

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in a study session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Jennifer Allen, Chair
*Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair
Rex Scott, Member
**Steve Christy, Member
Andrés Cano, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, 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 1:27 p.m.

**Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

1. CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 1:59 p.m.

2. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 3:28 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

3. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding potential litigation related to A.R.S. §13-4296 (Erroneous Convictions).

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

4. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum regarding Notices of Property Correction.

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

5. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding federal grant conditions.

Chair Allen stated this item was to proceed as directed in executive session.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

No updates were provided for this item.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

7. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

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

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

8. Pima County Climate Action Update

Update of Pima County's Climate Action Plan, as requested by the Board of Supervisors.

This item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Study Session Meeting of July 14, 2026.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

9. Monthly Financial Update

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

This item was removed from the agenda and staff would provide a report to the Board.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

10. Staffing Processes and Vacancy Policy

1. Discussion with County Administrator and Deputy County Administrators as to how staffing requests are analyzed and discussed with elected officials and department directors during the annual budgeting process. Also, discussion with same as to how staffing is discussed and monitored by administration throughout the rest of the year.
2. Discussion with County Administrator and Deputy County Administrators regarding the existing vacancy policy, how/why its current version was developed and if revisions to the current version should be considered.
(District 1)

At the request of Supervisor Scott and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Study Session Meeting of July 14, 2026.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. **Presentation**

Arizona Commerce Authority (ACA) Second Generation Opportunity Zone Designation Process.

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

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

12. **Presentation**

Federal Medicaid and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) cuts.

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

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

13. **Update on the Prosperity Initiative**

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

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

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned was at 4:32 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

7. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator
VP: Victor Pereira, Director, Parks and Recreation
ES: Eric Shepp, Director, Regional Flood Control District

- JA: We will then hop over to Item No. 4, which is an "Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety," and then after that item, we will go into our Executive Session.
- JL: Thank you. Madam Chair, if I may, we do have two senior advisors with us today, Sarah Davis and Jen Darland, who will be the leads on this presentation, but we are all available for any questions you might have. Thank you.
- JD: Good afternoon, Chair Allen, members of the Board, for today's Update on Initiatives Addressing Homelessness and Public Safety, I am going to pass it over to Sarah Davis, who will be providing the Board and the public an update on the Loop survey results, which were conducted as aligned with the One Pima Initiative passed by the Board back in November.
- SD: Madam Chair, Board, thank you, County Administrator Leshar, and thank you, Miss Darland, for the introduction. While the slides are getting pulled up, I will give a brief introduction before we dig into it. One Pima, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in November of 2025, directed and underscored several priority areas for collective response. Today we are going to be discussing Priority Area No. 1, "Prioritizing Loop Cleanup and Safety." Specifically, direction to develop a Loop improvement plan that is underpinned by community input facilitated through the Loop survey, which was deployed across the community in spring of 2026. I see the slide deck. Alright, next slide please. We will start with some of the highlights. We really sought to do a 10% survey respondent goal, which was 2,000 unique respondents across the community with a wide representation across zip codes, neighborhoods, every access point on the Loop, and every type of utilization of the Loop. We wanted to understand different types of utilization. We know that people utilize the Loop frequently. They are recreating on the Loop, and they are overall really satisfied with

the Loop and also gave several key recommendations throughout the open text options. Most respondents recreate through cycling and walking, have utilized the Loop for over six years and use it primarily in the mornings, but utilization is dependent on activity. Regarding improvements, respondents prioritized several amenities such as shade, water, navigation, and repair improvements, but underscored safety as a priority. Homelessness encampments and associated behavior emerged as a dominant safety concern, and there will be several recommendations to improve, enhance and expand the Loop, all of which will be discussed today. Next slide please. I want to start with the methodology and a couple of the limitations that we found in the survey. The Loop hosts 20,000 users monthly, which is an incredibly impressive number. The goal was to collect data from 10% of that usership. The survey was socialized in several different formats from several in-person community events, with a kickoff at the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan 25th anniversary. Other events like Cyclovia, the Rio Relay, lots of different County-wide events, social media through Board offices and County departments, among others. This survey was built to be easily accessed, multilingual and time efficient, taking about five minutes to ensure respondents would complete the entire survey. Questions prioritized how people use the Loop, their sentiments and experience using the Loop, and key recommendations that the County should consider in a Loop improvement plan. The 10% sample represented 1,972 responding to the English only version, and only 16 responding to the Spanish only version. We engaged roughly 20 in-person activity respondents at the Ormsby Park event, which was a partnership between District 5 and Community Workforce Development for neighborhood engagement. Social media engaged the majority of the respondents. Limitations include the need for more Spanish language outreach. The in-person events did not have as much traction as social media. Age distribution had a higher response rate of 45 and older, specifically 61 to 75 as the largest respondent group, so younger respondents were not as represented in the survey. The survey response areas were primarily around the Rillito use and not as representative of the Santa Cruz. So just knowing that as kind of a disclaimer on some of the limitations and opportunity zones of the responses that came in. For the subsequent slides herein and the data analysis of the survey, several questions were multiple select, so represent a many-to-one responses to respondent. We had three open text response options yielding roughly 1,500 responses. The multiple select, as I said, yield a higher multiple answer-to-one ratio, and the free text answers were distilled into qualitative, primary, secondary, and tertiary themes, all of which were measured on frequency of representation of those terms throughout the qualitative analysis. Next slide please. So, overall utilization of the Loop. Highlights of utilization include that 98% are using it for recreational purposes, often multiple times a week and mostly in the morning. Cycling and walking are the primary uses, and the majority of respondents have a long history of using the Loop, specifically stating they have used it for over six years. And largely, people are really satisfied with the Loop, either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied, with very few saying that they were dissatisfied. We did ask one question specific to safety and whether or not sentiments are "Do you feel safe on the Loop?" 60% responded yes, and roughly 40% responded no. We offered a free text option for that question, for the 40% that responded that they did not feel safe to elaborate as to why. Next slide please. So, Loop improvements. There was a series of multiple

select options in this question, and two offered open text questions. The reason this is relevant is because the rest of the data presentation will be around the qualitative feedback and the input gathering that was done. Overarchingly, people really want some amenities like shading, safety features, water, and enhanced navigation enhancements, so better ways to navigate the Loop, better signage, better mapping. Next slide please. So, the qualitative feedback, as we said, there were three questions that offered free text options. When you aggregate those, it comes up to 1,500 responses across. We know that homelessness and homeless encampments was the number one most frequently occurring term. It could have been the only feedback. It could have been speed of cyclists and homeless encampments. It could have been a series of primary, secondary, tertiary considerations. Just know that we have an entire analysis on homelessness, but the rest of the recommendations we did break out into some primary areas, such as rules and rule adherence, capital improvements and etiquettes. The other represents data entries that were not analyzable. Next slide please. Capital improvements, really central around repair and maintenance, enhancements for multimodal use and expansion of the Loop. Primarily, people really want to see investment in the resource and ongoing maintenance, specifically crack and resurfacing repair. Enhancements such as dedicated paths and multimodal use investments like areas to walk in, areas where higher speed activities can be done uniquely from slower speed activities and expansion of narrow corridors and enhancements of amenities as stated before, such as restrooms, shade, water access, trash. People want to see expansion of the Loop, especially adding bridge crossing where the Loop dead ends if there is ways to connect other jurisdictions or intra urban area access. That was repeatedly brought up and has an opportunity with some of the recommendations we have at the end of this slide deck. Next slide please. Rules and adherence to the rules can be bucketed into two major categories, specifically laws and behaviors, and who oversees the rules and/or laws or lack thereof. Those are the themes by which we are going to do analysis on rules. The comments around the rules tied to homelessness, drug use, crimes, and/or behavior and safety are tied to themes of enforcement. People really prioritize bike patrols, park police or interjurisdictional enforcement of behavior that is incongruous to the law. The other half of these comments were directed around rules around speed. So, how fast can you go? How can you use the Loop? E-bikes, large groups, everyone is going very fast, and that safety component and rules tied around etiquette and the interpretation that everybody has the right answer and no matter what activity you are doing, that is the right way to use the Loop, so posting of regular park rules and etiquette rules. Next slide please. This brings us to etiquette, which I think those that have been overseeing the Loop, involved in the Loop, managing the Loop hear these kind of comments all the time in and around etiquette and safety. Etiquette concerns are not unlike the feedback the County has gotten before on speed, shared use of the amenity, rights of way, and wanting clear posting of etiquette rules. Several concerns were expressed on high utilization days, where several activities are co-occurring. Accidents, who should have access to the right of way, and/or expansion opportunities to promote safety on use. Next slide please. This is where we will dig into encampments and safety. Safety was a large, pervasive priority throughout the survey across all of the qualitative feedback. Themes of homelessness, encampments and safety can be looked at in a few

different coupling of terms, themes, or sentiments. Often, the term was most coupled with trash or need for cleanup and remediation, but primarily homeless and safety were coupled with behaviors such as drug use, harassment and crime or perception of crime. People were more concerned about safety with high acuity behaviors than just the presence of encampments. Drug use and high acuity behavior or harassment was the most coupled terminology together.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: What is high acuity behavior?

SD: When someone is acting erratically. There is a couple different ways that this term emerged. Some could be, "I was harassed, I was assaulted, I had a friend who was assaulted, someone was yelling, someone was aggressive, creepy people came up." Terms like that where we think about the behavior tied to someone. We do not know if that person is homeless, but high acuity behavior that would lead someone to feel unsafe. These themes were routinely coupled with enforcement or wanting more present of some sort of enforcement, but also service connection. I will note that lots of people reported several positive sentiments about the cleanup efforts, about the remediation efforts, and hoping when the visibility of encampments are there, that there is some level of service coordination. There was a lot of good positive feedback in and around the efforts that the County has championed, with the opportunity to bolster more. Next slide please. So, what does this all mean? Several of the priorities have started to action. We have the Loop deployments that have netted several engagement opportunities, both with our Justice Service team, housing solutions, other healthcare opportunities, and several cleanup efforts, which have removed thousands of pounds of trash across the asset. The County is testing and deploying enhanced mapping. Right now, we have a static map. It is difficult to use if you are on a web device sometimes or you are actively recreating. We are developing a GIS non-static map by which you can navigate, find safety features, water features, bathrooms, near amenities. Our Pima County Communications team and ITD team are test running that right now. We are also exploring the development of a Loop app, which would be more recreative based with the ability to connect to our County Be Well program. It would also be able to connect and potentially interface with other wellness apps. The homeless protocol response. I want to underscore how valuable the data has been on encampment reporting and resettlement. This provides us a really good opportunity, especially with the survey results, where we start to see resettlements happen, are there opportunities that are capital improvement based, as indicated by some of the priorities in the survey response, where there are repeated resettlements such as dead ends. Dead ends, we tend to see have a higher rate of resettlement because there is not a lot of activity. So, investment in activation, exploring previous projects that have been designed or developed and seeing what those barriers are so we can start to activate some of these spaces that are underutilized. See Click Fix is also being explored for the reporting of repairs and other Loop problems. Our recommendations. This survey gave a lot of really comprehensive feedback that

could underpin the Loop improvement plan, and I think a lot of really formative work has been done to date by the amazing directors behind me, the County Administration on the future of the Loop and the future expansions and future investments, and how to use safety as a lens. Some of the data that we know around encampments as a multimodal lens by which we can look at investment and expansion with the lens of service provision and engagement of individuals and really think through the strategy comprehensively underpinned by community input. I think we recommend going forward. I think there is a lot of good planning to date that would put a framework of a Loop improvement plan together pretty quickly by the end of 2026, as aligned with the One Pima directives to do a multi-year future look planning effort on continued expansion, but also look at where areas of pain points are. Why is that area closed? Do we have a partner that does not want the Loop expansion there? How do we deal with these high priority zones? Collectively integrating the previous data to date, this planning session, I think is a really good opportunity to discuss proactively engaging and activating the Loop space. I am really excited about these responses. Thank you. Any questions?

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you so much. I appreciate the opportunity to review some of these survey results, Ms. Davis, and I am grateful to my colleagues for the One Pima adoption. It is clear to me that work is in progress. We have now done the important part to listen to the survey responses. However, I want to reiterate that some of the points that we heard in the qualitative feedback are efforts that have been discussed for many years at this point within the Parks and Recreation Department, and also within Flood Control. We really cannot distinguish between the two departments because they kind of have overlap between it. I guess my question first with County Administration is related to the mile markers. Administrator Leshner, can you talk to us about the timeline? Should we be expecting mile markers, which has been at least a three-year conversation with community advocates, or are we waiting until December for the capital improvement plan to come our way?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Cano, you are not going to be waiting that long. Director Shepp, do you have any information? Or perhaps Vic? I know that we have had a lot of conversations about wayfinding and some of the challenges initially about do you put a mile marker? Well, difficult because you do not know from where you started necessarily, but how do we ensure that we take some of the amenities on the Loop and allow people to, if there is a difficult incident, can call 911 and by looking around them or seeing some sort of signage, identify where they are and how they might be able to be found. Mr. Pereira, do you have any update on exactly where we are with some of those plans?

VP: Sure. Supervisor Cano, Board, with respect to the mile markers, that was an initiative that was brought up by our Loop subcommittee, and we actually put that out to the entire team. As far as what was the realistic...could that be done? Right? I do not have an answer for you. I can tell you that we are still working on it. I cannot

give you a date as far as when it is going to happen. There are some barriers to the mile markers. Initially, the Loop subcommittee was talking about putting some designs on the pavement, and that is not really a very good solution. I feel that, from a Parks and Rec perspective, we have adequate signage as far as mile markers on the Loop. Could we improve? Absolutely. We have over 2,000 signs out there on the Loop that are placed at various intersections, but they are at the most populous intersections, and they do provide mile markers as far as X miles until retail, X miles until some type of intersection. So, unless we have a specific, where a segment is lacking mile markers, I feel as the Parks and Rec director, we have adequate signage out there, sir.

JL: New information to me, too.

AC: Administrator Leshner, the importance of the application that has been developed by Communications and our IT team is that I hope that that can be an interactive opportunity for us to rethink how we can respond to somebody in an emergency situation. For instance, if I am on the Loop and I absolutely respect, Director Pereira, the 2,000 plus signs that you have, but right now, if I am on the Loop and I am walking on St. Mary's and I do not really recognize because I am distracted, I am listening to my podcast and I am running, I do not know if there was an emergency, if I can call law enforcement, I cannot send them a geofence of where I am at. I think that what we have to do is not have static signage. I think we have to be a lot more interactive and integrating the safety app and the wellness app into a platform that allows us to, for the most part, everybody is carrying a phone. You scan the QR code. I am with you that the pavement is not going to work, I know it costs us very little to be able to put a sign that is going to be able to serve all of these purposes. I just hope that there is going to be some integration on it. The Loop's safety committee has been asking for this, and I respect that there is both cost and to the advisor's point, the Loop may grow. I do not want to put permanent signs that we are going to have to change in a year or two. But that is kind of what I am asking the Administration to think of, is that there is ways for us to think creatively about this and it has been a few years that the safety committee has been reviewing.

JL: Thank you. I hear you, Supervisor Cano, we will follow up.

ES: Might I say one thing related to that by way of being creative, by way of wayfinding, we are putting...

RS: I apologize. I got a text from Supervisor Christy, who is participating remotely, and he just asks everybody to speak into the microphone because he is having trouble hearing.

ES: That sounds great. We have taken the wayfinding approach and are applying it to the bridges, the tributary watercourses. We will add additional location awareness by way of naming the watercourses. So, in addition to going under the underpasses like St. Mary's or Speedway, you will also be going over Valencia Wash, 18th Street

Wash. We will be putting signs out there over time, so there are multiple opportunities to be able to see where you are with that, do not include mile markers.

AC: Thank you, Director Shepp. Administrator Leshner, can you give us a summary of the Board's and Administration's consideration of the adoption of an e-bike ordinance that would allow for e-bikes on the Loop? Some of the safety concerns that have been mentioned, this Board is going to have to make a decision soon on whether to permit these or not.

JL: Thank you, Chair and Supervisor Cano, I believe the Parks Advisory Commission has been looking at that. Staff has been looking at that for some time, and it has changed a bit, but I know actually, Carmine, when you were still working with the organization, we were looking at revisiting the policy or bringing back recommendations. What is the timeline for that?

CD: Madam Chair, members of the Board, County Administrator, this topic is one that I had a conversation or several with Director Pereira about. So, coming out of the adoption of the Parks Master Plan, the firm that assisted us with doing that also has helped communities with this very issue. We have asked them to help collect a compendium of what other communities are doing around this topic. Currently, our rules do not allow for e-bikes, but we are well aware that e-bike utilization is occurring and that there are a variety of different conflicts that may arise as a result of that. We have been gathering up information from which then to come back to the Board and give some ideas on possible directions to go. I think that the survey, in fact, validated the desire for utilization of e-bikes, so it is something that we have started gathering inputs on and then can come back to this Board with some recommendations on.

SC: Madam Chair?

AC: Thank you, Madam Chair and Director Deputy DeBonis. I have two more questions, and I know, Chair Allen, that Supervisor Christy is wanting to also ask after I ask my questions. Related to the e-bikes, it is my understanding as well that we are waiting on some engagement from the County Attorney's Office on that as well. I hope that we might be able to ensure that the Board is getting proposed ordinances and getting that in a timely manner. The other question that I have is, well, I guess my two last comments will be that some of the things we have talked about: the app, the mile markers, the ability for folks to respond in real time to an emergency and have first responders come out. Those are responding, I think, to the need for additional safety along the Loop, and they are much needed. One thing that the One Pima plan, and remember that it is year two coming up in November, I just encourage this Board to consider ways that we will work with our regional law enforcement partners to ensure that something similar to a bike patrol can be considered in future budget years. I wish we could do it this year, but I recognize that we have a lot of needs, but I do not know how enforcement works if we do not have the bike patrol. That is a message to both us and our external partners to figure out what ways we can do to partner. Because the Loop is primarily within City limits, we are also relying on TPD officers to go into our County assets. I feel like we

need those men and women in uniform to be on the streets and not in our washes and not on the Loop. That is my opinion. My last comment is just I am grateful for it. A big part of the improvements, the Loop is one of our greatest assets and is so heavily used. Some of these improvements that we have heard about today are going to be in the several million-dollar category; shade, water stations, improved safety. I just encourage the Administration to figure out what that proposal and improvement plan will be, so that we can ask voters in a future bond what we can do, but that should not delay the immediate need for action. I think the things that we have heard are super impactful. Thank you. 2,000 people is a big sample, and I look forward to more updates in the coming months. Thank you.

JL: Thank you.

JA: Supervisor Christy, did you have a comment?

SC: Yes, I did. Along the lines of the e-bike. Are e-bikes considered motorized vehicles?

VP: Supervisor Christy, Chair, yes, they are. In Arizona state law.

SC: In my area where I utilize the Loop, there are numerous signs that prohibit the use of motorized vehicles. So, is it safe to characterize the current situation vis a vis e-bikes that they are not allowed on the Loop?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, that is correct.

SC: To Supervisor Cano's point, what type of enforcement is there on that issue, if we do not have adequate law enforcement patrolling the Loop?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, I am going to turn to Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, but I think self-policing is sort of the main way we are doing this. There is no one that we have hired or paid to simply go around the Loop and call in if they see people on e-bikes. We do receive comments from those who potentially had a more negative interaction, but, Mr. DeBonis, is there other work we have been doing with e-bikes on this?

CD: Chair Allen, members of the Board, County Administrator, you are correct. Law enforcement is not enforcing park rules, right? They would enforce laws of the state and the jurisdictions, so it would be self-enforcement. To the point that Supervisor Cano made, if there was an established safety patrol or some other means to do that, there would be more active enforcement. This has been a discussion point, and when we look at the safety aspect associated with e-bikes and risk and liability of it, the convention has been that e-bikes pose a risk or a hazard to other users on the Loop. However, we know that mechanically driven, human powered bikes also can go at great speeds. Also, then a risk potentially is having a rule and not enforcing it. We understand the need to evaluate and reconcile this and come back with some proposal on how we address e-bike utilization on the Loop going forward.

- JL: Thank you, Mr. DeBonis. Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy and others, that is what we hear the most is that we just need to be prepared to come back to the Board and have some recommendations on a policy of some sort for this, because I think the reality right now is that they are not allowed, but it is not policed so we all but allow it with those kinds of rules. So, we will be returning shortly.
- SC: Madam Chair, just to reinforce what the County Administrator is saying, isn't there a pretty good liability exposure for non-enforcement of prohibitions?
- JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, yes, we are concerned about the liability. We are also simply concerned about the physical harm to individuals and pets and other equipment that historically one thing we have found if you get hit by a bike or somebody is walking, there is a certain level of damage that can occur to your person. E-bikes are a different kettle of fish. They are heavier and they could have a much more significant impact on others. So, liability is one of the issues that is causing us to realize we need to deal with this sooner rather than later, Supervisor Christy.
- SC: Thank you very much.
- RS: Chair Allen?
- JA: Supervisor Scott.
- RS: Thank you. A few questions. First of all, to follow up on the points that Supervisor Cano made about a patrol on the Loop. It seems to me that the very presence of law enforcement is a reassurance for a significant part of our constituency and a deterrent for others. We are dealing with interjurisdictional concerns, but I am wondering, Administrator Leshner, if there have been or can be conversations with Mr. Thomure as to what we might do interjurisdictionally to promote more of a presence on the Loop.
- JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, we have not had that conversation specifically. We talked generally about the issues related to the Loop. I hear the message and we will put that on the agenda for our next regular meetings with the City and the County staff and talk about a joint partnership there.
- RS: Well, I appreciate it, because what I hear throughout the survey findings are people feeling...and it was a good sample size, when you have got 40% of respondents saying they feel unsafe on the Loop, that to me is a spur to us to take some kind of action and to take that action in partnership with the City. I do not disagree that there are other safety needs within both our jurisdictions that may be of greater significance than the Loop, but those survey responses ought to prompt that kind of conversation between the two jurisdictions as to what we can do together. Also, we get phone calls every now and then, as Director Shepp knows, about the aesthetics of the Loop, not just the Loop itself, but the Rillito. What are we doing, and feel free to designate whoever you want to have answer this, unless you want to answer it yourself, what are we doing to regularly check for the need for cleanup, not just

along the Loop where it might be a responsibility for Director Pereira and his team, but also along the Rillito, which would be responsibility for the district?

ES: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we have lots of activities that we do along the Rillito as well as on the Santa Cruz. As Supervisor Cano has pointed out in the past, unfortunately, the river is gradient down flow from the City of Tucson and other areas. So, in addition to homeless encampments which leave trash, we have programs for that, we have routine maintenance where we go around the watercourses and clean up encampments. We now have hotshot crews that can come in at a much quicker rate and remove that, but there is just ambient litter that either windblown or waterborne goes into the river. We partner with Tucson Clean and Beautiful and the Sonoran Institute, and we try to have community engagement and get some community ownership in the maintenance of both the Santa Cruz and the Rillito. It is a little bit Sisyphean where every new wind event or new storm event, more polar pops end up in there. We are trying very hard to keep that, but to some degree, there is some source control from the City of Tucson, and we can work with the City of Tucson. They use Tucson Clean and Beautiful to adopt washes and employ more resources in the tributaries, so that debris and trash does not end up in the river either.

RS: And it is the responsibility of your office to coordinate all those disparate efforts? For example, are the Tucson Clean and Beautiful teams letting you know what their areas of focus are?

ES: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we actually send folks to Tucson Clean and Beautiful. So, we have folks who, on their own volition, want to do some cleanup activities and we use Tucson Clean and Beautiful, who has both the resources and an agreement with us, liability waivers, so they are well set up to, and sometimes the projects are specific to the interested party. Other times we plan with them where those activities might be, so it is a little bit of six- and one-half dozen.

RS: Got it. Anything that you wanted to add with regard to regular checks that your team does on Loop amenities?

VP: Yes, sir. Chair Scott, Board, we are there seven days a week out on the Loop. My team is, they are taking care of the cleanliness, the operability seven days a week out on the Loop. What we do is we do not go into the washes, the Parks and Rec staff does not. We essentially go from guardrail to the Loop and everything other than that is in collaboration with Director Shepp and his Flood Control team.

RS: Could we go back to the slide with the recommendations on the screen, please? Thank you. What is the distinction between the first bullet and the fourth one? Because they seem to me to be saying the same thing. The first one says, *"Recommendation to proceed with a Loop improvement plan that builds on previously explored plan capital enhancements, expansion areas."* The fourth one says, *"Update the Board of Supervisors on the framework of a Loop improvement*

plan by the end of 2026, in alignment with One Pima." Are you talking about, I am not seeing the distinction between the two bullets.

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, basically, one is to do it, the other is to report on it. Ms. Davis?

SD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, correct. We would like to come back this year because we are embarking on year two of One Pima, because there has been such formative work already done in some of the expansion enhancements, capital improvements. So yes, the survey underpinned several of the concerns outlined in One Pima and gave us some good tangible ideas. There has also been a ton of formative work, so let us put it all together and come up with a forward-looking strategy that could be multiple years, to get to Supervisor Cano's point, some of these investments will have a cost impact. How are we evaluating what that looks like? What do low-cost recommendations look like? What are things we can activate now? What are longer term plans? We would like to come back and report at the end of this year with some of the strategies that we have already explored and say what the pain points are to the Board.

RS: And then recognizing, as we have heard today, that this work is going to be done in an interdisciplinary fashion, could we ask that that Loop improvement plan touch on the various areas of responsibility for different departments, and also how frequently they are talking with each other about enhancing collaboration? Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair...

JA: Hold on, I am sorry, can I note that we are now, stating the obvious, we have been joined by Supervisor Heinz.

MH: I am present and would like to speak.

JA: Please do.

MH: Thank you. And sorry if I missed some of this because I was late. The Loop is four jurisdictions, right? There is a bit in Marana. There is a bit in Oro Valley, obviously quite a bit in Pima County and in the City of Tucson. So, how do you all interact? This is starting to feel like a PAG meeting just because we are getting, and maybe that is something to think about. But if there is, whether it is cleanup or an encampment or secure, whatever is going on, how, okay, here is the border, so, do you just pick that up or do you call someone or what? How does that work exactly with all those other jurisdictions?

VP: Supervisor Heinz, Board, yes, sir, we have a quarterly Loop meeting that is chaired by my team. All the jurisdictions are present. All the players in Pima County are present. And this is where we talk about just what you mentioned, cleanup efforts,

special events along the Loop, major infrastructure repair that is happening, capital improvements, it is all discussed quarterly basis. And all the jurisdictions have a say and input, and it is chaired by my team.

JL: If I may, Chair Allen and Supervisor Heinz, to that, regardless of its location, it is our asset. The difference depends on whether law enforcement is called in, what that jurisdiction is, but the cleaning and the maintenance and that sort of thing, it is not another jurisdiction's responsibility on our asset.

MH: Okay, thank you.

ES: The only other thing that I would add, and I think this might resonate with Ms. Darland, but we know who is responsible for the day to day operation and maintenance on the Loop, whether or not it is Marana, Oro Valley, Pima County, etc., but then you have tributaries and you have areas adjacent to the Loop that do impact the Loop. That gets a little bit complicated sometime about who might the responding law enforcement be and things along those lines. Because on the Rillito, it is pretty complicated, you go into Pima County, you go into the City of Tucson, you go into Pima County, and so that does take a lot of coordination and Ms. Darland is actually pretty great at trying to resolve that problem.

JA: I will call on myself, I guess. Yeah, no, you have said enough, but first of all, thank you for both of your teams. I encounter the Parks and Rec team on the golf course, cleaning things up and keeping things moving. Also, in the partnership with Flood Control, had participated in a lot of the riverbed cleanups and some of the tributary cleanups and just appreciate that work. I think that the challenge around e-bikes, as an example, they are an example of one thing that is not allowed on the Loop. Similarly, we have that same issue, whether we are on our conservation land system, if we are at any of our parks, there are things that are prohibited. There are hours, there are types of things you should and should not be doing, and we simply do not have that kind of ongoing capacity to be enforcing all rules at all places at all times. That said, I think the Loop is a little bit different than a park and a community center because there is so much use. We are not the only community with an amazing multi-use path system. I was just in Boulder recently and they have hundreds of miles of intersecting multi-use paths. I was in Chicago sometime; they have also got some paths systems. I am going out to DC next month and I am going to be sitting down with folks that have a ranger program in which they have folks on bikes that essentially do a bike patrol, but also bring with them, they have got some water, they have got some food, they have got bike repair tools with them, and they are able to then call first responders as needed. I guess it is a long way of saying, have we looked into some of the other systems used by other municipalities that have Loop programs or a Loop like ours that can address the variety of needs that we have? Well, my concern about a traditional Loop patrol is that we are putting folks out on the Loop who are trained officers, and they are not somewhere else. A lot of the needs on the Loop are for water, it is dehydration, it is a flat, it is some of these other needs and we are using the wrong people for the wrong need the majority of the time. I guess the question is, have we looked at what other municipalities, other folks are using? Can we do more research into the types of

Loop bike patrol programs that are out there that might address the myriad of needs that people have when they are recreating.

VP: Chair Allen, Board, yes, ma'am. So that is actually part of the e-bike study. One of the requisites is for BerryDunn to analyze other jurisdictions here in the continental United States that have similar multi-use recreational paths, so we can glean information from them. If they did make the transition to e-bikes, what did they do? How did they improve the safety? How did they establish the adherence to the rules and the changing of the behavior? So yes, that will be part of the e-bike study that we are kicking off here within the next 30 days.

JA: Okay, but just to be clear, what I am talking about, in DC, for example, is like park rangers or something. It is not run by the municipality. It is a separate organization that gets a grant from the municipalities, and they have got folks on bikes that also have little trailers, and they have got all these other amenities with them. That is part of the e-bike study?

VP: They will be making formal recommendations on some type of bike patrol, park patrol for Parks and Recreation.

JA: Great, thank you.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Forgive me for not mentioning this earlier, but I recall that the Board authorized the expenditure of a small amount of funds to have a VetSec presence on the Loop, and Mr. Stuckey shared a report with the Board on the findings of VetSec in terms of their general impressions and also hot spots on the Loop. I would like to ask the County Administrator, when you are following up with Mr. Thomure, if you could incorporate some of the input that we got from Mr. Stuckey and his team. I think that would be helpful. Thank you, Chair Allen.

AC: Chair Allen, I just wanted to have some closing thoughts. There is really several conversations happening at this point. On the enforcement side, there is capital enforcement involving capital E enforcement with police entities, and that is responding to criminal activity. That is responding to somebody who is in the middle of a bike lane, a pathway blocking, drugged up. Then there is also just the little E enforcement, which is related to, is this person on an e-bike or not, and people to people disputes that just come with using a public amenity that does not have that. So, I believe that Chair Allen's point about a bifurcated approach is going to be really important. I love the idea of ambassadors who are there from a wellness perspective, because that would be something that would go in alignment with the app that we are creating. It is boosting the culture of safety. The point that I wanted to make for the conversation with Mr. Thomure, Administrator Leshner and colleagues, is that One Pima right now is focused on cleanup along the Loop in the Santa Cruz and the Rillito. We have removed almost 500,000 pounds of trash since

adoption of the Loop. That is of particular importance because it shows action. This current budget that we are proposing for that we are considering for next year includes an additional allocation for those cleanup efforts. I believe we got it wrong in the original adoption of One Pima in that we focused on the collector, which is the big river washes and big riverbeds, where basically all of the trash is going, instead of having the conversation about those tributaries in the inner-city washes, that ultimately is how we are getting this build up in the large bodies. I do not believe we have a regional coordinated effort on Tucson Clean and Beautiful coming up, on our County employees coming in, on our City employees coming in. And maybe that is year two, is figuring out how we do it. I would like some greater clarity on what the additional Flood Control allocation is and how we are going to be spending that to support cleanup efforts, and that can happen in a follow-up, but I thought it was a great conversation. There is nothing but pride ultimately with the Loop and I think we have got to remember that. It is on this Board to also reassure the public that we are taking their responses seriously and that we are following through with action. I do not know of any other jurisdiction that has picked up half a million pounds of trash in less than six months, but we have. That is huge. Thanks.

JA: Thank you all.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

11. Presentation

Arizona Commerce Authority (ACA) Second Generation Opportunity Zone Designation Process.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator
HVC: Heath Vescovi-Chiordi, Director, Economic Development

JA: We are going to quickly move on to Addendum Item No. 5. This is a presentation about the Arizona Commerce Authority Second Generation Opportunity Zone Designation Process. I am going to have to limit that to five minutes. Then next will be our Climate, and that will also be limited to five minutes.

HVC: We will get that presentation queued up. Chair, Vice Chair, while the presentation is coming up, thank you for the opportunity. I am just going to do a quick speed run presentation on the Arizona Commerce Authority Opportunity Zones 2.0 process. Opportunity zones are a statewide incentive that are being developed right now. What are they? Effectively, these are federally designated lower income census tracts where private investors will receive federal tax credits and incentives on long term capital investment and development. 2.0 authority comes from the One Big Beautiful Bill that was passed by the federal government, and we are moving forward on a new ten-year designation for opportunity zones throughout the State of Arizona. For rural communities, there is an increased benefit. Investors will receive a 30% exclusion on eligible deferred gain. Then as of July 4, 2025, there is a lower threshold of 50% of improvements in rural areas. This incentivizes more development in rural areas where there are opportunity zones. As far as general benefits, we are talking deferral of exclusions on deferred gains, as well as a ten-year exclusionary period for those gains as well. And then the Arizona context, we are going through the 2.0 process because there was approximately \$2.65 billion that were invested because of the result of the opportunity zone's first process. Next slide please, if there is such a thing. No worries. Pima County's role in this process is well attract eligibility. We have identified 12 eligible tracks that Pima County is responsible for choosing among. We get to choose 25% or three tracks to make a recommendation to the State, which then goes up to the Treasury for certification. The geographic scope in nature is unincorporated Pima County area or incorporated municipalities of 10,000 population or less. The City of Tucson is going through its own process, specifically with opportunity zones that have been designated and identified for them to choose from. There are a couple of different

eligibility criteria for you guys' reference on the slide, which I think we move forward maybe two. There we go. Option A is median family income of 70% or less of the metro's median family income. If you are in an MSA, or the state's MFI if not an MSA, or poverty rate at or above 20% and median family income at or below 125% of the MSA median income. Next slide, and next slide. In order to engage with stakeholders, we actually created a survey. We had that out for about ten days. We received 78 responses. Here is a quick snapshot of some of those responses that we received. It just breaks down who was responding to this survey and what types of information they provided, which is if they were aware of projects that might be eligible for the tracks, if they named any specific sites or if they had specific projects in mind. Next slide please. One thing, next slide, that we also engaged in is a quick analysis through Development Services of the zoning and entitlements for each one of these tracts. Through that analysis, we identified four that we are calling a first choice based off of investment potential, zoning flexibility and planning alignment. You can see all of those right here. Next slide please. Then there is a series of the remaining eight, which we are considering alternative tracks or alternate tracks. Those are ones with a little bit more complex development opportunity when it comes to land use constraints, entitlements and things of that nature. Next slide, and next slide. One other thing that we did was we tried to reconcile this with the community revitalization areas that were passed by the Board of Supervisors to see if there is an additional overlap there to effectively stack incentives. You can see right here that five of those twelve eligible identified tracks actually have CRA overlap, so that just adds additional benefits to the potential selected opportunity zones. Next slide. Next slide. And through the rating methodology, effectively what we did was we just took all of this information based off of what the Arizona Commerce Authority provided us, as well as what we received in those data sources and through the survey to basically talk about investment readiness, infrastructure and zoning, rural opportunity zone eligibility, incentive stacking, and things of those natures to identify which ones are the most readily available for investment within the next five years. Next slide please. So, we did come up with a preliminary track recommendations. Next slide. You can see those three right here, 4115, 4626 and 4512. This is because there is a combination of ease of ability to be able to invest in these regions, or in these areas I should say, as well as the alignment with the community reinvestment areas as well. Next slide. These ones are the preliminary recommendations for alternates as we previously identified, so these three are not as easily developable but still maintain some merit in consideration for the opportunity zone selection. Next slide. With that, there is a series of next steps. Definitely receiving information and requests of information for this Board, collecting additional input from the Board through the 15th of June. And then further staff evaluation on track selection, and then effectively transmitting that selection to the County Administrator for consideration, and then eventual transmission to the Arizona Commerce Authority for authorization with the Treasury, which is due on June 19th. With that, my presentation concludes, I will take any feedback that you have.

JL: Thank you, and Chair Allen, I might suggest, I know this is not agendized for action, but any direction that might be provided, for example, the staff recommendations do not include anything in rural Pima County. Also, South Tucson is on an alternative

site. If there is feedback and discussion from the Board about perhaps swapping out, as an example, one that might have been initially listed as a recommendation in the foothills or something, if the Board had any interest in looking at a rural or South Tucson location, we would certainly appreciate receiving that feedback.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I think what is missing, Administrator Leshner, is District 5 as well, and that could be District 5 on the list of recommendations. It could be that there is primarily a lot of that need is going to defer to the City of Tucson. If anything, what I would like is for us to get a report on what those City of Tucson areas are going to be. In terms of deferring to Mayor and Council, there are areas of unincorporated District 5 where County resources do not end up, and it is a growing part of our community that is on the southwest side, so I encourage us to invest in District 5.

JA: Then one clarifying question. I think I read that the priorities are for areas that are experiencing under development, right? Not necessarily new development, is that correct?

HVC: That is correct, Chair.

MH: If I may, Chair, quickly. What made South Tucson an alternate versus a primary or preferred recommendation? Just curious.

HVC: Chair, Vice Chair, simply because it is in its own zoning jurisdictional area, so we do not have jurisdiction over the zoning there. We are not necessarily unfamiliar with it, but you would have to go through an additional process with the City of South Tucson to facilitate development. That does not necessarily mean that it is off the table by any stretch, but that was the original thought process there.

MH: Do we have an IGA for development services with them?

JL: [nods]

MH: Okay, great. I would like to see that elevated if possible.

JA: Final thought. Right now, it is structured three priorities, three alternate. Does it need to be structured that way?

HVC: It does not, Chair Allen, Vice Chair. We actually can select as many up to three as we want. Those three are really up to the selection and feedback based off of the Board's feedback that you have just given right now.

JA: Well, thank you very much.

HVC: Thank you.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I just wanted to ask what goes into the additional staff evaluation that was mentioned?

HVC: Chair, Vice Chair, Supervisor Scott, if we do additional evaluation, it would effectively be identifying all of the different overlap for any of the additional tracks that you would like to recommend. Instead of them being alternates, we would go through a much more thorough evaluation process to see where overlap is, what the specific zoning is, what infrastructure looks like in those areas, and identify the longer term developability versus how quickly you could actually facilitate development within a five-year period.

RS: And just to follow up, I am gathering that that staff analysis will be based on which tracks are most likely to be selected based on federal criteria.

HVC: Chair, Vice Chair, Supervisor Scott, yes, sir.

RS: Alright. So, Board input is certainly helpful, but you are going to distill that Board input based on what your professional analysis determines is most likely to be approved?

HVC: That is correct, sir, yes.

RS: Alright, thank you.

JA: Thank you. My final note, please, just for future slides, several days before the meeting.

HVC: Yes, Ma'am.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Presentation

Federal Medicaid and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) cuts.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen

MH: Supervisor Heinz

SC: Supervisor Christy

AC: Supervisor Cano

TC: Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director Public Health, Pima County Health Department

JA: I am going to go first to Dr. Cullen. This would be Item No. 6 on the study session addendum. This is a presentation on the Federal Medicaid and SNAP cuts that we have requested.

TC: Chair Allen, members of the Board, we are going to give you an update on the local impact of federal policy changes for SNAP and AHCCCS. This is a very quick snapshot. Before I start, I want to let everyone know that this is a very moving target. The numbers keep changing. If you read a number in the paper and you look at our numbers, they may not match. If you read a number from Kaiser Family Foundation, it may not match. In addition, CMS on June 1st released a fairly significant rule that is currently in the process of taking comments until the middle of July. The reason why this is important is that it will significantly, the way it is currently written, limits the concept of medical frailty, which is what we had been working with the State and with AHCCCS on. I just want to reiterate that this is a moving target. We are going to see where we end up. We will have more information as we go along. Next slide. So, initially these slides are really designed to remind you that H.R. 1 passed resulting in these changes. We are anticipating being the coordinator for a response both within the County as well with our partners throughout the County, which will be primarily the healthcare systems, as well as community-based organizations that are ensuring that people have adequate enrollment in both SNAP and AHCCCS. Next slide. In your handout, you have two slides related for SNAP and two for AHCCCS. This gives you a sense, and I am not going to go over it, what the difference is between before H.R. 1 and after H.R. 1. These are really designed to help you understand the tremendous potential impact. ABA is an able-bodied adult, and you can see that used to be for 18 to 54 and now that is expanded for 18 to 64. The income calculation is really critical because that is how people have traditionally qualified for both SNAP and AHCCCS and you can see the deductions that have been removed. I am not going to go through all this, but the most important thing is really this proof required for income and work activities. I want to preface that discussion also by saying, we have no idea at this point how people will document, who will be able to document, how documentation will be submitted to the state level, and what verification will have to occur at that level. That is true for both SNAP and Medicaid as we move along. Next slide. The next slide is really designed to show you the percentage

change in Pima County. That number is real. There is almost a 50% decrease in the number of SNAP households. SNAP individuals are the addition of the adults and the children, so you can see who is primarily being affected. You can see that even if you did remain on SNAP, you have had a significant decrease in your benefit. We were talking with Mr. Holmes right before this. We want you to know that we are working on this at this current time. I am going to go into the plan later, but we do continue to enroll families in WIC. As you know or may not know, we have had an increase of 2,000 individuals enrolling in WIC in the last year. Once again, kudos to the County and the Board who continue to supplement the amount of funding that is required for WIC. We do have a Pima County referral form that we have pushed out probably maybe three and a half years ago now, in that you can ask for food assistance. If you ask for food assistance, we refer you to DES, and we do work closely with Dan at CWD, who has the ability to help people enroll and see whether they are eligible for SNAP. Obviously, there are additional tools that we need to be using as we move forward in this. Next slide. The next slide is now once again very similar to the first slide you saw about AHCCCS eligibility and reporting requirements. It somewhat follows what we had before. The able-bodied adult is once again an issue here. Those are people that, at this point in time, and this may modify, need to have 80 hours of work, volunteer, education and/or perhaps a few other things when they go to seek reenrollment in AHCCCS. Once again, both SNAP and AHCCCS are rolling enrollments, so not everyone will be affected in December or not everyone has already been affected with SNAP. If you had had an enrollment and your enrollment period has not happened yet, that is when this will become implemented for you. Next slide. The next slide gives you a sense of the projected AHCCCS impact. This is the one where the numbers are really all over the place right now. That is because of medical frailty. It is because of who is an able-bodied adult. We do believe if you look at the statewide estimate of 190,000, Pima traditionally is about 15% to 18% of that. So, we believe we will be at the 25,000 to 35,000 adults who will be subject to the new AHCCCS work requirement. The reason why it is not everybody is there are individuals that are still able, without meeting the work requirements, for instance, American Indians and Alaska Natives, though we do have reports that they are falling off the rolls right now. We talked with the deputy director at DES and the deputy director at AHCCCS. That is unintentional if it is happening, but there are reports of that, especially from the tribal communities. Next slide. I am now going to flip to the response for SNAP and AHCCCS changes. Next slide. I did talk briefly already about SNAP, but we did want to put this in the context of the Prosperity Initiative, which I also realize is on the agenda today. And you can see reducing poverty for families with children. Obviously, our concern is that the impact of SNAP and families falling off of AHCCCS will have a negative impact on that, which is one reason we are presenting this, to show you ways that we believe we may be able to mitigate part of the impact of this. However, if you think that 49% of the people that were on SNAP and Pima County have subsequently fallen off, there may be a point at which our mitigation is inadequate and insufficient to ensure that people have the resources that they need. Next slide. You had this in a memo that we did send out, we just want to reiterate for you that we have a proposed action plan. We anticipate that the first workgroup meeting is scheduled for June 19th. And you can see the three coordinated parts of this response in the memo that you received are many more

details than I am going to share with you today. Next slide. So, the action plan highlights are this; really ensure that we have support for enrollment. There have been reports that people are so disheartened that they are choosing to believe that they will not qualify for both AHCCCS and/or SNAP due to the changes that have happened. We do anticipate that the State is going to come out with a communication campaign specifically to target individuals to say, *"You may still be eligible, please reenroll or continue to consider enrolling."* And so, we will be working on that. We do have enrollment assistance, and as you are aware, we have trained our CHWs to be enrollment assisters. They will be working with El Rio to get additional mentoring to ensure that they can appropriately assist in enrollment. However, what is important to note is they are not enrollers, they are assisters. The final enrollment both for SNAP and AHCCCS, because it is a distribution of federal dollars, occurs only at DES and/or AHCCCS itself. They are the ones that push the switch that say yes, you are enrolled. However, the enrollment assisters can ensure that at the time the application goes in, it is complete. What we know is that there is significant delays right now. For DES, it is probably 90 days. For AHCCCS, it is even longer. Even though they have to respond to a submission within 90 days. What we are hearing is that at the end of that 90 days, people are then being told that something is missing, so they have to get that together. So, navigation resources, communication, referral pathways for clinical screening, food insecurity, referrals. I talked briefly about community resource navigation. However, once again, at the end of the day, this implies that community resources will increase to respond to the need that is occurring. I am not sure that we have that all lined up yet. Next slide. The next slides are just briefly going over the goals, and you can see streamline the access redetermination process. That means working with the state as well as working with our eHealth enrollers to assist that. Navigation and renewal assistance, analyze the trends and identify high risk populations. The State DES has given us an opportunity to request specific Pima County data that just came through this morning or maybe yesterday morning, so we will get at that and really try to ensure a seamless transition. The one thing that is missing here is the number of people that have fallen off of the Affordable Care Act subsidies in the State and in the County. That is another group of people because the subsidies decreased, there is the anticipation that hundreds of thousands of people are going to elect to not renew that. Those people will not be eligible for Medicaid because of their income. So, 140% of poverty. Now you get that up to 300% of poverty that had subsidies. Those subsidies have decreased significantly. We are tracking that. We have not paid a lot of attention to that at this point. Next slide is food insecurity, access to nutrition, which we talked about already. The SNAP eligibility requirements monitor the trends. I think this is that first slide I showed you with the almost 49% falling off of SNAP, there have been some chatter that perhaps we were not seeing that many people fall off. That is a real number. What we believe is some people may have had some SNAP benefits that were still in reserve and so, we have not seen the full impact of that yet in the community, especially seeking additional resources from the food providers that are there, and really ensuring that we work with alternatives which are fairly minimal and emergency food options. Next slide is goal three, which is really to prevent these future gaps in food security. SNAP has already happened. AHCCCS will happen in December and/or January. Once again, it will be a rolling falling off of AHCCCS. We will try to ensure that we

have a communication campaign that is adequate and we have worked with people. The first time you need reenrollment in AHCCCS, you need to have 80 hours of work, volunteer work, education in the immediate one month before that. We will then be going to a six-month reassertion that you can enroll. It is unclear at this point whether that six-month period at that time, whether they will only go back one month. They do have the prerogative to go back six months and see if every one of those months you were able to meet that requirement. And next slide. This is the action plan. Once again, you guys have this. I do not think I have to go through this. It does have a March start date because that is when we started looking at this and trying to anticipate what we thought the impact would be. And next slide. What the Board can expect from us. Hopefully some mitigation of what we are seeing. Something more than just the number of encounters we are having. I think the WIC numbers are foretelling, however, the fact that WIC has gone up 2,000 in the last 12 to 14 months is a significant indication and remember that those are numbers of enrollees. Those are not households; those are individuals that are enrolled. Next slide, and that is it. Sorry, I know I went really fast. I apologize for that.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you. Three questions. Why are we so good at people falling off of SNAP in Arizona? Aren't we the best State in terms of those? I think it is terrible, but 400,000 statewide. If that is not, maybe that is not fair, but I am just curious why were we so, why?

TC: Supervisor Heinz, Chair, remember both of these are related to the error rates and that if the error rate was in a certain period, the state would have to pay more, take up more of the federal cost of the benefit. However, when you talk to...the only person I have talked to is the deputy administrator at SNAP, it was because they implemented immediately. You are aware that the governor did do additional funding to go to SNAP so that they could hire personnel. They understand that there needs to be some mitigation of that. The other thing, though, is that there is a real delay in terms of the backlog right now, but I do not know that I know the real answer.

MH: Okay. Additionally, I was doing some calculating there but based on the numbers that you had up there, it looks like we were spending almost \$26 million. Well, SNAP is federal, but it was about \$26 million a month that was happening, and now that is down to just over \$11 million a month based on the new numbers. If you multiply that \$14 million by 12, we are basically losing \$178 million a year for people that used to be getting SNAP benefits. I just want everyone to understand that there is no way the County, the City, the State, nobody, I mean, community food banks, they are not making up for this, right? I mean, is that correct?

TC: Supervisor Heinz, I have not done that math. Thank you for doing that. I do believe it will be very difficult for the nonprofit, the community-based organizations and/or local government to compensate for the losses that are being incurred.

- MH: Thank you. Lastly, Chair and Dr. Cullen, how quickly can this be undone? I am hoping and anticipating that there will be a different Congress that might want to change things around a little bit, even with the existing president, if he is still around. Say something happens the first or second week of January next year to mitigate some of this, how quickly can we expect that some of these families could see some assistance?
- TC: Supervisor Heinz, members of the Board, I do not feel like I can comfortably answer that question. What it would require is a rebuilding of some of the infrastructure that currently exists. I think it is important to note that right now, because we do not know how to document the 80 hours, which is also required for able body, we are going to see a lot of changes, I think. I do not know the answer to that question.
- MH: That is fair. Thank you.
- AC: Chair Allen?
- JA: Supervisor Cano.
- AC: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. I want to start with a comment that we are already seeing the impacts of SNAP benefits going down in Pima County. I think there is really two different conversations, right? You have got folks who are in support of H.R. 1 saying these are requirements that should be expected when somebody is getting a public benefit. I think the most alarming data that you have sent to us in your correspondence is that we have lost SNAP benefits for 30,000 children in Pima County. Children who are not able to work, to my knowledge. Can you, Dr. Cullen, tell us about what the impacts are to children when they do not have access to food, just qualitative information?
- TC: Yeah. Supervisor Cano, members of the Board. What we know is that nutrition, especially early childhood nutrition, is critical. It is critical not only for physical development but for brain development. There are many historical and peer reviewed studies that have indicated that the impact of the malnutrition and/or inadequate nutrition early in life stunts growth, stunts brain development, and it cannot be recovered later in life.
- AC: And, Chair Allen, Dr. Cullen, can you then also tell us about what the impacts, with knowing what we already know, 30,000 kids without access to nutrition and 30,000 disenrolled already in Medicaid, H.R. 1 is conveniently packaged so that a lot of the additional restrictions are taking effect after the November midterm and on January 1, 2027, the dates that you included in your information. What are then the impacts to our region when people do not have healthcare or food and particularly children?
- TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, Chair Allen, this is a really critical question. I think the impact are to the families, to family disruption, to increasing poverty, to increasing issues within activities, for instance, in school, children will go who are not adequately fed at home because there is no SNAP benefits there anymore. However, I think the large impact that we all need to look at is the economic impact, the economic impact on the healthcare system. People that are ill still seek care. That care will now become uncompensated. The healthcare systems

are increasingly concerned about that. In addition, I think from a societal perspective, there is this societal disruption that occurs when families are no longer able to get the resources that they need in order to sustain health and wellness. The fear here is, especially in light of the Prosperity Initiative, that the work that the County is doing, the work the Health Department is doing, CWD is doing, everyone in the community is doing, will be negatively impacted by decreased resources. I think the numbers that Dr. Heinz shared, which I trust his math, but I have not done, are significant because not only is there a decrease in the funding to the community, those funds, from a SNAP perspective, are funds that are then spent at the grocers. They are spent to buy food, and that income for that grocer, for that provider is no longer in the system at all anymore.

AC: Thank you, Dr. Cullen, Chair Allen, colleagues. I think the last question you answered it, which was going to be related to uncompensated care because that trickle-down effect, ultimately everybody pays for that. We have got to find a way to really urge our federal administration to be aware of the negative economic consequences that happen when this takes place. I strongly feel that there is a small sentiment of people, a very, very small sentiment of people that think this is a good thing and that H.R. 1 is a good thing. It is my opinion that when you attach 60,000 adults unenrolled in federal benefits, plus 30,000 in reduced children benefits, you are already talking about 100,000 residents that are going to be impacted in Pima County by these changes. That is 1 in 10 of Pima County's population. And so, for those who are saying boo hoo, I think we have got to raise the alarms to figure out how we are going to deal with 10% of our population struggling to both get the healthcare that they need and the food that they should have access to. It is very alarming, and I urge all of us to reach out to Congressman Ciscomani and to send to our federal delegation all of the impacts at a local level of H.R. 1 to our region. Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Hi Dr. Cullen, I just have a quick question. It is my understanding that the Tucson Unified School District has a meal program for its students. I am not certain, but I am of the understanding that it is year-round. How does the TUSD meal program impact the SNAP program as far as providing food for young kids?

TC: Supervisor Christy, Chair, members of the Board, you are right, and they are not the only school district that has that. I think that there are multiple school districts, and I can get that information for you. The funding for that is independent of SNAP, so families that are eligible for the school lunch and/or breakfast program remain, if they were traditionally on SNAP because they qualified, would have continued to get SNAP benefits. That does not offset or modify any of the SNAP benefits that that family is eligible for, because they are two separate programs.

SC: So, if you are on the SNAP program, you cannot be eligible for the school meal program? If you are on the school meal program...

- TC: Excuse me for interrupting. Supervisor Christy, no, you can be eligible for both. And some of the programs are breakfast and lunch or after school even, so, the school-based program, you can be eligible for that, and you can be concurrently eligible as a family or an individual for SNAP benefits.
- SC: So, there is other outlets or opportunities for meals other than just the SNAP program?
- TC: Supervisor. Christy, yes, that is correct. People can retain their eligibility for the school-based programs.
- SC: Do you know how many are on the school program meals as opposed to the SNAP program?
- TC: Supervisor Christy, members of the Board, I do not, but we will get you that information.
- SC: That would be great. I would appreciate it. Thank you, Dr. Cullen, thank you, Madam Chair.
- JA: I was just looking up, I have also heard that there were cuts to the school-based food programs as well. That they have not gone without getting a tax as well, and so there is less funding for those programs is what I have heard. I do not have the data, but I do not know if you do.
- TC: Chair Allen, I do think that is true. We also know that there are cuts to the WIC program in terms of availability for things like fresh fruits and vegetables. We will get all that information back to you and the Board.
- JA: Okay. I did just pull up very quickly that in 2025, \$1 billion in funding for school meal programs and local food procurement was cut. Anyway, I would not trust more to come. I wanted to add before we wrap up that first, a big thank you. The research, the report that you all did, the action plan with it was tremendous. I really appreciate that work and the specificity and the timeline. I think it was a great report. The questions that I have, and maybe it is something because we are short on time could be just a follow up in future conversation. It is just about the uniqueness of rural communities because of issues related to transportation, internet connection, just lack of community centers, organizations, you name it. I just want to understand more about the working group and the degree to which the members of that working group, maybe a little more of who they are and the way that their tentacles are going to reach out to all the far corners of Pima County so that our rural communities have the opportunities to be able to participate in ways that folks in the urban areas do, because it is just so hard to get volunteer hours in the rural areas. I guess my other question that is related to that, given that in a lot of our areas in District 3, it is the Pima County libraries, the Pima County community centers and the Parks and Rec. It is a lot of our facilities that are the core hubs in the communities, and so I would also like to understand how other departments are going to be part of this and giving shape and form to people being able to comply with the new volunteering requirements or work requirements. And what we are doing, which is not to, I love that the Health Department is leading on this, as you

should, but I also just want to see a little bit more about how others are participating in it.

TC: Supervisor Allen, members of the Board, Celia has ensured and done lots of invitations to those other departments. We believe that they will be critical to not only perhaps offering volunteer hours but also helping inform and be a place where other individuals who the Health Department does not interact with have an opportunity to at least become aware of enrollment and other issues. At that first meeting, multiple other departments have been invited, and the hope is that we will be able to tease all that information out. From the rural perspective, as you know well, the community health workers will be playing a really critical role in those areas to be the eHealth assisters for enrollment. Obviously, at some point, because most of that is internet dependent, there is a secondary dependency on that last mile of digital infrastructure that the County has been working on to, but we can make sure in next reporting cycles that we specifically address what the interactions and the impetus will be in the rural areas.

JA: Then the final question, and you do not have to answer it now, but just for something to learn more about is just the budget for doing this. If it is existing resources or able to advance this plan, or if there are gaps in what is needed to be able to implement to the extent necessary to meet the need and the demand.

TC: Supervisor Allen, I would say right now, we believe that we can develop a plan and implement what is currently in the plan with our eligible resources that are especially some that are coming in the '26/27 budget. I do not anticipate, however, that we have resourcing that can mitigate the individual impact of the loss of, for instance, food stamps.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Dr. Cullen, I am really looking forward to getting more information on the school district program as well, but I do think we have to remind ourselves that school usually is going to end at around 2:30 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. I am sorry but then saying that there is already a program for a student, a child at 8:00 a.m. the next day where they can get fed. That gap in time, what is the calculation on that time anyway, 15, 16 hours? It just seems a little insensitive that, you know, our school districts are the ones that are going to be tasked with having to carry that burden absent federal intervention.

TC: Supervisor Cano, members of the Board, there is also the weekend and holidays. So, there are multiple times.

AC: Thank you. I forgot about that.

JA: Thank you.

TC: Thank you. I just want to give a shout out to my staff who have done amazing work, so thank you for letting them sit with me.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

13. Update on the Prosperity Initiative

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen

RS: Supervisor Scott

AC: Supervisor Cano

DS: Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development

HS: Helen Schaffer, Community and Workforce Manager II, Community and Workforce Development

JA: Just to state it for the record, this is an update on the Prosperity Initiative. This is the Study Session Addendum Item No. 7.

DS: Chair Allen, members of the Board, good afternoon. Thank you. It is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Helen Schaffer of the Prosperity Office of Economic Mobility, which spells POEM for those of you who like acronyms. She is going to give us an implementation update on the Prosperity Initiative. With that, I would like to turn it over to Helen.

HS: Thank you so much, Dan, Chair Allen, Board members, County Administrator, for providing time to discuss the Prosperity Initiative this afternoon. Next slide please. So, we are going to use this time today to update the Board about the implementation approach. We will talk a little bit about the policy framework, then go right into how we are embedding Prosperity Initiative into the organization, really into the DNA of the organization. It is bringing us back to a broader framework as a collective whole, which we think will be useful in terms of conversations that are planned with the City and others in the future. Ultimately, this is about how we continue to organize ourselves and our work so that low-income families with children are at the center of that effort. Next slide please. As you are aware, the policy consists of thirteen components to it and organized around four areas. Housing, work, health, education are the main areas, and the focus is on generational poverty reduction. Again, focusing in on low-income families with children, the entire content is evidence based, of course, and the Board passed the policy in December of '23. Next slide please. So, the approach to implementation, of course, is determined by the policy content itself. Unfortunately, it is quite comprehensive and robust, and it includes ten specific Board of Supervisors' directives. I want to call your attention to that third directive specifically, which describes operationalizing and institutionalizing these policies across County government. In other words, change is what I see there. It is about changing how we do things, making improvements to how we do things in a particular way. So, it is quite broad. It could be described even as ambitious in its scope, bold and ambitious in its scope. It is really asking us to do this work at scale. Across the entire organization and in a manner that is sustained because it is generational in its

impact. We need to do things that are not simply for today or tomorrow, next week, but really to embed these sorts of changes within our operations and organization so that they last, so it needs to be sustained. So how do we do that? Well, there are three main levers that we use. One would be change to culture. One would be change to policy and then the third, operations. Next slide please. Just to give you some sense of what that entails, operations budget cycle, for example, selecting Prosperity Initiative alignment. When departments are requesting their budgets, they are able to select Prosperity Initiative as one of their items making their budget requests. That enables us to then direct resources toward Prosperity Initiative work. If we cannot identify it, we would not be able to direct resources accordingly. Policy change, one example would be Outside Agency Grant Program, as you know, that policy governing that program was modified so that we are embedding Prosperity Initiative ideals into the RFP and the application so that we can fund Prosperity Initiative consistent work. Finally, culture. An example of that would be training, resources, tools, so that departmental staff can make decisions consistent with Prosperity Initiative. Okay, so this is all setting up the framework. Now let us get to some exciting emerging discussions that we have been having. Next slide please. So, what is alignment? What do we mean by that? That is a filler word almost that we talk about. When I started in this role, I thought, we are using this term a lot and I am not exactly sure what it means. It seems like government speak or a bit of jargon, so what does that really mean? Our Deputy County Administrator, Steve Holmes, has taken the lead in these conversations we have been having as a group. He has led us to think about what are we talking about when we say alignment? What does that actually mean? We started to put some details on that to figure out what is this actually involving so that it is centered around low-income families with children, and that is what we are looking at, right? How does this type of alignment generate impact in terms of reduction in poverty? Well, let us take a look on the next slide, please. Prosperity Initiative alignment means, and this is coming from the policy itself, it is not new, we did not just make this up. It is guided by the policy framework, but it is just pulling that out so that it is more clear and explicit in terms of actually moving forward on implementing. Okay, so low-income families with children receive County services that are streamlined. When we talk about something being streamlined, it is really from the perspective of that person who is receiving the service, who is participating in the program. So, it is from the perspective of the low-income community member, the parent typically, in this case, who is coming in for services, who is saying, "I want to sign up for something, I need assistance, I want to participate in this program." Is that an experience that is difficult or burdensome? Can we cut the red tape, basically? Let us see if we can do that, make it easier, or are we causing additional administrative burdens? The researchers call it that, so let us make sure we are not doing that. Let us make it easy right when we can. Second, let us make sure we are prioritizing that group of people, low-income families with children we need to be able to prioritize. Third, let us include people when we can. Let us not make programming or services that are happening in a vacuum. Let us make sure that we are bringing folks in and engaging them when we can to help inform the decisions that are being made about their lives. Again, these are broad principles, right? We are sketching out here the type of framework that we can apply across this organization and to other organizations. That is what this is about, so that we have agreement on those basic

terms. Then you can fill in the details from that position, because sometimes we get way into the weeds and into the details, and we are not in agreement about the overarching ideas, which makes things difficult. Finally, low-income families with children are served by effective programs and services, because that is the premise of this policy, is that we are using what works and not continuing to put effort and resources into things that are not effective. Next slide please. Examples of each of these, and I will not go into every detail here to keep things moving, but essentially, we are looking here, from the top, streamlining wraparound services, super important, warm handoffs. We had previous conversations just today describing these things. Making sure that we are not siloing, that we are connecting people, that we are working together, sharing information so that folks are not left to wonder what the next step is, but we are guiding them toward that. Conversations around those things. Policy driving other policy changes, capital investments. When we are making huge investments, when we can prioritize low-income neighborhoods, engage community members ask, what is going on in your neighborhood? What would you like to see? How does this impact you? What are your needs, etc. It is not to say these things are not happening now, they are for sure, but how can we strengthen, improve and so on, including engaging family members, engaging community members, especially in high need areas. We are looking forward to the capital improvements. I covered that one. It is an emerging new policy. Finally, I will just touch upon PEEPs as a great example of one evidence-based program which does have research support backing it. That program regularly reports out on outcomes, outputs, so the data is available to substantiate its effectiveness. Next slide please. Just a few notes. This framework is centering low-income families. It is organized by the desired result we want to see rather than starting with what we are already doing, which I think is a beneficial way to move forward in particular, when we are starting from different, perhaps siloed organizations or siloed programs, we can then be focused on the same sorts of goals together. That openness also, I think, is part of how innovation often happens, because the framing is opened up so that we can think about the different solutions that might be available, rather than starting with where we already are. We need to go somewhere different, so how do we do that? Let us look at the problem, move toward a solution together. I think that that is consistent with the goal of being creative and innovative. Finally, as I mentioned, operationalizing these is going to...this involves some refinement. There needs to be strategies developed around these things. As the Board is aware, we provide detailed reporting on all of the various different components of the work. That is not to say that those are not continuing and that we are not going to be providing the Board with those details of our fulfillment of all ten directives and the other pieces of the work at all, but just simply offering a framing that is around low-income families with children, and some of the key goals about this concept of alignment. That is all I have. Thanks very much. Happy to answer questions.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: If we could go back to what PI alignment means, that slide, it seems to me that what we are looking for more than anything else is effectiveness. I appreciate that the

PEEPs program was touted as an example, but I am wondering if the Board can get more information as to how we are operationalizing effectiveness because I keep coming back to something that the County Administrator said in her memorandum to the Board when we were asked to consider the Prosperity Initiative, which was that the two greatest measures of success were going to be decreasing household liabilities for families in poverty and increasing their assets. I think effectiveness is really the barometer that we are going to be looking at more than any other, and the measure of effectiveness is going to help to determine prioritization of resources.

HS: Yes. Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, I appreciate that question. Surely effectiveness is key in terms of how we go about measuring that. We do have a set of impact indicators, which are the long-term measures of overall community wide regional effort. These are things like housing affordability, child poverty, overall poverty, so these are the broad measures of the overall community wide effort toward the Prosperity Initiative. Of course, you also have outcome measures that are tracked by individual programs. An example for PEEPs would be third grade reading score. That is an outcome that is not directly linked to the program. It is a measure that we would anticipate is going to improve because of participating in PEEPs program. We are in the process of identifying those specific metrics for program level or smaller level. At that smaller level that is linked to the longer-term overall community wide goal. You are entirely correct that we need to do what is effective and also part of what is effective, I would suggest, has to do with engaging community members. Engagement is linked to effectiveness as well. And we can also measure how well we are engaging. For sure those are things that are top of mind for us as well.

JA: Supervisor Cano, and then I do want to just flag for my colleagues, unfortunately, that we are running out of time and we have two more presentations.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I believe that the Prosperity Initiative is one of the most important documents in our region, and I invite you to be very honest and open with this Board when things go a little south in the coming months. We just had a difficult conversation about impacts to our federal funding, and that is going to hurt low-income children, low-income families, but we have got to stay focused. I think the same way that data that is difficult to absorb is just as important as the data that is critical when we are celebrating our wins. I would love to see more information on the PEEPs data, because I have been asking and have not received information as to how, at this point we have got a program in operation for several years, and so we can track if that student stuck with us as a recipient, what their third or fourth grade level reading is at this point. I know that there is research happening, but it just has not made its way to me. I was on the phone yesterday with a major employer, who shall remain nameless, that will be making a major gift to the PEEPs program, because they are recognizing the County's contribution to this on early childhood education, while also supporting childcare costs, which are increasing. Also, the reason why I say that is that we cannot have a program that stays stagnant at \$10 million for PEEPs, it has to continue to grow because I want it to be as universal, eligible as possible, because that is smart for our region. I know we are limited on time, but I hope all that makes sense and look forward to more information.

DS: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, that absolutely makes sense. I firmly agree with everything that you are saying, and you have our word that we will give you the good and the bad, letting you know where we need to beef up things and where we are making success. Thank you.

JA: Thank you both. I think our office will just follow up separately with some follow up questions, but really appreciate the presentation.

DS: Thank you, Chair Allen. Thank you, members of the Board.

DRAFT