

## 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, April 21, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

\*\*Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, replaced Ms. Leshar from 2:05 p.m. to 2:20 p.m.

### 1. **CONTRACT**

Tucson Clean and Beautiful, Inc., Amendment No. 3, to provide for the Adopt-A-Wash Program, extend contract term to 6/30/27, amend contractual language and scope of services, 20010FD Special Revenue Fund, contract amount \$60,000.00 (CT\_23-401)

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

### 2. **RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION**

Pursuant to Pima County Code, Section 16.30.050(B), quarterly report of District approved Riparian Habitat Mitigation Plans.

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

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 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, April 21, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

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

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

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

\*\*Carmin DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, replaced Ms. Leshar on the dais from 2:05 p.m. to 2:20 p.m.

### 1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 2. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Veronica Boone, Wellness Director, Tucson Indian Center.

### 3. CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the passings of Chris and Jacque Sheafe, who passed away in a plane crash in Marana last week. He shared words written by Howard Weiss, that Chris Sheafe delivered kindness, respect, and intelligence across decades, and performed a multitude of community service through serving on the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association, the Tucson Breakfast Club, the Southern Arizona Water Resources Association, and more. A moment of silence was observed by the Board.

Supervisor Scott stated that he was pleased to have attended the graduation ceremony for the new firefighter class of the Golder Ranch Fire District on April 16, 2026. He also attended a celebration for the 10th anniversary of the Ann Day Wildlife Bridge, led by the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, where he was joined by many of Ms. Day's relatives.

Chair Allen shared that District 3 attended a family fun night for the Altar Valley School District, where they provided resources to 200-300 families. She provided upcoming District 3 office hours: on April 23, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Marana Food Bank; May 5, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Sahuarita Food Bank; and May 9, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Ajo Plaza.

4. **PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

Supervisor Cano acknowledged the anniversary of Lupita Murillo and her husband, Don, who attended the meeting.

**PRESENTATION**

5. **Recognition of Rabbi and Cantor Baruch J. Cohon**

Presentation of a Certificate of Recognition to Rabbi and Cantor Baruch J. Cohon, for his inspiring leadership both locally and nationally on the occasion of his 100th birthday. (District 1)

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

Supervisor Scott acknowledged the 100th birthday of Rabbi Cohon and recognized his continued legacy and service to Southern Arizona, his community, and his faith.

6. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of Gilbert Wilson, Events Coordinator, Stadium District - Kino Sports Complex, for 30 years of service.

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

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, recognized Mr. Wilson for his 30 years of service with Kino Sports Complex and the lasting impression he has made on the community.

7. **Recognition**

Recognition of the retirement of David Burnham, Graphic Design Specialist, Communications Department, for 25 years of service.

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

Mark Evans, Director, Communications Department, recognized Mr. Burnham for his 25 years of service, his willingness to volunteer, and his lasting contributions to the County.

8. **Recognition of the “We A.R.E. Gems” Quarterly Recipients**

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 23-5, Employee Recognition Program, the following employees have been selected for the quarterly "We A.R.E. Gems" recognition:

- Angelica Garcia - Pima County Attorney's Office
- Tai Summers - Pima County Attorney's Office
- Dennis Bell - County Free Library
- Erin Higdon - Human Resources
- Enrique Wilkins - Assessor's Office
- Heather Theinert - Information Technology
- Josh Chavez - Parks and Recreation
- Katrina Noble - Transportation
- Kyle Spindler - Finance and Risk Management
- Liz Delcamp - Conservation Lands and Resources
- Tom Peterson - Public Defense Services

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

County Administration presented the awards to the recipients.

**PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION**

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Kate Harrison, Communications Manager, Shelley Ain, Property Appraisal Supervisor, Danielle Rios, Department Personnel Coordinator, Stacey Bowman, Training and Education Coordinator, and Vanessa Valencia, Administrative Service Manager, Employee Recognition Committee, proclaiming the week of May 3 through May 9, 2026 to be: "PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

10. Presentation of a proclamation to Tess Mayer, Director, Marissa Alcorta, Deputy Director of Community Engagement, Isai Centeno, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration, and Paulina Aguirre-Clinch, Acting Deputy Director of Public Services, Pima County Public Library, proclaiming the week of April 19 through April 25, 2026 to be: "NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK"

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

11. Presentation of a proclamation to Frank Dillon, Deputy Director, Pima County Economic Development, proclaiming the week of May 4 through May 8, 2026 to be: "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

12. Presentation of a proclamation to John Fenton, Father of Brandi Fenton, celebrating: "THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRANDI FENTON MEMORIAL PARK"

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

13. Presentation of a proclamation to Sgt. John Randall and Sgt. Mylan Marble; and Cheyenne Burns, Carlos Avitia, Kacy Bieg, Alex St. John, Abram De La Torre, and Emmanuel Akintoye, Corrections Officers, Pima County Sheriff's Department, proclaiming the week of May 3 through May 9, 2026 to be: "CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

14. Presentation of a proclamation to Chris Johnson, Director of Nursing, Erica Alejandro, Assistant Director of Nursing, and Maggie Estrada, Health Services Administrator, NaphCare; Dominique Hamilton, Chief Nurse Representative, National Nurses United; and Julia Strange, Vice President, External Affairs and Brand, TMC Health, proclaiming the week of May 6 through May 12, 2026 to be: "NURSES' WEEK"

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

15. Presentation of a proclamation to Lane Santa Cruz, Vice Mayor, City of Tucson, and a representative from the Community Coalition for Prosperity, proclaiming: "A SHARED VISION, MISSION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROSPERITY INITIATIVE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY OF TUCSON AND THE COMMUNITY COALITION FOR PROSPERITY"

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

16. Presentation of a proclamation to Janay Arenas, Member, Pima County Small Business Commission, proclaiming the week of May 3 through May 9, 2026 to be: "NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

17. Presentation of a proclamation to Jimmy Hart and Aaron Scott, Co-Founders, Young Men's Symposium; and Cody Peck, Ron Burton, and Dwight Hart, Community Members, proclaiming the third Saturday of April to be: "STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY: YOUNG MEN'S LEADERSHIP SYMPOSIUM DAY"

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

18. Presentation of a proclamation to Rob Burton, Member, International Jazz Society, proclaiming the day of Thursday, April 30, 2026 to be: "INTERNATIONAL DAY OF JAZZ"

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

19. Presentation of a proclamation to Scott Blades, Founder, Tucson Interfaith HIV/AIDS Network, recognizing him for his extraordinary leadership and decades of service, and deep appreciation for his lasting contributions to the health and well-being of the residents of Pima County.

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

20. Presentation of a proclamation to Sally Crum, Mt. Lemmon Firewise Team Captain; Joe Gunia, Mt. Lemmon Fire District Chief; Trisha Tubbs, Greater Green Valley Community Emergency Response Team Council Member; and Kevin McNichols, Santa Rita Valley Fire District CERT Liaison, proclaiming the day of Saturday, May 2, 2026 to be: "WILDFIRE COMMUNITY PREPAREDNESS DAY IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

### **PROCLAMATION**

21. Proclaiming the week of May 1 through May 7, 2026 to be: "YOUTH WEEK IN PIMA COUNTY"

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

22. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Trista Di Genova addressed the Board regarding her ongoing civil proceedings against the County after a raid on her property and the seizure of her animals in 2023. She also indicated that there had been no response to her multiple complaints.

Laurie Moore stated that half of Pima County made less than the average income and asked how the Board was helping residents when they gave so much wealth to illegal immigrants. She stated that Supervisor Heinz had four jobs, including owning a tequila bar and a medical transcription company, and that another Board member made over \$400,000.00 a year. She urged the Board to reprioritize funding and create jobs in Pima County.

Cory Stephens spoke about proclamations; they were a waste of taxpayer money and were being used as tools for lobbying to special interest groups. She stated that Lane Santa Cruz had purchased alcohol with a City P-Card and that non-profits were spending a lot of money on lobbying.

David Hill expressed his concern with the recent increase in reckless driving within Pima County and that he hoped red light cameras were brought back and that he would love to be part of the solution.

Elaina Richards spoke about transportation safety and that Pima County was looking at triple the amount of road fatalities compared to the same time last year. She stated that young people saw cars as freedom due to the lack of available transit and urged the Board to take more direct action on a complete streets policy.

J.P. Salvatierra shared his disappointment with the Board for canvassing the RTA special election. He criticized the Board for going after Sheriff Nanos in the middle of the Nancy Guthrie investigation when it could have waited.

Dave Smith urged the Board to hold Sheriff Nanos accountable and that the Board's job was to enforce Arizona's laws. He spoke about Minute Item No. 50 and urged the Board to support it.

Joel Strabala spoke about the Board's efforts to limit immigration enforcement. He stated that they were unlawful and urged the Board to refocus to support federal immigration enforcement.

\* \* \*

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

Supervisor Heinz clarified that he did not own a tequila bar or a medical transcription company.

23. **CONVENE TO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to convene to Executive Session at 11:54 a.m.

24. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:22 p.m. All members were present.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

25. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction regarding a proposed settlement in Consolidated Cox Communications Tax Appeals, TX2020-001152 and TX2022-000428.

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

26. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), for legal advice and direction related to the potential waiver of attorney-client privilege, and the scope of such waiver, of the 65-page report prepared by NorthStar Employment and Legal Solutions, as referenced in the March 19, 2026, Administrative Investigation Final Decision regarding Sheriff Chris Nanos and other command staff.

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

**FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT**

27. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 385396, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Golf Club at Canoa Ranch, 5800 S. Camino Del Sol, Green Valley, Series 6, Bar, Person Transfer.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, 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.

28. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 385394, Kevin Arnold Kramber, Golf Club at Torres Blancas, 3233 S. Abrego Drive, Green Valley, Series 7, Beer and Wine Bar, Person Transfer.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, 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.

29. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 385068, Bruce Robert Barro, Barro's Pizza, 1970 W. River Road, No. 100, Tucson, Series 12, Restaurant, New License.

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

30. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 384780, Marie Danielle Burgess, Circle K Store No. 9573, 55 E. Continental Road, Green Valley, Series 9, Liquor Store, New License.

Janet Meza addressed the Board regarding Circle K's responsible retailer program that was implemented in Pima County's 101 stores. She stated that employees underwent biannual training and were regularly tested to ensure stores were not selling to minors and that they checked IDs.

It was moved by Chair Allen, 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.

**CONSTABLES**

31. **Hearing - Collection of Constable Fees**

ORDINANCE NO. 2026 - 5, of the Board of Supervisors, amending Pima County Ordinance No. 2018 - 28, related to the establishment of a ten dollar fee for every writ issued on behalf of a Justice of the Peace, pursuant to A.R.S. §11-445 (A)(17).

Eric Krznarich, Presiding Constable, Precinct 3, stated that this was a request to increase court-collected writ fees, which was currently at \$5.00 per writ and that last year the County received 3,860 writs of restitution for evictions that totaled just under \$19,000.00 in fees. He stated that legislation had changed to allow the Board to increase the fee to \$10.00. He explained that the fees were sent to the Constable Ethics Standards and Training Board and they issued grants in two cycles every year and that Pima County received a good amount of that grant money which helped pay for training, equipment and uniforms.

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

**FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

32. **Hearing - Adjusting Pima County's 1979-80 Base Expenditure Limit**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §41-563.01, discussion and public comment on adjusting Pima County's 1979-80 Base Expenditure Limit.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, explained that what was being asked of the Board was for the opportunity to go to the voters about adjusting the expenditure

limit that was established by amendment to the Constitution in 1980, and that it would not increase the tax nor authorize the increase of any tax levy.

Art Cuaron, Director, Finance and Risk Management, stated that he had the same presentation that was provided at the March 24, 2026, Board meeting and he was happy to go through it again at the pleasure of the Board.

Supervisor Scott requested clarification about why the amount recommended for increase was recommended.

Mr. Cuaron responded that the County's revenue stream would begin to exceed the current expenditure limit in Fiscal Year 2027, which would inhibit the County's ability to spend the money that it was currently projected to receive based on the County's sales tax collections and primary property tax collections. He explained that the recommended \$70 million would give the County a good runway for the next 20 years to be able to spend the money it was projected to collect and not have to go to the voters for another 20 years.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. Chair Allen closed the public hearing.

33. **RECESS**

Chair Allen recessed the meeting at 11:47 a.m.

34. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 11:49 a.m. All members were present.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

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

Chair Allen stated that the Arizona Border Counties Coalition had an upcoming meeting on April 23rd and that the Southern Arizona Education Council had not had a meeting.

Supervisor Scott stated that there had not been any meetings of the County Supervisors Association Legislative Policy Committee since the work of the Legislature had gone to a standstill.

Supervisor Heinz stated that in his capacity as the representative for PAG RTA, a business in his district that was affected by the 22nd Street bridge closure had reached out to his office and requested assistance regarding their decreased business volume. He stated that he met with the RTA executive director to work on a way to get the project completed faster.

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

**36. County Administrator Hiring Process**

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

Chair Allen stated that this would be a recurring agenda item until the Board hired a new County Administrator. She stated that the digital brochure was live and the position of County Administrator was officially open. She encouraged individuals to apply and more information would be provided at future meetings.

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

**37. Explore Tucson Project Presentation**

Presentation of the Explore Tucson Project, presented by Mrs. Thompson's Gifted Class from Canyon View Elementary School. (District 1)

Mrs. Thompson explained that her students had spent months researching Tucson's history, meeting with experts and the community, and creating a public-facing website tour. The students, in their presentation, spoke about how they explored and researched historic sites and museums in Tucson to learn about the City's history and culture and how young people could engage in the community through history.

No Board action was taken.

**38. Federal and State Legislative Agenda - Passenger Rail**

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyists to explore the feasibility and viability of accelerating the development of Passenger Rail between Phoenix, Tucson and Nogales, Sonora. This is related to Mexico's national "Plan 2030" to create high-speed passenger rail across the nation, including from Mexico City to Nogales, Sonora, and our region's ability to tap into this major infrastructure investment to create greater binational connectivity, commerce and economic development. (District 2)

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

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

Chair Allen requested a friendly amendment to the motion, to direct the County's federal lobbyists to advocate and encourage feasibility and initial analysis for passenger and commercial rail in the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill. Supervisor Heinz accepted the friendly amendment as the maker of the motion. Chair Allen withdrew her friendly amendment.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew the item from the agenda.

**39. Federal and State Legislative Agenda - Commercial Rail/Freight**

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyists to explore the feasibility and viability of increasing Pima County's capacity as a major inland port, including augmenting commercial rail capacity between Tucson and the Nogales Port of Entry. This is related to the ongoing expansion of the Port of Guaymas in Sonora, MX, to be able to take on a greater share of international shipping and freight. (District 2)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 38, for discussion related to this item.)

Supervisor Heinz withdrew the item from the agenda.

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

**40. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety**

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

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

**41. Pima County Climate Action Update**

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

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

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

**42. Report from Sheriff Nanos Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-253(A)**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Regarding receipt of a report requested by the Board of Supervisors from Sheriff Nanos in written and/or oral format regarding concerns related to Sheriff Nanos' work history, management of the Pima County Sheriff's Department including, but not limited to, personnel and financial issues, and interaction with federal immigration officials.

Chair Allen stated that this item was a placeholder in case Sheriff Nanos responded to the Board's request for a report in person, however it was her understanding that he was going to submit a response in writing.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that the report was due on this day and that she had just received a copy of the report. She confirmed that it had been

distributed to the Board both electronically and physically and was available to the public on the County's website.

Chair Allen stated that since Board members had not yet had the opportunity to read the report, the item should be continued so that there was time to review it.

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 12, 2026.

## **COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

### **43. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 20, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve submission of the Pima County 2026-2027 Annual Action Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

#### **FY 2026/2027 Pima County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program**

##### **Location/Applicant/Program/Activity/District/Request/Recommendation**

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Expanding Community Food Hub

Capacity/pf/3/\$50,000/\$0

Ajo - International Sonoran Desert Alliance/Plumbing Re-lining for Community Hub/pf/3/\$60,000/\$0

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Teen Project/ps/3/\$35,000/ \$34,000

Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc./Amado Youth Center/pf/3/\$101,400/ \$20,000

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group, Inc./Arivaca Historic

Hotel/pf/3/\$150,000/\$85,000

Avra Water Co-op, Inc./Aging Meter/MXU Install Program/pf/3/\$40,000/\$30,000

Drexel Heights Fire District/Family Safety Program/ps/3,5/\$58,525/\$15,000

Flowing Wells Neighborhood Association and Community Coalition (FWNACC)/ Operating Funds and Technical Assistance/ps/1,3/\$25,000/\$0

Flowing Wells School District/Flowing Wells Family Resource Center/ps/1,3/\$46,000/\$45,000

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Office

Addition/ps/2,3,4/\$70,000/\$0

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/Office Modification No. 2 and

No. 3 (first choice)/ps/2,3,4/\$52,500/\$52,500

Green Valley Assistance Services, d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/SHiM, Safety and Health in Motion Program/ps/2,3,4/\$30,000/\$15,000

City of South Tucson/Administration/admin/2/\$30,000/\$30,000

City of South Tucson/Code Enforcement Program/ps/2/\$50,000/\$10,000

City of South Tucson/Community Cleanup & Green Program/ps/2/\$50,000/\$5,000

City of South Tucson/Crime Prevention and Education Program/ps/2/\$50,000/\$0

City of South Tucson/Demolition Program/demo/2/\$50,000/\$50,000

City of South Tucson/Fire and Rescue Safety Equipment/pf/2/\$60,000/\$0

City of South Tucson/JVYC Youth Programs/ps/2/\$150,000/\$100,000

Pima County CWD/Administration/admin/All/\$463,574/\$463,764

Pima County CWD/Project Delivery/pf/All/\$50,000/\$0

Pima County CWD/Emergency Demolition/demo/All/\$65,000/\$15,000

Pima County CWD/Emergency Septic/hsg/All/\$100,000/\$70,000

Pima County CWD/Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$1,000,000/\$758,560

Bridging Futures, Inc./Bridging Futures, Inc. IMPACT/pf/2,All/\$500,000/\$0

Catholic Community Services of Southern AZ/Childcare Services for Low Income Families/ps/2,All/\$90,000/\$0  
 Catholic Community Services of Southern AZ/Food Security for Low Income Residents/ps/2,All/\$85,000/\$0  
 Catholic Community Services of Southern AZ/Serving Vulnerable Populations/ps/2,All/\$78,000/\$0  
 Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc./Nahui Ollin Wellness Program (NOWP)/ps/All/ \$75,000/\$20,000  
 Children's Clinics/Children's Clinics - Family Assistance Fund/ps/All/\$50,000/\$0  
 Children's Clinics/Children's Clinics - Casting Room Remodel/pf/All/\$106,000/\$0  
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair Program/hsg/All/\$275,000/\$275,000  
 DIRECT Center for Independence/Home Access Program/hsg/All/\$60,000/\$50,000  
 Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Improvements to Public Service Facilities for Domestic Violence Victims/pf/All/\$75,900/\$30,000  
 Habitat for Humanity Tucson/Habitat Home Repair Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation/hsg/All/\$170,000/\$100,000  
 Interfaith Community Services/ICS Facility Improvements/pf/All/\$38,443/\$0  
 Jewish Family & Children's Services of Southern Arizona/Financial Wellness Program and Emergency Financial Assistance/ps/All/\$69,382/\$0  
 Living Streets Alliance/South Tucson Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program/ps/2,All/\$30,000/\$25,000  
 MIKID Mentally Ill Kids in Distress/Behavioral Health for Uninsured/Underinsured Families in Pima County/ps/All/\$30,000/\$15,000  
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./Medically Tailored Meals for Low-Income Seniors/ps/All/\$75,000/\$30,000  
 Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona, Inc./New Packaging Machine for Affordable Meal Delivery/pf/All/\$50,000/\$50,000  
 Old Pueblo Community Services/Cocina del Pueblo/pf/All/\$256,500/\$0  
 Our Family Services, Inc./OFS 26-27 Banes Campus Security/pf/All/\$42,253/\$0  
 SER Jobs for Progress/SER Jobs for Progress Duct Work/pf/2,All/\$60,000/\$0  
 SER Jobs for Progress/SER Jobs for Progress Phase VI Floor/pf/2,All/\$55,000/\$55,000  
 Sister Jose Women's Center/Bedbug Prevention - Overnight Shelter/pf/All/\$50,000/\$45,000  
 Southwest Fair Housing Council/Fair Housing Enforcement, Education, and Outreach/admin/All/\$40,000/\$25,000  
 St. Luke's Home/Rental Assistance for Low-Income Seniors/ps/All/\$65,000/\$0  
 University of Arizona/Nourish & Grow: Community Driven Culinary Education and Increased Local Food Access/ps/2,All/\$79,383/\$35,000  
 YWCA of Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/ps/All/\$48,500/\$40,000  
**TOTAL REQUESTED \$5,391,360/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$2,593,824**

HUD Eligible Activity Abbreviations: admin = Administration; ps = Public Service; pf = Public Facility Improvement; infra = Infrastructure Improvement; hsg = Housing Rehabilitation; demo = Demolition;

**FY 2026/2027 Pima County Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program**

**ESG Component/Agency/Program/Activity Focus/District/Request/ Recommendation**

Street Outreach/Bridging Futures, Inc./Street Outreach/Individuals, Families/All/\$500,000/\$0  
 Street Outreach/Our Family Services/Street Outreach/Youth, Families, Individuals/All/\$50,000/\$0  
 Emergency Shelter/Emerge!/Emergency Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence/DV Families/All/\$54,625/\$45,000  
 Emergency Shelter/Green Valley Assistance Services/MAP-ES Emergency Shelter/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$30,000/\$5,000  
 Emergency Shelter/Our Family Services/Emergency Shelter/Families, Individuals/All/\$50,000/\$0  
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Casa Paloma/Single Women/All/ \$45,000/\$37,630  
 Emergency Shelter/Primavera Foundation/Family Pathways/Families, Individuals/All/\$45,000/\$37,630  
 Emergency Shelter/Sister Jose Women's Center/Deep Freeze Shelter/Single Women/All/\$33,076/\$0  
 Homeless Prevention/Catholic Community Services/Housing Insecurity Solutions/Families/All/\$90,000/\$0

Homeless Prevention/Green Valley Assistance Services/Valley Assistance Family MAP (Map a Plan)/Families, Individuals/2,4/\$45,000/\$45,000  
 Homeless Prevention/Our Family Services/Homeless Prevention/Families, Individuals/All/\$50,000/\$0  
 Homeless Prevention/Pima County/Homeless Prevention/Families, Individuals/All/\$38,507/\$38,507  
 Homeless Prevention/St. Luke's Home/Emergency Rental Assistance/Families, Individuals/All/\$50,000/\$0  
 Rapid Rehousing/Our Family Services/Rapid Rehousing/Youth, Families/All/ \$50,000/\$0  
 Administration/Pima County/-/Administration/All/\$16,926/\$16,926  
**TOTAL REQUESTED \$1,148,135/TOTAL RECOMMENDED \$225,693**

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, explained that this item was for the distribution of an annual allotment from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and was used for things like home repair, meals, and infrastructure. He stated that applications underwent a thorough review process and he was very happy with the recommendations brought before the Board.

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

Chair Allen expressed her gratitude to all the volunteers and committee members and for the reworking of the matrix to ensure that rural communities and organizations could operate on a level playing field due to serving a smaller population.

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

**FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT**

**44. Fiscal Year 2027 Expenditure Limitation Report**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 21, of the Board of Supervisors, designating the Chief Fiscal Officer for officially submitting the Fiscal Year 2027 Expenditure Limitation Reports to the Arizona Auditor General.

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

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

**45. Classification/Compensation**

The Clerk of the Superior Court requests approval to create the following new classifications, associated costs will be borne by the user department from within its current budget:

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

6127/ Superior Courtroom Clerk III/ 9 (\$49,795.20-\$69,721.60)/ 5/ NE\*

6128/ Superior Courtroom Clerk II/ 7 (\$46,134.40-\$62,233.60)/ 5/ NE\*

\*NE = Not Exempt (paid overtime)

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

## **JUVENILE COURT**

### **46. Juvenile Court Center Family Counseling Program**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 22, of the Board of Supervisors, electing participation by Pima County in the Juvenile Justice Services Family Counseling Programs and providing \$29,813.00 in matching funds.

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

## **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

### **47. Amending the Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule - May 2026 through December 2026**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding amending the approved meeting schedule for May 2026 through December 2026. A 5:00 p.m. start time for the second meeting of every month, was originally approved on January 6, 2026, the Board of Supervisors will consider adding built-in flexibility, as needed, during the second meeting of every month to accommodate executive sessions (which are always non-public), as needed.

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

Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board, requested clarification on what was approved by the Board.

Jan Leshar, County Administrator, stated that this item allowed flexibility in the start time for the second meeting of the month, which normally would start at 5:00 p.m., and that the Board could convene the meeting earlier to accommodate executive sessions.

### **48. 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the After-Action Reports prepared and presented by Pima County's Recorder and Elections Director, and/or designee, to include, but not limited to, addressing the new voting system implemented, as well as the deployment of the "Votemobile" during the special election period. (District 4)

At the request of Supervisor Christy and without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 12, 2026.

49. **Release of NorthStar Employment and Legal Solutions Report**

Discussion/Direction/Action to consider the potential waiver of attorney-client privilege, and the scope of such waiver, of the 65-page report prepared by NorthStar Employment and Legal Solutions, as referenced in the March 19, 2026, Administrative Investigation Final Decision regarding Sheriff Chris Nanos and other command staff. (District 2)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy to waive the attorney-client privilege between the Board of Supervisors and NorthStar Employment and that the report be released to the public. The motion died for lack of a second.

It was then moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Allen and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay," to continue the item to the Board of Supervisors' Meeting of May 26, 2026.

50. **State Legislative Agenda - Peace Officer Certification, Elected Sheriffs and Constables**

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyist to work toward the passage of legislation that would require Peace Officer Certification (AZPOST Certification) for all elected sheriffs and constables in Arizona. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated this had been a concern of his for a while, especially in regard to Constables that had died in the line of duty in Maricopa County as well as Pima County and others. He stated that elected Constables and Sheriffs in the State of Arizona did not need any type of certification training for law enforcement but Chiefs of Police, for example, needed Peace Officer Certification, as well as Correctional Officers, Sheriff Deputies, Police Officers and Detectives. He stated that this made common sense and was a really important public safety and public health issue. He stated that this was something that the County needed to very seriously consider adding to the legislative agenda for the state. He stated that due to the ongoing session, he had not received a clear answer about whether or not this could be done from a modification to the Arizona Revised Statutes, or if it would have to potentially be a constitutional referral. He stated that recently, the State of Washington did something similar because they also saw this as an issue and had put together a committee to do this exact type of certification. He stated that as a result, they were already being sued by their Sheriffs and it was an issue in multiple other places and that it needed to be watched closely. He stated that if this was something the Board did not want to consider, he could withdraw the item and reschedule it for a later date.

Supervisor Scott asked if Supervisor Heinz's office could solicit some input from the Constable Ethics, Standards and Training Board (CESTB). He stated that for the Sheriff, he understood that there could be a situation where a county's voter might want to elect a Sheriff that did not necessarily have a law enforcement background, given that was essentially an administrative position and they ran the department. He stated that most Sheriffs in Arizona, if not all, had a law enforcement

background, including Pima County. He stated that this was similar to the current County Attorney that was certainly an attorney, but her background was in defense, not in prosecution. He stated that this would be something that he imagined might come up in the legislature if they talked about it, especially if there had been instances in the past where county voters had elected a Sheriff that did not necessarily come from a law enforcement background.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he could look into that and clarified that in terms of voter choice, he would never want to prohibit, but if a person were to become elected to a Constabulary position or a Sheriff position, after being elected, then that was when he would want some kind of training or certification.

Supervisor Scott stated that was the reason why he wanted input from CESTB, because there was already some mandatory training in place that did not rise to the level of Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board. He stated unfortunately a former Constable that passed away in the line of duty had not gone through all her required training by that unfortunate date.

Chair Allen questioned if training was required once they served and what happened if they did not complete it. She asked when this item would be continued.

Supervisor Heinz stated that he would withdraw this item until the other legislative items were figured out.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew the item from the agenda.

51. **State Legislative Agenda - Aligning State Statute with Federal Law Re: Public Conspiracy and Corruption**

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyist to work toward the passage of legislation that would align Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) with Federal Law concerning public conspiracy and corruption (see 18 U.S. Code §241 and 18 U.S. Code §242) to ensure that such public corruption is recognized and can be prosecuted as a State crime in addition to being a Federal crime. (District 2)

Supervisor Heinz stated that it astounded him that Arizona was ranked 49th nationally, in terms of anti-corruption safeguards in the statutes. He stated that was not great and it lacked broad abuse of official misconduct statutes, and that severely limited the Attorney General's or County Attorney's ability to prosecute misuse of power, with the exception of bribery. He stated there were things in the statutes about bribery and some other specific, very narrowly tailored statutes that talked about misuse of campaign funding. He stated that other than those things, it really placed them in a bit of a pickle, and was also not great for the public, for residents and constituents to not have these safeguards in place. He stated that it forced reliance on federal enforcement. He stated that the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation and U.S. Attorney left gaps for potential politically motivated misuse of authority by government officials appointed or elected. He stated that basically, they were in a slim minority of states without any clear, enforceable

statute to address the abuse of power or authority while in office. He stated this was the reason why he thought they needed to somewhat urgently get this on the agenda to have at the state level, to try to fix this and to fill in the gaps and put in some protections, so that the Attorney General and potentially County Attorneys could do some things to protect the residents from a bad actor, and not just hope that the feds intervened, especially because it was not always known what they would get when they dealt with the feds. He stated that this was important and that he was happy to hear from his colleagues, but he was aware of the Board's interest in considering it at this time. He stated that he would withdraw the item and that it would be rescheduled.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated that Supervisor Heinz brought this item to the Board's attention and it sounded like he was able to get the Attorney General to become aware of something that she and her staff were not aware of in terms of a lack of statutory authority for their office. He stated that he was very happy to consider this moving forward. He stated it would be really helpful if they could receive something either from the County Attorney through the Attorney General, or from the Attorney General's (AG) office themselves. He stated to Mr. Brown that he was unaware, but in terms of the statutory need, it sounded like Supervisor Heinz identified some corroboration of that, either from the Pima County Attorney's Office (PCAO) or from the AG's office via PCAOA. He stated that it would be really helpful, not only to the Board as they determined the legislative agenda, but to the legislature as they were considering what the Board may be recommending.

Chair Allen stated that she was also curious whether this had been attempted in the past and why it was not already in place.

Supervisor Cano stated that the District 5 perspective was that he looked forward to supporting both items in the summer through the legislative agenda that would be considered by the Board. He applauded his colleague from District 2 for finding two concrete examples of ways that state legislation could support county taxpayers and county residents, especially on the public safety realm. He stated that he wanted to send their best to state and federal teams for their due diligence being done right now and putting out a lot of fires on their behalf. He stated that he was particularly looking at the state legislative agenda and the chaos that was coming out of that process. He stated that he did not miss it one bit and was grateful to be in Pima County with his colleagues. He stated that his District 2 colleague had worked closely with his District 1 colleague and the County Supervisors Association and that they had a vetting process already underway. He stated that as soon as the state budget stopped and was signed into law, in the snap of a finger, they got ready for the following year, and that he was curious where they might see some similar calls for reform throughout that process as well.

Supervisor Heinz withdrew the item from the agenda.

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 52. Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 24, of the Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District, Board of Directors, designating the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer for the Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District.

Chair Allen explained that in December, the Board had assumed the role of the Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District (ADWID) Board to assist local volunteers who had historically managed the water district as they transitioned to a new owner. She stated that this item was to appoint the County Administrator as CEO and the Finance Director as CFO so staff could provide support while Arizona Water worked with the County Attorney's Office on an operating management agreement and the eventual sale of the ADWID infrastructure.

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

## COMMUNITY AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

### 53. Short-Term Crisis and Emergency Resources (STCER) Grant Program - Round 2 Funding Recommendations

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

#### **Food Assistance Service Category**

#### **Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation**

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group (Arivaca HR)/Food Security in Arivaca/\$35,000/\$30,000

Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Food Pantry and Clothing Closet/\$42,895/\$25,000

Chicanos Por La Causa/Healthy Aging: Supporting with Food, Housing Utilities, Transportation, Referrals/\$25,000/\$25,000

Community Food Bank, Inc./Emergency Food Assistance Program/\$75,000/\$75,000

Compass Affordable Housing/Compass Your Healthy Home Market/\$64,590/\$45,000

Girl Scouts of Southern Arizona/Girl Scouts EmpowHERment Program: Meeting Food Insecurity Head On/\$25,000/\$25,000

Greater Vail Community ReSources/Emergency Food Assistance/\$25,000/\$25,000

IMPACT of Southern Arizona/IMPACT Food Bank/\$40,000/\$25,000

Interfaith Community Services/ICS Food Bank food purchase/\$75,000/\$25,000

International Rescue Committee, Inc./Food Security for Pima County Families/\$75,000/\$35,000

Iskashitaa Refugee Network/Supplemental Refugee Food Provision/\$29,545/\$29,000

Mobile Meals of Southern Arizona/Critical Nutrition Access Program for Vulnerable Adults/\$40,000/\$25,000

Old Pueblo Community Services/OPCS Food Services/\$75,000/\$25,000

Pima Council on Aging/Pima Meals on Wheels/\$75,000/\$40,000

Sister José Women's Center/Core Services/\$75,000/\$40,000

Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation/Enhanced Support Services of Southern Arizona/\$75,000/\$30,000

The Salvation Army/Hospitality House Food Assistance Program/\$44,000/\$30,000

Tucson Center for Women and Children, d.b.a. Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Domestic Violence Emergency Shelter Food/\$51,750/\$31,000  
 Tucson Medical Center Foundation/TMC Health Cancer Center Supportive Services Program/\$60,000/\$25,000  
 La Frontera Center, Inc./LFC Food Assistance Program/\$69,227/\$0  
 Pima Council on Aging/Community Lunch Program/\$75,000/\$0  
 Sahuarita Food & Community Resource Center, d.b.a. Marana Food Bank & Community Resource Center/MFB-CRC Emergency Food/\$30,000/\$0  
 St Luke's in the Desert, Inc., d.b.a. St Luke's Home/St. Luke's Home - Nutritional Services/\$75,000/\$0  
 The Homing Project/The Homing Project/\$86,112/\$0  
**CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$1,343,119/\$610,000**

**Housing and Utility Support Service Category**

**Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation**

Administration of Resources and Choices/Housing Counseling and Financial Assistance/\$100,250/\$25,000  
 Our Family Services/Reunion House Youth & Family Support/\$75,000/\$25,000  
 Our Family Services/New Beginnings for Youth and Families/\$75,000/\$25,000  
 Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Emergency Assistance - Housing and Utilities/\$57,914/\$0  
 Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc./Casa De Respiro/\$55,200/\$0  
 Chicanos Por La Causa/Healthy Aging: Supporting with Food, Housing Utilities, Transportation, Referrals/\$50,000/\$0  
 Child & Family Resources, Inc./Pima County Healthy Families/\$28,750/\$0  
 Community Home Repair Projects of Arizona/Emergency Home Repair/\$75,000/\$0  
 Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services/MAP-A-Plan (Basic needs-shelter/housing, utilities, emergency food boxes)/\$50,000/\$0  
 International Rescue Committee, Inc./Housing and Utility Support/\$75,000/\$0  
 Jewish Family and Children's Services of Southern Arizona/Financial Wellness and Emergency Financial Assistance/\$75,595/\$0  
 JobPath, Inc./Emergency Housing for Students/\$75,000/\$0  
 La Frontera Center, Inc./Housing & Utility Crisis Support/\$74,977/\$0  
 Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest/Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest/\$75,000/\$0  
 Pima Council on Aging/Rights & Benefits/\$75,000/\$0  
 Pima County Community Land Trust/Emergency Mortgage and Rental Assistance/\$75,000/\$0  
 Sister José Women's Center/Emergency Housing and Utilities Assistance at Sister José Women's Center/\$75,000/\$0  
 Southern Arizona Land Trust, Inc./Southern Arizona Land Trust Emergency Rental Assistance Program/\$75,000/\$0  
 St Luke's in the Desert, Inc., d.b.a. St Luke's Home/St. Luke's Home - Rental Assistance for Low-Income Residents/\$75,000/\$0  
 The Primavera Foundation/Family Pathways/\$51,000/\$0  
 The Salvation Army/Salvation Army Tucson Emergency Housing/Utility Support/\$67,100/\$0  
 Tucson Center for Women and Children, d.b.a. Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Domestic Violence Shelter Hotel/\$75,000/\$0  
 Tucson Medical Center Foundation/Tucson Collaborative Community Care/\$75,000/\$0  
 Youth on Their Own/YOTO Program (Academic Stipends)/\$40,000/\$0  
**CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$1,625,786/\$75,000**

**Legal Services Service Category**

**Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation**

Step Up To Justice/Emergency Legal Services: Housing and Consumer Protection/\$46,000/\$35,000  
 YWCA Southern Arizona/Pima County Teen Court/\$54,432/\$30,000  
 International Rescue Committee, Inc./Immigration and Legal Services/\$75,000/\$0  
 Iskashitaa Refugee Network/Refugee Legal Referrals and Events/\$37,851/\$0  
 Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest/Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest/\$75,000/\$0

Sunnyside Unified School District Foundation/Emergency Relief Support - JUNTOS/\$75,000/\$0  
**CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$363,283/\$65,000**

**Medical Expenses and Related Needs Service Category**

**Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation**

Banner Health Foundation, d.b.a. University of Arizona Cancer Center/Banner UACC Patient Transportation and Lodging Assistance/\$30,000/\$30,000

Arizona Diaper Bank/Diapers for Infants, Children, Disabled, and Seniors/\$75,000/\$0

International Rescue Committee, Inc./Covering urgent healthcare costs for refugees/\$25,000/\$0

Pima Council on Aging/Dementia Capable - Cognitive Screenings and Care Navigation/\$50,000/\$0

**CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$180,000/\$30,000**

**Transportation Service Category**

**Agency/Program/Amount Requested/Recommendation**

Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group (Arivaca HR)/The Arivaca Connector - Burrito Bus 2.0/\$25,000/\$25,000

Girl Scouts of Southern Arizona/Girl Scouts EmpowHERment Program: Inclusion and Accessibility through Transportation/\$30,000/\$25,000

Tucson Center for Women and Children, d.b.a. Emerge Center Against Domestic Abuse/Transportation Assistance for Domestic Violence Survivors/\$25,000/\$25,000

Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc., d.b.a. Valley Assistance Services Transforming Health Care through Transportation/\$65,361/\$0

La Frontera Center, Inc./Bridging the Gap: Youth Transportation Program/\$74,496/\$0

**CATEGORY SUBTOTAL: \$219,857/\$75,000**

**STCER 2 GRANT PROGRAM SERVICE CATEGORIES TOTAL: \$3,732,045/\$855,000**

Daniel Sullivan, Director, Community and Workforce Development, expressed his gratitude to the Outside Agency Committee and staff for their work reviewing this funding and ensuring the dollars were appropriated effectively. He stated there were minimum awards of \$25,000.00 and maximum awards of \$75,000.00, and 67 applications were received totaling \$3.8 million.

Supervisor Scott stated that based on the criteria used to make the recommendations, he asked how \$610,000.00 was going towards food assistance.

Mr. Sullivan responded that it was because that was the most immediate need. He explained that the logic was that due to cuts in SNAP benefits, more people were going to food banks and losing or not understanding what was happening with SNAP benefits.

Supervisor Scott stated that he expected that would be the answer and that part of the issue was not just federal actions, but also state actions about determining eligibility within the law.

Mr. Sullivan stated that was correct, and that SNAP cuts were rolled out earlier than Medicare cuts. He stated that he was working with Deputy County Administrator Holmes and the Health Director Dr. on how to ensure people had the correct information on their benefits.

Supervisor Heinz noted that although \$1.6 million was requested in the Housing Utility Support category, the Board was only able to give out \$75,000.00. He stated

that he understood food being the most immediate need but given the County's robust ending fund balance situation and the tremendous need, he suggested another funding round could occur before the end of the fiscal year.

Supervisor Christy asked if the normal way these programs would be funded, through the state or federal government, had been cut off.

Mr. Sullivan responded that these were agencies who had done business with Pima County in the past, particularly the Outside Agency Program. He stated that SNAP was directly administered by the State of Arizona.

Supervisor Christy asked if the funding was coming from the General Fund, and if so, if the source of the funding was always from the General Fund.

Mr. Sullivan responded in the affirmative. He indicated that there was always extra need and that there had not necessarily been cuts from state programs, they had actually seen additional rent and utility assistance programs, but there had been uncertainty from federal programs.

Supervisor Christy asked if there had never been money from the General Fund for these items.

Mr. Sullivan responded that there had, particularly in the Outside Agency Program, which this item was an expansion of that program on an emergency basis. Chair Allen pointed out that Arizona led the country in drop-off of people receiving SNAP benefits, at about 460,000 people in Arizona lost SNAP benefits, including an estimated 68,000 in Pima County. She said that based on the amount requested in the program, the need was increasing and expressed gratitude to staff for navigating this program. She hoped in the future there were federal and state policies that supported families rather than kicked them while they are down.

Supervisor Cano expressed his gratitude to Community and Workforce Development and the Outside Agency Review Committee. He stated that he was pleased with being able to provide much needed support for families and people in Southern Arizona.

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

## **COUNTY ATTORNEY**

### **54. Proposed Settlement in Consolidated Cox Communications Tax Appeals**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding a proposed settlement in Consolidated Cox Communications Tax Appeals, TX2020-001152 and TX2022-000428.

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

55. **Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy No. C 6.2, Board of Supervisors Delegation of Settlement Authority for Property Tax Appeals.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that the current policy delegated authority to the Assessor for tax appeal settlements up to \$30,000.00 and the proposed revisions would increase that authority to \$100,000.00. He stated that any proposed settlement of a tax appeal claim that was above that amount would come before the Board for their consideration.

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

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

56. **Revisions to Personnel Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Personnel Policy No 8-105, Annual Leave.

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

**CONTRACT AND AWARD**

**PROCUREMENT**

57. Workday, Inc., Amendment No. 6, to provide for the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System and amend scope of services, no cost, (SC2400001562) Administering Department: Information Technology

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

58. Iron Brick Associates, L.L.C., to provide for Deployment of Workday Grants Module, term date 4/21/26 to 8/31/27, IT Capital Projects Fund, contract amount \$425,000.00 (SC2600000072) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Finance and Risk Management

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

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

### **59. Trial Court Appointments - Nominating Committee District 3**

- Appointments of Kristen Randall, Stephanie Miller, Benjamin Elias, and Genesis Cubillas, Democrats, to replace Tom Tronsdal, Cazlin Robbins, Mari Helen High and Tim Escobedo. No term expirations.
- Appointments of Cristal Franco and Brad D'Emidio, Independents, to replace Walter Richler and Scott Cavell. No term expirations.
- Appointment of Pam Moseley, Republican, to replace Roxanne Ziegler. No term expiration.

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

### **60. CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

At the request of Supervisor Christy to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 1 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

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

\* \* \*

### **PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR CHRISTY**

#### **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

##### **Community and Workforce Development**

1. Old Pueblo Community Services (OPCS), to provide for an Affordable Housing GAP Funding Agreement for OPCS Veterans Center, term date 4/21/26 to 12/31/27, General Fund, contract amount \$500,000.00 (PO2600007903)

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

\* \* \*

#### **CONTRACT AND AWARD**

##### **Community and Workforce Development**

1. Old Pueblo Community Services (OPCS), (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

## **Elections**

2. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 4/21/26 to 12/31/29, contract amount \$500,000.00 revenue (CT2600000031)

## **Forensic Science Center**

3. Arizona State University, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT2600000036)

## **Office of Digital Inclusion**

4. State of Arizona, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for the colocation of the State of Arizona Department of Transportation Fiber Facilities within the Pima County Regional Middle Mile Project (PCRMMP), term date 4/21/26 to 6/30/28, contract amount \$2,546,870.00 revenue (CT2600000038)

## **Parks and Recreation**

5. Tucson Cactus and Succulent Society, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for the development, operation and maintenance of Pima Prickly Park, extend contract term to 8/14/31 and amend contractual language, no cost (SC2400000493)

## **Procurement**

6. Toshiba America Business Solutions, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide for Toshiba Multi-Function Device Maintenance PC Owned Service, extend contract term to 5/31/27 and amend contractual language, 10644CC PCA - Information Technology System - General Funds, contract amount \$600,000.00 (SC2500000623) Administering Department: Information Technology
7. Kaizen Laboratories, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for Point-of-Sale and Reservation Management System, extend contract term to 5/6/29 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount \$135,000.00 (SC2400001816) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Parks and Recreation and Conservation Lands and Resources

## **Real Property**

8. Southwestern Fair Commission, Inc., Amendment No. 2, to provide a license agreement granting use of office space located at the Pima County Fairgrounds (a.k.a. The Old West Building) to be occupied by the Pima

County Sheriff's Department for use as a temporary substation, extend contract term to 5/6/28 and amend contractual language, SD-Vail District Fund, contract amount \$84,048.00 (CT\_24-444)

### **Recorder**

9. Town of Sahuarita, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 3/24/26 to 12/31/26, contract amount \$15,000.00 revenue (CT2600000028)
10. Town of Oro Valley, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 3/24/26 to 12/31/26, contract amount \$25,000.00 revenue (CT2600000034)
11. City of South Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for election services, term date 3/24/26 to 12/31/26, contract amount \$6,500.00 revenue (CT2600000029)

### **Sheriff**

12. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), to provide a FBI Cooperative Agreement to support the Homeland Security Task Force with investigations focused on weapons and drugs, term date 4/21/26 to 9/30/26, contract amount \$90,000.00 revenue (CT2600000020)
13. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), to provide a DEA Cooperative Agreement to support the Homeland Security Task Force with investigations and removal of drugs, term date 4/21/26 to 9/30/26, contract amount \$30,000.00 revenue (CT2600000024)

### **Transportation**

14. City of Tucson, to provide an intergovernmental agreement for improvements to S. Country Club Road, E. Michigan Street to E. Milber Street, Project ID: 25138PTR, contract amount \$1,150,000.00 revenue/5 year term (CT2600000032)
15. City of Tucson, Amendment No. 1, to provide a lease agreement for 1313 S. Mission Road Testing Lab, asphalt and material testing, extend contract term to 4/14/27 and amend contractual language, contract amount \$39,339.82 revenue (CT2400000038)

### **GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE**

16. **Acceptance - Recorder**  
Arizona Secretary of State, to provide for the Arizona Voter Information Database (FY2026 AVID), \$152,395.72 (G-RE-108067)

## **BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE**

17. **Pima County Healthcare Benefits Trust Board**  
Appointment of Oscar Diaz, to replace Jared Perkins. Term expiration: 8/6/29. (County Administrator recommendation)
18. **Self-Insurance Trust Fund Board**  
Reappointment of Drew Palmer. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (Staff recommendation)
19. **Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee**
  - Reappointment of Daphne Hope. Term expiration: 7/31/27. (Committee recommendation)
  - Reappointment of Eric Post. Term expiration: 9/30/27. (Committee recommendation)
  - Reappointment of Ingmar Riedal-Kruse. Term expiration: 11/30/27. (Committee recommendation)
20. **Pima County/Tucson Women's Commission**  
Correction to term expiration: Maria Vianey Valdez-Cardenas, term expiration: ~~5/20/26~~ **2/2/30**.

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

21. **Special Event**  
Vaughn Tiller James, Pony Horse Foundation, Sweetwater Reserve, 4025-4049 W. Cuprite Loop, Tucson, April 18, 2026.

## **ELECTIONS**

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

### RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:

Autumn Luepke-009-DEM, Angel Martinez-026-DEM, Roger Vandabeele-040-DEM, Jennifer Martin-040-DEM, Erika Fisher-067-DEM, Mark Mandel-084-DEM, Joan Will-088-DEM, Katherine Stratford-091-DEM, Bert Gustafson-145-DEM, Martin Drozdoff-148-DEM, Iman Bah-154-DEM, Judith Browder-170-DEM, Teresa Knable-172-DEM, Cathleen Becskehazy-210-DEM, Peter Becskehazy-210-DEM, William Lake-Wright-069-REP, James Willenbecher, Jr.-127-REP, Mark Erwin-232-REP, Lori Erwin-232-REP, Isabella Sizer-227-REP

**APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:**

Lucas Titone-012-DEM, Michael O'Connell-033-DEM, Jose Lopezruiz-054-DEM, Lovely Ganthier-064-DEM, Keith Garner-073-DEM, Katherine Stratford-073-DEM, Nathan Malis-100-DEM, Susan Thistle-131-DEM, Judith Browder-143-DEM, Susan Cover-151-DEM, Richard Cover-151-DEM, Janet Hancock-151-DEM, Julie Prince-115-DEM, William Swan-210-DEM, Charles Wantman-214-DEM, Alida DeSaracho-061-REP, Lori Patterson-069-REP, Grant Anderson-093-REP, Jordan Ochoa-094-REP, Margaret Gerhardt-104-REP, Donna Wilhelm-106-REP, Sandra Shelton-108-REP, Jeffrey Allen-116-REP, Kelsey Forrest-116-REP, Lawrence Pecora-127-REP, Fernando Gonzales-144-REP, Natalia Escamilla-148-REP, Raoul Garza-154-REP, Timothy Geoghegan-170-REP, Johnny Gallego-173-REP, Patricia Hanson-181-REP, TammyAnn Kramer-198-REP, Pamela Neal-220-REP, Alex Bathe-220-REP, Daniel Olsen-224-REP, Mary Swain-Smith-243-REP, Roger Harmon-247-REP, Jeffrey LaMarch-275-REP, Nancy Carlson-275-REP, Theresa McCoy-275-REP

**RECORDER**

23. Pursuant to Resolution No. 1993-200, ratification of the Document Storage and Retrieval Fund for the month of February, 2026.

**RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE**

24. Minutes: February 3, 2026 and March 27, 2026

\* \* \*

61. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

---

CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

CLERK

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### 38. Federal and State Legislative Agenda - Passenger Rail

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyists to explore the feasibility and viability of accelerating the development of Passenger Rail between Phoenix, Tucson and Nogales, Sonora. This is related to Mexico's national "Plan 2030" to create high-speed passenger rail across the nation, including from Mexico City to Nogales, Sonora, and our region's ability to tap into this major infrastructure investment to create greater binational connectivity, commerce and economic development. (District 2)

### 39. Federal and State Legislative Agenda - Commercial Rail/Freight

Discussion/Direction/Action directing the County's lobbyists to explore the feasibility and viability of increasing Pima County's capacity as a major inland port, including augmenting commercial rail capacity between Tucson and the Nogales Port of Entry. This is related to the ongoing expansion of the Port of Guaymas in Sonora, MX, to be able to take on a greater share of international shipping and freight. (District 2)

#### Verbatim

---

JA: Chair Allen  
MH: Supervisor Heinz  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AC: Supervisor Cano  
JL: Jan Leshner, County Administrator  
MM: Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board

---

JA: So, we are going to go back to Item 34. This is an item introduced by Supervisor Heinz, Federal and State Legislative Agenda Item. I will pass it to you, Supervisor, to set this up.

MH: Thank you, and I know there are a lot of—oh, that is what that does. I hit the switch under the desk and my monitor changed so no one could see that except me so I just looked strange. All right, so Items 34 and 35 are related, as was presented during the January 29th Pima Association of Governments meeting, discussions about passenger rail that is occurring in Mexico, huge infrastructure program there, a six-year program, possibly more than that that they embarked upon in 2024, connecting Mexico City in three phases to our southern border, Nogales, Sonora. I have been very interested and had the Consul Fernando Sanchez representing the Mexican government and other government officials from Mexico, and also industry folks who are familiar with both the subject of 34, which is passenger rail and 35, speak to the Pima Association of Governments. That was very well received. There is a significant amount of interest in the state, especially our colleagues in Santa Cruz County and the City of Nogales are also very interested in this, as it would be greatly beneficial. This is generational infrastructure type stuff we are talking about,

would be greatly beneficial to Arizona, the nation, Tucson, Nogales, and of course, to Sonora. In talking with some of our federal and also our contract lobbyists here in Arizona, the request was made to have this formally be something that is on our legislative agenda so that they can do things like, for example, there is the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill is being marked up. I do not know where it is in the process, but I think that is something that they are planning to vote on at the federal level in September or October, and in order to fully engage with our lobbying team to get them to, maybe on the passenger rail side, get a few million dollars for a study to help elevate the identified corridor for passenger rail between, say, downtown Tucson and Nogales. That would be something that would be fantastic. In light of the fact that we do have Juan Ciscomani, who sits on Appropriations and the subcommittee for Transportation, and another representative, Greg Stanton, who is on Foreign Affairs as well as Transportation. This basically adds this to our legislative agenda so that our contract lobbyist and our federal lobbying folks can work on this and hopefully get some additional funds and attention on this particular project. I will, I guess, move that we add this item to our legislative agenda.

JA: I will second it and open it up for discussion.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. If I might, to my colleague from District 2, I am hesitant to add additional work to the portfolio of our state and federal contract lobbyists at this time. We have got budget appropriation process on both the state level and the federal level that I think requires our utmost attention, and we really are only just about two months away from needing to submit all of our proposed items for our legislative agenda to the County Administrator. I look forward to supporting these particular items in that document over the summer and look forward to continuing to partner with you on the number of options and exploration that we can have with those discussions with our partners. I am hesitant to do that right now, only because I know that our lobbying teams are trying to put out a lot of fires on our behalf.

MH: Just to clarify, this was requested by our contract lobbyist that we, the Board, do this. We are still going to be talking to him about these issues, he just would like to have the Board's affirmation of it. Also, the fact that the Surface Transportation Reauthorization is happening right now, I do not know that waiting two or three months would allow this to even happen, potentially on the passenger rail side one. So at least that one I would like to see move forward.

JA: I think my question is just one of scope and scale of what it is that we are directing our lobbyists to do. It seems like this is something that two or three full-time lobbyists could be working on for a decade. I am wondering how it is that we set—and just to state the obvious, that we have a very full legislative agenda from a legislature that is always looking to carve away some of the roles and responsibilities of the County and shifting costs to the County, a budget to navigate. They have got other things on their plate, so I am just wondering if there is a way to refine this so that we are giving explicit direction about what it is that they are working on? One example is, if we want our federal lobbyists to lobby on our behalf for the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill, right. If there is ways to make this more specific, I would be more comfortable with it, because otherwise this is a

decades long endeavor. I do not know how otherwise to how our lobbyists then balance this with the other things, if that makes sense.

MH: Sure, Chair Allen, that is alright. I guess we did write it more broadly, but that is the specific thing that they said that they felt comfortable and they could potentially accomplish that right now, to work to getting some kind of possible small appropriation for a study in that particular bill that is coming up later this fall. That is exactly what I have been asking them to help us with, so that is the specific ask.

JA: And with the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill, does that encompass both passenger rail, as well as commercial rail?

MH: Yes, I believe it, yes, yes.

JA: Then I wonder if I can make an amendment to this to direct the County's federal lobbyists to, you know, advocate, lobby and encourage, engage on these surface transport...someone else could probably come up with better wording, but working on the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill to try to get funds for some feasibility, some initial analysis, for passenger and commercial rail so that it is just a tighter package and then come back. I think as Supervisor Cano suggested putting this back onto our legislative agenda when we approve that review and approve that in, I think that is July.

MH: That would be fine. Then is that a substitute motion for my previous motion?

JA: I don't know.

MH: Because I do not know how this works.

MM: [Inaudible response]

MH: Oh, okay, an amendment? Yeah. Of course, that is fine. We can refine that like that. That would be great.

JA: So you are seconding the amendment, is that right?

MH: Accepting the amendment.

JA: Accepting the amendment. Is there a second to that amendment?

MH: You did.

JA: I seconded it?

MH: I made a motion, you seconded it

MM: [Inaudible response at the same time as Supervisor Heinz]

MH: You revised it, I accepted your amendment.

JA: Okay, alright, so any further discussion?

AC: Chair Allen, I will not be able to support the amendment either. I have received stakeholder input that this is not ready for prime time yet, and I have further questions about whether the County is in the lead on lobbying for this particular infrastructure investment. I would be happy to support it in a July legislative agenda as part of the 30 plus items that we consider, but having just been up there at the state Capitol, I recognize that late additions to our legislative agenda can be something that can distract us from what we are trying to do, which is to ensure that we are staying out of the legislature's way and that we are looking for additional investment. This conversation is a bilateral conversation that we have to have with lots of stakeholders. To my colleague from District 2, have we received assurances that we are making this appropriation ask, or is this an ask on behalf of the various stakeholders that are going to be impacted by an appropriation?

MH: To clarify, this is for congress, not the state legislature. What I am talking about now with this particular bill and why Mr. Racy asked us to consider this now.

AC: Even then, Chair Allen and Supervisor Heinz. Have we done our due diligence with the stakeholders on this particular item? Meaning, have we convened a group like the state of Sonora, like you said the Consulate's office has been engaged. The tourism agency, Visit Tucson, I would love to engage them on this process. I am just wondering, could we accomplish the same thing in two months' time with our comprehensive legislative agenda?

MH: I do not, again, having had discussions with all jurisdictional leadership at Pima Association of Governments, having had participants on both of these topics, 34 and 35 from the state of Sonora, from industry in Sonora literally working on these things right now, from the Arizona Department of Transportation. I think the only stakeholder that we have yet to engage at this point, I believe is a representative from Union Pacific, but this is very preliminary. This is study dollars. This is something that Mr. Racy suggested that we do as soon as possible because of the fact that in congress it is getting late to make any changes to that Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill, and there is no guarantee that anything gets in there but that is why I thought I needed to bring it forward a little sooner. Is there a specific stakeholder that you would like us to engage with? Because I am happy to include anyone who feels this needs more work.

AC: Chair Allen and Supervisor Heinz. My general hesitancy is that we are nearing the end of April and we have a legislative agenda that we are about to approve in two months and adding additional federal or state stipulations to our legislative priorities, I believe it is setting a bad precedent, and ultimately, we can get to the same destination in just a few months. What I am particularly interested in is...Administrator Leshner, you might be able to answer this, we already have a fully vetted federal lobbying strategy for infrastructure projects, and that list has been given the green light by the Board. Any time we ask and add more to our list of requests that, ultimately, in the eyes of appropriators, shifts where their priorities are on what is being asked of and so more specifically, when we start to add to the

federal agenda, I am concerned that County projects that we are requesting, there is infrastructure projects with capital improvements, there is also some public safety and public health efforts. Administrator Leshner, do you have an update on what those conversations have been with our federal delegation on those appropriations?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano. I do not have an update on those items, but happy to get those for you. I will just say that one of the reasons that we had asked that this item come back is we do have limited resources and we ask that our lobbyists not work on something that they are billing hours to the County without the authorization of the Board, which is why this has come back today as well. I think we are looking at any time we have something that we think expands past some of the original identified pieces, we come back to the Board for authorization and make sure that we continue to lobby on behalf of the full Board. Thank you.

AC: Thank you.

JL: Happy to get an update on the other.

AC: And Chair Allen, Administrator Leshner. Can you maybe give us some insight as to the additional full-time roles that we have just added to the Economic Development team? There is particularly an emphasis on foreign investment. Is this a conversation that might also kind of be supplemented by the addition of those positions and timeline for when those positions would start?

JL: Thank you, Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano. The Board did authorize two new positions, one dealing with foreign direct investment, and one to assist with our legislative program when you approved the funding, the allocation of some of the funds that we will be receiving from Project Blue sale of the land. We have created the positions, we have gone through the Human Resources process, the Board created those positions. I do not have an update today on the status of the hiring of those, but we will be happy to get back to the Board with that. But yes, I think both of those positions will certainly be able to advocate on behalf of this kind of project.

JA: You know, I think I am going to pull...what is the word? It is not even that late in the day...I am going to retract my amendment. I am sensitive to the limited resources that we have around the current lobbying effort, and I do not want to dilute. If we are on the edge of bringing on a couple of staff that would be able to work on this, then I think I would wait until we have got those staff on board and have more of a concerted effort. And the other part right of my amendment was about making sure that this is brought up as part of our legislative agenda, because I like to look at things in totality and see how things are fitting. So, I think I will pull back my amendment and hope that this can come back up when the staff are on board. And as we are putting together in two months, our full federal and state legislative agenda and sort of see it in the totality of what it is that we are trying to move forward so that I am not worried about our lobbyists being stretched too thin and being asked to do something else while they are working to advocate for other capital projects at the federal level and then the things that we have asked them to do at the state level.

MH: So, we hate rail now?

JA: I love rail, do not get me wrong. I want to be one of the first folks that is like jetting from here to Mexico City.

MH: Probably not if we do not actually vote on this. Look, it is not going to show up in the in the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill, anything, if we do not tell them in the next...soon to do stuff. I do not think it might be too late now. It is definitely going to be late in two weeks, two months rather. So, I do not know why this is actually a contentious issue. Literally, Michael Racy, on a call, suggested this.

JA: And the reauthorization happens on an annual basis, right?

MH: I do not know enough about congress, I am not sure exactly what frequency it happens. I know it is happening in September or October this year.

JA: Yeah. I mean, I feel okay waiting for a couple months because of the fact that this is a monstrous project. It will take 10, 20 years. People have been talking about rail from Phoenix to Tucson for...I had friends that joked that they could actually do—well, I will not tell you my anecdotes, but it has been something that people have been talking about and advocating for, and plans have been sketched out between Tucson and Phoenix for a long time. I think it is something that is going to take a while. I just want to ensure that we are not diluting the lobbying efforts that we already have in place and which come to an end when we renew our legislative agenda in just a couple months. That is why I feel okay with it, even though I love the idea of rail.

MH: Okay, is this going to be the same conversation we have for everything? Because I want to modify the legislative agenda three more times. So, I am just going to withdraw all the items and save everyone the....actually, no I will not. Let us talk about each of them.

MM: [Inaudible response]

JL: [Inaudible response]

JA: So, I withdrew my amendment...okay, so the original motion was there. Any further discussion? For your original items?

MH: [inaudible] second, so the motion fails.

JA: I withdrew my amendment.

MH: Oh, you withdrew the amendment?

JA: I withdrew the amendment, so then we return to the original motion that I had seconded. You made the motion, I seconded it, opened it up for discussion. And it was in the course of that discussion that I introduced the amendment. So that is gone. So, we are back now to the original motion.

MH: Okay. I guess to clarify, at what point would my colleagues be interested in talking about the legislative agenda? Even if there is an urgency, is there a specific meeting that we would like to talk about this on?

JA: When do we normally do the review of our legislative agenda?

JL: Chair Allen. We send the information out to staff in July. We bring it to the Board generally in late July or August, depending upon when the meetings fall compared to when do we need to get our proposed agenda to the County Supervisors Association.

MH: Okay, so bring this back in August when we want to get it done by Congress in September. All right. I will withdraw Items 34, 35, I don't remember...

JL: Addendum 8 and 9?

MH: I just want to hear, is that, my colleagues do not want to talk about anything for the legislative agenda? We can modify it at any time, guys, it does not matter the date. But is that what I am hearing? I do not want to waste anyone's time. Or I could put them in the form of a proclamation? No, too soon? Okay. This is kind of disappointing, guys, no one is saying anything, so...

JA: I would prefer to see them in the totality of everything that we are putting forward. One other thing that I will add, for the addendum ones, I do not yet know enough. And the other thing that I would want to know, and I do not know if I am sort of speaking out from other items, but it just I get unintended consequences. Things that we would be calling on lobbyists to advocate for, that would impact other counties. Because some of our items are specific to a certain context that we are sitting in, but I do not how it may affect others in the landscape. Other counties may be impacted. I think I would just want to dig in a little bit for 8 and 9 around that.

MH: Okay. Well, we can talk about 8 and 9 today, but I will withdraw 34 and 35, if that is the will of the Board, which I will interpret that it is because no one is saying anything other than you.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Related to items mentioned by my colleague from District 2. I have seen him be so successful walking the halls of congress and being able to represent the County's interests. I do think we are headed in the same destination for support of these items. I do want to ensure that we are staying focused on the County's capital infrastructure needs that we have already approved. What I worry is we keep adding to the legislative priority at the state and federal levels and we do not stay focused on those existing priorities. Adding this, I do not want the message to be that this is the County's sole item of importance. I am worried that once we go into an appropriations office at the federal level, that that is the message that is going to

be received. But as I have said, I have seen my colleague from District 2 work those rooms, work those negotiations, and I truly feel that we can still accomplish that either through the legislative agenda, or through the form, Supervisor Heinz, of a proclamation as well. I think that is not too soon as a solution for me, but I have already heard from stakeholders related to rail that need to be at the table. I firmly believe that with this Board support of additional Full-Time Equivalents toward economic development, with a partnership on bilateral and binational conversations, we are headed in that direction.

MH: Thank you.

JA: Okay, to clarify where we are. 34 and 35 are being pulled. We will see them again come July, August as part of the proposal for our legislative agenda or lobbying agenda.

SC: We could have driven to Nogales by now.

JA: My friends' jokes were that they could probably get to Phoenix faster using one of those hand-push rail things.

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 40. Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety

Verbatim

---

JA: Chair Allen  
RS: Supervisor Scott  
SC: Supervisor Christy  
AC: Supervisor Cano  
JL: Jan Leshar, County Administrator  
SB: Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
SH: Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator  
JD: Jenifer Darland, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

---

JA: We are now going to go to our other reports. That is Agenda Item 36, which is an Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety, to Ms. Darland.

JD: Thank you, Chair Allen, members of the Board. Good afternoon. Today's update...I will just wait for the slides to come up. Covers the second...not quite yet, sorry, we are actually on the update on homelessness and related issues, not as brilliant as Ms. Davis, could not do her presentation justice. While they are coming up, I can go ahead and give the introductory comments related to this particular update. It is going to cover the second of the Board directed progress reports on the One Pima Initiative, as passed by the Board of Supervisors in November of 2025. As you all recall, One Pima covers five priority areas that address public safety, access to treatment and care, including the revitalization of public spaces for recreational purposes and supporting impacted neighborhoods. You see before you those five priorities, "Clean Up for the Loop and Safety" being Priority No. 1. Priority Area 2 is "Public Health and Treatment Access". The third, "Expand Treatment and Diversion Programs." The fourth, "Stabilize Housing and Prevent Homelessness," and the fifth would be the "Support for Impacted Neighborhoods and Small Businesses." Today's report is the second progress report and is focusing on metrics and milestones associated with One Pima. Next slide, please. Thank you. So, for Priority Area No. 1, we are talking about the two impacted departments, which would be the Regional Flood Control District and Parks and Recreation. The Board may recall in December of '25, you all passed and approved a master agreement for the Regional Flood Control District to have expedited cleanup services of the Chuck Huckelberry Loop and adjacent washes. In total, since December, we have 92 sites that have been cleaned or remediated, a total of 181 tons, which equates to over 363,000 pounds. One ton equals 2,000 pounds. The total cost to date is \$207,006.81. Additionally, I want to note that the January update of totals in the February report have since been updated since staff have fully reconciled the billing, so the total adjusted cost and the sites reflect those adjustments accordingly. As the Board may be aware, we have the Chuck Huckelberry Loop survey, which launched on February 26th. It will

close at the end of the month, and so far, we have over 90% of the respondents having noted a preference for improved map, route planning and navigation tools and resources for their recreational use of the amenity. We look forward to the conclusion of the survey to inform those improvements, but suffice it to say, our County Communications, our County IT, Parks and Rec, and Regional Flood Control District are already making those improvements to the website, the tools, including the geographic information tools that help for improved route planning, wayfinding and distance calculation. Next slide please. This slide covers two priority areas in brief. The first would be Priority Area No. 2, "Strengthen Public Health and Treatment Access." The Board maybe has reviewed the 2025 year-end report provided by the Detainee and Crisis Systems team. That report highlights some enhancements with the Inmate Navigation, Enrollment Support and Treatment Program, otherwise referred to as INVEST, as well as enhancements with reentry coordination as well. Additionally, Priority Area No. 2 includes planning around the heat relief network activities as facilitated by the County Health Department, as well as community partners. I will speak only briefly. Just note that that is covered in this priority area. Ms. Davis is going to include many more of the activities in her presentation. Priority Area No. 3...

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Pardon me for interrupting. I have had a couple of questions that are specific to Priority Area No. 2. We have a memo that is connected with this item and under Priority Area No. 2, the last paragraph says that, *"The team continues to bolster medical and mental health services and programming at the County's detention facilities. Overall, medical and behavioral health appointments have grown by almost 50%, and medically assisted treatment, MAT, has grown over 265% in the recent three-year period."* I am not sure if I should direct this question to Director Darland or to Ms. Leshner, but when we had the Blue Ribbon Commission that was looking at the jail, one of the areas that they said that had the most significant stress on its operations were the areas dealing with behavioral health and medical care. Have we heard from Sheriff Nanos or anybody at the jail that these very laudable increases in medical and behavioral health appointments and MAT has had any facility impacts?

JL: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, I have not heard directly. I am happy to find out, get an update and provide that back to the Board.

RS: I would appreciate it.

JL: Thank you.

RS: I would appreciate it since that was something that came up when we got that report from the citizens commission that looked at the jail. Also wanted to ask, and I believe this is under Priority Area No. 2. Near the end of that memo, under the section that says, "Administration and Transparency," the section dealing with

“Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 Budgetary Planning for One Pima.” *“Budgetary considerations for One Pima are incorporated into the FY2027 budget and include \$100,000.00 each for programmatic enhancements to the Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP), and the Supportive Treatment and Engagement Program with Services (STEPS)...”* DTAP and STEPS. DTAP, I think is through the County Attorney's office, STEPS through Superior Court. Do we know if that is sufficient, that additional \$100,000.00 for each one of those programs, do we know if that is sufficient, based on what we understand to be the need for both of those programs?

SH: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, I have been meeting with the groups. I know Administrator Leshner and I met originally with the courts. One of the things in the programmatic piece is related to DTAP. There was a need for Surveillance Officers (SO), but part of that is, folks that are on probation in the DTAP space. And one of the issues is, as probation has got a lot of work on their plate, they are really asking for another individual that could help navigate some of these pieces for them. They seem to suggest that this SO under the \$100,000.00 that was actually allocated should be enough to at least begin to look at that court differently. DTAP and drug court is still part of that, just for the record, it has kind of been blended, but some of those folks are a little bit more involved, which are folks in the DTAP program. So as of now, it seems like right now we have hit the mark for them at least to really improve some of the programmatic pieces in the DTAP program. With the STEPS program, it is a little bit more comprehensive, and I will just try to be brief, but part of STEPS programming is for County Attorney to look at an attorney that can actually work these cases a little bit more in detail. That is been part of the concern funding wise. However, I have to add that there is funding from the Health Department that we are looking at enhancing as well. That is not captured here because it is part of a grant. The marijuana money is 217 funds where we are going to add another Navigator from our Helping Ourselves Pursue Enrichment (HOPE) contract that will sit more closely with our pretrial services division, working to really ensure that once people get to court, that they are making the follow up visits as well. In addition to that, we are talking about some system improvement work with the STEPS court as well with the with the presiding judge to see if there is ways in which we can mitigate any kind of duplication of efforts or unnecessary meetings that are causing more of attorneys to attend. So, if people are doing well, the concern is should they have to be coming in every week? And so, we are looking programmatically at stuff, reassessing the distribution of resources through our HOPE contract, through the Health Department and then this extra \$100,000.00 will add some value to the County Attorney, help support some of the caseload as well. I feel like we have approached more comprehensively than what is particularly captured in that allocation of General Funds.

RS: So just to make sure I am clear on this, Chair Allen, as far as the programmatic enhancement of \$100,000.00 for DTAP, that seems to be sufficient. The extra \$100,000.00 for STEPS is welcome, but there is also some grant funding from federal sources that you are looking into that would also help STEPS. Am I summarizing that accurately?

SH: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, that is correct.

RS: Okay. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JD: Thank you. Having covered Priority Area No. 2, we will go into Priority Area No. 3, which is "Expand Treatment and Diversion Programs." The Sobering Alternative for Recovery is still in a pilot phase. The contractor has provided a mid-point evaluation to the Health Department, which is currently under review. The transition center, as previously reported upon by Director Vesely at last March's meeting of the Board, is on track for completing their recruitment and training for full complement to seven days a week by May. Next slide please. Thank you. So here we are at Priority Area No. 4 and being that the Board has already heard and considered the items related to the outside agency dollars, I really want to bring attention to the fact that in this particular category, we do not have outside agency programs identified. Going forward, we can work with Mr. Sullivan and his team to identify ways to include those metrics into the next update for the Board related to One Pima initiatives. But since the beginning of this current fiscal year, beginning July 1, 2025 through the end of March of '26, the Pima County programming, which is funded by federal, state and local as well as County of FY26 affordable housing funds, has served over 2,000 households. Nearly half, 968 of those households, have been households with children, which is a strong correlation to the Prosperity Initiative where we know that we interrupt generational poverty by ensuring that households with school-aged children or children under the age of 18 remain stably housed. A total of \$3.9 million has been administered. Again, that is from funding sources from federal, state and local dollars, as well as the County's affordable housing funds for this particular fiscal year, and on total, we are looking at just shy of \$2,000.00 per household when you take it on the whole cumulative amount. Again, these programs are for home repair, weatherization, both those that are administered with the County affordable housing funds, as well as those administered by the Community Development Block Grant funds, which Director Sullivan and his team have presented for the Board's approval this afternoon. The rent and utility assistance, as well as mortgage assistance, these programs across the board are for households who are earning at or below 80% of the Area Median Income, and I believe that under current calculations, for a family of four that is just shy of \$75,000.00, and the rapid rehousing, which is focusing on housing individuals who are experiencing homelessness and low barrier, high demand settings. Over 78 households and 33 children in total thus far. Next slide please. Under Priority Area No. 4 is the direction to staff to create a shelter bed dashboard. This is one of the things that gives me the most hope and the most pride of team Pima. This is a GIS or geographic information system dashboard built by the County's geographic information team, that would be Erik Glenn and Olga Constantino. I believe it is important to call them out because they have been tirelessly working on this dashboard. This image before you right now does not even do the current iteration justice and where we are now. It is a static representation of what we have, which is a tool by which you can filter locations and shelters based off of those programs that allow for pets, those programs which have sobriety requirements. Individuals are able to locate resources that are also fixed sites for support, including the Pima County Transition Center, as well as the Southern Arizona Veteran Association. It

has various different layers that also include the ability to identify various bus routes that can help individuals navigate to where they are going. Our plan right now is for this dashboard to go live into a public testing phase beginning end of business today, and the public testing phase will go through to the end of May. That will allow us the opportunity to have this dashboard used in public settings by members of the public, community outreach workers, as well as shelter providers. We can still continue to inform and improve upon its use and application. Furthermore, during that particular period, the County's Homeless Management Information team will be providing updates on the bed availability Monday through Friday twice a day, once at 10:00 a.m. and a second time at 3:00 p.m. The goal will also be to work with the shelter providers to identify appropriate staff and ensure that they are trained on how to update their bed inventory on a daily basis. This application will continue to be a collaboration between the County as well as the City of Tucson staff for the Tucson Pima Collaboration to End Homelessness (TPCH). This has been an ongoing and a very thoughtful effort and has involved multiple presentations to community stakeholders on its development. We do not expect that it will be perfect when it goes live. We expect that we are going to make improvements on it, but it is the first time we have had a tool like this available for this type of care coordination. Next slide. Not to be too brief, but Priority Area No. 5, just want to remark upon the event that was co-hosted by Supervisor Cano, as well as the Vice Mayor for City of Tucson on March 28th. Community and Workforce Development (CWD) was supportive in terms of reaching out to over 30 agencies and programs for participation at this really important, what was a block party. A lot of folks who attended and were connected with things such as home repair. We had Health Department out there with their mobile vaccine clinic, resources and supplies from the Pima Animal Care Center. And concurrently occurring was the Red Cross Heat Walk. Ms. Davis will speak to that, but that particular neighborhood in that area of our region is one of the top five priority areas when we look at heat vulnerability and preparedness planning. Last, Administration Transparency, to circle back to Supervisor Scott's remarks, while this required two updates on progress reports to the Board, the plan going forward will be to prepare an end of fiscal year report, which will go into more depth on some of the FY 2027 One Pima initiatives that, while budgeted in the recommended budget right now, are still working through some of the conversations with respect to those planned enhancements as Deputy County Administrator Holmes spoke to just briefly, as well as working on some of the pilot program for the small business support program aligned with Priority Area No. 5. The end of fiscal year report will also include a summary of all adjacent One Pima activities, and that would also include the conclusion of the Loop survey results, proposed next steps and adjacent activities. With that, I will pause to take any questions.

SC: Madam Chair?

JA: Supervisor Christy.

SC: Can we go back to the last chart towards the one before questions? There, Administration and Transparency, you have "End of Fiscal Year Report, Summary of

One Pima Activities.” Then it says, “Loop survey results.” What is the survey that you are...?

JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, on February 26th, we launched a Chuck Huckelberry Loop Satisfaction Survey that went out in both English and Spanish. We shared that with our regional partners, including folks out in Marana and Oro Valley, where the Loop also resides.

SC: So who took the survey?

JD: I am sorry?

SC: Who answered the survey?

JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, that would be members of the public who have responded. We have promoted that on social media. We have had that at various different County outreach events in the community as well. But really, we are soliciting input from the public.

SC: Madam Chair. Help me if I am wrong on this, because I was channel scanning some local news stations, and they were doing a report on homeless encampments around the Loop. The report said that exactly 200 homeless encounters were made and the homeless individuals were asked about taking part in services, and they did not get one positive result. Was that correct in that news report?

JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, I want to be thoughtful that when we are talking about those particular results, those are not necessarily for encampments just within the wash or proximity to the Chuck Huckelberry Loop. Those would be actual results from surveys or inspections completed by your Regional Flood Control District (RFCD), as well as our homeless outreach team throughout the region from May of '25 to the end of March 2026. So, it is the entire region.

SC: Were those accurate numbers?

JD: Yes, sir.

SC: 200 people were inquired about taking services and not one said they would do it?

JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Christy, yes, with one caveat. When our outreach team is not able to engage with an individual, they may count a person, but if that person is not responsive, they may count that individual, but they do not count whether or not they declined. There are always going to be some data entry errors, but overall, from even the conversation which just occurred yesterday with our outreach coordinator, by and large, the individuals who are outreached to through the course of the encampment protocol, more than often will decline services. When they do accept any sort of support, it will be for bottles of water, pet supplies, maybe an update in their housing assessment, or to see if they have been matched with

housing. But when asked if they would like to have a connection to an available shelter or treatment provider, they decline.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you.

JA: If I may, just to clarify that. Those interactions are happening when the encampment protocol is being triggered, right? Is it then that the person that they are interacting with is also trying to get them to move on and pack up and move from where they are in a wash or somewhere along the Loop?

JD: Thank you for that clarification, Chair Allen. Actually, our process is that we go out in advance within the 72-business hour posting for Notice to Vacate. And then in many cases, the RFCD will coordinate with the outreach worker far enough in advance to provide ample notice to the individuals, to ensure that there has been proper notification and especially want to be thoughtful to provide individuals opportunities to accept services between the time they are initially outreached to, to the time that the contractor is going to be on site. It does not behoove us from an operational perspective, or even for an hourly cost reimbursement for the contractor to have individuals still in that space when the contractor arrives. So, the team and the effort, and the protocol since 2015, has always been geared to lead with humanitarian services in advance of a land management response. Again, we always strive to connect individuals with resources and support, and unfortunately, we have not had a lot of uptake in recent months...well, since I have been in this capacity, to be honest with you. With that said, we have ensured that our outreach coordinator has taken a tour of the Sobering Alternative for Recovery (SAFR) Center, so that they are also aware that that resource is a point to which they can also navigate individuals they encounter in their efforts, both in the wash and the County maintained spaces in the incorporated jurisdictions, as well as those spaces in unincorporated Pima County.

JA: But even in that protocol of reaching out in advance of the cleanup team coming through, is that conversation still framed by, "Look, somebody is going to be coming through in a week or two weeks..." or whatever the time frame is, "...to clean up this area, you cannot stay here." And then is it a, "Can I refer you to X shelter or other safe spaces?" Is that kind of the setup, the context for the conversation?

JD: Chair Allen, yes. That essentially it is to say that we will be coming by to clean up, and this is not a space that is suitable for habitation. As I am sure you all are also aware, our washes and waterways are densely vegetated, and in particularly dry conditions as well. We worry about the safety of the individuals in those spaces, so our goal is always to get people connected to resources as quickly as possible. I would say that our strategy can always stand to have more refinement. I look at what we see in the safe city deployments. That has been a partnership, for better or for worse, with the law enforcement entities. There are likely more connections that are happening, but that is always going to be occurring with a justice nexus. There is always going to be some level of citation, or I want to be thoughtful to not necessarily say always, but more often than not, there is going to be some sort of citation that may occur for individuals too. Our process right now is strictly land

management with outreach services, and where appropriate, we do have to engage with law enforcement when we encounter those individuals who will not move on day of decommissioning. But more often than not, our team responds that our contractor is able to proceed to work. Individuals have cleared the area. That does not necessarily mean that they do not come back and reinhabit later.

JA: And do we track the data as well around citations issued?

JD: Chair Allen, we do not hold that data. I would be guessing here, but I would have to go back and check with our crew, I very rarely, in our efforts with the Sheriff's Department, are we seeing law enforcement for the purpose of citation. We see law enforcement for the purpose of ensuring safety of the staff, but we are not seeing a citation in the unincorporated areas that are in partnership with the Sheriff's Department.

AC: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you. I really appreciate, Ms. Darland, your presentation. I do believe that one of the missing links to the One Pima plan is enforcement and a greater cooperation with the Sheriff's Department on what used to be called the bike patrol. The first versions of the One Pima plan included that amount, and I just believe we have to continue to work hand in hand with our law enforcement, both within the City of Tucson, but certainly in the unincorporated areas of Pima County where we can ensure that enforcement and citations are a part of the conversation. That said, I am very optimistic with the current plan that we have right now, and I am going to be paying close attention to what kind of modifications we can make to One Pima. I have been saying, what does One Pima 2.0 look like, right? But for the purposes of today's discussion, what is very important for us to recognize is that Pima County since December, since adoption of the plan, has ensured that over 363,000 pounds of trash has been cleaned up from our County waterways and washes along the loop, along the Santa Cruz. This is crucial and is critical as we begin to figure out how we are going to ensure that the public is seeing action, and I commend you on that. Regarding the loop survey and some of the feedback that we are getting, I encourage you to continue to do your outreach so that we can have a representative sample Countywide. April 30th is the last day of this survey, and I look forward to robust public participation from the taxpayers. I wanted to talk really quick, Ms. Darland, if it is okay, about the Pima Shelter and Community Resource dashboard. When I introduced the One Pima Initiative, I was really thinking that this would be an innovative way for nonprofits to be able to keep track of the amount of shelter capacity that is available regionally. The example I have always said is that if we know how many hotel beds are in Pima County at any one point by going on to a third-party app, we should certainly be able to know what kind of shelter capacity is there. I am encouraged that you find the tool to now be innovative. I am just curious, have we discussed any kind of modifications to the existing outreach and contracts that we have with some of our nonprofit providers so that they can pay in or we can pay them, for instance, to be adding aggregate data? What kind of conversations

have happened to make sure that this is a fully implemented asset and tool that does not just get lost in translation? I feel like we have all created a tool, and at some point, relied on others, this is where the County really has to take the lead in ensuring that the data we are getting that is aggregated is in real time and accurate.

JD: Sure. Chair Allen, Supervisor Cano. To that point, while the TPCH was working on their five-year strategic plan, they had convened a conversation with shelter providers, admittedly, around how do we better identify beds availability throughout our region on a day-to-day basis? That conversation got underway just in time for One Pima to give County staff direction to build out the apparatus by which that information could be updated on a daily basis. From the very beginning, following the direction from One Pima, I have directly been participating in the work group that the TPCH has been hosting on this particular development. It has been a close coordination, talking routinely with city to staff who lead that effort on behalf of the continuum of care or TPCH. Feedback from them and their buy-in is it is going to be easier for shelter staff to update their bed availability on a daily basis, versus in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), which is required by Housing and Urban Development. So, we have to strongly encourage that our shelter providers do not abandon the data entry and the HMIS in lieu of what will be a fairly easy inventory and public reporting tool. In terms of the requirement, we are walking in close partnership in terms of, we really want collaboration here, and I believe that shelter providers also have seen this being a valuable resource for them, because imagine that you are a shelter provider, you have no bed availability. This dashboard also provides you and your staff the opportunity to share available bed space and location with individuals who may be attempting to seek resources at your particular establishment. Overall, it has been very positive and well received. We will find out more conclusively at the general council of TPCH where we will be doing a training with identified shelter staff on the use and the update of the information. The other piece I would add, is that part of our fiscal year appropriation for our emergency solution grant funds, we have always consistently required that the funded shelter providers update their bed availability in a program within the HMIS. While the contracts for the awards that you all just blessed this afternoon go forward into their draft, we are also encouraging that we add that language to the contractual requirements there as well, to ensure that we are holding both of these as valuable data sets that we want to make sure our shelter providers are providing that information to.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen and Ms. Darland, I appreciate the updates, and I look forward to you letting us know as a Board how we can continue to support implementation of this particular recommendation. I will leave it to you to continue to push our nonprofits and figure out what ways they can be a partner in this. Without their data, this dashboard does not work, and I really think that what we need to be considering as a regional convener is the ability to incentivize their participation in this tool, but also to get creative about some of the other ways that we have talked. I mean, my colleague from District 4 mentioned some services that are often ignored by folks who are unsheltered, and because we know the answers. We have heard that some folks are not going to shelters because they do not have animal storage capacity or personal storage capacity. This dashboard should be just as easily

readily identifiable if those shelters have those particular amenities available for folks needing shelter space. And if they are not, we should also be looking for ways to incentivize the good work of those non-profits who are housing our neighbors in these times of crisis. I just will plead with us to continue to be thinking outside of the box so that we can have some action. Last but not least, Chair Allen, in preparation for 2.0 of One Pima, I am going to be paying close attention to the cleanup efforts. They have been proven to be successful countywide, as I mentioned earlier, but I have realized in conversations with our regional providers that we also need to be exploring how the inner-city washways and culverts are contributing really to a lot of that waste going straight into the Santa Cruz. We are focusing on the Santa Cruz, but we are doing it in reverse order, in my opinion, because the Santa Cruz is the collector, so to speak, so what we need to do is be mitigating all of the trash and debris that is leading to the Santa Cruz. I am still going to celebrate nearly 400,000 pounds of trash cleaned throughout the region. That is a good thing. I appreciate everybody's participation to make One Pima happen. The District 5 Office, Chair Allen and colleagues, has had lots of neighborhood meetings in the last several weeks, with those neighborhoods directly adjacent to the Pima County Jail. One Pima has made a commitment to those five particular neighborhoods who have no choice but to be a neighbor of a carceral facility, and the recommendations that I have seen from this Administrator to invest in those impacted neighborhoods, to work on some of the blight, to provide the infrastructure that is needed. Not only is it welcome news for these neighborhoods, but I truly believe that it is our way to be good neighbors and mitigate some of the unintended consequences over decades of being a neighbor to this facility.

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you, Chair Allen. This item is titled "Update on County Initiatives to Address Homelessness and Public Safety," and although the attachments dealt with the second One Pima Progress report, I had some questions about information that was sent to the Board in a memo dated April 17th, "Follow up on Evaluation of Homeless Encampments in Unincorporated Pima County." I want to say to both Director Darland and to Mr. DeBonis, who has apparently taken Ms. Leshner's place on the dais, I do not need answers for this today. In fact, it might be preferable, given the nature of these questions, to wait until staff has some time to prepare a written response to the Board. The first question comes from the bottom of page two of that memo, dealing with survey tools and encampment data, and this will follow up on questions and comments made by Supervisors Cano and Christy, says, "*Since May 5, 2025, through March 31, 2026, a total of 262 individuals were encountered, as well as 113 pets. Of the individuals encountered, 43 accepted a housing assessment, outreach supplies such as pet food, water, hygiene items, or use of a phone with no one accepting connections to shelter or treatment. At this stage of implementation of the enhanced protocol, this is an area of effort for which staff are working to better understand the barriers to accepting services.*" What I would like is some written response to the Board with more detail on how that understanding is being built. You are trying to get a better understanding of the barriers to accepting services, I would like the Board to know how is that understanding being developed. Secondly, under "Strengthening Operational Coordination." The end of the first

paragraph says, *“This stage of implementation of the enhanced protocol is focused on establishing and maintaining a routine cadence of intradepartmental operational reviews, including evaluating ongoing areas of emerging need that warrant coordinated attention, as well as strategies that assure a uniform understanding and application of the protocol.”* I would like some more detail on what is taken up in those intradepartmental reviews, so that the Board just has a better sense of what is being discussed at the end of that paragraph. Then a clarification question, and maybe you can answer this now. Are the intradepartmental coordination meetings different from the quarterly meetings that are mentioned in the next section, “Coordination with Law Enforcement and Strategic Partners,” those are different meetings, right?

JD: Chair Allen and Supervisor Scott, yes.

RS: Okay. All right. So that helps because near the end of that section, it says, *“Ongoing collaboration between County land managing departments, Justice Services and the Tucson Police Department demonstrates that reciprocal processes would both reinforce the protocols, prioritization of outreach and service connection, while also promoting an engagement approach that minimizes the risk of unnecessary criminalization of individuals experiencing homelessness.”* What I am gathering from that, is that the experience of the city working with our departments has been instructive. I would just like some more detail on the lessons learned there, and how we are trying to incorporate them into these reciprocal processes that we want to have in place with the Sheriff's Department. If I am reading that correctly.

JD: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, yes. And briefly, as you noted, we have been observing the role our departments are directly participating in the Safe City deployments. We are seeing through iterated processes what that looks like, including reported increases in folks accepting some form of service. It feels like it is beneficial for us to learn and lean into that and see how that can inform the conversation that we are having similarly with our Sheriff's Department on their participation in shared areas of that are not just for land management, but also for the things that are being encountered by patrol deputies as well.

RS: So, fleshing out those lessons learned I think would be helpful for the Board. To the point that you just made, Director Darland. I believe that Mayor Romero said at our last joint meeting that city staff had seen an uptick in the number of people who were accepting services. In the next section dealing with annual protocol review, it says, *“Emerging improvements in intradepartmental coordination, data, tools and resource deployment, and strategies to strengthen outreach engagement will be key points for update and discussion.”* Once the protocol is revised, I would just like the Board to get an update that notes the most substantial changes to the protocol and why they were made, because my understanding is that that is going to be happening in the late spring.

JD: For clarification, Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott. What we will do, the protocol now requires an annual review that we can go over all the processes because as we know, this is an evolving crisis and as such the conditions change. So, annually we

are required to get together with staff. This also requires a safety training and review, so that we make sure that staff know how to facilitate the protocol safely. We anticipate that there might be some clarifications overall, a major revision already has been blessed, but we expect that there might be some clarification on how that gets operated, both in the things that are initiated as a result of a regional report, versus what a department would do when staff encounter an encampment on an asset that their department is responsible for maintaining. That is more information than you ask, but we will absolutely be sure to share back with the Board the process and what we have learned from that annual convening and opportunities for improvement of this procedure.

RS: Awesome. That would be exactly what I was interested in, is what are the lessons learned in terms of application of the protocol as you go through that annual review with the various departments? The last question I had is really directed, Mr. Brown, to the County Attorney's Office, because this memo makes reference to the fact that Director Darland and Ms. Davis were working in partnership with PCAO to make the final determination that is noted at the end of the memo, which is that there is not any additional need for any new ordinances or anything of that nature. The Board got an Attorney-Client Privilege Memo from your office dated July 8, 2025. It was written by you and Bobby Yu, and although I cannot talk about the content of that memo here because we did not release it from attorney-client privilege, if you and your team, Mr. Brown, could look at this memo from Ms. Leshner and her team, and if there is any follow up from a legal perspective that the Board needs, especially reflecting back on the July 8, 2025, Attorney-Client Privilege Memo. That would be of great interest to me, especially when I look at some of the points made in the section of Ms. Leshner's memo that is headed "Inter-jurisdictional Opportunities."

SB: Chair Allen, Supervisor Scott, we will look into that and send you a response.

RS: Thank you very much. Chair Allen, thank you, and thank you, Mr. DeBonis and Ms. Leshner.

AC: Chair Allen. If I can add to that point to Supervisor Scott's, for additional inquiries with our counsel. I guess I should step back a bit. So, greater enforcement along the loop of bike patrol monitored by the Sheriff's Department, to my understanding, for a ten-person crew would be about \$1 million. I am, Mr. Brown, very curious, and Administrator Leshner, about the funding mechanism for such an investment of that nature. I mean, there is obviously the very simple, it could be a General Fund allocation and not next year's, but the following year's budget. It is not part of the recommended for this current year, but the specific question is, could a secondary tax fund the service like this? If Flood Control is the mitigating entity where the loop is overseeing enforcement issues, could that particular secondary property tax fund an expenditure in a law enforcement category? I am curious if that is permissible as we start to just figure out how to ensure that public safety is our top priority. Thank you.

JA: I have a question. Anyone else? It was eerily silent. I understand that it was in the slide, it was obviously just a flat image. However, I often find from the District 3 lens

that maps of the County often end just west of Tucson and do not include the rest of Pima County. Looking at that did make me think to ask, the degree to which the dashboard around, and I know it is titled "Shelter and Community Resources," the degree to which it includes the rest of Pima County and extends out to community resources around the extent of the County's boundaries?

JD: Yes, Chair Allen. One of the things that I am most proud of with the GIS team's perspective here is not only do they include the community shelters, they take a truly regional look at the resources, including our libraries, our cooling site. Our cooling network is going to be incorporated as well, so Ajo is represented on that map. As is Vail, as is Green Valley, as is Sahuarita, to ensure a true regional understanding of what resources are available, especially those programs that are provided by the County. Again, the static image does not do it justice. With that said, I would like to follow up with the County Administrator's permission to reach out to each of the Board offices to offer an opportunity to do a demonstration along with the GIS team, on what the functionality looks like. Your input is also important as we continue to refine, but I think you will be very impressed with the ability to tap into this resource and be able to navigate to the next available connection point. It is really dynamic, but we genuinely took a regional lens when it was built.

JA: Great, thank you. Also, I am curious how...there was a grant that we approved a month or so ago from the Garcia Foundation. Creating a...I think it was a resource hub, if I have the language right, and I am curious how that connects with the dashboard or does not connect and where things are at with that hub itself.

JD: Chair Allen. CWD, which is the recipient of that two-year award from the Garcia Foundation, is currently under discussions right now in building out that hub and what that will look like as far as functionality, as well as internal coordination with resource navigators and external partners. My recommendation would be I can connect with Director Sullivan, see when they would be able to provide the Board an update on the status of that development and what they anticipate rolling into that functionality. The goal would be that irrespective of it is a hub, that the County operates, or even the team at the City of Tucson's Public Communications and Safety Department who operate 311, it would equally be a tool and resource that they too could utilize to help individuals calling in for support to navigate to resources.

JA: Great, thank you.

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

### 41. Pima County Climate Action Update

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

Verbatim

---

JA: Chair Allen

SD: Sarah Davis, Senior Advisor to the County Administrator

---

JA: We are indeed going to move on then to Item 37, which is our Pima County Climate Action Update. I will turn it to Ms. Davis.

SD: Thank you, Chair Allen, members of the Board, Administrator Leshner. As the presentation is getting pulled up, I will one day land this presentation squarely on Earth Day, but happy almost Earth Day. And now the slides are here. So, without further ado, we will get started on our bimonthly update on the Climate Action Plan for County Operations. As noted here in the first slide, there are several of the first year tasks that are enumerated by the Climate Action Plan for County Operations and its partner document, the CAPCO Implementation Plan, and today is a really exciting update where we are going to be discussing several of the foundational, data-driven approaches to CAPCO that have resulted in some really exciting early project successes for the County. Similarly, we will be discussing the project interconnection with other priorities across the climate plan and other strategic initiatives across the County, specifically and discussed by my colleague, Director Darland, the One Pima Initiative and the Prosperity Initiative's Climate Resilience and Environmental Justice cross-cutting policy. Next slide please. Slide before that, please. Thanks. So, first order of business in our CAPCO, as discussed with the Board, is to conduct an energy assessment across County facilities and our wastewater operations. This is a foundational effort that will enable the County to select projects and improve operations and capital investments that not only improve the operations overall but position us to meet our energy goals and realize cost savings thereof. As the Board knows, last May the Board adopted Board Resolution 2025-11, which commits the County to reduce emissions by 60% from 2021 levels. The County's emission goal is now, over the next five years, 30,613 metric tons of carbon emission equivalent between now and 2030. That is in part thanks to the significant emissions reduction work resulting from the CAPCO predecessor, the Sustainable Action Plan for County Operations. Today, we are going to highlight two really exciting projects that have an estimated 6,300 metric tons of carbon emissions reduction over the CAPCO timeline, which represents collectively, 20% of that five year goal, which is very exciting. Next slide please. So, the first of these projects is the Corona de Tucson Regional Wastewater Reclamation site project, which the Board approved in October of 2025 in early consideration of the CAPCO. This site serves several areas of Pima County,

including rural Pima County, specifically Arivaca, Avra Valley and Green Valley. This project positively affects Supervisorial Districts 2, 3 and 5. The project was a result of an energy assessment of wastewater operations and critical project identification to meet not only our energy goals but improve outcomes of the County's water priorities. So, the project improves energy efficiency, aeration and has renewable energy on site. This will improve the energy efficiency and positively benefit disinfection capabilities, increased aquifer recharge and recharge credits. The data associated with the project is estimated to save almost 29 million in kilowatt hours and 16,537 metric tons of carbon emissions equivalent over the 20-year lifetime of the project. Over the CAPCO period, that is over 4,000 metric tons of carbon equivalent alone. This project cost was \$7 million, with a projected cost savings of \$7 million over the 20 years of the contracted lifecycle and is estimated to have \$11 million total gross savings. These estimates are based on current costs, estimated savings, and energy utilization across this facility, and this project is protected by a performance-based contract to ensure the energy savings are realized from implementation of the site energy improvements. Next slide please. The next really big success and data driven project is the Abrams solar installation over the visitor parking lot in the front of the building. This is another example of how the County used its energy data and assessment, and data-driven approaches to pick a project that is strategic in investment and represents shared priorities across the CAPCO and the County. The County used its energy cap, which is its data on energy use, energy costs, and building specific efficiency performance to select the Public Health Center for a larger scale solar array in the visitor parking lot as you see in the top picture. This project is in District 2 but also positively affects all district offices as the County has a statute mandate for public health and services that are provided in this facility. The solar installation is estimated to save almost 33 million kilowatt hours and 7,547 metric tons of carbon equivalent over the 25-year lifetime, with just over 2,000 metric tons of carbon equivalent over the CAPCO period. This project is also in alignment with heat vulnerability and higher heat island risk data and will support solar shade for our public health center visitors, which includes new parents, infants and families visiting our vital records, patients visiting the family medicine clinic onsite adjacent to Banner South Campus, and all the public visitors that come to the campus. The project cost is \$1.7 million and is anticipated to pay itself off in roughly 9-10 years or sooner, dependant on utility cost increases. Notably, these cost savings estimates across both projects might also see additional benefit through some of the few remaining Inflation Reduction Act credits, and we will update the Board accordingly. Next slide. Slide before. Thanks. This is the second largest priority of the CAPCO, and this is what we are calling the Heat Vulnerability Map. This is a monumental achievement for the County, and this is work led by our Pima County Health Department's heat effort under its emergency preparedness team. The Health Department has developed this map that includes longitudinal data on heat related illness and Office of the Medical Examiner data on heat related deaths. This also includes City of Tucson's 911 heat related emergency calls and has included other County GIS layers for manufactured home density, specifically from our Assessor's office, urban and surface heat islands, tree equity scores, social vulnerability, census tract layers, supervisorial districts, and more. This map uses public health and epidemiological data to directly respond to heat and develop strategic coordination of cooling center locations, heat preparedness

efforts, and neighborhood community engagement. As stated in the climate plan, this is foundational to informing all of the other strategies across the chapters within the climate plan, specifically its water and landscapes chapter, green stormwater infrastructure investments, tree planting, and other needed infrastructure investments across County facilities and parcels. Next slide please. In that same vein, I want to echo Director Darland's shoutout to our Geographic Information Systems team. They have been very busy between our two initiatives and various other County initiatives, building visual representations that are essential for us to do the work that we do in a strategic way. This is a map that we are calling the Climate Asset Map, which will eventually be available on PimaCan!, our website, in an effort to continue our reporting and accessibility to our climate initiatives for the public, this will be an overall map that the public can toggle through and find out the County's assets, such as EV charging, wastewater, solar installations, recycling, cooling center network, among many other layers that can be available and accessible. Next slide please. Like the projects before, I wanted to highlight an example of data-driven action and alignment across several of County priorities, and Director Darland highlighted this in her One Pima Initiative update, but I want to underscore the Silverlake Mission neighborhood, which is identified squarely in One Pima as an investment zone, opportunity area to continue to bolster the services and accessible resources in that area. The Silverlake Mission neighborhood is in District 5, identified in One Pima, and is the number three highest heat vulnerability zone across the top ten neighborhoods based on historical data. As you may have seen in media, each year the American Red Cross of Southern Arizona, the County, the city, and several other organizations community-wide partner to conduct heat preparedness canvassing. This effort works at the neighborhood level to distribute resources on identification and prevention of heat emergencies. The resources available for respite home repair assistance, utility assistance, and bolstering social cohesion across neighborhood-level community supports. This underscores the Red Cross' Know Your Neighbor model in disaster preparedness. This year, the vulnerability map ensured neighborhoods were canvassed that had a higher rate of heat related illness and death. Volunteers included Red Cross volunteers, University of Arizona and Northern Arizona nursing students, elected officials, County and city staff, among others. To date, this year, the team used the heat vulnerability map to conduct several neighborhood level heat canvassing efforts, reaching over 1,000 community members before heat season started. Pictured here is the Silverlake Mission neighborhood canvass. In addition to being identified, it has a cross section of justice involved individuals, high density of manufactured homes and higher heat related emergencies. This walk included the Pima County District 5 office, staff from Pima County and City of Tucson and demonstrates several ways in which the County's priorities coexist and co-benefit the community. Next slide and last slide. I will not be here until June, and so I wanted to give the Board an update on all the things that are going to be occurring in May. Importantly, our RFCD is going to be having a grand opening for the Julia Keen Stormwater Park on May 2nd, which is really exciting and we hope everyone can make it. It is a beautiful location. We will have a broader update in June on the Water Working Group priorities, which include stormwater park and detention basin enhancements. Heat awareness and wildfire awareness both occur in May and we continue to promote invasive species volunteering across County staff. Similarly, we have the Green Stewards, which

hosts a monthly roundtable on all of the priorities that are topical and timely to the County's PimaCan! effort. With that, I will conclude and take any questions that the Board might have.

JA: Thank you. So, I have a couple questions. I love to see the tree equity data. I look forward to sitting down and looking at specifically about District 3, but one of the things that I would love to see is, how organization wide we can integrate and prioritize planting more trees right into the things that we do. Whether it is Project Design and Construction, Transportation, Development Services, just about every department. The departments that have some nexus with land. How we are integrating in planting of trees and creating more shade throughout the County? I would love to see how we can do that. It is great to see the solar installations at Abrams. What is next? Not that it is done, but what is on the horizon?

SD: Chair Allen, members of the Board. We are thinking through our next solar installations now that the heat vulnerability map is complete. We really wanted to use that map to underscore because we can add GIS layers for County parcels and facilities. We have a couple of ideas. We are going to look at the energy assessment. Our goal is to have that complete across County departments and potentially working with Procurement to identify a partner agency that might support us on our overall assessment to strategically pick priorities that will net the most energy efficiency benefit and also meet our vulnerability nexus there to see what we should prioritize in the upcoming fiscal year. There is an investment slated in the Integrated Infrastructure Plan for, I believe, the Fiscal '27 budget for solar. And so, we are going to use that vulnerability data to identify just that. We have a couple in mind, but I would be remiss if I did not say we needed just a little bit more time for assessment on our next solar installation.

JA: That is fair. Alright, thank you very much.