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 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

1. **CONTRACT**

Josephine Elia and Vincent C. Elia, Co-Personal Representatives of the Estate of Ralph Elia, deceased, to provide an acquisition agreement for 140 acres of vacant land within the Brawley Wash Flow Corridor, located off Park Road, two miles west of Sandario Road in Section 6, T15S, R11E, FC-Floodprone Land Acquisition Program Fund, contract amount $257,500.00 (PO2600016915)

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 7:08 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 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

1. **AUTHORIZING FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE LIBRARY DISTRICT DONATION DOCUMENTS**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - LD1, of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Library District, to authorize the Director of Pima County Finance and Risk Management Department to execute documents on behalf of the Library District.

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

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 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 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

*Supervisor Christy participated remotely.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgment Statement was delivered by Jenny Flynn, CEO, Community Foundation of Southern Arizona.

3. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

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

4. **PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEDGE**

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passing of Linda Barber. He recognized Ms. Barber for her leadership, civic activism and commitment to the Republican Party for more than 50 years. He stated that she was a trusted advisor to Republican leaders in Pima County and throughout Arizona, and that her unwavering patriotism and deep love of country were evident and encouraged others to stand firm in their beliefs. A moment of silence was observed in her honor.

5. **CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Supervisor Cano stated that a ribbon cutting for the official reopening of the Richard Elias Mission Library would be held on Saturday, June 13, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., followed by a full day of activities until 5:00 p.m., and he invited everyone to attend.

He stated that the library was named in honor of late County Supervisor Richard Elias, his dear friend and colleague, and was newly renovated to accommodate more visitors.

Supervisor Heinz congratulated Sam Stuckey, the son of John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms, for graduating from the Northwest Fire Department Academy. He stated that it was great to see that public service was clearly a family tradition.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was honored to be a keynote speaker at the Adult Basic Education High School Equivalency Graduation Ceremony held on June 4, 2026. He stated how wonderful it was to see graduates receive their certificates and to offer his remarks alongside Superintendent Dustin Williams. He also acknowledged Supervisor Heinz's birthday.

Chair Allen noted the birthday of the Ironwood Forest National Monument. She acknowledged several Juneteenth celebrations throughout the month of June; on June 19th the third annual Juneteenth Art Expo at the Drawing Studio and a community wide festival on June 20th at the Kino Stadium. She stated that last week she met with a group of young women from the Amphi Women and Girls Union, who were refugees from around the world who lived in the Amphi neighborhood, and she was moved by their concern and advocacy for the local community. She stated that they had come up with some great recommendations, from neighborhood cleanup to opening the Amphi Park that had been closed, as well as concerns about family. She stated that these young women carried the struggles and concerns of their families who already worked multiple jobs and would be even more impacted by the loss of SNAP and AHCCCS benefits, and she looked forward to working with them in the future.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Matt McGlone, Community Outreach Manager and Chelsea Peters, Warning Coordination Meteorologist, Office of Emergency Management & Homeland Security, and Edward Buster, Chief of Security, Tucson Water, proclaiming the week of June 7 through June 13, 2026 to be: "MONSOON SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK"

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

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Mia Hansen, Executive Director, Southern Arizona Adaptive Sports, recognizing her outstanding leadership, transformative advocacy, and enduring contributions to the community.

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

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Brandon Gleason, Epidemiologist, Tyler Bacam, Epidemiology Program Manager, Mark Person, Community Mental Health and Addiction Program Manager and Andres Portela, Health Equity Program Manager, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming June 15 through June 21, 2026 to be: "MEN’S HEALTH WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

9. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Trista di Genova addressed the Board regarding the Pima Animal Care Center and the removal of her service dog, Dr. Baker. She requested the Board’s assistance with her case and read a resolution demanding his return.

Lauren Hebert, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 449, spoke about the County’s broad 3% wage increase that did not account for the rising cost of living for lower income earning employees. She highlighted the County’s unfair compensation system, which did not offer employees the ability to advance in their position’s salary range and proposed that the Board enact a tiered pay system.

Scott Krooksmer, AFSCME Local 449, urged the Board to reject a flat percentage increase and instead adopt an equitable tiered compensation model to improve job quality and that offered self-sustaining wages. He stated that the tiered model was a sound economic policy since lower income households immediately spent 100% of wage increases on local necessities.

Cassandra King spoke about eviction prevention and rehousing for the Community and Workforce Development Department. She expressed concern regarding the rise in Pima County employees seeking assistance and urged the Board to demonstrate their values through meaningful and equitable wage adjustments for employees who needed it most.

Angie Dougherty shared that she was a County employee and AFSCME union member who had taken part in labor negotiations between the two and was disheartened by the County’s lack of consideration for employee concerns. She stated that the County seemed very focused on recruitment, but she preferred that it focused on retaining its current employees with improved compensation.

J.P. Salvatierra stressed the importance of transparency and that prioritizing special interest stakeholders left the public’s concerns out of the decision process. He reminded the Board that they were elected to represent and listen to their constituents.

* * *

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Cano thanked the union members in attendance and stated that he had reached out to AFSCME 449 leadership and was also communicating with the County Administrator over similar concerns. He stated that it was important to recognize the hardships low-income employees faced and that even with the proposed wage increase, some low-income employees could not survive off their take home income in the current economy. He said that the recommended budget would offer childcare stipends and education reimbursements. He acknowledged that the County needed to provide compensation to employees with different needs and requested that the County Administrator research this matter.

Chair Allen requested that the County Administrator provide the Board with a cost breakdown of the scaled progressive pay increase proposed by union members. She also requested that County Administration and AFSCME 449 members meet to discuss any lingering issues that needed resolution.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

10. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Natasha Bassi, Westin La Paloma, La Paloma Country Club, 3800 E. Sunrise Drive, Tucson, July 3, 2026, from 8:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. (Independence Day Celebration)

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 approve the permit.

11. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

John Lashley, Tucson Speedway, 11955 S. Harrison Road, Tucson, July 4, 2026, from 9:30 p.m. - 9:45 p.m. (Independence Day Celebration)

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 approve the permit.

12. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Ashley Herrick, Skyline Country Club, 5200 E. St. Andrews Drive, Tucson, July 4, 2026, from 8:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m. (Independence Day Celebration)

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 approve the permit.

13. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 397365, Andrea Dahlman Lewkowitz, Chipotle Mexican Grill, No. 6072, 4746 E. Sunrise Drive, 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.

14. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 385696, Teresa Irene Salinas, Tiny's, 5975 S. Western Way Circle, 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.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

15. **Rezoning Closure and Rezoning Time Extensions**

A. **Hearing - Rezoning Closure**
ST. PHILLIPS FOOTHILLS, L.L.C. - CAMPBELL AVENUE REZONING
Campbell Foothills Investors LP, represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., requests a closure of a 7.02-acre rezoning from CR-1 (Single Residence) to the CR-4 (Mixed-Dwelling Type) zone on 4.13 acres and to the CR-4 ® (Mixed-Dwelling Type - Restricted) zone on 2.89-acres, located on the east side of Campbell Avenue, approximately one-fourth mile north of River Road, (Parcel Code 108-23-0890). The rezoning was conditionally approved in 2006, received time extensions in 2009 and 2015 and expired January 4, 2020. Staff recommends DENIAL OF THE CLOSURE of the rezoning. (District 1)

Bill Yeoman, Resident and Board member of Catalina Foothills Association, addressed the Board and stated that they wanted to protect the environmental and historic character of the old foothills and respect the Campbell Avenue scenic corridor. He noted that within the radius were noteworthy architectural structures, which included the 1940 Jostler and 1950 Tom Gist houses. He stated that the Association supported all elements of the Development Services Department staff recommendations. He stated that the long-standing agreement with the broader community regarding future development of this property should be extended and honored and that this agreement limited the development to 16 houses and the height limit of 24 feet and the action proposed in the staff report would accomplish this. He stated that the Association strongly recommended the developer consider the Catalina Foothills Association architectural guidelines included in the special area policy to enhance design capability with the greater Catalina Foothills community. He stated that the mission of the Catalina Foothills Association was to preserve the character and its unique collection of architecture and landscape. He stated that their neighborhood was one of the oldest master planned communities in Arizona, and that it was rare and worthy of preservation. He stated that it contained numerous homes listed on the National Register of Historic Places and many other historically significant residences eligible for listing in the National Register.

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve staff's recommendation for denial of the closure of the rezoning.

* * *

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

Supervisor Cano asked for counsel's guidance on whether the Board had to reopen the public hearing and if it required a notice.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, responded no, that the hearing had already been closed and that the Board would vote to reconsider, and if passed, would revote.

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

Chair Allen stated that the Board was back to the item and that they had already closed the public hearing.

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve staff's recommendation for denial of the closure of the rezoning.

* * *

B. **Hearing - Rezoning Time Extensions**

Co9-04-16, ST. PHILLIPS FOOTHILLS, L.L.C. - CAMPBELL AVENUE REZONING

Campbell Foothills Investors LP, represented by Lazarus & Silvyn, P.C., requests two five-year time extensions. The 7.02-acre rezoning from CR-1 (Single Residence) to the CR-4 (Mixed-Dwelling Type) zone on 4.13 acres and to the CR-4 ® (Mixed-Dwelling Type - Restricted) zone on 2.89-acres. The property is located on the ~~southeast corner of N. La Cholla Boulevard and N. Fountains Avenue~~ **east side of Campbell Avenue, approximately one-fourth mile north of River Road**, (Parcel Code 108-23-0890). Staff recommends APPROVAL OF FIVE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION SUBJECT TO

ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS. (District 1)

Completion of the following requirements within ten years from the date the rezoning time extension is approved by the Board of Supervisors.

1. Submittal of a development plan if determined necessary by the appropriate County agencies.
2. Recording of the necessary development related covenants as determined appropriate by the various County agencies.
3. Provision of development related assurances as required by the appropriate agencies.
4. Prior to the preparation of the development related covenants and any required dedication, a title report (current to within 60 days) evidencing ownership of the property shall be submitted to the Department Services Department.
5. There shall be no further lot splitting or subdividing of residential development without the written approval of the Board of Supervisors.
6. Transportation conditions:
    A. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be provided by the property owner(s) for this rezoning for review and approval by the Department of Transportation, prior to the first development plan or tentative plat submittal. The results of the approved TIA shall be used to establish required transportation improvements, and phasing of said improvements, to the area roadway system. The property owner(s) shall be responsible for construction of improvements as required by the Department of Transportation.
    B. Provision of improvements to Campbell Avenue, including but not limited to, widening of pavement to provide left or right turn lanes, or a continuous left-turn lane.
    C. The property owner shall dedicate 45 feet right-of-way for Campbell Avenue.
7. Flood Control conditions:
    A. Drainage shall not be altered, disturbed or obstructed without the written approval of the Flood Control District.
    B. The property owner(s) shall provide all necessary drainage-related improvements created by the proposed development both on-site and off-site of the subject property. The location, design and construction of said improvements shall be subject to the approval of the Flood Control District.
    C. All weather access shall be provided to all lots to meet concurrency requirements.
    D. A drainage study shall be submitted for review and approval that addresses the impacts of development to the federally mapped floodplain and local drainage area at the time of platting. This study should also determine erosion setback hazard areas and in particular the western portion of the rezoning site.
    E. First flush retention (retention of the first ½ inch of rainfall) shall be provided for all newly disturbed and impervious surfaces.

    F. As provided for in Pima County Code Section 18.07.080 Modification of Development Standards shall be proposed at the time of development in order to avoid Regulated Riparian Habitat.
    G. A Final Integrated Water Management Plan consisting of Water Conservation Measures identified by the applicant and commitment to serve from Tucson Water shall be submitted with the Development Plan.
    H. The use of on-lot retention volume provided in stormwater harvesting areas may be counted towards first flush retention to support shade and landscaping. The stormwater harvesting areas shall be located adjacent to right-of-way and pedestrian areas. Easement or other encumbrances shall

be applied to alert property owners of the purpose of on-lot retention and maintenance responsibility for the stormwater harvesting areas.

I. Encroachment into mapped Regulated Riparian Habitat not shown on the approved PDP is prohibited.

8. Wastewater Reclamation conditions:

~~A. The owner/developer shall not construe any action by Pima County as a commitment to provide sewer service to any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner/developer to that effect.~~

~~B. The owner/developer shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner/developer shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing, and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.~~

~~C. The owner/developer shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by the Development Services Department PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.~~

~~D. The owner / developer shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.~~

~~E. The owner/developer shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.~~

~~F. The owner/developer shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system will be permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.~~

Should the Board of Supervisors be inclined to approve this rezoning extension, the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department recommends the following wastewater conditions:

A. The owner(s) shall construe no action by Pima County as a commitment of capacity to serve any new development within the rezoning area until Pima County executes an agreement with the owner(s) to that effect.

B. The owner(s) shall obtain written documentation from the Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (PCRWRD) stating that treatment and conveyance capacity is available for any new development within the rezoning area, no more than 90 days before submitting any tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer improvement plan, or request for building permit for review. Should treatment and/or conveyance capacity not be available at that time, the owner(s) shall enter into a written agreement addressing the option of funding, designing and constructing the necessary improvements to Pima County's public sewerage system at his or her sole expense or cooperatively with other affected parties. All such improvements shall be designed and constructed as directed by the PCRWRD.

C. The owner(s) shall time all new development within the rezoning area to coincide with the availability of treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system.

D. The owner(s) shall connect all development within the rezoning area to Pima County's public sewer system at the location and in the manner specified by the PCRWRD in its capacity response letter and as specified by PCRWRD at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan, or request for building permit.

E. The owner(s) shall fund, design and construct all off-site and on-site sewers necessary to serve the rezoning area, in the manner specified at the time of review of the tentative plat, development plan, preliminary sewer layout, sewer construction plan or request for building permit.

F. The owner(s) shall complete the construction of all necessary public and/or private sewerage facilities as required by all applicable agreements with Pima County, and all applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act and those promulgated by ADEQ, before treatment and conveyance capacity in the downstream public sewerage system is permanently committed for any new development within the rezoning area.

9. Environmental Quality conditions:

   A. The subject parcel(s) shall connect to the public sewer.

   B. The existing road to serve the parcel(s) shall be improved to meet paving specifications defined by, or equivalent to those of, the planning department and/or highway department of the jurisdictional agency.

10. Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation condition:
    Prior to ground modifying activities, an on-the-ground archaeological and historic sites survey shall be conducted on the subject property. A cultural resources mitigation plan for any identified archaeological and historic sites on the subject property shall be submitted at the time of, or prior to, the submittal of any tentative plan or development plan. All work shall be conducted by an archaeologist permitted by the Arizona State museum, or a registered architect, as appropriate. Following rezoning approval, any subsequent development requiring a Type II grading permit will be reviewed for compliance with Pima County's cultural resources requirements under Chapter 18.81 of the Pima County Zoning Code.

11. Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation condition:
    The developer shall provide a "Public Non-Motorized Trail Easement and Public Utility Easement" over the Campbell Wash, coinciding with the Flood Plain boundaries, for the Campbell/Camino Real Trail #182.

12. Adherence to the preliminary development plan as approved at public hearing (Exhibit "B").

13. There shall be a maximum of 16 dwelling units in the rezoning area.

14. Building heights are limited to a maximum of 24 feet unless the Board of Supervisors provides specific written authorization to exceed 24 feet.

15. Upon the effective date of the Ordinance Resolution. The owner(s)/developer(s) shall have a continuing responsibility to remove invasive non-native species from the property, including those below. Acceptable methods of removal include chemical treatment, physical removal, or other known effective means of removal. This obligation also transfers to any future owners of property within the rezoning site and Pima County may enforce this rezoning condition against the property owner. Prior to issuance of the certificate of compliance, the owner(s)/developer(s) shall record a covenant, to run with the land. memorializing the terms of this condition.

16. In the event the subject property is annexed into the City of Tucson, the property owner shall adhere to all applicable rezoning conditions, including, but not limited to, development conditions which require financial contributions to, or construction of

infrastructure, including without limitation, transportation, flood control, or sewer facilities.

~~17. Ninety-five percent of the Campbell Wash shall remain undisturbed.~~

17. The property owner shall execute and record the following disclaimer regarding Proposition 207 rights. "Property Owner acknowledges that neither the rezoning of the Property nor the conditions of rezoning give Property Owner any rights, claims or causes of action under the Private Property Rights Protection Act (Arizona Revised Statutes Title 12, chapter 8, article 2.1). To the extent that the rezoning or conditions of rezoning may be construed to give Property Owner any rights or claims under the Private Property Rights Protection Act, Property Owner hereby waives any and all such rights and/or claims pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-1134(I)."

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Scott to close the public hearing and approve Co9-04-16, five-year time extension subject to original and modified standard and special conditions. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott thanked Mr. Yeoman and the applicant's representative from Lazarus & Silvyn for their ongoing communication regarding the Catalina Foothills Association's project development concerns.

Supervisor Christy asked for clarification if the previous motion was to deny the closure.

Chair Allen clarified that the Board had approved staff's recommendation for denial of the closure of the rezoning.

Supervisor Christy stated that he needed to change his vote to yes and asked how he could do that.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the Board needed to reconsider the item.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated the Board needed to vote to reconsider the item and upon affirmative vote to reconsider, make a motion to address denial of the closure.

Supervisor Heinz stated that the Board should complete the vote on this item first.

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

16. **Hearing - Comprehensive Plan Amendment Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 32, P25CA00004, Popovic - W. Desert Oasis Trail Plan Amendment. Owner: Philip and Somaye Popovic. (District 3)

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 Resolution.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

17. **County Administrator Hiring Process**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the County Administrator Hiring Process. (District 3)

Chair Allen stated that the application period concluded at the end of May and while there were some great candidates that applied, there had not been many applications that were received by Human Resources, and this would be difficult later in the hiring process once they started eliminating candidates. She stated that the recommendation from the Human Resources Director was to hire a recruitment firm to facilitate the hiring process so that they had a larger applicant pool. She stated that since it had been over thirty-five years since the Board had recruited for the administrator position, they needed to make sure it was done right.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz and seconded by Supervisor Scott, to direct staff to select a recruitment firm to facilitate the hiring process. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott asked if the Board could be provided with a time estimate on how long it would take to hire a firm to begin the recruitment process.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, explained that they preferred to do a modified direct select process, where the Procurement Department could contact interested companies in the business regarding their availability and select a candidate from the available list. She stated that Deputy County Administrator Holmes had already contacted the Procurement Director, and she believed that the process would take about 15 to 30 days to complete.

Cathy Bohland, Director, Human Resources Department, concurred and added that once a recruitment firm was selected adequate time needed to be provided for the recruiter to gather an applicant pool which could take between 30 to 90 days.

Ms. Lesher stated that once a recruitment firm was selected staff could come back to the Board with a revised timeline. She stated that at this point since the Board wished to identify a candidate in September, with a start date of October 1st, the hope was to be able to meet the desired time frame with 90 days of overlap.

Supervisor Scott requested that the Board receive additional information regarding the 30-to-90-day time frame cited by Ms. Bohland.

Supervisor Cano stated that he was supportive of the item in the sense that it demonstrated to the public their involvement in the process, however, he wanted to be clear that he was not interested in a national search. He stated his preference for the candidate to be Arizona based but understood that the timeline of the recruitment process was most important now.

Supervisor Christy asked about the cost to hire a recruitment firm.

Ms. Lesher stated that she did not know what the cost would be.

Ms. Bohland responded that she did not know either.

Supervisor Christy expressed concern with the cost of hiring a recruitment firm and asked if the Board could continue the item until they were provided with an estimate of what the process would cost. He stated that from his experience he knew recruitment firms were not cheap and felt more comfortable voting on the item after figures could be provided to the Board.

Supervisor Heinz stated it was his understanding that once a recruitment firm was identified for a direct select, it would be brought back to the Board for approval to hire that recruitment firm.

Ms. Lesher responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Heinz noted that a Google search showed that hiring a recruitment firm for a County Administrator in a large County would typically cost between $30,000.00 to $60,000.00 in estimated recruitment fees.

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

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

18. **County Supervisors Association (CSA) Presentation**

Update provided by CSA Executive Director Craig Sullivan and Michael Racy on the Second Session of the Fifty-Seventh Arizona Legislature, and to present an award to thank and honor Arizona Legislative District 21 Representative Stephanie Stahl Hamilton.

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

ELECTIONS

19. **Vote Centers**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-411(B)(4), designation of vote centers for the 2026 Primary Election on July 21, 2026.

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

Supervisor Scott inquired if the County sought any input from either the political parties or jurisdictional partners regarding vote center locations.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that the Elections Director had done outreach and had been in communication with a variety of individuals, which included political parties and jurisdictions. She stated that she would provide additional information to the Board.

Supervisor Christy thanked Director Hargrove for accommodating District 4’s Green Valley area. He stated that many of his constituents had struggled to navigate the voting process during the last election cycle, and he appreciated the Elections Director’s outreach efforts to include the community. He stated that it was brought to his attention that Green Valley Recreation was not hosting vote centers at their facilities this year even though they had done so in the past. He asked the County Administrator if she could follow up with Director Hargrove why this was, so that he could communicate that with his constituents.
Ms. Lesher responded that she would reach out to Director Hargrove and provide an update to the Board.

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

20. **Quarterly Report on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending March 31, 2026.

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

REAL PROPERTY

21. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025 and June 17, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

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

22. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025 and June 17, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

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

23. The Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2025 and June 17, 2025, continued the following:

Surplus Property

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

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

24. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of 120,892 square feet of vacant land, located east of North 1st Avenue and south of East Magee Road, Tax Parcel No. 220-18-0560, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 1)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

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

Arizona Department of Emergency & Military Affairs, to provide for FY2025 Emergency Management Performance Grant, $1,053,702.02/$526,851.01 General Fund match (G-OEM-82541)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

26. **Adding a Study Session to Second Meeting of Every Month**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Adding a Study Session for the second meeting of every month to accommodate executive session items without changing the time of the Regular Meeting, which may also be used for any study session items that the Agenda Committee places on the Study Session Agenda. (District 3)

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

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to add a Study Session to the second meeting of every month, to accommodate Executive Session items only, with a start time at 3:00 p.m.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

27. **Potential Litigation related to A.R.S. §13-4296**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding potential litigation related to A.R.S. §13-4296 (Erroneous Convictions).

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to authorize the Pima County Attorney's Office (PCAO) to join or file a lawsuit related to A.R.S. §13-4296 with the condition that PCAO will come back to the Board on June 23, 2026, with more details.

28. **Release of Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding release of the Attorney-Client Privileged Memorandum regarding Notices of Property Correction.

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to direct the County Administrator and the Pima County Attorney's Office to proceed as discussed in Executive Session and continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of June 23, 2026.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

29. **Budget Remediation Plans**

Staff recommends approval of the Budget Remediation Plans submitted by the Constables Office, Office of the Medical Examiner, and Public Defense Services, for Fiscal Year 2025/26, to support the continuation of programmatic operations through the remainder of the fiscal year.

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

Supervisor Scott asked the County Administrator if there was any additional information to add to this item.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded no, there was nothing in addition to the background materials for this item.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the budget remediation plan submitted by the Constables Office was for a vehicle purchase that they had not budgeted for initially.

Art Cuaron, Finance Director, explained that the Constables Office had sufficient budget capacity to purchase a new vehicle at the beginning of the fiscal year and were authorized to do so at that time, but an automobile accident caused them to go over budget due to repairs and the staffing increase in their medical coverage.

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

30. **Budget Remediation Plan Update**

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

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, explained that the Board had received a Budget Remediation Plan for the Treasurer's Office in the amount of $80,000.00 and it was in accordance with the administrative procedure. He reminded the Board that in February 2026, they approved use of contingency in the amount of $210,000.00 for a budget overrun in the Treasurer's Office at that time.

Jake Martin, Chief Deputy Treasurer, stated that on February 7, 2026, the Treasurer's Office had requested $210,675.00 to meet the necessary obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year, but they were back before the Board because something had not gone right. He explained that with the remediation plan submitted, they intended to eliminate a position with a total cost savings of $89,000.00 per fiscal year and due to administrative delays and bureaucratic processes that were not foreseen at the time, the remediation plan was initiated but did not get eliminated this fiscal year. He stated that as a result, they were projecting an $80,000.00 overage through the end of Fiscal Year '26. He stated that this remediation plan would allow them to effectively borrow the money from next year's budget and be cost neutral to the County for this specific remediation. He reiterated that they could remediate the budget immediately for $80,000.00 and by the new fiscal year, they would have the capacity to eliminate that position, resulting in a cost savings of $89,000.00 that would be returned to Pima County and keep them cost neutral.

Supervisor Scott requested that Ms. Lesher or Mr. Cuaron follow up on the presentation made by the Chief Deputy Treasurer, with any input from Administration.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that Chief Deputy Treasurer Martin had done amazing work closing what that deficit appeared to be. She stated that what was critical to address, as Mr. Martin described, would mean that rather than adding money to the base, that would continue to expand, that this be considered one-time money coming from next year's budget, so that while the remediation plan had been based on the elimination of a position that had not happened. She stated that it was critical that they moved forward and indicated that the position must be eliminated and that they could not continue remediating it just because they were exceeding their budget. She stated that this would be a one-time reallocation from next year to this year, with the understanding that on July 1st, the position would be eliminated.

Mr. Cuaron clarified that would work if the Board was to consider funding the Treasurer's budget this year from contingency and then for FY27 complete a budget amendment to take those dollars out of this budget and replenish the contingency effectively next year.

Supervisor Scott referred to the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Report and stated that under Fiscal Impact, the last sentence stated, "*If approved, the shortfall is recommended to be funded using excess fund balance received after Period 8 that was not incorporated into the Fiscal Year 2026/27 budget.*" He stated that sentence summed up the Chief Deputy Treasurer's presentation and the input from the County Administrator and the Finance Director.

Mr. Cuaron concurred and that they would effectively use the residual savings that was not built into the budget, which as of Period 10, was $9.9 million, it would come off of that amount and would be replenished through a budget amendment in FY27.

Supervisor Scott stated that Ms. Lesher had kindly offered kudos to Mr. Martin for putting this proposal together but was surprised that Mr. Martin presented it to the Board instead of the Treasurer. He asked if Treasurer Johnson was supportive of the proposal or if the responsibility for putting it together was delegated to Mr. Martin.

Mr. Martin responded a bit of both and explained that he had put the proposal together and presented it to the Treasurer and acquired his endorsement, and then they submitted it to the Finance Department.

It was moved by Supervisor Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the remediation plan request as drafted. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz stated that they had been shifting things around for a few weeks with the budget and asked if this was something the Board would vote for the 2027

Budget amendment at this time or at a future Board meeting. He stated that it sounded like a two-part solution.

Ms. Lesher responded that if the Board voted on this item it would allow them to approve the remediation plan for this year and when the budget returned for final adoption, they would ensure that it was noted there.

Supervisor Scott asked when the Board voted on final budget adoption, if that was something that would be noted by either Ms. Lesher, or Mr. Cuaron.

Ms. Lesher responded yes, and that there had already been tweaks to the tentative budget and a change in the fund balance and they would be clearly delineated for any modification to the document that was previously seen by the Board.

Chair Allen asked if the intended use of the funding that was approved in February had not occurred.

Mr. Martin responded that the entirety of that funding had effectively been exhausted and that they had anticipated that a position would have been eliminated, which would have freed up additional funds, to get them to the end of this fiscal year but that position was not eliminated. He stated that those funds did not exist, which meant they needed to effectively borrow from next year's budget.

Chair Allen questioned the reason for the delay.

Mr. Martin explained that to effectively execute the position change, they needed to promote one staff member to a position and demote a second staff member down into the position. He stated that it was a voluntary demotion, but that staff member would demote down into the position that the previous one was raised from. He stated that they needed the funds to do a promotion before they could incur the cost savings for the new position, or from eliminating that position. He stated that they could not get that done in this fiscal year, given that they were already projected over.

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

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

31. **Board of Adjustment, District 1**

Appointment of William Pew, to fill a vacancy created by Michael Reuwsaat. Term expiration: 8/19/29.

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

32. **Pima Animal Care Advisory Committee**

Reappointment of Kristen Pogreba-Brown. Term expiration: 6/30/30. (District 5)

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

33. **Fair Horse Racing Commission**

Reappointment of Ronnie Reyna. Term expiration: 1/17/28. (District 5)

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

34. **Bond Advisory Committee**

Appointments of Josh Jacobsen, William Kelley and Royal Martin. Term expirations: 6/8/32. (District 4)

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

35. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval of the Consent Calendar

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item Nos. 24 and 25 were set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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

* * *

PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

24. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental cooperative agreement for the Tucson and Pima County Home Consortium for Federal Fiscal Years 2026, 2027 and 2028, $871,904.00 (G-CWD-89631)

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay,” to approve the item.

25. **Acceptance - Justice Services**

Bridgeway Health Solutions of Arizona, Inc., d.b.a. Arizona Complete Health Solutions, to provide for the Transition Center Expansion - Community Investment Award, $100,000.00 (G-JS-106964)

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

Supervisor Christy noted that the purpose of this item was to double the size of the Transition Center due to increased demand and he requested an update be provided to the Board regarding the efforts and activities of the Transition Center to better understand the need for more space. He stated that the Board had not received any significant update on the Transition Center in quite some time and he wanted to know whether the goal of the request was to meet the needs of more visitors at the center or to accommodate more staff. He also inquired about the City of Tucson's contribution to the Transition Center.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded that an update on the Transition Center would be provided to the Board. She stated that the Board had directed the expansion of the facility to be open seven days a week with the goal of eventually being open 24 hours a day, and the grant fulfilled the seven days a week schedule, which increased staff and the individuals that were being served at the center.

Chad Kasmar, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the City of Tucson had contributed two additional navigators to support the Transition Center's seven days a week expansion. He stated that Director Vesely could provide an update on the Center's services at a future Board meeting and that the grant was to support the Center's services and to create a safe space to retreat to if there was an emergency.

Supervisor Christy clarified that the City of Tucson's contribution was manpower as opposed to financial support.

Ms. Lesher responded in the affirmative.

Supervisor Cano asked if Supervisor Christy had toured the Transition Center.

Supervisor Christy responded no.

Supervisor Cano stated that the Transition Center was an important asset in District 5 and encouraged Supervisor Christy to visit. He indicated that on March 11, 2026, an annual report was provided to the Board, and it included a summary of the achievements of the Center. He asked Deputy County

Administrator Kasmar to provide a perspective on the importance of the Transition Center to law enforcement in the region.

Supervisor Christy reassured Supervisor Cano that he was not against the center and intended to vote in support of the item. He recognized the positive impact it had on those affected by homelessness and was incredibly proud of the efforts made thus far. However, he noted that it had been a long time since the Board had received an update on the program's funding or received data on how they served constituents which was why he requested a formal update.

Supervisor Cano thanked Supervisor Christy for his comments and noted that the Transition Center's expansion was part of the One Pima adoption. He asked if Mr. Kasmar could explain how the Transition Center was important to law enforcement.

Mr. Kasmar stated that the idea was to break cycles of folks living in crisis by connecting them with services that helped with mental health and substance use disorders, food and house insecurities. He stated that if the program broke the cycle of individuals who shoplifted and got arrested that became a solution for law enforcement. He added that the goal was to reduce folks being rearrested and to reduce recidivism.

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

1. Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, Amendment No. 2, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount $1,450,000.00 (PO2500015062)

Community and Workforce Development

2. Arts Foundation for Tucson and Southern Arizona, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Public Art Program - Operational Support and Services, extend contract term to 6/30/27, amend contractual language and scope of work, General Fund, contract amount $125,000.00 (PO2500039463)

3. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for occupancy and operation of Low-Barrier Bridge Housing Project at The Craycroft (formerly Knights Inn), Regional Affordable Housing Fund, contract amount $434,035.04 (PO2600014785)

Procurement

4. **Award**

   Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001727, Amendment No. 4, Johnson Controls US Holdings, Inc., d.b.a. Johnson Controls Fire Protection, L.P., to provide for Simplex Fire Alarm equipment and service. This amendment increases the annual award amount by $150,000.00 from $200,000.00 to $350,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of $750,000.00 and appends the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention and Safety Plan language to the contract pursuant to Pima County Procurement Code 11.40.030. This increase is needed to replace out-of-date fire alarm systems to make buildings safer for staff and public. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

5. Next-Turbo Americas, L.L.C., to provide for a Next-Turbo blower, parts and service, 5001FD Regional Wastewater Reclamation Fund, contract amount $450,000.00 (SC2600000351) Administering Department: Regional Wastewater Reclamation

6. Ameresco, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Solar Photovoltaic Energy Facilities Project - Site 8: Martha Cooper Library. This amendment executes a termination of the contract on 6/30/26 and a buyout of the associated equipment, no cost (SC2400000848) Administering Department: Facilities Management

Real Property

7. Wail Abushaar and Salsabila Alkhateeb, to provide for Sales Agreement No. Sale-0120, 0121 and Special Warranty Deed for the sale of vacant surplus property that consists of 40,711 square feet located at 5335 and 5365 N. La Canada Drive, Tax Parcel No. 104-02-171A, contract amount $146,000.00 revenue (CT2600000056)

Regional Wastewater Reclamation

8. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for wastewater billing services, extend contract term to 12/31/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (CT_18-196)

9. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for wastewater billing services, extend contract term to 12/31/26 and amend contractual language, contract amount $150,000,000.00 revenue (CT2600000055)

Sheriff

10. Town of Sahuarita, Amendment No. 1, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for law enforcement dispatch services and the management of associated records, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount $372,891.00 revenue (CT2500000029)

11. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $2,500.00 revenue (CT2600000045)

12. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $2,000.00 revenue (CT2600000046)

13. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for video court hearings of municipal prisoners, contract amount $5,500.00 revenue (CT2600000047)

14. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $7,218,158.45 revenue (CT2600000050)

15. City of South Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $182,820.85 revenue (CT2600000051)

16. Town of Marana, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $288,729.20 revenue (CT2600000052)

17. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $226,811.47 revenue (CT2600000053)

18. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the incarceration of municipal prisoners, contract amount $194,351.36 revenue (CT2600000054)

19. Sheriff’s Auxiliary Volunteers Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide for property loss protection - SAV vehicles and extend contract term to 6/30/27, no cost (PO2400006085)

20. Sheriff’s Auxiliary Volunteers Tucson, Amendment No. 2, to provide for property loss protection - SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount $8,683.00 revenue (CT2400000034)

21. Sheriff’s Auxiliary Volunteers Green Valley District, Amendment No. 2, to provide for property loss protection - Green Valley SAV vehicles and extend contract term to 6/30/27, no cost (PO2400006084)

22. Sheriff’s Auxiliary Volunteers Green Valley District, Amendment No. 2, to provide for property loss protection - Green Valley SAV vehicles, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount $5,582.00 revenue (CT2400000033)

23. Saguaro National Park Arizona, Amendment No. 3, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for law enforcement dispatch services and the management of associated records, extend contract term to 6/30/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount $26,385.00 revenue (CTN_SD-23-107)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

24. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
City of Tucson, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

25. **Acceptance - Justice Services**
Bridgeway Health Solutions of Arizona, Inc., d.b.a. Arizona Complete Health Solutions, (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

26. **Acceptance - Office of Digital Inclusion**
AARP, to provide for the AARP Community Challenge Grant Agreement, $15,000.00 (G-ODI-105689)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

27. **Cooperative Extension Board**
Appointment of Dulce Pesqueira Quevedo, to fill a vacancy created by Maria Messenger. Term expiration: 6/30/28. (Committee recommendation)

28. **Election Integrity Commission**
Appointment of Arthur Kerschen, to replace Scott Stewart. Term expiration: 6/8/28. (Libertarian Party recommendation)

29. **Bond Advisory Committee**
- Appointment of Jennifer Flood, representing Town of Marana. Term expiration: 6/8/32. (Jurisdictional recommendation)
- Appointments of Jesus Bonillas, Elva de la Torre and Albert Elias. Term expirations: 6/8/32. (District 5)

30. **State Board of Equalization**
Appointment of Usiel Barrios, to fill a vacancy created by Peter E. Pearman. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 5)

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

31. **Special Event**
- Concha Maria Montes, W.A.L.D., Inc., Ajo Plaza, 15 W. Plaza Street, Ajo, July 4, 2026.
- Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, July 19, 2026.
- Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of Saint Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Parish Hall and Gym, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, August 29, 2026.

ELECTIONS

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

<u>APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY</u>:
Christopher Puca-239-DEM, Monikah Hunter-006-REP, Donald Osborne-009-REP, Glenna Stallard-021-REP, Stacy Forster-083-REP, Barbara Hernandez-088-REP, Nancy Whitaker-118-REP, Zoila Joyner-127-REP, Donine Henshaw-158-REP, Janet Neustedter-163-REP, Jonathan Amengual-166-REP, Kelly Hines-174-REP, James Sutherland II-175-REP, Trevor Childs-175-REP, Bruce Weldy-188-REP, Bonnie Poe-222-REP, Seth Keshel-249-REP, William Nieves-275-REP

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

33. Minutes: March 24, 2026 and April 21, 2026 (Special Meeting)
Warrants: May, 2026

* * *

36. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

____

CHAIR

ATTEST:

____

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

26. Adding a Study Session to Second Meeting of Every Month

Discussion/Direction/Action: Adding a Study Session for the second meeting of every month to accommodate executive session items without changing the time of the Regular Meeting, which may also be used for any study session items that the Agenda Committee places on the Study Session Agenda. (District 3)

Verbatim

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

JA: Item No. 3 on the addendum. This is an item that we added. This would be creating a Study Session to the second meeting of the month of the Board of Supervisors and just to say what it is not proposing. It is not proposing that we have a full, robust Study Session in both of our meetings. This is aimed more at ensuring that we can have an Executive Session before the meeting starts at 5 o'clock, so that we do not have to do what we did at the last second meeting of the month, which was because we had Executive Session, we changed the meeting time and scheduled it at 4 o'clock, kind of at the last minute, which was confusing. This would ensure that we can get Executive Session over with before 5 o'clock so that we are not here very late. And when the public comes in the evening, they do not have to sit there while we are in Executive Session. I will move to add a second Study Session to the second meeting of the month.

MH: Second.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Heinz. Discussion?

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: I want to reiterate that I am still paying close attention to whether this new schedule is both being a good steward of our taxpayer dollars. There is respectfully one person in this audience right now in the evening, and it has been that way for pretty much the last three. And I do not believe that… I want our County Administration and our departments to really get disciplined about the timing on our Study Session and I know that we are kind of already running up on, I mean, look at today, right? We had to cut our conversation short. And so it is going to be both the Board's responsibility to make sure that we are moving fast, but also the departments. And I just worry that by now quite literally doubling, right. This is now we went from two meetings to four with this motion. Or, you know, as we consider it. I want to ensure that it is just for Executive Session, for the additional Study Session, and that we consider it be like at 2:30 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. right before, and only if needed, if it is an executive. I think if we get into the habit of it being every meeting, I would rather provide an authorization for the County Attorney to have flexibility and decisions until that one Study Session, a lot of word vomit. I love greater ability to, you know, think differently. And I appreciate the efforts to be doing all of this with some reforms. I am going to continue paying attention to whether it is worth the investment.

JA: I think you are not alone. I think this is an experiment, and it is iterative. And we will probably continue to have items on the agenda with adaptations to what we have started. So yes, and I think we should be paying attention to whether or not the evenings are resulting in what the goal was. And yes.

JL: Chair Allen, may I get some—I am sorry.

AC: I was just going to say so are we I mean, are we amenable to it being as needed only, and a start time closer to our official meeting? So like a 3:00 p.m. or a 4:00 p.m., instead of a 1:00 p.m.?

SB: Chair, Supervisor, for me, yes. Fine for me for Executive Session.

JA: Anyone else?

JL: Chair Allen may I just get some clarification from staff because the item is written saying it may also be used for study session items that the agenda committee wants to put on, and what I heard Supervisor Cano say is that the second Study Session would only be for Executive Session. So, if we could get clarification from the Board about that so that we know how to staff it appropriately.

JA: I am okay with it being limited to Executive Session, as needed. If there is not an executive session and that the time be close to the regular meeting per Supervisor Cano's suggestions.

AC: So for clarity, Chair Allen. Just to make sure that we have continuity for the Clerk who has to post all of this, for this second meeting, if needed, is a 3:30 p.m. time certain, okay? That gives us…

JL: One hour.

AC: One hour to discuss.

MM: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano. I guess it would depend on how many executive sessions are going to be on that second Study Session.

AC: How about 3:00 p.m.?

SB: Chair, Supervisor. 3:00 p.m. is better than 3:30 p.m.

AC: And what is the deal, Chair Allen and Madam Clerk, with the tape that needs to be queued up beforehand? So is 4:30 p.m., technically our end time?

MM: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano, we just need time to finalize the first video of the Study Session and then for staff to set up as well for the regular meeting. So that is that half hour that we have asked for.

MH: So that is not necessary for an Executive Session only Study Session, right?

AC: It will because it is Study Session, which would be two separate meetings.

MM: Yes. That is correct.

MH: What are they recording? This space empty?

MM: Chair Allen, Supervisor Heinz. If there is a Study Session because of Executive Session, we will still need to post an agenda, do roll call, the Board has to take action to go into executive session and then come back out to adjourn.

JA: I have to do this [holds up gavel and laughs]

SB: Chair, if I might add, Supervisor Cano, because this came up today, perhaps a consideration of executive session plus study session items that were moved from previous, because otherwise that item goes a month later.

JL: Yeah.

SB: Okay. Just because it came up today, I wanted to raise that.

JL: Okay. That is not what you are saying. You are saying…

AC: Yeah. So my input and I am hoping for the Board support, is that we do Executive Session only. Second Study Session, Executive Session only, as needed, with the start time at 3:00 p.m. with the hopes that that gives us an end time of 4:30 p.m., to be able to flip the tapes. I want to also just reiterate this is not about whether I am concerned about additional duties. I am in District 5, planning all of my meetings before with this new time at 4:00 p.m., right. I am booked for the next month, for instance, with 10:00 a.m.'s to 3:00 p.m.'s, when we have these for those second days. So that is truly my hesitation is that we have already scheduled in advance.

JL: And again, just to be clear that…

SC: Chair?

JL: …The staff presentations that are placed are standing requests from the Board, so those are on. We are happy to modify those. If the Board would prefer to get any of that information in memo format rather than study session or agenda, just let us know.

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Yeah, I think we need to pretty much define the purpose of what we are doing here. Are we doing this to accommodate more agenda items and executive session items, or are we doing it to increase public participation to make it convenient for them to be present in these meetings? I do not see how, we basically, if you combine the hours involved in both Executive Session and Study Session into the regular session, we have just shifted the time from in the morning all the way to the afternoon. But starting in the afternoon, it is basically the same time. And I am just, I am trying to figure out, is there not a better way where we can whittle down the items, particularly the presentations the County Attorney, or excuse me, the County Administrator just mentioned that. I just wonder, are we achieving what we set out to achieve?

JA: I mean, I think that is the question because this is new. But I will say for this particular item, it is intended to ensure that we can start at 5:00 p.m. And that in doing so, when people come because it is in the evening, that the public does not have to sit there, you know, from 6:00 or 7 o'clock while we are in executive session, meaning then that we are, everybody is here till 9:00 or 10 o'clock when we actually wrap up the meeting. So it is taking that slice out of executive session, putting it above the meeting, so that people do not all have to sit here, staff, the public, until 9:00 or 10 o'clock. That is the goal of this particular item. And then the rest of it is a larger, you know, not an existential question, but of what are we doing with all of these changes? I think it is about making things a little more efficient, a little more structured. Certain types of discussions happen at different times and creating greater availability for public in the evenings.

SC: So, Madam Chair, what is the item before us now?

AC: So, Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Kind of sharing the same concern, Supervisor Christy. What I am hearing that makes me supportive of this is that if there is a need for our lawyers to have to talk to us, it is better to have a calendar time instead of it being like we had to recently with a special meeting, call one, right? And so, this is giving us some flexibility to have that option. And on that front, I absolutely agree that we should have the opportunity for our counsel to be able to meet with us as needed.

SB: And Chair, I do not usually weigh in this much, but the flexibility is still there if needed. If we are not done at 5:00 p.m., to come back at 8:30 p.m. when the public part is done and finish, you know, if a conversation needs to happen.

JL: Unless it is about an agenda?

SB: Unless it is about an agenda item. Correct.

JA: Alright.

MH: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: And colleagues, I think I mean, today it is particularly dead because we have an unusual and like concurrent City of Tucson council meeting occurring right now. So, I think that is why it may look a little…

JA: A little light?

MH: Yeah. But we obviously did this second and fourth Tuesday thing, we made that change to intentionally not overlap. And so, this is just one of the times when it happens. I think they did that. But yeah.

JA: And it is summer.

MH: Yeah.

JA: Alright. So, there is a motion. I think I made the motion to add a second Study Session to the second meeting of the month. The agreement that has been clarified, I do not know that needs to be included in the motion, right around, that it is solely for the purposes of Executive Session. There is no Executive Session, then there is no Study Session, ideally starting around 3 o'clock.

MH: And I seconded it right?

JA: It was seconded by Supervisor Heinz. All those in favor? Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Opposed.?

SC: [Thumbs down]

JA: Item passes 4-1.