

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 17, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. CONTRACT

Solis Engineering Co., L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide for Design Engineering Services: Drexel to Valencia East Bank Restoration, term date 2/17/26 to 8/31/27, Regional Flood Control District Tax Levy Fund, contract amount \$1,415,862.75 (SC2600002611) Administering Department: Regional Flood Control District

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

2. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Staff recommends adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. F 54.10, Regional Flood Control District Establishment and Use of Reserves.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that several years ago, the Board established a policy for the maintenance of a Fund Balance and this policy was similar to that for these funds.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that staff recommended the policy be implemented to provide additional fiscal stability in these funds and that it was modeled after the General Fund policy. He explained that the Reserve was three months of the prior year's actuals operating expenditures, while the Cash Flow Reserve was three months of operating expenditures from the current budget year. He stated that with Wastewater, they were codifying in policy what they had already done for a number of years with respect to the reserves. He stated that each year they brought this to the Board to discuss the rate plan with Wastewater and that those policies were vetted through the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) which had

provided a letter of support in December. He reiterated that this was brought forward to strengthen the fiscal stability, promote long term financial responsibility in each of these funds, and to provide for the stability in the Library District Fund and the Regional Flood Control District Fund, as well as codifying Wastewater's policy.

Supervisor Christy asked why this was being done now, if there was no current policy, what prompted it and if it was part of the audit done by the Auditor General. He requested a highlight on the reserve usage.

Mr. Cuaron responded that there was no established policy for the Reserve Balance before, and it was good fiscal management and prudent to bring it forward for Board consideration. He stated it helped to add to the policy when those reserves could be used for unforeseen emergencies and it was a financial management tool. He stated that there was no Auditor General request to put these policies in place, though it did strengthen the County's financial position with the use of these reserves. He reiterated the policy outlined when the reserves could be used in certain situations and approval by the Board to use the reserves. He stated that it also outlined repayment of the reserves within a three-year payback window in the Library District and Flood Control District. He explained that the reason it was brought before the Board was because it was modeled after the General Fund Reserve and it provided additional fiscal stability and strengthened each District's ability to withstand economic uncertainty.

Supervisor Christy asked if the reserves could only be used in emergencies by particular departments and could not be swept into something else or some other area specifically for that department.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative and provided an example stating that if they wanted to use reserves in Flood Control it could only be used for operational expenditures or unforeseen expenditures in the Flood Control District.

Supervisor Scott asked for a layman's description of a Fund Balance Reserve and a Cash Balance Reserve, the distinctions between them, and the importance of each one.

Mr. Cuaron responded that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account in a general household, and that a Cash Flow Reserve was like the current cash balance in that savings account.

Supervisor Scott stated that the item listed some scenarios where the Board would approve the use of reserves. He asked whether the Board would get a recommendation to use the Fund Balance Reserve or the Cash Flow Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron explained that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account and in a general household, there was an emergency fund that went untouched unless it was needed. He stated that it was calculated at the end of each fiscal year, depending upon the prior year's actual expenditures. He explained that a Cash Flow Balance was how much cash that fund held in the bank at any given time. He

stated those were the distinguishing measure between the two, and that calculation was based upon the current year operating expenditures, three months of budgeted operating expenditures, not a lookback period, but a prospective basis.

Supervisor Scott referred to the Flood Control District policy, which was very closely connected to the Library District, under "Authorized Use of Reserves," it listed occasions where the Board of Supervisors might approve the use of reserves. He asked when it would be recommended that the Board use the Fund Balance Reserve as opposed to the Cash Balance Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron responded that in the case of budget authority, that would be Fund Balance. He explained that cash reserves were just a measure of how much cash was on hand at any one point in any fiscal year. He stated that as they did their financial planning, they wanted to make sure that the decisions being made from a budgetary perspective did not reduce cash flow reserves below the level that was defined in the policy. He reiterated that Fund Balance Reserve would be for budget authority, but the cash was needed to fund that. He stated the expenditure did not have cash associated with it and that Flood Control could also use the cash reserve in that given year to coincide with the fund balance authority.

Supervisor Scott stated that under Section 4, it stated, "Any use of reserves must include a plan to restore fund balance and cash reserves to the minimum required levels within three fiscal years." He asked when the Board received the recommendation, if that was something that would be made along with the recommendation to use reserves, or if it would come afterward.

Mr. Cuaron stated that would typically fall in the recommendation as to how that difference would be made up or repaid over the three-year period or shorter, depending on how it impacted the fund's finances.

Supervisor Scott asked if everything would be considered at once and if they would not be waiting on a recommendation on how to replenish the reserves. He asked if they anticipated a need for a similar policy for the Stadium District.

Mr. Cuaron stated that was correct and explained that at this time, a policy for the Stadium District would not be recommended because the majority of the funding for the Stadium District came from the General Fund, which would be codifying use of the General Fund in the Stadium District, and it was not prudent.

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

3. **HEARING - CODE TEXT AMENDMENT**

ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - FC¹, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Flood Control District, amending the Floodplain Management Ordinance Chapter 16.24 (Floodway Requirements) to authorize compensatory storage as a method for property owners to comply with the no-rise criteria for regulatory floodways.

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

4. **HEARING - RULEMAKING ENACTMENT OF PIMA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT TECHNICAL POLICY 001 AND TECHNICAL POLICY 002**

ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - FC2, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Flood Control District, adopting Technical Policy 001 Acceptable Methods to Demonstrate No-Rise in the Base Flood Elevation and Technical Policy 002 Allowable Methods of Post-Construction Flood Protection for Structures.

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

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 17, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY

Staff recommends adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. D 32.14, Library District Establishment and Use of Reserves.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that several years ago, the Board established a policy for the maintenance of a Fund Balance and this policy was similar to that for these funds.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that staff recommended the policy be implemented to provide additional fiscal stability in these funds and that it was modeled after the General Fund policy. He explained that the Reserve was three months of the prior year's actuals operating expenditures, while the Cash Flow Reserve was three months of operating expenditures from the current budget year. He stated that with Wastewater, they were codifying in policy what they had already done for a number of years with respect to the reserves. He stated that each year they brought this to the Board to discuss the rate plan with Wastewater and that those policies were vetted through the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) which had provided a letter of support in December. He reiterated that this was brought forward to strengthen the fiscal stability, promote long term financial responsibility in each of these funds, and to provide for the stability in the Library District Fund and the Regional Flood Control District Fund, as well as codifying Wastewater's policy.

Supervisor Christy asked why this was being done now, if there was no current policy, what prompted it and if it was part of the audit done by the Auditor General. He requested a highlight on the reserve usage.

Mr. Cuaron responded that there was no established policy for the Reserve Balance before, and it was good fiscal management and prudent to bring it forward for Board

consideration. He stated it helped to add to the policy when those reserves could be used for unforeseen emergencies and it was a financial management tool. He stated that there was no Auditor General request to put these policies in place, though it did strengthen the County's financial position with the use of these reserves. He reiterated the policy outlined when the reserves could be used in certain situations and approval by the Board to use the reserves. He stated that it also outlined repayment of the reserves within a three-year payback window in the Library District and Flood Control District. He explained that the reason it was brought before the Board was because it was modeled after the General Fund Reserve and it provided additional fiscal stability and strengthened each District's ability to withstand economic uncertainty.

Supervisor Christy asked if the reserves could only be used in emergencies by particular departments and could not be swept into something else or some other area specifically for that department.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative and provided an example stating that if they wanted to use reserves in Flood Control it could only be used for operational expenditures or unforeseen expenditures in the Flood Control District.

Supervisor Scott asked for a layman's description of a Fund Balance Reserve and a Cash Balance Reserve, the distinctions between them, and the importance of each one.

Mr. Cuaron responded that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account in a general household, and that a Cash Flow Reserve was like the current cash balance in that savings account.

Supervisor Scott stated that the item listed some scenarios where the Board would approve the use of reserves. He asked whether the Board would get a recommendation to use the Fund Balance Reserve or the Cash Flow Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron explained that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account and in a general household, there was an emergency fund that went untouched unless it was needed. He stated that it was calculated at the end of each fiscal year, depending upon the prior year's actual expenditures. He explained that a Cash Flow Balance was how much cash that fund held in the bank at any given time. He stated those were the distinguishing measure between the two, and that calculation was based upon the current year operating expenditures, three months of budgeted operating expenditures, not a lookback period, but a prospective basis.

Supervisor Scott referred to the Flood Control District policy, which was very closely connected to the Library District, under "Authorized Use of Reserves," it listed occasions where the Board of Supervisors might approve the use of reserves. He asked when it would be recommended that the Board use the Fund Balance Reserve as opposed to the Cash Balance Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron responded that in the case of budget authority, that would be Fund Balance. He explained that cash reserves were just a measure of how much cash was on hand at any one point in any fiscal year. He stated that as they did their financial planning, they wanted to make sure that the decisions being made from a budgetary perspective did not reduce cash flow reserves below the level that was defined in the policy. He reiterated that Fund Balance Reserve would be for budget authority, but the cash was needed to fund that. He stated the expenditure did not have cash associated with it and that Flood Control could also use the cash reserve in that given year to coincide with the fund balance authority.

Supervisor Scott stated that under Section 4, it stated, "Any use of reserves must include a plan to restore fund balance and cash reserves to the minimum required levels within three fiscal years." He asked when the Board received the recommendation, if that was something that would be made along with the recommendation to use reserves, or if it would come afterward.

Mr. Cuaron stated that would typically fall in the recommendation as to how that difference would be made up or repaid over the three-year period or shorter, depending on how it impacted the fund's finances.

Supervisor Scott asked if everything would be considered at once and if they would not be waiting on a recommendation on how to replenish the reserves. He asked if they anticipated a need for a similar policy for the Stadium District.

Mr. Cuaron stated that was correct and explained that at this time, a policy for the Stadium District would not be recommended because the majority of the funding for the Stadium District came from the General Fund, which would be codifying use of the General Fund in the Stadium District, and it was not prudent.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

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, February 17, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Meheria Habibi, International Rescue Committee.

3. CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Supervisor Cano thanked County staff who participated in District 5's Love of Lectura author series, which was nearing its end. He stated that it brought four local authors to an exciting venue and the previous author had been former District 5 Supervisor, Dr. David Yetman. He stated that the final author series would be held on April 2, 2026, at the Pima County Courthouse and it would feature Dr. Lydia Otero, who had done work focusing on gentrification and urban displacement. He stated that Dr. Otero had a new book titled, "Maria Cordova's Casa" and he looked forward to celebrating that. He indicated that tickets would be released in a few weeks and were free due to generous community sponsors.

Chair Allen acknowledged the passing of Reverend Jesse Jackson earlier that morning, who was a tremendous leader in the Civil Rights Movement, and had been involved in the creation of the Rainbow PUSH Coalition, and who brought people together to further equity and justice. She stated that this was a loss for the country, but also a reminder of the work still ahead. She thanked the Human Resources Department for the Black History Month celebration that would be held on February 19, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

Supervisor Scott shared that the District 1 office was proud to be one of the sponsors of an event that would be held on February 18, 2026, at Palo Verde High School, conducted by the African American Museum of Southern Arizona. He stated the featured speaker would be Tony Dungy, the first African American NFL coach to win a Super Bowl and a renowned motivational speaker. He added that the County Administrator had also helped sponsor the event and they looked forward to welcoming Coach Dungy to Tucson and Pima County.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

4. Presentation of a proclamation to Elizabeth Slater, CEO, Katie Maxwell, Board President, and Vida Rodriguez, Program Graduate, Youth On Their Own, proclaiming the day of Sunday, February 1, 2026 to be: "YOUTH ON THEIR OWN DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

5. Presentation of a proclamation to Soleste Lupu and Joseph Rodgers, Founders, Dancing in the Streets Arizona, proclaiming the day of Saturday, February 7, 2026 to be: "DANCING IN THE STREETS ARIZONA DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Crystal Moore, President and CEO, Russ Stone, Operations Manager, and Hilary Van Alsborg, Board Chair, Downtown Tucson Partnership, proclaiming the month of February 2026 to be: "DOWNTOWN TUCSON PARTNERSHIP APPRECIATION MONTH"

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

7. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Laurie Moore addressed the Board regarding mobile voting units in rural areas and referred to it as ballot harvesting on wheels. She questioned the need for the units in rural areas unaffected by Propositions 418 and 419, and asked whether there would be observers in the mobile unit.

Lisa Stuessel stated that the RTA special election left the majority of voters disenfranchised without the ability to vote in person. She stated that there were only six ballot drop-off locations, and they were all within nine miles of each other, whereas Pima County covered over 9,000 miles. She also expressed concern about the visible signature on the ballot without the privacy envelope.

JD Wallace, representing Tucson Electric Power (TEP), provided an update on how TEP delivered safe, reliable, affordable, and renewable service to the community. He stated that TEP's largest solar site produced enough power for over 40,000 homes and described plans for more solar and battery storage at other sites. He shared TEP's growing investment in the community, benefiting non-profits and residents, and that TEP was well below the national average for outage time.

Robert Reus spoke about the purpose and founding of the Democratic Party. He stated that the Party had been created to deliver prosperity through honest and frugal government.

Robert Cook spoke in support of the Pima County Climate Action Plan and commended the County for its progress. He stated that solar development was one of the key ways to lower emissions, and it was cheaper than fossil fuels.

Ron Proctor addressed the Board and spoke about his involvement with the Greater Tucson Climate Coalition. He described a research paper on photovoltaics that showed how clean they were for the environment and urged the Board to review it.

Betsy Smith spoke about the hysteria surrounding ICE operations and that they were just enforcing the law. She urged the Board to not waste their time with resolutions and to do their jobs.

Dave Smith expressed his support for those working in law enforcement and the rule of law. He stated that immigration enforcement was not the State or County's business.

Rolande Baker spoke in support of Minute Item Nos. 33 and 34. She stated that ICE had no place in Pima County and should not be masked. She also expressed her opposition to the proposed detention center in Marana.

Matthew Roll, Science Technology Engineering & Math AZ, d.b.a. Da Vinci Tree Academy, spoke in support of Minute Item No. 13. He stated that the non-profit school had received a notice of foreclosure and needed forgiveness of back taxes so that they could continue to serve marginalized communities.

Betts Putnam-Hidalgo spoke in support of Minute Item Nos. 33 and 34. She stated that democracy started from the bottom up and that she wanted everyone to be safe in their community. She thanked the Board for their efforts.

Jay Tolkoff addressed the Board regarding increased crime and that it seemed people were not being held accountable for criminal activity. He questioned what alternative there would be if ICE's accountability factor was taken away.

J.P. Salvatierra voiced his opposition to Propositions 418 and 419 in the upcoming RTA special election and that they would only perpetuate the RTA's cost and project inefficiencies. He indicated that the City of Tucson's plan would provide a greater cost benefit.

Isabel Garcia spoke about the need for a real town hall where people could present facts. She stated that immigrants were an essential part of the economy, and she questioned why people were not concerned about the wars in Latin America which were causing people to migrate.

Tanya Nunez expressed her support for Minute Item Nos. 33 and 34 and stated that this was the bare minimum of what the community demanded. She called for jobs and housing to be funded instead of ICE and the military and urged the Board to be on the right side of history.

* * *

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Scott requested that the Board be provided with information from County Administration in partnership with the Assessor's Office and Treasurer's Office, on how the public was being made aware of their right to seek tax relief. He also thanked Chair Allen for enforcing the rules and regulations of the Board during Call to the Public.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

8. Hearing - Fireworks Permit

Erin Kallish, Caterpillar, Inc., 5000 W. Caterpillar Trail, Green Valley, March 1, 2026, from 8:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

9. Hearing - Liquor License

Job No. 375219, Kevin Arnold Kramber, The Hills by Monica, 6960 E. Sunrise Drive No. 110, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Supervisor Scott stated that this was his sixth year serving on the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) for the County Supervisors' Association (CSA), which met to determine stances on bills moving through the Legislature. He shared that at their last meeting, the CSA LPC unanimously voted to oppose a Senate bill that would impose restrictions on vote center uses by Counties, and this was consistent with actions taken over the past six years. He stated that he thought of this when the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security made comments about elections in Arizona being a disaster. He indicated that her comments were baseless and that Supervisors of both parties knew that elections in Arizona were administered fairly.

Supervisor Cano applauded Supervisor Scott's work with the CSA. He stated that he was hopeful for Senate Bill 1373, which would appropriate \$250,000.00 to support the Pima County Summer Youth Employment Program, though he did not anticipate it would move. He stated that last year Pima County hired over 600 youth and had over 3,900 applicants, and this year they anticipated hiring over 850 interns with applications currently live. He asked Supervisor Scott for his support with the CSA.

Supervisor Christy noted that the Board had unanimously voted to place the issue of home title fraud on the Legislative agenda. He asked Supervisor Scott to work with the Assessor and be familiar with the legislation and give it the support that it needed.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated the comments from both of his colleagues. He indicated that the bill Supervisor Cano spoke about was unlikely to come before the LPC given that it was specific to the County, but he would advocate for it with the legislators. He stated that there had already been discussion at the LPC regarding a possible bill for the issue that Supervisor Christy referred to and that would affect all fifteen counties, so it could still happen in the current session.

Supervisor Heinz asked Supervisor Scott what the LPC and CSA thought about the astounding number of bills and asked how they were dealing with it.

Supervisor Scott stated that it had certainly provoked some novel comments from members and had caused them to get into a new numbering sequence for bills.

Supervisor Heinz stated that at the last meeting he provided the wrong date for the Regional Transportation Authority election and the correct date was March 10, 2026. He shared that Pima Association of Governments (PAG) received a presentation from representatives from Mexico, the Mexican Consul and others involved in two major border projects related to long-term infrastructure, and that one of them was expanding the port in Nogales. He commented that three federal

representatives, Arizona's two U.S. Senators, and a representative from Congresswoman Grijalva's office were present, as well. He stated that PAG also discussed Mexico reestablishing passenger rail from Mexico City to the southern border, and that they were also looking at putting together a subcommittee to regularly meet with partners on those projects.

Supervisor Christy clarified that the RTA election was a mail-in ballot and constituents could not vote at a polling place.

Chair Allen stated that the Southern Arizona Education Council had not yet met and that the Arizona Border Counties Coalition met on January 22, 2026, with representatives from Yuma, Santa Cruz, Cochise, and Pima Counties. She stated that they received an update around the role of foreign direct investment and an update from the Arizona Departments of Transportation regarding port expansion projects. She indicated that a communications and narrative project was also discussed due to the misrepresentation of the border region.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

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

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

12. Pima County Climate Action Update

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

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

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

CLERK OF THE BOARD

13. Petition for Relief of Taxes

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11104(G), Science Technology Engineering & Math AZ, d.b.a. Da Vinci Tree Academy, has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2021, 2022, and 2023, for Tax Parcel Nos. 134-11-3670, 134-11-3680, 134-11-3720, 134-11-3730, 134-11-3740 and 134-11-3750.

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

14. **Petition for Relief of Taxes**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-11104(G), Academy of Mathematics and Science, Inc., has petitioned the Board of Supervisors for relief of taxes and associated interest/penalty for tax years 2023 and 2024, for Tax Parcel Nos. 106-12-198B and 106-12-199B.

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

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

15. **FY 25/26 Pima County GAP Funding for Affordable Housing Development and Preservation**

Staff recommends acceptance of the recommendations as awarded, for the following projects:

- Tohono O'odham Nation Housing Authority, San Isidro Subdivision, \$500,000.00
- El Pueblo Housing Development, Main and Davis, \$500,000.00
- COPE Community Services, Shasta Apartments, \$1,000,000.00
- El Pueblo Housing Development, Stone and Speedway, \$500,000.00
- Mercy Housing Mountain Plains, Limberlost Family Flats, \$500,000.00
- Spire Development, Inc., Drexel Commons, \$500,000.00
- El Pueblo Housing Development, Craycraft Towers and Lee Street Duplexes, \$500,000.00
- Old Pueblo Community Services, OPCS Veterans Center, \$500,000.00
- Habitat for Humanity, Mountain View Development, \$500,000.00

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

16. **Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources (STCER) Grants - Round Two**

Staff recommends approval of an allocation in the amount of \$855,000.00 in additional STCER funding and approval of the proposed process and timeline.

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

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

CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES

17. The Board of Supervisors on November 4, 2025 and January 20, 2026, continued the following:

Contract

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

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

18. The Board of Supervisors on November 4, 2025 and January 20, 2026, continued the following:

Contract

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)

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

19. **Budget Remediation Plan Update**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the Pima County Treasurer's Budget Remediation Plan request for Fiscal Year 2025/26.

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

It was moved by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the Budget Remediation Plan as requested for Fiscal Year 2025/26 for the Pima County Treasurer's Office. Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

20. **Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends adoption of Board of Supervisors Policy No. F 55.1, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department Use of Reserves.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that several years ago, the Board established a policy for the maintenance of a Fund Balance and this policy was similar to that for these funds.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that staff recommended the policy be implemented to provide additional fiscal stability in these funds and that it was modeled after the General Fund policy. He explained that the Reserve was three months of the prior year's actuals operating expenditures, while the Cash Flow Reserve was three months of operating expenditures from the current budget year. He stated that with Wastewater, they were codifying in policy what they had already done for a number of years with respect to the reserves. He stated that each year they brought this to the Board to discuss the rate plan with Wastewater and that those policies were vetted through the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) which had provided a letter of support in December. He reiterated that this was brought forward to strengthen the fiscal stability, promote long term financial responsibility in each of these funds, and to provide for the stability in the Library District Fund and the Regional Flood Control District Fund, as well as codifying Wastewater's policy.

Supervisor Christy asked why this was being done now, if there was no current policy, what prompted it and if it was part of the audit done by the Auditor General. He requested a highlight on the reserve usage.

Mr. Cuaron responded that there was no established policy for the Reserve Balance before, and it was good fiscal management and prudent to bring it forward for Board consideration. He stated it helped to add to the policy when those reserves could be used for unforeseen emergencies and it was a financial management tool. He stated that there was no Auditor General request to put these policies in place, though it did strengthen the County's financial position with the use of these reserves. He reiterated the policy outlined when the reserves could be used in certain situations and approval by the Board to use the reserves. He stated that it also outlined repayment of the reserves within a three-year payback window in the Library District and Flood Control District. He explained that the reason it was brought before the Board was because it was modeled after the General Fund Reserve and it provided additional fiscal stability and strengthened each District's ability to withstand economic uncertainty.

Supervisor Christy asked if the reserves could only be used in emergencies by particular departments and could not be swept into something else or some other area specifically for that department.

Mr. Cuaron responded in the affirmative and provided an example stating that if they wanted to use reserves in Flood Control it could only be used for operational expenditures or unforeseen expenditures in the Flood Control District.

Supervisor Scott asked for a layman's description of a Fund Balance Reserve and a Cash Balance Reserve, the distinctions between them, and the importance of each one.

Mr. Cuaron responded that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account in a general household, and that a Cash Flow Reserve was like the current cash balance in that savings account.

Supervisor Scott stated that the item listed some scenarios where the Board would approve the use of reserves. He asked whether the Board would get a recommendation to use the Fund Balance Reserve or the Cash Flow Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron explained that a Fund Balance Reserve was like a savings account and in a general household, there was an emergency fund that went untouched unless it was needed. He stated that it was calculated at the end of each fiscal year, depending upon the prior year's actual expenditures. He explained that a Cash Flow Balance was how much cash that fund held in the bank at any given time. He stated those were the distinguishing measure between the two, and that calculation was based upon the current year operating expenditures, three months of budgeted operating expenditures, not a lookback period, but a prospective basis.

Supervisor Scott referred to the Flood Control District policy, which was very closely connected to the Library District, under "Authorized Use of Reserves," it listed occasions where the Board of Supervisors might approve the use of reserves. He asked when it would be recommended that the Board use the Fund Balance Reserve as opposed to the Cash Balance Reserve.

Mr. Cuaron responded that in the case of budget authority, that would be Fund Balance. He explained that cash reserves were just a measure of how much cash was on hand at any one point in any fiscal year. He stated that as they did their financial planning, they wanted to make sure that the decisions being made from a budgetary perspective did not reduce cash flow reserves below the level that was defined in the policy. He reiterated that Fund Balance Reserve would be for budget authority, but the cash was needed to fund that. He stated the expenditure did not have cash associated with it and that Flood Control could also use the cash reserve in that given year to coincide with the fund balance authority.

Supervisor Scott stated that under Section 4, it stated, "Any use of reserves must include a plan to restore fund balance and cash reserves to the minimum required levels within three fiscal years." He asked when the Board received the recommendation, if that was something that would be made along with the recommendation to use reserves, or if it would come afterward.

Mr. Cuaron stated that would typically fall in the recommendation as to how that difference would be made up or repaid over the three-year period or shorter, depending on how it impacted the fund's finances.

Supervisor Scott asked if everything would be considered at once and if they would not be waiting on a recommendation on how to replenish the reserves. He asked if they anticipated a need for a similar policy for the Stadium District.

Mr. Cuaron stated that was correct and explained that at this time, a policy for the Stadium District would not be recommended because the majority of the funding for the Stadium District came from the General Fund, which would be codifying use of the General Fund in the Stadium District, and it was not prudent.

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

HUMAN RESOURCES

21. 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

2107/ Assistant Director Library/ 18 (\$93,392.00-\$140,067.20)/ 1/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

22. 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

6115/ Division Director, Justice Court/ 18 (\$93,392.00-\$140,067.20)/ 1/ E**

**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' second meeting in March 2026. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott inquired about the justification for continuing the item.

Chair Allen stated that she needed clarification on whether this item was a salary increase for the Ajo Court Administrator, if this was creating a new position or increasing the salary for a current position that oversaw support staff at the Ajo Court. She stated that there was also some ongoing legislation that was moving its way through the Arizona Legislature related to this.

Supervisor Heinz asked if delaying this item would cause any issues with the requesting entity.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that this item was from the Courts and it was her understanding that this was to simply get all the positions lined up, but there was a question about the interpretation. She stated that she would work with the Courts to see if someone was being held up from funding at this point.

Supervisor Christy asked if this dealt specifically with the court in Ajo.

Chair Allen responded in the affirmative.

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

23. **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
2118/ Financial Information Systems Manager/ 18 (\$93,392.00-\$140,067.20)/ 1/ E**
**E = Exempt (not paid overtime)

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

PARKS AND RECREATION

24. **Naming of Canoa Preserve Park Softball Field No. 1, Ivan Allison Field**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 6, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the naming of Canoa Preserve Park Softball Field No. 1, Ivan Allison Field.

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

Supervisor Christy provided a brief biography of Ivan Allison, "*He came from Michigan and purchased a home in Green Valley in 1996 and was passionately involved in developing softball in Southern Arizona, before the BAJA Sporting Club was formed. He was an organizer and relentless recruiter, getting people to come play softball, even if a person said they did not play softball. He was instrumental in BAJA becoming an organization and helped write the bylaws and fundraise. If something had to be done, Ivan did not even wait until the next morning. Ron Kopf and Ivan bought BAJA's first tractor to maintain the fields at Sahuarita Park for \$700.00.*" BAJA is the nickname or the nomenclature for the softball league in the area. "*In 2003, Ivan revived the Tucson Showdown Senior Invitational Tournament for Men and Women and organized enough BAJA players to put a team into a tournament. Ivan organized a team of 65-year-old BAJA players to travel to tournaments in Phoenix, Las Cruces, Yuma and more. When Ivan passed away, the family requested that donations be made to the Parklands Foundation,*" He stated

that Mr. Allison passed away on July 31, 2011, and due to his long and storied past with the softball league and Green Valley, it was most fitting that the softball field be named after him.

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

REAL PROPERTY

25. The Board of Supervisors on October 14, 2025, November 4, 2025 and January 20, 2026, 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)

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

26. The Board of Supervisors on November 4, 2025 and January 20, 2026, continued the following:

Contract

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)

At the request of the County Administrator and without objection, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

27. **Extinguishment of Alley Easement**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 7, of the Board of Supervisors, for the extinguishment of a perpetual easement for alley purposes, as Pima County Right-of-Way Easement Extinguishment No. A-0094, within Section 13, T13S, R13E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

28. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400000834, Amendment No. 12, Amazon.com, L.L.C., to provide for On-Line Marketplace for the purchase of products. This amendment extends the term of the contract commencing on 6/1/26 and terminating on 5/31/28 to align with the cooperative contract renewal and adds the annual award amount of \$1,700,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$8,050,000.00. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Procurement.

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

Chair Allen provided the history of this contract which showed that in 2018 the initial contract was for \$150,000.00, with a not-to-exceed amount of \$300,000.00, five months later another \$100,000.00 was added, three months after that another \$150,000.00 and a year later \$400,000.00 had been added which brought it to \$950,000.00. She stated that it was a startling jump to a not-to-exceed amount of \$8 million.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he assumed this contract was done because it was saving the County money. He asked if there were efforts being made to source some things locally that were being purchased on Amazon.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, responded that the contract was because of costs. She stated that Procurement worked with local businesses to get them set up with doing business through Amazon, in addition to direct selection.

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

29. Runbeck Election Services, Inc. (Headquarters: Phoenix, AZ), to provide for election print services and materials, General Fund, contract amount \$5,000,000.00 (SC2600000005) Administering Department: Recorder's Office

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

Supervisor Christy noted that Exhibit A in the scope of work, made many references to Pinal County, but nothing about Pima County.

Chair Allen stated that this was a cooperative agreement with Mojave County and that it was done to drive down costs.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative. She stated that Pima County had been working with the Mojave contract which could also be based in some way on Pinal.

Supervisor Christy asked whether it required a specific agreement that included Pima County. He pointed out that Mojave was not Pinal County.

Ms. Leshar responded that part of the cooperative agreement was the contract with Pima County.

Supervisor Christy stated that it did not say Pima County anywhere.

Ms. Leshar stated that this was a contract between Pima County and Runbeck Election Services.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that Supervisor Christy was referencing Exhibit A of the Scope of Work attachment, which included the description of services and referenced Pinal County, but the underlying contract properly referenced Pima County. He asked Legal Counsel if there was a need to be concerned about that.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded that as long as the Board approved the item with the acknowledgement of the Scrivener's error, and that the error was corrected, it would be fine.

Supervisor Heinz inquired whether there needed to be an amended motion.

Mr. Brown stated that the motion should acknowledge that the exhibit had the wrong County.

Chair Allen amended her motion to approve the item with a note that Exhibit A within the contract should be specific to Pima County.

Supervisor Heinz accepted the amended motion, as the seconder to the motion.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Christy for bringing this to the Board's attention. He stated that since the contract was related to elections, he felt it may be better to postpone this item until the Board received a contract that included a scope of work attachment with the corrected language. He stated that he was not comfortable with Procurement having sent what may have been a carbon copy of another agreement.

Ms. Leshar stated that she would contact the Recorder to get an amended document.

Chair Allen stated that given that this was an Elections item, there may be some need for the contract to get in place and asked if the Board could move forward with it.

Supervisor Christy stated that he was comfortable moving forward with the notation that the item should say Pima County.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the contract referred to the scope of work and the activities performed, so if the motion indicated that it was clearly intended for Pima County, it was fine to move forward with it.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Discussion/Direction/Action: Pima County Board of Supervisors and City of Tucson Mayor & Council Joint Meeting on March 3, 2026, from 12:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m., at Pima Association of Governments Office, 1 E. Broadway Boulevard, 4th Floor, Tucson, AZ. (District 3)

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

31. 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election

Discussion with the Pima County Recorder and/or designee regarding the conduct of Pima County's first all-mail, countywide election, as well as the office's new "mobile voting unit" including, but not limited to, its acquisition and the plan to deploy it "countywide" during the upcoming 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election. (District 4)

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

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

32. Presentation of Pima County Strategic Plan Overview

Discussion/Direction/Action: Presentation of the Pima County Strategic Plan Overview.

Nancy Cole, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator, provided a slide show presentation and stated that as they were early in the budget process, changes might be made prior to the recommended budget. She explained that one key takeaway at the tactic level, there was about 81% of available tactics in use by cost centers within the County. She stated that it was a fairly high percentage for the first year and was a result of the past several years where they introduced pillars, goals, strategies, and tactics. She stated that it might point to the fact that they needed to

be looked at more carefully, whether they had been applied correctly and consistently, to show if they were too specific or repetitive to ensure good coverage of the entire plan. She pointed out that Pillar 1, Public Service, had the highest concentration of both the number of departments and the amount of resources requested. She stated that many of the internal service departments resided entirely within this pillar, and many operational or external service departments chose to align with the tenants of public service. She stated that this was not surprising, as the root description of everything the County did was public service. She referred to the slide and stated that it showed the top five tactics through three different lenses; total number of departments, total number of cost centers and the highest amount budgeted. She stated that the tactics, "Provide Outstanding Department Services" and "Achieve Department Operation Plan Objectives" both in Pillar 1, ranked in the top through all different measurements, which showed shifting of the dollars of the top five. She stated this was where high concentration of dollars, such as the capital program under, "Manage Projects via Best Practices" or "Implementing Fiscal Stewardship," which included fund reserves in those. She referred to the following slide and stated the Board had seen it on December 2nd, but she pointed out that they added a new narrative area to specifically address how the department, as a whole, aligned with the Strategic Plan and Prosperity Initiative, and that at the program level, they would have specific goals, objectives and performance measures and would be used as part of each department's annual action plan.

Supervisor Scott requested a summarization of the review process regarding, "Tactics, Objectives and Metrics are currently under review."

Ms. Cole stated that as the budget was being reviewed from a resource perspective, they were also looking at the narrative information received, how they described what they did, their functions, services, goals, and what their performance measures were. She stated that those were included in every budget book seen yearly but this was the first time they looked at alignment with the Strategic Plan. She stated that in the process, she would share the information with County Administration and then meet with each director to confirm that what they put in the process was accurate and consistent with what they were doing, what they intended to do. She stated that the information would be used to create an action plan for each department that could be summarized at the County level. She referred to the following slide that showed some examples of things seen with information that had been entered along with the budget process. She stated that with Community and Workforce Development (CWD) the majority of resources were in Pillar 2, Quality of Life at 79%, which showed direct alignment with the Prosperity Initiative. She stated that many of the departments' everyday work was geared toward improving quality of life. She stated that for Transportation, which was more of a public works type, versus a community service type and it showed a shift. She stated that Pillar 1 had a little over a third, and that was public service, and Pillar 3 had a little bit over the majority of their work. She stated that constructing and maintaining the County's transportation system was the focus of Transportation. She stated that this showed they were focused on operations and modernization, as well as customer service and responsiveness and fiscal stewardship and that was what was seen from these two different things. She stated that with the Prosperity Initiative Alignment, in a

community services department there was a lot of direct alignment. She stated that in public works, there was still some alignment, even though it was not immediately apparent. She referred to the table on the slide and stated that for CWD on the fourth row down for, "Workforce development job/skills training employer services," that referenced budget group or program 6184, which was the workforce development group. She stated that within this budget group, there were nine different cost centers, which all provided workforce development activities, but they were broken down by categories such as adult, veteran, youth, business employer services or other relevant breakdowns. She stated that this group measured the number of individuals served by those various categories and that would measure the number of employers assisted and jobs supported, retained and created. She stated that was an example of not really changing the process, but applying the Strategic Plan to what was typically done in the budget book, and was expected moving forward. She stated that they continued working with the budget team and departments to review this year and were on track with their Communications team to update their website and have a fully publishable Strategic Plan in the near future.

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

33. **Prohibiting the Use of County Property and Resources for Civil Immigration Enforcement Operations**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 10, of the Board of Supervisors, prohibiting the use of County property and resources for civil immigration enforcement operations.

Chair Allen stated that her office had initiated this resolution and thanked County Administration and the County Attorney's Office, for their support and direction from the previous meeting. She stated that the resolution very clearly explained why it was needed and read the following from paragraph six and seven of the resolution, *"County-owned and County-operated buildings exist to provide public services and civic access, and the presence of ICE officers conducting civil immigration enforcement activities within County buildings and facilities may deter residents, particularly immigrant, mixed status families from accessing essential services, participating in public processes or engaging with County programs. The unauthorized use of County property and resources for civil immigration operations interferes with the County's authority over, and use of, its own property and erodes trust between immigrant communities and local law enforcement, weakening the relationships that are essential to ensuring public safety and effective community policing."* She stated this was the reason for the resolution.

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

Supervisor Christy stated that when this was first presented to this Board and to the public, it was an ordinance and now it was merely a resolution. He stated that it was similar to the Huidbay mining resolution and that there must be some legal ramification because it was a toothless and meaningless resolution. He stated that

there was no enforcement, and if there were enforcement or ordinance behind it, this Board would basically be asking if it were passed to engage in violence with federal enforcement through other enforcement agencies. He stated it was odd that it was brought before the Board as an ordinance and now as a resolution and asked why it changed.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, explained that there was a certain time requirement for an ordinance, and there very well might be an ordinance on its way. He stated that a notice for an ordinance regarding masks was published on the previous Friday, but the general answer was that masks were outward facing and an ordinance might be appropriate.

Supervisor Christy stated this was regarding County property.

Mr. Brown responded that he was providing a global answer because it applied to both items. He stated that for County property, that was more inward facing and a resolution would be more appropriate.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the subject of enforcement.

Mr. Brown stated that for the subject of enforcement, an ordinance would be more appropriate, and there would be one forthcoming that might have an enforcement mechanism.

Supervisor Christy asked why a resolution was being considered if an ordinance was forthcoming.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that at the last meeting, there was a request for this to come forward as an ordinance, and it was noted at that time that it did not meet the legal requirements for public notification of the draft ordinance. She stated that due to the Board wanting to move forward with an initial policy statement or resolution, so that they did not have an absence of any kind of statement on behalf of the County prior to the adoption of that ordinance. She stated this was discussed at the last meeting and was back today with a policy statement or a resolution and then would be brought back to the Board at the March meeting once they had enough time to publicly notice the draft ordinances.

Supervisor Christy commented that this was an affectless, worthless exercise.

Chair Allen stated that the Board was going through the process as agreed and outlined at the previous meeting. She stated the Board voted on and gave direction for this to move forward. She stated that as the Administrator noted, there would be a resolution at this meeting, and the ordinance would be brought forth at the next meeting since the ordinance required some public postings.

Supervisor Scott thanked Chair Allen for recounting the previous discussion and that they were moving through these in the stages as described. He stated that the resolution was far from toothless because they were a policy making Board. He

stated that the Board provided direction to the 7,000 employees of Pima County. He stated that some findings at the beginning of the resolution were mentioned, but he felt it appropriate to look at some of the sections of the resolution regarding scope and enforcement. He referred to the resolution under Section 2, Prohibition on County Consent for Civil Immigration Enforcement Activities in County Facilities. *“A. No County department, agency officer or employee shall give consent for federal officials to access or use any Pima County-owned, leased, or operated building, facility, or property for purposes of civil immigration enforcement without a valid arrest warrant signed by a federal or state judicial officer...”* He stated that if someone with an enforceable warrant came in wanting to deal with what had been heard, were the worst of the worst, they were going to be able to do that. He stated that it was these sweeps seen around the country, warrantless sweeps, where people were being picked up often based purely on race or ethnicity, that would not be allowed on County property. He stated that similarly very important, in Section 4. Implementation and Enforcement, *“County Departments and Agencies shall develop policies and procedures as necessary to implement this Resolution. Implementing procedures shall provide that any County employee who becomes aware of the attempted or actual use of County property or resources for civil immigration enforcement shall immediately report to their supervisor, who will communicate with County Administration.”* He stated that was direction from the Board and under Section 6. Scope, *“A. Nothing in this Resolution shall be construed as restricting or interfering with the execution of court orders or lawful judicial warrants with the rights of any person or entity under state or federal law, with providing assistance with the investigative activities of any local, state or federal law enforcement agency relating to suspected violations of criminal law; with the enforcement of criminal law; or as limiting or restricting the enforcement of federal immigration laws to less than the full extent permitted by federal law.”* He stated that Pima County had, through its various departments, especially the Sheriff's Department, partnerships with state and federal law enforcement agencies. He stated that the Board had recently approved, by a unanimous vote, accepting funding from the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a task force that dealt with human trafficking and other crimes that occurred on the border. He stated that what they were saying was that these warrantless, random sweeps that were being seen around the country were not going to happen on County property.

Supervisor Christy asked what would happen if sweeps occurred in the County.

Supervisor Scott responded that his understanding was that the scope of this resolution dealt with operations being staged on County property, which was the scope of the County's authority.

Supervisor Christy asked what would happen if it occurred on County property within the scope of the County's authority.

Supervisor Scott stated that was hypothetical because the premise of Supervisor Christy's question assumed that federal authorities were going to use County property for staging their operations. He stated that he did not know that was necessarily going to be the case, but like many local governments around the

country, it was proper and necessary for them to take responsibility in terms of safeguarding County property over which they had authority.

Supervisor Christy asked how many of these incidents had been experienced in Pima County.

Ms. Leshar responded that she was not aware of any to date.

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

34. **Masking and Identification of Federal Agents**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 11, of the Board of Supervisors, concerning the masking and identification of federal agents in the course of civil immigration enforcement actions.

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

Chair Allen stated that as an introduction to the item, some of the language within the resolution explained the rationale behind it and the need for it. She read the following from paragraph three, *"The FBI warns that it has become difficult for communities to distinguish between legitimate federal law enforcement operations and illegitimate impersonators, endangering both civilians and real federal officers. Such actions by impersonators also endanger the health and safety of local law enforcement officers. Officer impersonation endangers victims, terrorizes communities, undermines confidence in legitimate local and federal law enforcement, and impedes legitimate local and federal law enforcement operations when citizens refuse to comply with legitimate local and federal officers due to a mistaken belief that the officer is a criminal impersonator. Clear identification of law enforcement officers-including visible agency affiliation and unique identifiers-supports accountability, lawful conduct, and public trust. Conversely, the presence of masked, unidentified individuals carrying weapons or law-enforcement style equipment in public spaces or near polling places creates confusion, fear, and potential danger for both residents and legitimate officers. The County has a responsibility to use its voice to advocate for practices that uphold civil rights, human dignity, and transparency for all residents, regardless of immigration status. The presence of masked unidentified ICE and other federal agents in the County erodes trust between immigrant communities and local law enforcement, weakening the relationships that are essential to ensuring public safety and effective community policing."*

Supervisor Christy stated that when he presented his substitute motion, one thing that never seemed to be a topic in these actions of masking was as a result of federal agents being targeted by agitators, rioters and protesters to personally expose their private information so they could be threatened. harassed or even killed. He stated that this was the reason agents felt compelled to be masked up to prevent themselves from being led into a situation of violence, which had been the

overriding proponent of people that did not want agents to wear masks. He stated that there was nothing wrong with having certain identification and his substitute motion called for it. He stated that he always encouraged identification, but when people were identified by facial appearance and then searched on the internet and then were targeted, including their families, enforcement agents felt compelled to protect themselves. He stated that none of this doxing, threatening, exposing the private and personal information of law enforcement was addressed in these resolutions. He stated that if it included some of the anti-doxing issues, there was a very good possibility that law enforcement would feel safer and would compel them to remove their masks. He stated that it was interesting to see how this was based on masks, to make those agents that had masks on as some threatening individual, when in fact they were the ones being threatened.

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

PROCUREMENT

35. CHASSE Building Team, Inc., Concord General Contracting, Inc., Durazo Construction Corporation, Kapp-Con Incorporated, Kitchell Contractors, Inc. of Arizona, L.L.C.; Kittle Design & Construction, L.L.C., Lloyd Construction Company, Inc., and S.D. Crane Builders, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide a Job Order Contract: Remodel and Construction Services and amend contractual language, Various Funds, contract amount \$2,800,000.00 (SC2500000074) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

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

Supervisor Christy inquired about the total amount for renovations to the Drexel building to accommodate the Recorder's Office and Elections Department.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, replied that this item was an amendment to an existing master agreement with multiple contracting firms, and it added a one-time increase of \$2.8 million. He stated that the Drexel building renovations were part of it, but he was unsure if the item was exclusively related to only that facility. He stated that he would clarify that and provide that information to the Board.

Jan Leshner, County Administrator, stated on January 29, 2026, a memorandum from Rod Lane, Director of Project Design and Construction, was provided that described allocation to a variety of projects: \$531,000.00 for 33 N. Stone, \$1,416,472.00 for the Drexel building, and \$800,000.00 for two facilities projects.

Supervisor Christy inquired about the County's plan for the Country Club Road facility once it was moved out.

Ms. Leshar responded that was part of an ongoing discussion about the use of buildings and that County Administration would be bringing a complete overview back to the Board.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., added that the Board had discussed space utilization in the downtown area at their initial retreat, and that the Board should expect a briefing on such space and other locations, such as the Country Club Road facility at a future meeting.

Supervisor Cano clarified that the Board was not discussing the County Club location today, and he commended the work currently being done on County facilities. He asked if it was possible to start looking at how many jobs were created in the private sector by these contracts.

Ms. Leshar responded that the County was not currently doing that, but it was a great suggestion. She added that staff would provide an update add it to future items that came before the Board.

Supervisor Scott stated that the Recorder's Office and Elections Department were currently leasing property in order to deal with their space issues, and he asked if they would be able to get out of those leases following the purchase of the Drexel facility.

Ms. Leshar responded that the County had recently broken out of one of the leases for the Recorder's Office. She stated that she was unfamiliar with the specifics of the lease with the Elections Department and would report that information back to the Board.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

36. Transportation Advisory Committee

Reappointment of Charlene Robinson. Term expiration: 1/17/30. (District 3)

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

37. Election Integrity Commission

- Reappointment of Ryan Maese. Term expiration: 7/25/27. (District 3)
- Appointment of Jamie Sullivan, to fill a vacancy created by Cam Juarez. Term expiration: 2/16/28. (District 5)

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

38. **Community Action Agency**

Appointment of John Vasquez Bedoy. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 5)

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

39. **Board of Adjustment, District 3**

Appointment of Nancy Musgrave, to fill a vacancy created by Matthew Tennyson. Term expiration: 2/16/30.

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

40. **Board of Adjustment, District 5**

Appointment of Benjamin Yawakie, to fill a vacancy created by Hector Campoy. Term expiration: 8/31/30.

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

41. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

Upon the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 4 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

Upon the request of Supervisor Heinz to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 23 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

It was then moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Health

4. Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for the expansion of Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in Pima County,

amend contractual language and scope of services, Health Special Revenue Fund 2002, contract amount \$11,500.00 (PO2500037576)

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

Supervisor Christy stated that this item would allow for the purchase of one additional question and inquired about that additional question.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that the specific question was not known yet, but this item expanded the ability to add a question. She stated that the amount paid and what was done with surveys was determined by the number of questions.

Supervisor Christy stated that the item allowed for one additional question related to firearm safety and asked if there was any more specific information.

Ms. Leshar responded no.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR HEINZ

TREASURER

23. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**
Staff requests approval of the Certificates of Removal and Abatement/Certificates of Clearance in the amount of \$157,077.57.

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

Supervisor Heinz asked why Bank of America was eligible for the fee and penalty abatement for fees owed from 2013-2021.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded that this item was submitted by the Treasurer's Office, she would contact the Treasurer and provide that information to the Board.

Supervisor Scott asked Supervisor Heinz if he wanted to continue this item.

Supervisor Heinz stated that it did not seem like Bank of America should qualify for that and he wanted it explored.

A substitute motion was made by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of March 3, 2026.

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

1. Habitat for Humanity Tucson, Inc., to provide an Affordable Housing GAP Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for the Casitas on Park Project, term date 2/17/26 to 12/31/28, General Fund, contract amount \$727,000.00 (PO2500038319)

Facilities Management

2. YMCA of Southern Arizona, Amendment No. 1, to provide for YMCA/Public Works Parking Garage License Agreement located at 50 W. Alameda Street, extend contract term to 2/28/31 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$217,500.00 revenue (CTN-FM-21-72)

Health

3. Arizona Board of Regents, on behalf of University of Arizona, to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$229,509.95 (PO2500036633)
4. Arizona Department of Health Services, Amendment No. 1, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Pima Animal Care Center

5. Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona and its Veterinary Diagnostics Laboratory, to provide for veterinary pathology services, General Fund, total contract amount \$240,000.00/3 year term (\$80,000.00 per year) (PO2500019553)

Procurement

6. Aztec Flooring, L.L.C. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), Continental Flooring Company (Headquarters: Scottsdale, AZ), Flooring Systems of Arizona, Inc. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), and Tucson Commercial Carpet, Inc. (Headquarters: Tucson, AZ), to provide a Job Order Contract: Flooring Services, Various Funds, contract amount \$500,000.00 (SC2500000668)
Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

7. ARAG North America Incorporated, d.b.a. ARAG, L.L.C., Amendment No. 5, to provide for employee pre-paid legal services, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, Employee Contributions Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (SC2400001161) Administering Department: Human Resources
8. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 5, to provide for On-Call Design Engineering Services: Eric Marcus Municipal Airport and extend contract term to 6/15/26, no cost (SC2400001195) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction
9. AZ Wastewater Industries, Inc., to provide for a 2025 F550 TV-LAMP II Truck, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Fund, contract amount \$541,488.29 (PO2600001620) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

Real Property

10. WANRack, L.L.C, to provide for Pima County Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way License for a Fiber Optic Communications System, term date 2/17/26 to 6/30/31, contract amount \$3,000.00 revenue (CT2600000008)
11. State of Arizona, Department of Transportation, to provide a Purchase Agreement for the sale of Pima County owned property for the I-10 Improvement Project (Sale-0141), contract amount \$124,370.02 revenue/3 year term (CT2600000007)

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

12. Pinal County, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for a Right-of-Way license for the provision of sewer services, no cost/5 year term (SC2600000021)

Transportation

13. Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for design and construction of improvements to South Houghton Road Multi-Use Path (TIP ID 3.24) and amend contractual language, RTA Fund, contract amount \$22,800.00 revenue (CT2400000022)
14. Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for design and construction of improvements to Palo Verde Safety Improvements (TIP ID 4.23) and amend contractual language, RTA Fund, contract amount \$62,362.00 revenue (CTN-TR-24-96)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

15. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 8, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Continuum of Care "Scope of Work for Fiscal Year 2025 Renewal Grant Agreement" from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), for the One Stop Rapid Rehousing Program, \$283,204.00/\$70,801.00 General Fund Match (G-CWD-79111)
16. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 9, of the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the approval of the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS grant amendment for Fiscal Year 2023-2026 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, no cost (GA-CWD-65910)
17. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
City of Tucson, to provide for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care Program - Supportive Services - Coordinated Entry Project, \$46,100.00 (G-CWD-82574)
18. **Acceptance - Sheriff's Department**
Governor's Office of Highway Safety, Amendment No. 1, to provide for State Electronic Data Collection Program/Materials and Supplies (printers, scanners, power/data cords and accessories) and extend grant term to 7/31/26, no cost (GA-SD-93587)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

19. **Amended Board of Supervisors Study Session Meeting Time**
Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting time for the Study Session Meeting Schedule for the period May 2026 through December 2026.

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

20. **Special Event**
 - Samantha R. Thomas, American Heart Association, Westin La Paloma Resort and Spa, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, February 7, 2026.
 - John Walter Kenning, Santa Catalina Catholic Church, Santa Catalina Catholic Church Hall, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 17, 2026.
 - Stephen Paul Kindred, Green Valley Recreation, Green Valley Recreation West Social Center, 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, February 17, 28, March 5 and 19, 2026.

- Caroline Christine Wesnitzer, Valley View Preschool Family Faculty Organization, La Encantada, 2905 E. Skyline Drive, Tucson, March 7, 2026.

21. **Wine Fair/Wine Festival**

Chris Johnson, d.b.a. Sunset Ride, Voyager RV Resort, 8701 S. Kolb Road, Tucson, March 10, 2026, from 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

TREASURER

22. **Request to Waive Interest**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-18053, staff requests approval of the Submission of Request to Waive Interest Due to Mortgage Satisfaction in the amount of \$145.62.

23. **Certificate of Removal and Abatement - Certificate of Clearance**
(PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

24. Minutes: December 2, 2025

* * *

42. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

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

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

JA: We are going to go with Item 16, which is an Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety with Director Darland.

JD: Thank you, Chair Allen, members of the Board. While all the slides are coming up, just in the interest of time, we typically start these updates grounding in the five priorities that establish the Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions as established by the County Administrator in December of '23. Today's update is going to center on the first of two progress reports called for in the Board's acceptance of the One Pima Initiative. So, in the interest of time, we are going to forgo the recital of those five Office of Housing Opportunities and Homeless Solutions priorities and just suffice it to say that the Office is, in fact, aligned with One Pima. And again, as the Board is no doubt familiar, in November, the Board adopted the One Pima Initiative, which is a two-year coordination plan. It identified five strategic areas of focus. The first is "Prioritize Loop Cleanup and Safety." The second is to "Strengthen Public Health and Treatment Access." The third, "Expand Treatment and Diversion Programs," and the fourth to "Stabilize Housing and Prevent Homelessness," and the fifth to "Support Impacted Neighborhoods and Small Businesses." Again, today is the first of two reports required in the Board's adoption of the Initiative. The second will be April of 2026. Next slide please. Starting with Priority No. 1, we are going to be talking about, real briefly, a follow-up on the Loop cleanup and safety efforts. In January, we provided the Board the December totals of number of sites or jobs completed and the total tonnage collected, as well as the costs as when you factor in January's totals as well. We are at a total of 27 sites completed. That could be one particular site or a stretch that includes more than one area of concern, and it includes 54 tons of debris and trash that have been collected at a running cost total at present of over \$89,393.00. The next step that we are working on now is again creating the finalization of some wayfinding along the Loop. That is going to be incorporating some signage. This is the team at the Regional Flood Control District, Conservation Land and Resources, as well as staff out of the County Administrator's Office, making sure that these signs are also reflective and incorporate the 25th anniversary of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. Staff are also finalizing a community user survey for satisfaction and suggestions on improvements to the Chuck Huckelberry Loop, and we also

continue to engage in conversations on various tools that can be used, that can be public facing for the public to report issues and on the conditions of the Loop, as well as that would include broken fences to areas of the path that need to be patched, as well as encampment activities as well. Next slide please. So, the second priority, again, One Pima serves as a framework that strengthens and aligns work carried out each year by the County and specifically in chiefly the Health Department as well as Detainee and Crisis Systems. Those activities continue to be ongoing. Just started, I believe two weekends ago there was the kickoff for summer of 2026, heat planning and cooling center coordination began. This is a coordination with the County, as well as the City of Tucson and other community agencies and partners. Again, we continue to explore opportunities either in this legislative session or future that can support enhanced or expanded coverage for individuals who are going through treatment. Next slide please. And so, Priority No. 3, "Expand Treatment and Diversion Program." The Sobering Alternative for Recovery, that pilot program launched January 1st of this year. It is a voluntary low barrier treatment setting for individuals experiencing acute intoxication due to drug use. Since its launch and continuing forward it involves ongoing coordination with the Health Department, the City of Tucson, as well as contracted provider Community Bridges Incorporated. For the updates on the metrics so far, we can go ahead and advance to the next slide, and I am going to pass it over to Deputy County Administrator Holmes to provide this information.

SH: Just want to be brief, but I think this is important data out the gates for the SAFR center. First couple of weeks in January, this is data up until the end of January. We have got two weeks in that we are still getting data on. Long story short here is that we started out with very few patients. Kind of take advantage of that as we know recovery is a tough business, right? It is just hard for people to do that. We have had five patients that referred that third week, and then 33 patients referred that following week. We have been averaging roughly about 8 to 12 people these first few weeks of February but let me jump into the data briefly. What we are finding is the average stay is about 26 hours for folks. So, the majority of people are not staying for full four days that we have available, which is 96 hours. People are self-selecting out as a voluntary option for folks. So, we are finding people who are struggling to still stay within those days that are allotted to them. Most of the drop-offs are from TPD, although we have allowed CBI to allow folks that are in those 24-hour units to move into that. But most of our TPD drop-offs, but there are personal emotional factors that are leading for people not staying those full days. Go to the next slide, please. So just some key takeaways, and this is early on so I do not want to draw large correlations to the efficacy of this effort yet, but at this point we are continuing to iterate, looking at ways in which we can find functional places that are actually going to have people stay longer. I think out the gates, we are finding that the folks are coming out of encampments and going over here either through a deflection program or on their own as a voluntary option. We are finding they are not staying very long. The people who are staying longer seem to be less acute in their conditions of substance use disorder or behavioral health. So, we are continuing to look at the data, wondering if we can expand this more to people overdosing in the emergency rooms. And then equally important, just making sure we are holding CBI accountable to some of the data structures that we are going to

need. This is super brief, but as data is coming out of the gates on this effort, I just want to make sure our Board of Supervisors have accurate information that it is too early to draw any kind of correlation on the efficacy of this program, and we are still finding that many folks are not staying for four full days. Not surprising. Continue to iterate, and we will bring more updates to the board as we get more data.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. Just to follow up on that last bullet, Mr. Holmes, "SAFR may be stabilizing but not effectively converting to treatment continuation, reducing long term overdose prevention impact." You and I had a discussion a few weeks ago about the possibility of SAFR partnering, if you will, with another Community Bridges entity within the City of Tucson. Just wondering if that is still something that is under active consideration?

SH: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, that is correct. We are still having discussion around using potentially Desert Cove as an alternative, as a continuation of people who are leaving SAFR. We just have not had people actually transition to anywhere else because they are not staying the four full days as of the end of January. So, I want to make sure I am accurate in what I am stating here, continue conversations on bringing that online into this program. We are probably about a month away from that actually coming to fruition.

RS: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: I also had a quick comment, and this is not about the substance per se of the slide. It is really important the points on there, and I will say that I struggled to understand it because I feel like there is some terminology, it has made me think about our slide decks are like, these are external facing for people to be able to understand some of the analysis of our programs and what is happening. But there are phrases in here that, you know, I had to read them four or five times. Like "non-clinical self-directed disengagement." I read that phrase three times out loud, and it felt like one of those balderdash games where you have to read something, and then eventually I am like, "Okay, so people decided to leave themselves." And so, I do want to ask that we strive for clarity and try to step away from the jargon that is used within the field, within the space of the work. That is just a general statement, because I feel like I encountered this a bit going through the slide deck. I will just say that, thank you.

JD: Yes, thank you, Chair Allen. Next slide please.

SH: So, I will not spend more time here. I think there is just some increased suggestions as we look to refine the data points that we brought here quickly to you. As we look at the next month of data and start really honing in with some of our lived experience personnel and support staff to make sure we are improving the ongoing ways in which we can make it more effective, and workshop those particular

discussions and continue to examine that length of time and length of stay, which continues to elude us at this point. Next slide. We will go ahead and jump to the next, just for time.

RS: Can I ask, Chair Allen, before we go to the next one, since the last slide referenced the Transition Center. Attached to the slide presentation is a memo from the County Administrator on One Pima update. I know there is staffing going on right now, but ideally, when do we expect the Transition Center to be seven days?

SH: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we are just getting those positions posted. It took a while for us to create cost centers, to be able to move funding from the opioid. My guess is it is going to take us at least four to six weeks to actually hire. It is because we are looking at lived experience folks. It takes a little longer, so if I put a timeline out, we are looking potentially early April at the soonest.

RS: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Allen.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I recognize the bureaucratic constraints that we have as any local jurisdiction does. The One Pima Plan was passed in November, and that would mean that there would almost be a six-month gap between when we committed to a transition expansion and when we are actually going to be seeing that. So, I appreciate timeliness. I appreciate your hard work. These are all wins today that we need to be focused on but let us not move at the speed of government, please. Thank you.

JD: Thank you, Chair Allen. I will take you through the final slides here real quickly and we will get to any remaining questions. Priority No. 4 is around stabilizing housing and preventing homelessness. You will hear today, Agenda Item 20 will be the consideration of nine projects being brought forward to you by Community and Workforce Development. Nine projects that have received staff recommendations and endorsement by the Pima County Regional Affordable Housing Commission. On March 3rd, Community and Workforce Development and Development Services will also be bringing forward to the Board for consideration and approval the Ten-Year Housing Strategy and Funding Plan. This aligns with the Board policy that outlines a ten-year funding plan for affordable housing development to both keep people housed and build more affordable housing. Continuing to work with County Geographic Information Systems team, as well as our community partners and Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness and the Southwest Institute Research on Women, on the finalization of a regional dashboard. Right now, we are in the process of confirming information, relevant details provided by each of the respective shelter providers to ensure that we have all of the information accurate. We continue to engage with community shelters on the various different enhancements and needs that will help them create humane and supportive low barrier environments. Next slide please.

JA: Director Darland?

JD: Yes.

- JA: On the previous slide for the dashboard, is there a timeline for going live?
- JD: Chair Allen, right now we are just finalizing getting some information. I do not have a strict timeline right now. We had hoped to have it done by the end of January, but we are working with, trying to track down the information. We want to make sure that we at least get it live, hopefully by the 1st of March, we may have to have just shelter cards that are placeholders until we get all of the actual details ready to go. What we would ideally like to have is something that once it goes live, it is live and full form.
- JA: Thank you.
- RS: Chair Allen?
- JS: Supervisor Scott.
- RS: Following up on your question. In the same memo that I referenced earlier at the last paragraph under Priority Area No. 4, it says that your office, "Continues to engage in dialog with shelter providers to address operational challenges in low barrier shelters, emphasizing preventative strategies and clear standards for staffing and support. This includes overall analysis on the approaches and evolving operational considerations for shelter spaces that could encourage more acceptance and utilization." That reads to me that we are working with shelter providers to try and do a more effective job of reaching out to people who have been resistant to shelter services or both. Is there going to be any kind of action plan that is developed in concert with those shelter providers? Try and have some more effective outreach to the service and shelter resistant.
- JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, presently, the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness has created a shelter strategy that is aligned with ensuring that we have all shelters provide as low barrier setting as possible. As I am sure you can appreciate, each of the shelters has different operational standards by which they are operated. I think our goal here for the Board would be to identify a baseline set of expectations that when we do our annual funding through our competitive process with federal dollars for emergency solution grant funds or community development block grant funding, that we align the Board's priorities and some of those barrier settings so that the low barrier settings versus...I appreciate the question, but I think that our goal would be that whenever we are funding these environments, that we are getting them to meet a barrier or an environment that meets the Board's standard.
- RS: That is helpful, but given that we were asked to appoint a representative from this Board, and Supervisor Cano is our representative, and a representative from the Sheriff's Department to the TPCB Board, I do not know if what the shelter strategy that you are talking about is part of their overall strategic planning approach, but if the goal is to reach out to the people who have been resistant to shelter and services not only in their best interest, but because their public behaviors are often

of concern to other constituents, I would hope that is a high priority, not just for us, but for TPCH.

AC: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, what I hope Administration understands is that our County role is to be innovative in these approaches and to hold hands with TPCH and One Pima should be encouraging and funding those additional barriers. That can look a lot of different ways; we get a HUD grant and an added scoring point on our funding system will be, "Do you have a storage space for the unsheltered? Do you allow pets?" And we can allow an additional point to be able to be considered in that application process. The innovation that I hope we have, similar to the shelter platform, how can we as a County actually fund it from a public health perspective? Because I think it is clear that we know why folks are not going. They are not going because they are not getting storage and they are not getting pets. And so, I just hope that we can keep that in mind so that we can look for opportunities. We have just participated in a number of shelter visits in midtown as District 5 with the District 3 office, and this is going to require some different thinking. I fully appreciate the work that you are doing, Ms. Darland, to be able to advance the One Pima Initiative with these regional partners. I am particularly wanting there to be an incentive-based participation into the platform. What I do not want is the perception to be, "The County is telling us what to do, how to do it," and I have a feeling that when we are looking for buy in, whether that is through TPCH or not, that is what is going to end up happening. So we have to really navigate carefully and I have full confidence that you are doing that on our behalf.

JD: If I may, just briefly, Chair Allen, to that point, I think that one of the challenges, too, is that the evolution and the standard approach to shelter is changing. I think that that is going to be part of the conversation. The barriers that folks are coming in, yes, possessions, pets, partners, has long been standing to be thought to be the challenge, but these individuals are staying homeless longer, and the complexity of care that they need when they go into those environments is becoming much more challenging for our traditional setup. So, we will have more information on how that conversation is being informed for the April update to the Board. Sorry, we are on number five.

RS: Chair Allen?

JD: One more slide back please.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I am sorry, I neglected to ask this question when you were on priority number three, but one of the priorities of One Pima, and it is listed under Priority No. 3, is "Expansion of the drug treatment alternative to prison program and the supportive treatment and engagement programs with services," DTAP and STEPS. And in the last paragraph, under Priority No. 3 it says, "Discussions are ongoing with the Pima County Attorney's Office, Pretrial services, and Public Defense leadership on opportunities to enhance both those programs." Can we get, Ms. Leshner, some more information on the scope and nature of those conversations and when we

might actually see some recommendations, either to the Board or maybe it would be to the Board and Mayor and Council?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, we are looking at them primarily as they lean into the budget.

RS: Okay.

JL: Because we will be looking to provide an overall One Pima element within the budget, including additional funding for DTAP and STEPS. So, I think no later than the end of April, when you begin to see the tentative budget would be the latest you will start seeing the results of that.

RS: Alright.

JL: Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Ms. Leshner. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JD: Okay. Next slide please. Thank you. So, the fifth and final priority is to “Support Impacted Neighborhoods and Small Businesses,” and part of that is including the study working with Community and Workforce Development on some neighborhood revitalization strategies for the Silverlake Mission area. Again, on March 3rd, when Community Workforce and Development Services bring forward the ten-year housing strategy, there will be a set of recommendations that will bolster this priority of One Pima as well, which would include that consideration of additional community revitalization areas, which sort of signal an ongoing investment to areas that will also potentially bring in more outside investment from other programs as well. Then on March 28th, Community Workforce again will be supporting a community resource event, working in partnership with the District 5 office. Finally, on this particular point, Economic Development is working on finalization of a policy aligned with small business supports. That will be part of the April 26th update. Next slide please. Last, but not least, at the January meeting of the Board, a request was put forward to establish a One Pima web page, and thanks to the dynamic team over at Pima County Communications as well as IT’s web development team, James Thornton and Bryce Potter, we have a page and it is not simply one particular page. It is a page that gives you a brief highlight of the five priorities as adopted by the Board. Those cards to the left of your screen are hyperlinked to independent pages that go into more detail on each of the priorities. The next phase of the web page will be to build out a link to the data, which will be all metrics associated with One Pima activities. So that is where we will be posting the information related to the number of sites cleaned up in a particular quarter or phase will also have information on the number of households that have been served through affordable housing funds. Again, deep appreciation to James Thornton and Bryce Potter, who right now are finalizing a few of the extra I’s to be dotted and T’s to be crossed. The page is live. You can search for it from the County’s web page. We are finalizing where it is going to land and rest, as well as a

small little abbreviated website address which we will be able to send to the Board once it is all tidied up. With that, I am happy to take any additional questions.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you. I feel like there should be a bingo of when I am thanking you. Ms. Darland. I want to reiterate my thank you to you and to the County Administration for making the One Pima Plan have the legs that it deserves. This Board adopted this plan to have a holistic approach to better coordination with our governments, partners, and the nonprofit and private sector, and we are really just at the beginning of this two-year commitment. And so, I applaud your work. I want to ensure that related to the SAFR Center, we are getting access to timely information. With CBI, we are spending a lot of money in a short amount of time, and we were missing two reports today. I have full confidence that we are doing incredible work there. I look forward to visiting the SAFR Center and met some of the staff coincidentally working on the data side at a community function, and they are ecstatic about the investment. Looking forward to that. I want to update the Board that the impacted neighborhoods surrounding the jail in the Silverlake Mission reinvestment zone also had a round table two weeks ago. It might have been last week, but I am losing track of time. I would describe it as a breath of fresh air for the County to be listening as an adjacent neighbor and as the landlord in the area surrounding the jail, surrounding the Fleet Services building, that entire sector we are the owners of. And so as we look for ways to mitigate some of the decades of disinvestment in the area, I am really encouraged by our ability to improve quality of life, to reduce poverty in the area, and to be there as a County with the infrastructure support, to be able to give these impacted neighborhoods the breath of fresh air that they have been asking for and that they deserve. Last, but not least, related to cleanups, I was out on the Loop not too long ago, about a week ago, and I have not seen improvement from my first tour, perhaps in August or October, from the corridors between Grant and Congress. I would like to ensure that we prioritize cleanup in those areas with our contracted service, because I am hearing from the west side neighborhoods that that is a top concern. I have reiterated that to County Administration, but I want to ensure that I do that on the dais. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Alright. Well, thank you.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

12. Pima County Climate Action Update

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

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
CD: Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator
SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

JA: I am going to move us along to Agenda Item 17. This is an update on the Pima County Climate Action Plan.

SD: Chair Allen, members of the Board. Administrator Leshner, it is an honor to be here for you today to talk about the Climate Action Plan for County Operations and our PimaCan! effort. So, we will just jump right into it. Next slide. Today I will be giving updates on all movement across the plan but highlight key areas for discussion. Primarily the kickoff that we had post the Board adoption of our Climate Action Plan for County Operations and the implementation plan. We kicked off all of these efforts on January 9th with our Climate Action team to fully inventory our first-year goals, strategies, and accomplishments that we hope to complete in year one. I want to focus some time of this update to talk about our carbon and energy priorities, specifically looking at our full building and facilities footprint and energy audits. Extreme heat kickoff and preseason planning which, although it is cold and rainy today, does start in February, and so a lot of effort has been directed towards extreme heat work. I want to update the Board in conjunction with memorandum that was provided earlier last week around the County's participation in the Tucson Electric Power Integrated Resource Process. Next slide please. With the approval of the CAPCO and its partner document, the Climate Action teams did kick off our first year with a January 9th workshop to underscore the first-year goals. Carbon is a big component of that. As underscored by the Board adopted resolution last May, we have a very aggressive goal to reduce our carbon emissions by 60% from 2021 levels. So, I want to be pretty data driven and rooting us back into what that looks like. With the graphic on the left, the blue emissions is our actual emissions, which include TEP's commitment to renewable energy. The green is our activities in renewable energy and energy efficiency without TEP's commitment, and the orange is business as usual if we did nothing. As you can see on the right, the 38,000 metric tons of carbon emissions equivalent is our goal for 2020. That reflects the 60% reduction. I want to really highlight for subsequent slides the difference between the green line and the blue line, because that really does affect our

participation in TEP's Integrated Resource Planning process and our strategic investments to meet our goals. As you know, most of our emissions are made up from our County facilities portfolio, our Regional Wastewater and Reclamation efforts, and Fleet. One new area of data that we are going to proceed into is commuter emissions and associated baselining of that data. Next slide please. Today we are going to highlight on facilities and operations and the commuter emissions. Regional Wastewater and Reclamation is already well ahead in some of their work on facilities and equipment upgrades and some of their strategic use of energy efficiency projects, as is our Fleet Services. One key component that will underpin this whole plan is a full audit of our buildings. And so, we will make that as exciting as possible, but it really is data driven on how we look at energy efficiency investments, renewable energy opportunities and aligning it with the integrated infrastructure plan. I really want to give a shout out to our team at Department of Environmental Quality, who puts out the Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Plan survey. We really sought to increase our participation rate last year to really try to get a good baseline for commuter emissions. It usually hovers around 39%. It eclipsed 55%, which we are going to hope to get more and more participation as the years go on, but I do want to say the volume of travel pledges that came into our DEQ department to reduce the Pima County commuter emissions was double what it usually is in the last quarter of last year. I think a lot of that is due to our increased communication and engagement of County staff, so that is huge. Next slide please. Carbon and energy, this really is a foundational component of a lot. Not just our Pima County Climate Action Plan but what we are seeing in utility costs, how we are participating and engaging in Tucson Electric Power's Integrated Resource Planning effort, and how we are evaluating the energy efficiency projects we have already done. We are collectively working to do that in year one. As you can imagine, our facilities portfolio and energy performance is wide ranging and it will require different initiatives to meet different needs based on aging infrastructure, location of the buildings, what type of services we provide in those buildings, such as the downtown footprint is going to have more energy efficiency strategies, whereas our buildings that have more land have more opportunity for renewable strategies. So that is going to be the first year. One really exciting deployment based on these strategies and looking at our buildings and how they rank on energy efficiency, we are looking in that mid-range building, and one really key accomplishment that will kick off our CAPCO is our Abrams solar project. We really were data driven and strategic about how we picked that project. We looked at a mid-performing building. Abrams is our Public Health Center, providing services not just in our Public Health facility, Vital Records, it has a family medicine clinic in it, and it has leased space and is often used for community meetings. And it has a lot of parking around it. It is a bond funded facility and so it provides, this project is really exciting to me. We plan to complete it on May 30, 2026, but it is twofold, right? Not only is it going to provide renewable energy generation to our essential services down at Ajo and Country Club, but it also provides solar to shade opportunities. So, we have got infants coming in for vital records for birth certificates. We have patients coming in for family medicine clinics. It is in a vulnerable census track, and so how we continue to think about things that are these multiple layers of wins for the community is how we also look at our energy efficiency and renewable generation strategies. In alignment with this audit and our

audit of our energy efficient investments, we want to evaluate the building that we are in right now. As you know, there were many investments to redo this building, which is the Admin East building. We are going to evaluate that and what that meant in terms of cost savings, energy generation, all of our kilowatts per hour used and apply that to other agent infrastructure opportunities. Similarly, we are going to be developing a data analytics tool for tracking all these actual emissions, which will go on the PimaCan! website. Next slide please. Heat season. Again, it is a cold rainy day which is perfect to talk about heat pre-season planning. As many of you know, the City of Tucson convened and kicked off their third annual Southern Arizona Heat Summit, of which many community partners, jurisdictions, community-based organizations, the University and the State engaged as planning support, plenary speakers, breakout session facilitators, including many County departments, specifically breakout sessions on extreme heat and public health, energy in our grid, heat workforce protections, and bolstering our cooling center network. This really is a pivotal annual event that convenes lots of stakeholders together that will continue to work together throughout heat season. One critical component of what we are doing this heat season is heat vulnerability mapping. We are using 2024 data. Why? It was the hottest summer on record with extreme heat in April and a post-season extreme heat wave in October, which led to increased heat risk, heat deaths and heat presentations in our area hospitals. It also had two major power outages, and during those power outages, our cooling center network website got over 5,000 hits within the first hour of that power outage. That underscores the importance of our cooling center network and so what we are doing collectively is convening our data to look at census tract demographic data, the heat risk indices and social vulnerability data, and we are adding it to our heat related illness and death data. So, we are looking at heat priority zones. That is really important to overlay our cooling center network map in geospatial technology to make sure we have cooling resources where we are seeing some of these high incidence rates of heat related illness. We are also using that to inform our neighborhood approach. I think there is a lot of social cohesion opportunities, and this is something that is underscored in both PimaCan! and One Pima is to look at neighborhood opportunities to bolster that kind of trust and utilization of the cooling center network, and make sure we get critical resources that we need across the community. The final thing on heat planning, we all share communications materials so that we say the same message collectively across the community. It has become a huge asset to our risk planning and ways that we get the word out to the community. Next slide please. Finally, we provided the Board a memorandum about Pima County's participation in Tucson Electric Power's Integrated Resource Planning Process. This is required by the Arizona Corporation Commission every three years, and we will provide a recommendation to Tucson Electric Power on the portfolios. The meetings to date have been really foundational in understanding the energy demands, utilization, costs, portfolio. We will be receiving some proposed portfolio recommendations from TEP, by which our County will convene across our climate teams folks to do environmental reviews on air quality costs, demand, and making sure that that portfolio, again, our success in our climate plans are also based on TEP's commitment to some of this mixed portfolio in renewable energy generation. Next slide please. Finally, I just want to do a quick overview. While we had kind of focus areas because those are the biggest areas that need to be

actioned, we are using our heat vulnerability mapping to also inform our landscapes chapters, green infrastructure investments and our tree planting strategies. We are moving forward also with the Invasive Species Administrative Procedure for consideration, which would hold our County departments accountable for invasive species remediation on our properties. And water, we are doing the ever-exciting audit of our water use in our County facilities, which we have been really great about our water use across our County facilities, with an average annual 15% reduction. So that will be very exciting. And finally, I want to underscore the Pima County Green Stewards. It is a coalition that brings forth this critical engagement opportunity and education for all staff. We open up monthly roundtables to highlight everything that we are doing on the Climate Action Plan, and ways to get staff informed and involved. Spring roundtables included a CAPCO overview in January, the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan 25th anniversary. We are going to do something for Bike Month, and we are doing Landscapes and Smartscares Programming and Heat Season Awareness. That concludes my slides, but I would be remiss to not include an update that happened on February 12th, which is a bit of a federal update pertaining to the Environmental Protection Agency repeal of the endangerment finding. We, pervert you of the Board adopted resolution, are committed to reducing our emissions by 60% from 2021 levels, so we will be proceeding onward, but that is a substantial piece of public health, sustainability and climate policy so we will provide a more robust memo. I believe it will be tied up in legal excitement for the next few months, but we will provide the Board a bigger update from Pima County's Department of Environmental Quality that will update on state and local impacts for air quality monitoring. And with that, I will conclude my presentation.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: With what you just referenced, the Trump Administration has seriously curtailed a lot of the regulations from the previous administration and the EPA regarding these issues that you have outlined. Do you see anything being jeopardized as far as funding for this program that you just described?

SD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, a lot of our grant funding that was outlined in the Biden Administration has already been curbed. In a lot of ways, what we are doing with energy efficiency is looking across what does it cost, how do we budget for it? What saves money? As we see increasing energy costs, how can we save money through energy efficiency projects? The endangerment finding was enacted in 2009, so we really see more state local policy impacts on that from emissions criteria and how that unfolds in our air quality monitoring, but I will also ask Deputy County Administrator DeBonis for any additional comment other than what I have outlined.

CD: Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, I do not have anything to add.

SC: Madam Chair, there is no noncompliance issues with these new directives on our part in Pima County that you might be thinking might expose any kind of funding?

SD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, not at this time, no.

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair Allen. Question, and thanks for the presentation, with regard to the Carbon Working Group, I noticed that wastewater treatment operations accounts for 46% of the County government's emissions. Maybe there are, but would representatives of one or two reps from Wastewater to be involved with the Carbon Working Group? Is that currently, I did not see that, is that something we could do?

SD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz, they are a part of the Carbon and Energy Working Group.

MH: Great, thank you.

SD: I will write that down more clearly, but they are huge assets to our Carbon and Energy Working Group.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen. Ms. Davis, I might have made this request previously, but I am not sure if I did. With regard to the Wildfire and Invasive Species Plan that is going to be forthcoming, given that we have so much State and Federal land adjacent to County land, as well as obviously private property owners, can that plan address the partnerships that we have with those other governmental entities?

SD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, absolutely. That is underscored in the Wildfire Mitigation Plan and also will be underscored in the Community Wildfire Protection Plan, which is the regional plan which is being developed right now. As we drive down to CAPCO level, we are going to support, across our County departments, of which we have huge land resources, how we identify and partner with those jurisdictions, communities, neighbors, neighborhood associations on invasive species remediation specifically. But it all ties back to that foundational regional partnership in those two bigger regional plans.

RS: Fantastic, thank you. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Alright. Thank you, Ms. Davis.

COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

16. Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources (STCER) Grants - Round Two

Staff recommends approval of an allocation in the amount of \$855,000.00 in additional STCER funding and approval of the proposed process and timeline.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
DS: Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development

JA: Item No. 21, Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources Grants. This is round two, an allocation of \$855,000.00. I will move the item.

MH: Second for now.

JA: Okay, alright. Seconded for now by Supervisor Heinz. Discussion?

MH: Thank you, Chair Allen and colleagues. I am debating one proposed modification. Just that if we might consider bifurcating the limit from just a \$75,000.00 across the board to maybe having a different limit for entities providing any legal services. My understanding is that ones that do this usually are spending upwards of \$250,000.00. So, maybe making it like \$75,000.00 for pretty much everything else, but if it is a viable program or plan or whatever for an entity that is providing legal services at the discretion of the Commission, they could potentially go up to \$125,000.00 for legal services, if anyone would like to make that modification or discuss it more, I would like to hear your thoughts.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: To the suggestion from my colleague from District 2, I am recalling that when we did the first round of allocations, there were questions about legal services and whether we could actually provide in that area. Is that something that either the County Administrator or Deputy County Attorney could address?

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we can look into it. It really depends on the use, how the funds are intended to be used and what the intention is. You have more details.

- RS: So, Chair Allen, just to follow up on that point, the recommendations for the use of these funds are made to us by the Outside Agency Review Committee. Mr. Brown, are you suggesting that the County Attorney's Office would want to also vet any proposals that came in under legal services?
- SB: Madam Chair, Supervisor Scott, that is correct. We have examined some of these requests in the past. At times we found statutory authority to do so, sometimes through implied authority coupled with Board policy, but it is a detailed analysis that we would like to go through each and every time.
- RS: Just for that particular area?
- SB: Really any time we want to spend general funds on legal services.
- RS: Okay. And then I just wanted to ask Supervisor Heinz with regard to your recommendation, how did you arrive at that figure of \$125,000.00?
- MH: Thank you for the question. Just in discussing with groups like IRC and others what they had previously been budgeting and doing in terms of legal services in their organizations, the number \$250,000.00 or more was what we have been told. So that is why...the limit of \$75,000.00 if that is applied also to legal services is not, I mean lawyers are expensive I get it. So, the \$125,000.00, I did not feel like saying all the way up to \$250,000.00, so I was splitting the difference there, that is all.
- RS: I do not have any issue with the recommendation that my colleague is making. It sounds like it is already going to happen, that the County Attorney or whoever she designates is reviewing anything. Would you review that before it goes before the Outside Agency Review Committee or in conjunction with them?
- SB: Madam Chair, Supervisor Scott, I am not sure. I think what is difficult is not knowing what the use will be, not knowing what the facts are around the use. I am not sure in the order of operations, if it makes more sense for us to review before or after.
- RS: It almost seems to me, not trying to act like an armchair attorney, but it almost seems to me, considering everything that that Committee has to consider while they are also considering regular Outside Agency funding at the same time frame as we saw in the memo attached to this item, I think it would be better if you did those reviews before, because why have them devote that time.
- AC: Chair Allen?
- JA: Supervisor Cano.
- AC: [To Supervisor Scott] I am sorry, were you looking for a response really quick?
- RS: I do not know if...I think he is still talking with the County Administrator. So is before possible Mr. Brown?

SB: Yes, Supervisor Scott, before is possible. I will work with County Administration.

RS: Very good, thank you.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I am reluctant to make any changes to the framework that we had in the first round of this really important relief. I am saying that because, number one, I do not want there to be any unfair advantage to any one particular organization. If we are bifurcating...if we are splicing the limited resources that we have available with the hopes that one entity will be able to be both eligible and able to access a significant part of these funds, that is not the work of this Board. I think it is the work of the Outside Agency Committee to come with their recommendations. What I am really trying to ensure does not happen again, as I think has happened in multiple iterations, is that just because one organization does not get funded, suddenly the entire process was...it did not work out. I want to avoid that in the second round. I also appreciate the Finance Director and Administrator for looking at what available resources we have to offer this incredible investment in the people of Pima County, given the unprecedented need. That is just my two cents. I am happy to look at next year's budget for a very specific allocation to a particular service, but it is important for this process to be nearly as identical to what we did in the first round. That is just my two cents. Thank you.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: I do not want to take up a lot of time, but is there a possibility that I could maybe get from the County Administrator, just a brief synopsis to remind me and to clarify why this is called Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources when the Board is going to make a consideration of recommended awards not until April 21st. I do not understand the Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources part of this whole thing. It is the second round, and we voted on it before.

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, I am sorry, Sir.

SC: I am certain I did not vote for it the first time. I just want to clarify why we call it Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources, and we are not making a recommendation until April 21st.

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Christy, you are correct. This is the second round of funding. When this came to the Board, when we first began this in September or so of last year, when there was a variety of governmental shutdowns, we had SNAP funding problems. We had significant need, primarily we had in the some of our food pantries, the Community Food Bank and such, and we expedited that funding round to be the short-term emergency funding so we could get those dollars out the

door by the end of the year. At that time, the Board asked that we come back again with a second round. We have done that and have just kept the format the same.

JA: I guess I would just add that in terms of adjusting the maximum request amount for any particular category, I think I am more comfortable with having a set amount; the \$75,000.00 that an organization can request. Somewhat because I think that all of the areas warrant and require a good chunk of resources. Providing housing and utility assistance right now is also incredibly timely. Food assistance, transportation and medical assistance. So, it is hard for me to justify increasing the request cap in only one category.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: As a way of navigating the intricacies of these proposals and also taking into account what you just said, which is that we are really putting our finger in the dike here in terms of the widespread community need, is there willingness to give the Outside Agency Review Committee some latitude in terms of recommending to the Board amounts higher than that threshold, if they feel that not only that individual request is warranted, but that they can meet the other needs in as equitable a fashion as possible. In other words, is there a way to empower them even more than we already have?

JA: I would say I could support that, if the argument is that there is a gap in the field, right? Like there are many organizations that do one particular thing, and if there are very few organizations providing a need and there is a gap in that need, then I could see a justification given that, I am overdue for lunch, streaming words together, and that the Outside Agency Committee could then have that leeway to be able to be more responsive if there is an identifiable gap in service that is legitimately not being covered.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Would setting the limit for \$125,000.00 across the board instead of having two different limits be more reasonable?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I am going to reiterate that we should not be...we had a process that was successful that worked. If the recommendation is \$800,000.00 and we are increasing what organizations are going to apply for, given that we are not receiving Federal or State support in these priority areas, we are only going to be able to really then support 4, 5, 6 entities at that level. This is not supposed to supplement the entirety of the Federal funding cuts. This is supposed to be short-term budgetary investments from this County. So, I would not be in favor of that. I

am comfortable with Supervisor Scott's suggestion that perhaps we allow the Outside Agency to review where there could be some exceptions for increased investment, but I am going to reiterate, we cannot form this County-wide policy and investment for one organization.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I appreciate Supervisor Cano's comments, because I think it is important that agencies that are applying have familiarity with the process. I mean, that is what we have really looked to do. For example, with the GAP funding process is we adjust it based on how things have played out but we strive for continuity and consistency. I think if there is that caveat that I mentioned earlier that Supervisor Cano just referred to that the Outside Agencies Committee, based on their deliberations, both specifically and holistically, could go beyond that. Then I think, given that they are the ones getting into the weeds on this, I would like them to have that authority.

MH: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, what are you proposing?

RS: Essentially just that we tell the Outside Agencies Committee that the thresholds that were set remain in place, but that they could recommend to us some adjustment based on the merits of an individual proposal and whether or not that adjustment would have an effect on overall equity.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: I am coming up with a creative solution, and I do not know if it will satisfy my colleague from District 2. In the application process, if there is an opportunity for the applying organization to provide a summary of emergency financial need greater than the support that they are requesting, that can then be reviewed by the Outside Agency Committee as a set of information to help inform their decision and their recommendations to the Board, and let staff figure that out, right? I want to respect Supervisor Heinz that this particular fund exists because of your advocacy, but I also do not want to set an unfair advantage in that application process. I think a statement of exceptional need or something similar to that might be able to be a good in between that I hope will allow all applicants to be able to demonstrate why perhaps they would be requesting additional funds. Is that a good in between and vague enough for the Administrator to...?

MH: That sounds fine to me, just what are we exactly telling this Commission to do though? Because I think that might be not very clear to them.

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz, I am going to look to staff to see if they have got clarity. [To Daniel Sullivan] I see you writing madly so I want to know what is going on.

DS: Chair Allen, members of the Board, I am hearing that there is going to remain a cap, but that we open it up to where there might be additional needs from any organization that might be providing a singular service that is not widely captured throughout the community.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: I think the four words that Supervisor Cano used, "statement of exceptional need," can definitely be guiding, but I also am confident they will continue to look at everything holistically, as well as whatever they might find in any specific proposal.

JA: So my understanding is that that is not necessarily need to be reflected as an amendment, that that was some guidance, but we can approve the item as it is written on the agenda. So, did we move the item?

MH: Yeah.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. If not already, it is now. All those in favor say "Aye."
Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Opposed?

SC: Opposed.

JA: Item passes 4-1.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

19. Budget Remediation Plan Update

Discussion/Direction/Action: Review of the Pima County Treasurer's Budget Remediation Plan request for Fiscal Year 2025/26.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
JM: Jake Martin, Chief Deputy Treasurer, Pima County Treasurer's Office
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management

JA: Budget Remediation Plan Update. Discussion/Direction/Action: Reviewing of the Pima County Treasurer's Budget Remediation Plan request. So?

JM: Chair Allen, County Administrator Leshar, members of the Board, thank you for having us here today. We do appreciate the opportunity to speak. My name is Jake Martin. I am, of course, not the Treasurer. I am the Chief Deputy Treasurer. I authored the remediation plan, and I am more than happy to speak on it today. I do have one operational question before we proceed. Would the Board like me to read the remediation plan as it is written, or would the Board like me to take questions on it?

JA: If you could just give a high-level summary and then questions.

JM: Fantastic, thank you for the clarification. So to start out, our remediation plan is authored as essentially a last-minute effort to meet all of our statutory and operational obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year. One of our largest concerns in one of our largest projected overages for the FY26 budget is in the personnel category, where we are expected to be \$100,147.00 over our budget. Now, of course, personnel costs continue to rise annually. This is true for all departments. However, the Treasurer's Office had two positions swept in October of 2025, which reduced personnel budget capacity by \$169,860.00, which lends to the unforeseen overage. The loss of this personnel budget capacity was unplanned by the current Treasurer and the current Administration as it took place prior to the term beginning. The loss of nearly \$170,000.00 in personnel budget capacity, combined with a flat 2% reduction in FY24/25, effectively resulted in a 7.5% cut to the department's overall budget. In addition, we have a projected overage in the postage and freight category. Postage is a critical expense within the Treasurer's Office as we mail tax receipts, requested statements and delinquent notices. With

increases in costs with the United States Postal Service, we are projecting an increase of mailing expenses by 7.4% annually. In addition to that, we have Pima County significant population growth as well as vendor fee increases. Our mailing costs have escalated significantly, and we are projecting an overage in that category of \$69,330.00. In addition, we have software maintenance and support renewals. In Fiscal Year '25, our actual expenditures on software were \$98,985.00. Software is essential for tax collection, operations, and vendor prices, according to our IT Department, typically increase by 5% to 10% annually. Given the non-negotiable and generally consistent rates of these expenses and security and operational requirements to the Treasurer's Office operations, cuts to this category that we can afford to take are extremely limited. As a result, an overage is expected in this category. In addition, the Treasurer's Office has several expenses that are required by statute, such as A.R.S. §42-18109, which requires the Pima County Treasurer's Office to publish information about the annual tax lien sale in a local newspaper for two consecutive weeks each February prior to the sale. In Fiscal Year '24/25, this advertising cost totaled \$16,318.00. As expenses rise, we are expecting an overage in this category as well, and I will say, since I initially authored this plan we have already hit a budget stop on our advertising expenses. Overall, the Treasurer's Office has been enacted as a responsible steward of public funds and once again is submitting this request as a final effort to meet all obligations. Before making this request, our department absorbed all prior cuts and explored every possible solution to operate within the Fiscal Year '26 budget. Software expenses have been shifted to our OSR fund, which is traditionally reserved for large scale software infrastructure upgrades every 4 to 6 years. We have had to dip into that, which will limit our ability to upgrade our servers when the time comes. We have moved over everything that we can to the other special revenue fund and are requesting a remediation plan to help us make it through the end of the fiscal year.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: I am looking at your reporting in the background of this, and you state here that, "The Treasurer's Office operating budget has been reduced by almost \$260,000.00." Who made these cuts? The Board of Supervisors made these cuts?

JM: A lot of those cuts result directly from personnel sweeps. So, position sweeping that the Treasurer was not aware of because he was not in office at the time that those cuts took place.

SC: The Board of Supervisors, which sets your budget, had nothing to do with these cuts?

JM: Essentially, they were standard procedural cuts that unfortunately, our department was not able to prevent.

SC: Was there a loss of revenue? Did the People's Bank make some bad investments?

JM: No. In fact, our portfolio was very strong, but the Treasurer's Office does not keep our investment revenue, nor does it go to our budget.

SC: So, these are just normal run of the mill employee position sweeps?

JM: Yes, and I would be happy, if your office would be interested, to send over the specific positions that have been swept.

SC: I would prefer to have the County Administrator let us know how these...

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy. If you recall, in the past we came to the Board that provided budget adjustments of 3% and 2% in the past when we had difficult financial times. Those budget cuts, as approved by the Board, impacted every County department, whether they were elected or appointed officials. Another element of this is, as you know, we provide elected officials a great amount of autonomy to run departments within the guardrails of the budget established by the Board. Sometimes when we have elected officials who wish to either increase salaries of employees within the department or have other budget concerns within the department, we look at how that department would request to make adjustments, and they sometimes do that by giving up other PCNs in order to increase salaries for some. Some of that is what has occurred, and as noted, some of it happened prior to this administration.

SC: So, Madam Chair, Ms. Leshar, when it is stated here that the operating budget has been reduced by almost \$260,000.00, it is fair to say that the Board did not say, "You are going to be cut by \$260,000.00?"

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, the Board approved the percent...

SC: That amount?

JL: A percent across the board cut that we did as adjustments in a couple of previous years at a 3% and 2%. They were then implemented by the departments.

SC: Thank you.

JL: Thank you.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Just had a quick question for the Deputy Treasurer under postage and freight, it says, "Without an increase in budget authority to meet the projected overage, the department will be forced to limit or cease the mailing of delinquent tax notices and or tax receipts." Are those statutory responsibilities of the office?

JM: Tax receipts are not statutory; however, delinquent notices are.

- RS: Okay, and then I also wanted to request, Chair Allen, because if you look at the item as submitted to the Board, signed by the Finance and Risk Management Director and also by the Deputy County Administrator and County Administrator, it says, "Finance and Risk Management recommends that the Board of Supervisors review the Treasurer's request and provide direction on the submitted remediation plan for the remainder of the fiscal year." This is different than recommendations that we have gotten before with budget remediation plans. Recommendations that we have gotten before ask the Board to approve the remediation plan on the recommendation of Administration. So, with the language of that recommendation in mind, I would like for the Board to get a presentation not just from the Treasurer's Office, but also from the County Administrator, or whoever she might want to designate as to how we got to this point from the perspective of Administration.
- JL: Thank you. If I will just note, Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, many of the remediation plans that come forward simply are from County administrative departments. As we have mentioned, we provide some flexibility within the elected officials, and I think Director Cuaron is here to speak, and happy to provide some comments, but I think there is a bifurcation from my perspective of the administrative costs and personnel costs. I have no quarrel at all with the fact that the costs have gone up and appropriate to accommodate that, because even the tax statements, if they are not required, are a function that this Board has asked and we have all asked that there continue to be complete transparency and information provided to the public. The asterisk, if you will, when I look at the personnel costs is that while they have gone up this year, I think an issue is that we allow flexibility within the budget parameters to make decisions as an elected official and we have seen the budget go up because of some increase in salaries. I want to be able to comment that I think as we come forward with getting to the rest of the fiscal year with this remediation plan, which I think we can ultimately support as Administration, I think it is important to have the conversation and just make sure that as we look at future budgets, that any of the salary increases that occur within even the elected officials' offices are consistent with what provided all County employees.
- RS: So just to follow up, I think we did get a recommendation with regard to the Sheriff's budget the last cycle, but is it the assertion of Administration that salary increases were granted by the Treasurer that were not within the parameters of the adopted budget?
- JL: If I may, Chair Scott, I am sorry.
- RS: It is only February.
- JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, and I think as the Treasurer and Chief Deputy know, as an example, there was a request for a salary adjustment that included as the spend plan for that how they would fund it in future years would be to request a supplemental in future years. They got paperwork back that I had written all over where I said, "I cannot in any way approve today supplemental requests for the future and therefore any additions to salaries at this point need to be considered

that there may or may not be future budget adjustments and/or may need to be absorbed within the current boundaries of the budget.”

SC: Madam Chair?

RS: Hold on one second.

SC: I am sorry.

RS: Did you also say, Ms. Lesher, with regard to my request, that Director Cuaron had information for the Board? I just wanted to ask for that, but I defer to my colleague if he had a question to follow up on what you asked.

SC: I would just like to ask my colleagues if they would be open to continuing this item until we have a full evaluation given to us by the County Administrator?

RS: Supervisor Christy, speaking for myself, I appreciated what I heard from not only the Deputy Treasurer and the County Administrator, but I am eager to hear more from the Finance and Risk Management Director.

JL: Director Cuaron, if you have information, please.

ART: Administrator Lesher, Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, Administrator Lesher summed up the comments that I was going to have myself, so I have no further information. I think what is presented before you in the remediation plan submitted by the Treasurer's Office, combined with what Ms. Lesher has outlined, provides an overall summary of where we are at with the Treasurer's Office.

RS: So, the item was put on the agenda by Administration. Again, the recommendation is that we review the Treasurer's request and provide direction on the submitted remediation plan for the remainder of the fiscal year. My question is, if the remediation plan were not approved by the Board, if we did not provide direction with regard to this remediation plan, what would be the course of action?

JL: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, I think that particularly with the hard costs that are being seen by the Treasurer, I would recommend you pass and approve this plan to get to the end of the fiscal year, but just wanted to make sure that we provide some clarity and that the conversations will continue to occur that we do not have increased personnel costs in addition to those afforded other County employees.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you. I appreciate the Treasurer's participation today and the Administration's recommendation. With that, I would like to move the budget remediation plan as requested for Fiscal Year '25/26 for the Pima County Treasurer's Office.

MH: Second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz? Discussion?

RS: Chair Allen?

JS: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Based on the last statement from the County Administrator, I am comfortable supporting the plan, but I am certainly expecting that there is going to be continued conversations between the Treasurer's Office and County Administration as to how we would address these issues moving forward in subsequent fiscal years.

JA: I would also add that I understand the increase in costs from postage and other things in which that occurs. When it comes to personnel, I think it is important to stay within budget. I understand that there were some positions that were lost, that were swept in October. My understanding is that, reading your write up, that there is a process to try to keep those positions. There is a reason that they get swept or left open for too long, but there is a process in place with HR to try to keep them in place. If there is a need to reallocate those funds, I would encourage you to negotiate that with HR rather than going over budget. It is not a great look for our Treasurer to be out of budget. So, I would also ask to work within to the confines of the County's compensation plan and trying to go through the existing processes and channels that I think all of us within the County had worked within, even as elected offices, to utilize the investment in that process so that we are consistent across the County.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: I commend your comments and I agree with them, and that is why I will be voting no on this.

JA: We will take it to a vote then. All those in favor say "Aye." Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Those opposed?

SC: No.

JA: The item passes 4-1.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

31. 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election

Discussion with the Pima County Recorder and/or designee regarding the conduct of Pima County's first all-mail, countywide election, as well as the office's new "mobile voting unit" including, but not limited to, its acquisition and the plan to deploy it "countywide" during the upcoming 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election. (District 4)

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
GCK: Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder

JA: So, moving on to Addendum Item No. 3. This is the 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election. This was an item put on by Supervisor Christy in District 4. Discussion with the County Recorder and designee regarding Pima County's all-mail countywide election and the new mobile voting unit.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. Hopefully technology will prevail here. I would like to start with a couple of examples that my office is experiencing on this voting issue. Let us see if it will. [Plays a recording] *"Hi, I am sure you are getting lots of calls. I just voted my ballot, but I am not going to mail it because it has got my signature on the outside, plus my voting barcode. I mean, it is going to be all over the internet, no doubt, if I put it in the mail, possibly. Anyway, I wonder, is there any kind of legal situation, legal possibility of there being a pending case on something like this? Because it is never been allowed before that our personal voting information was exposed on the outside of a mail-in ballot anyway."* Then there was a letter to the editor that voices this too, *"Just looked at my mail-in voting packet. I am concerned my info on the back of the mail in packet includes all my information, including my name, address, precinct signature, and phone number for all to see. What the heck? Voting is supposed to be private. How is this private? Where is the insert envelope to keep it all private? The City paid an untold amount of money for printing their number one debacle of explanations. I want privacy. This is just another nail in the coffin."* And then I finally got another email from a constituent, *"Curious. This is the first County wide mail in election for a 20-year tax with no ballot privacy envelopes, exposed signatures, three drop off locations, all in the City, and the debut of the Recorder's brand new mobile voting unit. Nothing to see here."* So, Madam Recorder, thank you so much for being here today. And before we begin and I turn it over to you, I do want to express our condolences on the loss of your

mom. Thank you for being here. I need some help and guidance. How do I explain this to my constituents? And this is just the beginning.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Before we hear from the County Recorder, and of course, we also on behalf of this District 5 office and the entire Board, send you our condolences, County Recorder, I have a question for Supervisor Christy. When you put an envelope in the mail, Supervisor Christy, do you put your return address on it?

SC: I do.

AC: And usually that would include your name, correct?

SC: Usually.

AC: Okay. So, the point that I want to make when we are previewing this conversation is that nothing from what we are doing in this election has differed from what other counties throughout Arizona have done. There is personal identifying information on the prior ballot that was the green envelope. That perhaps is an adjustment that the District 4 office is considering here, but to get into a downward spiral of nefarious claims about whether your name is on an envelope, when that is precedent for decades under the United States Postal Service, I just think it is mind boggling to hear that as your introductory remarks, Supervisor Christy, to this conversation, I look forward to working with our County Elections team and with our County Reporter to dispel any concerns that I believe are genuine from your constituents. I want this to be a proactive conversation, but to my colleagues and to the Chair and to the Recorder, I will not allow false information to be spread about the security of this election, because that is a direct affront to our County workers who deserve our support Supervisor Christy. Let's recap, let's have a different conversation here. And let me just say to the folks who have been extremely vocal on this side, I have sat in hearing rooms for more than seven years at the legislature where the differences were very real. Work it out, shake it out, because you are here to voice your opinion and we are here to work. Decorum is a privilege and presence is a privilege in this room. [To a woman in the audience] I am looking at you because they have been quiet. So, I look forward to talking to the County Recorder.

SC: To respond to Supervisor Cano, I do put a return address with my name and address on, but I do not put my signature on it.

JA: I would like to welcome our County Recorder, County Recorder staff who have joined us here today to respond to the item and have prepared both materials and presentation and comments. So, I would love to hear your presentation.

GCK: Chair Allen, Board, thank you so much for having us and inviting us today. And thank you for your condolences. It has been a very difficult time, but we felt it was

very important to address some of these questions and concerns. First, I want to acknowledge that my staff member has just handed everyone a packet. In that packet is a media release, a one-page explanation of the Votemobile, including a few photos, a save-the-date for the ribbon cutting, and the proof of images that is going to be printed on the side of the vehicle. I think we have the ability to use the document imager. Is that available?

JA: Getting a nod, yes.

GCK: Yes, thank you. And so, my staff member will have that visible. There it is. Okay, thank you so much. The Regional Transportation Authority election, historically we have only had three locations open. The Recorder's Office in previous years had only the offices in which we occupy. For our office, that includes the 240 N. Stone, the 6550 S. Country Club, which is also known as our ballot processing center. And then in lieu of our 6920 E. Broadway location, our 6920 E. Broadway is a micro-office. It has five desks in that location. It is not large enough for us to have voting activities in there, and because of that, we have come up with an agreement with the City of Tucson Ward 2 office at 7820 E. Broadway to host our voting location there, which would act as an extension of our office. We are also deploying the mobile voting unit, which allows us to provide replacement ballots on site in rural locations. We will be having a location in Ajo, Arizona, in Sahuarita, Arizona, and also in Nanini Library, which is the northwest side of Tucson. We are currently in the process of getting our vehicle wrapped and finalizing the equipment and technology. I will remind the Board that we, the Recorder's Office, are in our 26th consecutive month of facilitating elections. That includes the 2024 presidential election cycle, and the six elections that we had last year, including two federal elections that were unexpected, so we are in our 26th month. We are trying to get this information out as fast as possible. I do want to address some of the concerns about our ballot drop-off locations. We do intend to install more ballot drop boxes in the coming year. We are working very closely with Procurement and with a company to receive boxes that would then need to be installed. We do have additional security practices that we employ when installing these boxes, so it is not simply a matter of I can get one out in a week. It does take a lot of coordination, but we are working on expanding that coverage throughout Pima County. In regards to the single envelope decision, we are on our fourth, maybe fifth election cycle where we have utilized this technology. It is simply we have reduced one envelope. That has sped up our processing. It has addressed many of the concerns of people making errors when they are submitting their ballot affidavits to us. It has reduced the number of signatures that are left off. It is still secure. In order for bad actors to do anything with your private personal information, they need to have additional information, such as the last four digits of your social security or your full birth date. All of that information is still protected under State law. And we take it very seriously, and we do not provide that information out into the public. The single envelope issue, furthermore, within the next 10 to 15 years, Pima County is projected to have over a million voters. Maricopa County currently utilizes a one envelope return system for their 2 million voters. Again, our intention is to provide drop boxes so that those who do not feel comfortable utilizing the USPS may return it in that way. I do want to acknowledge that we appreciate the work of the United States Postal Service, their

hard work, and their professionalism. Ballots are treated with utmost care and security within their facilities, and we are government to government, so I just want to acknowledge that hard work. We do not have any concerns about any foul play.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you. Recorder Cázares-Kelly, did you just say that Maricopa County uses the same ballot that Pima County is now using? Return envelope, I should say.

GCK: Supervisor Cano, Chair Allen, yes. Maricopa County uses the same type of ballot affidavit return system. They only have the visible signature and a phone number. We encourage people who simply do not feel comfortable putting their phone number on the back of the envelope to visit our voter dashboard at recorder.pima.gov, confirm that the phone number that we have on file is up to date and correct, and if not, then they can submit a correction for that information. But if that information is correct and you feel confident that you have not made any mistakes, you are fine to leave that off. We do not encourage it just in case we have questions. If you have a broken arm or something like that, where your signature is not going to look as it normally does, and you already know that, of course that is going to be even more important for you to ensure that we have a way of connecting with you.

AC: And Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Recorder Cázares-Kelly, can you give us the one minute version of ballot verification and the steps that the Elections team and the Recorder's team make from the moment they receive that returned ballot and the verification processes are there, and can you please also inform the Board about whether there are safeguards in place to ensure that there is perhaps, for instance, can somebody vote twice, and I believe the answer is no. I think it is important for us to have that clarification in 2026.

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, yes. What happens once we receive the ballot, first, it is important to know that wherever we receive the ballot, whether that is dropped off in our office or through a ballot drop box, or if we are picking up at the US Post office, we are doing so with bipartisan teams. They transport all of our ballots together. They deliver them and secure them within our ballot processing center on Country Club. They are scanned. The reason that they are scanned is to tie that person's information to that specific ballot affidavit. That way, if we were to receive a second ballot from that same person, our system would literally alert us that this is a secondary ballot affidavit, and we are to then investigate why. It will not allow us to signature verify two ballot affidavits for a single voter. The ballots are scanned and when it is scanned, voters receive, if they have signed up for our text or email notifications, they get that at that point. If they would like to look it up on our website

or even just call our office, we would be able to tell them whether or not we have received it because it has been scanned into our system. We do have human beings reviewing each and every one of those signatures. We are comparing it against the signature in your voting record. If there are multiple signatures, that means we have a much likelier chance of being able to verify. If there is any reason we are not able to verify, let's say that you are missing your signature, or it just looks really bad and we cannot confirm it, we do have a process where we may contact the voter directly.

SC: Madam Chair?

GCK: Each one of those processes are done in a bipartisan manner.

JA: Thank you. Supervisor Christy.

SC: Madam Chair, Madam Recorder, how many drop boxes are in Maricopa County?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, I am not aware of how many are there. Previously in Maricopa County under different Recorders, they have had large numbers of ballot drop off locations, they have had smaller numbers. I am not aware.

SC: Madam Chair, Madam Recorder, again, if you look at my District, particularly the Green Valley area, the average median age of residents there is 74 years old. They have never done this mail in ballot process before. They are traditionalists, they like to go to a polling place. There are no polling places anywhere. There are drop-off locations, but none of them are in the immediate Green Valley area. They have to come all the way, at their age and perhaps even in their incapacity, to Downtown Tucson or to Councilman Cunningham's Ward Office. I would just entertain the idea that the Joyner Library, the Kirk Bear Canyon Library, Esmond Station Library, certainly they are as secure as Council Member Cunningham's office. Why can't we have more convenient places for those who really do have issues of mobility coming all the way down to Tucson to correct an issue that they might have with their ballot?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, first, I think it is really important to know that the data shows that our senior voters are actually more likely to be voters who vote by mail and have been on the active early voting list. That is very, very common. We are also seeing an increase in the number of people who are voting by mail or choosing to opt in to the active early voting list, and a decrease in the number of Election Day voters. I think that is really important for everyone to know. Green Valley has never hosted or not to my knowledge, we have never had an early voting site in Green Valley. We do plan to deploy our mobile voting unit in Sahuarita, which we will be pushing out a media release and a lot of information. We will be reaching out directly with our community partners and communicating with them what their options are for returning their ballot via our mobile voting unit, and that is also an interest of ours, is expanding the ballot drop box opportunities throughout Pima County. And again, due to issues with Procurement and because of the short timeframe between elections, we simply were not able to get that equipment within

the timeframe, so that is something that we are still working on. We are still discussing where ballot drop boxes will be available throughout the County. That includes rural locations. If you have a recommendation on specific locations, my office would love to hear what that is.

SC: We have been doing that with the County Elections department on a regular basis. I am surprised that there was no sharing of information on that, because we have offered specific space for this type of activity. Madam Chair, if I could, can we talk a little bit about the mobile voting unit? Could you just give us the thumbnail sketch of what it is?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, the mobile voting unit is a trailer that will be pulled by a very big truck. It is a trailer on a gooseneck. There it is, can you turn it to the side, please? You can see just a very general idea. And again, this was created for the mockup on the side. If you see it says, "Pima County Recorder's Office, Votemobile, E-wodalt ma:gina," which is the way to say it in O'odham and "Votomovil" in Spanish. It is a trailer that we are able to pull into any large parking lot and open a voting site. This is a huge game changer for Pima County. We have been struggling with many of our locations. You earlier mentioned our libraries. Our libraries during this time period, a lot of times are having reading programs. They are having other community programs that do not allow us to have a site during that time. This is a secure location. It would be staffed in a bipartisan manner. It is a minimum of three people who would be responsible in this mobile voting unit.

SC: And how will it function with this RTA vote?

GCK: With the Regional Transportation Authority election, this is the very first time we will be deploying it. We are going to take it to a total of four locations. That is Sells, Ajo, Sahuarita, and Nanini. Two of those locations have not been confirmed, so I am throwing out Ajo and Nanini, but we have not yet finalized whatever paperwork we need to have that in their parking lots, but that is the intention.

SC: Are there going to be observers?

GCK: There is an area within the trailer for observers. I did meet last week on Tuesday with three of the five Party Chairs: the Republican, the Democratic and Green Party. We did take a look at observation space within my downtown office and our Country Club facility. I think everybody is in agreement that given the walkways and the equipment needs and taking into consideration voter intimidation, the areas that we have marked off are sufficient for the observation process. We have determined a similar area within our trailer, so there will be observers. That is now something that is if there is a request for observers, it is now required by law that we allow them, but they are not required to complete the process. So, we do not need observers to run the site. However, if they are requested to be there and they meet the minimum requirements, which we have discussed in great lengths with the Party Chairs, then yes, we will allow them within the sites.

SC: And Madam Chair...

JA: I would like to note that we have a time-certain at 11:00 a.m., it is now 11:06 a.m., plus or minus. So, I am going to move us along. This is an item for discussion. If there are further questions, I would encourage Supervisor Christy to reach out directly to the County Recorder. Thank you so much, Recorder Cázares-Kelly, for the constant work you are doing around innumerable elections over the last year plus. Thank you to all of your staff who I know endure harassment and threats and other difficult situations, so very much appreciate the integrity and the trust building that you bring to the County around the work of our elections. And thank you as well for your innovation, particularly as related to the mobile unit, and making sure that there is access to areas that are harder to reach and are often underserved. So, much appreciation. Thank you.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Yeah, I am so sorry, I wanted to just convey to the Recorder, and thank you again for being here, that Tom Murphy, the Mayor of Sahuarita, reached out and we had a discussion about the subject of additional drop boxes. And his suggestion, I thought might be helpful, is, like, consider utilizing the Town Council offices, Town property. He said that that would be something that they would be happy to facilitate. I might suggest that that would be something in Marana and Oro Valley and other places as well.

JA: Supervisor Scott? Oh, I am sorry, did you want to...?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz, that is something that our office had discussed. Like I said originally, we had hoped to have more permanent ballot drop boxes cemented into the ground, installed and ready for this election. Unfortunately, that was not something we were able to do. In order for us right now, as we have already begun this active election. It was active in January 23rd when we first mailed out our military and overseas ballots. Early voting began, and we mailed out the remainder of the ballots to the entire County on the 11th. Because we are in an active election, it is much more difficult for us to pivot and make those changes. Though that was something that we strongly considered, unfortunately, I think it would create an undue burden on our office at this moment. Again, because this is an all vote by mail election and we are really trying hard to be as responsive to the community as possible. However, many of these locations and some of our early voting locations have remained unutilized or very minimally utilized before. You will see much more robust voting locations for the primary and the general election. We are working to communicate that information, but the Legislature just changed the election day for us, so we are having to make all the changes to all of our documentation to reflect that and to secure locations, which is a constant issue for us. We have had a lot of trouble securing locations for us because unlike Election Day, we are there typically longer periods of time, which is why the mobile voting unit allows us to choose the day and time that works for our office, and we do not have to kick anybody out of that location while we provide the important services to our community. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen. I think it is important for the public and media to know what certainly the Recorder knows and the Board knows, which is that the reason the RTA election is an all-mail in election is because that was the decision of the RTA Board. The RTA is a special taxing authority authorized by the Arizona Legislature. It has its own Board. Their Board voted to make this an all-mail election, and then we, the County, entered into an intergovernmental agreement with them to administer this election. That is all accurate, correct, Recorder Cázares-Kelly?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, yes, that is accurate.

RS: Thank you, and then I just had one question for you with regard to drop boxes. The drop boxes that exist in Pima County currently have both cameras to ensure 24-hour surveillance of the drop box area and also fire suppression equipment, which has unfortunately proven to be necessary in ballot drop boxes around the country. So, I know you said you are talking to Procurement about putting up more ballot drop boxes around the County, and I would certainly join with my colleagues and ask that they be evenly distributed. What is the cost when you are talking about all that equipment, roughly?

GCK: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, the cost is a lot more expensive than you would think. Not only is it very expensive to have one of those secure boxes which are unique to election administration, one that has the high level of security features that are needed in this type of scenario and the equipment listed, including cameras and fire retardant, all of those types of features. In addition to that, the cost to install these boxes, depending on the timeframe, could also be substantial. We are in the middle of determining what that is going to be, but it could be very expensive, meaning we may have to roll out certain ballot drop boxes and prioritize certain areas. It depends on the size of the ballot drop box. The ones that we have currently are small. Oro Valley, for instance, is going to need a much larger box that is going to cost us more. We are going to have to determine where we can permanently house that box. There is additional considerations that we have to take. The ones that we have currently are all on County property. So, if we are talking about installing a box in another jurisdiction, we would have to then worry about intergovernmental agreements determining who is responsible for this. I do want to clarify that these boxes are not under surveillance. They are under camera, but we are not watching them 24 hours a day. I do not have the type of budget to ensure that they are being watched 24 hours a day. They are only unlocked during the active election. So as soon as we send out ballots for the general public, we then open those boxes and we are keeping an eye on them during that time, and we are able to take a look at video should an event arise where it would need to.

RS: Thank you, Recorder Cázares-Kelly. Chair Allen, I think it would be instructive and informative for the Board if the Recorder could work with the County Administrator to get the Board some more information on costs and other criteria associated with the placement of drop boxes at your ability to do so. Thank you, Chair Allen.