

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 16, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Jan 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 10:00 a.m. He participated remotely.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Lindsey Curley, Librarian I, Community Engagement Office, Downtown Library, Many Nations Committee.

3. CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Supervisor Cano congratulated Jazlin Ladriere, District 5 staff, who had recently accepted a new position with Congresswoman Grijalva, as a Legislative Assistant on the House Natural Resources Committee. He stated that Ms. Ladriere was a Tucson native who graduated from Pueblo High School and received her BA in Latin American Studies with a Minor in Mathematical Science from Smith College. He indicated that following graduation, Ms. Ladriere joined the Peace Corps, serving in the Dominican Republic where she held youth workshops, taught literacy and life skills, and engaged in community driven development.

Supervisor Christy acknowledged Mica Mountain High School for their State Championship in football. He stated that this was a great accomplishment, a great statement for the team and perseverance for a new high school on their back-to-back championship which set a record for the school.

Supervisor Allen wished everyone a Happy Hanukkah, Solstice, Christmas and Kwanzaa. She stated that the Town of Ajo held an annual Christmas Eve celebration which was a tradition that dated back to 1916, and that the event was supported and sponsored by the Ajo Rotary Club, Ajo Gibson Volunteer Fire Department and the International Sonoran Desert Alliance. She stated that Winterhaven provided a light show throughout the neighborhood, which was also located in District 3 and she encouraged people to go and visit.

PRESENTATION

4. Alan Young, the District 2 Commander for the American Legion, Department of Arizona and members from the Stadium District to present a plaque to the Pima County Board of Supervisors in recognition of their partnership in the repair and maintenance of the monuments at the Korean War Memorial site. (District 2)

Alan Young, District 2 Commander for the American Legion, Department of Arizona, presented a Certificate of Appreciation to the Board and staff from the Kino Sports Complex. He stated that the Veterans Memorial and Gold Star Family Memorial had been vandalized and he worked with the County to restore and repair the site.

No Board action was taken.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Bill Buckmaster, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, December 30, 2025 to be: "BILL BUCKMASTER DAY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Kathy Walter, President, National Letter Carriers Association (NALC), Branch 704; Michael Moriconi, President, and Connie Sadler Nelson, retired President, American Postal Worker Union (APWU), Tucson Area Local 255; Anthony Zamorano, Tucson President, and Bernie Gonzales, Local Union 320 President, National Postal Mail Handlers Union (NPMHU); Susan Naugle, State President, and Russell Ayres, Assistant District Representative, Arizona Rural Letter Carriers Association (ARLCA), proclaiming the day of Tuesday, December 16, 2025 to be: "U.S. POSTAL SERVICE WORKERS' DAY"

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

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Mark Cardenas addressed the Board regarding his support for Beale Infrastructure and noted that union trades had built Arizona's infrastructure. He stated that the project would be fully union-built, it provided good wages, benefits, training, and opportunities for local families.

Fernando Lebron on behalf of SMART Local 359, expressed support for Project Blue. He stated that it created local, well-paying union jobs and that the project invested in Tucson's future by building careers, apprentices, and delivering quality facilities with local union labor.

Will Fostel stated that holographic routing technology reduced energy use compared to current data center routers. He encouraged the Board to support building the world's most energy-efficient data center in Marana.

Rory Jones expressed support of Project Blue as a benefit to Marana while he encouraged the Board to protect the desert environment and invest in advanced, sustainable technology. He stated that it would provide long term benefits for future generations.

Linda Kraemer stated that refugees in Pima County relied on federal benefits and IRC health services to access food, medical care, and stability. She indicated that cuts to those services would increase health risks, food insecurity, and strain on the healthcare system.

John Wood addressed the Board and described how SNAP benefits were crucial for refugee families' food security and integration, and outlined major challenges in the DES system. He stated that SNAP support helped refugees stabilize, find jobs, and contribute to the community and taxes.

Katrina Martinez highlighted how refugees' path to self-sufficiency depended on legal and employment support, including assistance with status adjustments and job placements. She stated that delays or confusion around work authorization hurt household stability, increased reliance on public benefits, and limited workforce participation.

Glenda Avalos expressed her opposition to the data center, citing community harm and minimal local benefits compared to corporate profits. She encouraged unity to protect the environment and quality of life for future generations.

Jonathan Dailey commented that Project Blue would provide union members and their families with stable jobs, healthcare, and career opportunities.

Jason Sangster stated that Project Blue would allow their members to work close to home, keeping families together and building a skilled local workforce. He

encouraged the Board to approve the binding agreement that satisfied community concerns on water and power.

Vivek Bharathan expressed his opposition to Project Blue and raised concerns about the Sheriff's Axon contract, including AI costs, drone use, data sharing, and accountability. He urged the Board to delay approval until those issues were fully addressed.

Judge Sara Mae Williams addressed the Board regarding their failure to hold Superior Court accountable and for bypassing local control, leaving her court with outdated systems despite her repeated requests for support. She stated that the issue was about power, not performance, and called for decisions affecting her court to be based on facts rather than allegations.

Betsy Wilkening expressed her opposition to Project Blue, citing high water and energy use, minimal local jobs, and insufficient benefits for future Tucson generations.

Robert Reus opposed Project Blue since it would raise electricity rates and strain water resources. He stated that the project prioritized profits for a few over the needs of the majority and urged the Board to reject it.

J.P. Salvatierra urged the Board to reject data center projects like Project Blue and Copper World. He stated that special interests and private profiteering could unlawfully exploit public assets, and that the Board must act within its legal authority to protect the public trust.

Gabriela Laz expressed his opposition to Project Blue, and that the jobs were short-term while long-term costs and water depletion would burden the community. She urged the Board to act as stewards of the City, preserve resources and reject corporate exploitation.

Kathleen Drener expressed her frustration with six months of advocacy against Project Blue, highlighting misleading promises, lack of transparency and unanswered health concerns. She thanked Supervisors Cano and Allen for their support.

Jon Ralston addressed the Board regarding the land sale for Project Blue, that while it offered short-term economic benefits, its long-term impacts, such as high water use and potential misuse by companies, could harm the community.

Joe Abbott expressed support for the infrastructure project. He highlighted that it would create thousands of construction jobs, permanent positions, significant tax revenue, and would keep workers local.

Florence N. Johnson urged the Board to vote against the sale of county land to Beale for a data center, citing excessive electricity use, rising utility costs, and

environmental risks from nuclear energy. She also expressed her opposition to funding for the Sheriff's partnership with the FBI and Axon.

* * *

Chair Scott indicated that Call to the Public had reached the one-hour limit.

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

* * *

Kathy Thomson addressed the Board regarding opposition to the hyperscale data center stating that it would harm desert, strain resources, and would mainly benefit corporations. She encouraged the Board to protect the land and future residents.

Isabel Garcia expressed opposition to the acceptance of \$50,000.00 from the FBI, and that it could target local families under the guise of combating federal crimes. She criticized Project Blue, it offered temporary jobs and would harm future land and communities.

Cora Peterson expressed opposition to Project Blue, highlighting Amazon's withdrawal and Beale's lack of guarantees, and that it would harm community resources.

Raye Winch stated that Project Blue could harm health, the environment and strain the electrical grid. She urged careful review and community accountability.

Julie Dittmer requested clarification from the Board on whether transferring the land title for Project Blue by December 25, 2025, was mandatory or discretionary. She stated that signing the deed was a separate legal act from the approval of the purchase agreement and must be done transparently in public.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Allen requested that the County Administrator communicate with Chief Justice Timmer regarding the Ajo Justice Court to clarify the appeal process for Judge Williams. She stated that Judge Williams worked hard to keep the court functioning despite challenges with the historic building and unreliable electricity and deserved the opportunity for a proper review.

8. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Cano and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," and Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to convene to Executive Session at 10:00 a.m.

9. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:02 a.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding legal considerations relating to the County adopting an unpaved roads ordinance.

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

11. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to convene to Executive Session at 12:07 p.m.

12. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:45 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding consideration of Binding Memorandum of Agreement with Humphrey's Peak Properties, L.L.C.

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

14. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Dewey-Fields, et al. v. Pima County, et al., C20242165.

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

15. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3), for legal advice and discussion regarding an update on federal law enforcement activities.

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

16. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding an update on SB1500.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

17. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Jennifer Flores, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. St. Andrews Drive, Tucson, December 31, 2025 from 10:00 p.m. - 10:05 p.m.

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

18. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 360852, Omar Luis Solorzano, Salad Nation, 6425 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

19. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 361327, Aashma Adhikari, 7-Eleven No. 46263A, 6855 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

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

TRANSPORTATION

20. The Board of Supervisors on December 2, 2025, continued the following:

Hearing - Code Text Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2025 - 32, of the Board of Supervisors, relating to Traffic and Highways (Title 10); creating a new Section 10.37 Unpaved County Roads, to regulate certain unpaved county roads to maintain health standards for Air Quality.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to close the public hearing, remove the item from the agenda and proceed as discussed in Executive Session. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen stated that she felt staff could come back with an item that accomplished the goals of protecting air quality throughout Pima County while doing it in a way that protected the long term health of the community.

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Allen highlighted two key things from the Board of Health (BOH) meeting, their discussion about the public health environmental assessment of data centers and Johns Hopkins had offered to collaborate with the Health Department in developing the public health assessment tool for the heavy waterpower users that related to the due diligence of the ordinance. She expressed excitement for the outside perspective and collaboration. She stated that the BOH had unanimously voted for the Health Department to present their research for the proposed unpaved road ordinance, and that the Board of Supervisors had not heard their presentation on this day, but hoped it would be presented in the future with the incarnation of the ordinance and that they would learn more about the public health impacts of heavy truck use on unpaved roads.

Chair Scott asked the County Administrator to follow up with the newly renamed Metropolitan Education Commission regarding an update on the leadership of the commission and its new configuration.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

22. 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.

23. Medical and Dental Insurance for County Employees - Fiscal Year 2026/27

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that the proposal to the Board was adoption of the medical insurance rate for the following year and that there were

three elements. She stated the first was the amount that employees were charged, which was about 13% of the overall cost of health benefits. She stated that the rates for employees were not increasing but would be maintained at the current rate. She stated that the second element was approval of the continuation of the healthy lifestyle premium discounts. She indicated that an employee could get up to a \$50.00 discount per pay period by living a healthy lifestyle, answering questions periodically, and not smoking, which would bring the total employee cost of health insurance to \$9.93 per pay period. She stated that the third element was employees enrolled in the high-deductible plan, to provide \$1,000.00 for employees enrolled as individuals and \$2,000.00 for families or employees with other coverage as well, it helped toward their deductible. She stated that it was being utilized, and there were funds of about \$22 million that were saved in all accounts combined with the average balance of a little over \$4,000.00. She reiterated that the recommendation was for approval of the medical benefits package that was described, which included the continuation of the current rate, the \$50.00 per pay period for the healthy living program, and the County's HSA contributions.

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to approve the following recommendations as detailed in the County Administrator's Memorandum dated December 16, 2025:

1. Continue the current FY 2025/26 medical premium equivalents through FY 2026/27 as detailed in Table 3.
2. Continue offering up to \$50.00 per pay period for participating in the HLPD Program.
3. Continue County HSA contributions as detailed.

No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Allen stated that she was glad this was being done since it was important to keep costs low for employees. She asked if they could elevate another benefit in the new year, the employee loan assistance program, Kashable. She stated that people were overextended after the holidays and that it was a very useful program. She asked that they do what was needed for it to be pushed up in January and encourage employees to utilize it. She expressed appreciation for the wellness program and noted that she was only 5,000 points away from hitting the 70,000 mark that would make her eligible for a gift card.

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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

24. Final Plat With Assurances

P24FP00015, Verano, Section 10, Block 1, Parcel G/H, Lots 1-157 and Common Areas "A", "B", "C", and "E". (District 2)

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

25. **Final Plat With Assurances**

P24FP00016, Verano, Section 10, Block 1, Parcel I, Lots 1-78 and Common Areas "A", "C", "D", and "E". (District 2)

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

26. **Final Plat With Assurances**

P24FP00017, Verano, Section 10, Block 1, Parcel J, Lots 1-115 and Common Areas "A", "B", and "C". (District 2)

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

27. **Final Plat With Assurances**

P24FP00018, Verano, Section 10, Block 1, Parcel K, Lots 1-130 and Common Areas: "A", "B", "C", "E", and "F". (District 2)

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

PARKS AND RECREATION

28. **Parks and Recreation Master Plan**

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission recommends adoption of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

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

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

REAL PROPERTY

29. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 400.82 acres of vacant land to the National Park Service, located north of Gates Pass Road and east of Kinney Road within and adjacent to the Saguaro National Park; Tucson Mountain District, without public auction, in the amount of \$2,964,000.00. (District 5)

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

30. Belvedere Terrace, L.P., Newport SW, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Belvedere Terrace Gap funding for affordable housing, extend contract term to 1/1/27 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400002972)

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

31. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Emergency Eviction Legal Services Emergency Housing - Rehousing Assistance, amend contractual language and scope of services, contract amount \$113,222.00 decrease, to allow that funding to be used to cover cost overruns, capital improvements at The Craycroft (formerly Knights Inn) (CT_24-468)

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

Chair Scott questions why these were being advanced and asked for a status report on both The Craycroft and any impact it would have on the EELS program.

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, stated that this was an amendment to the Arizona Department of Housing grant that they received and was up in June, and that part of it was to provide towards the rent of The Craycroft and to also work with Compass Affordable Housing to rehouse folks out of The Craycroft. He stated that they had got off to a slower start, and with the funds that had been allocated from the Board, they had been going through at a better pace and housing people more quickly. He stated that staff worked with Compass Affordable Housing and the City of Tucson to reduce the rehousing budget and put those funds into the capital needs at The Craycroft. He stated that some upcoming projects may include filling in the pool, adding a playground, or adding a fire system. He stated that overall, it was one of, if not the best run shelter in Arizona, and that more than 90% of participants left to positive destinations. He indicated that in the most recent report for November, the number increased to 96% of people that had positive exit destinations. He added that The Craycroft remained an integral, successful, and thriving part of the EELS program.

Chair Scott asked if The Craycroft dealt mostly with families.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative. He stated that it also included the elderly, individuals who did not fit into traditional congregate settings very well, and those who had been referred to by Constables.

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

32. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for Emergency Eviction Legal Services - Emergency Housing - for operation of The Craycroft (formerly Knights Inn), extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, Arizona Department of Housing - S.B. 1720 Homeless Shelter & Services Fund, contract amount \$113,222.00 (PO2400003500)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 31, for discussion related to this item.)

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

County Administrator

33. City of South Tucson, to provide for an intergovernmental agreement for fire and emergency medical services, total contract amount \$1,200,000.00/4 year term (\$300,000.00 per year) (PO2500038417)

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Allen to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors Meeting of January 6, 2026. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Scott stated that the County Administrator had requested this item be continued and inquired about the reason for the continuation.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated that a question arose regarding if there were County lands within the City of South Tucson, to ensure that they had a legal contract.

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

Facilities Management

34. Stratford Art Works, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide a Joint Development Agreement for renovation of Teatro Carmen, extend contract term to 12/23/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$37,500.00 (PO2400016708)

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

Procurement

35. Axon Enterprise, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for tasers, body cameras and data services, extend contract term to 1/31/36, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$45,000,000.00 (SC2400001268) Administering Department: Sheriff's Department

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

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 6, 2026.

Sheriff

36. Federal Bureau of Investigations, to provide for a Cost Reimbursement Agreement to partner with federal law enforcement to detect, investigate and prosecute crimes against the United States, contract amount \$50,000.00 revenue (CT2500000077)

Chris Nanos, Pima County Sheriff, explained that the contract was for crimes against children and that for decades it was known as Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC), which was housed with one detective in the sex crimes unit. He reiterated that the intergovernmental agreement had been in existence for years and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) would reimburse them up to \$50,000.00 for overtime costs. He stated that the unit usually had \$10,000.00 to \$12,000.00 a year in overtime on those cases. He stated that it had nothing to do with Homeland Security Investigations or connections to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). He stated that 40 years ago when he was in sex crimes and they had child pornography, videotapes of child pornography were found behind a closet door on a search warrant, which had advanced to the age of the internet, and that no longer existed. He explained that as a result, they constantly received calls from out of state police departments who notified them that someone in Tucson was selling or purchasing child pornography. He stated that they would look up the IP and issue a warrant, collect the computers and download to that law enforcement agency for those cases. He stated that although very rare, they existed in Tucson. He stated that this was strictly for child predators and the money was strictly for upkeep of upgraded equipment since they used technology to complete their investigation.

Supervisor Cano asked Sheriff Nanos to reiterate that this particular item may just be grossly misworded on the agenda as it related to the fear and the separation of families that community members were currently experiencing related to ICE and HSI. He asked if this was what the Board was considering with this item.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he had recently received an email from someone concerned about him going against his own policies of not working with ICE. He stated that before Trump was in office he always contended and stated that they

would never work with ICE on immigration issues. He stated that ICE was its own entity, they had a tough job to do, but that was not the Sheriff's job. He stated that the Sheriff's job was about keeping the community safe and that they would never work with ICE like they did with any federal agency. He stated that if they had a case that impacted this community, they would work with them on that but it had to deal with local state laws only. He stated that ICE had no one in their jail, and he refused that and they always had a good working relationship with the Sheriff. He stated that he spoke with the former Assistant Special Agent in Charge routinely and helped each other out. He stated for example, they may come across some migrants with children without parents, and they called on the Sheriff for help, and he would contact Department of Child Safety and they would take custody of those children and make arrangements for those children to be with family. He stated that when it came to the recent raids, for example, ICE had done exactly what they needed to for the Sheriff's Department and they did what everybody in law enforcement did, de-conflict dangerous situations. He stated that when his narcotics team completed a search warrant, those could be dangerous. He stated that if they were in the middle of the City of Tucson, they should be contacting the City of Tucson Police Department (TPD) and they communicated with them in case they needed assistance or gave them a courtesy call. He stated that they had no incidences with ICE.

Supervisor Cano thanked the Sheriff for demonstrating a true pulse of leadership for the community on this particular issue and wanted to ensure that the public knew that for this particular contract, this was an existing resource that had been available for the Sheriff to be able to go after the bad actors hurting children on the internet, and that it was a reimbursement for up to \$50,000.00.

Sheriff Nanos stated that was correct and it had no ties to immigration, but they might find migrant children, and in that case, they would at least work with the consulate. He stated that they had a duty to report to the consulates of several countries around the world when they learned of someone in their custody.

Supervisor Allen stated that the contract made reference to the Southern Arizona Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking task force. She asked how this task force and the ICAC were related to one another.

Sheriff Nanos responded that communication flowed across the nation and there was certain information that the Sheriff was obligated to produce, called inlets. He stated that it was the National Crime Information Center and they put that information out. He stated that this was another task force they could receive from the ICAC information on something they might have knowledge about. He stated that they were a member of ICAC which would assist them. He reiterated that this item was for reimbursement of overtime and stressed that it had nothing to do with immigration and his team was well aware of his position and would contact him before getting involved in that kind of position.

Supervisor Allen commented that when she had spoken to Sheriff Nanos he stated that this was for reimbursement of overtime up to \$50,000.00 and there was one deputy relevant to it.

Sheriff Nanos responded in the affirmative, one detective was assigned to the ICAC team and a part-time backup detective. He stated that however, if they did a search warrant for someone, they needed several detectives present, these might require some overtime. He stated that any of those bodies would be submitted for reimbursement of overtime. He stated that he did not see it growing much more than it was and that the FBI and Drug Enforcement Agency were always asking for the Sheriff to belong to a task force but they did have that kind of staffing. He stated that they wanted to help them because they helped each other and gave them information that they would never be able to obtain. He indicated that state and local partners also worked with the same team, TPD had two or three detectives assigned to their ICAC, Oro Valley, other agencies and Department of Public Safety.

Chair Scott stated that the memorandum of understanding that Supervisor Allen referred to between the FBI and the Sheriff's Department looked like a template they used with child exploitation and human trafficking task forces around the country.

Sheriff Nanos stated that the verbiage used was taken from that template to be put on the agenda. He stated that they could do a better job of cleaning that up because they knew that the FBI might be involved in human trafficking, but ICAC was not. He stated that ICAC might find something like that, and if they did, they would definitely get ahold of the right authorities, in this case, the FBI. He stated that this was not their mission, their mission was child sex crimes across the internet.

Chair Scott stated that specific to the Southern Arizona Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking Task Force, the signatories on the agreement would be the FBI, the special agent in charge, and himself. He asked if there were other Southern Arizona entities that were considered to be part of this task force.

Sheriff Nanos responded that he could speak for them as to what their roles were. He stated that he knew TPD had a presence like the Sheriff did with the ICAC task force, but did not know if that extended to that long acronym task force.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

37. Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources (STCER) Grant Program Funding Recommendations

The Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee and staff recommend approval of the following STCER awards:

Food Assistance Service Category

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Food Pantry and Clothing Closet/\$75,000/\$25,000
Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona/Emergency Food Assistance/\$75,000/\$57,000
Compass Affordable Housing/Your Healthy Home Market (YHHM)/\$25,000/\$25,000
Friends of Robles Ranch/Robles Ranch Food Bank/\$30,000/\$25,000
Greater Vail Community ReSources/Emergency Food Program/\$25,000/\$25,000
IMPACT of Southern Arizona/Outside Agency Food and Clothing Banks/\$40,000/\$25,000
International Rescue Committee, Inc./Food - Outside Agency Program Job Readiness Training and Medical Case Management/\$75,000/\$25,000
Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona/Critical Nutrition Access for Vulnerable Adults/\$44,000/\$25,000
Portable Practical Educational Preparation Inc./Amado Youth Center Food Project/\$27,500/\$25,000
Sahuarita Food Bank, d.b.a. Marana Food Bank & Community Resource Center/Emergency Food/\$30,000/\$25,000
Sahuarita Food Bank, d.b.a. Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center/Emergency Food/\$45,000/\$25,000
Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/Enhanced Support Services of Southern Arizona/\$75,000/\$25,000
Amistades, Inc./Pima County Community Development Block Grant - The Leaders in Action, Youth Prevention Program (2013-2021)/\$34,000/\$0
St. Luke's Home/St. Luke's Home Nutrition Services/\$75,000/\$0
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$675,500/\$332,000

Housing and Utility Support Service Category

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Emergency Assistance - Housing & Utilities/\$75,000/\$29,000
Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair/\$75,000/\$29,000
Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/MAP-A-Plan Program For Basic needs (Shelter/housing, utilities, emergency food boxes)/\$40,000/\$25,000
Interfaith Community Services/Emergency Financial Assistance (EFA)/\$75,000/\$57,000
Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern Arizona/Financial Wellness and Emergency Financial Assistance/\$34,691/\$25,000
Our Family Services/Common Unity Program (CUP)/\$75,000/\$25,000
Our Family Services/Family Shelter/\$75,000/\$31,000
International Rescue Committee, Inc./Housing/Utilities - Outside Agency Program Job Readiness Training and Medical Case Management/\$75,000/\$0
Pima County Community Land Trust/Emergency Mortgage and Rental Assistance/\$75,000/\$0
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$599,691/\$221,000

Transportation Service Category

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Transforming Health through Transportation/\$35,000/\$25,000
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$35,000/\$25,000

Legal Services Service Category

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

Step Up To Justice/Emergency Legal Services: Housing and Consumer Protection/\$47,000/\$29,000
International Rescue Committee, Inc./Legal Services - Outside Agency Program Job Readiness
Training and Medical Case Management/\$75,000/\$0
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: ~~\$47,000~~ \$122,000/\$29,000

Medical Expenses and Related Needs Service Category

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

International Rescue Committee, Inc./Medical Expenses - Outside Agency Program Job Readiness
Training and Medical Case Management /\$75,000/\$0
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$75,000/\$0

Multiple Service Categories

Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group/Food & Clothing and Senior Support/\$35,000/\$28,390
Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona/Refugee Emergency Assistance for Families/\$75,000/\$34,000
Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Casa De Respiro/\$65,000/\$29,000
Pima Council on Aging/PCOA Rights and Benefits/\$50,000/\$29,000
Salvation Army/Short-Term Crisis & Emergency Program/\$75,000/\$25,000
The Primavera Foundation/Homelessness Intervention and Prevention (HIP)/\$75,000/\$30,000
Tucson Center for Women and Children, d.b.a. Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Flexible Financial Assistance for Domestic Violence Survivors/\$75,000/\$31,000
Youth on Their Own (YOTO)/YOTO Program (Stipends)/\$40,000/\$25,000
Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Pio Decimo Childcare Program/\$50,000/\$0
Child & Family Resources, Inc./Home Visitation Programs in Pima County/\$75,000/\$0
Chicanos Por La Causa/Healthy Aging: Supporting with Food, Housing, Utilities, Transportation, Referrals/\$75,000/\$0
CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$690,000/\$231,390

STCER GRANT PROGRAM SERVICE CATEGORIES TOTAL: ~~\$2,122,494~~ \$2,197,191/\$838,390

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that Community and Workforce Development (CWD) Department worked with the Outside Agency Committee, that a few weeks ago, the Board, in response to a significant increase need for a variety of reasons, created this Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources (STCER) using 10% of the additional Fund Balance. She stated that the outside agencies met and reviewed a huge number of proposals that were before the Board for recommendation regarding the allocation of those initiatives.

Supervisor Allen stated that there were about 38 applications received and scored by the outside agency using a new points and matrix system that the committee put together, designed to account for some disparities around rural applicants and some urban applicants. She stated that they talked with some of the committee members to hear how this kind of dry test run of the new system went and folks felt like they were able to develop really good consensus amongst committee members and were able to move forward applications that worked through the process. She thanked the committee and CWD staff for moving this forward so quickly. She stated that it was tough and there were many organizations that did not get funding, and that they would have loved to fund more, but her understanding was that this

was potentially the first phase of many crises, perhaps, to come. She stated that she was proud that they were able to react quickly and be able to meet some of the needs of the community.

Supervisor Cano echoed his colleague's comments and commended his colleague from District 2 for his leadership on bringing the idea to this Board for consideration. He stated that as a result, they had a citizen driven process, with money out the door to support some of the most vulnerable residents in Pima County. He stated that this was exactly the type of response that was needed in a time of such uncertainty, with cuts at the federal and state levels. He thanked the Outside Agency Citizen Review Committee, and CWD staff for the quick turnaround. He asked the County Administrator to keep the Board informed about a second round in as early as February, before the end of the year, and allow the Board to make a second round in March or April, if there were available funds from the same pot of funding. He stated, if possible, to come back with that recommendation in February, March review, and April distribution but only if they had the capacity to do so as things could change in that time frame. He stated that he wanted to celebrate nearly \$1 million in resources going out to provide food and emergency assistance to Pima County residents.

It was moved by Chair Scott to approve the program funding recommendations, as listed. No vote was taken at this time.

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, asked which two amounts would be approved.

Chair Scott apologized since he forgot that Ms. Manriquez mentioned that to him and asked for her to share that information with the Board.

Ms. Manriquez stated that there were corrections to two of the listed amounts. She stated the first correction was to the Legal Services Service Category, Category Subtotal, which currently listed \$47,000.00, it should be \$122,000.00. She stated that the second correction was to the STCER Program Service Categories Total, it currently listed \$2,122,191.00, it should be \$2,197,191.00.

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

Supervisor Cano stated that it would be helpful if the County Administrator could work with the CWD team. He stated that there were a lot of folks that were not funded, and his guess was that it was strictly a financial decision because there were limited resources that were available. He stated however, if there was going to be an opportunity for scoring, those that did not score high enough, if it was aligned to the Prosperity Initiative, or if there was not alignment to an emergency criteria, in the proposal that he did think it would behoove them to do some kind of technical assistance or feedback to each one of the organizations. He stated that he felt as though the entities would not have applied if there was not a need and currently

there was no additional help going out the door. He stated that what they could do was, in that same process, hold hands with some of these organizations and look for continued additional funding opportunities. He stated that most importantly, if there was a second round, he would rather have that conversation earlier than later, but he firmly believed that this was a matter of a limited pool.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 3-1, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay,” and Supervisor Heinz abstained.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

38. **Proposed Settlement in Dewey-Fields, et al. v. Pima County, et al.**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Dewey-Fields, et al. v. Pima County, et al., C20242165.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

39. **Binding Memorandum of Agreement Houghton Data Center Project**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of Binding Memorandum of Agreement with Humphrey’s Peak Properties, L.L.C., a single purpose entity of Beale Infrastructure, outlining Community Benefit Commitments by Beale Infrastructure in connection with development of the Data Center Project known as Project Blue.

Contract

Humphrey’s Peak Properties, L.L.C., to provide a Binding Memorandum of Agreement Houghton Data Center Project, no cost/perpetual (CT2500000087)

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

Supervisor Cano provided the following statement, *“I want to acknowledge the two groups who joined us today. To our union members, I see you and I respect you. We need more good paying jobs in this region, and my door will always be open, especially to apprentices and training programs, because I know that we can grow opportunity the right way. We will disagree on Project Blue, but I will be here for you and the trades for many more chapters in our shared work. I look forward to many of our union brothers and sisters staying closer to home and providing for their children and families after this land sale closes, and to the community leaders in red, the No Desert Data Center Coalition. Thank you for your leadership and for your organizing. For the last six months, you have made our community proud, learning about the impacts of Big Tech and communities across our Nation. You have brought those lessons learned here to our own backyard, and you have made*

lifelong friends as organizers. Thank you. Throughout the United States, communities are warning us what happens when governments approve massive data center deals without enforceable guardrails, harm to public health, strain on water and energy, and residents losing their right to say yes or no. We cannot rush deals like this for short-term gains because the costs do not stay short term. They linger in our bodies and our neighborhoods and in our public trust. This weekend, I attended the unveiling of a community mural on Tucson's south side. It carried the names of neighbors and loved ones who are no longer with us, people we lost after decades of exposure to contaminants in our aquifers, contamination tied to decisions made by powerful institutions, our government, the Air Force, the Air National Guard and private defense contractors that remain a major part of our economy today. This mural took me back to where my public service began as a teenager in the Sunnyside High School auditorium, sitting through an air quality permit hearing led by Pima County fighting for beryllium monitoring because a plant next to our schools was poisoning the air and remembering that my grandmother worked there, was exposed there, and ultimately lost her life to the very harm we were begging government to mitigate. Our community has lived the price of 'trust us'. We have lived the consequences of secrecy. We have lived the damage done when public health is treated as an afterthought, when residents are asked to carry the risk while someone else collects the reward. That is why I cannot support Project Blue in its original or current form. Let's tell the truth about how we got here. Pima County was never the lead negotiator in this deal. We were the landowner, and when the City unanimously stepped away from the deal, instead of starting over, we were told to sprint. Beale handed us their contract and told us to sign it. They waived their own contractual conditions, then used that legal right to corner the County. That is not partnership. Now we are being asked to approve one of the largest land sales in our County's history, on the southeastern edge of town, where our growth will continue for decades to come. We are landlocked as a County, so this is not just one campus. It is what gets built around it. Industrial build out, infrastructure demands, and long-term impacts. And the most basic question remains unanswered. Who is this for? We as a Board were never given a direct, transparent briefing at the dais about the end user. When Amazon was reported as out, this Board was not told clearly and directly. We have since learned that Meta is out. So, I will ask again, who is this for? If you cannot tell the public who this land sale is for, you cannot ask the public to accept the costs. Let's talk about what the public was promised. When Tucson was part of the plan, the community was told there would be more than \$100 million in public benefit tied to reclaimed water infrastructure, benefits that Tucson residents could point to, touch and rely on. And after the City denied annexation and ended negotiations, that promise evaporated. What we are being asked to do today is accept a fraction of that promise that we were presented in June, a \$5 million dollar down payment and maybe \$10 million dollar later with language that allows commitments to be clawed back. This, colleagues, is not a binding community benefit. This is a press release with an exit door. And when our Board of Health asked for us to evaluate public health impacts, when the community asked us to slow down and do basic due diligence, this Board said, no, that choice will follow us. Public trust is not built by moving fast. Public trust is built by being honest, being transparent and being willing to start over when

the deal in front of you is not protective of the public interest. On top of that, our County Administration should have done a better job bringing us a contract that protects the County's interests. They did not. Our attorneys were not brought into these conversations early enough. They were not positioned to protect the public early enough and that was a failure. And when this Board could have shown a little bit of courage, after weeks and months of residents coming here pleading with us to do the right thing, we looked the other way. So today I am disheartened and disappointed. We owe our residents an economic development strategy that invests in the businesses already here. We owe our residents real urgency on public health and public safety. We owe our residents infrastructure upgrades, higher wages and a stronger quality of life without sacrificing the neighborhoods that have already sacrificed enough. District 5 will never entertain an economic development deal of this nature again. Do not come back to this Board with an economic development proposal that divides us the way that Project Blue divided our community. Do not come back to this Board with an economic development proposal that shortchanges this County's historic commitment to protecting our Sonoran Desert, and do not come back to this Board with a proposal that ignores the legacy of contamination and environmental exposure in our County, where neighbors' names are etched into our murals on the south side because powerful institutions treated our community as disposable. I get it. Some consider our communities to be expendable in the interest of economic development. From the District 5 perspective, it is my duty to never let them be. Thank you."

Supervisor Allen thanked Supervisor Cano for his beautiful and powerful remarks. She stated that she came from a family that had been impacted by air quality issues and lost many men in her family from silica, air quality issues, and impacts of mining, and the impacts of their decisions were very real, meaningful and impactful in people's daily lives. She expressed gratitude that unions were involved and were able to secure a project labor agreement that mattered. She stated that unions brought economic stability to her family, ensured that they had retirements and were able to buy a home and there was value in keeping skilled trades labor in Pima County. She stated that many of their residents drove to Pinal and Maricopa Counties and other places for jobs and she understood that they needed jobs in this community. She stated that she was glad they had organized labor that could flex their muscle and build some power of organized labor, and appreciated that they had community members who were committed to air quality, clean energy, and for standing up and being strong, loud, clear and packing the room to the No Data Centers in the Desert Coalition. She stated that they had brought forth the issue that no one knew about in their community and blew it up into an issue that she heard about from every corner of the County. She stated that people knew about the data centers and the impacts it had on water, on TEP and the ACC. She stated that they were all household names as they should have been for a long time and had been increasingly holding accountable decisionmakers in ways that decision makers for too long had enjoyed operating below the radar. She thanked them and stated that they took the issue and their resistance and brought it out and blew it up in the community and people all over the world saw it. She stated that they were part of building a movement that was powerful and it would continue to have ripple effects.

She appreciated that County Administration and the County Attorney's Office dug in. She stated that Beale had not wanted to do a legally binding document and they did not have to, it was convenient, however they pushed them and were able to get them to agree to legally binding terms. She stated that she continued to stand clear and consistent and the economic benefits that had been presented to them for Project Blue did not outweigh the cost, short and long-term costs in their community, as evidenced by the fact that their vote opened up the floodgates and they would have to deal with the consequences. She stated that it was not just what happened on the 290 acres of their land, but also what happened in Marana, Sahuarita and what could happen on Davis-Monthan. She stated that data centers saw an opening and they jumped in and were wedging that opening into something larger, and that the County was not prepared for the impacts and consequences of that. She stated that TEP did not have the energy and they were coal fired power plant data centers. She stated that they could say that it was renewable energy and that credits were going to be bought but the reality was that they were extending the life on coal fired power plants. She stated that coal fired plants resulted in deaths of those who lived around them, decisions had consequences and that there was still so much more within their 290 acres that they did not know about yet, which confounded her. She stated that they did not know what phase two and three looked like, they did not know how many data centers or how much energy they were going to use, and yet they were going to move forward and that confounded her. She stated that she did not support the agreement as she had not supported previous votes, and that what gave her solace were the things they did around reforming non-disclosure agreements, calling for an end to tax breaks that data centers enjoyed on the backs of state and local governments, initiating the process to change their zoning so that they did not end up in a situation like this again. She stated that they had laid some groundwork so that when it came to them again, they had bricks in which they could say no, as they should have said no from the get-go. She indicated that she was afraid this decision would be the legacy of this Board and it pained her. She hoped that in the new year they could get on a page where they thought about economic development in a meaningful way that supported their community based on the strengths of that they had done, who they were, and looked for the long-term stability and prosperity of their community. She believed that they could do that and that it would take some good decision making.

Chair Scott thanked County Administration and the County Attorney's Office for negotiating the Binding Memorandum of Agreement with the Beale Infrastructure team. He made the following statement, *"Back when this project was being structured, it was planned and envisioned as the work of two jurisdictions. Some of what is outlined in this enforceable document was expected to be included in the development agreement between Beale and the City of Tucson. After the decision to deny annexation was made, Pima County was obliged to move forward in a way that sought to assure the public that the plans and assurances from the developer would come to pass, as promised. When we approved the land sale and rezoning in June, the original conception of the project made far greater use of both potable and reclaimed water than what we now see before us, because the project at the time was aligned with the conservation and infrastructure plans of the City's water utility,*

the Memorandum of Agreement commits the project to use a closed loop system that operates by recirculating minimal quantities of water. Any water usage on the site of the development will be approved by our State's Department of Water Resources and must meet the requirements of the County's preliminary Integrated Water Management Plan. Beale and Tucson Electric Power (TEP), given the significant amount of power that will be used on site, were required to submit an energy supply agreement for consideration by the Arizona Corporation Commission. The terms of that agreement were being discussed by Beale and TEP, even before the City of Tucson made its decision not to annex the property. It is important to recognize that the energy supply agreement governs only the first of the three phases of this project, and that there will need to be a new energy supply agreement submitted for each of the next two phases. As this Memorandum of Agreement states, TEP will also provide power to the project using resources that are existing or under development. There are also safeguards for other ratepayers and financial commitments that Beale must abide by that further protect the utility and its other users. All this was already in place, but what this Memorandum of Agreement provides is a path forward for ensuring that Beale's commitment to match 100% of its energy consumption with renewable energy is met. Every year an independent and qualified third-party verifier, approved by both Beale and Pima County, will confirm that the project has achieved the renewable energy commitment. This is a laudable and significant accomplishment, and the people of Pima County deserve to know that their representatives pushed hard for this independent verification of Beale's commitments to renewable energy, in our discussions with them. From the beginning, one of the most compelling features of this project has been the economic benefits to the County and our constituents. They are also a prominent part of this document. Beale will pay the County close to \$21 million dollars for this acreage, and the County Administrator must engage the Board in a wide-ranging discussion as to the best uses of those proceeds. The people we represent must see that we are using this money in ways that enhance our ability to deliver the services and supports they count on from us. The \$3.6 billion dollar capital investment in this project is the largest of its kind in the history of our County, and will have a positive, profound effect on our local economy, just like the proceeds from the land sale, the increased County tax revenues \$58.8 million dollars over ten years will be used in ways that benefit the public. There will also be greater tax revenues for local school districts and state government that will benefit their constituents. Only 1% of the existing employers in Pima County provide more than the 180 full-time jobs and permanent jobs that will be part of this project. Moreover, the more than 3,000 construction jobs that will result are not temporary, as some have labeled them. Rather, they will be filled by our friends and neighbors in the building and construction trades who have devoted their careers to these professions, many of whom were here this morning and in previous meetings. As we have heard, many of those Pima County workers currently travel many miles each day to other parts of the state to do their work. There has been passionate and thoughtful opposition to this project, often based in legitimate concerns about how we make use of and govern the technologies that play larger roles in our lives. However, there has also been unduly alarmist and defeatist rhetoric deployed by some project opponents, calling into question our abilities as a community to

balance economic development with environmental stewardship. Pima County has historically struck that balance, and this agreement will help us to build on that proud record. We should approve it and hold both ourselves and the Beale team accountable for seeing that its terms are fully implemented.”

Upon roll call vote, the motion carried 3-2, Supervisors Allen and Cano voted “Nay.”

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

40. Transportation Advisory Committee

Appointment of Erin Johnson, to fill a vacancy created by Lucretia Free. Term expiration: 12/15/29. (District 4)

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

41. Merit System Commission and Law Enforcement Merit System Council

Reappointment of Michael Hellon. Term expiration: 12/31/29. (District 4)

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

42. Board of Adjustment, District 4

Appointment of William Yarnell, to fill a vacancy created by R. Craig Finfrock. Term expiration: 3/1/29.

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

43. CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of the Consent Calendar

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 13, 14 and 15 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Christy and carried by a 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar, as amended.

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

7. **Award**

Award: Purchase Order No. PO2500037925, MaxSecure Systems, Inc., d.b.a. Max-Secure (Headquarters: Williamsville, NY), to provide for MaxSecure Anti-Ligature Inmate Furniture. This contract is for a one-time award in the discrete amount of \$439,030.00 (including sales tax). Funding Source: Sheriff Inmate Welfare Fund. Administering Department: Sheriff's Department.

Christopher Nanos, Pima County Sheriff, stated that this was a perfect example of how they could do better in working with the Board, the County Administrator and the Procurement Department on the language for the item on the agenda. He stated that that was not \$400,000.00 for a double bunk bed and a toilet and clarified that it was for an entire unit. He stated that it took several units to make an entire pod of 70 to 80 inmates that were high risk, and these were typically suicide watch inmates and they put the furniture in place. He stated that this item came up over a year ago, but they had not gotten it recognized at that time. He stated that this was a sole source, so they needed to go back and get sole source. He stated that the funding was available and had been provided by the Tohono O'odham Nation last July.

Chair Scott expressed his appreciation that Sheriff Nanos was addressing the items one at a time.

Supervisor Allen stated that she had thought they were spending \$17,000.00 per stool and \$120,000.00 for installation of furniture in one cell, so it would be helpful if that was clarified on the BOSAIR, and that it was clarified that the funding was covered from the Tohono O'odham Nation from Prop. 202.

Sheriff Nanos apologized for the confusion and stated that staff was working on those things.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Countywide Rapid Rehousing Program, extend grant term to 6/30/26 and amend grant language, no cost (GA-CWD-73048)

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

14. **Acceptance - County Attorney**

Vermont Law School, Inc., to provide for the National Center on Restorative Justice, \$250,000.00 (G-PCA-84722)

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

15. **Acceptance – Health**

The Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for immunization services and amend grant language, \$927,578.00 (GA-HD-66161)

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

18. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**

Freeport-McMoRan, to provide for the Mitigate to Protect: Public Safety through Firewise Action, \$20,000.00 (G-OEM-100694)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that the grant was provided by Freeport-McMoRan in the Green Valley area that was designated to ensure that there were adequate funds available to mitigate wildfire danger. He stated that it was to encourage communities and HOA's to involve themselves with the Firewise program to protect their lives, limbs and property from wildfires, which had taken a life of its own. He stated that the Firewise program had been a hallmark in the Mt. Lemmon area, which had the most devastation but other communities in District 4, as well as his colleagues' Districts were doing a tremendous job of making people aware of how they could protect and buffer their homes from potential wildfire conflagrations. He thanked Freeport for

their continued generosity and for the grant on such an important issue that affected everyone in Pima County.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. Altar Valley School District, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for short-term work experience and basic education, term date 5/1/26 to 6/30/26, General Fund, contract amount \$77,756.80 (PO2500036705)

County Attorney

2. Apache County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement to jointly conduct the prosecution of Richard Baptiste in CR202500177 and Anicia Woods in CR202500178, no cost (SC2500000615)

Facilities Management

3. LJL Properties, L.L.C., to provide a lease agreement for space within Central Pet, located at 2420 N. Jackrabbit Avenue, PACC Donations and Bequests, contract amount \$117,600.00 (PO2500036062)

Health

4. Helping Ourselves Pursue Enrichment, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Pima CARES Project, extend contract term to 8/31/26 and amend contractual language, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Fund, contract amount \$110,489.88 (CT_24-239)

Procurement

5. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, Amendment No. 4, to provide for original equipment manufacturer (OEM) warranty parts and repairs. This amendment increases the shared annual award amount by \$125,000.00 from \$804,000.00 to \$929,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$2,357,000.00. This increase to the shared annual award amount will be allocated as outlined in the attached Supplier List table. The increase is a result of unexpected maintenance of County vehicles which led to an increased demand for parts and repair services.

Funding Source: Internal Services Fund. Administering Department: Fleet Services.

Supplier Contract No./Supplier Name/Current NTE Amount/Increase Shared Annual Award Amount/Cumulative NTE Amount

SC2400001575/Holmes Tuttle Ford, Inc., d.b.a. Holmes Tuttle Ford
Lincoln/\$356,799.98/\$18,000.00/\$374,799.98
SC2400001576/Watson Chevrolet, Inc./\$888,338.59/\$0.00/\$888,338.59
SC2400001577/DT Automotive Center, Inc., d.b.a. Desert Toyota of
Tucson/\$142,399.99/\$0.00/\$142,399.99
SC2400001578/O'Reilly Chevrolet, Inc./\$287,661.37/\$0.00/\$287,661.37
SC2400001579/Jim Click, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Dodge/\$136,109.57/\$0.00/\$136,109.57
SC2400001580/Jim Click Ford, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Ford
Lincoln/\$352,000.00/\$107,000.00/\$459,000.00
SC2400002319/Jim Click, Inc., d.b.a. Jim Click Hyundai/\$68,690.50/\$0.00/\$68,690.50
Total: \$2,232,000.00/\$125,000.00/\$2,357,000.00

6. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001184, Amendment No. 6, Iron Mountain, Inc., d.b.a. Iron Mountain Information Management, L.L.C., to provide for ballot storage and destruction services. This amendment extends the term of the contract commencing on 1/22/26 and terminating on 7/1/26. No additional funds are required at this time. The extension is needed to align the termination date with the termination date of the Port of Portland contract that was used cooperatively. Administering Department: Treasurer.
7. **Award**
Award: Purchase Order No. PO2500037925, MaxSecure Systems, Inc. (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
8. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400000876, Amendment No. 7, Morpho USA, Inc., d.b.a Idemia Identity & Security USA, L.L.C., to provide for biometric products and service. This amendment extends the termination date to 6/30/27 and pursuant to Pima County Procurement Code 11.40.030, appends the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention Plan provision to the contract. No additional funds are required at this time. Administering Department: Sheriff's Department.
9. Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., Amendment No. 11, to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Northwest County Service Center (XNWHLC) and extend contract term to 6/30/26, no cost (PO2400018739)
Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

Real Property

10. River Overlook, L.L.C., to provide for Sales Agreement No. Sale-0145 and Special Warranty Deed for a portion of vacant surplus property that consists

of 12,738 square feet located on the south side of River Road and west of La Canada Drive, Tax Parcel Nos. 104-04-040L and 104-04-042B, contract amount \$51,000.00 revenue (CT2500000082)

11. River Overlook, L.L.C., to provide for Sales Agreement No. Sale-0140 and Special Warranty Deed for a portion of vacant surplus property that consists of 31,668 square feet located south of River Road, north side of the Chuck Huckelberry Loop and west of La Canada Drive, Tax Parcel No. 104-01-0450, contract amount \$129,000.00 revenue (CT2500000079)
12. Therapeutic Ranch for Animals and Kids, Inc., to provide a lease for property located at 3605 E. Edith Road for activities related to animal and equine-assisted programs, contract amount \$89,193.48 revenue/5 year term (CT2500000083)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

13. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
Arizona Department of Housing, Amendment No. 1., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
14. **Acceptance - County Attorney**
Vermont Law School, Inc., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
15. **Acceptance – Health**
The Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1., (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
16. **Acceptance – Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 4, to provide for Arizona's Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention Program, amend grant language and scope of services, \$419,252.00 (GA-HD-70319)
17. **Acceptance – Health**
Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the home visiting services for the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program and amend grant language, \$392,462.02 (GA-HD-70324)
18. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**
Freeport-McMoRan, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)
19. **Acceptance - Public Defense Services**
AZ Department of Child Safety and Administrative Office of the Courts, Amendment No. 20, to provide for the FFY2025 Title IV-E Foster Care Administrative Costs for Legal Representation Child or Parent and amend grant language, \$596,012.82 (GA-PDS-66302)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

20. **Community Action Agency Board**

Reappointment of Judith Keagy. Term expiration: 12/31/26. (District 1)

21. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**

Appointment of Catlow Shipek, to replace Scott Kolt. Term expiration: 3/1/29. (District 3)

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

22. **Special Event**

Alejandro Torres, Corpus Christi Catholic Parish - Tucson, 300 N. Tanque Verde Loop Road, Tucson, December 13, 2025.

23. **Temporary Extension**

12104140, Steven Alex Dunn, The Parish, 6453 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 17, 2026.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

24. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**

El Dorado Place \$4,000.00; Summit Ridge \$4,000.00; The Quails Apartments \$2,098.00; Summit Ridge \$3,891.00; TUSD Finance Dept. \$27,453.04; BSI Group, L.L.C. \$1,591.28; Tank's Managed by the Fairfax Companies \$1,205.18; JMD Asset Management, L.L.C. \$775.00; Valley Assistance Services \$2,123.43; Valley Assistance Services \$3,096.95; Valley Assistance Services \$2,878.58; Valley Assistance Services \$3,607.15; Valley Assistance Services \$3,493.06; Valley Assistance Services \$552.01; Sheliona Manuel-Morago \$550.00; Arizona Commercial Lighting and Supply \$1,639.23; Copper Health Holding, L.P. \$3,022.00; Pacifica Brentwood, L.L.C. \$2,419.94; Arizona Department of Transportation \$1,703,928.12; JCG Technologies, Inc. \$550.00; View at Starr Pass \$1,945.00; Summit Ridge \$6,102.00; Summit Ridge \$2,456.00; JMD Asset Management, L.L.C. \$3,080.09; View at Starr Pass \$1,595.00; Dexter & Dexter Law \$59.20; Sienna Ridge AZ, L.L.C. \$4,000.00; Arizona Recycles, L.L.C. \$150.00; Summit Ridge \$749.00; 410 N. Grande Ave, L.L.C. \$4,000.00; Rio Viejo Apartments \$1,206.00; Stiletto Consulting, Ltd. \$7,925.00; Summit Ridge \$1,541.26; Banner-University Medical Center South Campus \$21,344.00; SREIT Las Villas De Kino, L.L.C. \$1,256.00; The Best Bead Show, Inc. \$970.00; WSP USA, Inc. \$872.48.

TREASURER

25. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**

Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$28,811.85.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

26. Minutes: October 14, 2025

* * *

44. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott

AC: Supervisor Cano

JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator

JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

RS: Ms. Darland, our update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety. Administrator Leshar, any introductory remarks?

JL: [Inaudible]

RS: Ms. Darland, thank you so much for sharing your day with us.

JD: Thank you, Chair Scott. Thank you, members of the Board. I will wait for the slide deck to get pulled up. Next slide please, thank you. As the Board is no doubt familiar at this time, all of these updates are going to be grounded in one or all five of the priorities that establish the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions. Just briefly overview, it has been a long day, so I will just keep this light and tight. Number 1, is around the inventory of County and partner programing. Priority 3, is describing and illustrating how the homeless response system works and how we coordinate care for individuals experiencing homelessness. Priority 3, County and public facing communications. For today's presentation, we are going to be looking at Priorities Nos. 4 and 5, which are continuous improvement plans with a goal of ensuring County programing is responsive, sustainable and equitable, as well as Priority 5, which is developing a means of tracking the efficacy of these programs. Next slide please. I apologize, the bars completely vanished on this slide, so I will make a note for going forward. But we are looking at data with respect to the regional encampment reports received over the last five months. The purpose of looking back five months is, that would be the time where we began to implement many of the enhancements to the County Administrative Procedure, more commonly referred to as the Encampment Protocol. What we are wanting to look for here are the track or the trend lines associated with those reports received by the County. Those would be reports that fall out of the City of Tucson's jurisdictional boundary. That means we are taking all data reports, both those that are falling on County land, as well as those that are falling on private assets that are owned and maintained by other agencies, entities and private land owners. It is important to note that this data does not necessarily reflect what scrubbed down, meaning what we have verified across both the City's efforts as well as the County's. And you may see some duplicates in here, meaning a site that is reported more than one time. It is important to note that on average, the County accounts for roughly between 8% and 10% of the overall regional reports on any given monthly basis. Over the last

five months we are seeing a trend that keeps us at or below about 8%. Next slide please. What you see before you right now are historic data associated with encampments, as verified by the Regional Flood Control District mainly received through what is called the drainage complaint process that the department manages. This data goes back between 2018 and April of 2025. Again, that is the line that we snapped with respect to all of the enhancements that have come on Board related to the improvement on the encampment protocol. We did in these maps, want to make sure that we pointed out and made as a landmark the Chuck Huckleberry Loop, which, as you can see, is really a much like our washes and our waterways. This is really a regional asset, so as we start to have conversations about policies and strategies to interrupt some of the behaviors associated with unsheltered homelessness, including the ways to connect those individuals to care, we really need to make a concerted effort to engage our neighboring partners in the jurisdictions of Marana and Oro Valley, on those strategies so that we can be as cohesive and as aligned as possible. Next slide please. I have touched really briefly on the fact that we have taken for over the course of what was 2024, with finalization happening just recently last few months, a deep dive on what is the County Administrative Procedure. It was formally chaptered under the County Administrative Procedures as 50.02. It is now listed and cataloged as 46.01. Our emphasis here was about clarifying the roles and responsibilities by bifurcating the process between how a department would respond when their staff or personnel are reporting to duty and happen to encounter an encampment, versus what the process would be in terms of those general delivery or regional reports, those reports that for all practical purposes, constituents are bringing to our attention. We do not know exactly which department is going to be responsible, if a department is going to be responsible, and we facilitate the investigation and response accordingly, again, if it is on County land. The enhanced protocol continued to reinforce what had already been established when the protocol was first initiated in 2015, which is a service response that focuses on priority environmental risks and the service coordination for individuals experiencing homelessness. I really want to point out that while the protocol was established over ten years ago, it has always been foundational to that process to ensure that we are connecting individuals experiencing homelessness to shelter and housing resources. It has always been part of our practice. The operational enhancements, as I noted, are to ensure that we have a process by which we can give department directors a walk through or a go forward when their personnel happen to be reporting to a site and encounter an encampment, versus how we facilitate the response for those encampment reports that come from a regional process and are not necessarily known for who will facilitate the cleanup. That has been now centralized for the regional reports and general delivery reports. Those will now be addressed by the Regional Flood Control District. The district has added two additional personnel to be able to facilitate that response on behalf of Pima County. They have also centralized their operations to be much more responsive to the areas throughout the jurisdiction where these encampments may be reported. As you may recall, and in the materials provided, you will know that map shows you pretty predictably where this is going to occur. Their new location allows them to get to those locations pretty efficiently. As the Board approved earlier this month, the hotshot vendor, which will

allow for the district to be able to have cleanup services on site within 72 business hours following the initial investigation, and/or outreach services being offered to those individuals. Finally, we have used GIS to further, we have already used existing GIS data layers, but we are incorporating enhanced survey tools to be able to tell a more complete and comprehensive data story around what is occurring on County land and throughout the region. Next slide please. By the numbers, since May of 2025, over 83% of the camp reports that we have received have been verified as being active encampments, meaning there is evidence of individuals having resided in that space within the last 12 to 24 hours. Of those reports, about 70% are not active encampments, so that means it could be an encampment that has been abandoned, or it may just be a wildcat dumping or debris that may sort of settle after a weather event. Within the 83% that the team has counted a total of 207 structures within the waterways and channels and other areas on County assets. And of those active sites, approximately 58% of them have evidence of campfire or cooking fire. This would mean some sort of space that would show that something had been burning within, to either warm themselves like a fire pit or something to cook a meal. But these would be spaces that I want to state and restate that staff are not encountering active encampment fires at the time of the field inspection. They are simply encountering active encampments where it is clear that the individuals in that space have lit some sort of fire to either, A., warm themselves, and/or, B., prepare food. Next slide please. Using that data point as a verified spaces, plus with those spaces where we have evidence of some sort of campfire having occurred, this is where that data is populating the map. Using the Chuck Huckleberry Loops as a land asset, you can see where some of this activity is being recorded through the field inspection. This map helps to facilitate the discussion that we are having with law enforcement, including fire. Working with Senior Advisor, Mari Vasquez, and her work with the Office of Emergency Management, and all of their work with respect to the wildland urban interface. We want to make sure that what we are doing with this information is, we are bringing it back to those agencies to say, how can we connect your response with service providers so that we can more efficiently connect individuals experiencing homelessness to some sort of shelter, so that we can further reduce or mitigate the risk that those types of activities may present to the individuals themselves, as well as the surrounding community? Next slide please. On the demographic data with the individuals, what we have for the last few months is that over 182 reports were submitted. These are outreach reports submitted by our outreach services provider, which is staff out of the Community and Workforce Development (CWD) Department's Homeless Services Division. A total of 166 individuals were encountered. It is important to note that they may come to an encampment there. It may be active with individuals in that space, but individuals we count as encountered would be those individuals who choose to engage and talk with our outreach team. Of those, a total of two persons were identified. It is important to note that older persons are usually categorized by HUD's definition of older person, which is anybody who is age 55 and older. While we do note that that may be older in other agency efforts as well, over 83 pets have been counted, and in total 33 individuals have accepted services. It is important to note here that we are always looking at this as ways to better connect individuals to true services. What we do

find, more often than not, is that individuals will accept what we call support services, meaning they will accept maybe bottles of water, maybe some hygiene items that our staff have. Maybe they will take pet care but very rarely are they vocalizing that they want to be connected with either a case manager or behavioral health support, treatment support, or shelter. They will sometimes ask that their housing assessment be updated in the Homeless Management Information System, and also that they will also give permission for the team to look them up in the Homeless Management Information System to see if they have been matched with a housing provider. Next slide please. Landing the update here, just to give a few high-level updates on One Pima as approved by the Board in November of this year. The action plan is underway on efforts associated with all five of the priorities. The first progress report is due to the Board in February of 2026. Just real briefly, this presentation really sort of did touch a little bit on Priority No. 1. Priorities 2 and 3, staff have participated in meetings with the Arizona Complete Health provider, and we have also been in a meeting with AHCCCS. As well for opportunities to enhance our legislative advocacy on efforts to connect individuals to treatment supports. With respect to Priority No. 4, for stabilizing housing and preventing homelessness. CWD received a total of 15 applications for Fiscal Year '25 Gap funding for housing development and preservation. The team over at CWD has impaneled an evaluation committee. Those recommendations will be going before the Housing Commission in January for later presentation to the Board in February. Similarly, CWD, as well as Development Services, and the City of Tucson, our regional partners, are finalizing what is the ten-year housing strategy and funding plan. That too will be going before the commission in January. It is estimated with presentation to the Board in February. Also want to point out on this Priority No. 4, we have had really good conversations with the representatives from the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness (TPCH) on the development of a dashboard related to shelter coordination, to be able to provide information on available shelter beds. That is positive and that is moving in a good direction. Also, a very positive conversation with the director of the Pima Animal Care Center on strategies to connect low-barrier shelter or any shelter to pet supports as provided by that department. And finally, Priority No. 5, we are working with Supervisor Cano's Office and the District 5 Office on ways to further enhance bringing resources and community support. All of the best programming that the County facilitates, either directly or with contracted partnership to that community, as well as showing up to support their efforts in engaging the neighborhood associations in that particular area. Our regional conversations and planning continue. We are actively participating in the Safe City implementation meetings, which are happening weekly. This is the opportunity where we talk through our strategies on the deployments, working with Tucson Police Department (TPD) that also involves our land managing departments. Chiefly, that is going to be our Regional Flood Control District, as well as our Parks and Rec team, as well as the Pima County Transition Center. As previously noted, we are talking with Marana and Oro Valley on that regional coordination with respect to how do we work and liaise when we have unsheltered homeless activity, on/or adjacent to the Loop? As well as how can we ensure that our responses are streamlined when we know that there are maybe some risk factors associated with unsheltered homelessness and encampments?

Also want to make sure that the Board is aware that the 2026 Point In Time Count, the call for volunteers is out that will be occurring Wednesday, January 28th. You can obviously reach out to me if you would like some more information. Happy to have you join my team and also the Fiscal Year '25 HUD Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). HUD had released this back in November 13th, and then last week we got notification that HUD had withdrawn the NOFO. HUD is due in U.S. court on Friday, December 19th, where they have to go before the judge with any changes to the NOFO. This is sort of in a little bit of a holding pattern. If the Board may recall, the HUD NOFO is largely the funding that comes through our community as administered by the TPCH. That is going to be the largest of the money that is directed toward serving homeless households. We are waiting in a holding pattern to hear what comes out of that adjudicated process and any changes that might be forthcoming from the department. Finally, I want to just land here that last week, the working group from the Justice Metro folks got together with report outs from two of the four work groups. That would be the data and the courts. Those individuals those teams will be coming forward with policy recommendations in the future and I believe that cadence of discussion between that workgroup will align with supporting the dialog and the discussion of the joint meetings. Next slide please. I want to end the presentation, as well as the year, by the way, on a little bit of a positive note, I rarely get to do that so I am very excited about this. We know that the activities associated with the Loop have been a concern to our Board and to our constituency at large. And we know that the efforts underway between the City of Tucson with TPD, as well as our County efforts and teams, they are working tirelessly to connect with individuals and ensure that this amenity is used and recreated on. Last week, we received through the Regional Flood Control and the Loop feedback form, I am not sure exactly which pathway it took. This was a genuine constituent comment card that came through last week, and I will read it just here for the record, the comment is as follows, "We ride the loop 2 - 4 times per week. We really notice and appreciate all of the ongoing work to expand and maintain the loop, keeping it safe and attractive. We are especially thankful for the cleanup of homeless camps and associated debris. We feel less nervous riding this year and our rides are much more pleasant. Many thanks to all those involved in keeping this amazing recreational infrastructure in good condition." Just for the record, we did share this with our colleagues over at the City of Tucson as well as with TPD. These are hard, challenging times, and there is truly a joint jurisdictional effort to address this and ensure that our public spaces, as well as connections to care, are working in a coordinated fashion. With that, I am happy to take any questions.

RS: Before I turn it over to Board members for any questions or comments. Administrator Leshar had something that she wanted to add.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott. Simply to let the Board know that under some of the new rules out of HUD, the Board of Supervisors, is being asked to identify a member of the Board to serve on the Tucson Pima Collaboration and Homelessness Continuum of Care, or the Board of directors, if you will, of that organization. We have asked that that item be placed on the January 6 agenda, when you have the

list of organizations to which you make appointments. Just wanted to let people know about that. That is a new one and begin to think about it as you prepare for the new Year. Thank you.

RS: Thank you ma'am. Any comments or questions from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott. Always appreciate Ms. Darland's reports. Excited to see the One Pima Initiative start to really become a reality. I just wanted to reiterate to staff that I look forward to participating in one of the cleanups. I would like to be there when that is happening and look forward to hearing more information from your office about when that schedule is going to be happening, and particularly obviously, in District 5. Thank you.

JD: Sure.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments from Board members? I just wanted to ask, and I do not know if I should direct this to you, Ms. Darland, or to Ms. Leshner or anybody she would want to designate. The two additional full time equivalents in the Regional Flood Control District that are dealing with encampment reports. What are their main tasks?

JD: Chair Scott. Their main tasks are to validate that the encampment report is in fact on County land or asset and determine the next course of action. They will also go out and they facilitate what is called, a field inspection, which is a field survey where they take pictures and photographs of the surrounding area and verify whether or not it is in fact an encampment. They also can facilitate by posting the 72-hour notice to vacate, which again starts the process on when we will do our site cleanup. They also coordinate with the homeless outreach teams wherever possible. Essentially, they are taking care of addressing those general reports that come in from the region, the regional reporting tool or from general delivery constituent reports that may also be coming in. They facilitate the process of, A., validating the space, 2, inspecting it, coordinating with outreach, posting notice to vacate and then reinspecting the space after it is been cleaned up.

RS: And we are fond of using acronyms and government and FTE stands for full time equivalent. So these are two full-time, 40 hour a week employees and the focus of their responsibilities is on dealing with the enhanced encampment protocol.

JD: Chair Scott. Correct, and I would also say that their talents are being utilized by the department in other ways. Both FTE's came from internal hires, one from Conservation Land and Resources, and the other, I believe, came from Department of Environmental Quality. These two individuals have a great deal of understanding about the public lands that are managed by the County. They understand the systems and the Regional Flood Control District also uses their talents and their expertise in other ways that benefit the department and the department's objectives, not just the encampment itself.

RS: I appreciate that and given the increased attention to the needs brought about by the revisions to the encampment protocol, it would be great if we could get updates from time to time on the insights and experiences of these two employees.

JD: Chair Scott, absolutely and furthermore, just in case, I was remiss in not mentioning it, since the Board's approval of the hotshot vendor contract. The 72-hour business hours rather, there will be some data associated with that, but likely will not come in until toward the end of December, is what the team has made me aware of. So, we will be able to share with you the number of sites remediated, the tonnage removed, as well as to your point, any of the other experiences that the team has had. I can absolutely communicate that with Director Shepp.

RS: And could we get in the January report, a breakdown of the costs and any other pertinent data associated with encampment removal from lands that are the responsibility of the County?

JD: Chair Scott, yes, I can put that together.

RS: Thank you, thank you. Any other comments or questions from Board members? Alright, Ms. Darland, thank you very much.

PARKS AND RECREATION

28. Parks and Recreation Master Plan

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission recommends adoption of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
VP: Victor Pereira, Director, Parks and Recreation
TJ: Teresa Jackson, Consultant, BerryDunn

RS: Item No. 22, Parks and Recreation. This is the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Administrator Leshar, any introductory comments?

JL: No. Chair Scott, we do have Vic Pereira, the Director of the Department, who is with us and we will introduce the consultant who has been helping to develop the plan. I believe you have each had an opportunity as well to meet with staff on this. So, look forward to presentation that we have timed it five minutes pending questions. Thank you.

RS: Alright. Thanks.

VP: Chair Scott, Board, Ms. Leshar. Good afternoon, I am Vic Pereira, the Director of Parks and Rec (PR) and today, with me, I have Teresa Jackson who is the consultant for BerryDunn. Teresa and her team have quarterbacked this effort for the last 18 months on the Parks and Rec Master Plan. This briefing will remain extremely very high level and will complement the one-on-one detailed brief that we had with each of the Board members last month. So why a master plan? Why now, and what are we going to do with it? PR has been a department since 1947, and we have never had a master plan. Last July when the Natural Resources Division transferred to the Conservation Lands and Resources Department, we thought that this would be a opportune time to actually have a strategic roadmap to guide the department over the next 10 to 20 years. So, each year during the budget process, we will focus on the implementation plan and the priority areas. And Teresa will cover both of those with you here, later on in this brief. Each year, as we budget, we will programmatically measure ourselves against these priority areas and the implementation plan and that will drive our decision making as we budget. What I am extremely most proud of throughout this entire process is our community outreach. Foundational to this project was our resident driven approach to ensure

that we had the right amenity, at the right location for what our constituents wanted. Collectively, very done, and the PR staff, we attended five major community events. We had nine public district meetings. We had five specific recreation, user group and stakeholder meetings. We have collaborated with our jurisdictional PR Directors and staff to include the City of Tucson, Oro Valley, Marana, and Sahuarita. We mailed over 3,500 statistically valid surveys, which yielded a 95% confidence rating with a 3.8% margin of error. And lastly, we have kept our Parks and Rec Advisory Commission abreast of everything that is been going on in the last 18 months. And last month, they unanimously endorsed the master plan. Our external engagement strategies were both in English and in Spanish to include our website. And in total, this dynamic community outreach approach had over 9,500 touchpoints within Pima County. I am confident that the strategic document highlights current recreational gaps and services, lays the foundation for future growth and improvements and reinvestment needs. Through the department's fiscal diligence and with the County Administrator's support and the Board's support, your Pima County Parks and Rec will continue to set the community standard. Your endorsement and approval today of this master plan signifies our collaborative commitment for continuous improvement and lasting success. Thank you. I am going to turn it over to Teresa.

TJ: Board, it is a pleasure to be here with you today. Thank you, Vic, for the wonderful introduction. I want to touch on a few items and then we will just do a light touch on the plan. I had the opportunity to meet with each of you back in October, but as Vic said, a key goal of this or a key element, is the right amenity and the right place. And so a key aspect of our work was completing a full inventory of the system and really comparing it to what we heard through community engagement findings, ultimately looking to identify any gaps in desired amenities. These results are presented through an interactive story map that shows both County and municipal assets, helping the County understand gaps without duplicating services. Next slide please, and you can actually continue one further. Thank you. Another key component of our work was an operations assessment including benchmarking against national standards and peer agencies of similar size. This analysis used annual metrics collected by the National Recreation and Park Association. National benchmarks indicate a staffing shortfall of approximately 25 Full Time Equivalent's (FTEs) and lower than average per capita spending, equating to an estimated \$6.6 million funding gap. Cost recovery is also significantly below peer norms, with County recovery approximately at 9% annually, compared to a median of 27% for large agencies. Peer agency comparisons show the County provides a broader range of services than many comparable agencies across larger and a more complex system. Finally, the operational analysis found that budget growth has not kept pace with inflation since 2019, making it increasingly difficult to sustain current service levels amid rising costs. Next slide. As we take a look at plan priorities and the implementation plan itself, it lays out how Pima County will advance parks and recreation services over the next 20 years. Recommendations are organized into six priority areas with clear goals and phased actions. Next slide. Action items across the six priority areas are classified as either a short-, mid-term or long term goals. When we look at really, our short-term goals the next five years, FY26 through 30, this is where we really focus on building the foundation. So staffing

systems and organizational capacity. We want to deliver some early park and facility improvements, especially at regional parks. Also complete critical assessments for pools and buildings to really guide future capital investments. And then lastly, strengthen programming in our rural areas and improve access overall to parks and amenities. Now, as we look out into the mid-term FY31 to 35, this is where we would like to see the beginning of those major capital projects, including Esmond Station Park and key park updates. Additionally, during this mid-term timeframe, this is where we would look to move forward some pool renovations and also modernization of community centers. It is also a wonderful opportunity to grow volunteer capacity to support expanding services. Then, as we look at the long-term, FY36 to 46, this is really an aspect where the department is always working towards these pieces, but we start to shift toward long-term sustainability upgrades across the system, incorporating renewable energy strategies to reduce operating costs, and continuing those large scale capital renewal projects to keep our parks, facilities and amenities in good condition over time. Next slide. I referenced there is six priority areas. Priority A, is our strength in an organizational capacity. Again, this is about our staff systems policies. It also includes improving data collection as well as preparing for accreditation. This portion also, hits on creating long-term funding and bond strategies. As we look at Priority Area B, this is where we have our expand access and equity. So, we want to ensure residents across all districts, urban, suburban and rural have fair access to parks, programs and facilities. There is a focus here on rural programming, regional park upgrades and advancing Esmond station. Next slide. Looking at Priority Area C, this is maintain existing assets. We want to prioritize reinvestment in our aging parks pools and community centers to extend those life cycles and maintain our service quality. Looking at Priority Area D, broaden recreation access. This is where we are expanding and diversifying our recreation opportunities to meet the expanding and changing community needs. This is also an area that includes lighting our athletic fields. So really, extending use and access and there is also a number of aspects about expanding our aquatics programming. Next slide. Finally, as we look at Priority Areas E and F, E is where we focus on enhancing our partnership and communication, so we see some opportunities to really strengthen collaboration with municipalities, schools, nonprofits, as well as private partners. Also want to take a look at building local marketing capacity and some of those rural areas and expanding volunteer programs. Finally, I referenced somewhat in our long term goals, Priority F, is the advanced sustainability and resilience. So, focus on drought tolerant landscapes, renewable energy, reclaimed water use as opportunities present themselves, and converting all field lights to LED. Next slide. It has really been a pleasure working with such an organized and dedicated staff across the system that is not only unique, but also very significant in scale. Thank you very much for your time. Happy to open it up to questions and discussion.

RS: Any questions from Board members? If not, I will move that we, oh I am sorry, Supervisor Allen. I did not see your hand.

JA: Yeah. Well Chair Scott, thank you. Thank you for the outreach. I know that a lot of the communities in District 3 really appreciated having the opportunity to come. I

heard the folks turned out well in areas like Picture Rocks and turned out in Ajo. The Parks and Rec facilities in rural communities are so incredibly important and they are oftentimes some of the only places in which people have to gather. And for kids and seniors alike, to be able to get out and stretch their legs and get some exercise and be together. There is a couple of things that I wanted to ask about, particularly, the Priority Area F, around sustainability. I guess I am wondering whether or not all sustainability efforts are reserved until the years 2035 to 2046, because that is kind of a ways away. And if indeed there is ways to think about, if we look at our heat map, for example, or looking at some of the data from the Health Department around the communities that are feeling the greatest heat burden. If some of those climate sustainability measures could be integrated into areas that we have already identified as being priority areas for addressing some climate impacts.

VP: Chair Supervisor Allen, great question. Thank you for that. I will tell you that even though the sustainability was a long-term initiative, that is something inherent that we are doing every single year. I will give you a couple examples. We are constantly submitting for projects to replace the outdated old halogen lights to new LED lights. Every time that we touch a park, we always take a look and see if we can reduce turf. Over the last five years, we have reduced close to five acres in turf, which reduces water. We always try to improve the irrigation systems. Currently this year, we do have a reclaimed water project at Arthur Park where we are going to be getting ten fields of City water and well water and onto the reclaimed water. Even though it says it is a long-term strategy, it is something that we are always tackling every single year from a sustainability initiative. Thank you.

JA: Two things that I will highlight that we hear a lot about reflected in the master plan. But I, you know, hope that there are things that get moved on quickly. Three Points, and building up the infrastructure there. It is a community, as we know, that has grown, grown rapidly, continues to grow. Not a whole lot of community infrastructure or recreational infrastructure. People have asked for things like walking paths and more places to recreate. And then similarly, and I think this is something that looks like was mentioned in a lot of different communities, is around the aquatics capacity and people being able to have some extended hours on pools, especially areas that are high seniors, because it is a place where people get some exercise and we hear about it a lot, and I am sure you did as well.

VP: Chair Scott, Supervisor Allen, thank you. I will let the cat out of the bag. I actually have a memo that is currently in route to Ms. Leshner. We are moving out on this. The people have spoken, and I go back to right amenity at the right location for what people want. I have a proposal currently that will be hitting Ms. Leshner's desk to increase the aquatic hours at our regional pools, which will include Ajo, and also making them free next year. Okay, so now I am putting pressure on Ms. Leshner to approve those, but that is sitting with her. I will tell you my top three priorities from this strategic plan. Number one, is we really need to get a regional park out in Vail, that is the number one, they have no recreational amenities out there. That is number one, number two, is what you just mentioned is our rural communities. Ajo, Arivaca, Three Points, Picture Rocks to ensure that they have the same level of

access and equality that the greater Tucson Metro has, as far as parks and rec amenities. And then number three, is what we have heard from the feedback is, before we build new, let us maintain what we have. So that is just the general maintenance and repair of our infrastructure. So those are the three major top priorities that I have. And if you would give me some money tomorrow, I can move out and I can give you what my three tactical priorities are. So, thank you.

JA: Thank you.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Director, I want to say I appreciate everything that you and the BarryDunn team have done to create this master plan. It was very important. It is equally important for me to ask our County to think about ways to support our inner-City parks in District 5. When I look at the overall share of the facilities that we manage as a County, just by virtue of placement on a map, District 5 families do not see the benefit of our County services with our Parks and Recs team. It is not to say that we do not have exceptional County parks on the south western part of District 5 that are thriving, that are hubs, and that I look forward to, also, like my colleague from District 3, look forward to continued conversations about how we can expand their reach and how we can ensure that families and children are supported. I look forward to those conversations and recognize that really, the elephant in the room right now is, is the funding structure needed to move these proposals so that they can become reality? And look forward to that, and no, Mr. Christy, I was not talking about you as the only elephant in the room. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. I am sorry Mr. Pereira, were you going to respond?

VP: Chair. Before your final comments, I do want to say that the document in front of you, and I apologize, there was an administrative error specifically on page 11 and 13. So where it was written, "poverty" and it should be "prosperity." So I would like just for the record, we will be changing page 11 and 13 where those two administrative grammatical errors will be changing the words "poverty" to "prosperity." That is completely on us and I thought that I uploaded the correct document. So that will be a change in the final one. Thank you.

RS: And the Clerk was making note of that as well. You know I appreciate that Supervisors Allen and Cano made their comments before I was able to make mine, because when we were talking, you and I, and your consultants, and the District 1 team, we talked about how intergovernmental agreements (IGA) between the County and school districts can often be a way of expanding the use of amenities, especially in underserved areas. There is an IGA that has been in place in our district, I think, with both the Marana Unified School District and the Amphi Unified School District, dealing with Arthur Pack and also Coronado K-8. You will correct me if I...

VP: Correct.

RS: ... am wrong and just wondered if you could share with the Board how we might make use of IGAs with school districts to expand the use of amenities around the County, especially in underserved areas?

VP: Chair Scott, thank you, Board members. We will continue to leverage those and like we talked about during our one-on-one session, this is very similar to what you just mentioned with the Marana and the Amphi. We have intergovernmental agreements with the Ajo community as well. I believe the IGA structure was in our initial term so we will continue to leverage that every way that we can. And like you mentioned, it does come down to funding because for example, in District 1, the way we could leverage an IGA would be with the Catalina Foothills School District because there is a gap that was noted during the master plan for aquatics up on the northeast side. So, you have my word that I will look at that as well.

RS: Thank you. And when you say you will continue to leverage IGA's, I know you will keep in touch with the District offices in terms of opportunities where you might see those in the various districts and I am sure Supervisors and their staffs may look for those opportunities as well.

VP: Yes, sir.

RS: And any other questions or comments from Board members? If not, I will move that we follow up on the recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission and adopt the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

JA: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Allen. Any discussion on the motion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye, or giving a thumbs up. Aye.

MH: [Thumbs up.]

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

SC: Aye.

RS: Alright, that item passes unanimously. And thank you both so very much.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

35. Axon Enterprise, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for tasers, body cameras and data services, extend contract term to 1/31/36, amend contractual language and scope of services, General Fund, contract amount \$45,000,000.00 (SC2400001268) Administering Department: Sheriff's Department

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator
CN: Christopher Nanos, Pima County Sheriff
JG: Julia Gates, Chief Financial Advisor, Pima County Sheriff's Department
DO: Derek Ogden, Captain, Pima County Sheriff's Department

RS: Alright, let us go then to Item No. 29. This is Axon Enterprise Incorporated, to provide for tasers, body cameras and data services, extend the contract term to January 31, 2036, amend contractual language and scope of services, general fund contract amount \$45 million. Sheriff?

CN: Big number. We do not take that lightly, but I think the Board needs to know. Chair Scott, members of the Board. This did not just come up. My team has been working on this. In fact, behind me I have Captain Derek Ogden, who oversees our technology services area, and he has worked from the onset with our body-worn camera teams and Axon. I think it was about five years ago when you provided us the funding to go to a body-worn camera system. Technologies advanced, we know that and we know it costs money. It is no different, you get upgrades on your iPhone all the time. Sometimes we like them, sometimes we do not. But it is a need. Your home computers upgrades, updates all the time. This is no different, but part of the problems we had with this is we go back to January or December, maybe of 2024, when we first started talking with Axon about what they could or could not do for us with the body-worn camera, some of the technology and how we could help them. Some of the help we did was really testing and experimenting (T&E) some of their products. Some were good, some were not. Tasers, for example. A few years ago, the Taser was, and it is what we carry now, TASER 7 and you pull the trigger and a couple of wires come out and hit your target. It is less lethal. It saves lives, we believe, and it also can prevent injuries. It is a tool, it is a use of force, but it is a way to mitigate that force. Today the tasers now, and that wire might be 20-25 feet long, today they have literally, if you can imagine, no wires, little balls that fire out of these

guns, as to just tell you, as simple as my mind works and these balls shoot out at 40-45 feet with greater accuracy and a better effect. There is just, when you are dealing with wires, you are wrestling around, you yourself are getting tased. This eliminates a lot of those things. We looked at all of those things with them, and I actually stood up at a Axon conference with them and said, you sold us several million dollars-worth of TASER 7's old technology. All the while, you knew you had this new stuff coming out. What? What is that? How is that good faith in partnership with your law enforcement community? And they came back weeks later and said, "Sheriff, we will change them out. No charge." And that was a good move, good move on their side to show us that, yeah, they are a good faith corporation that wants to help us benefit things and understands that I have got a limited budget. Over a year ago, they came to us with all of this updated technology. Some of the things we will talk about, AI, more for me, the linguistics. I can talk to you in English, but it will come out in Mandarin if that is the language I need to express, you can talk to me in Mandarin and it will come out in English to me. Transcription, it is basically a transcription service that they had bragged, that originally five years ago, it had 85% transcription. We looked at it, and went, that the accuracy of 85% was not even close. But as the year went on and we developed and worked with them, that transcription service now is better than 90 to 95% accurate. And they put some tools in there like, you and I are having this conversation, it is being recorded, I hit a button and it will tell us exactly what we said verbatim. But the tools, the safeguards are, now somebody has to review it for its accuracy before it ever prints a report. And what I thought was kind of interesting was one of the tools for accuracy was I could say, no, it is all good because Chris Nanos just lazy and he hits a button and says, yeah, no, it is good. I do not need to read it. It will kick it back to you because it put in there a line of all this conversation. Oh, and by the way, that purple elephant that just walked out the room, he did not walk out the room. It was basically a trap. You better be reading your reports or it will not approve them and it will kick back. There is just a lot of little intricacies that they listened to us. We T&E it for over three months in the field with deputies and a good two and a half months in our jail. Every single deputy and correction officer who played with that, every one of them swore that not only does it give you accurate reports, but it gives you better, more detailed reports because it takes in every bit of the conversation, not just what I might assume is important, but it puts it all there in front of you. So, there is a lot of benefits. I think they have shown studies that it can save over 280,000 man hours. Because to do that report is a push of a button and less than 11 seconds you can have a report in front of you to read and proof and all of that. The bigger point here is on the \$45 million. Over a year ago, when they came to us, they told us it was \$112 million. And I looked at it and said, there is no way that I can go back to my Board or to my community and say, I need \$112 million. This is just that is crazy. You have to work with us. And we worked, my team worked, my finance officer Julia Gates, Captain Ogden, and others worked and paired this thing down to where it is today at what I believe is a more reasonable price. They are more than willing to work with us on how that note is structured. For them, what they are telling us is, they would like some sort of commitment before January, or at least by January, February, to say, yes, we are going to do this because what it does for them is it frees them up. We are being offered a price on 2024 pricing for an item that is

coming out in 2026 and nobody else gets that pricing, just us. But the pricing actually does not kick in until, if you so desire, until 2027. January, February of 2027, because of the way we have structured the note for us. Again, like I say, I am not a finance whiz. I have people who are, I am not a techie person, but I do have Captain Ogden here, particularly when it comes to the AI. I can talk to you about how AI in this regard is different than what we think of AI as a general consumer. The general consumer AI is designed to use by everybody for anything. This is specifically tested and designed for public safety. The AI on the consumer, the data could be used in all kinds of ways. We know that. In this case, the data is ours. It remains with the Sheriff's Department strictly and solely. The cameras we have today, in 2021, when that contract was approved, laid out, very clear, the video we take, the audio we take, even though we upload it to a cloud service that holds it in Evidence.Com. Evidence.Com does not own it. Axon does not own it. The Pima County Sheriff's Department owns it. If those two closed shop and said we are done and walked away, the product is ours. We decide. Captain Ogden could go into better detail. If you are an agency and you want our information, even though it is on a cloud, you cannot have it, only the Sheriff says you can have it, so every piece of that is different than where you have out in the consumer area. There is creative speculations that can lead to hallucinations. They can hey, can you do this? And the AI can kind of manipulate that data. That is not this. Creativity is really just turned down, there is no hallucination. Our creativity is, if anything, if you think of this as AI, I would tell you that that is probably the wrong way to think about it. The way to look at this is, this is a transcription service that is controlled by us. We do not allow, AI does not get to sit there and say, I think he meant to say this. No, it is exactly what you said. Until you prove it, edit it and revise it. There is a required manual upload of data in the consumer AI. Ours has nothing like that, it takes humans to approve it and to review all of that data before it is ever uploaded, shared, or even printed. And there is no testing in today's AI for the consumer, it is pretty standard that the testing or safeguards on law enforcement specific use cases are just out there, not here. Ours is rigorously tested not just for accuracy but for bias, and it uses data that is represented by law enforcement specialists. They take a look at what that is and they make a decision on what its use would be, and its accuracies. And again, like I said, I was amazed to see a deputy would write a report. It could be very benign, but it is a one paragraph AI came up with a very same information, and it was a page long. The information was not wrong, it was just more thorough, more accurate, and you get to control that accuracy by slipping in a review process that says you will review it. And if you do not catch the little hidden, I call them traps, it is not going to work for you, it will kick it back. Every deputy, every single, I think it was 20 of them, reviewed this and said all around the County. They were mad at Captain Ogden because he had taken it away, because now we had to test it somewhere else. And so, when my team sits back and tells me this is a benefit, this really helps them save time, to be able to do the work that we hire them to do, I am sold. So, I know I have rambled on here. I will take whatever questions you have, but I may point you, when you ask that question, to Derek or my Chief Finance Officer.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Sheriff. That sounded like to me what you experienced was the same thing I went through in the car business with the model changeover. It always seemed to be those kinds of issues. But let us talk about the budget a little bit. When you include this new addition, we are adding roughly \$26 million to, when it started it was \$26 million. Now with this additional request, it is now up to almost \$71 million. How do you plan on structuring this in your budget? Is this going to come into Fiscal Year 2025 or be carried over into 2026? How do you look at that?

CN: Excuse me. Yes, sir. So, what we were looking at was by extending it for ten years. So you were in a ten-year plan in 2021 and we are at year five, midway point. So, Axon is saying we will give you an additional five extra years because you still got five years left on your existing contract. So, they would extend that out. So, over the period of I think 31 to 36, 37, Julie is probably better equipped than answering that for you but...

SC: But you are going to extend the budget?

CN: For a ten-year period. Yes, sir.

SC: Based on the years, based on the remaining amount?

CN: Correct. That is how we come to a guesstimate of \$4.5 million. Is that \$45 million cost is spread out over ten years. You can, just like we did the first one, you can front load this and do \$40 million up front and pay five over the next ten years, or do \$5 million in the first year or first nine years and do \$40 at the end. It really is up to the Board as to how they structure that.

SC: And we can do that directly with Axon?

CN: Correct.

SC: So we can...

CN: Well, before I overstate, is that accurate? Please.

JG: Supervisor Scott, members of the Board.

CN: Please tell them who you are.

JG: I am sorry. I am Julia Gates. I am the Chief Financial Advisor to the Sheriff's Department and we have reviewed the existing contract alongside with the proposed contract that would run through 2036. The current proposal would extend the contract to amount of \$59 million. What we have in the Sheriff's Department secured budget from the current existing contract is \$15 million. So, what we would need from the Board is to provide funding for \$45 million, of over the course of the next ten years. It breaks down to about an additional \$4.5 million of what we would need to be added to our current general fund budget.

SC: Thank you.

JG: Thank you.

RS: Any other questions from Board members? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Sheriff Nanos, this is a very technical question, and I am not sure who is going to be able to answer it. You know, the supporting material does not give me the assurance at this moment that we are in control of the data as a County. Section 3 has two definitions, and I am just going to read them for the purposes of discussion. "Provided Data" means de-identified de-personalized data derived from County's TASER energy weapon deployment reports, related TASER energy weapon logs, body-worn camera footage, and incident reports." Definition number one. Definition number two, "Transformed Data" means the Provided Data," that we just talked about, of course it just lost it. The provided data... Let me start all over. "Transformed Data" means the Provided Data used for the purpose of quantitative evaluation of the performance and effectiveness of TASER energy weapons in the field across a variety of circumstances." So, I think that is telling us that one is capturing, one is kind of de-identifying the footage that it is capturing. And the section right under it says, "Axon shall own all rights and title to transform data and derivatives of transformed data." My reading of that tells me that it will not be confidential data, but there is still some kind of aggregate information that is going to them. So, I want to see more information on that. There is also sections here as I was moving forward a little bit more on the contract related to privacy, and you know, I guess where I am at Sheriff, is that, I understand the cost savings. I understand that this is a tool that is already in use, and that this is going to save us money in the long run. So, I am sympathetic to the Sheriff's concerns in particular, but I am just wondering if there is better explanation that we need right now about some of these real privacy concerns that are proliferating in communities across our country, and in particular, if this data is able to be shared with other jurisdictions. And I have heard assurances that we are not sharing this compilation of data with other jurisdictions. Is that accurate, including the federal government?

CN: That is very accurate.

AC: And right now, Sheriff, Chair Scott. We have a manual person, we have a person I should say, a real person, not a bot, that is filtering this data before it ever gets compiled and to fix some of the hallucinations that are taking place. Right?

CN: Exactly, yes.

AC: How many folks do we have doing that work?

CN: I am going to let Captain give you the exact number, but we have a body-worn camera team that deals with redaction, which is quite a task in itself. I am proud of the fact that if you ask for body-worn camera video footage for a FOIA request from

some other jurisdictions, it is six months to a year's out. We are within a month usually, of getting that stuff, and it is all redacted, and we go through the same redaction as we would if you FOIA an accident report, a vehicle accident report. It goes through our team, goes through our detectives, goes through our legal advisor. And then a decision is made as to what is released. But I am going to have Captain come up and Derek stand up and introduce yourself. He can be, he is going to get into ways much better than I.

AC: That is how I feel when I ask Administrator Leshar for more information, you know, and really quick. Thank you, Mr. Ogden. Also, when we are uploading to the cloud, all of this video, is that another software company or is it Axon? Thank you.

DO: Well good afternoon. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Derek Ogden. I am a Captain with the Sheriff's Department. Thank you for your questions because our agency and the Sheriff, we take those questions seriously and to all the community members that have reached out with those similar concerns. We have taken a year and a half to vet these questions and to listen to those concerns, and really, in opportune for us to be as transparent as we can and to find a way to be the most productive and efficient agency we can, while taking all of those concerns. So yes, that is the same company. So, when we upload that to our evidence.Com, which is the system that it is called, that is also with Axon. Now our agency, as the Sheriff said, we own all of that. That information cannot be shared without going through a redaction process, final approval through a chain of command or legal advisor, and finally, with the Sheriff. So, all of the concerns that that would get out in any other way, that has to be approved by our chain of command, by the Sheriff, and by our legal advisor, before it is shared with anybody. So our department owns and our County owns all of that data. To the first question, sir, where how do we, the data and how do we protect that? So, when our deputies or corrections officers have an interaction with a member of the public, and that is captured on our body-worn camera and the later a public records request for that happens, that goes through redaction process. So, any confidential private information that is seen in that body worn camera, any involved members of the public that are not involved in that call themselves, their faces are redacted. Any of that confidential and private information is redacted from that video. It then again goes through that chain of command to make sure that there is nothing missed. It goes through our legal advisor, and finally to the Sheriff for final approval, for redaction. So we take that very seriously. We understand any and all privacy concerns, and we do our best to make sure that nothing that is confidential, private, or should not be released is not released, whether it be any of our written documents or the video as well.

AC: Mr. Ogden, thank you for that response. Chair Scott. But that is not just public records request, that is also in preparation for any court proceedings, trials, right, that are needed to proceed with any prosecution?

- CN: For prosecution, County Attorney Laura Conover, she has her own redaction team as well. So, we work closely with them. We may redact something, give it to them for all kinds of legal reasons, they may further redact it.
- RS: Any other questions from Board members? Supervisor Allen?
- JA: What would happen if Axon is subpoenaed by an agency of the federal government to hand over data? Pima County Sheriff's Department data?
- DO: That would go through our Sheriff. We own and maintain all of our records. Axon is just basically, a housing through the Evidence.com platform that we use. Our agency, our County, we own all of that data.
- CN: I understand your concern. These are, your concerns are exactly where we were over a year ago when this contract first came out with Axon and the use of data and how it would be stored. These were challenges that we not only asked about but worked with Axon to ensure us that those things would not occur. To your point, if Axon is asked, here is a subpoena, we want all that data. Remember now, they do not just have ours, they have an entire nation's law enforcement data. To be honest with you, I guess if they wanted to, they may be able to, I do not know. And I will ask Captain Ogden if he knows. Is there something we have electronically that blocks Axon from doing that? I do not believe so, but if it could happen, I guess it could happen. But if channels are used to program, if the contract is spelled out well and the rules are followed, I do not believe that would happen but...
- DO: Again, it is our understanding that all of the data, the evidence, everything that our department puts into that system is owned by our department. So, Axon under a subpoena, and I do not want to speak for them. They do not have anything to provide. We own all of that. But I can get those answers for you for sure.
- JA: I mean it is my understanding just a simple, you know, looking up Axon now and given the federal environment in which we are in, they are very proud to boast that they are the agency or the institution contracted by Homeland Security. So, there is obviously concerns then about proximity of our data. And then it is, you know, just over here on the same cloud, or next cloud over, homeland security in those collaborations. So, there is there is a couple of other things in looking a little bit into Axon that have raised some flags. There is a lawsuit against Axon by a competing AI company on the grounds that Axon's body-worn cameras contained chips that are linked to the Chinese government posing espionage and some surveillance risks. There was also, in 2022, most of the companies AI ethics board resigned over the company's plans to put tasers on drones. There is a long list of things in which Axon has done and has been sort of mired in some controversy, both around civil rights, civil liberties, and some of their, I do not know if you want to call that a business model of tasers on drones. I am concerned, right, that there is within the contract categories of data, both from utilizing their cloud services, data acquired through body cams, data acquired through drone use as well, and all of that feeding up in. I guess I am also wondering, I know that the County IT department has

created a working group of task force looking at data security, and I am wondering whether this contract has been and this work has gone through that group, consulted with, what have been the processes and the conversations in place, focused specifically on securing and protecting the data of County residents?

DO: Well, I can tell you, at least with the existing contract and all of the upgrades we have worked together. It has gone through the criticality security questionnaires, all of those things working with it, especially as we have moved through to the procurement process in the event that this was approved by the Board to make sure that all of those things had been checked, confirmed, and that there were no questions or concerns that there was.

JA: Do you feel like there is more that could be done to protect our data? The security of the Sheriff's Department data, and the data related to Pima County residents?

CN: Supervisor Allen, members of the Board. What could be done is exactly what we have done, and that is work with our IT, work with County leadership, work with Axon, share with them our concerns. Some of the same concerns you are speaking of, and iron those out in a process that has been well over a year in the makings. I feel comfortable with what we have put down in a contract, but I am not an attorney, even though attorneys were involved in that. If your question is, could we do more? I think what you do is like we do with any contract, is you take that contract to your legal teams and say, does this meet all of our concerns? I do not know that Axon can ever tell us, besides what is on a contract, what they can or cannot do with the touch of a button when we are dealing with today's world of technology. For me to assume that, it is ours. We know the data is ours, and we only know that because it is in a contract. Axon cannot get it without asking us. They cannot share it without asking us. It is only contractual and so, based on those contracts, which you see, we bring them to you, I do not know that there is much more. I wish I could build a firewall that says Axon you cannot look now that you have given it to us. I do not, you know, we are trying to really just keep up with the times and upgrades that help us have the ability to provide our citizenry with the best tools that allows us to serve our community in the best way possible. I do not know what to tell you, other than, I really do understand your concerns. They were our concerns, but we have taken all the steps we can and working with our IT, expressing the Chinese chips and things. That was done in 2021 when this contract was first brought forward, that we were not going to do those things. Does Axon have drones that can shoot tasers? I imagine they do, but I do not think they are the only company. The question to ask is, does the Sheriff Department have those? No, we do not. And there is a reason. It is because we say that is a piece of equipment, is not developed, is not safe, whatever it may be, it does not meet my eye to say this is a good tool. Body-worn cameras today, trust me, I would much rather have, I do not know, \$35, \$45 million, I could buy me a lot of deputies. I could certainly use those. But I know that technology does allow us to become more effective, more efficient, and a way to... The money is just never ending, right? We know that. Using technology to be smarter can also help us with our financial futures as well.

- JA: One last question. So, if we own the data, does it mean then that it is held on our servers or is it held on Axon servers?
- CN: I believe it starts off on... I will let Captain Ogden could explain that, but I know that and I want you to know something. I think we said something to one of your questions that we do not share that with other agencies, and we do share some of that data. Think of our PRCIT, Pima Regional Critical Incident Team. There is an officer involved shooting. It is my team that is involved in the shooting as the focus officer, Tucson Police Department (TPD) or Oro Valley may be the investigative agency. They have access to that, just as we have access to theirs. So, on a local level, that sharing occurs, but TPD cannot get it from Axon, and they cannot get it from their own systems. They have to ask us.
- DO: And it is my understanding to your question, that the server itself, which we refer to as Evidence.Com, we pay for that, but it is an Axon product. So, while we put all the things into it, that is what we own. We do buy that from them, but that is part of our contractual agreement with them, is that all of our digital and electronic evidence is stored in Evidence.Com, and that is an Axon server that we buy as part of that contract within. If that answers the question.
- JA: I have a question, this is maybe for the Administrator. I know that we are in the process, that we have an IT committee that is looking at the data, and security, and the ethics and protections. Where is that at? Do we have, because I am wondering and where my head is going, is if we have established some lines, that these are the sort of security protections that we as the County demand and expect for wherever our data goes? And if this contract meets those standards or not? And is there alignment there and is there review there that needs to happen and assessment?
- JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen. As you know, the committee is standing up. The committee has not reviewed this or looked at this from that perspective, and I think we would be happy to get the data group to take a look at it if we need to hit a brief pause and make sure that they are an external party or part of our other IT operations, or scrubbing it as well, but it has not convened to discuss this item or to review this contract.
- CN: If I might add, just real quick. Clearly, if there is any entity out there that can secure this more so, I stand right behind it.
- RS: I think Supervisor Heinz had a question. The Clerk said that you had raised your hand, Supervisor?
- MH: Yeah, just to clarify. Does this new contract increase the budget for the Sheriff's Department by \$4.5 million every year for ten years going forward, or am I, did I mishear that, or misunderstand that?

- JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. Yes, it would do that and the idea being, and the reason we have looked at it is, that it holds steady the cost over the ten-year period, rather than, it might be the same for the next couple of years, and then it would increase, we think, quite dramatically. So, this would be a plus up of the budget to accommodate this contract.
- MH: I mean, I do not know, like in 2020 the budget for the Sheriff's Department was \$160 million. I believe it is now a little bit over \$190 million in the five years I have been here. Is there a way that we could do this with internal savings, instead of increasing another \$4.5 million to the Sheriff's Department, which has received the most money of any department, division, office, agency or anything at all that we do at the County, in terms of the money we can control. Has that been looked at? Because I would prefer that we not dedicate another \$4.5 million when we are, I mean, throwing scraps at the refugees, trying to deal with food banks and emergency crisis situations and so many of the other priorities we have. Affordable housing, environmental stewardship and I just, I do not know. I just feel like that is, can we economize internally and just absorb it that way, instead of having to increase the budget by \$4.5 million a year going forward, is what I am asking?
- JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz. For the current year, I believe what we are looking for is the increase, because we are halfway through the fiscal year and not sure where the Sheriff's Department would accommodate the \$4.5 million savings. But as we begin to look at next year, we are happy to work with the Sheriff's Department and see what we might be able to do so that it is not automatically the plus up of that amount, but that we can see other savings in some area and we could commit to work with the Sheriff's Department and he has always been working with us on that. But I cannot indicate that we would be able to find savings within the department at this point, in this current fiscal year.
- MH: And last question, why is this coming before us right now? Like is there a specific, and I may have missed this, but is there a specific reason that we are talking about this like right now, today? Is there some offer that expires at the end of the year? I am just curious, is there a need to vote on this today or can this be discussed for another meeting? I am just curious if there is like some kind of an urgency or concern about the timing or what prompted this to come forward now versus six months ago or versus six months from now?
- CN: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz...
- RS: If I could just, I apologize, Sheriff. If I could piggyback on that question, because I would like it to be addressed not just by yourself, but also by the County Administrator, because the Board of Supervisors agenda item report was signed, not just by the Sheriff. It was also signed by the Procurement Director, the Deputy County Administrator, and the County Administrator. I think Supervisor Heinz's question, I would like it addressed not just by the department head, but also by the County Administrator or anybody she would want to designate to respond.

JL: Happy to start with the first part, if I may.

RS: Please.

JL: Chair Scott. This came through the Procurement Department. We have signed off on the procurement process. It came through Director Collins, through Mr. Holmes, and then through me. We believe that it is an appropriate request. You do not see necessarily recommendations from this. We sign off and bring forward our ability to staff in the requests from the elected officials directly to the Board.

RS: Thank you. Sheriff Nanos?

CN: Chair Scott, madam County Administrator, and Supervisor Heinz. I am sorry, my back is to you. This actually came about over a year ago from us when we were starting to see their upgrades, and they being, Axon. They started trying to sell the wares and we were certainly in no position to purchase anything and we wanted to see what it was they had available to us with those upgrades. Those upgrades improved and got better and better as time went on. But I guess to answer more direct Supervisor Heinz your question, as to why now? Axon told us that they are holding down their prices for us. When we first started negotiating in 2024, they told us they would continue at that pricing up until 2026, January. When they told us that they could no longer after that time, after January of 2026, could no longer hold those prices because, in fairness to their other law enforcement teams that they work with, they are not getting this price. We are the only ones being offered what they call a leadership price only because of the relationship we have maintained with them throughout the last 4 or 5 years. They find us as a good partner to work with and so that is really the only reason it is coming now. Again, when they first came to us, it was \$112 million. They actually say to us, if this is not accepted at 2031, at the end of 2031, all the equipment we have are body-worn cameras, our tasers, all of those, become theirs, we are leasing it, so they get all of that back and now we are starting at scratch for whatever cost the market will bear. They anticipate that to be an average of 6% to 10%, 8% a year of an increase. So, they see it as we are really getting a pretty good cost savings, \$112 million to \$45 million. I can live with \$45 million and comfortably come to the Board and say, I think we are getting somewhere here with them in a fair market value. When I started, we had six shooters, wield guns. Today, we have automatic, semi-automatics, cars, as Supervisor Christy pointed out, the technology in cars is incredibly different than it was five years ago, much less 40 years ago or ten years ago. So, to their point, I think they have in good faith negotiated their pricing down and are now offering us an opportunity at current pricing to move this project ahead ten years.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Go ahead, Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Sheriff. It has been a true joy to work with the District 5 Office, and you and our conversations have meant a lot to me. I do believe that this contract has

many different perspectives, and I look forward to getting to an agreement on this passage. You know, when I hear one of our elected officers, particularly our Sheriff, asking for support for our deputies, our men and women in uniform, I do think we have to pay attention and listen. And this is a technology that is already in use. But I also, before approving this, need to hear some reassurances that on data privacy, that you are listening to this, and I would like to continue the item for one meeting and to see if you might be able to come up with your exceptional team on some ideas to involve a citizen driven process on it. You guys come up with the idea, Data Privacy Citizens Committee, something that gives an explanation of what we are doing and where we are going with contract of this nature. We are in a truly unprecedented time where you have got you have got surveillance really impacting lots of communities. I also understand the perspective that if an emergency is taking place or a crime happens, do you want it to be recorded? Do you want there to be documentation? Do you want a transcript? In most instances, I would say that most people would say yes to that question. I would like specifically to see a further explanation of what this transformed data means, and whether that can be removed from the contract. My guess is not because the way AI works is, it is aggregated and it is large language models that talk. And so my belief is that somehow Axon, the only way this works for them is if they get the scrubbed version of our data so that they can predict things moving along. This is not, from my perspective, a continuance, an outright denial of this. It is a need for us to have a continued conversation with our community about how we are going to use county taxpayer dollars wisely, especially when this is projected ten years out. And to the points that have already been mentioned here, we are making tough, difficult decisions. This Board passed a primary property tax rate at a neutral rate in the last year, and we do not know what our General Fund balance is going to be at the end of this year but right now, it is at \$11. This would indicate that this would be almost a third of that if trends, of course, were to be the same and all of that. So, there are fiscal concerns that we have to also be navigating in all of this, while also allowing you to have the autonomy to run your department. So, I say all of those things to say, please let Axon know we look forward to continuing to work with them and I am going to move that we continue this item to our next meeting.

RS: Could I ask you a favor, Supervisor? Because I have not had the chance to ask any questions. I am inclined to support your motion, but if we second that now, I am not going to be able to ask some of the other questions.

AC: Absolutely. I will withdraw the motion.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor.

MH: I also have a follow up.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Heinz. I will call on you here in just a second. My question had to do with some responses, Sheriff, that you had to both Supervisor Cano and Supervisor Allen, when they asked you earlier about data privacy concerns. You

said we had our IT look at it. Was that the IT division within your department or the County's IT department?

CN: I will let Captain Ogden.

DO: Yeah. Pima County, sir, through Pima County.

RS: Mr. Baca's Department?

DO: Yes, sir.

RS: Okay because what I would...

CN: Before...

RS: Go ahead Sheriff.

CN: Before, because I do not want to get Mr. Baca in trouble.

RS: You are not.

CN: We were working with IT and Procurement to try to get a package put together to present to this Board that was as complete as possible. We did not want to come here with nothing from IT or Procurement. We know their role is important. We just knew that like we said at the start, your concerns are our concerns, and they have been our concerns for a long time. When this first started with Axon over a year ago. So, yes.

RS: To that point. I am inclined when he makes it, to support Supervisor Cano's motion, especially since you said Axon needs an answer by January, which I gather is the end of January. And we meet again on January 6th but I would want to report, Ms. Leshner, from Mr. Baca's department and I would think that Supervisors could send questions to the County Administrator, that could then be forwarded to Mr. Baca, that might address some of our concerns. But I have an additional one, and it is related to this deal that we are getting from Axon, which I am sure they are not just doing out of the goodness of their heart. But we had a ten-year contract with them in 2021, and I remember because it was like in the fall of 2021 that we took it up. Now they are coming in at the halfway point and wanting us to extend it past 2031 to 2036. Would also like a report to the Board from the Sheriff and County Administration with regard to why that is a good deal. Breaking that down a little bit more, like how did they come down from the \$112 to the \$45? I would like to know some of the granularity behind all that, if we look at this continuance. But let me, unless you had something to say in response to either of those things.

CN: [Nods head, no]

RS: I was going to go to Supervisor Heinz. Okay. go ahead, Supervisor.

MH: Thanks, and this can be for staff or the Sheriff. This comes from a position of ignorance as to this specific area. But like, are there other Axons? I know we are about to change who we bank with for like hundreds of millions of dollars and I guess, it is not going to be Bank of America anymore. But I know the Treasurer is talking to Chase and Wells Fargo and a few others, probably. But like, are there other Axon or Axon-like entities? Was this a competitive process? I heard the procurement directors signed on to this. Are we supersizing just an existing contract with an existing relationship that we already have, or was the new stuff, can that not be, are there other entities that do this and have we looked at those and asked them for pricing? And was this sort of like a process, or is this just our existing relationship entity asking us for a larger contract for some more services? And if this was already explained, I apologize, but I did not catch that before.

RS: I do not think it was already explained and I know Mr. Holmes wants to be recognized, but I am just looking back through the BOSAIR and when we approved this as a Board in September of 2021, I am sorry I said October earlier, it was a sole source procurement. Was that what you wanted to say, Mr. Holmes? Go ahead sir.

SH: Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz. Just for context, Axon is a company we also use with Public Defense Services (PDS) and with our County Attorney. So, they offer a suite of solutions that are part of a whole camera redaction system. They all work together. Part of the way our PDS works and our County Attorney is they take those body-worn cameras, they take the information, are able to use the Axon system. So, it is a pretty extensive suite that is used across the County, not just for our Sheriff's Department, but used also by County Attorneys and our PDS. I just want to make sure that is clear. There was a contract that came to the Board last year around this time for those two entities, which was similar in scope in terms of price increases. So, this is common practice when companies are changing year to year, they are price increases, their incentives to extend the contract. We did that with PDS and with the County Attorney's office last year around this time, I believe December, the last meeting in December of last year, specifically for those two departments in a similar fashion.

RS: Thank you very much. Supervisor Heinz, any follow up, sir?

MH: I guess just the last thing, will waiting until January 6th, like in any way compromise our ability to secure the same deal or is that going to be okay? I do not know if that is a staff or a Sheriff question, but I just want to make sure before we potentially continue it, we do not end up kind of causing another issue.

RS: Go ahead, Sheriff.

CN: Yes, sir. Chair Scott, Supervisor Heinz, members of the Board. They wanted to know of a commitment before the end of 2025. So, December 31 is what they were hoping to hear from. We will talk to them, let them know. I, first of all, Supervisor Cano, I appreciate your kind remarks. We, again, understand the concerns and the

questions and we will work with IT and maybe we can drag, I say drag, I think they are willing to get some people from Axon in a room with IT, so that they can kind of make sure your answers are, the transformed data, get that better defined and find out. Because I think for Axon, a number of their issues were also when I talked to them about the Taser 10, that they gave us a 7 and they got a new model. They said there are some proprietary secrets that they are working with other vendors on, and so they could not... I do not know that is part of this, but we can learn a little more from Axon and IT as to what they can do, particularly in defining that the terms of the contract, making them with better clarity.

RS: So, you do not think it is, to Supervisor Heinz's question and referring to Supervisor Cano's possible motion, you do not foresee any difficulty if the Board were to continue this item to January 6th?

CN: You are asking me to speak for a pretty big corporation there. I would hope that they would understand that this is a big ticket item for us, and it is a very important item for the community. I mean, we look, I am old school. If I could give you those cameras and you hire 100 deputies with those cameras, I would rather do that. But I also know and realize that cameras are the way it works, and it helps me in managing my department. It helps in building that public trust. We have seen a number of officer involved incidents, shootings and others. It really does protect us, and it does show some transparency.

RS: I would hope that they would recognize that the Board is not like the state legislature, where things come up for first, second and third reading. We get things on our agenda, and if we have enough information, we are able to consider them at that time.

CN: Yes.

RS: But if we do not and we seek to continue them, I would hope for, like you just said, for a contract of that size, they would recognize that there was some information that Board members needed, not just from Axon, but also from your department, from County Administration, and would understand the basis for that continuance and not just yank their offer.

CN: Again...

RS: Again, because they are not making it out of the goodness of their hearts.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I am concerned about that issue. If we pass a deadline date, it could definitely affect the price of the whole purchase. Is there any kind of cushion between now and the end of the year that given that the Sheriff can go back to Axon and his staff and see

what their status is on allowing it to go into the next meeting? What if they say, no, absolutely not, this is only good through December 31st, and if you do not make a decision by then, we are withdrawing the offer. Is there any kind of cushion for the Sheriff to find that out in advance of December 31st, and then the Board can at some point maybe deliberate it in some manner to accommodate this?

CN: Chair Scott, Supervisor Christy, members of the Board. "Derek?" He is going to explain it better than I. "Come on up here." I believe he has had some conversations with his Axon partners they said that if there is an agreement, the agreement could be canceled for no reason. Any other reason you wanted within a 30-day period but... "Please correct me."

DO: So, we recognize the timing with this and some of the concerns and some of the questions that have come up. And one of the assurances that we were given is that, even if it were approved, the contract was approved and they were consolidated and amended, that we have the ability to cancel that contract at any time without penalty. So, it allows for some of that buffer, I think, to your question that if things had come up that it can be.

SC: Mr. Chair, Sheriff Nanos. Would you be comfortable if this Board conditionally approved it based on the responses from Axon?

CN: Well, I would be fine with that. However, I understand some trepidation. Well, I think if I may, allow my team to contact Axon when we leave this meeting and let us see what they tell us and I will get back to the Chair and Ms. Leshner and others. I will let you all know.

RS: Thank you, Sheriff. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I appreciate you, Sheriff. I look forward to supporting this contract and ensuring that some of the conversations that we have had today are remedied, that they are provided to the Board in a memo form. I do believe that you have great soldiers in the fight to tell you, of course, you know, speed up the timeline. But this is not a function. The Board is exercising its due diligence right now. And I am not blaming any one particular person. But when you schedule something on the last meeting of the calendar year and then tell us that this is the only time we are going to be able to do this, and I was only thinking of the continuance, and we talked about this yesterday evening after I had some more conversation. And then in your introductory remarks earlier, I heard you say February or March, maybe it would give. I do not want to go that far. I want us to have an expedited timeline. I want us to get all of the conversations here so that we can ensure that we are protecting our data. I appreciated Assistant County Administrator Holmes's perspective, the holistic perspective of the fact that our County departments are already using similar contracts. And so at this point, I think I am not even focused as much as I am on... Well, let me put it this another way. This administration should exercise great caution when putting together a \$4 million

increase to the County budget. And I want to work with the Sheriff and with the Administrator to figure out how we are going to navigate that path forward.

CN: Thank you, I appreciate that.

RS Supervisor Allen?

JA: One thing as the County Administrator and IT had looking at the security protections, and I want to make sure, well, two things. One, is that there is an eye towards the protections of civil liberties, that it is not just about the data security, but it is often noted that the increased utilization of AI in law enforcement can be problematic, and including that that generating reports through AI can have the potential for bringing in bias and unreliability. There is lack of transparency for how AI derives its inputs, and then there is just not a whole lot of privacy protections. So, one is an eye towards civil liberties. But then the other thing and I think is important, is to also consider the alternative of not doing this and is our data more secure by not going this path? Are we protecting civil liberties by not going this path so that there is a sort of no action alternative that is also contemplated? Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Any other questions or comments from Board members? I know that Supervisor Cano had to leave out, but I hear the door, so he is coming back. Any other questions or comments from Board members on this item?

AC: [Inaudible]

RS: Supervisor?

AC: [Inaudible] motion?

RS: You can.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. On Item No. 29, I move that we continue the item to... the 20th or the 6th?

RS: I thought we initially talked about the 6th.

AC: Let us do the 6th...no.

RS: Assuming that gives County Administration and the Sheriff time to get back to us.

AC: Sorry, let me start all over. Chair Scott, I move Item No. 29, continue the item until our first meeting in January, January 6th.

RS: And that we request the...

AC: Additional information as discussed by the Board today.

RS: I will second that. Any discussion? Now the discussion moves to the motion on the table. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye, or giving a thumbs up. Aye.

MH: [Thumbs up.]

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

SC: Aye.

RS: That passes unanimously.

CN: Thank you so much, Chair Scott and members of the Board, for your time today. Appreciate it.

RS: Thank you, Sheriff. Appreciate the time of you and your staff members.

CN: Thank you.

RS: Very grateful for discussion of all three of these items even though it seems like a long time ago since we talked about the previous two. Thank you very much.

CN: Good discussion.

RS: Thank you.

CN: Thank you.

RS: Thank you.