

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the City Council of the City of South Tucson, Arizona, held Monday, May 6, 2024, at 5:30 p.m., at the City of South Tucson Council Chambers, 1601 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, South Tucson, Arizona.

Staff Present: Veronica Moreno, Interim City Manager  
Lourdes Aguirre, Finance Director  
Jon Paladini, City Attorney (via Zoom)  
Mark Reader, Stifel (via Zoom)

CAC Members Present: Karen Karl, Chair (Excused)  
Melissa Brown-Dominguez, Vice Chair  
Dan Eckstrom  
Arlene Lopez  
Dennis Luttrell  
Dwight Metzger  
Scott Sears

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Dominguez: It is Monday, May 6<sup>th</sup>, 5:41 p.m. We will call our Citizens Advisory Committee meeting to order. Roll Call, please.

### 2. ROLL CALL (By Ms. Moreno):

Mr. Dan Eckstrom: Here.

Mr. Dennis Luttrell: Here.

Ms. Arlene Lopez: Here.

Mr. Scott Sears: Here.

Mr. Dwight Metzger: Here.

Ms. Karen Karl: Let the record show that Karen Karl has been excused.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Present.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chair Dominguez: We don't have any Minutes to approve, do we?

Ms. Aguirre: There was Minutes provided in the email.

Mr. Eckstrom: There was like 88 pages of them. It's a verbatim transcript.

Mr. Metzger: Maybe you can copy them.

Mr. Eckstrom: They were in the email for the notice of the meeting.

Mr. Metzger: It's a little cumbersome to print 80 pages out, I think.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Should we do a motion to approve?

Ms. Lopez: Should we wait until everybody reads them?

Ms. Moreno: Go ahead and make a motion if there is a majority to approve them.

Vice Chair Dominguez: I mean, there's a transcript of what we said.

Ms. Moreno: And there was no action for last meeting.

Vice Chair Dominguez: No.

Ms. Moreno: There was more conversation, review.

Ms. Lopez: It's verbatim.

Mr. Metzger: I'll make a motion to approve.

Mr. Eckstrom: Second.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Roll Call.

Mr. Eckstrom: Yes.

Mr. Luttrell: No.

Ms. Lopez: Yes.

Mr. Sears: Yes.

Mr. Metzger: Yes.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Approve.

Ms. Aguirre: Is that for both sets?

Ms. Moreno: Is this a motion to approve the Minutes for April 22, 2024, and April 30, 2024?

Mr. Metzger: That's correct, I think, that was the motion.

Ms. Moreno: I want to make sure that the record reflects that the motion was to approve the Minutes for both April 22, 2024, and April 30, 2024. There were five Ayes and one Nay.

Ms. Aguirre: Correct.

Vice Chair Dominguez: We move on to Briefing.

#### 4. BRIEFING

##### a. Recap of April 20, 2024, Meeting

Ms. Aguirre: Just to provide a brief recap of the last meeting that we had, Mr. Reader provided us with an updated presentation in which he included an additional \$2 million which could be sold for bonds at a future date. I think it was 2029, should there be capacity in the property valuations at that point. The purpose for that was it would free up more general fund dollars, because after 2029, then we would no longer have the \$400,000 savings. But with that transaction, then the City would have \$400,000 and an additional \$200,000 in savings. Another thing that would help achieve is the payoff of current bonds, the 2019 bonds which have a long history.

Mr. Metzger: It helps pay it down.

Ms. Aguirre: Yes, correct, it helps pay it down.

Ms. Lopez: It was the 1980's, wasn't it?

Ms. Aguirre: Yes, it's been rolling forward since the 1980's, for decades. So, this proposal that was provided by Mark is a really good proposal. You can see it on the screen there. Again, it helps achieve \$400,000 in savings up through 2029 and then in 2029, but through the issuance of an additional \$2 million you have additional savings. And I think that at the last meeting, the direction from you all to Mark was just to work a little more on the ballot language. No other scenarios to run, just work on ballot language.

b. Review of Financing Options Scenarios/Updates

Mr. Metzger: I'm not sure we took a straw vote, but I got a sense people are largely supportive, but I wonder who has questions now whether there are concerns about this as is. Does anybody have questions.

Mr. Eckstrom: Yeah, I'm used to business forms like a profit and loss statement and a balance sheet. Is there something like a balance sheet for the City?

Ms. Aguirre: Yes, we do. We have a balance sheet that is currently posted online.

Mr. Luttrell: Ok.

Ms. Aguirre: It is the audited financials through Fiscal Year 2023.

Mr. Luttrell: Yeah, just thinking of the City assets, you know, like for example we have that \$10 million retirement debt and I was just thinking about what the City has, and I would say if you liquidate all the assets of the City you probably couldn't come close to \$10 million. Not excluding roads, I'm talking about City Hall, I'm talking about the other stuff, I don't know, and if the City went to a bank to borrow money, I think they would probably laugh about its ability and about its assets. But maybe somebody's got more of a feel for what the City's at. It's almost like the City is upside down financially.

Mr. Sears: Well, it is. Will the City have to file bankruptcy if the bond doesn't pass?

Mr. Eckstrom: The City can't file bankruptcy; it's called Municipal Debt Readjustment.

Mr. Metzger: What happens then?

Mr. Sears: The Judge is in control of the City finances.

Mr. Eckstrom: The Federal Court does it.

Mr. Sears: In a nutshell, what is our total debt for the City? It's \$13 million for the pension fund, there's this bond that we are trying to pay down on.

Ms. Aguirre: It's around \$20 million.

Mr. Sears: The total revenue this would bring in is how much?

Ms. Aguirre: Total revenue?

Mr. Metzger: Maybe Mark would know.

Mr. Sears: Mark, what's the total revenue the bond brings in?

Mr. Reader: The total revenue is the annual revenue generated from the property tax rate, right.

Mr. Sears: Yeah.

Mr. Reader: We have designed the bond issue and tax rate and revenue to issue these bonds to pay off the general fund monies and so I would respond to that by looking at this column right here, so for example, I hope this helpful, it's a complicated question because we are shifting our debt from our City debt, essentially our city, the town, general fund in this case to the property tax, right.

Mr. Sears: Yeah.

Mr. Reader: So, we are shifting that. In this case here, here's our 20% money and we are going to generate in this case here \$140,000 in revenue. All good? See column 6 there?

Ms. Lopez: Uh huh.

Mr. Reader: That's our revenue coming in. Then on our 6% money, the really important money, to achieve our public policy objective of \$400,000 a year through 2029 and remember in '29 or '30 we are going to pay the rest of it off, so we get \$600,000, right. You remember this one here, the \$600,000 here goes away in 2029 or '30. That's going to be very helpful for us. We are still going to need the \$400,000 for our deficit and we have a couple hundred thousand of course that maybe the City can use for additional contributions to the fire pension fund, unfunded liability, right. So, to answer your question, that is the revenue coming in off our property tax base, so I don't know, let's just look at '25, '26, that's \$140,000 and if we go to our 6% money there's another \$550,000 rounding numbers. So, \$700,000 per year coming in off our property tax base all the way through '29/'30. So that is going to help us with the fire service situation, the general fund pressure, and then we still, as you know, we have to plan at some point to address the unfunded primarily fire liability which has been brought into the conversation for transparency purposes. I appreciate your questions. It is something that needs to be addressed. It's been on the City's radar screen. With their challenges over the years, it's been very difficult to manage. They are making their annual required contribution so it's all good. Pensions are being paid; the pension debt could be growing because we are paying 730, and so we all know over time, and maybe we come back and do some kind of other revenue adjustment in the future, right. We talked about that a little bit to address the fire and the police unfunded public pension liability.

Mr. Eckstrom: The unfunded liability is what, \$2 million?

Ms. Aguirre: For fire, a little more than \$2 million.

Mr. Eckstrom: Is it \$2.6?

Ms. Aguirre: \$2.6 million.

Mr. Eckstrom: And then?

Ms. Aguirre: \$10.1 million for police for a total of \$12.7 million.

Mr. Eckstrom: That's kind of, weren't we looking at fire and then we were going to look at another what, \$2.6 million.

Ms. Aguirre: Another \$2 million.

Mr. Eckstrom: Was it \$2 million?

Ms. Aguirre: Yes.

Mr. Eckstrom: The \$2 million was for what?

Ms. Aguirre: To pay down the rest of the bond, the 2019 bond and free up general fund dollars.

City Attorney Paladini: Lourdes, this is Jon. Can you repeat? Last week we discussed this, if we pay down \$2.6 million of the excise tax bond, it frees up \$400,000. If we pay \$2.6 million into PSPRS to pay off the unfunded liability, it frees up like \$200,000. So, I think we are kind of going down a rabbit hole when we keep talking about PSPRS debt and all the other debt. All of that is calculated in when the City goes to get its bond rating which is basically credit report or credit score. So, the bond companies, the bankers, will look at all of that and assign the City a bond rating. We are hoping for something in the A's, because that would give you the lowest rates with the higher credit score, but to pay down the PSPRS debt, the \$2.6 million in new general obligation money does not achieve what we are trying to achieve, which is to basically to fund a full-service fire department, regardless of the model.

Ms. Aguirre: Thank you, Jon.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Any further questions from anyone?

Mr. Sears: Dennis, when you brought up the liquidation of all of South Tucson we wouldn't begin to cover -

Mr. Luttrell: Our PSPRS even.

Mr. Sears: So, what is your concern there?

Mr. Luttrell: Yeah.

Mr. Sears: This is the way to get some of the money that we need knowing that we would have to go back to taxpayers again and then ask them for more but where are you going with that, those concerns?

Mr. Luttrell: Well, I think that the taxpayer doesn't really know the position of the City, for one thing, and I don't know if that would change their perception of (inaudible) more taxes if they see that the City is not functioning financially.

Mr. Sears: Yeah, well, I hear that, and a concern of mine when I bring that up, too, is. are we asking, are you along the line of thinking of asking the people for more money to get us to address the bigger issue, the elephant in the room?

Mr. Luttrell: I don't know, I think maybe we could change management in the City because I remember when (inaudible) was here, things like that, weeding out businesses and trying to get more businesses and things in here. I don't really see that there's really any real concerted effort to really work on bringing in more revenue to the City.

Mr. Sears: That's out of our scope of our work here. I think we're way off, our Committee is just to worry about the bond and we are going to direct it to the City Council then it's up to the voters.

Mr. Luttrell: You're right.

Mr. Sears: I mean, it's way off track, I'm sorry, but I don't want anybody ---

Mr. Eckstrom: And I don't think we're in a place to discuss that because we don't have authority on that.

Mr. Sears: Yeah, we're just here to see, this is basically to help South Tucson try to get on its feet right now, whether it's going to work or not, it's up to City Council and City Manager.

Mr. Luttrell: Yeah.

Mr. Eckstrom: So, without the police and fire retirement, if we didn't include that, what would be the total request?

Ms. Aguirre: The total request should still be on the 6% that goes towards all other. I think it should still be the \$2.6 million and the \$2 million.

Mr. Eckstrom: The \$2 million is for fire, right?

Ms. Aguirre: Correct.

Mr. Eckstrom: And the \$2.6 million?

Ms. Aguirre: For fire as well because the \$2.6 million only gives you savings through 2029 of \$400,000 and after that, the payment again jumps up to \$600,000. If you add the additional \$2 million then you at least have consistent savings throughout.

Mr. Sears: Then you can figure out what you are going to do with the rest of it and restructure your City around it for now.

Ms. Aguirre: Correct.

Mr. Sears: You have time to rebuild, basically.

Ms. Aguirre: Correct. Yes, you would have that consistent \$400,000 cash flow to help with the fire service.

Mr. Sears: So basically, what we are looking for is to say if it goes to City Council and it's a good deal, then it's a good deal and other than that, not much else to talk about because all the politics involved doesn't involve us unless we vote.

Ms. Lopez: Now, if you have the general obligation bond, once that is paid off by the taxpayers, it's called sunset, or whatever?

Ms. Aguirre: Correct, yes.

Ms. Lopez: And it's not an ongoing tax. If you go the other way with property tax, that's on going. So if they see that once this is paid off and they are not going to be charged anymore taxes, they're going to trying for this and it's going to be paid off. That's an incentive for people to work for it. How long it's going to take to pay it off, I don't know.

Ms. Aguirre: Fifteen years.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Fifteen years.

Ms. Lopez: It's fifteen? Ok.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Anymore questions?

Mr. Sears: I say we vote and send it to City Council and let them vote on it.

Mr. Metzger: I guess at the last meeting I was ready, halfway through the meeting, and ok, I'm done, I'm going to support this, that's what my Council Member wanted me to do. I'm still there. I know it would be

best if we were unanimous in our support for this, so we could take a strong, awesome Committee of people to say we all want this to happen. I'll look at it as it is cut and dry. If you want South Tucson to have a fighting chance, you vote yes on the bond. If you want to keep it the way it has been running, you know, without money, it's pretty cut and dry. I guess we want to ask Dennis or anyone else that might be less than 100% committed to this, is there anything we can do to get you behind that?

Mr. Luttrell: There's \$1 million for the fire truck and I wonder, for example, we could go to City of Tucson and buy a fire truck with a half-life on it, something like that, for half price and then with negotiations to reduce it by like \$500,000.

Mr. Sears: I think our recommendation goes to the Council and they decide which route they are going. They may contract with the City of Tucson. They may decide to leave it up to the voters, let the City Council Members decide.

City Attorney Paladini: Veronica our Lourdes, remember that the 20% money which is for capital expenditures is up to \$1.5 million, so if we determine, the voters approve bonds up to \$1.5 million on that capital expenditure money, we don't have to issue it all.

Ms. Aguirre: Right.

City Attorney Paladini: If we only need \$750,000 of that, we issue \$750,000 at the current point to do whatever we do, we remodel the fire station, buy the truck and we still have \$750,000 in authorized funds that we could issue later on if we need additional capital improvements related to Fire Department. So, we don't want to under authorize this just in case there isn't a truck available for say for \$500,000 versus \$1 million, or that the truck cost \$1.2 million because prices are all going up or whatever. Just understand, remember that, that this is authorization to issue bonds doesn't necessarily mean all those bonds get issued, and if the City issues bonds less than what is authorized, those numbers that Mark is providing are actually going to go down a little bit on the monthly cost.

Mr. Luttrell: I didn't understand that, thank you.

Mr. Sears: We don't have to spend all that money.

Ms. Lopez: It depends on what type of fire truck you get.

Mr. Sears: And that's a Council decision, how they want to spend it.

Mr. Metzger: Ok, I'm good with that.

Ms. Lopez: Do we have to do this?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Does the language have to be part of our recommendation? Does it have to be finalized and included in our recommendation?

Ms. Moreno: Did you hear that Mark, Jon? The question was the language that you have presented here, is that what will be presented to Council, or do you have to go back?

Ms. Aguirre: Are you going to modify the language for the ballot?

City Attorney Paladini: The ballot language, Mark, if you could point to that.

Mr. Reader: Authorized to issue up to X dollars, does that make sense?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Uh huh.

City Attorney Paladini: So, because typically in bond sales, you know, let's just say if you pick another city or town, Marana has been mentioned, Sahuarita has been mentioned, \$60 million in bonds, we're not going to issue \$60 million in one swoop because projects are going to come in line over many years, so you may issue 10 or 15 initially, or 20, then another 20, and so over time the bonds are sold in order to bring money into the budget to spend it on projects. So, this is obviously on a much smaller scale, but if we decide, or the Council decides that it doesn't need the whole \$1.5, it still has the authority to do that, but it doesn't issue necessarily all at once unless we need to.

Mr. Reader: Madam Chair, can you hear me?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Yes.

Mr. Reader: Here's our draft now on the question, we talked about this a little bit. This is what you would see in the voter pamphlet and in the voting booth.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Right, and I know last week we talked about if that second bullet point had to be so specific, I think, were you going to find out about that?

Mr. Reader: Yeah, so this would be about \$6,120,000 for right now, and let's go through this real quick if you don't mind. Paul Gales, the City's bond attorney, will have to approve everything we kind of go through, but to give him direction we would have the dollar amount that we talked about. I'm coming up with, Lourdes check this for me, \$6,120,000, right?

Ms. Aguirre: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Reader: And remember, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee, that's our fire apparatus and fire station for \$1.5 million, and then we get to our 6% money. Here's your \$1.5 million for the new money I call it, right. And Jon is exactly right, that's authorization, and then as the City fine tunes that number, by hopefully getting good bids or a used truck or what have you, we can figure that out. This gives us the authorization which I think is smart if I'm in your chair, this inflation is out of control as you know and the bids that are opening are a little mind boggling. It's nobody's fault, it's the way it is. And then we had our 6% money, right, \$2.6, and then we have to wait a few years as we build capacity by paying off debt and hopefully you grow your tax base. So, another way we generate revenue as you all know, how can we grow our tax base to bring revenues into the City. Sales tax revenues. That's what our Arizona cities live off of. So, it is our job as cities to grow economic development and make it happen. I know your City is working hard on that, right? So, here's our \$2.6 million and \$2.020. I came out with \$6,120,000. That would be the amount in the ballot question and then it would say, provide funds for fire projects including acquisition of necessary vehicles and equipment and repair and renovation of the fire station. Everybody good with that or did you want to change that a little bit?

Vice Chair Dominguez: I think we are all in agreement with that.

Mr. Eckstrom: Does that include the option of even contracting for service?

Mr. Reader: No, that's capital.



Ms. Aguirre: Whether it's us doing the work or paying for it to be done, it goes toward the same improvements we need on both sides.

Mr. Eckstrom: And that would be the \$1.5 million.

Ms. Aguirre: Yes.

Mr. Reader: And in one of the economic models the City would work with, under the Tucson situation which hasn't been determined yet, the two agencies would probably work together, I would think, to indicate and come up with a plan to make the appropriate improvements and to get the right type of equipment to have a very solid fire service in your City. So, that's our 20% money as we have been calling it. The second bullet point that Paul came up with is free up revenues to be used to pay for fire protection services that are currently pledged to the payment of the first excise tax purchase agreement executed by the City in 2019, by providing funding for refinancing or paying off, I like the word paying down, or refinancing such purchase agreement, a little legalese, right, the proceeds of which refinance the cost, I guess we have to put this in here, the prior situation of settling a lawsuit and previous construction renovation, equipping, improving or acquiring land for various city facilities including the City Hall and Library.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok.

Mr. Reader: Ok, so it's kind of a two-part bullet point, one with the new money, two, or the refinance of the 2019 financing that had previously financed critical highly essential public infrastructure needs of your City.

Ms. Aguirre: Mark, do you think there is any way we can make that language a little more concise?

Mr. Reader: Yeah, I think we can get Paul on the phone, Lourdes. You want to send over some thoughts? When you say more concise, what are you guys thinking?

Ms. Moreno: Jon, if I may, Mark, Lourdes. I missed the last meeting so I'm just trying to catch up a little bit here. Mark, it's Veronica. What is the purpose of having to mention the lawsuit? Just curiosity, not that it's not important, but I was just wondering like, you know, so is a portion of what is getting paid by the voters is going to be going toward a lawsuit? I would think that, but that was just another question.

Mr. Reader: Yeah, I thought the same thing. We are going to have to check with Paul, but I would say, could we come up with the following: free up revenues. Do we like that term? Free up general fund revenues to be used to pay for fire protection services. We have got to also include emergency management, emergency medical.

Mr. Eckstrom: So, it's part of the fire service.

Ms. Moreno: Yes.

Ms. Moreno: Why can't we just say fire?

Mr. Reader: Ok.

Mr. Metzger: Sounds better to add emergency medical.

Mr. Reader: Fire protection currently pledged by prior 2019 financing. So, what we can do, Lourdes and Veronica, let's check with Paul and let's re-do this. I think what you are saying, what the Committee is saying, is there any way to simplify it, is that better?

Ms. Moreno: Yes.

Ms. Aguirre: Yes, and possibly not have to reference things like even the lawsuit. I think that may confuse people, being that it's a lawsuit from the 80's.

Mr. Reader: If it's ok with the Committee, maybe we can have a call tomorrow as schedules permit, with Paul to re-do this to make it a little more simple for our voters to understand. I agree with you. Now, most of the explanation is going to be in the voter pamphlet that we are going to work on and that will explain why we are doing this. We are going to have, as we mentioned before, going to voters, we are going to outline the situation that you are all aware of, obviously. We are probably going to prepare a Q and A format, a Question and Answer format. Sahuarita is doing this as we mentioned to you, to help our voters understand what they are voting for. So, we will work with Staff and all the professionals, glad to share with the Committee as appropriate, but we will get through a lot of that in the voter pamphlet and we will try to simplify this as best as we can, but we need to have our bond attorney kind of advise us so we don't get into a pickle.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok.

Ms. Aguirre: Sounds good.

Ms. Lopez: I have a question. Where it says refinancing such purchase agreement, can we put in there refinancing and in parenthesis paying down to making it a little more clear for the voters?

Ms. Aguirre: Yeah, we can ask. We can ask the bond attorney that question.

Ms. Lopez: And also, this acquiring land for various City facilities?

Ms. Aguirre: Well, that's tied to the previous use of the 2019 bonds.

Ms. Lopez: Ok.

Vice Chair Dominguez: That whole last sentence, it's the combination of all the debt, the use of the money that was in the 2019 bond.

Ms. Lopez: So, we can leave combination and then put that down?

Mr. Eckstrom: I think we ought to wait and see what language is recommended, then we can try to ask for any kind of adjustments that we might think might work.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok.

Mr. Eckstrom: I think we almost have to get the legalese that's going to pass the muster.

Mr. Reader: Yes. But we understand what you are asking for and I completely agree with all of you, and we will do our best to work with the bond attorney. Jon will be helpful, as well as Staff, to see if we can simplify this for our voting public.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Does the Committee have to agree on the language in order for us to send a recommendation to City Council or can City Council move this forward without us?

Ms. Lopez: I think it would be best for us to look at it.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok, definitely.

City Attorney Paladini: I don't necessarily think that the Committee has to agree on the exact language. I think it could be part of the general recommendation that the language include certain terms or certain concepts. If the Committee wanted to make a recommendation tonight, obviously you would be able to do that. If you wanted to wait until next week and wait until we get advice on the language, then I suppose you could. It's truly up to you but I don't think it's necessary.

Ms. Aguirre: I think some of the Members did express, Jon, that it would be easier for them to kind of proof the language to just make sure that it is concise and it's understandable especially since they have been tracking along this entire presentation from the start in more depth.

City Attorney Paladini: That's fine, so if the Committee wants to recommend specific ballot language, then set another meeting for next Monday, we will still do a report to the Council tomorrow. If the Committee wants to give the Council a status report and then wait until next week to make a final recommendation, that's your call as the Committee.

Mr. Luttrell: I move that we do that.

Vice Chair Dominguez: How does everybody else feel about that?

Mr. Sears: To make a recommendation?

Mr. Luttrell: No, to wait until next week.

Mr. Sears: That would be the 13<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Luttrell: And if Staff has the proposed language maybe they could email it to us so we can look at it before the meeting.

Mr. Reader: We can get another draft of the ballot question turned round tomorrow and ship it out. Does that sound good?

Ms. Aguirre: Sounds good.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok, so if that is the case, do we have to wait.

Ms. Moreno: Do we want to meet on Thursday, then?

Vice Chair Dominguez: I guess it doesn't matter.

Ms. Aguirre: Well, it wouldn't matter unless you are going to have another Council meeting next week.

Ms. Moreno: The next one is May 21<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Aguirre: If you wait for the regular cycle then you can still have a meeting next week with this Committee.

Ms. Moreno: So, you still have another Monday before the next Council meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup>.

City Attorney Paladini: That gives the Council plenty of time if you present the voter recommendation on the 21<sup>st</sup>, and the next meeting the Council can adopt the Election Resolution which is plenty of time for the Pima

County Recorder to get the ballot language and all that. So don't rush it, I guess, is the point if you're not comfortable, waiting another week.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Well, I think it would be a stronger recommendation if we had everything buttoned up for City Council.

Ms. Aguirre: Correct.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Can we look at the calendar for next week, next Monday?

Mr. Eckstrom: I can't do it next Monday.

Ms. Moreno: So, Tuesday?

Vice Chair Dominguez: So we can do an update to the Council tomorrow.

Mr. Eckstrom: Do you have a Council meeting next Monday?

Vice Chair Dominguez: There's one tomorrow.

Ms. Moreno: We can do a report for this in the Reports, just like a very general report.

Ms. Aguirre: I won't get into specifics, I will just tell them how many times you have met and what it is that you guys are waiting for now, just language.

Ms. Moreno: And that you tentatively plan to bring this to Mayor and Council at the next regularly scheduled meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup> with a recommendation from this Committee.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Ok.

Mr. Eckstrom: The meeting is on May 21<sup>st</sup>?

Ms. Moreno: Yes, after tomorrow, the next meeting. This Committee has time to read the ballot language so by the time we have the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting you will have it all.

Mr. Eckstrom: So, when would this Committee meet?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Next week sometime if you are all available on the 13<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Aguirre: Well, are you all available on the 13<sup>th</sup>?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Is everyone available on the 13<sup>th</sup>? Are you, Dan?

Ms. Lopez: It's on Monday.

Mr. Eckstrom: The 13<sup>th</sup>, yeah, I can be there.

Ms. Aguirre: Mark, would you be available for next Monday, the 13<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Reader: Yes.

Ms. Aguirre: How about you, Jon?

City Attorney Paladini: Let me check to make sure, I think so. I would be available until 6:00 by Zoom.

Ms. Aguirre: Do you want to have it at 5:00?

Vice Chair Dominguez: I think Karen works until 5, so that's why we set it for 5:30.

Ms. Aguirre: How about on Tuesday? Are you guys available on Tuesday?

City Attorney Paladini: Would you all be willing to start the meeting at 5 because then I could be there for the whole thing.

Vice Chair Dominguez: It works for me. We would have a quorum, so, she might walk in a little late, though.

Ms. Aguirre: Ok, so next Monday the 13<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m.

c. Open Meeting Law Training

Ms. Aguirre: Were we planning on doing the Open Law Training today?

Vice Chair Dominguez: I don't know if it's necessary.

Ms. Aguirre: It's not necessary at this point?

City Attorney Paladini: Honestly, I think you guys are doing fine; I don't think it's necessary.

Ms. Aguirre: Ok, wonderful.

5. DISCUSSION

a. Committee Discussion

Ms. Aguirre: And did you guys already have the Committee Discussion, or did you want to discuss more?

Mr. Luttrell: I think we're good.

6. ACTION AGENDA

a. Possible Action on Recommendation to City Council

Ms. Aguirre: And then Action Agenda, you guys will be postponing the action until 5/13 of next week.

Mr. Luttrell: Yes.

7. CALENDAR

Ms. Aguirre: You guys made a motion for the Calendar to meet on the 13<sup>th</sup> and it was first motion by Dennis Luttrell and seconded by Dwight Metzger. Do we have to vote on that or was it consensus?

Vice Chair Dominguez: Consensus.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aguirre: So, the last item is Adjournment.

Vice Chair Dominguez: Motion to Adjourn.

Mr. Luttrell: Second.

The meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Veronica Moreno, City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the Special Meeting Minutes of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CA) of the City of South Tucson, Arizona, held on the 6th day of May, 2024. I further certify the meeting was duly called and a quorum was present.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Veronica Moreno, City Clerk