

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, January 6, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. **CONTRACT**

Youth Outdoor Experience, d.b.a. Ironwood Tree Experience, to provide for the Community WATER Program, Regional Flood Control District Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (PO2500038867)

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

Chair Scott stated that several of the program's goals and predicted outcomes aligned with several of the Prosperity Initiative policies and that there would be collaboration between the Regional Flood Control District and Community and Workforce Development in youth workforce programs. He asked the County Administrator if she could follow up with the Board on whether this was the kind of model that could be adopted by other departments in terms of moving some of the Propensity Initiative policies forward and if she could also follow up with Dr. Schafer as to whether or not this was a model that could be deployed in other areas.

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

2. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Clean & Beautiful, Inc., to provide for the NatureWorks Program, Regional Flood Control District Fund, contract amount \$250,000.00 (PO2500038927)

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

DRAFT

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, January 6, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance

2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Nathan Bacal, M.A., M.P.A., Executive Aide, Pima County Board of Supervisors, District 1.

3. POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passing of Dr. Calvin Baker, who was the Superintendent of the Vail School District. He read a proclamation that the Board had presented to Dr. Baker on December 3, 2019. He stated that Dr. Baker would be remembered for his contributions to the educational community and that his leadership and contributions would continue. Supervisor Christy stated that the public was welcome to attend a celebration of Dr. Baker's life at Christ Community Church on January 17th at 3:00 p.m. A moment of silence was observed in his honor.

Chair Scott appreciated that the proclamation read by Supervisor Christy used the phrases "high caliber" and "high character" in referring to Dr. Baker. He stated that he had met Dr. Baker when he was a classroom teacher, and that he always offered tremendous insight that came from a place of student well-being. He thanked Supervisor Christy for providing the opportunity to pay tribute to him.

4. PAUSE 4 PAWS

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

5. **CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Supervisor Cano introduced Arianna Martinez-Reyna, District 5's new Executive Assistant and Communications Coordinator. He stated that Ms. Martinez-Reyna's had a strong background in public-facing service, had completed a Peace Corps training experience and had a long history of engagement with the YMCA. He indicated that she was a University of Arizona graduate with a Bachelor of Science in Care, Health and Society and a Bachelor of Arts in Mexican American Studies.

Supervisor Allen acknowledged the riot that had taken place five years ago at the Capitol building in Washington D.C. She stated that Donald Trump must be held accountable and not be allowed to deflect from what actually happened that day. She stated that the FBI estimated that 2,000 to 2,500 people entered the Capitol building, and some participated in vandalism, looting, and assault on Capital Police officers. She stated that within 36 hours, 5 people died and many were injured, including 174 police officers. She also shared that it had been 15 years since January 8, 2011, when U.S. Representative Gabby Giffords and 18 others were shot during a "Congress on Your Corner" event held in Tucson. She stated that according to Johns Hopkins, guns remained the leading cause of death for children and teens, and yet there had been no significant gun control legislation. She also acknowledged that January 19, 2026, was the Dr. Martin Luther King holiday, and that there would be a celebration at Reid Park from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. She stated that would be a town hall held by Arizona Attorney General Kris Mayes on January 13th at 11:00 a.m. which would hear opinions on a TEP rate increase request. She shared District 3's upcoming office hours, which would be on January 7th at the Hub in Three Points from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., January 10th at the Plaza in Ajo from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., and January 13th at the Sahuarita Food Bank from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00p.m.

Chair Scott thanked Supervisor Allen for her moving remarks. He shared that the County would be leading a remembrance ceremony on January 8th at the Memorial behind the Historic Old Courthouse and that there would be remarks from former Congressman Rob Barber and Mayor Regina Romero.

OATH OF OFFICE

6. **Board of Supervisors Procedural Organization**

Selection of Chair and Vice Chair.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, to select Supervisor Allen as Chair for 2026.

It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Chair Scott and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, to select Supervisor Heinz as Vice Chair for 2026.

PRESENTATION

7. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of David Sanders, Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation, for 22 years of service.

Ronald Overholt, Superior Court Administrator, acknowledged David Sanders for his 50-year career in probation and his 22 years of service to Pima County.

No Board action was taken.

8. Recognition

Recognition of the retirement of Mary Ruiz, Judicial Administrative Assistant, Superior Court, for 25 years of service.

Ronald Overholt, Superior Court Administrator, acknowledged Mary Ruiz for her dedication and service for 25 years to Pima County.

No Board action was taken.

9. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Trista Di Genova addressed the Board regarding her ongoing civil actions against the County in response to a raid on her property in 2023 and the seizure of her animals. She called for the removal of Sheriff Nanos and urged the Board to take action.

Glenda Avalos spoke about the current federal administration who openly violated laws and legal processes, and that privacy needed to be protected at a local level. She stated that the County needed experienced deputies rather than Axon's technology and urged the Board to vote against Minute Item No. 29.

Dave Smith spoke in opposition to Minute Item No. 29 and that the Sheriff's Department was going on a spending spree of new technology that would not improve overall performance. He urged the Board to consider the taxpayers' resources.

Florence Johnson stated that Minute Item No. 29 was a significant increase in the Sheriff's budget, that the money would be going to another county and an increase of this amount should have been put out for a competitive bid. She stated that Tucsonans would lose jobs and be put at risk.

Sandy Wilson, on behalf of Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, presented an award to Supervisor Heinz for being a patriotic employer and contributing to national security and protecting liberty and freedom.

Robert Reus thanked Supervisors Allen and Cano for standing up to Project Blue. He stated that the community needed clean industry and low water use. He appreciated Supervisor Christy for sticking to his principles, but reiterated the need for a clean environment.

Amy Bass, representing Portable Practical Education Preparation Inc., with the Amado Youth Center, thanked the Board for standing up to peer pressure. She also thanked Supervisor Allen for her support of rural communities.

Vivek Bharathan asked the Board to vote against Minute Item No. 29, citing his concerns about how the federal government might obtain and use that data. He questioned the data retention policies and what might happen if data fell into the wrong hands.

Jennifer Stern spoke about Axon's speech-to-text services and how that technology was often not accurate. She noted the need for trained officers and translation services and urged the Board to vote no on Minute Item No. 29.

J.P. Salvatierra stated that executive sessions were essentially non-disclosure to the public. He stated that this was a time when the federal government did not have the public's best interest at heart.

* * *

Chair Scott closed Call to the Public.

10. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 12:04 p.m.

11. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 12:41 p.m. All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

12. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding an update on SB1500/A.R.S. §13-4296.

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

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

13. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 367325, Stacie Lynn Rochford, Sonoran Grove, 3233 S. Abrego Drive, Green Valley, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

PROCUREMENT

14. Hearing - Solicitation No. IFB-2500021503, OEM & Remanufactured Printer & Fax Toner Cartridges

A. Appeal of Procurement Director's Decision

Pursuant to Pima County Code 11.20.010(H), Rasix Computer Center, Inc., d.b.a. Academic Supplier, appeals the decision by the Procurement Director regarding Solicitation No. IFB-2500021503, OEM & Remanufactured Printer & Fax Toner Cartridges.

B. Award

Award: Multiple Supplier Contract No. SC2500000635, Group 1 OEM: Central Jersey Office Equipment, Inc., d.b.a. State Toner (Headquarters: Freehold, NJ) and Group 2 Remanufactured: CVR Computer Supplies, Inc. (Headquarters: Brooklyn, NY), to provide for OEM & Remanufactured Printer & Fax Toner Cartridges. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the shared annual award amount of \$350,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Information Technology.

Bruce Collins, Director, Procurement, explained that this item consisted of an invitation to bid where the award process was based on awarding to the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. He stated that the system used for this was BidNet, which would capture the name of the entity or business submitting the bid, however, they had a two-step process. He stated that they asked the company that was awarded the contract to sign the Offer Agreement. He stated that the name on the Offer Agreement was the entity that the County would do business with and may not be the name of the company that submitted the bid. He stated that in this particular case, a solicitation was issued on October 27, 2025, the system collected the information, and they had a very good outcome of nine responses. He stated that on November 25th they published a Notice of Award, which was their standard process, but it included incorrect information. He stated that it listed the name of the entity that submitted the bid, not the name of the entity that signed the agreement. He stated that as a result, they implemented departmental training to correct the process so that future issues were not anticipated. He stated that Procurement received the protest, and the appellant protested that the name of the entity that submitted the bid could not provide the services required. He stated that they were correct, however, the name of the entity that signed the Offer Agreement, which was in the instructions to the bidders, provided all of the required documentation indicating that they could provide the services and met the requirements. He stated that the protest was denied. He acknowledged the administrative error, that it has

been corrected and had correctly reposted the names of all the bidders and the entity that signed the offer agreement, which was attached to the background information. He stated that, based upon the fact that the recommended company that appeared in Item B. submitted all of the required documentation indicating they could provide the products needed, it was properly submitted, and his recommendation was to deny the appeal and move forward with the award.

Ash Shah, President, Rasix Computer Center, Inc., d.b.a. Academic Supplier, stated that one of the conditions of the Invitation for Bids was that the lowest, reliable and responsible bidder must be authorized by HP. He stated that Office Pal, the intended awardee, initially did not submit a letter of authorization from HP with the bid, or later, after multiple reminders by the Pima County Procurement Department, instead, Office Pal suggested to award Group 1 to Central Jersey Office Equipment at the same prices graded by Office Pal. He stated that this was highly irregular as both these entities were completely different, which amounted to collusion between two competitors. He stated that he provided the documents to support these statements and humbly requested that both these vendors be disqualified, and that the award for Group 1, original cartridges, be given to the next lowest bidder, which was Rasix Computer Center, Inc, a qualified vendor, that had been supplying inks and toners to Pima County for the last ten years without any incident or complaint.

Supervisor Allen asked for clarification regarding the allegation of collusion and the alleged back-and-forth communication.

Mr. Collins stated that the communication was between the Pima County Purchasing Department and the two suppliers, primarily the office supplier. He stated that since they submitted the bid, and it was for a different company, his staff contacted them for clarification as to who was actually officially bidding. He stated that they had a document from the awardee that they recommended, but because of the discrepancy, they wanted to be clear that the bidder understood that the County would be honoring the company that signed the offer agreement. He stated that for the offer agreement, all of the submittals were time and date stamped electronically when the bid was submitted. He stated that their records showed that all of the certifications required, that they were an HP distributor were submitted with the original bid in accordance to the solicitation requirements. He stated that they did not attempt to address the allegations of collusion. He stated that they had a clear respondent that followed the instructions and provided all of the documents electronically and reiterated that they were time and date stamped.

Mr. Shah explained that on the bidder certification on Item No. 16, page 14, the contractor's legal name was Office Pal, and the business also known as Central Jersey Office Equipment, which in fact was incorrect because Office Pal was a different company than the Central Jersey Office Equipment, and he submitted the legal entity ID certification with the State of New Jersey as evidence. He stated they were two different companies and not as stated in the certification, so that certification should be considered fraudulent.

Sam Shah, Director, Rasix Computer Center, Inc., d.b.a. Academic Supplier, explained that two copies of the bidder certification submitted by Office Pal existed and they were both signed and dated at exactly the same time and date stamped down to the second. He stated that they existed on the two agreements for the initial hearings for this contract which they also submitted. He stated that on the original offer certification, the contractor's legal name claimed Office Pal and the business was also known as Central Jersey Office Equipment, which they claimed that the revised awardee was doing business as but that was not the case. He stated that they were two different companies, and he believed that the signed Offer Agreement was either doctored or fraudulent because the facts did not match up to what the result of the appeal was.

Mr. Collins responded that during the point that staff communicated with the vendors because of the discrepancy in the names, additional information was submitted that was not considered. He stated that in the initial submission, it was submitted with the name of the company that the Procurement Department had recommended. He stated that he believed that they followed the instructions and had a lawful bid that could provide the services requested. He indicated that he wanted to change his recommendation and provide two options for the Board. He stated that the Board could award it to the vendor they recommended or they could consider canceling the solicitation and rebidding it, to protect the integrity of the process and Pima County, in lieu of awarding it to the lowest bidder in this particular case.

Chair Scott asked the County Administrator if she supported the Procurement Director's revised recommendation.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, concurred.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the recommendation would cause a problem with regard to the need for materials or delay things in a way that would provide difficulty for County operations.

Mr. Collins responded that they could have a stopgap measure and utilize another procurement method, a Cooperative, and acquire the items until the item was solicited and awarded.

Chair Scott asked Mr. Collins if he could restate his two recommendations.

Mr. Collins reiterated that his first recommendation was to deny the appeal and award the contract for Item B. to Central Jersey Office Equipment, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, and option two, was for the Board to direct the Procurement Director to cancel the solicitation and reissue it.

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing and direct the Procurement Director to cancel the solicitation and reissue it.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. The Board of Supervisors on October 14, 2025 and December 2, 2025 continued the following:

Addition of Study Sessions

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of the addition of study sessions to the Board of Supervisors' meeting schedule. (District 1)

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

It was moved by Chair Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to begin regular meetings on the second and fourth Tuesdays starting in May, with the second Tuesday being a Study Session from 1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., and the regular meetings starting at 5:00 p.m.

It was then moved by Supervisor Christy for there to be opportunities for Call to the Public at both Study Sessions and regular Board meetings. The motion died for lack of a second.

16. **Appointment of Board members to Boards, Committees and Commissions**

- Arizona Border Counties Coalition
- County Supervisors Association (Legislative Policy Committee)
- Pima Association of Governments and Regional Transportation Authority
- ~~Sun Corridor, Inc.~~ **The Chamber of Southern Arizona**
- Visit Tucson
- ~~Metropolitan Education Commission~~ **Southern Arizona Education Council**
- Board of Health
- Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Allen to serve as Board representative on the Arizona Border Counties Coalition.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Chair Scott to serve as Board representative on the County Supervisors Association (Legislative Policy Committee).

It was moved by Supervisor Allen, seconded by Supervisor Cano, and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, to nominate Supervisor Heinz to serve as Board representative on the Pima Association of Governments and the Regional Transportation Authority.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Chair Scott to serve as Board representative on The Chamber of Southern Arizona.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Cano to serve as Board representative on Visit Tucson.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Allen to serve as Board representative on the Southern Arizona Education Council.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Chair Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Heinz to serve as Board representative on the Board of Health.

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Supervisor Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to nominate Supervisor Cano to serve as Board representative on the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

17. The Board of Supervisors on December 16, 2025 continued the following:

Contract

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

At the request of the Pima County Attorney's Office and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of February 3, 2026.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

18. **Final Plat With Assurances**

P25FP00013, Canyon Homes, Lots 1-15 and Common Areas "A" and "B". (District 1)

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

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

19. Monthly Financial Update

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

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, provided a slide show presentation regarding the financial update for December with the actuals as of November 30th. He stated that the takeaway was that they had continued financial stability for FY25/26 based on the numbers that were in the presentation and in the memorandum that had been sent last week to the Board. He stated that the General Fund revenues continued to be projected to exceed the budget by about \$726,000.00, buoyed by state-shared sales tax increase of about \$881,000.00. He stated that when combined with the expenditures trending lower than budget, by \$6.8 million, County departments had done a good job of monitoring their spending thus far in the fiscal year. He stated that the Fund Balance was projected to increase by \$14.7 million through the actuals of November 30, 2025, and as they got into more of the fiscal year, the Board would likely see that number increase. He stated that at this point, he would recommend that the Board apply the excess Fund Balance toward the FY26/27 budget. He referred to the slide and went over the numbers that corresponded to the overview page. He stated that there were General Fund revenues of about \$726,000.00 and expenditures of \$6.8 million. He stated there was a Transfers In variance, due to lower-than-budgeted indirect cost recoveries from grants. He stated that they also had the Transfers Out that had exceeded the budget for unbudgeted operating transfers for the Clerk of the Court to finish renovations. He stated that led to their \$14.7 million increase in the Fund Balance for the forecast for December 2025. He went over the following slide which showed the breakdown of the Fund Balance reconciliation for '25/26 which included an estimate of '26/27 of \$13.9 million, different from the \$14.7 million due to the Board's approval to use \$838,000.00 for the short-term crisis funding that was allocated at their previous meeting. He stated that as they looked toward '26/27 and reverting back to 17%, that estimate was \$103.3 million. He stated that it would leave them in the positive \$2.6 million, based on the numbers through November, which was a very positive sign as they moved through the fiscal year. He stated that they had not used any contingency aside from the aforementioned Human Resources pay strategies back in July. He stated that the final slide was prudent to include because the Board asked within the last quarter of 2025 to bring forward Fund Balance policies for Regional Wastewater Reclamation, Library and Flood Control Districts. He stated that two of those policies were reviewed and approved by the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee and the Library Advisory Board and the Board had received correspondence regarding the approvals. He stated they were currently working on the development of a Flood Control policy and anticipated bringing all three before the Board's consideration sometime in February.

Supervisor Cano reiterated District 5's perspective that the prior Board action of having a short-term crisis response was step one to figure out the need in the

community. He stated that if there was another effort for it they would certainly work with County Administration to figure out if there was a pathway for that. He stated that he was encouraged by the numbers shown and that was his way of saying that much of the balance should be applied toward next year's budget, but change could happen over the next several months as federal and state uncertainty remained. He stated that legislature would be starting in just a few days and they had no idea what would come down from that front. He stated that he recognized that what was most important from the Board perspective for the County Finance team was reassurance. He stated that the Board would not go on a spending spree but there was continued need in the community, so they had to stay focused and work together.

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

20. **Quarterly Report on Collections**

Staff recommends acceptance of the Quarterly Report on Collections for the period ending September 30, 2025.

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

HEALTH

21. **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

Staff recommends acknowledgement of the MOU with Pima County Department of Justice Services for Strategy Area 2: Peer Navigation Support. This MOU is for an initial term of 1/6/26 to 1/5/27, with \$626,470.00 in funding and includes two one-year renewal options.

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

Chair Scott stated that this item funded the expansion of the transition center for potentially three years, to operate seven days a week and asked what the Board would consider after those three years, whether there were discussions about sustaining staffing, and what means would be used to evaluate the success of the expanded operations.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, responded that after the three years, staff would come back to the Board on whether this was something they wanted to continue, and that it could be funded with General Fund dollars or future grant funding opportunities. He said that for now, this funding would give time to measure success and then come to the Board with a much clearer recommendation on whether they could continue the program.

Chair Scott asked that if there was no grant funding available and the Board felt that the program should continue, was there potential that they could then get a recommendation to use General Fund dollars to continue staffing.

Mr. Holmes responded in the affirmative. He stated that they were still looking at measures related to recidivism with people committing misdemeanors. He stated that as they broadened their reach to people committing felonies, they brought in a new way of looking at some of the metrics that they were not measuring or capturing in that.

Kate Vesely, Director, Justice Services, stated that in relation to how this could be continually funded, the justice system was one of the most expensive investments for many governments. She stated that they collected far more metrics than what correlated to success because it was not yet known where the successes were happening until the data was analyzed. She stated that it was their intention and belief that the data being collected would show an improvement in expense areas, and that there would be excess savings over the three years that could be applied to ongoing operations.

Chair Scott inquired about the City of Tucson's (COT) involvement and commitment to providing additional staff and if there were further discussions about that.

Ms. Vesely responded that the COT had committed to providing additional staff, and they had been very helpful in responding to resource requests even beyond their original contributions. She stated there were active conversations about where to pull staff from and was confident the COT would honor their commitment.

Chair Scott asked if the Board could receive updates as needed, as the transition center moved towards the fulfillment of a seven days a week model.

Ms. Vesely responded in the affirmative.

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

22. **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

Staff recommends acknowledgement of the MOU with Pima County Department of Justice Services for Strategy Area 4: Law Enforcement Co-Response. This MOU is for an initial term of 1/6/26 to 1/5/27, with \$597,305.00 in funding and includes two one-year renewal options.

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

Chair Scott acknowledged the Tucson Police Department program that this item would help expand and asked what lessons could be taken from this program to help police departments in Marana, South Tucson, and the Sheriff's Department build a true regional co-responder program.

Kate Vesely, Director, Justice Services, stated that the co-responder model was not new, and that it was being used across the country with TPD's program being nationally recognized by the Department of Justice, and a learning site for others. She stated that the purpose of the regional co-responder program was to bring all the expertise already being utilized under one umbrella and extend it to more rural areas. She stated that this model would look at a collaborative response to respond to individuals at risk across all jurisdictions and bring the benefits of the TPD program to rural areas of the county like South Tucson and Marana. She stated that they would partner with community vendors to do that work and figure out how to keep on grant-funded staff.

Chair Scott stated that since Justice Services would be facilitating this broader, regional approach, he asked what that meant for the department's contact with law enforcement entities in the other jurisdictions.

Ms. Vesely responded that there was already strong relationships with those entities, and that Justice Services partnered with law enforcement and clinical care vendors to provide services that her department could not. She stated that her department functioned as an administrative coordination entity to help manage things so staff could proceed further.

Chair Scott stated that Dr. Cullen had mentioned that some of the metrics being used to evaluate some of the programs would be discussed at the Regional Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee. He asked if there would be metrics for evaluating the success of this regional co-responder program.

Ms. Vesely responded that he could not get her to stop talking about metrics if he tried.

Chair Scott asked if the Board could get regular updates as needed.

Ms. Vesely responded in the affirmative.

Chair Scott thanked Ms. Vesely and Dr. Cullen for their attendance on such short notice to answer his questions.

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

23. **Contract**

The Haven, to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$663,576.10 (PO2500036359)

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

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

24. **Contract**

Liberty Partnership Community Council, to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$246,174.50 (PO2500036724)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion and action related to this item.)

25. **Contract**

Community Partners Integrated Healthcare, Inc., to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$927,795.70 (PO2500036362)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion and action related to this item.)

26. **Contract**

Boys to Men Tucson, Inc., to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$258,409.80 (PO2500036715)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion and action related to this item.)

27. **Contract**

American Indian Association of Tucson, Inc., to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$232,777.60 (PO2500036989)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion and action related to this item.)

28. **Contract**

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc., to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$196,372.00 (PO2500036873)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 23, for discussion and action related to this item.)

PROCUREMENT

29. The Board of Supervisors on December 16, 2025, continued the following:

Contract

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

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

It was moved by Chair Scott and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to remove the item from the agenda, direct the County Administrator to look into all County contracts with Axon to determine if and how those agreements can be consolidated, and to examine whether the Data Governance Council's recommendations could be fully adopted as directives from the Board. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Heinz offered a friendly amendment to the motion, to direct staff to explore the potential for a competitive process in consolidation of the contract.

Supervisor Allen offered a friendly amendment to the motion, to direct staff on scenario planning in the case of requested information of data that should not be shared and the recourse and plan in these situations.

Chair Scott and Supervisor Heinz accepted the friendly amendments. Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

REAL PROPERTY

30. **Surplus Property**

Staff requests approval to sell surplus property consisting of approximately 2,483 square feet of vacant land, located at 1450 W. River Terrace Drive, by auction to the highest bidder. (District 3)

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

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

31. Compass Affordable Housing, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the Pima County Countywide Rapid Rehousing Program, extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, no cost (PO2400015971)

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

Procurement

32. Award

Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400001633, Amendment No. 4, 4imprint, Inc., to provide for promotional items. This amendment is for a one-time increase in the amount of \$250,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$1,750,000.00. This increase is needed to cover upcoming event costs and maintain funding until contract renewal. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Health Department.

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

Recorder

33. Regional Transportation Authority, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 1/23/26 to 6/30/26, contract amount \$1,800,000.00 revenue (CT2500000086)

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

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

34. Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development

Arizona Community Action Association, d.b.a. Wildfire, to provide a Memorandum of Understanding for the FFY26 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Community Partnerships to increase SNAP enrollment, \$122,966.51 (G-CWD-92490)

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

Supervisor Christy asked what oversight existed to ensure applicants qualified for the program. He stated it was a difficult time to try to expand the program when Washington was making safeguards a priority, and he wondered if the County should first make sure that what was done currently was being adequately safeguarded for proper applicants.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that this was for retroactive funds from last October, during the time of the government shutdown and that dollars came in when the government reopened and what was before the Board was the reimbursement of those funds.

Supervisor Christy stated that the item said to increase SNAP enrollment.

Ms. Leshar stated that was correct. She stated that during that period of time, the County had looked at how they worked with SNAP enrollment to ensure those dollars provided funding for the enhanced services.

Chair Scott asked if the County was continually ensuring that residents who qualified for SNAP were made aware that they were qualified.

Ms. Leshar responded in the affirmative.

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

35. **Acceptance - Health**

The Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for COVID-19 containment, \$48,305.71 (G-HD-100410)

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

Chair Scott stated the background materials indicated this item dealt with all respiratory illnesses and prevention of all respiratory illnesses. He asked if this was accurate.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, responded in the affirmative. She stated that these funds had been authorized through the Department of Health Services and were recently allocated to Pima County.

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

36. **Acceptance - Health**

The Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the enhanced detection, response, surveillance and prevention of COVID-19, \$400,000.00 (G-HD-100408)

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

37. **Acceptance - Health**

The Arizona Department of Health Services, to provide for the Mitigating the Impact of COVID-19 in Communities of Color (MC3), \$55,719.23 (G-HD-100409)

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

38. **Acceptance - Health**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Pima County - SPRING Initiative for an Equitable and Healthy Community and amend grant language, \$1,076,426.00 (GA-HD-66118)

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

39. **Dates and Times for Board of Supervisors Meetings**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Discussion of the time and days of regular Board of Supervisors meetings, along with Study Sessions. Directing Administration and the Clerk of the Board to make arrangements for staff in light of discussion. (District 3)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 15, for discussion and action related to this item.)

CONSENT CALENDAR

40. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

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

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Detainee and Crisis Systems

1. LeCroy and Milligan Associates, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Opioid Abatement Funding - Coordinated Reentry Planning Services Programs, extend contract term to 6/30/26, amend contractual language and scope of services, Attorney General State of Arizona Opioid Abatement Grant Fund, contract amount \$31,404.00 (PO2400000758)

Information Technology

2. Dakota Internet Partners, Inc., to provide for a Tower and Rooftop License Agreement for Wireless Communications Facilities located at 6950 S. Beehive Avenue, contract amount \$84,797.52 revenue/5 year term (CT2500000085)

Office of Emergency Management

3. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Amendment No. 1, to provide a Communications Use Lease for Ground Air Transmit Receive (GATR) Communications Site and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400002242)

Procurement

4. **Award**
Amendment of Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2400002406, Amendment No. 1, KONE, Inc., to provide for elevator maintenance and repair. This amendment increases the annual award amount by \$120,000.00 from \$350,000.00 to \$470,000.00 for a cumulative not-to-exceed contract amount of \$470,000.00. County has experienced more elevator repairs than previously anticipated, as well as increased costs relating to increased inventory of elevators maintained on this contract. Funding Source: General Fund. Administering Department: Facilities Management.

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

5. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
Tucson Electric Power Company (TEP), Amendment No. 4, to provide for the TEP Low Income Weatherization Program services, extend grant term to 12/31/26 and amend grant language, \$150,000.00 (GA-CWD-65929)
6. **Acceptance - County Attorney**
The State of Arizona, Governor's Office of Youth, Faith, and Family, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the Arizona STOP (Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Grant, amend grant language and scope of work, \$147,196.27/\$49,116.00 General Fund match (GA-PCA-70382)
7. **Acceptance - Office of Emergency Management**
Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management, to provide for the HB 2001 Pima County Damage Assessment Team Kits for Emergency Response and Recovery, \$146,450.00/3 year term (G-OEM-101385)
8. **Acceptance - Pima Animal Care Center**
Animal Legal Defense Fund, to provide for the Collaborative Response Project for support of thorough investigations, veterinary forensics and treatment related to animal cruelty investigations, \$59,000.00 (G-PAC-102075)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

9. **Public Safety Personnel Retirement Board**
Election of Detective Mark Martinez, to replace Sergeant Hans Goritz. Term expiration: 12/31/29. (Board recommendation)
10. **State Board of Equalization**
Appointment of Jeffrey Teplitsky, to replace George Garcia. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (District 1)
11. **Election Integrity Commission**
Reappointment of Tiana Smith. Term expiration: 12/18/27. (County Administrator recommendation)

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

12. **Special Event**
 - Stephen Paul Kindred, Green Valley Recreation, Inc., Green Valley Recreation West Social Center, 1111 S. GVR Drive, Green Valley, January 20, 24, February 3 and 8, 2026.
 - Edward Lucero, Roman Catholic Church of St. Elizabeth Ann Seton - Tucson, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church - Parish Hall, 8650 N. Shannon Road, Tucson, January 24, 2026.
 - Fred Narcaroti, Oro Valley Sports Alliance, Inc., Catalina State Park, 11570 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, February 21, 2026.

ELECTIONS

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

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Ronald Feinsod-061-DEM, Edgar Soto-092-DEM, John Chernoski-084-REP, Frederick Bledsoe-096-REP, Thomas Rogers, Jr.-211-REP, Patricia Rogers-211-REP, Parralee Schneider-243-REP.

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Henry Aldrete-021-DEM, Matthew Leve-025-DEM, Stephanie Miller-034-DEM, Ravi Shah-096-DEM, Edgar Soto-104-DEM, Claire Knipe-107-DEM, Martha Thompson-161-DEM, David Daniels-207-DEM, Paul Donaldson-207-DEM, Anakarina Rodriguez-235-DEM, Sarah Price-084-REP, Tammy Thornton-231-REP, Terra Patient-262-REP.

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

- 14. Minutes: October 21, 2025
- Warrants: December, 2025

* * *

41. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

CHAIR

ATTEST:

CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

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

Addition of Study Sessions

Discussion/Direction/Action: Consideration of the addition of study sessions to the Board of Supervisors' meeting schedule. (District 1)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney
ART: Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management

RS: We are still sitting as the Board of Supervisors. We are taking up Item No. 17, which is "Unfinished Business, Addition of Study Sessions," and consistent with the request that Supervisor Allen made to the Clerk prior to the meeting, we are also going to take up her Addendum item, which is "Dates and Times for Board of Supervisors Meetings." I think just to give you the opportunity to explain why this was an Addendum item, I am going to turn it first over to Supervisor Allen.

JA: Thank you, Chair Scott. We added the Addendum item to ensure that we could have the discussion and decision about the two interrelated components, one being the addition of study sessions, but also the implications that that could have around our regular meetings, so that we could talk about them together because they are indeed inextricably linked.

RS: I appreciated that not only for the reasons that you stated, but I know that Ms. Leshar, in her December 30th memo to the Board on the topic of study sessions, addressed the need for an item just like the one you put on the Addendum. So let us open it up to discussion, concerns from Board members. I will say if you go to Ms. Leshar's memo, I think she did a thorough and detailed job of laying out the questions that we need to consider. Go ahead, Ms. Leshar.

JL: Chair Scott, I was going to point out the memo is actually from me and the Clerk of the Board.

RS: My apologies.

JL: Jointly.

RS: Sorry, Ms. Manriquez, not used to getting memos from you, but Ms. Lesher gives us a lot.

JL: Thank you.

AC: On Fridays, Chair Scott.

[Laughter erupts]

RS: If it is okay with the Board, unless there is anyone who has any introductory comments, we could go through these questions if that strikes you as a good way to proceed. Go ahead, Supervisor Allen.

JA: I would love to do that. I just want to toss out overarching goals, at least for me, that are guiding this discussion are that we can, as a public body, ensure that the public can effectively engage and creating more opportunities for the public to be present at our meetings becomes then really important for getting that sort of feedback. Then also ensuring that we have spaces to really dig in on some of the complex issues that come to us. There is a lot of reports and substantive data that we get from staff, and oftentimes this venue is a difficult one for us to have discussions. You know, being in a line is not really the most discussion-oriented format. I think the combination of study sessions and also thinking through how to ensure that the public can really engage around our decision making, be present for it, the overarching principles underlying my perspective on these matters.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy.

SC: We are addressing both the study sessions and a change of scheduling of the Board of Supervisors meeting at the same time?

RS: Yes.

SC: Well, I will not address at this point the study sessions, and I am keeping an open mind on all of the components of both the Board of Supervisors meeting and the study sessions, but I do want my colleagues to consider some things. Just as consideration. I am not using it as any kind of a wedge or a bulldozer to try to push an idea on, but just merely in this process that we consider them. The first consideration that I think is essential is a definitive accounting of the costs involved. I know there has been some kind of cocktail napkin. I do not mean to degrade it like that, but just some off the top of our head discussions of the costs between extra staff time, parking, security. I know there is a number of other items too that are involved in the cost. So, I am asking my colleagues to consider that. Secondly, there

has been a custom established as far as the schedule of the Board of Supervisors meeting. I think it is fair to say that it is those who care about coming before the Board, or having business before the Board, or attending the meetings, speaking to call the public. I think it is well established that the public knows that, as has been the custom and has been the scheduling for many, many years now, I would have to say probably always, that the Board of Supervisors meetings have always been the first and third Tuesday of the month at 9:00 a.m. Now, if we are going to massage that or reschedule that whole thing, that is going to take a learning curve by the public to become aware of that, as well as for it to be publicized and as well as for the general public to know about it. I am worried that people will still show up as they do, if they have business before the Board, as they always have, to come to the Board, the first and third at 9:00 in the month, and they could potentially come here and there would be no meeting, so that I would ask that be considered as well. The third item for consideration, merely consideration again, is since the pandemic, we have remote participation, and that is always available to the public, not only for participation in a phone in, but to view the proceedings on YouTube or the County channel that provides it. We did not have that prior to the pandemic. We have that now, and it has been utilized quite often, as well as remote participation. So those three considerations, the cost, the custom that has been established for the schedule, and the remote participation, I think should be looked into as we proceed with these discussions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Any other initial comments from Board members before we move into the questions outlined in the County Administrator's memorandum?

[no responses]

RS: So the first question, they are broken up into three categories, "Study Sessions, Time of Day of Regular Meetings and Study Sessions, and Meeting Day of the Week." The first question, 1., A., "Should Study Sessions be held once a month?" Supervisor Allen?

JA: Yes.

RS: Okay, and I concur. Any other comment on that first question?

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Supervisor Christy?

SC: I have no problem with a monthly study session. I think the time of it is going to be a deciding factor. And also, can it be determined if it is scheduled that as we proceed to that date of the study session, at some point, there might be evidence that we do not need to have a study session, that it can be retracted? Also, what would the parameters be? Is there going to be a quorum required or who is going to attend? I think it should be strictly to the supervisors. No staff should be in a proxy situation in those study sessions. If the Board wants to have one per month, I would certainly

be open to that, as long as there is flexibility in the timing, as well as the hours. I would think that a study session would be most effective during the working day. That would be my preference, if we go the once-a-month study session.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. And Mr. Brown, just to affirm this, study session is a meeting of the Board, so it would require a quorum of members to go forward?

SB: A quorum is, Chair Scott, generally required to take action. If the study session were simply to discuss and share information, if there were not a quorum, I believe the study session could still continue because there would be no action taken.

RS: But to Supervisor Christy's other point, it would not be appropriate, unless they were called upon by a member, for staff to participate in a proxy role.

SB: I think that is correct. I think it is at the discretion of the Board to set those types of guidelines.

RS: Thank you for raising those issues, Supervisor Christy, and thank you for responding to them, Mr. Brown. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. Can we clarify that point with counsel? What does that mean? Perhaps it is a question for my colleague from District 4. What are you wanting to ensure that staff not act as a proxy for? Which staff in particular?

SC: For instance, if you had something that was conflicting with the study session and you were unable to attend. I do not think it would be appropriate for someone of your staff, I do not know who, to fill in your place and act as you being a Supervisor.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Christy. I share that same sentiment, but to be clear, County Administration or department staff can participate in that meeting? My interpretation of a study session is, this same exact format here with staff on the other side, and we are engaged in an informational conversation, presentations, requiring no action is able to continue. So, I just wanted to clarify which staff we were talking about. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Please, go ahead.

AC: On the question of am I supportive of a study session once per month? Yes, and I would like it to be on the same day of an existing Board of Supervisors meeting. I would prefer for it to be... probably no later than a start time of 2:00 p.m. or 3:00 p.m.

RS: So, you are artfully moving us into the second question, which is “Should study sessions be held immediately preceding one of the two regular meetings?” And your preference is that that be the case?

AC: [Nods head, yes]

SC: [Inaudible]

RS: No, I think what he is saying is that, correct me if I am wrong Supervisor Cano. I think what you are saying, is that we would have study sessions preceding a regular meeting, and you are also, by implication, proposing that that regular meeting occur sometime after the study session, late afternoon or early evening?

AC: Yes.

RS: Okay. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: So, in answer to the first question, yes, once monthly study session, and I was going to add an echo, the sentiments from District 5 that preferably not a third meeting out of the month, but something that aligns with existing meetings. And I also favor an evening start time of 5:00 p.m., so a 2:00 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. start for study session would make sense.

RS: Could you repeat those times, sir? I am sorry, I did not catch that.

MH: Sorry. If we do Board meetings in the evenings, a 5 :00 p.m. start, and then a 2:00 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. study session start, whenever we have that monthly.

RS: Supervisor Cano and Supervisor Heinz moved us into the second question, which was appropriate because I think there is a consensus that having study sessions once a month is a good thing. They are both expressing the desire that study sessions be held immediately preceding one of the two regular meetings, and that we would then move one of our two regular meetings to a late afternoon, early evening, start time. Any comments on that? Supervisor Christy?

SC: The late afternoon, early evening, start time, we have had meetings that go 7, 8, 9, 15, 25 hours. If you start at that time, at 5:30 p.m., what is the end time?

RS: Well, I do not believe there would be a designated end time.

SC: That is my problem and that is why my suggestion is, that we maintain the schedule of the regular Board of Supervisors meeting at it is customary time, and then schedule a study session over and above, and in addition to, the two normal Board meetings. What time would be appropriate? Any time that we could start in an expeditious manner, 9:00 a.m., 10:00 a.m. in the morning, or 2:00 p.m. or 3:00 p.m. in the afternoon, but certainly be done well before 5:00 p.m. or 6:00 p.m.?

RS: Well, let me offer something, and I have actually shared this with the County Administrator when she was following up with individual Board offices as to how we might proceed. I agree that if we have once a month study sessions that they should precede a regular meeting, which would then mean that we would have one of our regular meetings have a late afternoon, or early evening start time, that would allow people who find it difficult to come to a Board meeting during the regular work day to be able to do so. However, I also think that there are members of our community who would find it difficult to make it to a late afternoon, or early evening Board meeting. I think a lot of members of who we saw from, for example, the Catalina Foothills Association and Tucson Mountain Association, I would bet some of those members are more comfortable with the traditional Board start time. So what I was thinking, and what I proposed to the County Administrator when she was polling us as individuals, is that the non-study sessions meeting day continue to be at 9:00 a.m., and that way we would have a one regular meeting that started at the regular time, but we would have another regular meeting that started in the late afternoon or early evening. That would give all members of our community the opportunity to attend Board meetings at times that fit with their own personal schedules. I wondered what my colleagues thought about that. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I think, as a student of human behavior in medicine, patterns are important. And to my colleague from District 4, I agree whatever changes happen, it is going to be months before that gets ingrained in the community with the media who cover us, all that. I think if we are bouncing back and forth between like a 5:00 p.m. meeting and a 9:00 a.m. meeting in the same month, that is going to create some chaos and make it a little bit harder to adjust to whatever our changes are. So, I would favor that whatever we do, we keep it the same time, at least for the first few months, to see how things are working and not go back and forth, because that will cause some people some serious issues, and again, the pattern of 9:00 a.m. has existed for decades, I get that, but if we are going to start a pattern of aligning more with or mimicking what the City of Tucson does, we are talking about a similar situation of an evening meeting, afternoon study session. I think it is important to stick with that to then get that new pattern established. Otherwise, it gets to be really complicated.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. To complicate things, I do not want a Tuesday night meeting the same time that our colleagues across the bridge are meeting. And I feel as though a Wednesday is bad, so I would prefer Monday if we are going to look at another day. I want to throw that out. The more I have been thinking about this, Administrator Leshner, can you remind me, since I am the newest member of the Board, what is our planned budget hearing process for the spring? How many budget hearings do we have and can we try something in the spring with that budget hearing process of maybe, perhaps doing those in the evening and seeing how it works? If it is a bit of a compromise to see what that participation can look like and see what that cadence is like. Because right now, those happen at the regularly scheduled meetings, they are presentations. It is study session-like, right? What do we have planned right now. I see our Director of Finance is also here.

- JL: Thank you, Chair Scott and Supervisor Cano. Yes, Mr. Cuaron is here. We have not fully fleshed out what all that will look like. As you know, the Clerk has been polling the Board to see when we might be able to get together and have a retreat with the Board and look at all of the issues related to the budget, including when those public hearings might be held. Mr. Cuaron, I think we have got some dates in May that we have tucked in, or March?
- ART: Administrator Lesher, Chair Scott, Supervisor. Happy New Year, thanks for having me here. The two dates that we have on the calendar right now that are known, budget presentations are February 17th, that is the strategic plan overview. And then March 17th, that is the presentation of our CIP. Our recommended budget is due to be sent out to the Board of Supervisors on April 17th. May 19th is the tentative budget adoption as of today, with final adoption in June. With the adoption of the tax levy then coming August 17, 2026. So that is the current schedule, notwithstanding any additional meetings requested by either the Administrator or the Board of Supervisors.
- RS: Thank you, Mr. Cuaron. Any follow-up to that, Supervisor Cano?
- AC: [Nods head, no]
- RS: Supervisor Heinz?
- MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. I think hearing what we are hearing, and I agree with not doing something in parallel with the City of Tucson because we have a problem with media coverage. Literally, we both use the same channel to broadcast this for people who want to watch it in that manner. I do not know how that would work so I think that makes a lot of sense. We could avoid that by moving to a Wednesday. But if my colleagues want to stick with the Tuesday, we could simply do the second and fourth weeks of the month and start that in February, because that gives 5:00 p.m. meetings. Whichever meeting of the month, we add a two-hour study session to before one of those, start it the second week of February to give the Clerk's office and everyone time to adjust. I think that would be a reasonable place to start this.
- RS: Supervisor Allen?
- JA: I also think that I like Tuesdays. I just do not like the conflict with the City of Tucson, the Town of Marana, TUSD, South Tucson. We all meet at the same time. Shifting to that other pattern of the second and fourth, I think is a great way to work around that and keep us on the Tuesdays because those are sort of a sweet spot during the week. On this question of time of day, I also agree that it would be confusing. I do get that there is a lot of people that do not like to drive as soon as it gets dark. I also think that if we move both meetings to the evening, I think that consistency is going to be helpful for people, and I think it will be confusing to have meetings that start one in the morning, one in the evening. I think to Supervisor Christy's comment about the length of time of our meetings, I know for me that as my bedtime starts to get closer and closer that we will speed up our meetings.

SC: Why do we not do that now?

JA: Well, I think the creation of the study session actually pulls quite a few items off of our regular agenda and puts them into a different space so that the meeting agenda for the regular meeting then becomes much more focused on the decision-making items, as opposed to the discussion items which move to the study session. So, my hope is that that gets us through the agenda quicker.

RS: Supervisor Cano?

AC: So, I am going to make a suggestion that we start...did you say the second, Supervisor Heinz? Second and fourth?

MH: [Nods head, yes] Second and fourth.

AC: Second and fourth weeks beginning in May. I am not comfortable going any sooner than that. There is going to be a lot of time for adjustments that are going to be needed. And so, second and fourth Tuesdays in May, study sessions would start at 1:00 p.m. with a 5:00 p.m. start time of our regular meeting. I believe that would allow us to have the Call to the Public section. A good hour, hour and a half, people would get here. Allow us to have that time frame to get started around 6:00-6:30 for the items considerations. I personally want to be done with these meetings no later than 7:30-8:00 and I am stating that goal right now. I feel that delayed implementation is really important. I recognize the desire to do it sooner, but we have got to do this right, and this is a big change. I do think we need to reconsider—revisit this, I should say, at the end of the year to see if it has worked and recognize that the Clerk should also, as part of the budgetary process, be working with the Administrator to, in the budgetary process, not hold back on the additional requests and resources needed to implement the changes that the Board is asking. These meetings function only with the support of the staff and our Clerk's office, and I want us to ensure that the public is supported. They will be through the Clerk's office. I do not want the public to be charged for parking when they are coming here. I want some form of validation to be offered and if they are in our El Presidio parking garage, I want our garage to be open and I want security there. Somehow, we are going to have to figure that out in form of a motion. That is my recommendation.

RS: So, what you are proposing, Supervisor, is that we move to at the beginning of May, move to meeting the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month, with one of those meetings being Study Sessions that begin at 1:00 p.m., and regular sessions that begin at 5:00 p.m. And all regular sessions beginning in May, not just the study session day, but the non-Study Session day the meeting would begin at 5:00 p.m. Alright, let us discuss that because I am seeing some nods from other supervisors with regard to Supervisor Cano's suggestion. Supervisor Christy?

SC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I still would like to have some kind of analysis from the Clerk as to what it would cost as far as overtime or keeping staffing on in the evening, and security and parking and all of those cost issues. And is it really going to be cost effective to do this, or is it going to be quite a bit of expense that may not guarantee

the outcome that everybody is trying to obtain? I think it is essential that we do talk with staff about it. They put in long hours, and they would have to be here whenever we have these meetings, but it would be essential that we have a cost accounting on it.

RS: To Supervisor Christy's question, other than the information that was in the memo to the Board from the Clerk and the County Administrator, anything that you can respond to now, or do you need some additional time to get into what he is asking about?

JL: Chair Scott and Members of the Board. At the last meeting or when this was discussed, there was a question about the cost. I polled those departments with which we work the most for this, Facilities Management, Communications, Information Technology, our Security Manager, and the cost that we have put in here regarding additional about \$300.00 per meeting, was about maybe \$200.00 per meeting for security, would be the impact we believe in parking and security. The other positions we have discussed will simply be a scheduling matter that as we have, I believe all five incorporated jurisdictions also meet in the evening. We have been chatting to see how that works, about how the scheduling would be so that people come later in the day on the days of Board meetings. So that is the only—what we have seen has been identified in this memo. I think the greater challenge will be to the Clerk of the Board, and I appreciate, waiting until May allows some time to add additional staff to come back and see what we might need to do with the budget to provide the additional personnel, because while many of the other positions we work with might be salaried, they are not necessarily in the Clerk's office. I believe in a memorandum of December 1st, the Clerk did provide some additional costs, but you may have additional information. I think you have delineated what the cost might be in that memo, but the greater challenge will be in her office.

RS: Ms. Manriquez, anything you wanted to add with regard to Supervisor Christy's inquiries?

MM: Chair Scott, Board members. If our office does have to hire additional staff, there may be additional costs to reconfigure our office space to include that additional staff. Without knowing...right now it is still an unknown if there is going to be changes and if we are going to need additional staff. And also too, our office, right now are open Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Will we be required to stay open 8:00 a.m. to whatever time the meetings end in the evening? Because then that would add additional costs.

RS: So, your question is not just in terms of staffing of the meetings, but whether there would be an additional requirement that the Clerk's office itself be open?

MM: Yes.

RS: Okay, alright. Supervisor Christy, any follow-up to the input from the Clerk and the County Administrator?

SC: No.

RS: Okay. Any other comments from Board members? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Chair Scott, I think, given that most other jurisdictions already have this type of format in terms of their meetings, I know that we can do this. I think the most cost-effective thing, even if it does take a little bit more money, is to be as available as possible to the people that we work for. So, I think it is important that we do this. I also think May seems like a little bit long. Maybe February is too short, but maybe we could split the baby there and do April or something. But I wanted to ask Administrator Leshner and also Clerk Manriquez what they think about the timeline, because I would like to get it, if you agree with this, I would like to have it happen as soon as possible.

RS: To that question, if you are able to respond to it, what would be the earliest that both the County Administrator and the Clerk think that we could move to this new calendar? I know that we would have to, perhaps as soon as the next meeting this month, consider a new schedule of meetings, because we have already adopted the schedule for 2026. What would be the earliest date that you all think we could get this underway? Supervisor Cano had proposed May. Supervisor Heinz is asking if we could do it a month before that.

JL: Chair Scott and Members of the Board. I think the longer runway that allows us to let the public know that the meeting time has changed and things like that will be helpful. Getting a little runway so that we can work with staff is fine. Once again, the challenge is going to be in the Clerk's office, in that moving to the new schedule may require additional staff, and there is a period of time by which she will be—no, you can speak for yourself—but adding Human Resources (HR), adding personnel takes a little bit of time getting through. The need to survive HR, I believe I heard earlier...

RS: I really set the tone for that.

JL: Yeah, but that that would be the piece, is just any runway. What we have been chatting about is should the Board move to an evening schedule, how we can detail other personnel to be helpful through that. May does provide us some time, you know, to really make sure we are ramped up appropriately. How long would we need?

MM: Chair Scott, Board members. Just so everybody is aware, we currently have a vacancy in our office that we have had difficulty filling and it has been at least going on two months now, that we have had difficulty filling, that would do support for Board meetings. So just so you are aware of that, we do have difficulty filling the positions and keeping people in our office.

RS: Okay. Any follow-up from Board members on that input? Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I would just say, in terms of whatever the Clerk's office needs to make this happen, I favor doing. And so, if you need to offer bonuses or incentivize in other ways or be very creative with timing. Obviously not everybody is salaried, but certainly on these particular days when the meetings are late, people do not have to be there at 7:30 a.m. in the morning. They can come in at 1:00 p.m. or 2:00 p.m. and so I think just liberality all around in terms of whatever you need for your office, you know, we will sign the check, that kind of thing, with the permission of the majority of the Board, of course. But I think whatever the Clerk's office needs, I am willing to listen to and provide.

RS: To that point, Ms. Leshner. I know that you and the Deputy County Administrators work on addressing hard-to-fill positions. Is this the kind of situation where that might lend itself to those structures that you already have in place for hard-to-fill positions?

JL: Chair Scott, we would be happy to meet and work with the Clerk to look at those positions and see what salary adjustments might be needed to facilitate the hiring of those positions.

RS: Okay. I am going to tentatively suggest, based on the need for further investigation by both the Clerk and the County Administrator, that we proceed as Supervisor Cano has proposed, but with the hope that maybe we can do it sooner, as Supervisor Heinz has proposed, depending on how we are able to move forward with those staffing and other challenges.

MH: [inaudible]

RS: It would be, yes.

MH: I will second that.

RS: All right.

MH: We should probably restate it for the Clerk.

RS: Well the motion is, that we would begin meeting on the second and fourth Tuesday of the month starting in May, and that our meetings would shift to begin at 5:00 p.m. starting in that month. Which of those two Tuesdays would be best for Study Sessions? My own belief is it would be the second as opposed to the fourth.

[Supervisors Cano, Heinz, and Allen nod head, yes]

RS: Did you get that, Ms. Manriquez?

[No audible or visible response received]

SC: But?

RS: Go ahead.

SC: Is there not a caveat there, depending upon the cost analysis?

RS: There is.

SC: And that that may not happen.

RS: That is why I said that is what I would tentatively propose. That is what I would tentatively propose.

SC: With that caveat?

RS: Indeed, because if they were to come back to us and say, for whatever reason, this is difficult to move forward with, then we could...

SC: Reconsider?

RS: We could reconsider. Anyone in the majority could move to reconsider.

SC: Does Supervisor Heinz still second that?

MH: I think we should change it [inaudible].

RS: What I am saying is that we should direct the Administrator and the Clerk to move forward with that goal in mind, with the hope that we could do it sooner. But to Supervisor Christy's point, if they were to come back and say, "This is not doable," then I think what they would be telling us is what Supervisor Cano was saying he wanted to consider at the end of the year anyway, which is, was this not just achievable, but did it meet the ends that the Board had? Go ahead, Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Chair Scott, and I guess to Administrator Leshner, is this doable in May?

JL: Chair Scott, I believe it is.

MH: In that case, I would like the motion not to be tentative. Let us just move it and then vote on it and if we need to make some changes going forward, we put it on another agenda.

RS: I am very comfortable with that, Supervisor, yes. Alright, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Under study sessions...

MM: Chair Scott?

RS: Oh, go ahead, Ms. Manriquez.

MM: Just for clarification, can you please repeat who made the motion, who seconded and repeat the motion so I can...?

RS: I made the motion, Supervisor Heinz seconded it. It was to move forward with the goal of beginning regular meetings on the second and fourth Tuesdays, starting in May, with the second Tuesday being a study session day that would start at 1:00 p.m., correct? And then the regular session would start at 5:00 p.m. The fourth Tuesday would be regular session, also starting at 5:00 p.m.

MM: And then Chair Scott, so for the second meeting, the study session starting at 1:00 p.m., will there be an end time?

MH: 4:00 p.m., 5:00 p.m. [inaudible]

[inaudible discussion from members]

SC: No no, for the regular sessions, right? We just determined that...

MM: You are starting the regular session at 5:00 p.m., so are we going to do study session from 1:00 p.m.- 4:30 p.m., 1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.? To give staff time to...because we would need time to change out the meeting schedule, you know, do a little bit of.

AC: 4:30 p.m.

MM: Okay, thank you.

SC: Mr. Chair, is there some kind of affirmation that we will not be here until midnight?

RS: Well, I think it is Supervisor Allen's bedtime. She is going to hold us all.

JA: I know. The alarm will go off saying that I need to go to bed.

SC: I could just see us going on and on and on.

JA: No.

RS: As somebody who worked in TUSD, and I do not want to give Mr. Brown PTSD from his TUSD time. I have those concerns myself, but I think Supervisor Allen made a

very important point. And it is touched on all the memoranda that we have gotten, which is that a lot of the things that take up time during regular sessions are now going to be moved to Study Sessions.

MH: I would just add, Chair, our human circadian will help with this because there will be meetings in the winter where we will start the meeting and it will be dark already or close, so we are not going to want to hang out for seven hours and talk, I hope.

SC: I would just like to see how it is cut off.

AC: Well, and I am going to be a devil's advocate, part of this change is going to be that we may confront difficult moments where this room is going to be packed the way we have seen over the last year. I am not going to limit public comment. I am not going to cut off public debate. Part of making this accessible is sitting here doing our due diligence and listening. So, I mean, I do not know, Supervisor Christy, I do not want to be here at 10:00 p.m. either but if our work requires that, that is what is expected of us.

SC: I agree with you. I have no problem listening to the public talk and Call to the Public, but I do have a problem with is how my colleagues go on and on and on and on.

MH: Okay.

RS: Well, thank goodness you are always so concise. Alright, so that was the motion. Any further clarification, Ms. Manriquez?

MM: So it is safe to say study sessions from 1:00 p.m.- 4:30 p.m. Obviously the Board can, if they finish sooner.

RS: Right.

MM: The meeting is done sooner. Then with the regular meeting starting at 5:00 p.m., okay?

RS: Yes.

MM: And then location? Are Study Sessions are going to be held in this room as well?

RS: That was something that Supervisor Allen alluded to in terms of having a discussion. I think they could be held in this room if there was some furniture that that was brought in that would lend itself to that kind of dialog that you are talking about. Let us discuss that.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Go ahead.

SC: Let us throw in another caveat. In the evening meetings of the regular Board meetings that there be no executive session.

RS: Well, oftentimes executive sessions are...

SC: Very lengthy.

RS: ...requested by the County Attorney's office for the statutory reasons that we have them. So, I do not think Mr. Brown is going to agree to that.

SB: Chair Scott. I just wanted to mention that we can work executive sessions before 5:00 p.m. Potentially schedule them at 4:00 p.m. so when we get to the rest of the meeting, it is not interfering with the time that we have the public there.

SC: Oh, that means we will be done with executive session by 10:00 p.m.

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Last, this is a little whimsical, but I am curious from the Attorney's perspective, do we lose quorum if more than two members of the Board are asleep?

[laughter erupts]

MH: Probably, right?

[No audible or visible response received from counsel]

MH: Okay.

AC: Chair Scott?

RS: Yes, sir?

AC: I do believe we can do executive session as part of that study session period. Jurisdictional partners do that and I do not see why we cannot use this room. If we want to do the retreat-style room that we did in the courthouse and ensure that the public can still have some seating and have that layout, that is not a horrible option. I just think it poses another logistical challenge, since it is difficult, you know, it is two different spaces, and it puts more burden...and brings up a point too, for our administration of what do we want this room to be, as we masterplan this building and how do we want to have it be multi-purpose as well? That is just my feedback.

RS: I appreciate that. Supervisor Allen?

JA: We could also pull some bar stools up around this. That will get us in a much more familiar tone. I do think that Supervisor Cano's comment around thinking long-term about as this building gets renovated and worked on. Thinking about long-term, the appropriate format. I also would ask the Administrator in working with IT, the Clerk's

office and others, that if the Copper room, for example, is a viable option, then to just explore what some options might be so that Study Sessions actually have us sitting around the table, as opposed to sitting in a very subtle arc.

RS: So we passed that motion, and it seems to me that that motion addressed, if you go to the Administrator's memo, her questions 1., A. and 1., B., but also her questions 2., A., 2. B., and 3., A., seems to me the only questions we have not addressed are 1., C. and 1., D., which is, "Can any member of the Board of Supervisors or the County Administrator request specific items be put on the Study Session agenda?" I would say yes.

JA: I would agree.

RS: Okay. Anybody disagree with that?

[No audio or visible response received]

RS: Okay, and then, "Should Study Sessions be open to the public and allow for public comments?" In other words, should there be a time for Call to the Public during Study Sessions as well as during regular meetings? What is the sense of the Board on that?

SC: I am just throwing this out, Mr. Chair, maybe the more opportunities for the public to speak, either at a Study Session or a Board of Supervisors session, will give adequate time in both venues and it may cut down a whole bunch of people at one where you could spread them out over two if they so desire.

RS: So, what you are saying Supervisor, is that we would...the Board has adopted rules for Call to the Public. It is an hour, three minutes per speaker, but if there are 20 or more speakers, then it goes down to two minutes per speaker, and we can extend that beyond the hour which we have historically done. So, what you are saying is, if we allowed that during Study Sessions and regular meetings, that would not only afford a lot of opportunity for public comment, but might make sure that there is not a ton of it in any one meeting?

SC: Agreed.

RS: Okay. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I would just say that I do not know if there is the same need because we are not taking any formal action in the Study Session, and because a Board meeting with a formal hour plus long Call to the Public is about to happen at 5:00 p.m. or 5:30 p.m. or whenever that falls. I do not think there is the same need to do it at a Study Session that there would be as a place where we are taking action. And if there is an item in the Study Session that someone wants to talk about, they can do it before we can take any action on it anyway at one of the Board meetings.

RS: Thank you for that. Any other input on that question about having a Call to the Public option during Study Sessions?

SC: Do we need a form of a motion?

RS: Go ahead, Supervisor Heinz, if you wanted to make a motion.

SC: Well, no, I was going to make a motion.

RS: Oh, you were going to, I am sorry. Go ahead.

SC: That there be opportunities for Call to the Public at both Study Session and a regular Board meeting.

RS: Is there a second to that?

MH: Could we have staff have more discussion about this and then figure this out later?

RS: Yes.

MH: Or we can figure it out today, but I am not comfortable moving that now.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Perhaps we could look into what our other jurisdictional partners are doing. I do not know. I think not only does the City of Tucson have Study Sessions, but I think the towns do as well. Maybe some of the school boards, Pima Community College, I am not sure. Maybe finding out if they are building Call to the Public into those study sessions. Do you know from your time with the city, Supervisor Cano, do they have Call to the Public during Study Sessions?

AC: [nods head, no]

RS: They do not. So, is the Board comfortable with having staff look into how that is handled around the region and then readdressing it?

SC: Mr. Chair, with that item in mind. I think the thrust of the discussion that I was hearing about the need to have these new meeting schedules and evening meetings was to allow more participation with the public and giving them the opportunity to address the Board. I think the more opportunities for the public to do that, the better. If we have a Study Session with public comment and Board of Supervisors with public comment following that, we really achieved that interaction with the public.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Supervisor Cano?

AC: Chair Scott, I do not disagree with you. I do want us to have staff explore the inquiry about what other jurisdictions do. We are going to run into, when we open that Pandora's box of individuals speaking at one or both, if we have 100 people, and they want to speak at both the Call to the Public in the afternoon and the Call the

Public in the evening, we are going to have to make that determination. I do not disagree with you, but somebody is going to get upset in that process. I feel like if there is precedent of one, the Study Session for me is an opportunity for us to provide guidance to staff on internal issues, get the preparation going that we need to advance policy and then be prepared for the policy discussions in the evening that should be vetted at that point to be able to move things faster. So, I hear you and if there are other jurisdictions that have that both, certainly willing to support your motion at another time.

MH: Chair Scott?

RS: Supervisor Heinz?

MH: I also think the public is not shy. I think that they will let us know what their opinion is of this. If they feel that we are following the model of the City of Tucson having this Study Session be dedicated to deep dives into things and presentations and internal discussions like my colleague from District 5 just stated, if that is a pattern, if they do not want that, we will hear that from them because we are not doing this until May. So, we do not have to do this today.

RS: Okay. Any other comments on both Agenda Item No. 17 and the Addendum item from Supervisor Allen? Alright, well I think we had the motion and there is some clear understanding of how to proceed. Thank you to my colleagues for this wide-ranging discussion. And Supervisor Allen, thank you for making it even more wide-ranging by adding your Addendum item.

23. **Contract**

The Haven, to provide for Substance Use Prevention and Response Interventions, One Arizona Distribution of Opioid Settlement Funds Agreement, contract amount \$663,576.10 (PO2500036359)

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
TC: Dr. Theresa Cullen, Director, Pima County Health Department

RS: We are going to take up the items that are still on the agenda, which are Items 23 through 30 under the Health Department and I did have some questions about various of these items. It is possible that my colleagues did as well. Is there interest in entertaining a motion approving all of them, or would you rather go through them one-by-one?

MH: [Inaudible and thumbs up gesture]

RS: All is great., then I will...

SC: [Inaudible and raised hand gesture]

RS: Okay, so you are good with 23 and 24 but not the others, is that what you are saying?

SC: [Inaudible]

RS: Oh, I am sorry. So, you are good with 25 through 30?

SC: [Nods head, yes]

RS: Which was the motion you were going to make in the first place. With that in mind, I will move items 25 through 30.

SC: Second.

RS: Moved and seconded by Supervisor Christy. Discussion? Supervisor Cano?

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. The recommendations before us are the result of lots of effort by a citizen-driven committee, and I want to thank them for their incredible work to get these recommendations before us. The opioid settlement funds are an opportunity for us to provide meaningful investment in substance abuse treatment in our community, and this was a competitive process. Over 30 applications, and a truly competitive process, that allowed us to be able to assess need in our

community. I wish we had more resources to fund every application, but the reality is, that resources are limited. I still have questions about what opportunities we have in the roadmap ahead to ensure that the money that is available, that is left over, \$1.4 million, to be able to get that out the door. I know that the Regional Opioid Settlement Advisory Committee (ROSAC), the committee tasked with expending that money, is going to be looking at that very question in the coming months so that we can ensure that they are looking at that very question. I would rather us distribute that money rather than hold on to it. I also, in that same sentence, recognize that Opioid dollars are very unpredictable in terms of when they are coming in and when they do not. I want to say thank you to our staff and to the committee for their due diligence and also want to continue to ask us to be innovative in the process that gets us to today. I want to applaud the recommendations that are here, but I do not think that we have truly scratched the surface of where we can be. Going from 30-plus applications to such a narrow amount tells me that we are not spreading the wealth the way that we should. We are hyper-targeting a very limited amount and that means that we are not holding hands with 30-plus partners who could also need our support. What that tells me is, that we need to be looking for additional funding opportunities as a County to support that work. Opioid dollars will not be the only funding source that we should be relying on. With that, I look forward to supporting the recommendations. Thank you, Chair Scott.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor. Any other questions or comments? Supervisor Allen?

JA: I would like to echo Supervisor Cano's recognition and thanks to both the Pima County Health Department, their staff, as well as the volunteers that comprise the ROSAC for their hard work. I have seen the research, and the process that they went through, to really dig deep and ensure that the Request for Proposal (RFP) that went out is informed by data. It is informed by best practices, and it was a lot of work. It was a heavy lift. So, the commitment from the ROSAC members is significant. I was glad to see the mix of both prevention and treatment strategies, as well as real intentionality around reaching youth, reaching indigenous communities as well as young men. There is a piece that I think, and maybe I have said this before, that I get stuck on, around what it all adds up to. I get this is limited money, and it is not enough money, as Supervisor Cano noted, yet the need is so incredibly great, for addressing the needs of our community. I acknowledge and went back and looked at the RFP, and looking at some of the goals, and still feel like there is a piece that might still be missing, around what do we want it all to add up to. Both this money, as well as thinking about the future rounds of grants or thinking about the extension of these grants over, it sounds like some of them might be considered multi-year, but what does long-term success look like? And then how does our funding strategy meet those needs? How are we measuring, not just doing hash marks, and tallying who, number of people served, and where they are, and what zip codes they are? But what are we affecting the change that we have said that we need to affect? I just need to see how this work, how this funding is adding up, and are we being transformative in the use of this fund? I also want to see more funds brought in. I would love to figure out whether or not any of the funds that are held by the Attorney General might be able to make their way into Pima County, so that we

can be allocating them directly where we need them. Again, thank you to Dr. Cullen and her team and all the volunteers that are part of that effort.

RS: Any other questions or comments from Board members on items 25 through 30? Dr. Cullen, thank you very much for coming in. I had some questions related to Items 25 and 27, and we will raise this again when we take up Item No. 24, because I really see transitional wraparound support and law enforcement co-response is very much connected. In each instance, you are trying to help people to not fall back into where they have been and bring some stability and support into their lives. My question would be, we have designated a significant amount of the funds for transitional wraparound support and law enforcement co-response. But how can we expand our work in both those areas, and how can we use what we are learning in one area to support the work in the other? Is it possible that we might consider moving some of the mobile Medication for Opioid Use Disorder (MOUD) services into those categories? Because, again, they seem to align very well with each other, transitional wraparound support and law enforcement co-response. They speak to not only what we are trying to achieve for the people being served, but frankly, also to some of the frustrations in the community that we hear. So, just wondered what you all might have to say about how we can expand the efforts in those two areas, and perhaps that might even inform how we do additional RFPs? I realize there is a lot of questions embedded there, but I think you know where I am going.

TC: Supervisor Scott, Members of the Board, Administrator Leshner. Thank you for the opportunity to share where we are today, which you have in terms of the RFP for approval. In addition, I think these are really important questions. What we know is that our approach has to be comprehensive, coordinated, integrated, with not only the other people that are funded, the other proposals, but in addition with other work that is being currently done in the community, as well as the justice system, law enforcement, community-based organizations. Our approach is to ensure that there is integration and cross-collaboration between the multiple vendors that will be funded through this current amount of money. In addition, as you know, we did fund Sobering Alternative for Recovery (SAFR). SAFR is another opportunity for us to ensure that individuals that are suffering from substance abuse have an option of where to go for transition. Once again, you will recall SAFR is up to 96 hours. So, your comment about the need for these to be integrated is appropriate, and the recognition that there will need to be additional funding. As you did note, there is a small amount of funds that was not appropriated by the panels that chose to award these RFPs. At the same time, there is a meeting later this week with the ROSAC to look at that funding that has been left and to provide some guidance to the Public Health Department and obviously eventually to the Board of Supervisors about appropriate ways to spend that. One thing that is important to note is, all of these RFPs have significant metrics attached to them. It is up to the Health Department to ensure that those metrics cross reference. So, if you have spent time at all with the Board of Supervisors Agenda Item Reports (BOSAIRs) and the proposals, you will see that there are many times when there would appear to be metrics that could cross reference to each other. Our goal is to pull those together and ensure that if one proposal is funding A., but there is an intersect with B., that we ensure that they are aware of each other. At the same time, I think the Public Health Department and

the ROSAC would beg a little indulgence as we start standing these up and figure out how we are going to ensure that, for instance, The Haven works closely with Tucson Indian Center or whatever those two are, where they will intersect. For your specific comment about contract 25 and contract 27, which are both wraparound and provide services, our hope is that in conjunction with work, for instance, that the County is already funding with justice services, and other work that is being done through SAFR, we will be able to ensure that that comes together. I was on a call earlier today with the state and Centers for Disease Control about our overdose deaths for the first quarter of '25 compared to '24. What we see is pretty significant differences in geographic areas, in age groups, in race and ethnicity. Hopefully, what you have seen in the selection of the RFP is that, the goal is to really create a patchwork and have the Health Department and the other people that are engaged with us, so that together, transition services, law enforcement, we are working closely with the police department. We have already had engagement with Tucson Fire and EMS because of so many overdoses are, thank goodness, non-fatal overdoses. And what we want to do is ensure that the wraparound services, the transitional services that may be available, are extended into those people that have already evidence that they have, in most cases, serious substance abuse through an overdose, but also have recovered from that overdose. So, hopefully that is a long-winded way of saying there is lots of work to do. We recognize there are many touch points between the different vendors that hopefully will be awarded contracts today. We know there is additional work. To comment on the mobile money that was not awarded the \$300,000.00. As you saw, there is over \$1 million that was not awarded. And once again, that will be discussed this week, later with the ROSAC committee itself. That money has already been approved by the Board for an expenditure this year, so my hope will be that the ROSAC, with appropriate guidance from the Health Department and the organizations that are represented on the ROSAC, that we will be able to accelerate a way to award those funds during this fiscal year. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Dr. Cullen. Just to follow up, there were 38 applications responding to the RFPs. A significant number of them did not meet the minimum qualifications. Thinking about the alignment between transitional wraparound support and law enforcement co-response, are there potential applicants, either in that initial batch that did not meet minimum qualifications, or others in the community that we could coach up, especially in those two areas of transitional wraparound support and law enforcement co-response?

TC: Yes, Chair Scott, Members of the Board, yes. Actually, I had a discussion with one of them this morning. So, I am aware that there are many other opportunities with different people that applied and for one reason or another, were found to not meet the minimum qualifications that are working in this space in the community at the current time. I do believe with support from the Health Department, we can help identify those individuals, those organizations, and hopefully be able to go out with another RFP that people that were found to be ineligible during this round will be eligible during the second round.

- RS: Excellent. Also had questions with regard to No. 26 and everything else under "Youth Prevention Services in Areas of Designated Need." I really appreciated that No. 26, as well as some of the other items, made specific reference to outreach to early adolescents, kids in middle school, and perhaps also high school freshmen. As Mr. Holmes and I know from our service in the K-12 world, early adolescence is where you catch or lose kids academically. I think it is also where you catch or lose kids in terms of getting the messages out about abuse and addiction and how to prevent those behaviors. My question for everything under Youth Prevention Services is, are we making a sustained and systemic effort to make sure that middle school kids really are a big focus of our work in that area?
- TC: Chair Scott, Members of the Board. I can unequivocally answer yes to that. I think it is important to note that the reason why Youth Prevention Services was funded at \$1.25 million, is this belief that prevention matters, that we need to be, not only in middle school, but earlier in elementary school, middle school and high school. In addition, as you may be aware, Prop 207, which is the Marijuana tax money, is used by the Health Department specifically for youth and schools programs. We anticipate that that work, which includes a focus on mental health, suicide prevention, as well as behavioral health issues, will be conjoined with many of the individual RFPs that will be funded later today, hopefully.
- RS: With regard to the metrics available to measure performance for both that item and the other items, is there a specific office within the Health Department that is tracking those metrics, or does it depend on the program?
- TC: Chair Scott, Supervisors. There is not a specific office at this time. However, we do have a focus on evaluation within our Health Department itself. These programs will be overseen by the Community Mental Health and Addiction Program. Many of them will be overseen directly by me because of my personal interest and my commitment to ensure that we continue to fund programs that deliver. As you may recall, we did have a mobile unit. That was funded previously. We pulled that contract because we were able to focus on the metrics and saw that it was not delivering. I do not anticipate non-delivery, but what I do anticipate is that the Health Department will ensure that these metrics are followed appropriately. Now, what is important to note is, that the metrics that you see in your BOSAIR are the ones that have been proposed during the RFP process. Once each of these proposers meet with us for a kickoff meeting, it is possible that some of these metrics may be modified. I think that also gives us the opportunity to ensure that cross touchpoint that we hope we will be able to see. Once again, those cross touchpoints should not only be within the domain, so within youth, but across the five different areas. Even though we did not fund mobile, the fifth area in my head is SAFR because that is funded and had a soft launch earlier this week.
- RS: And does the discussion of metrics sometimes come, or a better way to ask this, would we envision that the discussion of metrics would possibly come back before the ROSAC, as well as, be a discussion within the department?

TC: Yes, Chair Scott, Members of the Board. The expectation is that we will be reporting at least quarterly out to the ROSAC. What we are seeing with each of these contractors, in addition, what we are seeing in the community at-large. As you know, our goal is to reduce not only the number of overdoses, the number of fatalities, non-fatalities, but also the substance use concerns itself. So, we will be tracking those figures as well as we can.

RS: And then just one other question about the items that we are currently considering. Because we made the motion before you came in, we are considering in bulk items 25-30. We are going to come back to 23 and 24, which might have more specific reference to the work of Ms. Vesely's department. 26 makes explicit reference to two school districts, Sunnyside and TUSD. It makes sense, they are the two biggest districts in the County. But in terms of outreach to middle level kids all around the County, under that Youth Prevention Services heading, how are we ensuring that all of our districts, perhaps especially our districts that have schools in rural areas, are getting this same level of attention?

TC: Chair Scott, Members of the Board. As you probably can see when you look at these as a whole, you see attention to rural areas through a different proposer. You see attention to American Indian, Alaska Native Youth. You see attention to those two school districts that are called out, but you also see an overall attention to youth. I would take that as a charge to the Health Department from you that we ensure that we create opportunities for prevention, for education, for teaching in all the school districts. I will say our Youth to Schools Program was at Marana School District on Monday of this week, teaching a large cohort of educators about mental health and how to prepare and recognize for concerns in the youth that may be in that school district. So, at the same time that we have these that we mentioned that our Youth in Schools Program is out there every day, mostly directly in the school districts throughout the entire County, ensuring that districts that want us to be in there, as well as charters, parochial and privates, which have needs and have identified them, that we are able to respond to those needs.

RS: Excellent. I did not know if there were any other questions from my colleagues on Items 25 through 30.

[No audible or visible response received]

RS: Nope? Alright, all in favor of approving those items, indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Alright, those items are approved unanimously.

PROCUREMENT

29. The Board of Supervisors on December 16, 2025, continued the following:

Contract

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

Verbatim

RS: Chair Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
JA: Supervisor Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator

- RS: Let us, in the time remaining, go to Item No. 31. This is unfinished business, contract with Axon Enterprise, Inc. The Board will recall that we had Sheriff Nanos here at our last meeting. He also followed up some of the questions that Board members had with a memo that is attached to this item. There was also a memo from Ms. Leshar with reports of the discussions of the Data Governance Council that is in the Information Technology Department (ITD). Ms. Leshar, any introductory comments before I ask if there is any questions or discussion from Board members?
- JL: Chair Scott and Members of the Board. The highlights to summarize the Sheriff's request is, this would be a contract that provided additional enhanced services with an extension of the contract for a lengthier period of time in order to lock in what he believes to be a lower rate at this point. With that, the current contract is in place through '31, and we would welcome any direction from the Board about any amendments to, or next steps. Thank you.
- RS: Thank you, Ms. Leshar. Comments, discussion from Board members? Supervisor Allen?
- JA: You know, I do not want to underscore, reiterate the same comments that I made last time, but they are in many ways still relevant, even with the additional information. My concerns persist even with additional information from the Data Governance recommendations and review. I think the reason that we are considering this is, at the pressure of Axon to lock ourselves into a new contract, despite the fact that we still have five years left on this existing contract. That, in and of itself, could stand alone as a concern. I pulled a quote from the letter of

opposition to this contract from the Pima County Deputies Organization that I thought was poignant. They said, "Axon body cameras already capture citizens in the worst moments of their lives, often from the inside of their homes. Axon gathers and stores our evidence. Axon programs are on our County phones. Axon supplies our less lethal equipment. Now the Sheriff wants Axon to write our reports. Our public agency is rapidly becoming ensnared by a private corporation. Soon we will be so entangled with Axon that the consequences of breaking free will be too high." I appreciate that perspective. My understanding is that, and it is a shallow understanding, but that Axon contracts. We have contracts on multiple layers throughout the County in different departments and areas and I appreciate that. However, I feel like it has become a bit convoluted. In reading through this proposed contract, there is multiple layers of contracts embedded within it, and it feels a bit like a shell game, especially when they are trying to get us to extend the ten-year contract onto a contract that still has five years left. I am also concerned about the content of this contract. Layering on expansions of AI, at a moment right now, that is fairly unprecedented when we have a federal administration that is actively and aggressively seeking access to local governments' and state governments' data and opening up access to data within areas that have previously been protected. Internal Revenue Service data has now been made accessible to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. There was efforts to get into Social Security data, Medicaid data. These are unprecedented times, and so I am very concerned right now about increasing our scope with Axon and what the consequences of that could be. For that and many other reasons, I do not support approving this contract.

SC: Mr. Chair?

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Allen. Supervisor Christy?

SC: I echo a lot of the concerns that Supervisor Allen has just verbalized. Maybe not in the certain categories that are concerning her, though I understand the concerns. There are a lot of red flags in this, a lot of discomfoting issues, and they have already been discussed by my colleagues at the last meeting and again by Supervisor Allen. Very simply, in addition to all of the issues that were raised about the questions of this particular agenda item, I look at it in a couple of ways. We are being asked to come up with another \$45 million for AI and 0% for the deputies. I think that really needs to be looked at, and I think that is a troubling issue as well. Second, is a question that I keep hearing throughout our society regarding AI, what jobs will be going away with AI if we would approve this? I think that has significant factors involved as well. I just think that the whole issue at this particular point with the discounted rate from the original price to what is being promulgated as something that needs to be taken advantage of right now or else, reminds me of the car business. So, I have a number of things. It just does not sound right. Maybe it could be analyzed, or massaged, or broken down in a more progressive manner about certain issues that are raised. I am all in favor of quicker response times by the deputies, but too much of it does not sit right, does not feel right. We have budgetary problems with the Sheriff as it is. Again, it always seems that the deputies are second class citizens when it comes to any kind of allocation of funds. So, I will not be supporting this either.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Christy. Supervisor Heinz?

MH: Thank you, Chair Scott. I think one of the best ways to get a discount on services is to have a competitive process. Actually, I really appreciate the Sheriff bringing this forward. I am not going to support it, as I think I have indicated, but I have done some kind of a deep dive here. There is not just one vendor that exists that can do these things. We do need this stuff. We have to have this multiple layers of encryption at whatever federal standard to make sure that this information is safe and people cannot hack into it. We need to have these redaction services. We need to have most of the stuff. I even think, triggered use of drones as...not for a surveillance state thing, but pre-first responders. Like some little thing can zip out there possibly faster than any human can get there. To see, "Okay, this is a domestic incident. There is a weapon involved, appears that shots are being fired." We know we need to send two ambulances, or three ambulances, a fire truck, no fire truck. I do think, even the drone thing is worthwhile, which we have already approved, I think. But finding out that there are two contracts within the Sheriff's Department. I believe one contract with the courts, which we have less control over, and another contract that covers Public Defense Services, the Legal Defender and of course the Pima County Attorney's Office. All have different lengths of term. Some of them end in 2031, some of them end in 2034 and the last time we did a major contract, 2021, October, that was a sole source contract and I looked at the responses from the Sheriff's Department. That means that was not a competitive process. I am not necessarily faulting that because I believe in discussion with staff and meeting with some experts on this. This technology was very innovative and maybe something that there were not a bunch of vendors at the time that we approved this, but I would like to see our staff look at all of those issues, aligning the contract terms. I do not want to see a contract where this kind of rapidly changing technology, frankly, I do not think more than three years, but maybe three years with a couple of one-year extension options. I do not want 5- or 10-year contracts because that is beyond the term of a Board. That just seems strange to me, especially with the speed with which things are changing. The most important thing I believe, is to get all these contracts aligned and get all these services, extend an offer to the courts. I know we cannot make them do stuff but see if they want to participate and for whatever subsections of the County that need these services, let us do one big RFP. Have a competitive process, because that could save us potentially tens of millions of dollars over the next decade for a lot of these services that are, in fact, essential for law enforcement. So, I am not going to support the item, but I would like to see us take a step back, do a big, like a forest for the trees kind of analysis and then see how we can maybe renegotiate some things here.

RS: With that in mind...and I am sorry, Supervisor Cano, any comments you wanted to make? Because I had a motion I was going to suggest, but we have not heard from you yet, so please go ahead, sir.

AC: Thank you, Chair Scott. First, I want to thank the Sheriff for bringing this item to our consideration. I have deep respect for Sheriff Nanos and the work that he and our entire department at the Sheriff's Department does to keep our community safe. I

committed to the Sheriff that I would be open to this request and since then, I have read this contract closely. I have consulted neutral third parties about this contract, and I have heard from residents. Based on that due diligence, I cannot support the extension of this contract today. Let me explain why in plain terms. My vote today is not a vote against the men and women in uniform. I have deep respect for the work that our deputies do, and I am grateful that when District 5 residents call 911, the Sheriff's Department shows up. Body-worn cameras are here to stay, accountability tools are here to stay, and the County already has a contract in place with Axon for the next five years. I am committed to making sure that our deputies have the resources they need to keep the public safe and to do their jobs. So, what is this vote actually about? It is about whether we lock Pima County into a broad, long-term contract out to 2036, at a time when technology, policy and risk are changing month by month. It is about whether we authorize an additional \$45 million without stronger safeguards and without a broader community conversation about why this expanded surveillance is needed and how this data will be protected. The proposed expansion in this contract involves new tools and technologies, drones, license plate reader systems, and AI software. Those tools create more data about where people are, who they are with, and what they are doing. And once that data exists, we do not fully control who can demand it. That puts civil liberties at risk, and it could expose our neighbors, our families, protesters exercising their 1st Amendment rights and everyday residents who have done nothing wrong. That is the core issue for me. And here is the most important point. We are not in a situation as a County where we have to rush. The current contract still has years left. We have time to do this right. Time to separate what is truly necessary from what is optional. Time to be precise about what is new versus what is a continuation. I look forward to continuing to work with our Sheriff on the fundamentals, better pay, the right equipment, the staffing and support our deputies need, and the tools that strengthen transparency without expanding surveillance beyond what our community can accept. If there is a narrower approach that maintains continuity while building stronger protections and building public trust, I absolutely will consider that in good faith, but this contract is not that. For those reasons, I also cannot support this. Thank you.

RS: Thank you, Supervisor Cano. I join my colleagues in being unable to support the item. So, I wanted to make this motion and see if it incorporates the concerns of the Board. First of all, I would move that Item No. 31 be removed from the agenda, and that we direct the County Administrator to look into all County contracts with Axon to determine if and how those agreements can be consolidated. The third part of the motion would be, that the recommendations from the Data Governance Council that are outlined in the County Administrator's memorandum to the Board, that those not merely be recommendations, but that the County Administrator examine if they can be fully adopted as directives from the Board. That would be my three-part motion.

MH: May I ask a clarifying?

RS: Absolutely, sir.

MH: I would love to hear that we also include in that motion, a direction to staff to additionally explore the potential for a competitive process in that consolidation.

RS: I would welcome that as a friendly amendment, Supervisor Heinz. Absolutely perfect.

MH: And I second that.

RS: Alright, thank you. Discussion on the motion? Supervisor Allen?

JA: Can you restate the third component of your motion?

RS: That the recommendations from the Data Governance Council be considered by the County Administrator as not merely recommendations, but directives from the Board.

JA: Okay, can I add one more?

RS: Please.

JA: That is some scenario planning. In the case that data is requested, legally, that we do not feel that we should share, what recourse, what is our plan in those situations?

RS: I gather, Supervisor Allen, we would need some guidance as to that point, not just from the County Administrator, but perhaps from the County Attorney.

JA: Yes, please.

RS: All right. I would welcome that as an addition to the motion, if you are okay with that Supervisor Heinz?

MH: [nods head, yes]

RS: All right. Further discussion? Supervisor Christy?

SC: Just a question and clarification to the County Administrator. Could you tell us who serves on the Governance Committee?

RS: Oh, that is a good question.

JL: No. Chair Scott, I am sorry, Supervisor Christy. I am afraid I do not have it at my fingertips. I am happy to get a memo out to the Board and let you know who is on it. It represents a variety of departments, led by Javier Baca from ITD.

RS: Thank you for that question, Supervisor.

SC: But those participating on the Board are department heads?

JL: Primarily.

RS: Alright, any further discussion on the motion? All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Aye.

MH: Aye.

JA: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

RS: Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

DRAFT