

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, November 4, 2025. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

Also Present: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:20 a.m. He left the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Elizabeth Cozzi, AuD, Associate Vice President Community Development, United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona.

3. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

4. PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passing of Parralee Schneider, who was a valued community member of the Tanque Verde Valley and District 4. He stated that Ms. Schneider had lived in Tucson since 1946, graduated from Salpointe Catholic High School, and attended the University of Arizona and she had been involved in many community and volunteer activities, including the Arizona and Pima County GOP, the Forty-Niners HOA, Friends of the Kirk-Bear Canyon Library, the Tanque Verde Neighborhood Association, and C.E. Rose Elementary. He requested a moment of silence in her memory. He also congratulated Alicia Brewer, owner of Bake a Difference Cookie Shop, for being honored by the Small Business Commission as the Small Business of the Year. He stated that she was a proud Vail

resident and business owner, who operated a family-run bakery that donated one dollar from every cookie sold to a local nonprofit supporting animal welfare.

Supervisor Cano expressed appreciation for Election workers and stated that Election Day required significant County resources, especially for consolidated elections, and that many people were eagerly awaiting the results from today's election. He also welcomed the union members that were present at the meeting. He announced that this week District 5 would launch a four-part series called Love of Lectura, which translated to "Love of Reading," and that the series was created to bring the community together around books by local authors whose stories reflected local experiences. He stated that the first event was scheduled for November 6th at 5:30 p.m., at the YWCA with former State Representative Lorenzo Sierra, the author of *Fight Like Hell*, which was a memoir about his near-fatal experience with COVID-19 and his wife's battle with breast cancer. He shared the confirmed lineup for the remaining events: in December, Tohono O'odham poet Ofelia Zepeda; in February, former District 5 Supervisor and PBS host David Yetman with his book *Saguaro*; and in April, local author Lydia Otero, who would discuss gentrification in the barrios. He stated that all the events were free and attendees would receive a copy of each featured book.

Supervisor Allen noted that the County's ECAP was underway and encouraged all County employees, including supervisors and staff, to participate. She explained that contributions could be deducted from paychecks either as a one-time donation or spread throughout the year and that the campaign's goal was to raise \$275,000.00. She thanked the committee members who organized the campaign, departmental staff who supported it, and the United Way for serving as a key partner in efforts to build a stronger and more compassionate Pima County.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Jacob Bernal, Executive Director, and Alexander Lewis, Board Chair, Tucson Indian Center, proclaiming the day of Saturday, November 8, 2025 to be: "TUCSON INDIAN CENTER 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.

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Dan Sullivan, Director, Rhonda Pina, Deputy Director, Gabriel Lopez and Nicole Scott, Community and Workforce Managers I, Community and Workforce Development, proclaiming the week of November 4 through November 11, 2025 to be: "OPERATION GREEN LIGHT WEEK"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Sarah King, Executive Director, Pat King, Board Chair, and Mary Miller, Founder, Altar Valley Conservation Alliance, proclaiming the month of November 2025 to be: "ALTAR VALLEY CONSERVATION MONTH"

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Bill Leith, proclaiming the day of Tuesday, November 4, 2025 to be: "BILL LEITH DAY"

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

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Aaron Cross addressed the Board regarding the number of experienced staff the Sheriff's Department had lost to other agencies due to poor leadership. He asked the Board to take action, such as by providing raises and having competitive salaries.

Courtney Hoyt explained that Tucson had long depended on local builders whose work strengthened the City's infrastructure. She emphasized that investing in local construction projects kept money in the community and gave future generations a reason to build their lives in Pima County.

Shawn Blubaum spoke in support of the Beale Infrastructure Data Center project and that reversing the agreement would damage Pima County's business reputation. He stated that the project would create jobs, generate stable tax revenue, and strengthen the region.

Wayne Dorris expressed support for the Beale Infrastructure Data Center project, highlighting the long-term benefits of data centers, including high-paying local jobs and tax revenue for the community.

J.P. Salvatierra stated that national democracy and public trust were under threat, including through proposals like nondisclosure agreements. He stated that the Copper World project would damage local water resources and must be stopped to protect future generations.

Brian Pena addressed the Board regarding his support of Project Blue. He acknowledged community concerns but emphasized the project's potential for economic growth and technological advancement in Pima County. He stated that Beale's commitment was to their safety, local hiring, and no wage theft.

Dr. Barbara Eiswerth explained that cutting SNAP benefits would harm newly arrived refugees who faced trauma and complex bureaucratic systems. She urged the County to advocate for continued support during their first five years in the U.S.

Marjie Brecht stated that refugees faced a complex resettlement process and needed public benefits when they first arrived to become self-sufficient. She emphasized their contributions and moral characters and urged the Board to provide food assistance.

Mohammed Fadulalmsula spoke about his experience fleeing Sudan after working for 19 years at the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum and sought resettlement in the U.S. through the SIV program. He explained that he and his family had not yet received benefits, leaving them in urgent need, and requested support for refugees facing similar problems.

Joshua DeSpain expressed support for the Beale Infrastructure project, noting its redesign to an air-cooled system that reduced water usage. He highlighted the project's first phase would bring 3,000 union jobs to Southern Arizona, which would boost the local economy, and mentioned ongoing efforts to establish a project labor agreement with Beale Infrastructure.

Bill O'Brien praised the County's emergency funding initiative for food banks, and shared his own experience of seeing food run out at local pantries. He urged support for refugee resettlement agencies, noting their role in helping newcomers navigate the system and avoid vulnerability.

Fabian Sandez, Regional Manager, Western States Regional Council of Carpenters, spoke in support of Project Blue, emphasizing its potential to provide local jobs, reduce commutes, and create apprenticeship opportunities. He highlighted the project's long-term benefits for Pima County, which included increased tax revenue, public safety, and infrastructure.

Bill Ruiz stated that Project Blue would provide high-paying union jobs and create 3,000 construction positions, boosting Pima County's economy and exceeding workforce projections.

Sergio Estrada spoke in support of the Beale Infrastructure Project that would create 3,000 direct construction jobs, apprenticeships, and long-term economic and tax benefits for Pima County.

Frank Sisha addressed the Board in support of the Beale Project and emphasized its benefits for workers, families, and Pima County's economy.

Luke Felix-Rose expressed his opposition to Project Blue's high energy demands, potential costs to ratepayers, and lack of guaranteed union jobs. He stated that the developer had not been transparent or trustworthy, and urged the Board to prioritize community interests over corporate profit.

Robert Reus spoke about the United States no longer being a rich country given the homelessness and hunger and criticized Tucson's election process for failing to

provide required polling places. He explained that he did not vote for any candidates and planned to form a new political party next year.

Herye Harerimana stated that many recent policy changes caused many refugee families to lose SNAP benefits, leaving them struggling to secure enough food. He urged the Board to support emergency funding for food banks and resettlement agencies to help refugees access basic support and rebuild their lives in Pima County.

Olive Mukbalisa, explained that the loss of benefits left many refugees unable to afford both food and essential legal services needed for permanent residency. She urged the Board to support resettlement agencies so refugees could access reliable legal assistance during their transition.

Reed Spurling spoke in opposition to Project Blue, warning that its massive energy demand would strain the grid, increase water consumption, and raise costs for ratepayers. He urged the Board to protect the region's climate, energy affordability and water by stopping the project.

W. Kate Spaulding, Manager, Pima County Teen Court, thanked the County for years of support for the YWCA-run juvenile diversion program. She highlighted its restorative justice model, thousands of teens served and mentored, and strong outcomes in communication, conflict resolution, and keeping youth out of the school-to-prison pipeline.

Alan Munoz expressed his support for Project Blue's potential to create local jobs, generate tax revenue, and retain young workers in Pima County. He emphasized the carpenters' commitment to safe, quality work, community-based construction.

Jon Ralston stated that the Board should hire outside counsel to stop the Project Blue land sale, indicating that the process shut out the public and tied officials' hands. He cited the Milgram experiment and warned against following authority at the expense of the community.

Claudio Rodriguez thanked the County for supporting the Community Food Bank of Arizona, highlighted rising hunger due to SNAP cuts, and urged the community to volunteer, donate, and help meet growing needs.

Annie Kunz, Program Director, Jewish Family and Children's Services, spoke on the County supporting Afghan refugees facing food insecurity due to SNAP cuts. She stated that most households had working adults but still relied on benefits, and that cuts would impact around 130 Afghan families in Pima County.

Richard Lerma expressed support for the Beale Infrastructure Data Center, emphasizing its creation of well-paying local jobs in construction and ongoing operations. He spoke about the project's long-term benefits, including strengthening

energy infrastructure, supporting apprenticeships, and sustaining Arizona's workforce and economy.

Jonathan Dailey expressed his support for the Beale Infrastructure Data Center, emphasizing the project's benefits for local working families. He highlighted that laborers were the foundation of construction, providing safe, skilled work, and stressed that approving the project supported economic growth and opportunities for real people in the community.

Sean Lopez spoke in support of the Project Blue Data Center, highlighting its potential to provide steady, dignified careers for local workers. He emphasized that union labor ensured safe, quality construction, supported families and communities, and urged the Board to approve the project as an investment in both Arizona's workforce and infrastructure.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

Chair Scott asked if any Board members wanted to request staff to follow up on any matter that was brought before them during Call to the Public, request that an item be placed on a future agenda or respond to a criticism. Chair Scott indicated that Mr. Brown, who served as the Board's parliamentarian, asked that Board members be reminded that comments made after Call to the Public should be about those three things only.

Supervisor Heinz requested that staff follow up with the concerns brought forward by Sergeant Cross, specifically losing deputies to DPS and other law enforcement agencies, and the concern for one of the driving factors being a lack of competitive salaries.

Chair Scott added to Supervisor Heinz's request, a response from staff working in partnership with the Sheriff.

Supervisor Allen acknowledged Ellie Towne and her husband, who were in attendance and indicated that they had attended the kickoff of the renewal of the Senior Meal Program at the Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center together. She stated that Ms. Towne and other seniors rallied when funding got cut and raised the money to resume the program, and that there were over 50 seniors at the kickoff event. She stated that the program was back due to the dedication of Ms. Towne and the other volunteers.

Supervisor Christy questioned if Supervisor Allen's comments were in accordance with the three things that could be done after Call to the Public. He stated that if they were, then he had comments that he wanted to make as well.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that they were not and that comments should be about one of the three items stated by Chair Scott.

Supervisor Christy asked Mr. Brown if he would allow him to make comments along those lines, as he had with Supervisor Allen.

Mr. Brown stated that at this point, yes.

Supervisor Christy thanked the union members for their attendance and articulating the basic positive aspects of Project Blue. He stated that they were the backbone of the community and they expressed common sense which had been lacking during the entire discussion about Project Blue. He applauded their efforts and stated that he was behind them.

10. 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 12:23 p.m.

11. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 3:50 p.m. Supervisor Heinz was not present. All other members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding discussion with outside counsel regarding external investigations of the Pima County Sheriff's Department.

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

13. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding legal options related to Project Blue.

This item was for discussion 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 update on federal actions.

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 proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. Legislative Action to Address Short-Term Rentals

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administrator to send a letter to Governor Katie Hobbs, Arizona Senate President Warren Peterson, Arizona House Speaker Steve Montenegro, and the legislative delegation of Pima County urging them to support legislative action to address short-term rentals. (District 3)

Supervisor Allen stated that she had received a request from the Board's colleagues in Yavapai County to join them in support of other counties around the State that were struggling with affordable housing and with the shift from private homes being acquired by outside entities and corporations, and then put into a short-term rental stock, thereby taking them out of available housing. decreasing the supply and increasing the cost of housing in communities. She stated that this would be a letter calling on State leadership to review this issue and to review legislative action that could restore decision making to local communities about the use and the prevalence of short-term rentals in the community. She noted that this was also an issue that the County Supervisors Association (CSA) approved during their annual meeting and was now part of that organization's legislative agenda, an effort that was led by Yavapai, Coconino and Cochise Counties. She hoped her colleagues would support the item.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that as indicated by Supervisor Allen this was put forward by Yavapai County and asked if she could cite any issues or hotspots in Pima County.

Supervisor Allen stated that it was difficult to ascertain the number of short-term rentals and their ownership across Pima County but there were issues around short-term rentals being scattered across Pima County. She stated that there were communities where it was far more acute like Bisbee, Prescott and others where it had a devastating impact on their overall affordable housing. She stated that the request made to the Board was to stand in solidarity with other Counties and present a united front to leadership, calling on the urgency of taking this issue up legislatively.

Supervisor Christy requested clarification whether there were issues or hotspots that Supervisor Allen could specifically point to in Pima County.

Supervisor Allen responded that there absolutely were issues in Pima County.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the hotspots in Pima County.

Supervisor Allen stated that to her understanding it was more dispersed throughout Pima County, not a single community that they could pinpoint such as Prescott, Bisbee, Sedona or others, but it was distributed throughout from the Foothills to Ajo communities.

Supervisor Christy asked whether a Homeowner's Association (HOAs) could ban short-term rentals.

Chair Scott stated that he did not believe that they could and added that the Legislative Policy Summit for the CSA had passed this resolution, which was put forth by Yavapai County, with Coconino County in support, and only three Supervisors were in opposition. He stated that there was tremendous support for the resolution by all the Supervisors. He stated that for the most part, when it was discussed in the large County caucus, which included the Supervisors from Maricopa and Pinal Counties, all of the Supervisors in the large County caucus were in support of what Yavapai and Coconino had put forth. He stated that they were told that Arizona had the most permissive laws in the country regarding short-term rentals and that there had been a high-powered lobbying firm employed by Vrbo and Airbnb to ensure that there were no changes to Arizona's very permissive laws regarding short-term rentals. He stated that what was heard during the general discussion was that Supervisors from all over the state said that this was a problem in terms of regulating short-term rentals. He stated it was a local control issue that was brought up and was a big issue within the CSA, as well as at the League of Cities and Towns.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, asked Deputy County Administrator DeBonis, Jr., if he was aware of pockets within the County about concerns on the issue.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that, occasionally, the code enforcement team received complaints. He stated that, as indicated by Supervisor Allen, they were dispersed throughout the County, so those were mostly associated with rental properties where events were being held. He stated it could be a wedding event, or party that was causing disruption in the neighborhood but other than that, this issue had not been tracked. He added that they responded when they received complaints from adjacent neighbors.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Allen for bringing this item forth. He believed that his colleague from District 4 brought up a good point, which was that the Board needed additional data to inform Pima County residents about the impact of short-term rentals. He expressed support for the item because the County would be joining communities of all sizes and of all political majorities in different parts of the State where short-term rentals had impacted quality of life and housing supply being impacted as a result. He stated that when a house was flipped and a short-term rental company purchased it only for short term rental use, that reduced the ability to house people and reduced affordability. He stated that better tracking of this issue was needed for community benefit and that he always favored dashboards. He stated that he had heard from residents in the Gates Pass Neighborhood, of one

specific property that was a short-term rental, where they were unable to contact Airbnb or the property owner and were left with a loophole of people not being able to have a voice. He stated that because Governor Ducey passed a preemption in his final year in office, they had a situation where even Republican Cities, Towns and Counties were asking for more autonomy to make their own decisions. He stated that this proposal would add to the legislative agenda a bipartisan effort to tell the legislature to do something about this.

Supervisor Christy asked Supervisor Cano if he wanted to continue this item in order to receive more information.

Supervisor Cano stated that he did not need additional information to support this item, and that he was aware of the impact of short-term rentals in the community because he was currently experiencing that with constituents in his district. He clarified that as part of this, he requested that the Board receive additional information so that they could make an informed decision, not related to this policy, but it ensured that they knew the true impact county-wide.

Supervisor Christy stated that there were still private property rights and that homeowners could do whatever they wanted with their home. He stated that as far as the behaviors listed in the draft letter, it seemed to him there was a remedy for those behaviors and that was called law enforcement. He stated, however, if there were, as Supervisor Cano suggested, more information about the nuances of this issue and how pervasive or not it was in Pima County, and what the ramifications were, he might be persuaded to support it.

Supervisor Allen noted that it was her understanding that HOAs could not prevent short-term rentals within the HOA. She stated that the only kind of tool that they held was that they could limit the length of stay to 30 days or some decision making around the length of stay but could not ban short-term rentals. She added that the letter itself noted that data from Vrbo and Airbnb estimated there were 6,000 short-term rentals in Tucson alone and this data was not tracked by the Assessor's Office because their data demonstrated that something was an investment property, but not necessarily the managing entity and what type of rental was used. She stated that the concerns about short-term rentals was not about individual families renting out their house for a short period of time, or a casita in the back, the biggest problem was that there were big companies buying up the available housing stock and then putting them out as Airbnbs. She stated that the concentration of folks that had Airbnbs and the corporations that were then controlling it, removing it from the housing stock which was the biggest threat and the biggest issue.

Supervisor Christy stated those were valid issues that should be explored and if the Board had a more comprehensive detailed report on these issues, he might be compelled to support it, but without that information, he could not.

Chair Scott stated that if this item was approved by the Board, they would provide direction to their contracted lobbyist that would amplify the efforts of the CSA staff

because of the resounding support for a similar measure at the Legislative Policy Summit the prior week and the CSA staff would be following up with the Legislature as well.

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

16. Fiscal Year (FY)26 Emergency Funding for the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona and the Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administration to send Emergency Funding in the amount of \$600,000.00 to the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, and \$200,000.00 to the Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center, to ensure that they have the food resources they need to meet the increased demand they already are experiencing due to the federal government shutdown, the passage of the "One Big Ugly Bill" Act which strips SNAP eligibility from tens of thousands of Pima County residents, including tens of thousands of children, and other Trump administration policies that have wreaked havoc on the economy, affecting working class and poor families the most. This funding, limited for now to FY 2025/26, shall come from the approximate \$8.38M in extra, unencumbered and unrestricted Beginning General Fund Balance with which the County began FY 2025/26, per the most recent Financial Update provided to the Board. (Projected Beginning General Fund Balance of \$126,746,493.00 as of July 1, 2025, rather than the budgeted amount which was \$118,366,104.00.) Smaller Resource Centers and Food Pantries are welcome to apply for funding through the upcoming Outside Agency RFP process in November.

Additionally, directing the Administrator to support the Food Banks' outreach and communications efforts to the broader community about the importance of making a charitable gift this season to ensure that nobody in our community goes hungry. (District 2)

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of December 2, 2025. Upon the vote, the motion carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay."

17. Fiscal Year (FY)26 Emergency Funding for Refugee Resettlement Agencies Serving Pima County

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administration to send Emergency Funding in the amount of \$250,000.00 each, to the three Refugee Resettlement Agencies serving Pima County: IRC of Arizona, Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest, and Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona (\$750,000.00 in total funding, FY26), for the purposes of supporting refugees, asylees and others

they serve to complete the process of applying for Legal Permanent Resident ("Green Card") status and related services. The funding shall come from the approximately \$8.38M in extra, unencumbered and unrestricted Beginning General Fund Balance with which the County began FY 2025/26, per the most recent Financial Update provided to the Board. (Projected Beginning General Fund Balance of \$126,746,493.00 as of July 1, 2025, rather than the budgeted amount which was \$118,366,104.00.)

As was made clear at the October 21st Board of Supervisors meeting, because of Trump's "Big Ugly Bill," refugees, asylees and others who have not yet adjusted their status to Legal Permanent Resident - though legally here and legally authorized to work, and though they are paying taxes! - have now lost access to basic social safety net supports like SNAP (as of 11/1/25), AHCCCS (as of 10/1/26) and Medicare (as of 1/1/27) as well. The more legally present refugees, asylees, and others whom we can help to adjust their status to Legal Permanent Resident (all taxpaying members of our community already!), the more members of our community who will continue to benefit from the basic social safety net programs that we all contribute to, and we all rely on. (District 2)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 16, for discussion related to this item.)

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Christy to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of December 2, 2025. Upon the vote, the motion carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay."

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator, provided a slide show presentation and stated that it was a continuation from the October 14th meeting, as a preview as they concluded the calendar year that highlighted some areas for metrics that might be part of a discussion at either the December or January meeting and a follow-up on the Justice Metro discussion and working groups. She stated that this update would be grounded in one or more of the five priorities that established the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homelessness Solutions in December of 2023. She stated that the presentation would touch on Priority No. 5, which was a continuation on the strategies that aligned in partnership with law enforcement efforts to address community safety and other broad policy opportunities. She stated that at the last update to the Board she shared the development in efforts where outreach partnered directly with law enforcement to engage individuals in services. She stated those individuals that were not suitable for direct transport to jail due to a felony level offense, and/or were cited and released on a misdemeanor and adjudicated in video alternative to jail models. She stated that at the October 14th meeting, there were questions aligned with Tucson Police Department's (TPD) efforts adjacent to sections of the Chuck Huckleberry Loop and had followed the incident that occurred with the cyclist the week prior. She

stated that TPD Police Chief Kasmar had presented information and stats to Mayor and Council indicating there had been a total of four deployments around the Loop, specifically around the Rillito and the Santa Cruz Loop. She stated that TPD was the lead agency and that it was for law enforcement only and other services were not present on site. She noted that when it came to those strategies with Pima County's programs, the Sheriff's Department provided transport for individuals that were taken into custody in each of the events, and the Transition Center provided staffing support for those individuals that were released from jail. She stated that there was a volume of service that had been attended to by the County's Pretrial Services and it was supported by the Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) and Parks and Recreation Department. She stated that from October 7th through October 20th, TPD reported 138 arrests of varying different charges but the events on October 27th were not included in Chief Kasmar's update since it was after his presentation to the Mayor and Council, but they did a similar effort within Rillito where they had approximately 20 arrests. She stated that the Pima County Transition Center saw a high increase in the number of individuals that normally went through that particular service point and they typically averaged between 15 to 20 individuals per day. She added that during each of these enforcement efforts, they saw an increase of 40 to 65 individuals per day. She stated their strategy was to do everything they could to connect individuals to resources and services, not limited to, but included pathways to treatment and navigation to shelter, if needed. She stated staff adjusted their staffing model and moved and pivoted them to 12-hour shifts when they were provided with the opportunity, to ensure that they could provide services to as many people as possible. She referred to the following slide and stated that this was a highlight as they wrapped up the calendar year that would tie up the presentation she would provide to the Board in December and that it would be a full picture of what they had seen, and the number of regional encampments reported for the calendar year. She stated it would also detail the strategies that had been informing the enhancement of the Pima County Administrative Procedure that guided their response in that space. She explained that overall, for ten months, they had seen that Pima County was either assigned or had received reports for encampments that fell within the unincorporated section, which was at about 9% of the overall population. She stated that it was important to note that the number shown in the totals were only those that had not necessarily been verified and there could be duplicates or things that were not encampments, such as debris in a wash, an abandoned shopping cart, or an abandoned encampment that was no longer inhabited. She added that it could also be a report of an encampment on an asset that was not under the County's direct operational control. She stated that in the following month, they would be able to be more granular on what they learned as they verified those sites, the pivots and the operational deployment of staff and resources, to allow them to regularly share with the Board what it was that they were interfacing with when staff went to those sites. She concluded by briefly addressing the Justice Metro working groups' discussions that were convened by Chair Scott and Mayor Romero, largely from a justice lens, that had evolved to four working groups. She stated that these groups would address topics such as courts, data, engagement and enforcement efforts, and the Transition Center. She stated that the courts were looking to improve their program

so the working groups met and began discussions on some policy recommendations for some shared pain points that would make their operation more efficient and outcomes more meaningful to the individuals they interfaced with. She stated that the feedback they received was for court alignment and ensuring there was an increase in the number of individuals that were referred to certain court programs and providing some incentives for the participants. She stated that there was also discussion on shared data systems, increasing the visibility between the County and the City programs to better align for service coordination and the ability to monitor how those programs worked together. She stated that it would also include a data governance structure and there were information technology systems used at both the County and City that would be appropriate for this, but also very methodically placed, since it dealt with a high level of personal identified information. She explained that feedback regarding improvement of collaboration for engagement and enforcement efforts meant aligning the right types of service programs and partners with services like outreach plus law enforcement, or services for those waiting in a queue position for enforcement only. She stated that as the Transition Center processed those individuals, they were directly aligned and tethered back to the Transition Center so they could connect people to resources. She added that feedback on improving how they engaged in discussion on how to encourage individuals to accept services was also received. She stated conversations often occurred knowing there were data points that suggested some individuals were service resistant, but it was more complicated than that. She stated that their approach to engaging individuals for services often was a multilayered approach that needed to take place on several occasions and not done as one-time engagements. She stated that it was about relationship building, trust building and having the next best option available at the time that the individual was willing to accept services. She stated that it was not that people were saying no, although some did, but it was complicated in that space, and it was not a one size fits all strategy. She shared that the Community and Workforce Development (CWD) Department had also seen through their resource lines for rent and utility assistance an increase in the demand for services, it was seasonal as they approached the holiday season, but staff had reported seeing an increase in first-time inquiries for rent and utility assistance. She stated that they instituted collecting data associated with those individuals such as their employment status, whether they were employed with the federal government, if they were furloughed, or federal contractors. She stated there was not an actual stat, but noticed they were individuals that were federal employees, including active military. She stated that the need started to hit programs and CWD was positioned to respond since they had the Board's appropriation of \$8.5 million. She stated that \$3.5 million was determined to be used specifically for keeping people housed and that \$2 million was appropriated for rent and utility assistance. She stated that conversations with CWD on the program were still early but would be working on putting together something for the County Administrator and the Board's consideration in the future.

Chair Scott indicated that his office received a request from Supervisor Cano's office for information on the working groups that came out of the convening of their justice system partners that Mayor Romero and himself had engaged in and they

felt it was appropriate for all the Board's offices to receive that information. He stated that Ms. Evans, from his office, would work with the Clerk to distribute the information to their offices. He expressed gratitude to Mayor Romero and her team for working with them on convening those working groups and asked Mr. Holmes if there was anything else he wanted to add since he had engaged in the working group alongside Deputy City Manager Morales.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, explained that the court's currently had the deepest levels of discussion and there were still a lot of people that did not know how it worked. He stated it was elusive to many people new to that space as they attempted enforcement as a new tool. He stated that they spent time trying to educate individuals, specifically the presiding judges and the end game of working collaboratively to find innovation in that space. He stated that there were a lot of systems that could be improved and they were exploring that, but what they wanted to push was where they could create some innovation particularly with the subset of these individuals and they hoped this would be part of the outcome. He stated that some of the specialized courts had been at play for a while but had not seen much participation and they were reviewing those barriers. He stated that if they could not create a new court but some strands within those courts then that would benefit some of those processes much quicker for prosecution or motivation to change behavior.

Supervisor Cano thanked Ms. Darland for the opportunity to spend time with her along the Loop and with the RFCD and Parks staff. He stated that they were able to visit some of the hot spots that had faced increased congregations of encampments and were able to ask some questions about cleanup and their efforts which was a priority for District 5. He stated that as enforcement happened throughout the County related to encampments, he thanked the County Administrator for providing them with daily population reports. He stated that it was slowly increasing because more people were getting arrested on the street. He stated that it was time for the Board to start to look at innovation, technologies and data. He stated that when he first became Supervisor, he had heard about the Inmate Navigation, Enrollment, Support and Treatment (INVEST) Program, and although he had the full memorandum in front of him, there was still information he did not have. He asked how much was spent on the grant they received and that between INVEST, Supportive Treatment and Engagement Programs with Services (STEPs) with Superior Court and the Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP) with the County Attorney, there was a pipeline for them to look at as the population in the jail increased. He asked if they could be looking at targeted investments for those low-level offenders that were on bond that perhaps they could not afford. He stated that they were going to take action because he did not want that number to continue increasing and to have to depend on the Sheriff's Department to be okay with it. He stated that as people came in, they had to be moved out toward evidence-based programs. He stated that he appreciated the updates and looked forward to the conversation with the City on these efforts. He reiterated that the District 5 office was actively looking for those evidence-based programs that should use the County's investment to a greater extent.

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

19. Joint Meeting between Pima County Board of Supervisors and City of Tucson Mayor & Council

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a joint meeting between the Pima County Board of Supervisors and City of Tucson Mayor & Council, on November 18, 2025, from 12:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m., at Pima Association of Governments, 1 E. Broadway Boulevard, 4th Floor, Tucson, AZ.

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

Chair Scott stated that for his upcoming monthly meeting with Mayor Romero he had asked the County Administrator to work with the City Manager to ensure that discussion of the joint meeting agenda was their sole topic of discussion, because he felt that it might take some time to nail everything down. He stated that there had already been solicited suggestions for agenda topics from Board members but they could have discussion about other agenda topics at this time.

Supervisor Cano stated that he looked forward to the conversation with the City of Tucson (COT) and was grateful that they had found a neutral space that accommodated everybody. He expressed my sincere commitment to having that conversation be a collaborative one, focused on joint efforts and how the County and COT could move forward together. He stated that he recognized some of the concerns about process that had been publicly raised at a COT Mayor and Council meeting, but he thought it was important for all of them to recognize existing efforts that were taking place to tackle the use of fentanyl in the community and the impact it had on so many people from so many walks of life. He stated that his expectations were that the meeting would be held in a respectful manner with the ability to have thoughtful conversations about how they were going to move forward, particularly as it related to the use of County property and County facilities before another jurisdiction asked them what they should do with their own County property. He stated that they needed to have a full picture of what it would take for them to even consider that, specifically, the Annex that had been mentioned by members of the COT Council at their last meeting. He stated that property was in District 5 and he looked forward to continuing to work with the County Administration and the COT to figure out a reasonable path forward. He stated that before the Board considered any additional investment in that particular space, he had been constantly meeting with neighborhood associations since April 15, including those on the West Side, those surrounding Sentinel Peak and A Mountain, and what was essentially a carceral environment with Pima County Jail, with a sexual offender housing facility managed by the state, and the Transition Center. He stated that they needed some good neighbor mitigation working with the COT and the County hand in hand so that they could provide some benefit to the residents who had, by no choice of their own, the County facilities as their backyard. He stated that there had been over 500

people housed in that facility, but that environment was no longer at that capacity and to assume they could house that many people in that facility was inaccurate. He stated that as they moved forward the conversation needed to be had with reason and with facts. He noted that he looked forward to the joint conversation and to the County presenting how its plan related to justice, to the courts, to public health, how all these facets were already happening and looked for additional ways to ensure that this could be prioritized.

Chair Scott appreciated Supervisor Cano's remarks because he had some sincere concerns, not only about comments made by members of the COT Council at their last meeting, but also comments made when the Safe City Initiative was rolled out and he wanted the joint meeting to be a collaborative and harmonious gathering. He stated that he had some prepared remarks that he wanted to share with his colleagues that reflected on things that were said by their COT colleagues, *"I am pleased that we have a date for this Board's first joint meeting with the Tucson City Council, and want to acknowledge before saying anything else, that there will always be things the County can do differently or better. When I added an item to our October 14 agenda to discuss the topic of meeting with our colleagues in the City it was done so in the spirit of collaboration and partnership. That day, none of us said anything critical about the City and its dedicated efforts to address unsheltered homelessness and its effects. Unfortunately, when Tucson officials introduced their Safe City Initiative and when they had their own vote on joint meetings on October 21, they felt obliged to attack the County, disregarding or mischaracterizing our equally dedicated work to take on these issues. As the Board Chair, it is important for me to respond appropriately in instances such as this. The message also needs to be sent that assertions or comments, like the ones made by Mayor Romero and some City Council members, cannot be repeated when we gather together on November 18. That would detract from the goal of working in harmony to respond to these vital community concerns. Mayor Romero said on October 21 that we need our jurisdictional partners to step up and act now. Councilmember Cunningham asserted that we cannot count on the County. Some of the other topics discussed at their meeting included the County's Transition Center, the use of opioid settlement funds, and enforcement efforts associated with the Safe City Initiative. Here is what was not said. The Transition Center is a county initiative in a county facility, authorized by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors. It was inspired by the research and work of County staff and already has a proven record of success. The City of Tucson contributes some staffing to the operations of the Transition Center, but they took close to 14 months after the center had opened to get their full staffing commitment in place. The request to expand the Transition Center's hours came from this Board, and we have received a memo from the County Administrator detailing how that might happen. It will be vital for the City to do its part to ensure those expanded operations when they are begun. When the opioid settlement funds were being distributed, two of the towns opted to go their own way. Pima County joined with Marana, South Tucson and Tucson to make joint use of those funds. For many months, I asked our previous Chair and the County Administrator when the intergovernmental agreement allowing our mutual work would come to the Board for approval. The answer was that it was*

being delayed by the City of Tucson, and that we could not get clear answers as to why. Meanwhile, the Board authorized staff requests to make use of County funds to get more Narcan on the streets and to take other steps to combat substance abuse and addiction. There was much discussion on October 21 by the City Council, as Supervisor Cano just alluded to about the County's Mission Annex property and how it might be utilized. Our staff informs me that the County has already spent over \$1 million to prepare that property for any future uses. Whatever we do there, we want it to be done correctly and to produce tangible outcomes as our Transition Center already has. Our partnership with the City will be crucial to taking the next right steps at the Mission Annex, but it is inaccurate and unfair to assert that we are dragging our feet. The grant proposal, authored last year in an effort to secure funds for Mission Annex use, was jointly developed by two City and two County staff members. I meet with Mayor Romero once a month, just as Chair Grijalva and Chair Bronson did. The County Administrator and City Manager are also participants. During one of those meetings, I shared the data collected by Vet-Sec, our contracted security firm, regarding hotspots on the Loop, where drug use and other illegal activity frequently takes place. When it comes to responsibility for law enforcement, every one of those high profile areas is within the City of Tucson. We hope that data was used and will continue to be used to inform some of the activities detailed by Tucson Police Department Chief Kasmar during the October 21 discussion of the Safe City Initiative, and we heard some reference to that in Ms. Darland's report today. With regard to joint meetings of our two bodies, Chair Grijalva told me when I took over as Board Chair that the topic had been discussed with Mayor Romero during her tenure. I raised it early on this year and also reached out to Board offices to request potential agenda items. You can see that by reviewing agendas from the spring for my meetings with Mayor Romero. She did not formally raise the topic in a City Council meeting until this fall, insisting to her peers that she had been pushing for such a meeting for a long time. Pima County is proud of the many research-based programs we have in place at the jail and throughout the community with regard to behavioral and mental health interventions. There was reference made during the October 21 meeting to medically assisted treatment for substance abuse, which has had demonstrated success at the jail. The County and City should have a robust dialog about jurisdictional responsibilities for behavioral and mental health that includes the State of Arizona, but it is without merit for City officials to claim that the County is ignoring its roles and responsibilities in this area of policy. As Ms. Darland outlined in her presentation, Mayor Romero and I have jointly convened meetings of our justice system partners in the courts, the City and County Attorney's Office, the Pima County Sheriff's Department, and the Tucson Police Department. Those meetings have resulted in the creation of four working groups that will make recommendations to both the Board of Supervisors and City Council. The efforts of these groups are especially focused on people whose substance abuse results in justice system involvement, notably those who are repeat offenders. The Mayor and I have also met with leaders of the Tucson Pima Collaboration to end homelessness as they embark on their federally required strategic planning process. We have both asserted our belief that jurisdictional priorities and the demonstrated needs of our community need to be better addressed by TPCH when people turn to them for

services. As my colleagues will recall, both the City and County have federally mandated roles within the local continuum of care, but there are also private sector entities involved with TPCH. There is much more that I could say about Pima County's work to help deal with all the challenges associated with unsheltered homelessness, including the efforts of multiple County departments when they respond to reports of encampments on County property. The Board hears from Ms. Darland, as we did today regularly, as to her efforts in this space. Many of our departments work in partnership with City staff in ongoing efforts to offer services and provide shelter to those who need both. When she rolled out her Safe City Initiative last month, Mayor Romero claimed the County has not been an active participant in addressing these issues. To the contrary, Pima County has been and will continue to be a leader in taking on unsheltered homelessness and the associated need to increase our housing stock. We look forward to continuing our partnership with the City of Tucson in these endeavors, but collaboration will be hindered if City leaders persist in making baseless charges about both our track record and our level of commitment."

Chair Scott stated that he planned to share his remarks with Mayor Romero during their monthly meeting because he wanted their joint meeting to be one that both entities could participate in harmoniously and collaboratively.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

20. Classification/Compensation

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

Class Code/ Class Title/ Pay Grade (Salary Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

2114/ Medical Director - Detainee and Crisis Systems/ 25 (\$256,443.20-\$410,300.80)/ 1/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the department that would use this classification.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded it was the Medical Director within the Detainee and Crisis Systems and that they worked with all of the behavioral and medical care in the jail.

Supervisor Christy asked if the County had been investigating marketplace competitions in NaphCare.

Ms. Lesher responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Christy requested more information.

Ms. Lesher responded that a full report would be provided to the Board. She stated that it was part of the ongoing discussions of their review with NaphCare.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Board had approved a \$55 million contract extension with NaphCare and asked why a potential \$400,000.00 yearly position was being created at this time and how this position and the ones listed in Minute Item No. 21 could be funded within the current fiscal year.

Ms. Lesher responded that the positions listed in Minute Item No. 21 were reclassifications and renaming of positions primarily within Conservation Lands and Resources (CLR). She reminded the Board that a few years ago Natural Resources Parks and Recreation had been split into two departments and that the new director for CLR had reclassified/renamed positions, but there would be no increase to the budget. She stated that for Minute Item No. 20, if they looked at similar positions such as the Medical Director in the Office of Medical Examiner, they had medical staff within their departments that interfaced with others in the community and those were the market rates for physician positions.

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

21. **Classification/Compensation**

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

Class Code/ Class Title/ Pay Grade (Salary Range)/ EEO Code/ FLSA Code

2109/ Historic Preservation Officer/ 18 (\$92,081.60-\$138,112.00)/ 1/ E**
2110/ Cultural Resources Compliance Manager/ 16 (\$75,816.00-\$106,163.20)/ 2/ E**
2111/ Historic Preservation Analyst/ 15 (\$68,931.20-\$96,512.00)/ 2/ E**
2112/ Cultural Resources Compliance Manager/ 15 (\$68,931.20-\$96,512.00)/ 2/ E**
6113/ Cultural Resources Coordinator/ 11 (\$54,142.40-\$75,774.40)/ 2/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 20, for discussion related to this item.)

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

REAL PROPERTY

22. The Board of Supervisors on October 14, 2025, continued the following:

Contract

El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County Highway Maintenance Reimbursement Agreement, contract amount \$200,000.00 revenue (CT2500000067)

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

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

A substitute motion was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 20, 2026 and request that County Administration both monitor the lawsuit and communicate with the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity to ensure that the County's actions related to SunZia and El Rio Sol will not adversely impact the lawsuit. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Conservation Lands and Resources

23. SunZia Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for SunZia Transmission Line Project Mitigation Agreement, contract amount \$33,600.00 revenue/2 year term (CT2500000069)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 22, for discussion related to this item.)

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

A substitute motion was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 20, 2026 and request that County Administration both monitor the lawsuit and communicate with the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity to ensure that the County's actions related to SunZia and El Rio Sol will not adversely impact the lawsuit. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

24. El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for El Rio Sol Transmission Line Project Mitigation Agreement, contract amount \$850,500.00 revenue/2 year term (CT2500000070)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 22, for discussion related to this item.)

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

A substitute motion was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 20, 2026 and request that County Administration both monitor the lawsuit and communicate with the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity to ensure that the County's actions related to SunZia and El Rio Sol will not adversely impact the lawsuit. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

Real Property

25. SunZia Transmission, L.L.C., to provide an Agreement to Donate Real Property and Special Warranty Deed, conveying 6 parcels of vacant land totaling 139.6 acres to Pima County located in the San Pedro River Valley in Sections 24, 25, 30, T11S, R17, 18E, Pima County, Arizona, term date 11/4/25 to 5/3/26, CLR-Mitigation/Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$3,000.00 for closing costs (PO2500031450)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 22, for discussion related to this item.)

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

A substitute motion was moved by Supervisor Allen and seconded by Supervisor Cano to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of January 20, 2026 and request that County Administration both monitor the lawsuit and communicate with the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity to ensure that the County's actions related to SunZia and El Rio Sol will not adversely impact the lawsuit. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-0, Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote.

26. Town of Marana, to provide an Acquisition Agreement and Special Warranty Deed for surplus property consisting of approximately 13.34 acres of land, in Section 14, T11S, R10E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, contract amount \$345,000.00 revenue (CT2500000071)

Chair Scott asked if a unanimous vote by the Board members who were present in the meeting would satisfy the statutory requirement of a unanimous vote by the Board for this item.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded in the affirmative.

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

27. Christopher R. Sullivan, Amendment No. 1, to provide an Assignment of Lease to assign the current agriculture lease between Pima County and Christopher Sullivan to the Town of Marana, consisting of 13.34 acres of land, in Section 14, T11S, R10E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, no cost (CTN-PW-21-44)

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.

28. Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District, to provide a water easement for the extension of a water line to a planned residential development, located in Section 9, T15S, R12E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona, contract amount \$3,000.00 revenue (CT2500000075)

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.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

29. **Hearing - Agent Change/Acquisition of Control/Restructure**

Job No. 360659, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Los Pocho's Sports Grill, 5801 S. Palo Verde Road, Tucson, Acquisition of Control.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

30. **Representation for the Constituents of the 7th Congressional District**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing Pima County to support the lawsuit filed by Arizona Attorney General Kris Mayes regarding the need for the United States House of Representatives to officially seat Representative-Elect Adelita Grijalva. (District 2)

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Allen and carried by a 3-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," Supervisor Heinz was not present for the vote, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

31. **Legislative Policy Update: Lobbying AZDES and AZDOT**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing Pima County's lobbyist to work with AZDES and AZDOT on some rulemaking/training/fixes needed to remove unnecessary

barriers and streamline processes for the benefit of refugees and others contributing to our community, as follows.

Work with AZDES to:

- A. Ensure that non-credit workforce training, English language acquisition, and other adult education programs that individuals are participating in - whether offered through a refugee resettlement agency, a local community college, or another provider - COUNT toward the new work requirements for able-bodied adults in HR1, in order to be able to access benefits; AND
- B. Work with education providers to identify/clarify acceptable forms of documentation that can serve as proof of participation in non-credit educational programming to meet work requirements; AND
- C. Provide clarity on which volunteer programs are recognized as State-approved for meeting work requirements.

Work with AZDOT to:

- A. Ensure that all customer service staff at all MVD locations across Arizona are made aware of the fact that refugees, by virtue of their official refugee status through the Department of State (Form I-94, which they have when they enter the U.S.) and their unrestricted Social Security Card issued by the Social Security Administration, are eligible to work in the United States, and that that eligibility does not expire.
- B. Ensure that all MVD staff understand that the expiration date on a refugee's "Work Authorization Card," a form of picture ID they obtain early in resettlement, does NOT mean there is an expiration date to their ability to live and work in the United States. MVD staff should not be turning away a refugee with proper documentation in terms of issuing or renewing an Arizona Driver's License, and should not be linking the Driver's License Expiration Date to the date shown on the "Work Authorization Card." (District 2)

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

Chair Scott asked the County Administrator if the item was approved by the Board if it would be sent as outlined by the sponsor to Mr. Rossi and his team.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative and that the CSA would also be made aware of it.

Supervisor Christy stated that this was being directed in the wrong direction and asked why it was going in the legislative route rather than to the Governor since she controlled all of these. He asked the County Administrator if the request was within the scope of the lobbyist's contract.

Chair Scott stated that his understanding of the item was that they were asking the lobbyist to follow up with department personnel in those two departments, there was

no proposed legislation. He stated that as part of his duties with the County, he contacted staff in various state departments.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that they recently reached out to the State Land Department Director on mining issues, they had written both as the County Administrator and the County on behalf of the County. She stated the County's lobbyist would be looped in to work with DES and the Department of Transportation.

Supervisor Christy asked if this should be sent directly to the Governor as opposed to the Legislature.

Supervisor Cano responded that they were doing just that. He stated that the Legislature could receive policy priorities by any stakeholders. He stated that their session would begin in January, and that the proposal was in the rulemaking, which was handled by the Executive, not the Legislature.

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

COUNTY ATTORNEY

32. Ratification of Pima County's Participation in a Class Action Settlement

Discussion/Direction/Action: Ratification of Pima County's participation in a class action settlement against Jazz and Hikma related to the drug Xyrem.

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about Xyrem.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that Xyrem was a drug primarily used to treat narcolepsy.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

HEALTH

33. The Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the continuity of Woman, Infant and Children (WIC) Program in Pima County, term date 11/15/25 to 2/28/26, General Fund, contract amount \$399,440.00 (PO2500034674)

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

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that her hope for this was simply interim funding. She explained that in Pima County there were approximately 4,400 infants, postpartum moms, new moms, and babies that received formula and necessary food through the WIC Program. She stated that it was a county program with funding received through the federal government and the state. She added that with the ongoing freeze, this funding was not guaranteed to be provided but the County needed to ensure the program continued and that came out to just shy of \$400,000.00 to do so and it was their belief that these funds would be reimbursed, but that was not guaranteed, in which case they would need authorization to move it from the General Fund.

Supervisor Cano stated that every day that passed without a resolution to the federal government shutdown meant more families across the country were left wondering how they would make it through the week. He stated that in Pima County the impact was real, in six days funding for the WIC program would run out leaving over 4,400 infants without access to formula and essential nutrition. He stated that the County played a vital role in administering the program through the Health Department and in partnership with El Rio and Marana Health, delivered services daily to thousands of families. He stated that they had seen firsthand how much these benefits mattered and that because of the shutdown, the County was being asked to fill a gap that should never exist. He stated that the plan before the Board was for less than a half million from the General Fund to keep the WIC program operational through the end of November. He stated that it was temporary, targeted, and transparent and that every dollar would be tracked. He stated that he was hopeful that the state and federal government would do their job to hold Pima County taxpayers harmless for stepping in to protect families in crisis. He stated that this decision was not just about emergency funding, it was about who the County was as a local government. He stated they had both a moral and economic responsibility to act because when infants went hungry, the costs rippled across the entire community, from hospitals to schools to the workforce. He stated that they could not control what happened in Washington, but they could control what happened in Pima County. He stated the Board was tasked with one decision, whether to choose to keep babies fed, families supported, and the community strong and he felt they should consider that.

Supervisor Christy stated that according to the Grand Canyon Institute, a nonpartisan group out of Washington, reported that the administration had already tapped Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which had \$23 billion dollars earlier this month to fund the WIC program during the government shutdown. He added that he had just been notified that the Trump administration was to pay partial November Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits by Wednesday. He stated that this was a federal government issue and it appeared that the money had been released and that WIC had been funded, at least for the short term. He stated that hopefully, if the Schumer Shutdown was removed, and

perhaps if his colleagues spoke to their Democrat Senators from Arizona to go back to Washington and get to work to open up the government, this would not be happening and could have been avoided.

Chair Scott asked if Administrator Lesher could partly respond to Supervisor Christy's comments, whether there were new points as to why County Administration felt it necessary to place this item on the Board's agenda.

Ms. Lesher stated that at the time, it was their understanding that there was uncertainty regarding the full flowing of those funds and the receipt. She stated that as mentioned at the beginning, their hope was that they would be reimbursed and would be able to continue without using the General Fund. She stated that if this was approved, it allowed the County flexibility to ensure that daily programming was not missed of food and formula for babies. She stated they would keep the Board updated if they found out that money had flowed and they were receiving the dollars from the federal and state governments, then they would not use this General Fund allocation, but this allowed them the flexibility to ensure they did not miss providing these services.

Chair Scott summed up that this was a fluid situation, and staff felt that it was a prudent and timely ask of the Board.

Ms. Lesher concurred.

Supervisor Cano stated that the background materials suggested that the funding would run out in six days and questioned if there was news that the Trump administration would clear what should be the right thing to do, which was feed the kids, and asked if the County had six days to ensure the gap was closed.

Ms. Lesher responded in the affirmative and that she felt this was the prudent thing to do to ensure they had the capacity, authorized by the Board, to provide that funding, should there be any gap in receiving the funds.

Supervisor Cano asked if the County had received any indication that the Trump administration was going to fund the WIC program for Pima County to date.

Ms. Lesher stated that she had not yet formally received any information.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, confirmed that as of last night, they had not received any word. He stated that since the initial memorandum that was sent to the Board, the dollar amount changed, having started out at about half a million and had gone up to \$499,000.00. He stated they received new information weekly from the Arizona Department of Health, at which point, as of the Addendum deadline, the dollar amount before the Board represented when they were told funding would be cut off. He stated that if it changed again, the County had an intergovernmental agreement with them that could be modified and payment may

not be necessary, but that this was a pass-through to the State of Arizona that funded this program through the federal government.

Supervisor Christy asked if it would be a proper characterization to state that things had changed significantly since last Friday regarding this item.

Ms. Lesher reiterated they had not received, as a County, any formal indication that anything had changed. She stated that she had been watching open-source media that conversations had been taking place and that there were assurances that the federal government would be providing these fundings. She stated they did not formally have that in place, which was why she asked for the authority to be able to spend out of the General Fund, then to be reimbursed, if and when those federal dollars were available but it provided them the safety net if there was any slowing down in receiving those funds.

Supervisor Christy asked if Administrator Lesher could categorically assure the Board that if that money from the General Fund was spent in the manner described, County taxpayers would be refunded.

Ms. Lesher responded that the General Fund would be refunded, not County taxpayers.

Supervisor Christy stated that the General Fund was made up of money from the taxpayers.

Ms. Lesher understood that but did not want it to sound like checks would be sent out. She stated that if they borrowed the money from the General Fund, it would be reimbursed if they received the WIC funding from the state as the allocation from the federal government.

Supervisor Christy asked if that could be promised.

Ms. Lesher stated that she could promise that and they would continue to provide updates to the Board and the public.

Supervisor Christy asked if she would have more confirmation by the end of the day.

Ms. Lesher stated that she did not know the timing of that, but as soon as they received formal notification, other than what was seen on the news, they would update the Board.

Supervisor Allen stated that this was a manufactured crisis that was riddled with uncertainty, with enormous intentional uncertainty and this was a federally funded Pima County program run by the Health Department that provided much needed formula for infants. She stated that the degree of uncertainty varied daily by what was leaked out and ascertained right from the administration, as essentially, kind of

a weapon that was wielded against children, families and babies. She stated that this was a critical program, and that the Board had to act and hoped they would be reimbursed. She stated that they would be protecting this program and protecting infants in the community.

Chair Scott appreciated that the County Administrator pointed out that this recommendation from staff was both prudent and timely, and he especially appreciated the reference to safety net, because that was what the Board would be providing in very uncertain times for the recipients of this program, and they had a statutory role.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

34. Industrial Development Authority

Appointment of Paul Kraft, to fill a vacancy created by Frank Y. Valenzuela. Term expiration: 9/5/26. (Authority recommendation)

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

35. Conservation Lands and Resources Advisory Board

Appointment of Alexandra Mora. Term expiration: 6/30/31. (District 5)

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

36. CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of the Consent Calendar

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. Arivaca Coordinating Council/Arivaca Human Resources, Inc., to provide for facility improvements, USHUD CDBG Fund, contract amount \$33,000.00 (PO2400012722)

2. Direct Center for Independence, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Home Access Program for emergency home repairs and extend contract term to 9/30/26, no cost (PO2400012730)

Facilities Management

3. Jumbo Property Group, L.L.C., to provide a lease agreement for PACC to create a Satellite Adoption Center at 7225 E. Broadway, Suite No. 140, term date 11/15/25 to 2/14/29, Friends of PACC Fund, contract amount \$416,079.25 (PO2500033237)

Procurement

4. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2500000055, Amendment No. 1, Ritz Safety Corp., to provide for industrial and personal safety supplies. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$180,000.00 from \$250,000.00 to \$430,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$430,000.00. This increase is required due to new hires and items needed to meet OSHA compliance requirements. Funding Source: Wastewater Ops Fund. Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation.

5. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for Engineering Design Services: Sunset Road: I-10 to River (4SRRIV) and extend contract term to 11/30/26, no cost (CT_21-331) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction
6. Can/Am Technologies, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Teller implementation licensing and support, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (SC240001624) Administering Department: Information Technology
7. Global Tel*Link Corporation, d.b.a. ViaPath Technologies, to provide for Inmate Communication Systems, \$800,000.00 estimated revenue/4 year term (CT2500000056) Administering Department: Sheriff's Department
8. Veregy West, L.L.C., Amendment No. 1, to provide for guaranteed energy cost savings services for the Corona de Tucson Wastewater Reclamation Facility, amend contractual language and scope of services, no cost (PO2500012265) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

9. Hazen and Sawyer, DPC, Amendment No. 3, to provide for Wastewater Reclamation data analytics support, extend contract term to 10/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_23-44)

Transportation

10. Pima Association of Governments, to provide an Agreement for Public Art Funding for visual enhancement of transportation projects, term date 11/4/25 to 12/31/29, contract amount \$125,000.00 revenue (CT2500000073)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

11. Acceptance – Constables

Arizona Constables Ethics Standards and Training Board (CESTB), to provide for CESTB equipment-uniforms, \$3,130.81 (G-CO-94836)

12. Acceptance – Constables

Arizona Constables Ethics Standards and Training Board (CESTB), to provide for CESTB ballistic vest, \$7,157.06 (G-CO-94837)

13. Acceptance - County Attorney

Office of the Arizona Attorney General, to provide for the FY2025 Victims' Rights Program Award, \$158,400.00 (G-PCA-89235)

14. Acceptance – Health

Early Childhood Development and Health Board (First Things First), Amendment No. 3, to provide for the child care health consultation and amend grant language, \$11,850.00 (GA-HD-70298)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

15. Animal Care Advisory Committee

Appointment of Tom Crowley, Registered PACC Volunteer, to replace Charles Shumway. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (Organizational recommendation)

16. Pima County/City of Tucson Outdoor Lighting Code Committee

Ratification of reappointment: Amy C. Oliver. Term expiration: 10/18/29. (City of Tucson recommendation)

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

17. Special Event

- Theresa Marie Marcus, Christ Lutheran Vail Church, 14600 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, December 6, 2025.
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D. Inc., ~~Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, 201 W. Esperanza Avenue (location change), Ajo, October 17 and 18, 2025.~~
- Stephen Paul Kindred, Green Valley Recreation, Inc., GVR West Social Center, 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, November 11, 14, December 16 and 19, 2025.

18. Temporary Extension

- 14103017, Kevin Arnold Kramber, AMVETS 770, 3015 S. Kinney Road, Tucson, November 8, 2025.
- 12104529, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Wild Garlic Grill, 2870 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, May 8, 9 and 10, 2026.

ELECTIONS

19. Precinct Committeemen

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Sanford Salz-145-DEM, Patrick Blair-195-REP, Darren Venters-207-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY

Lucas Ormand-057-DEM, Jeanie Colaianni-077-DEM, Christina Gumbmann-077-DEM, Mary Raymond-127-DEM, Carla Andrews O'Hara-145-DEM, Stefani Brancato-184-DEM, Ann Bonar-194-DEM, Leif Hammar-219-DEM, Andrew-John Torre-246-DEM, Michael Ivan-055-REP, Ronald Allen-072-REP, Ryan Wissman-146-REP, Mark Dunham-218-REP, Cynthia Miley-223-REP

RECORDER

20. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of September, 2025.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

**21. Minutes: September 2 and October 9, 2025
Warrants: October, 2025**

* * *

37. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

16. **Fiscal Year (FY)26 Emergency Funding for the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona and the Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Directing the County Administration to send Emergency Funding in the amount of \$600,000.00 to the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, and \$200,000.00 to the Sahuarita Food Bank & Community Resource Center, to ensure that they have the food resources they need to meet the increased demand they already are experiencing due to the federal government shutdown, the passage of the “One Big Ugly Bill” Act which strips SNAP eligibility from tens of thousands of Pima County residents, including tens of thousands of children, and other Trump administration policies that have wreaked havoc on the economy, affecting working class and poor families the most. This funding, limited for now to FY 2025/26, shall come from the approximate \$8.38M in extra, unencumbered and unrestricted Beginning General Fund Balance with which the County began FY 2025/26, per the most recent Financial Update provided to the Board. (Projected Beginning General Fund Balance of \$126,746,493.00 as of July 1, 2025, rather than the budgeted amount which was \$118,366,104.00.) Smaller Resource Centers and Food Pantries are welcome to apply for funding through the upcoming Outside Agency RFP process in November.

Additionally, directing the Administrator to support the Food Banks’ outreach and communications efforts to the broader community about the importance of making a charitable gift this season to ensure that nobody in our community goes hungry. (District 2)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management
CV: Carlos Valles, Executive Director, Marana and Sahuarita Food Bank
SK: Suzanne Kammerman, Executive Director, Arivaca Human Resources
CR: Claudio Rodriguez, Vice President of Policy and Advocacy, Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona
CT: Callie Tippett, Executive Director, Greater Vail Community Resources
TM: Tom McKinney, Chief Executive Officer, Interfaith Community Services

RS: We will now go back to the Regular Agenda and the two time certain items. The first one is Item No. 11. Fiscal Year '26 emergency funding for the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona and the Sahuarita Food Bank and Community Resource

Center. This was put on the agenda by Supervisor Heinz, and I will turn it over to him.

MH: Thank you very much, Chair Scott. And as we heard, I think very well during public comment, this is a real issue and literally moments ago, I am just seeing from the New York Times, President Trump, I think over the weekend it sounded like courts were stepping in to keep those SNAP benefits alive. I believe the administration responded that they would do so, but only at half of the rate for November, which instead of \$6.00 a day is \$3.00 a day, so awesome. But as we have seen in previous situations, this administration does not always do what the courts say, until they say it like 20 more times. Looks like now the President is specifically threatening, as of moments ago, to withhold any SNAP funding until after the shutdown ends. As we all know, this is particularly affecting us since we do not have a Congresswoman. I was actually at the Sahuarita Food Bank as well as the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona, just a few days ago, talking to their amazing staff, seeing their operation and we heard again in Call to the Public, that they are physically running out of food before they are able to serve folks that are waiting in line to get help. That is, before the SNAP cuts have gone into effect, which appear like they are now in effect. And looking at, I did not know this, but apparently, Elon Musk's efforts in DOGE have impacted our food bank's ability to get additional food from farmers, for example, I did not know that. So that has been ongoing since May. And you have heard from food bank staff that the increase in demand has been, they are measuring it by the week. And again, the SNAP cliff has not even hit yet. We still have a shutdown. We have something like close to 30,000 folks, either federal contractors, or federal employees, here in southern Arizona doing all sorts of essential services. They are living through a shutdown, many of them essential employees. They are working without any paychecks now, two paychecks, going on a third. I do not know about anyone else, but I live paycheck to paycheck too, so that is not going to go well for folks. And I would really appreciate it if we could have the leaders from the Community Food bank, Natalie Jayroe, as well as the Sahuarita Food Bank, Carlos Valles, come forward and give us some, on the ground assessment, as to what they are seeing before we discuss this further, or make any motions or votes.

RS: Certainly, Supervisor, your guests are welcome to come forward at this time.

CV: Chair Scott, members of the Board. I brought some of my colleagues that you might all know. This is a regional effort that is affecting us all. I cannot just share from the Sahuarita or Marana area, but collectively here in Pima County, we are seeing an impact. Right now what we are seeing are a lot of federal employees that are coming in to our food bank stating that this is...

RS: I apologize for interrupting. If you could just state, for the public and the media, your name...

CV: I apologize Chair Scott.

RS: your association, and the folks who are with you.

CV: I am Carlos Valles. I am the Executive Director of both the Marana and the Sahuarita Food Banks. I have Suzanne Kammerman, who is the Executive Director of Arivaca Human Resources.

CR: I am Claudio Rodriguez, the Vice President of Policy and Advocacy for the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona.

CT: Hi there. I am Callie Tippett with Greater Vail Community Resources, serving southeastern Pima County.

TM: And Tom McKinney, I am the CEO of Interfaith Community Services.

CV: Thank you all again. Thank you for this opportunity. You know, we are talking about SNAP cuts, but the fact is, right now we are having a lot of federally furloughed employees come through our doors telling us we have never had to use your food bank. What do we need to do? And so, it is disheartening to be hearing about this and Supervisor Heinz, we do appreciate you reaching out to us and also the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona. But this is a much bigger effort. It is a regional effort, it is a national effort and so, much like my colleague Claudio stated, we are reaching on the community to come and volunteer, donate, work here in your community. If there is a local food bank, local food pantry, another organization that is serving your community, reach out to them because I know that the item that is on the agenda is just short term, but we need to continue working together as a community. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, sir. Anybody else wish to address the Board?

CR: Yeah.

RS: Mr. Rodriguez?

CR: Yeah, yeah. Thank you again. It is a whole lot easier when there is not a timer counting down, but as our partner Carlos mentioned, you know, there are people coming in for the first time. And we do expect that not to just be because of the shutdown, but because of HR1 impacts. Right now, we have Veterans who have been exempt from SNAP benefits as of July 4th, when the bill was signed. So, we have Veterans who are having a much harder time actually come to our doors, seek for assistance, they are learning to navigate it, and they have to make new work requirements, as well as foster youth, who, once they age out of the program, they used to be exempt so they did not have to do all of the requirements because of their situation. Now they are no longer exempt, as well as, able bodied folks. But the biggest message here is, as I mentioned earlier, and as Sergeant Cross mentioned, it is unfair to also put this burden on you. It is for the community to come together because at the end of the day, that is what makes our organizations thrive, is people coming together. So again, I ask our neighbors, our partners and people in the audience and people watching, to donate, volunteer and show up for community. Thank you.

RS: Thank you.

[another speaker raises hand]

RA: Yes, ma'am, please.

SK: Suzanne Kammerman in Arivaca and both Community Food Bank and Sahuarita Food Bank are partners of ours. And thank goodness we are in the food bank network of Arizona so that our tiny little town of Arivaca can partake with all of the funds that are filtering down through that. But I have got a real story that happened to me this week. So, we have a Arivaca Helping Hearts Fund, which is an emergency fund, and a family of five came in and they normally can take care of themselves. They have never come to us for assistance before, and because of the food stamp cut, they cannot pay their propane bill. So, she said we had a choice between we cannot purchase food. We know that this month that we will not be able to pay food. We have a propane bill that we are filling up, we just got down into the lower 40s last night in Arivaca. Propane is their sole heat, so they needed help with their propane bill. So, the ripple effect of this is affecting our communities in more ways than just food.

RS: Thank you ma'am. Alright...

[another speaker reaches for the mic]

RS: Oh, go ahead, Ms. Tippett, I am very sorry.

CT: Sorry about that. Thank you for this opportunity. Just wanted to share, from our perspective what we are seeing. We are seeing federal furloughed workers come and visit us for the first time, struggling with the weight of making that choice and seeking assistance from their community and we appreciate efforts to access resources for community food banks. It is imperative that not only that we provide food, but we provide nutritious food. So, access to protein, access to fresh, healthy produce. Organizations like mine do not have the infrastructure in place to purchase those things in large quantities. Organizations like the Community Food Bank bear that weight, organizations like the Sahuarita Food Bank bear that weight, and then they push food and commodities out to organizations like ours. I just wanted to share that also, our food banks are all connected through the Length to Feed Program. And so we can see if somebody has come to us that they have also maybe visited Sahuarita in the past, or maybe the Community Food Bank and families are limited to the amount of distributions that they are able to receive, so if there is a concern about abuse of use or food bank hopping, we are linked, and we are working together to make sure that we are serving the broadest and largest amount of people in our community. Thank you.

TM: And I will just share, in the last two weeks we have seen 20% new people but the other number that has been incredible, is the amount of people that have not used the food bank in over a year and a half, two years, that are having to come back to resort to that. Almost 30% of the people had not been at a food bank in that amount of time. So, it is furloughed workers, but it is also the people that do have jobs that

were balancing their budget with SNAP benefits to be able to make the other payments.

RS: Thank you, Mr. McKinney. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to thank all of the representatives for addressing the Board. I wanted to just provide the opportunity for the Community Food Bank, Mr. Rodriguez to answer a few more questions, if you do not mind. First off, thank you for working with my office in the first two months of me being a Supervisor, affording me the opportunity to visit the community food bank, meet your new CEO. I learned a lot. And what I am hearing Mr. Rodriguez right now is that you have got the federal shutdown impacting workers, and we are a community made up of lots of federal employees and that is one demand on the system right now. You have also got vulnerable communities that are losing access to SNAP benefits because of the One Big Beautiful Bill. And at the same time, you have contingency plans, of course, to be able to weather the storms like any good organization does. Can you walk us through as the federal shutdown continues? Let us say it finishes before Christmas. What is the state of the community food banks contingencies? You do not need to go in full detail here because we want to, you know, protect that proprietary information but I do think that we should paint a picture of need in the immediate short term, but also be very clear with the public that after this shutdown, there will be irreparable harm to our communities because of the One Big Beautiful Bill.

CR: Yeah. Thank you for that question, it is a really great question. So, we have been monitoring the bill since it was introduced, since the beginning, because of the beginning of the year of 2025, when DOGE came in, they took out \$500 million from USDA program money that would go to The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) boxes that people come pick up. So, from there, we had to adjust and as prices of food continue to go up with tariffs, with just the economy the way it is, you know, people being laid off, you know, even our DES workers in the state, we lost 500 staff. So that also reduced the amount of applications for people applying for SNAP to get through. And it slows down the process. So, it puts people in a place of hunger. So, our contingency plan is we have a finite amount of food, the finite amount of food that we get delivered through USDA, through the federal commodities program. So, the more people come in, we went from around 12 items in a box, to right now, we are doing seven items just to meet the need. So, it does not mean that everybody gets more, someone gets more, someone gets less. We are just trying to be equitable across so folks can get it. As of last week, due to the shutdown, we were not expecting a lot of people who were being furloughed to come through our doors the first couple of weeks because that is not what we have seen in the past. But as we now are in what day 35, 33, we are seeing more. We are getting special requests for distribution. So, people are asking, how do I access this? Do I need to be on SNAP to go to food bank? You do not need to be on SNAP. You can just come in, this is for everybody who needs it, we ask a couple of questions, you verify your household and that is what the process looks like. They go through a line, they get a box and as my colleagues mentioned, they come once a month, we are linked up so no one can double dip. So, if people are afraid of people coming in for extra services, they do not, but people are allowed extra pantry

visits, which generally falls within our donated produce. Last week we spent \$100k in food orders, this week we are looking at \$115 and if the shutdown continues, and what we are seeing in the rise of need, we are expecting to spend at least up to \$120, this is per week. So, to put it in perspective, it is a lot of food, so a truckload of rice when you see down the street a semi, like we order rice like that is the biggest commodity that we can get, that can feed the most people, as well as beans. And then with the holidays coming, people are going to be coming more through our doors because kids are out of school, they come through. So, our contingency plan is that our doors will be open. It just means that food will be less depending on how many people come through. So, we are also looking at the refugee population who have been in need as well, women and children as well because of the WIC programs. So, we are putting out call outs and that is why every time I am up here, you know, it is not fully your responsibility, it is not the state's responsibility. We pay taxes to the federal government, and right now it is being withheld. And as Supervisor Heinz mentioned, it is \$6.00 a day, now it is reduced to \$3.00 and that probably will not be released this week, maybe later next week, right before the holidays. To put it in perspective, the average recipient gets \$150.00 a month when it comes to SNAP benefits. So, it is \$150.00, you are not getting \$1,000.00, you are not getting \$2,000.00, you get \$150.00 on average. So that is about \$75.00 for the month of November. That is maybe a nice, you know, Thanksgiving dinner or what have you. But that is the reality that we are facing. And it is not complicated, it is just really complex the world that we are navigating at this moment, and I hope that answers your question.

AC: Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez. I appreciate you answering that and Chair Scott, just brief comments. I mean, look at the impact already trickling down because of Congress's inability to offer solutions to one of the most important necessities, which is food. I am horrified that anybody would think that because courts intervened last week, and the Trump Administration is now saying we will send the SNAP benefits. Oh, but by the way only half, can you imagine surviving on \$75.00 a month in a SNAP benefit and relying on that to feed a family of 3 or 4. I appreciate the contingencies that you have placed Mr. Rodriguez and the leadership at the food bank, and I heard a message of local governments will not be able to do it alone. You are going to continue to need support from the community. Just last night, I was at a neighborhood association meeting in Catalina Vista in midtown and District 5, where they agreed to \$1,000.00 contribution to the food bank that is incoming. And I believe that, as a result of this One Big, Horrific Bill, and even the SNAP benefit, the WIC benefits, I looked into it, they are using the Trump tariffs to be able to provide emergency response to that. So, we can find money for other things in this federal administration, but not something as simple as food. If you get the idea, Chair Scott, that I am getting, my blood is boiling a little bit, it is because it is, this is a very personal experience having grown up on food stamps and being raised by a single mom. So, I see the impact and I see the tremendous need that we are going to have to hold hands together in the next couple of months and appreciate you all sharing some more information.

CR: Can I add one more thing? Just want to add one more thing. We are working with our Congressional and Senate representatives, so we have reached out to Gallego,

Kelly and Ciscomani to let them know to reach an agreement. So, we give them updates on how this is impacting to give them perspective. At the end of the day, it is your decision, it is their decision, you all just have to make the best decisions from our perspective and we are going to just be here. Thank you.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you Chair. One of the things that I found really compelling, is that like when you spend dollars as opposed to donations that go so much farther. So, the reason I think it is so important to get some additional dollar signs in your bank account is because when you go and purchase things, you get massive bulk deals. I just want to just really quickly, could you confirm that for the Board and explain that a little bit to us?

CR: Yeah, so I am not money hungry, but the reality is that when we ask people to do drives and food drives, we ask people do not buy the food. If you are going to buy food to donate, just give the money directly because we can multiply that threefold. So, for every dollar you give, we can make that into three. Because of our bulk purchasing power that goes and distributes through all our partner agencies like Sahuarita, ICS, and all the folks throughout Pima County. And just a reminder, you know, the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona is responsible for Southern Arizona, the five most southern counties. But our biggest bulk of distribution happens in Pima because of population. That is why I am always asking if people donate, we can triple that money, and it is a tax write off. So, that is what I ask people to do. But if you have pantry items you have to clear, please donate them. And also volunteer hours are super important. So, go to any one of our partner sites. Come to us, we can volunteer. We would love to have all of you all there packing boxes so you can see what the operation looks like and distribution so you can see your neighbors. Invitation to Supervisor Christy, please come out to Green Valley, we would love for you to see our facility out there, to check it out, and just meet some of the folks. Thank you.

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Unfortunately, this issue, and it is a very serious one, but it is seeped in politics. The Big Beautiful Bill, the Trump Administration, the federal government. I again, go back to the fact that the Trump Administration has been ordered to disperse the funds, and they are investigating on how they can do it legally. Again, going to the Grand Canyon Institute. Here is an area where my democrat colleagues on my left have failed to explore or pursue, and they probably have the most influence in getting some results. And that happens to be with our Democrat Governor, Katie Hobbs. I do not hear any kind of effort on anybody's part to contact the Governor's Office because according to the Grand Canyon Institute, even though she may not have the direct ability to transfer funds, if the federal government refuses, Governor Hobbs has at least two sources of funds that could be pulled from if she were to call a special session of the legislature. The current revenue for the state is coming in at \$128 million above projections. Given that the monthly federal SNAP benefit total is about \$155 million, these funds would go a long way toward covering a month.

However, in the short term, the JLBC indicated for the fiscal year, it had a balance of \$1.5 billion. Funding SNAP for one month would require only 10% of those funds, which would later be repaid. I ask, and I urge my democrat colleagues to contact Governor Hobbs. Tell her what the situation is down here. She has the ability to call a special session and get funds that could be allocated for this, rather than out of the taxpayer's household account of the General Fund. There are ways to do this that are proper, if not from the federal government, then to the state government. Those are the two entities that control this. It is not something that County taxpayers should be on the hook for, especially if we have no guarantees that if the funds come in, the County will be reimbursed.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Will my colleague from District 4 join me in asking the Republican Senate President and the Republican Speaker of the House to join hands with this Governor to call a special session, because I do not know if you know this, but to enter a special session, it requires the green light from both the Governor, the Senate President and the speaker of the House.

SC: I will join in on that, and I will obviously assume that you will be the catalyst to get Governor Hobbs to join in on it.

AC: And Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy. You realize that the state has no role in funding SNAP. They have an administration of SNAP, but the funds actually come from the federal government.

SC: The funds come from the federal government, and they are given to the state, and the state can get together and bring them down to the local level. That is all I am saying and it has not been explored. We never have even heard anything about the Governor.

AC: I want to thank, Chair Scott, my colleague from District 4, for agreeing to call for a special session to the Governor. I do not know that there will be political will to do that. We already, because of the One Big Beautiful Bill, will have a \$400 million deficit to the General Fund coming in next year. So, when we go talk to our legislators in the coming months for opening session, it will not be a matter of what can we spend on. It will be a conversation about what will we cut. That is a \$400 million hit already to our state coffers and so I know it feels uncomfortable and it feels political to hear this kind of fact from the dais, but this is the impact of an administration that has chosen the very wealthy and billionaires to benefit, while the rest of us are left behind. Those are the impacts of our legislation right now Supervisor Christy.

SC: Mr. Chair, I assume then, that my colleague, Supervisor Cano, is not willing to discuss this with the Governor.

AC: I would love to talk to the Governor about how SNAP and Pima County is going to ensure that Women, Infant and Children will not be held hostage in the midst of this chaos.

RS: Thank you, Supervisors. Any further comments, Supervisor Allen?

JA: Thank you all for being here. Thank you for the work that you do. Thank you, Supervisor [Heinz], for bringing this to the forefront. I think that the thing that is so challenging, I am just sort of speaking what it is that I am struggling with, right, is that it was, first, it was all the folks who were laid off from federal departments and agencies, and then folks who got federal grants and contracts. You know, we already had a bunch of folks who had lost their jobs. We have got folks who are furloughed, folks from SNAP benefits that are being dangled around, as a political game, not knowing if they are going to get them in weeks or months and how much the quantity will be. And then making all of us chase after them. It is insulting to everyone involved. And then looking at H.R.1, it is designed to whittle down those recipients of SNAP. With the new employment requirements, the goal is to actually diminish SNAP so that we have folks without having food benefit. We are three months in our budget. We are less than one year into this administration, this federal administration, and we are in a human crisis, and it is food security. I mean, security, we are just looking for just food stability at this point, at a much low bar, and it is going to be an eviction crisis tomorrow, homelessness crisis that is exacerbated. We can see the dominoes, and they are going to be falling one after another in our community. You all are doing the frontline work to try to weave together that safety net that we depend on, every one of us. Yeah, it is just critical and it is overwhelming, just to be frank, it is incredibly overwhelming at the amount of need that there is. The other piece, well, I will just leave it at that for now.

RS: Thank you. Supervisor Heinz, did you have some further comments?

MH: Just because, you know, things are changing rapidly while we are talking about this. But just to underscore, from 10:45 a.m., so that is relatively current, though there might have been a tweet, I do not know. In a post on social media, Mr. Trump charged that benefits under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP quote, "Will be given only when the radical left democrats open up government, which they can easily do, and not before!" The President's comments carried great political, legal, and economic significance and raised concern that the administration might be violating a judge's order requiring the government to keep funding SNAP payments. So, while the President, while the federal administration sort of again, play around here. We are here in Pima County. We have the capacity to do this emergency funding. This is not going to fix anything permanently, but we can make sure that hunger, true hunger, is not going to hit as many people in our community by passing this. I know it is tough. We have our own budget issues. We have revenues coming in a little better, a little stronger than we were expecting. Looks like maybe we are going to win the SSP lawsuit and maybe get that \$10 million back. Do not know when that is coming in, but we do know that people are going to be going hungry literally right now. And it is incumbent upon us to take action. We do not have the luxury of playing around with this as a political football in

D.C., or closing the County government, or any of that nonsense. What we do know, and I can tell you as a doctor, as I have seen hunger and I have seen what this does to people, I have seen homelessness in the E.R., in the hospital. This is something we can do. We can contribute to some and we can help to stave this off for people at least for a few weeks, maybe through the holidays with these funds and with these excellent people, community servants here, to administer them and so I look for your support.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: I am hoping to ask questions of staff, and I do not know if there is any more comments from our guests so they can be seated.

[speakers thanked the Board]

AC: Thank you.

RS: You had questions for staff Supervisor?

AC: Yes, and Administrator Lesher. I wanted to perhaps get some greater information from you and our Director of Finance about the proposal that my colleague from District 2 has, the source that our colleague has recommended, the General Fund balance. I received information from the Director about where we were last year around this time and just kind of can you paint a picture of what we actually have in the coffers to be able to support any modifications to that pool of money?

JL: Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. I know you asked specific questions of Director Cuaron. [Directed at Mr. Cuaron] Perhaps you can share that with the full group today about what the fund balance is looking like and where we are at this point.

ART: Administrator Lesher, Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. As of September, which was the last forecast that we put together, our projection for available Unrestricted Fund Balance as of that period is \$9.3 million. Keep in mind that that is a projection based on anticipated revenues coming in and expenditures being at or below budget through Period 3 of the fiscal year, so that is through September.

JL: Thank you.

RS: Do you have any other questions Supervisor?

AC: Director, Administrator Lesher. Can you paint another picture right now? Is this paper money? Is it budgeted already? What liabilities do we have? The point I want to emphasize is that our General Fund Contingency balance, which is what this Board voted on in June, that is our rainy day fund. That is our ability to tap into it. That is \$1 million and we have already spent about \$100,000.00 or so. We are down to \$900,000.00. The totality of both the items on 11 and 12 being considered today would eliminate the rainy day fund that we set aside in May. Is that correct, Administrative Lesher?

JL: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. Yes, and if I may, I think part of the concern and what I believe it has been, the issue is what we are hearing from today and what we are continuing to see is extraordinary need, that I think of this similar, to what we have been dealing with as a Board in the County, with the state cost shifts. We are seeing some cuts coming in from the state. We see cuts coming in from the federal government, and we simply are not going to have the capacity as Pima County or any of our local governments to fill the gap of need that may be created by the lack of some of the funding that we are seeing occurring, either long term or right now, as we see this short term shutdown. My concern has been that while we are seeing potential increase in what we thought would be the Fund Balance from last year, those are preliminary numbers. And we do not know what all is going to be asked of the Board and of the County in the next nine months or through the remainder of this year, and that is a concern. And I think, as Supervisor Allen has indicated, we are seeing need. You are looking at the numbers, we are seeing the jail numbers go up. We are hearing a need for some additional funding. We know that we have concerns in our eviction programs. We know we have increased need in many of our County programs. And part of my concern and wonder is there an ability for us to look at the multitude of requests that you are going to be receiving and see how we can appropriately filter those, compare them, and come back with ongoing recommendations to the Board about how we can fund those that need, because my fear is, what we heard today, 20% increase for Sheriff's Department. We have extraordinary need there. We have need at the food banks. We do not know what is happening with SNAP and other programs. And we just are sitting here today not knowing what all the need is going to be to fill the gaps that are coming your way.

RS: Colleagues. I would like to make a motion that I think addresses the complexity that Mr. Valles referred to at the beginning of this discussion, and the multitude of organizations that are involved in this. And my motion is to continue both Items 11 and 12, until our first meeting in December. And I can give some reasons for that motion if there is a willingness to offer a second.

SC: Second.

RS: Thank you. The reason I am making this motion is 1 in 8 Americans, 40 million people receive federal food benefits. In Arizona, it is 923,000 people, or 12.2% of our population. We are still trying, staff is, to verify the numbers in Pima County but I think one of our guests made reference to them. There is not the capacity for local government to be able to address all of the needs that are being brought out by decisions being made in Washington. There just is not. And the Board approved Addendum Item No. 9, because there was already a statutory role for the County with regard to the WIC program, as we heard during the discussion of that item. But Items 11 and 12 address just a few of the entities in our County who are providing services and support to the people who need it. And what I think we need is some process for a discussion of when the County can provide support and how that will happen. And these two items, although extraordinarily well intended, and I joined and thanking Supervisor Heinz for bringing the items forward so that we can at least have the discussion. If we continue this until the first meeting in December, we can direct Administration to return to us with a process for determining, if and when,

County support is warranted, and to whom. Right now, these two measures do not do that, and we need to know more about what the County is able to do. As Mr. Cuaron just said, these are projections, these are estimates. The County Administrator has confirmed that if we pass these items today, it would eliminate the Contingency Fund. I think if we give the Administration some time to come back to us with a process describing how and when, and to whom the County can be in support, I think that is the better way to go. Discussions on the motion?

SC: Mr. Chair, I completely agree and concur with that prudent and thoughtful approach and a responsible approach. And I also would like to include in that discussion brought back by the County Administrator and the Administration, is the impact of the \$9.5 million that we are still owed and have we received? And if we do not receive it, what are these other items going to impact as far as our entire budget and the Contingency Fund? There are a lot of issues out there that are not being addressed in these requests that we still have to deal with, have not had a chance to deal with them, and only time will allow us to do that. Plus, it will give us the ability to look at these items as Chair Scott has indicated in a very rational, thoughtful and comprehensive manner. Rather than running off and not taking into consideration, the dire and negative consequences of such actions that could occur, and I will support that motion with you.

RS: Further discussion on the motion to continue the two items to the first meeting in December? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. I want to thank my colleague from District 2 for bringing both these items to the Board's consideration. I want to ensure that the public knows some additional information. In the current budget that the County already approved this summer, \$433,000.00 is already going to the Community Food Bank of Southern Arizona. The Sahuarita Food Bank and Marana received \$242,000.00 from that same pot of money. So, we are talking already about nearly \$1 million out the door. And I will be in support of continuing this discussion so that we can continue to work with our state and federal partners to see where we need to step in. I will say transparently from this dais, that I do not believe no action is sufficient. I especially am paying close attention to the fact that right now, every week, it is costing the Community Food Bank and our partners \$100,000.00 a week to meet demand right now. I do not believe that this is the responsibility of local taxpayers, solely. I think we need to work with our private sector, we need to work with our community partners, and I want to thank our Community Food Bank workers for yet again being frontline workers in the face of uncertainty. You did this during the pandemic. You are now doing, and you do it every day, frankly, now that increased demand is happening right now. I am optimistic that we can find measured policy that we can support, that is tangible, and that has the most impactful use of County taxpayer dollars, and I want to reiterate that we are already spending nearly \$1 million on food assistance in this current budget. And as we consider more, please know that this Board has less than \$900,000.00 to be able to respond to emergency efforts for the entire duration of this fiscal year, meaning between now and May. This is the first major issue that we have got to consider, excuse me, June, but there will be a cadence to this kind of support where I cannot justifiably say that all of that

be eliminated right now. We have 7,000 employees and emerging needs of a million County residents, but I am in support of a smaller amount to support at least a portion of what is being requested by my colleague from District 2. It is the humane and moral thing to do.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Further comments on the motion? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I think I will also support the motion because I think, as I said earlier, but this is a food stability is kind of the tip of the iceberg, and other things are inherently going to ripple out after that. And I want to make sure that we have a plan, that we have thought through it, we know where we are going to tap, and if it is not from our budget, or perhaps it is tapped. And this is a request that the Administration that we work with other municipalities, so we are in communication with one another because this is indeed a crisis that is affecting all of the towns and the County, all of us together. That we are also calling upon the private sector, some of the donors across the community, that now is the time, to up the ante and support our community and food banks and frontline service providers. This is the moment and it is going to get worse. I guess that is as much as I would want to just, you know, open up the bank, but it is not, we got to think about the future.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I would like to agree with Supervisor Allen's assessment about all hands on deck type of situation. This is a community wide effort. We have always been very supportive of the food banks throughout our community here, and the people of Tucson. Speaking of which, City of Tucson, I am sure is going to be partnering with us in this effort, as the other jurisdictions in Pima County. And the people of Pima County have always been generous. I know they will come through on this particular case. And just as an example, Tucson Electric Power just donated \$50,000.00 to the food bank, so it can be done community wide and we need to explore all that before reaching into uncharted waters that we do not know about in our budget. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Any other comments from Board members, Supervisor Cano and then Supervisor Heinz, were you seeking recognition? Okay, my apologies. Supervisor Cano? No, Supervisor Cano? All right. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

SC: Aye.

MH: [Shakes head, no]

RS: Any opposed? Item passes 5-0...

MH: No, Absolutely, no.

RS: Oh, I apologize, Supervisor Heinz. I did not hear you.

MH: No, I am opposed.

RS: I did not hear you, I apologize. These two items are continued until the first meeting in December, by a vote of 4-1, with Supervisor Heinz opposed.

SC: And for the record Mr. Chair, that is Item 11 and 12?

RS: Yes, sir.

SC: Thank you.

REAL PROPERTY

22. The Board of Supervisors on October 14, 2025, continued the following:

Contract

El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County Highway Maintenance Reimbursement Agreement, contract amount \$200,000.00 revenue (CT2500000067)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Lesher, County Administrator
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
JF: Jack Ford, Project Development Associate, El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C.

RS: Let us go to Item No. 17, which is unfinished business. It is a contract with El Rio Transmission, L.L.C., to provide for Pima County Highway Maintenance Reimbursement Agreement, contract amount \$200,000. I will move the item.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: Before we go to that.

RS: Please?

SC: May I just do a little fishing expedition? Could we address 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23?

RS: I think just based on discussion we had at the agenda committee, I think there are some particular details associated with some of these other items that I know Supervisor Allen wants to address. Is that correct, Supervisor?

JA: That is correct.

RS: Alright, so I apologize, Supervisor Christy, you know, I am a fan of bundling.

SC: I am too, and I am also a fan of going to the bathroom, which I really need to do. So that is why I am...

RS: Well, Supervisor, you know, you can leave the dais at any time.

SC: You know, I can hear everything in the back. So would you excuse me?

RS: You go right ahead, sir. Alright, I am going to move Item No. 17.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. I swear I heard him. Let us have discussion on that item. Supervisor Allen?

JA: Well, so I would actually like to say I reached out and spoke with the Chairman of the Tohono O'odham Nation and the Attorney General, and they have concerns with the County taking these actions at this particular time, given their opposition as plaintiffs to some of the impacts this project will have on ongoing litigation. So, I would actually like to make a motion that we table items 17 through 20 and request that County Administration monitor the lawsuit and keep in communication with the Tohono O'odham Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity, or the plaintiffs in the suit, to ensure that any future Board actions related to SunZia and El Rio Sol will not adversely impact their case.

RS: So that is a substitute motion. Is there a second for that?

AC: Second.

RS: Seconded by Supervisor Cano. Let us have discussion on the substitute motion and Supervisor Christy, did you hear what that was?

SC: Yeah, to table.

RS: Table items 17 through 20, and then just further details to the motion. You were asking for follow-up from Administration and consultation with both the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity?

JA: Yes.

RS: Okay. Any further discussion from Board members?

SC: Just to be clear, this is just Supervisor Allen's desire to have more information from certain groups?

RS: Yes.

SC: And it is going to be tabled to which meeting?

RS: Oh thank you, that would be [hand gesture towards Supervisor Allen] thank you.

JA: So, I am asking that the Administration monitor the lawsuit and keep in communication with the Nation, with the two plaintiffs, the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity, to make sure that any Board actions do not negatively impact actions related to SunZia or El Rio Sol, will not adversely impact the litigation.

RS: So you are, you are...

JA: Because the concern, sorry...

RS: No, no, I apologize.

JA: Because what has been shared in conversations with the Nation is that they feel like these items will adversely impact their litigation.

RS: So just to be clear, you are asking for indefinite postponement until we get some clarity on those points?

JA: As the litigation moves forward, keep in touch with the Nation so that, if and when these come back up, or if we put them back on, it is at a time in which they will not negatively impact the litigation. Makes sense?

RS: Alright, Supervisor Christy? But then I also have a question for Administration.

SC: Yeah, I would share that question too with Administration. What is the impact of this? Seems like an indefinite delay. We have got contracts going here and revenue coming into Pima County and transmission to areas that desperately need to have this infrastructure. I cannot believe that the Nation have not been kept informed on this whole process up to now. These are major expenditures that are going through their tribal lands and the importance of these items are going to be withheld until, if I am hearing correctly, an indefinite time. Does that not have a breach of contract involved somewhere?

RS: And this is, in the instances of 17, 18 and 19 revenue to the County. So let me ask with regard to the motion, Administrator Lesher, what are the ramifications, if any, to the County for indefinite tabling of these four items?

SC: And Mr. Chair, if I could, before...

RS: Please.

SC: Could we add up the revenue that this would impact on those three items? I would do it by hand, \$200,000.00, \$33,000.00, \$850,000.00.

RS: So it is a little over a million.

JL: Chair Scott?

RS: Administrator Lesher.

JL: Thank you, Chair Scott, members of the Board and I will ask Mr. DeBonis for a little additional information. But I think as you heard these contracts before you today provide for revenues for some of the conservation mitigation that is required through the Arizona Corporation Commission and some funds for road maintenance in the area. But the specifics, we have both the Director of our Conservation Lands and

Resources, as well as Mr. DeBonis. Mr. DeBonis, we will start with you for additional, if we could. Thank you.

CD: Chair Scott and members of the Board. So, I think most notable is the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) condition that is part of the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility. So that is Condition No. 37 and what that required is that the project developers, if you will, mitigate for impacts to lands that the County leases to fulfill our conservation obligations under our Section 10 Permit. So, the agreements that are the donation of land and then the monetary in-lieu payments for impacts to those areas are designed to meet the condition of the ACC approval. So I cannot tell you today what the impact of that may be on the project going forward and adherence with the requirements imposed by the ACC. And so, you know, you have representatives of the project here. They may be able to speak to that a little better than I. The road maintenance agreement is similar to an agreement that we did previously with SunZia. That is a \$200,000.00 contribution to go ahead and enable the County Department of Transportation to fund additional road repairs on a road that we are already required to maintain, that we already maintain and have obligation to maintain, so that one does not tie directly to the ACC condition but that is sort of the framework of what is in front of you today. The County staff has worked with SunZia and El Rio Sol to come up with the agreements that are before you today. We negotiated in good faith based on the criteria that applies to this project.

SC: Mr. Chair, just to back up what the Administrator was saying, this would affect the Redington Road issue and the agreement that was made as far as maintaining that. That has become a safety issue to the folks out in Redington. They just had a horrific murder out there last Christmas, because responders could not get out there quick enough because the road conditions were so bad and this particular item addresses exactly that. There are some real significant impacts that if these are not passed, will remain, that have been in the works to try to be repaired and addressed for decades. And this is the opportunity that we have been having, and this is the opportunity we have been given to get those things addressed. This severely impacts the safety of the Redington area residents on at least one of these issues. And they have been working on this with the County, with the transmission company, with the electrical people and all public safety and the community leaders and the community residents. This really, if this is held up, will have devastating effects on what has been in the plans, in the works for a long time. This needs to be passed, and I think this could be a breach of contract.

RS: Supervisor Allen and then Supervisor Cano.

JA: Correct me if I am wrong Director DeBonis, but on Item 17, this is a reimbursement for maintenance work on the road that we will do anyway. So, it is a question of whether we are getting reimbursed for the maintenance or not getting reimbursed for the maintenance, but the maintenance, my understanding is, proceeds.

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Allen. The County Department of Transportation does maintenance on the roadways, so Redington and San Pedro, they budgeted about

\$130,000.00 a year to do that maintenance. They will continue to do that maintenance, that they normally and routinely would do on the roadways. This agreement, Item No. 17, presumes that the project is going forward by El Rio Sol, that as a result of that, going forward, there is additional heavy vehicle traffic on that roadway that would add to the deterioration of the road. And the \$200,000.00 agreement would go towards addressing that additional impact. So, the Department of Transportation, if this agreement is not approved today, would continue to do routine maintenance using Department of Transportation funding. This agreement is intended to fund additional maintenance that would be necessary as a result of the increased usage from the project construction.

SC: And Mr. Chair, Mr. DeBonis?

RS: Hold on just a second. That was Mr. DeBonis responding to Supervisor Allen. She still had the floor. And then I was going to call on Supervisor Cano after that. Pardon me Supervisor Cano and then Supervisor Christy.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott, Administrator Lesher and Mr. DeBonis. Are we in violation of any breach of contract by extending this to a future date? And let us answer that before I recommend an additional date.

CD: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. I do not think we are in breach. I think the question pertains to the indefinite tabling of it and tying it to then the steps in the lawsuit, and so I understand entirely the desire to communicate with the tribe and with the Center for Biological Diversity on the effects of these actions upon the suit that is pending. So, there was a ruling in the Appellate Court on that. We have not seen as of yet, a calendaring of any further court dates on that and I think a continuance with a defined time frame to allow us to gather additional information, speak with the tribe, speak with the Center for Biological Diversity, would enable us to come back and give you a full picture of how this relates to the concerns that they may have. And so the requirement for mitigation was imposed by the ACC and I cannot speak to today what the result of an indefinite tabling may be on that particular process. I do not know what El Rio Sol's next step would be. Would they go back to the Corporation Commission and indicate we attempted to mitigate, in adherence to the Condition No. 37, and we were unable to do so, and then ensue a process with the ACC? And again, you have project representatives here who can maybe speak more closely to that. So, I do not believe by continuing the item we are in breach. I would suggest that if there was a defined time for continuance to enable us to engage with the tribe and with the Center and come back to the Board with that information, then you would have before you additional details from which to make a decision and we can work with the County Attorney's Office to evaluate any of the impacts that may become of a decision by the Board not to approve the agreements.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Quick comments and then I will make a suggestion. This entire situation could have been avoided and could have happened with tribal consultation, and it could have ensured that we, as a Board, did not have to be put in this position. I believe that what we have are folks who want to see action on this,

and you have got our tribal partners who are saying, we were not consulted by the County, we are actively in litigation, and I remind the County Administration and my colleagues that every single Board meeting, we start with the Land Acknowledgment and if we want to be good partners in this conversation moving forward, it should not come from this dais to ask if we have engaged in meaningful tribal consultation. And I think that is the crux of what happened here. I am in support of letting the Board not intervene in this process, and I feel that we do need clarity for both the applicant and for the County's position with a more defined time frame. I do not know if my colleague from District 3 will accept our first meeting in January, January 13th. That is two months of time for folks to come together, for our County staff to be able to work with the applicant and the Tohono O'odham Nation, and I think it is a measured outcome that I hope can gain support by District 3.

RS: Is that acceptable to you, Supervisor Allen, as the maker of the motion?

JA: It is.

RS: Alright. So let us have discussion.

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes.

MM: So just for the record, the first meeting in January is January 6th.

RS: Okay.

AC: Got it. Not on my calendar so I should be here on January 6th. Do we have a 13th?

MM: Chair Scott, Supervisor Cano. It is January 6th and then January 20th.

AC: Which one would you prefer Supervisor Allen?

JA: January 20th.

AC: January 20th.

RS: Alright. So let us have discussion because what we are talking about now is tabling items 17 through 20 until January 20th and I had a question to Mr. DeBonis. You had indicated that having a date certain for the items to be taken up again would assist with discussions with both the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity, as well as the applicants. Does that timeframe seem like it would work for the County in terms of our own purposes?

CD: Chair Scott, it does.

RS: Alright, Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you. Just as a point of clarity, you mentioned that the County is spending \$120,000.00 a year maintaining the Redington Road. With County funds, with the

County equipment. Has that proved in there in the residents' mind, to be an adequate amount of money and an adequate way to maintain that road?

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, we continue to get contacted by residents who would like to see increased maintenance on the roadway. We work with certain property owners out there, particularly ranching property owners, who would like to see additional maintenance. At an upcoming meeting this Board will see an agreement with the Redington Natural Resources Conservation District to have that district do maintenance on behalf of Pima County on that roadway. So we have been working over, quite frankly, several years with residents and property owners out in the area to increase maintenance on the roadway.

SC: So, Mr. Chair. Mr. DeBonis, this has been a real hot spot with the community out there?

CD: Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy, it has.

SC: And just one other suggestion. We have representatives here that maybe they could give a statement about this issue and also be how postponing it till mid-January would affect the whole.

RS: I think that is a very reasonable request, Supervisor. Thank you. Anybody from the applicant group that would like to address the Board?

JF: Chair Scott and Board, I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. Excuse me. Sorry. My name is Jack Ford. I am a Project Development Associate for El Rio Sol Transmission, L.L.C. We go by Rio Sol. I am not a part of the SunZia project. The SunZia Transmission is a separate project. I would first like to speak to the nature of the ongoing litigation. That litigation is between the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Center for Biological Diversity, and the Bureau of Land Management, and that is a lawsuit specific to the SunZia Transmission Project. It does not involve El Rio Sol Transmission.

RS: In terms of the motion, Mr. Ford, continuing these four items to January 20. If that was what Supervisor Christy had questions about, and I am sure the entire Board would as well.

JF: Yes, thank you. Our understanding and thank you, Supervisor Christy, for bringing it up, is that this road is in need of maintenance and we have a relationship with the Redington Natural Resource Conservation District, who has expressed concerns with the Redington and San Pedro River roads. And we would like to supply that funding to the County as soon as possible. And we have that check written. I believe it is ready to be sent to the Pima County Treasurer as soon as possible. In terms of how that would affect our project. We would like to, of course, comply with all agreements for our project as soon as possible. But I believe January 20th, it would not cause any undue burden to our project.

RS: Thank you, Mr. Ford. And then just to follow up, because I think this is a concern for the entire Board, certainly for Supervisor Christy, given his representation of the

area. But it sounded to me, Mr. DeBonis, like work on Redington Road that is being reported to us as a concern by the residents out there will be done regardless of whether these items are continued and that the Department of Transportation is in contact with residents out there and with the District 4 office to make sure that those immediate needs on that road are addressed.

CD: So, Chair Scott, routine maintenance on the roadway will continue, and so there will be no enhanced or additional maintenance that occurs, which, if the project is not moving forward, may not create an issue. In other words, the higher volume traffic is one of the bases for the agreement with El Rio Sol is that they will put additional vehicles on there. They will be large class vehicles that have additional impacts on the road, and they are contributing to mitigate for those additional impacts to the road. I think aside from that the residents would like to see increased routine maintenance as well. And so that is a conversation that we continue. We have worked closely with the Redington Natural Resources Conservation District. And as I said, there will be an agreement coming forward where we will contract or propose to this Board contracting with them. They have personnel in the area. They have equipment that they can deploy in the area. This is at the farther reaches of the Pima County Roadway Maintenance System. This is a long rural dirt roadway that has volumes of ranching activity as well as residential vehicular activity. So we continue to work on that aspect with the residents and the conservation district separately. And their desire is that we do more maintenance, period, regardless of whether this agreement with El Rio Sol.

RS: When do we anticipate that other item coming before the Board?

CD: I believe that it will be in front of the Board on November 18th.

RS: Okay, very good. Any other questions or comments on the motion from Board members? Supervisor Christy?

SC: I just want to make sure that Supervisor Allen has made it clear what kind of information or what kind of additional discussion that would suffice as far as what it is Supervisor Allen's looking for.

RS: Did you want to restate anything from your original motion, Supervisor Allen, now that the that we have a date certain.

JA: So the motion to table the items 17 through 20 until January 20 and requesting that County Administration both monitor the lawsuit and communicate with the Nation and the Center for Biological Diversity to ensure that our actions related to SunZia or El Rio Sol will not adversely impact the lawsuit.

RS: And that language is still good with you, Supervisor Cano, as the seconder?

[Supervisor Cano nods in agreement.]

RS: Okay. Supervisor Christy?

SC: My only concern is that 48 hours or 24 hours before the January meeting, someone in those two entities decides, nope, it is not acceptable we have problems. There has got to be some kind of ability for us or the County to be able to monitor and respond to issues well before the 12th hour, and that is my biggest concern. That will come right down to the deadline something's going to crop up, that is going to be an objection. There needs to be some cushion in there where those objections, should they come up, come up before the last minute.

RS: Well and I think that is not an unreasonable ask as we are working with those folks. But what I am hearing from County Administration and from Mr. Ford is that this delay would not cause any hardship to either the County or to El Rio Sol. So I am willing to support the motion. All those in favor of tabling these four items until January 20 indicate by saying Aye? Aye.

JA: Aye.

AC: Aye.

SC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Those items will be taken up again on January 20. Thank you so much for your time and engagement.