on the premises, and there would be a two-year reporting period biannually, via employment certificates, which is a similar mechanism that we have used across similar types of agreements for economic development. There are also two different types of reversion for the land, specifically, there is a County parcel, one construction reversion opportunity, and County parcel, two construction. I am going to go into the economic performance component and the land reversion component. For economic performance enforcement, what has to happen, is there has to be the creation of 75 jobs within that 84 months, that is then reported to us, and that is the new position satisfaction date, then thereafter, that kicks off the reporting period of two years and they would have to report twice a year, each one of those times. Failure to meet the requirements, we give notice to cure for 60 days, which allows them 60 days to remedy whether or not they reported, or if there was an issue with the count. Without the cure, the buyer will actually pay the County damages in the amount of new positions that are below the required threshold, at a cost of $12,500.00 per position, it shall not exceed $250,000.00 per report or $1 million over the course of the overall two-year reporting period. On the land reversion component, if the buyer fails to meet the construction start date, i.e. 24 months after the closing date, the County will have the right and option to purchase the property back from the buyer.

DRAFT

If the buyer fails to commence construction on parcel two, and the new position satisfaction date has not been met, the County may then reserve the right to purchase back the remaining parcel to undeveloped area. Next slide please. Of great importance as well, the closing requirements for the transaction. Closing must occur within one year of the effective date. i.e. today, if approved, closing would take place within 45 days of meeting the closing conditions, i.e. the closing date and the closing conditions include that the property receives non-appealable entitlements, including adoption of future zoning, annexation and zoning translation. Upon annexation into the City of Tucson, the property has successfully been annexed into the City of Tucson and that the buyer shall have received adequate or contracted future delivery of necessary utilities for the project, including power, water and wastewater discharge services. Next slide please. If you have any questions, I am here to take them as well as other representatives from staff. I should also mention that Tom Drzazgowski from Development Services is here as well, and he can provide information on the staff report from the Planning and Zoning meeting, if so desired, by the Board of Supervisors. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. I asked my colleagues after we heard from Ms. Silvyn if they wanted to defer questions. Do you want to ask questions of either Ms. Silvyn or Mr. Vescovi and representatives from Tucson Water and TEP before we start the public hearing portion, or do you want to wait and ask all questions after we hear from other speakers? Because we are going to keep the public hearing open and you can ask questions of anybody, including people who have filled out yellow cards. Supervisor Allen?

JA: I have a few questions now.

RS: That is just fine. That is why I wanted to ask, go ahead Supervisor.

JA: Ms. Silvyn, there is a map that shows the project area outlines it. The map shows, I should probably refer it to myself, but it says, “Phase I” written on it and then there is sort of an inset that digs into it, there is a dotted green boundary that also says, “current phase” and then there is a number of buildings in there about 4 or 5, maybe six, and then there is some other buildings in the other part. I am confused about the phases. What is Phase I, what is Phase II? What is Phase III, and how do other properties that have been mentioned, what is the picture, what is the scope of what we are talking about?

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. Very good question and that was one of the maps that we showed on the screen. The project that is before you today and the project that is the purchase and sale agreement and the zoning is the 290 acres. That 290 acres as you are noting, has the potential for ten buildings total, and when I say ten buildings, what I mean are the ten data center buildings. To your point, there are some other ancillary buildings, offices and other things that are on that map. When you actually count the boxes, it is more than ten but I am counting the data center buildings, the dotted line that is up in the upper right hand corner, is what we are calling Phase I of this project, which could be up to four of the data center buildings,

along with some of the ancillary buildings. That is the phase for which the economic impact statement was done and the intention is to build that site out and that is part of the specific plan, again, and part of the 290 acres. The Beale Infrastructure is looking at some other sites, but they are not before us today and they are still in exploration. So, our focus today when we say phase one and later phases, it is all related to the 290 acre site that is at I-10 and Houghton. Phase One is the again where the EIS was and then later phases, you will also see there is three phases in the purchase and sale agreement which do not necessarily track those phasing lines that are on that map but it is all related to the to the 290 acres.

JA: Okay. So the, I sort of drew my pen not that that makes it any more clear, but is this area then the phase one that is got the one, two, three, four potential data centers, when we hear about the and talk about energy consumption, water consumption that is in relation to these four data centers?

KS: So I would I am going to I am going to try to answer this and then if I either get it wrong or need more clarification, either Logan or others can step up. So, in discussions with the utilities, there were not just consolidating into that area because the question and it would be, I would suggest irresponsible to just be only dealing with those four buildings. So, there is a lot of discussion about all of it. The phase one, which is the four is the immediate and that is definitely what everybody's focused on for purposes of getting the project going but the discussions and the studies all the way across for both utilities have been about the full project.

LC: Yes, I think I would just add to that. So those first four buildings.

RS: Just introduce yourself for the record, please.

LC: Oh god, of course, Logan Craig, Vice President of Development for Beale Infrastructure and so the first the current phase is those four buildings that is what the economic analysis is based off of, that is what our immediate focus with TEP and Tucson Water is based on. The property can support future development beyond those first four buildings but those future phases are certainly in a more exploratory phase right now. Our current phase is these first four buildings and associated infrastructure.

JA: And the, but the sale is for the entire 290, right?

KS: Yes.

JA: Okay.

KS: Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, sorry I keep, yes, the answer to that is yes.

JA: Can I also ask a rate question for TEP or for whoever? So, we were looking at the rate and so for large general service so this is the qualifier, this may not be the applicable rate but the large general service commercial energy charge per kilowatt

hour in the summer ¢1.72, winter ¢1.43 and then for residential, it is you know, it is tiered based on usage but the 0 to 500 per kilowatt hour is 0.086720 and then scales up but not exceeding 11.113594. So that is you know, it is significant difference right between what residential pay is significantly more. So, I just wanted to get some clarity because I think I heard that the rate that the tenant would be paying would not be this sort of traditional rate for large commercial and users, it would be at a different rate, and what would that rate be?

EB: Chairman Scott, Supervisor Allen, Erik Bakken with Tucson Electric Power, Senior Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer. So, I believe what you are looking at, maybe just one component, the way that our rate structure is set up, is that those large industrial customers typically pay more than residential, that has been a long standing policy with the Arizona Corporation Commission to ensure that we are finding ways to keep residential rates as reasonable as possible. And so what you will see is that that industrial customer, whether it is Project Blue or others like Ms. Silvyn said, we are a volume based business. So as we see those sales being made, the costs that we have fixed costs in particular substations, transformers, poles, lines are then spread across the customer base. When you have a large customer come in with a type of demand that we are seeing with either industrial customers or Project Beale, they are now paying a higher percentage of those fixed costs, which really helps to drive down kind of the overall affordability or drive down the overall cost for our residential customers and really promotes affordability.

JA: So, what would the rate be?

EB: I do not have a number, we are in still in conversations with Project Beale. We are in the process of finalizing that contract but I can tell you again, as Ms. Silvyn said, that there is no economic development discount for this project or for this customer. I do not have an exact number for you today. There are a number of different components that go into that bill, especially for a large industrial customer energy capacity, other components that make up that total bill. So I do not have a number for you today, but certainly that structure that we just talked about will be in place for project work.

JA: And then, if I may, so I also heard and I may have, may have heard wrong, that there will be support for the construction of a new substation.

EB: Yes.

JA: Did I mishear that? And then related to that, I am also interested in knowing what will happen then if there is a new substation and there is also a need for more transmission lines and I am curious whether or not Project Beale is contributing to that and whether or not we are also requiring that those lines be undergrounded.

EB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, so as we have gone through this conversation with Project Blue over the last few months, we have really been focused on two things. One, affordability, which we just discussed, two, reliability and so Project Beale has

agreed to pay for any new transmission substation infrastructure up front that they need for this project that promotes reliability in the area. In fact, they have agreed to oversize the substation that is needed, and that really allows for additional reliability in the area, but also potentially additional growth. It will require additional transmission lines, but again, we are going through that process, and we are in a relatively less urban area than you might see otherwise, and so we do not suspect there will be any concerns or issues with transmission at this point. Again, based on how our rates are set up, we are not planning to underground any of the infrastructure needed to serve Project Beale.

JA: And maybe this might be my last question for the moment. We have been trying to get some information about how much energy will Phase I require. I am not sure if you are able to answer that.

EB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. At this point, we are still in conversations and finalizing the agreement with Project Beale, so at this point, not really able to talk exactly about the energy consumption.

JA: I have read in looking at other data centers, that it is often my understanding, is that data centers from about a decade ago were about 20mw hours per month, newer AI focused data centers consume up to 100mw hours per month. Are we in the ballpark?

EB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. What I can say, and what I know, is that we are working with state-of-the-art technology. I do not have the energy consumption numbers for the type of technology that is being utilized but we have had conversations about energy efficiency, about how we might be able to make sure that we can accommodate the power needs of Project Blue. The other thing I would just mention is that, as we finalize that agreement, it will be reviewed and approved by the ACC. There will be full regulatory approval and review of the agreement as it is finalized.

JA: I guess I am looking for a commitment about whether or not, not a commitment, that with an increased demand that TEP will continue on the path of shutting down the coal-fired generating stations. Will not use this as an opportunity for expanding or for building nuclear generating stations and not use this as an opportunity to expand natural gas generating stations, but instead, as the demand expands, that we will be using it as an opportunity to be generating carbon neutral investing in clean energy proliferation in our community. Can we get that kind of commitment?

EB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. What I can tell you, is that our 2023 Integrated Resource Plan, as Ms. Silvyn highlighted, calls for a significant amount of new renewable energy coming from both solar wind as well as storage. I will say that today we do not have any nuclear in that Integrated Resource Plan. We are continuing to move through the energy transition. We have a net zero carbon emission goal for 2050. We have to continue on this path as we bring on more renewables though. If you look at that 2023 Integrated Resource Plan, we do need

to at least look at additional natural gas to support the number and the amount of renewables that we are bringing into the system. The intermittent power needs to have a backup and today those backups are storage as well as natural gas. So we will continue to look at that as a potential option but as we have heard, Beale is very committed to a sustainable path forward, as is TEP. We plan to partner with them and look at all of those opportunities, look at those options to continue in that energy transition, to reduce our carbon emissions and bring on more renewable power as it is needed.

JA: Okay.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott, I was hoping that our representative from TEP might be able to come back up and answer. I feel like I need one more opportunity to advocate for some of the concerns and the role as it relates to the energy grid. I am hearing that TEP has been in conversations with the applicant, and that you feel able to absorb not only the additional energy load here, but that you are confident in the technologies that you have to be able to use this. I think what is important here is that I need to say for the record, that I understand the water conservation proposal to this, and I have full confidence from the water teams at Tucson Water and City leadership. I am less able to have that kind of certainty on the energy delivery side and I am saying that respectfully. I would just hope that perhaps what you can do is provide another answer about TEP's commitment to this project, why it is important to you, and for you to have an opportunity to give voice and to perhaps respond to some of the criticisms that have come on the energy side.

EB: Chairman Scott, Supervisor Cano. What we see is a real benefit not only to our customers, in terms of providing additional affordability by spreading those fixed costs through a larger customer base, in particular, one large customer that will be paying a higher percentage of those fixed costs. So benefit to our customers, but also a benefit to the region in terms of, and I think you will probably hear a little bit more about this later, but tax base and we talk about some of the numbers jobs and the fact that Tucson is willing and able. TEP in particular, willing and able to support this type of customer. The way we do that is through our resource plan as we have looked at it today. We have some additional capacity that we had planned for to accommodate growth, that growth is here and so we are in the process of working with Project Blue and finding a way to accommodate their energy needs. We have the power, we have the capacity necessary to be able to do it. We are just in the final process, the final discussions of finalizing that contract and then we want to make sure as one of the most reliable utilities in the industry. You see in some of the metrics that J.D. Power, for instance, we want to make sure that we are not jeopardizing reliability for our customer base and so we will continue to develop additional resources. Renewables will be a part of that equation and also ensure that we are maintaining the reserve margin that we need in the event of emergency. If for some reason there is an issue on the power grid, we have the reserves, we need to continue to service our customers reliably. So I hope that answers the

DRAFT

question and that is the analysis and the conversations that we have had internally as we have started to talk with Project Blue.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Your response was sufficient, thank you for it. I think the only thing that I am curious about, and it might be for Ms. Silvyn, I am not sure. At what point does the TEP agreement become public, if at all. I feel like you have got a lot of these non-disclosure agreements, and you have got this process that each level of government, the City, the County is stepping forward with this information. How does TEP and Unisource plan to provide that information to the public?

EB: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano, as we finalize the agreement, it will need to be filed with, reviewed and approved by the ACC. At that point, it will be a public document.

RS: Any other questions, Supervisor Cano, for either Ms. Silvyn or Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi, or our guests from TEP and Tucson Water? Go ahead Supervisor.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. There actually was one discrepancy that I was not familiar with. It says that the average annual is $68,000.00, but the metrics say $75,000.00. I just do not know if we are talking about $68 or $75.

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. The economic impact study was done with the larger number with a combination of all on site jobs but the actual end user employment, as well as some of the contractors that is the $64,000.00. All of the economic, the information that came from the number of employees and the salary in the economic impact study was based on 180 at $64,000.00. The purchase and sale agreement is the commitment in the PSA to the 75 employees that will be at $75,000.00, and it is really the distinction between those that are, let me try and say it this way, the 75 at $75,000.00 are embedded in the 180 number at 64. We put more in the economic impact study with a broader range. Does that answer?

AC: Yes.

KS: Okay, thanks.

RS: Was that it Supervisor?

AC: Yes.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My first question would be to our Deputy Director from the Water Department at the City of Tucson. Ms. Silvyn alluded in her presentation about the oversight of the agreements, and the oversight of the contracts, and basically, the control that exists with these clawbacks, if you will, within the agreement. My first question is to City of Tucson Water, Ms. Silvyn said that the teeth in the agreement is with Tucson Water. Could you explain to us what that

DRAFT

means and what its ramifications are? Should there be violations in the agreement that you foresee? And what would those violations consist of?

SS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Scott Schladweiler, Deputy Director, Tucson Water. Within the development agreement, there will be a couple of stipulations included in there, one will be financial penalties that will be levied upon the tenant should they exceed water use, or approach annual exceedances. That annual water amounts that will be allocated in the development agreement, those are still being worked out, but that is a one of the teeth that we, or some of the teeth that we will have in the agreement. There will also be some additional stipulations included in there that will not allow further development throughout the phasing that we saw on the site, until the reclaimed and renewable infrastructure is complete and built out through the site.

SC: Mr. Chair, I am assuming that the oversight would be conducted by Tucson Water?

SS: Correct.

SC: And the implementation of the penalties would be done by Tucson Water?

SS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, that is correct.

SC: Great, thank you. My next question is to Ms. Silvyn. You mentioned in your presentation, and you can confirm it, TEP is offering no special incentives to the project?

KS: Yes. Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. That is correct. There are no economic incentives requested in the rate structure at all.

SC: My question is, if there is no economic incentives in the rate structure to the project from TEP, is the County, or is the City, providing any economic incentives in this project?

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, no economic incentives are being requested by Project Beale.

SC: Mr. Chair. We are not going to see, Ms. Silvyn, the economic incentives that we have seen in past Pima County projects that have come to the surface?

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, that is correct. On the City and the County, there are some incentives that are offered at the State and those will be availing ourselves of those, and those are actually calculated in the economic impact statement. The numbers you see in the economic impacts statement assume that those incentives are in place. So those are real numbers with that State-level incentive in place, but no requests are being made of any of the additional economic incentives at the County or the City, both of which do offer some to industrial and employment type users. We are not requesting those.

DRAFT

SC: Mr. Chair and Ms. Silvyn. Just to reiterate, Pima County taxpayers are not paying for any incentives in this project?

KS: That is correct.

SC: Mr. Chair, Ms. Silvyn. Realistically, looking at the entire project, I am looking at it purely from a business transaction between the County and the developers. One of the contingents of the closing includes that the property has to be successfully annexed by the City of Tucson. So, realistically, we could be approving and talking and listening and doing all the things that we are doing today with this project but the final arbiter, the final determination, is with the City Council and the Mayor and their approval of annexation. So realistically, the ball is in their court at the end of the day.

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, that is correct because there is no water service unless there is annexation.

SC: Mr. Chair, Ms. Silvyn, the City of Tucson is really in the driver's seat on this end.

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. At this moment in time, you are in a driver's seat relative to the purchase and sale agreement and zoning, and the next driver is, yes, the City of Tucson.

SC: Which leads me to my next question, Mr. Chair. It has been stated that the property will revert to Pima County if the construction date is not met, correct?

KS: Yes.

SC: What happens if there is no annexation approved by the City of Tucson? What happens to the property?

LC: Logan Craig. Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Annexation is a condition precedent to closing, if that annexation does not occur, we will not be closing on the land for the contract so it will remain County owned property.

SC: That is all the questions for now, Mr. Chair, thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. I had a few questions. The first one is for our guest, it could be for either Ms. Silvyn, or our guests from TEP. If we look at the fact sheet that was prepared by County staff, item 5.2 says that Project Blue will fund grid upgrades that will benefit other customers and support economic growth. How will the project itself fund grid upgrades, and what portion of the overall infrastructure cost to serve Project Blue does that funding plan cover?

EB: Eric Bakken with Tucson Electric Power. Chair Scott, that refers to the electrical infrastructure needed to deliver power to Project Blue, which includes transmission

lines, substation transformers, and they have agreed to pay up front for that infrastructure.

RS: There would not be any cost of that infrastructure that would remain for other ratepayers to cover?

EB: That is correct.

RS: Okay, thank you. Then this next question is either for Ms. Silvyn, or our guests from Tucson Water. Going back to the fact sheet, it says Project Blue will ultimately utilize 100% renewable water resources, primarily reclaimed water and there has also been a lot of discussion about how the project is going to be water positive. Can you give us some sense of what ultimately means and some sense of the timeline for ultimately utilizing 100% renewable water resources?

AC: Chair Scott, can I, to that point?

RS: You may. Supervisor, please?

AC: Thank you. I also wanted to talk about, how when you are responding to that question, if you can talk about the impacts to our Santa Cruz River Heritage Project, for instance, and whether this pipeline can still support existing conservation efforts.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor.

CC: I will start to answer. Christina Casler, Director of Water, Beale Infrastructure. Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. The first part is, ultimately, we are proposing to build a very large infrastructure project, this could take maybe a couple years. We are anticipating that we are going to be online before then if we are due to hit all of our benchmarks, and so in the interim, while we are still constructing the reclaimed water system, Tucson Water has said that we can use a portion of their potable water system, and they have allocated that, instead, given us a limit to not only how much we can use, but also how long we can use it. We are given a deadline, these deadlines are laid out in the development agreement, where the teeth are, and we are still working through the penalties, but the very much commitment is to only use the potable water for industrial purposes. They will still have bathrooms and everything on site, but the reclaimed water system, while it is being built and getting out to the site, it is an 18-mile pipeline, one of the largest infrastructure projects that Tucson Water has seen. This will only tide us over, so that is the first question. The next question about water positivity is that Beale Infrastructure, in conjunction with Project Blue, we have committed to working with Tucson Water. There is already a list of projects that Tucson Water has proposed that will add to the overall water portfolio and the health of the watershed basin. I will allow Tucson Water to elaborate a bit more on that, but the commitment…

RS: And those would be the water replenishment projects?

CC: These are replenishment projects so they are to add to the overall quantity, quality or access of water within the watershed and so many of these are water quality potential projects, specifically PFAS removal. Those are options and we are going to undergo an alternatives analysis to identify which ones are most feasible to hit. The timelines that we have in terms of we would like to replenish water the year it is consumed, not 12 years in the future. There will be timeline requirements and volume requirements laid out in the development agreement and then Scott?

SS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Just to add to what was just said, we are developing a suite of projects. We are working with the Project Blue Team to see what those are as she just alluded to. There are a number of different projects, some involve system conservation treatment projects to help restore lost capacity as a result of water quality or groundwater quality issues that we have, not the responsibility of Tucson Water. Those are all in the works, and one thing I do want to clarify, is the potable use that will be used to start the project that will be included in the water positivity calc. We are not allowing them to use it without having them replenish that water over time. To answer your question, Supervisor Cano, water will still flow to the Santa Cruz, so that will be unaffected.

RS: Thank you very much. Supervisor Allen, did you have a follow up question? Please go ahead.

JA: I did. It was mentioned that there will be a timeline, I am curious what the timeline is?

CC: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, Christina Casler again. We are anticipating it is about two years, we are hoping but construction projects take time. There will be enforcement of that transition in the development agreement but right now it is anticipated to be a two-year time timeline.

JA: And that is two years for building the pipeline, and then the timeline for getting the first few data center buildings up and running? How do those pieces fit together?

CC: Well, I will let Logan answer that one.

LC: Logan Craig, Beale Infrastructure. Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen. We anticipate that that two-year timeline to be at the end of which all operating buildings will be then switched over to the renewable resources off of potable. We are tracking towards that two-year construction timeline and then that clip date matching up with that.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Christy?

SC: One more scenario on the claw backs and the oversight. Let us assume that the rezoning request is approved today, let us assume that the City of Tucson annexes it but then the construction date is not met, and there is a requirement that it be met at a certain date, let us assume it is not met. What happens to that property? Is it de-annexed back to Pima County, or does it remain annexed by the City of Tucson?

KS: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. I had not thought about that scenario, but I think the answer is that there is really no provision there. There are very limited times where you can de-annex a piece of property back into. Mr. Brown can correct me if I am wrong, but there is very limited times where you can de-annex, and this would not be one of them. I think it would remain zoned and would remain annexed in the City of Tucson.

SC: Mr. Chair. I do recall Valencia Road, they had a similar situation where the City allowed the County to annex it, and they de-annex it, but is there a possibility that in the contract or the agreement that should the construction date not be met, and it has been annexed by the City of Tucson, that the property reverts to Pima County?

KS: I feel like I am playing Stump the Chump, and I am the chump.

RS: Administrator Lesher, did you want to weigh in on that? Okay, Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi.

HVC: Chair Scott, Vice Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy. Yes, there is that opportunity. So although it would remain within the City of Tucson, if they do not meet the construction start date, we do have the right to exercise that reversionary component to purchase that land back effectively from them. That would be at the appraised market value or you would have to do a new study at that time, it would be whichever price was less, that we would purchase it back for.

SC: Mr. Chair. There is a process that can be put into the contract and the agreement that should the worst case scenario happen, it can revert back to Pima County property.

HVC: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy. Yes, sir.

SC: Thank you sir, thank you.

RS: Thank you. Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi while you are at the microphone. Ms. Silvyn mentioned that currently the SELC is only served by potable water. Obviously, the infrastructure improvements that are part of this project will mean that there will be reclaimed water available at SELC, but there is other infrastructure improvements that are part of the project that will benefit SELC. I am wondering if you could comment on how the entire scope of infrastructure improvements at SELC would help the County in terms of marketing that area for other development projects.

HVC: Chair Scott yes, sir. The infrastructure development that would happen in that region would actually light up, if you will, significant area of land for additional development opportunities. So, number one, the SELC would be much more infrastructure rich, new transportation infrastructure at Houghton, reclaimed water system, very nearby, higher capacity electrical transmission systems in the area, wastewater service, so all of those things in order to the benefit of SELC from an economic development perspective. Along the line of the reclaimed water that is

being built, you would be lighting up all of that area for economic development opportunities as well. So not just the SELC, but also the Rita Ten, Arizona State Land Planning Center, planning area as well. So we are talking potentially thousands of acres of land that can be utilized for economic development or other development, specifically, in addition to the electricity, is the idea that reclaimed water can be utilized by new industrial users instead of having to tap into potable resources that normally would have had to occur without the construction of that line.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Lesher, did you? If you could just go back because there was a question during Ms. Silvyn's presentation, but also, Supervisor Cano had a question with regard to the economic performance requirements. How was it determined? How were they determined, especially the required number of full-time employees, which is 75? And then how does that align with the number of full-time jobs that are expected to be in place by year three of the project, which is to go to Ms. Silvyn's presentation, 180?

HVC: Chair Scott. Excellent question, we came to the 75 through extensive negotiations directly with the client themselves, as I briefly mentioned, the ability to enforce employment in this agreement is one of the underpinnings of being able to enter into the agreement itself, so we came upon that number.

RS: Per statute?

HVC: Yes, per statute, thank you sir. So we came to that number as agreeable between us and them. It allows us that enforcement. It also inoculates us or insulates us a little bit more from potential gift clause issues. Although the appraisal value is market rate, and we are selling the land at that, we have this additional stick, if you will, included in there to make sure that we have additional insulation. And again, not done in a vacuum, but definitely in confluence with us, and as well as, timing, as well as, the client themselves.

RS: So, the 75 full-time employees. Are those employed by the client, but the additional could be contracted employees, they contract with the client, but they are not necessarily the client's employees? But to go to Ms. Silvyn's emphatic point, they are still full-time employees, thus the 180.

HVC: That is correct, sir.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz? At this point, we are posing questions to Ms. Silvyn, Mr. Vescovi-Chiordi. The other Supervisors and myself have had the chance to pose questions, wondered if you had any that you wanted to ask?

MH: No thank you, I have been well briefed, and I am comfortable.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Alright at this point, unless there are any other questions for our presenters, I am going to start going through the cards, and again, everybody is

going to have an opportunity to speak, each person will have two minutes. Our first three speakers are Tomás Díaz de la Rubia, Tristan Torres and Emily Albaugh. If you want to be close to the front of the room so that you can come to the microphone when it is your turn to speak. Doctor, you are first.

[Speaker comments are listed under the item after the standard and special conditions.]

RS: Since we have no further speaker cards, I am going to move that we approve the Specific Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendment, subject to standard and special conditions.

SC: Second.

RS: And close the public hearing. Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. Discussion on the motion? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Mr. Chair, thank you again. The way that this whole process is synchronized, I am looking at, basically, as a business proposition between Pima County and a buyer. We have had 20 unused acres of land situated in a growing region out in the southeast that have been vacant and not utilized to their fullest potential. We will be getting $20 million for the sale. The taxpayers will be receiving $20 million for the sale. I have to look at it as far as, is it a good or bad business proposition. We have a lot of safeguards involved if certain areas of the sale are not met. We have a lot of safeguards to ensure that the properties are going to be handled in a proper fashion. We look at the economic development that we are taking a $20 million sale, selling it to a private equity firm in the private sector, who will then construct a building that will be put on the tax revenue rolls, that will provide millions of dollars in tax revenues, that we are trying to find holes to fill, even as we go through this budget process. This meets all those criteria that I think have the rationale to go ahead and approve. The City of Tucson, it is their baby as far as annexing it but as far as the County is concerned, from a business proposition, it is a good deal and I want to be on the right side of this opportunity, and I certainly do not want to have, and I am old enough to remember, and there are many in this room that are not. I am old enough to remember the Motorola fiasco, and I do not want this to be a Motorola minute. I am hoping my colleagues will join me in supporting this sale, and that the effects of it will reap the benefits that are so obvious that we can. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Data centers are not new in Arizona by any stretch of the imagination. There is over 60 in the Phoenix area and the greater Phoenix area that reportedly use about 177 million gallons of water a day, 7.4% of our energy is currently utilized by data centers. My understanding is that SRP, currently has about 40 data centers in the dock that would use an excess of 10,000 megawatt hours, a whole lot, we will say, more than we can fathom, of energy. It is astounding, the growth of this and this is just a snapshot within Arizona. My understanding is that there is more than 3,000

data centers across this country and then around the world. There is clearly a need for data centers but I think the fundamental question is, where. And where, is dependent then on what are the resources that are available. Doing that sort of opportunity cost for where they would get located. This is really hard because on one hand, our colleagues from labor, 3,000 construction jobs here in Tucson, that means a lot. I knocked on a whole lot of doors and I would be standing on someone's doorstep and their partner would be driving in and just be getting unloaded the truck, they are electricians, they are coming back from Phoenix doing jobs there, that is real. Our people are having to work and drive to other places, and that is a problem, that is a strain on families and that is real. We need jobs here, absolutely and they should be quality jobs that are family sustaining wages here. There is tension points though and it is a classic dynamic of jobs versus the environment and so zooming out from that, the thing that I have learned to do over the years, because this is not a new dynamic of that clash, is to zoom out and think about the big picture, think about the long-term. Think multiple generations forward and within that, what is the best decision for our community, because the thing about our role on the Board of Supervisors, our role as government is that we get the privilege to think not just about the water, the energy, the jobs. We think about the future, all of those pieces and how they can fit together and best serve us right now but also best serve us moving forward generations ahead. So in doing that, we talked to folks from TEP, Tucson Water, from Beale, from the County but I also reached out to labor, environmental groups, and I reached out to other elected officials who have made this exact same decision, who have been in this position under NDAs, not knowing what they were getting into and the things that we heard talking with other cities, both here in Arizona, as well as in California, is that some folks have some regrets and they regret that they were not able, and they made some changes moving forward, so Santa Clara, for example, Silicon Valley, now has some incredibly specific regulations in place, and they are compliant with every city's I mean, that is California, right? So every the legislature requires that every city have a climate action plan. They have project labor agreements, community benefit agreements, 100% carbon neutral. They use no water because the climate is less than 85 degrees and so they can utilize cooling technology that does not depend on water in the way that it would here. I you know, I appreciate the focus on and the work to build the pipeline for reclaimed water, that is phenomenal, undoubtedly phenomenal but the fact is that reclaimed water is only, we only have it if we have potable water. The two are interconnected and given our drought, given the limits on cap, it is in our groundwater, right? I do not, it is useful, but I am just concerned about the limitations that we have on the potable water which creates the flow then of reclaimed water. The other thing I wanted to, a couple of things I wanted to mention that we heard from other communities who have data centers. One was that it is a myth that a data center is going to beget other industry and is going to bring about an economic development boom. What other people told us who are in the Phoenix area, from Chandler, from Mesa, from the Silicon Valley, is the data centers beget data centers. There were promises from Google, Microsoft, Amazon, Apple that other industries were going to come, but they did not. What they got was more data centers that consume more water, more energy. The last piece, well, a couple more quick things. Sorry. We also talked to members of our

Planning and Zoning Commission, and I think there is a problem here in how the things can be put forward to our commission and they do not know what they are approving. We talked to three folks who felt like they did not get the adequate information. They were given these generalities of what this land might be used for, and got an 8-0 approval for it and now have concerns and wish that they had been given a greater totality of information of the full picture and they have now expressed some concerns and I think that is something we need to go back and look at. I also think we have to look at environmental impact reports. We have tremendous information on the economic benefits, but we need to start doing environmental impact reports that are the equivalent of the detail that we get on an economic analysis of projects. That is something that other communities do and we need to start doing here as well. You know, our community cares right from dumping out and reusing the baby's bathwater and I will avoid making a joke about throwing out the baby and, you know, just everything from replacing our light bulbs to using gray water to water our trees like we are a community who cares about our water and our energy. It would, I would have a very hard time knowing that someone on a fixed income is out replacing their light bulbs, and then knowing that we would be giving away, that we would be opening up a data center, right? That is consuming vast amounts that we do not actually even know. Right? Getting to a lot of folks concerns about transparency, but enormous amounts of energy. I cannot support this, thinking about the long term well-being of future generations and what our desert needs to survive for itself and for the people.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Supervisors Cano, Heinz? Okay. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, I want to thank everybody for coming out today on both sides and really appreciate the work that our County Administrator and Economic Development staff were able to produce leading up to this proposal Today, I am casting a no vote on Project Blue. We are not just building in the desert, we are building on a legacy. Generations of Tucsonans have worked to protect our water, preserve open space, and grow responsibly. And we owe it to them to get this right. You do not send a team onto the field without a game plan, and you do not win championships by leaving your fans in the dark. Public support is not background noise, it is part of the strategy. I support sustainable job creating innovation and this growth at this scale, that growth must be earned and it starts with creating public trust. Across the country, communities are questioning the impact of data centers. We should too. Here in Tucson, our water portfolio and conservation track record give us a strong foundation but process still matters. This is where I disagree with those who are in support of me voting no. I have reviewed the data, I have asked the hard questions and our region's water experts, the people who have made Tucson a national conservation leader, have been clear. This project is water positive and that matters. It matters because we would not be having this conversation if Tucson Water had not built upon decades of water conservation strategy and so I do believe our folks, our water experts, have the science and the data available today at their disposal to say that this is a deal that should move forward. But I cannot vote yes when so many public questions remain unanswered. From the County perspective, this is a straightforward land sale. No County tax

dollars are being spent but the issue here is not just the deal, it is whether we have earned the public's trust and I do not believe that we have, that is why I have asked the County Administrator to launch a public facing website with frequently asked questions and all the legally shareable documents that we can provide. As of yesterday, that information is now available on our County website. Thank you to Administrator Lesher for doing that. We should not spend billions without knowing what the risks, terms, and long term costs are. We do not ask that of your households, if you have billions and if you do not, you know what you are doing around the kitchen table when you are tasked with making tough decisions. And so the City of Tucson perhaps now has the need to engage more with the community on this conversation. I have full confidence in their ability and in Tucson Water's expertise to do it right. To those who remain skeptical, I hear you. I urge you to keep an open mind not every data center is a threat and when the science tells us it enhances our reclaimed water system and we are getting the infrastructure we need, we should probably listen. I want us to do more than approve projects. I want us to encourage the Beale team and so many of the folks who want to see this project happen, to keep asking what our community needs to be able to make this a palatable partnership. Community benefits agreements, commitments to public briefings, creating a diverse community advisory board, adopting clear reporting standards, these are the metrics that are super critical because real progress is not just what you build, it is who you build it with and in Tucson, we do not build shortcuts, we build legacies Thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. I always like to give my colleagues opportunity to speak before I do as the Chair, but I want to share this statement with all of you. In a column published in the Arizona Daily Star on May 18th, Sandra Watson, the head of the Arizona Commerce Authority, said the following, “The capital investments made by data centers stimulate local supply chains, benefiting suppliers, contractors and construction workers. These projects not only drive immediate economic growth, but establish long term economic stability by attracting further technology investments and development opportunities. Aside from the many individual benefits Project Blue will bring to our region,” Ms. Watson's words attest to why I will be enthusiastically voting to approve it. The boost it could provide to our local economy may well be transformative. Many of the targeted industries cited by both Pima County and the Chamber of Southern Arizona will be positively affected. We have heard what it means for the County's ability to market the Southeast Employment and Logistics Center for future development. Having said all that, the vast majority of Pima Countians who have contacted our office about Project Blue have encouraged me to vote against it. They have, in most cases, including here today, shared thoughtful concerns about the potential effects on our energy and water resources. Their opposition is often based on what they have observed in other places around the world that have built data centers. From the first briefing I received on this project, it was abundantly clear that County staff and everyone associated with it anticipated that environmental concerns, especially related to water, would be paramount with this Board and the people we serve. Plans and promises have been made that, if they are fulfilled, could make this project a model for how to balance economic development and environmental protection. We have

to do everything we have planned and promised. There can be no excuses for failure, no excuses for faltering. I am certain that I speak for my colleagues and the people we represent when I say that to do otherwise will not only diminish any economic benefits this project may bring, it will cause people to lose trust in government. It could also cause harm to this place we love and call home. Let us do a roll call vote Ms. Manriquez.

MM: This is to approve subject to standard and special conditions. Supervisor Allen?

JA: No.

MM: Supervisor Cano?

AC: No.

MM: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Yes.

MM: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Yes.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes. Item passes 3-2 with Supervisors Allen and Cano in opposition.

DRAFT