MEMORANDUM

Date: January 22, 2016

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Continued Item from the December 15, 2015 Board of Supervisors Meeting Regarding Rillito Park Foundation Operating Agreement**

At the December 15, 2015 meeting, the Board of Supervisors continued this item to February 2, 2016. Since then, ongoing public discussions continued regarding Rillito Regional Park; several topics regarding the Park were raised by Mr. Gary Davidson and former Supervisor Ed Moore on two consecutive daytime radio programs. In addition, at the January 19, 2016 meeting, the Board approved and extended the previous agreement with the Rillito Park Foundation to continue horseracing activities through July 1, 2017.

The purpose of this memorandum is twofold. Part I responds to specific questions raised regarding the facility's uses, users and fees charged; Part II discusses issues that should be considered in any future policy discussions regarding Rillito Park.

Part I

1. **What is the total number of estimated users at Rillito Regional Park?**

   The total non-racing visits at the park are an estimated at 300,000 to 400,000 annually. These users include farmers market attendees, approximately 12 regular special events, and regular soccer and other field sport users.

   The number of visitors attending horseraces is estimated at 50,000 to 60,000 annually, or an average of 3,500 to 4,500 per race day. Peak race day attendance has exceeded 6,000.

2. **What does each user group pay?**

   A. Events

   Events pay in accordance with Board-adopted Ordinance No. 2009-64 (attached), which establishes the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation (NRPR) fee schedule for use of various County parks and recreational facilities and for services. Some charges are based on the number or type of facilities

used. Events that sell tickets also include a surcharge; therefore, the total payment is based on attendance levels. The NRPR fee schedule is attached.

The largest recurring fee contributor at Rillito Regional Park is the Heirloom Farmers Market, which pays the greater of $400 or 12 percent of gross rent per day of use. Special events, which are an estimated at 12 each year, vary in revenue production from several hundred dollars to $5,000 or more.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2014/15, special events at Rillito Regional Park provided total revenues of approximately $28,000. The Heirloom Farmers Market provided additional revenues of $21,000. Dark Day Simulcast Racing, a special event held outside of the contracted "horseracing season," generated an additional $5,000 in revenue for NRPR.

B. Horseracing

Beginning in 2014, horseracing fees increased to $1,750 per race day, plus $0.50 per paid visitor. This fee schedule primary reflects the approved Rillito Regional Park fee schedule. Table 1 below shows the fees paid for use of the facilities during the horseracing season for the past five years:

Table 1: Horseracing Fees Five-year History.

Year	Rent
2015	$ 62,871.00
2014	24,500.00
2013	21,562.50
2012	18,700.00
2011	6,500.00
Total	**$134,133.50**

The facilities are only under the control of the operator on race days; the infield and parking areas remain available to regular users on all other days.

C. Soccer

Nonprofit youth leagues, including the Tucson Soccer Academy (TSA), are not charged for field use without lights, per the NRPR fee ordinance. For-profit youth leagues (if they existed) would pay $5.00 per hour, and adult league and general

field use fees are $10 per hour. Lighted field fees are charged to all users and range from $7.50 per hour for all nonprofit youth leagues to $15.00 per hour for adult and general field use. The charges for lights do not recover the cost of energy for the lighting (see Table 2 below).

Both nonprofit and for-profit organizations pay field rental fees if those rentals are used for tournament purposes that charge entry fees at rates of $100 or $200 respectively, per field per day without lights.

The following are the soccer fees paid last fiscal year:

Table 2: Fiscal Year 2014/15 Soccer Fees Paid.

Youth Field Use	$ 0
Adult Field Use	953
Youth Tournaments	1,200
Adult Tournaments (none were hosted at Rillito)	0

D. County Lighting Costs

As previously stated, the NRPR fee schedule establishes field rentals that include lights at rates ranging from $7.50 per hour for nonprofits to $15 per hour for for-profit entities. In FY 2014/15, the County's electricity cost was $17,368 for Rillito Racetrack Complex infield lighting (only).

The TSA is the predominant user of the infield light system. Through light use fees at $7.50 per hour, TSA reimbursed the County $14,613 of the County's $17,368 infield lighting costs in FY 2014/15; a cost recovery of 84 percent.

A few of the special events conducted at the complex also use the infield lighting system; but those costs are believed to be negligible perhaps adding a few percent to the cost recovery.

3. Who controls the park? Racetrack?

Pima County owns Rillito Regional Park, which is managed by NRPR. During the racing season, January to March, the Economic Development and Tourism Department administers and manages the contract and the operator of the race meets in coordination with NRPR. NRPR still manages and controls the Park during horseracing.

4. **What are the options for the site if racing is no longer at Rillito?**

   The grandstand, clubhouse and parking areas need considerable repairs and updating. The 2012 Facility Assessment and Cost Analysis estimates the total cost for these repairs at over $2.5 million. The facilities, if allowed to remain vacant or unused, create a significant "attractive nuisance" liability for the County. Demolition cost of the facilities is estimated at $500,000 to address other considerable issues such as asbestos. Since listed on the Historic Register, the County would most likely spend additional dollars documenting the historic features prior to demolition. Both upgrades/improvements and demolition of the racing facilities are currently unfunded. With the failure of the proposed bond package, there are no monies for additional soccer fields either at Rillito or the future soccer tournament site at Kino South.

   The annual cost to maintain Rillito Regional Park is approximately $400,000. Revenues derived from special events, the farmer's market and horseracing offset only a small portion of this cost; $97,000, or 24 percent. Youth soccer continues to utilize the fields, while covering approximately 84 percent of their lighting costs only. The ability to use these fields at no cost and pay only a portion of the actual lighting costs reflect the Board's continued commitment to and support of youth sports.

   Elimination of either special events or horseracing at Rillito Regional Park will require additional General Fund subsidies to NRPR for ongoing maintenance and operation of this site. Until funds are identified to improve or demolish the racing facilities, the proposed operating agreement with the Rillito Park Foundation provides some funding for site improvements (at the operator's expense), as well as additional liability coverage during the racing season.

Part II

As indicated above, on January 19, 2016, the Board approved and extended the previous agreement with the Rillito Park Foundation to continue horseracing related activities through July 1, 2017. Therefore, the continued item should be either withdrawn or tabled; and in any future policy discussions regarding Rillito Park, the following should be considered:

A. Rillito Park has been a multiuse park since 1987, when the first soccer fields were constructed on the property.

B. Rillito Park was encumbered by a legally challengeable voter initiative approved in November 1984 through 2005, limiting the use of Rillito to a horseracing and commercial venue, with park purposes as a clearly secondary use (see Attachment1). Legal Opinion No. 90-1 of then Deputy County Attorney Albin Krietz dated January 4, 1990 regarding validity of the initiative is Attachment 2 to this memorandum.

C. In 2005, the Board formed the Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee. It included 14 members divided among horse racing and field sport enthusiasts. The committee unanimously recommended that "All existing uses at Rillito continue until a suitable replacement facility is established for horse racing." The funding for a replacement facility was predicated on both funding and a suitable alternative site. The Board accepted these recommendations on August 1, 2006. (See Attachment 3: Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee recommendations.)

D. Pima County has been the only local government entity investing in Rillito Park. That investment has been targeted to promote multiple uses of Rillito, including special events, park or soccer uses and the farmers market.

E. No further investment is currently planned to increase the number of soccer fields at Rillito; hence, it is likely the horseracing facilities will remain in place for at least the next 5 to 10 years or longer, further emphasizing the need to operate Rillito as a multipurpose public park.

F. Pima County has no interest in, nor do we intend to make any investments in, the horseracing grandstands, clubhouse, horse barns, or other horseracing infrastructure. Such is the obligation of the private foundation operator.

G. To further the public purpose objectives of Rillito Park, the only existing structure that currently warrants additional County investment would be the development of a commercial kitchen on the property for multiple purposes, including those related to public health; demonstrating healthy cooking and promoting healthy eating.

H. Pima County does not begin to offset our operating costs associated with the Park from any activity. In total, the County's operating investment in the Park for FY 2014/15 was $400,000, and the revenues recovered were $111,484 which includes all site rentals and lighting fees. Soccer fees at the facility are essentially zero, with the exception of field lighting; and the fees paid for field lighting continue to be subsidized by the County.

I. NRPR operates and has always operated a unified calendar for scheduling. There are no other County entities that do so; hence the concern expressed in the recent public hearing regarding a unified calendar is incorrect (see Attachment 4).

Based on the above, it is obvious Rillito will remain a multiuse community public park for some time; hosting soccer and related recreational activities, horseracing, special events, and the farmers market. Within the region, the largest number of consolidated soccer fields now is located at Rillito; the next largest number of soccer fields is located at the Kino Sports Complex, followed by Udall and Golf Links Parks with the third largest.

Currently, there is no additional capital funding for further conversion of Rillito Park for single purpose use, and such likely will not exist for 5 to 10 years, perhaps longer. Hence, primarily by default, Rillito will continue to operate as a multipurpose park. However, the Board could address this issue in policy discussions relating to Rillito.

CHH/mjk

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

p.3
520 620 1414
Pima County Elections
07:05p
03

PROPOSITION 400

OFFICIAL TITLE

PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

TITLE INITIATIVE NO. 400: AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN OFFICIAL PLAN PROVIDING FOR THE USE, ACTIVITIES AND STATUS OF THAT CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS OWNED BY PIMA COUNTY, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY EIGHTY-EIGHT (88) ACRES, GENERALLY KNOWN AS "RILLITO RACE TRACK."

SECTION 1. PIMA COUNTY HEREBY DECLARES THAT SAID LAND SHALL BE UTILIZED FOR RECREATIONAL AND HISTORIC USES, INCLUDING HORSE RACING APPROVED BY THE ARIZONA STATE RACING COMMISSION, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS OF PIMA COUNTY.

RILLITO RACE TRACK SHALL BE ADMINISTERED UNDER THE PIMA COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

SECTION 2. PIMA COUNTY SHALL LEASE RILLITO RACE TRACK, PUSUANT TO A.R.S. 11-256. THE LEASE PROVISIONS SHALL PROVIDE, AT LEAST, THAT COMMERCIAL HORSE RACE MEETS, HORSE SHOWS, RUGBY, SOCCER, SOFTBALL, ENTERTAINMENT, COMMUNITY AND CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES, RESTAURANTS, AND ALL FORMS OF LEGAL COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES MAY BE CONDUCTED ON THE PREMISES BY THE LESSEE FOR A PERIOD OF TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 1985.

SECTION 3. PIMA COUNTY HEREBY DESIGNATES RILLITO RACE TRACK AS THE OFFICIAL PIMA COUNTY RACE TRACK FOR COUNTY HORSE RACE MEETS FOR A PERIOD OF AT LEAST TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS FROM JANUARY 1, 1985.

SECTION 4. PIMA COUNTY HEREBY DECLARES ITS FULL SUPPORT OF THE PETITION FILED WITH THE ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATIONS OFFICE, SEEKING TO HAVE THE RILLITO RACE TRACK DESIGNATED A STATE HISTORIC SITE.

IN THE EVENT A PETITION IS FILED SEEKING TO HAVE RILLITO RACE TRACK DESIGNATED A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, PIMA COUNTY HEREBY DECLARES ITS FULL SUPPORT OF THAT PETITION.

IN FURTHERANCE THEREOF, THE IMPROVEMENTS ON THE LAND SHALL BE MAINTAINED.

SECTION 5. THE PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DOES NOT HAVE THE RIGHT, POWER OR AUTHORITY TO CHANGE OR AMEND THIS ORDINANCE.

PROPOSICION 400

TITULO OFICIAL

PROPUESTA POR PETICION DE INICIATIVA

UNA ORDENANZA ADOPTANDO UN PLAN OFICIAL PROVEYENDO PARA EL USO, ACTIVIDADES Y ESTADO LEGAL DE AQUEL CIERTO TERRENO Y MEJORAS QUE PERTENECE AL CONDADO DE PIMA, CONSISTIENDO DE APPROXIMADAMENTE OCHENTA Y OCHO (88) ACRES GENERALMENTE CONOCIDO COMO "HIPODROMO RILLITO" ("RILLITO RACE TRACK").

SECCION 1. EL CONDADO DE PIMA POR LA PRESENTE DECLARA QUE DICHO TERRENO SERA UTILIZADO PARA USOS RECREATIVOS E HISTORICOS, INCLUYENDO CARRERAS DE CABALLOS APROBADOS POR LA COMISION DE CARRERAS DEL ESTADO DE ARIZONA, PARA EL BENEFICIO DE LOS CIUDADANOS DEL CONDADO DE PIMA.

EL HIPODROMO RILLITO SERA ADMISTRADO BAJO EL DEPARTAMENTO DE PARQUES Y RECREACION DEL CONDADO DE PIMA.

SECCION 2. EL CONDADO DE PIMA ARRENDARA EL HIPODROMO RILLITO. DE ACUERDO CON A.R.S. 11-256, LAS PROVISIONS DEL ARRENDAMIENTO PROVEERAN, CUANDO MENOS, QUE CARRERAS COMERCIALES DE CABALLOS, EXPOSICIONES DE CABALLOS, FUTBOL RUGBY, BALOMPIE, SOFBOL, ENTRETENIMIENTO, ACTIVIDADES COMUNALES O CARITATIVAS, RESTAURANTES Y TODO TIPO DE ACTIVIDADES COMERCIALES LEGALES SE PODRAN LLEVAR A CABO EN EL RECINTO POR EL ARRENDATARIO POR UN PERIODO DE NO MENOS DE VEINTICINCO (25) AÑOS COMENZANDO EL DIA PRIMERO DE ENERO DE 1985.

SECCION 3. POR LA PRESENTE EL CONDADO DE PIMA DESIGNA EL HIPODROMO OFICIAL DEL CONDADO DE PIMA PARA TODA CARRERA DE CABALLOS PATROCINADA POR EL CONDADO

POR UN PERIODO DE NO MENOS DE VEINTICINCO (25) AÑOS A PARTIR DEL PRIMERO DE ENERO DE 1985.

SECCION 4. POR LA PRESENTE EL CONDADO DE PIMA DECLARA SU PLENO APOYO A LA PETICION ARCHIVADA CON LA OFICINA DE PRESERVACION HISTORICA DEL ESTADO DE ARIZONA, PIDIENDO QUE EL HIPODROMO RILLITO SEA DESIGNADO COMO SITIO HISTORICO DEL ESTADO.

EN CASO DE QUE SE ARCHIVE UNA PETICION PIDIENDO QUE EL HIPODROMO RILLITO SEA DESIGNADO COMO SITIO HISTORICO NACIONAL, EL CONDADO DE PIMA POR LA PRESENTE DECLARA SU PLENO APOYO A ESA PETICION.
EN ADELANTAMIENTO DE ESO, LAS MEJORAS EN EL TORRENO SERAN CONSERVADAS.

SECCION 5. LA JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES DEL CONDADO DE PIMA NO TIENE EL DERECHO, PODER NI AUTORIDAD PARA CAMBIAR O ENMENDAR ESTA ORDENANZA.

p.2 520 620 1414 Pima County Elections Mar 05 08 04:59p

PROPOSITION 400
PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

OFFICIAL TITLE

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN OFFICIAL PLAN PROVIDING FOR THE USE, ACTIVITIES AND STATUS OF THAT CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS OWNED BY PIMA COUNTY, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY EIGHTY-EIGHT (88) ACRES, GENERALLY KNOWN AS "RILLITO RACE TRACK".

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE

AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING LEASING SAID LAND FOR 25 YEARS FOR RECREATIONAL USES INCLUDING HORSE RACING AND ALL LEGAL COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES; DESIGNATING SAID LAND AS OFFICIAL COUNTY RACE TRACK; PLACING TRACK UNDER ADMINISTRATION OF COUNTY PARKS DEPARTMENT; DECLARING SUPPOET FOR NATIONAL HISTORIC STATUS OF TRACK; AND PROHIBITING AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE.

PROPOSITION 400

A "YES" Vote shall have the effect of requiring the use of Rillito Race Track for horse racing and recreation for 25 years.

A "NO" Vote shall have the effect of not requiring the use of Rillito Race Track for horse racing and recreation.

YES 293 → ← 293 SI

NO 295 → ← 295 NO

PROPOSICION 400
PROPUESTA POR PETICION DE INICIATIVA

TITULO OFICIAL

UNA ORDENANZA ADOPTANDO UN PLAN OFICIAL PROVEYENDO PARA EL USO, ACTIVIDADES Y ESTADO LEGAL DE AQUEL CIERTO TERRENO Y MEJORAS QUE PERTENECE AL CONDADO DE PIMA, CONSISTIENDO DE APPROXIMADAMENTE OCHENTA Y OCHO (88) ACRES GENERALMENTE CONOCIDO COMO "HIPODROMO RILLITO ("RILLITO RACE TRACK").

TITULO DESCRIPTIVO

UNA ORDENANZA REQUERIENDO EL ARRENDAMIENTO DE DICHO TERRENO POR 25 AÑOS PARA USOS RECREATIVOS INCLUYENDO CARRERAS DE CABALLOS Y TODA ACTIVIDAD COMERCIAL LEGAL; DESIGNANDO DICHO TERRENO COMO HIPODROMO OFICIAL DEL CONDADO; ASIGNANDO EL HIPODROMO BAJO ADMINISTRACION DEL DEPARTAMENTO DE PARQUES DEL CONDADO; DECLARANDO APOYO PARA LA DESIGNACION DEL HIPODROMO COMO SITIO HISTORICO NACIONAL; Y PROHIBIENDO ENMENDACION DE LA ORDENANZA.

PROPOSICION 400

Un voto de "SI" tendrá el efecto de requerir el uso del Hipódromo Rillito para carreras de caballos y recreación por 25 años.

Un voto de "NO" tendrá el efecto de no requerir el uso del Hipódromo Rillito para carreras de caballos y recreacion.

Special Bond Election in and for Pima County, November 6, 1984

Elección Especial de Bonos en y para el Condado de Pima, 6 de noviembre, 1984

QUESTION

PROPOSITION A

SHALL THE COUNTY OF PIMA BE AUTHORIZED TO SELL ITS GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $15,000,000 TO COMPLETE PLANNING AND DESIGN, AND TO ACQUIRE LAND AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR PARKWAY, FLOOD CONTROL, AND PARK IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GENERAL AREA OF THE RILLITO RIVER, PANTANO WASH, AND TANQUE VERDE WASH COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE RILLITO CORRIDOR AND TO PAY ALL NECESSARY LEGAL, FINANCIAL, AND ENGINEERING COSTS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; SAID BONDS TO BE ISSUED IN ONE OR MORE SERIES IN DENOMINATIONS OF $5,000 OR MULTIPLES THEREOF, TO BEAR INTEREST FROM THEIR DATE TO MATURITY OF THE RESPECTIVE BOND AT A RATE NOT TO EXCEED 13% PER ANNUM, PAYABLE SEMI-ANNUALLY, ON JANUARY 1 AND JULY 1 OF EACH YEAR, AND TO MATURE IN NOT TO EXCEED THIRTY YEARS FROM THEIR DATE OF ISSUANCE?

Bonds YES 304 → ← 304 Bonos SI

Bonds NO 306 → ← 306 Bonos NO

PEGUNTA

PROPOSICION A

¿DEBERÁ EL CONDADO DE PIMA SER AUTHORIZADO A VENDER SUS BONOS DE OBLIGACIÓN GENERAL EN LA CANTIDAD PRINCIPAL DE $15,000,000 PARA COMPLETAR EL PLANEAMIENTO Y DIBUJO, Y PARA ADQUIRR TERRENO Y DERECHOS DE PASO PARA BULEVAR "PARKWAY", CONTROL DE INUNDACICNES Y MEJORES DE PARQUES EN LA REGIÓN GENERAL DE EL RILLITO, PANTANO WASH Y TANQUE VERDE WASH COMUNMENTE CONOCIDA COMO EL CORREDOR RILLITO Y PARA PAGAR TODO COSTO LEGAL, FINANCIERO Y DE INGENIERÍA EN RELACIÓN CON ESTO; DICHOS BONOS SERÁN EMITIDOS EN UNA O MAS SERIES EN LA CANTIDAD DE $5.000 CADA UNO O MULTIPLOS DE ESTA, DEVENGARÁN INTERES DESDE SU FECHA HASTA EL VENCIMIENTO DEL BONO RESPECTIVO A UNA TASA QUE NO EXCEDERÁ 13% POR AÑO, PAGADERO SEMIANUALMENTE, EL PRIMERO DE ENERO Y EL PRIMERO DE JULIO DE CADA AÑO, Y VENCERÁN EN NO MÁS DE TREINTA AÑOS DESDE SU FECHA DE EMISIÓN?

C. ADVERTISE FOR BIDS

Transportation: Request permission to advertise for bids for the fabrication, storage and delivery of 75 bridge girders for the Swan Road Bridge over the Rillito River W. O. #4BSWA2 Nov. 29/11:30 a.m.

D. SCHOOLS: Tucson Unified District No. 1

Ratification of Resolution No. 1984-280 re an exchange of investments held in trust to provide payment of refunded bonds.

E. CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, AMENDMENTS

1. Resolution No. 1984-281 authorizing amendment to IGA with PAG for Regional Water Quality Planning

2. Resolution No. 1984-282 IGA with Pima Association of Governments, Slow the Flow Indoor Water Conservation Program

3. Resolution No. 1984-283 authorizing agreement between Estes and Pima County for the construction of Kolb Road north of Sunrise Drive.

4. Resolution No. 1984-284 authorizing agreement between Fairfield and Pima County for the construction of La Cholla Boulevard.

5. Resolution No. 1984-285 authorizing agreement between pima County and Canyon View Propperties for Canyon View Estates.

3. GEN-ELECTIONS: GENERAL, NOVEMBER 6, 1984

The Director of Elections (Barry Bahill) presented for Board consideration canvass of votes cast in the General Election held on Tuesday, November 6, 1984. He stated the canvass includes all write-in votes and is reported from 277 precincts. The total number of registered votes in Pima County is 301,469 and the total number of persons who cast votes in the General Election was 222,091 which is 73.67 percent of the total registered voters. The canvass consists of candidates from Democrat, Independent, Libertarian, Republican, Social Worker and PBP parties and includes candidates for Presidential, State, County, School District Boards, Justice of the Peace, Superior Court Judges, Fire District Officers, and several propositions, but does not include a canvass of Proposition A, relating to sale of bonds for design of the Rillito Parkway nor the issuance and sale of bonds for the Mt. Lemmon Fire District, which by law must be canvassed 12 days after the election. The official canvass is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS	COUNT	PERCENT
D - Mondale	91,585	42.09
R - Reagan	123,830	56.91
L - Bergland	2,193	1.01
U. S. REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 2		
D - Udall, Moris K.	48,605	90.55
P - Torrez, Lorenzo	5,074	9.45

	COUNT	PERCENT
U. S. RESPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 5		
D - McNulty, Jim	74,216	46.80
R - Kolbe, Jim	82,962	52.32
L - Johnson, Herb	1,395	.88
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 6		
D - Stephens, Alan J.	994	70.50
R - Guinn, Hugh N	416	29.50
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 6		
D - Evans, Henry	855	39.97
D - Raymond, Bobby	659	30.81
R - Hartdegen, Jim	625	29.22
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 7		
D - Rios, Peter	5,530	64.69
R - Nunne, Jim	3,018	35.31
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 7		
D - Hudson, Roy	5,097	52.86
R - Pacheco, Richard "Dick"	4,546	47.14
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 9		
D - Baker, James	10,872	44.16
R - Hill, Jeffery J.	13,747	55.84
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 9		
D - Jones, William D. "Bill"	9,079	24.25
R - Baker, Bart	14,170	37.85
R - English, Bill	14,185	37.89
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 10		
G - Gonzales, Luis Armando	13,099	68.62
R - Register, Dwayne S.	5,989	31.38
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 10		
D - Cajero, Carmen	12,524	54.15
D - Higuera, Jesus "Chuy"	10,604	45.85
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 11		
D - Gutierrez, Jaime P.	24,134	100.00
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 11		
D - Goudinoff, Peter	18,979	50.35
D - Kromko, John	18,712	49.65
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 12		
D - Minette, William E.	15,506	36.58
R - Mawhinney, John T.	26,885	63.42
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 12		
D - Capps, Lonnie	12,535	15.94
D - Ewing, Reid	21,528	27.37
R - Hershberger, Pete	20,712	26.33
R - Jewett, Jack B.	23,882	30.36
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 13		
D - Biggers, John W.	14,306	33/23
R - Lunn, Greg	28,744	66.77

	COUNT	PERCENT
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 13		
D - Bartlett, David C.	21,080	26.49
D - Carlson, Helen Grace	13,431	16.88
R - Hawke, Larry	26,255	32.95
R - Lewellen, Tom	18,854	23.69
STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT NO. 14		
D - Brousseau, Georgia Cole	15,510	40.74
R - Delong, William J. "Bill"	22,564	59.26
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT NO. 14		
D - Resnick, Cindy L.	19,303	33.70
R - Evans, Frank	16,949	29.59
R - Green, Jim	21,024	36.71
STATE MINE INSPECTOR		
R - McCutchan, James M.	119,799	100.00
CORPORATION COMMISSION, TERM EXPIRES JANUARY 1, 1991		
D - Weeks, Marcia	95,383	46.12
R - Borozan, George	104,358	50.46
L - Tobin, Ronald C.	7,060	3.41
CORPORATION COMMISSION, TERM EXPIRES JANUARY 1, 1987		
D - Jennings, Renz D.	100,343	50.70
R - Gibney, William	90,265	45.61
L - Sturzenacker, Ken	7,317	3.70
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT NO. 1		
D - Howell, Jim	16,539	34.71
R - Dewhirst, Iris O.	31,108	65.29
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT NO. 2		
D - Lena, Sam	15,972	100.00
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT NO. 3		
D - Moore, Edwin R. "Ed"	20,686	58.88
I - Stash, Robert N. "Bob'	11,957	34.03
I - Vance, Don L.	2,492	7.09
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT NO. 4		
D - Bacal, Eva K.	18,981	36.05
R - Morrison, Reg T.	25,591	48.60
I - Aufmuth, Dave	8,079	15.34
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT NO. 5		
D - Yetman, David A.	19,166	100.00
COUNTY ATTORNEY		
D - Neely, Stephen D.	149,505	71.90
R - Mach, William C.	58,433	28.10
SHERIFF		
D - Dupnik, Clarence William	170,569	100.00
COUNTY TREASURER		
R - Kirk, James Lee "Jim"	151,780	100.00
COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT		
R - Lohr, Anita	146,113	100.00

	COUNT	PERCENT
COUNTY RECORDER		
D - Kennedy, Richard J.	157,810	100.00
COUNTY ASSESSOR		
R - Jeffers, Arnold	148,190	100.00
CONSTABLE-JUSTICE PRECINCT 1		
R - Allen, Bill	42,618	100.00
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE		
JUSTICE PRECINCT 2		
D - Rubi, Pete M.	17,327	100.00
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE		
JUSTICE PRECINCT 4		
D - West, James R.	11,460	100.00
CONSTABLE-JUSTICE PRECINCT 4		
D - Wisdom, Lee	20,245	100.00
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE		
JUSTICE PRECINCT 6		
D - Girard, Emojean Kerber	30,367	100.00
CONSTABLE-JUSTICE PRECINCT 6		
D - Wactor, Roy	19,353	50.73
R - Archer, F. Lee	18,799	49.27
FELDMAN, STANLEY G.		
JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA		
Be retained-Yes	134,965	82.76
Be retained-No	28,121	17.24
GORDON, FRANK X., JR.,		
JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA		
Be retained-Yes	131,033	82.89
Be retained-No	27,040	17.11
BIRDSALL, BEN C.		
JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF ARIZONA, DIVISION 2		
Be retained-Yes	136,546	83.21
Be retained-No	27,554	16.79
ROYLSTON, ROBERT D., P.C.		
JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT, DIVISION 3		
Be retained-Yes	141,317	84.08
Be retained-No	26,765	15.92
BROWN, MICHAEL J., P.C.		
JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT, DIVISION 9		
Be retained-Yes	134,466	83.88
Be retained-No	25,835	16.12
HANNAH, J. RICHARD, P.C.		
JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT, DIVISION 12		
Be retained-Yes	129,962	80.32
Be retained-No	31,846	19.68
MEEHAN, THOMAS, P.C.,		
JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT, DIVISION 1¢		
Be retained-Yes	143.420	84.95
Be retained-No	25,404	15.05
HAWKINS, JOHN G., P.C.,		
JUDGE OF SUPERIOR COURT, DIVISION 17		
Be retained-Yes	136,255	84.61
Be retained-No	24,775	15.39
BOARD OF EDUCATION-TUSCON UNIFIED DISTRICT 1		
NP - Castillo, Thomas J	81,517	34.29
NP - Hall, Bob	77,704	32.68
NP - Strauss, Robert A.	76,535	33.03

BOARD OF TRUSTEES-EDUCATION MARANA SCHOOL DISTRICT 6	COUNT	PERCENT
NP - Bennett, Brad	2,387	13.52
NP - Coe, William G.	2,472	14.00
NP - George, Arline R.	1,839	10.41
NP - Hill, Fredrick J.	3,117	17.65
NP - phariss, Kenneth	1,014	5.74
NP - Post, Dan	2,774	15.71
NP - Sharnetsky, Dorothy	1,139	12.11
NP - Ungermann, Philip S.	1,916	10.85

BOARD OF EDUCATION, FLOWING WELLS UNIFIED DISTRICT 8		
NP - Armistead, Bettye J.	5,138	25.87
NP - Robertson, J. M. "Jim"	4,859	24.46
NP - Steinbach, Robert E., Jr.	4,745	23.89
NP - Stinnett, Roger	5,121	25.78

BOARD OF EDUCATION, AMPHITHERTER UNIFIED DISTRICT 10, SPECIAL TERM		
NP - Druke, Jean R.	13,740	100.00

BOARD OF EDUCATION, SUNNYSIDE UNIFIED DISTRICT 12		
NP - Cox, Billie "Bill Jim,Jr.	5,160	24.12
NP - Holliday, W. A. "Doc", Jr.	5,866	27.42
NP - Palacio, Randolpho "Randy"	4,829	22.57
NP - Palmer, Richard C.	5,536	25.88

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, TANQUE VERDE DISTRICT 13		
NP - Dryden, Laurie J.	1,320	16.67
NP - Leavitt, Lewis M.	1.544	19.50
NP - Wilson, Silvija S.	1,143	14.44
NP - Hilts-Scott, Shirley F.	1,434	18.11
NP - Mullis, Sonja F.	1,341	16.94
NP - Lindley, Linn A.	1,135	14.34

BOARD OF EDUCATION, AJO UNIFIED DISTRICT 15		
NP - Casey, John J.	936	75.24
NP - Brack, William S.	308	24.76

BOARD OF TRUSTEES-EDUCATION, CATALINA FOOTHILLS DISTRICT 16		
NP - Presley, James E.	2,471	20.56
NP - Ballantine, Joseph S.	2,775	23.09
NP - Julien, paul D.	3,375	28.08
NP - Ravencroft, Jackson P	3,399	28.28

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, VAIL DISTRICT @)		
NP - Rogers, Rita	595	19.60
NP - Dreyfuss, Joe	508	16.94
NP - Muldowney, Sharon	667	21.98
NP - Mentzer, Douglas A	493	16.24
NP - York, Dan	772	25.44

BOARD OF EDUCATION, SAHUARITA UNIFIED DISTRICT 30		
NP - Armour, Michael	576	12.83
NP - Barter, Charles F.	1,016	22.63
NP - Tnaqye, Wayne W.	480	10.69
NP - Jarre, Gunny A.	265	5.90
NP - Hunt, Norman	1,038	23.12
NP - Elam, Tom	1,114	24.82

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, EMPIRE DISTRICT 37		
NP - Robinson, R. Jack	41	43.16
NP - Hollingsworth, Penny S.	22	23.16
NP - Ruben, Audrey Irene	32	33.68

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, EMPIRE DISTRICT 37, SPECIAL TERM		
NP - Duvall, Penny Jeanette	63	100.00

	COUNT	PERCENT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, CONTINENTAL DISTRICT 39		
NP - Clendaniel, George W., Jr.	4,881	27.66
NP - Rasmussen, Gerald T.	4,640	26.68
NP - Stevens, carolyn F.	4,939	28.40
NP - Wohlman, Cyvia J	3,001	17.26
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INDIAN OASIS DISTRICT 40		
NP - Francisco, Enos Juan, Jr.,	724	23.90
NP - Martinez, Larry D.	476	15.71
NP - Chico, Antone M., Jr.	362	11.95
NP - Juan, Louise	407	13.44
NP - Johnson, Albert A.	455	15.02
NP - Pablo, Clifford Andrew, SR.	605	19.97
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INDIAN OASIS DISTRICT 40, SPECIAL TERM		
NP - Harris, John	384	35.99
NP - Mendez, Donald W., SR.	683	64.01
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, MARY E. DILL DISTRICT 51		
NP - Poynter, Pat D.	233	17.79
NP - Fetter, Pamela J.	194	14.81
NP - Harvey, Florence I.	311	23.74
NP - Harmon, Janet M.	315	24.05
NP - Timm, Dave	257	19.62
CENTRAL ARIZONA WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTOR		
NP - Barr, George W.	103,321	18.19
NP - Cortner, Hanna J.	73,768	12.99
NP - Doyle, Mary	103,355	18.19
NP - Holub, Hugh	59,912	10.55
NP - Ronstadt, Marilyn "Corkey"	107,785	18.97
NP - Sebba, Jon B.	54,478	9.59
NP - Vandermark, Brad	65,460	11.52
MEMBER, GOVERNING BOARD, PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 1		
NP - Tang, Ester Don	18,981	48.62
NP - Vasilius, Janet	20,060	51,38
MEMBER, GOVERNING BOARD, PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, DISTRICT 2		
NP - Urias, Ernest	6,343	25.17
NP - Valdez, Mario P.	6,596	26.17
NP - Wagner, Edwary A. 'Ed"	12,263	48.66
MEMBER, GOVERNING BOARD, PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 5		
NP - Christensen, Alphus R. "Chris"	9,538	36.16
NP - Molina, Marie Christing "Chri"	10,156	38.50
NP - Rutz, Jose Agustin	6,684	25.34
AVRA VALLEY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT BOARD MEMBER		
NP - McFarland, Jack	353	26.00
NP - Hooper, Jimmy C.	270	20.35
NP - Hudson, Charles R. "Chuck"	352	26.53
NP - Kline, George W.	352	26.53
CORONA DE TUCSON VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Heifferon, Barbara	300	16.99
NP - Edwards, Willard, Jr.	362	20.50
NP - Hunter, Les	345	19.54
NP - Tomasovich, Mike	380	21.52
NP - White, A. B.	379	21.46

DREXEL HEIGHTS FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - McCoy, Clyde	1,800	16.30
NP - Fell, Joan	1,839	16.65
NP - Hobbs, B. Wayne	1,809	16.38
NP - Van Brocklin, Charlie	1,673	15.15
NP - Connell, Robert P.	1,922	17.40
NP - Baker, Ralph II	2,001	18.13
FLOWING WELLS VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Lathrem, Charles Alan	4,089	49.54
NP - Fair, Ronald D.	4,165	50.46
GO' .R RANCH VALUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Walsh, Frank A.	577	41.30
NP - Miller, Stan	337	24.12
NP - Dusenberry, Hal	483	34.57
GREEN VALLEY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Browning, John R.	5,269	48.67
NP - McKinley, Walter D.	5,558	51.33
MOUNT LEMMON VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Brown, Bill	43	53.75
NP - Zimmerman, Robert T.	37	46.25
MOUNT LEMMON BOND QUESTION		
NP - Yes	38	82.61
NP - No	8	17.39
NORTHWEST VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Renfroe, Joseph W.	5,568	50.60
NP - Paulus, Harry D., Jr.	5,435	49.40
PICTURE ROCKS VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Edgerion, Jack L.	375	17.95
NP - Durbin, Roy	273	13.07
NP - Vinson, Charles	364	17.42
NP - Stidham, Matthew R.	264	12.64
NP - Burson, Carl W.	165	7.90
NP - Pekelder, William	336	16.08
NP - Grill, Martha Ann	312	14.94
RINCON VALLEY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Heins, Suzanne E.	379	100.00
SABINO VISTA VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Stravold, J. Richard	1,058	34,26
NP - Schlossbert, Ed	1,023	33.13
NP - Green, R. Jeffrey	1,007	32,61
TUCSON ESTATES VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Spacklin, Walter Absalom	1,110	25.95
NP - Murray, Len	550	12.86
NP - Drexel, Joseph H.	1,178	27.54
NP - Nickelson, John W.	1,075	25.13
NP - Jorgensen, peggy	364	8.51
WHY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - HOge, John n.	42	100.00

	COUNT	PERCENT
DREXEL HEIGHTS FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - McCoy, Clyde	1,800	16.30
NP - Fell, Joan	1,839	16.65
NP - Hobbs, B. Wayne	1,809	16.38
NP - Van Brocklin, Charlie	1,673	15.15
NP - Connell, Robert P.	1,922	17.40
NP - Baker, Ralph II	2,001	18.13
FLOWING WELLS VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Lathrem, Charles Alan	4,089	49.54
NP - Fair, Ronald D.	4,165	50.46
GOLDER RANCH VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Walsh, Frank A.	577	41.30
NP - Miller, Stan	337	24.12
NP - Dusenberry, Hal	483	34.57
GREEN VALLEY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Browning, John R.	5,269	48.67
NP - McKinley, Walter D.	5,558	51.33
MOUNT LEMMON VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Brown, Bill	43	53.75
NP - Zimmerman, Robert T.	37	46.25
NORTHWEST VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Renfroe, Joseph W.	5,568	50.60
NP - Paulus, Harry D., Jr.	5,435	49.40
PICTURE ROCKS VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Edgerion, Jack L.	375	17.95
NP - Durbin, Roy	273	13.07
NP - Vinson, Charles	364	17.42
NP - Stidham, Matthew R.	264	12.64
NP - Burson, Carl W.	165	7.90
NP - Pekelder, William	336	16.08
NP - Grill, Martha Ann	312	14.94
RINCON VALLEY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Heins, Suzanne E.	379	100.00
SABINO VISTA VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Stravold, J. Richard	1,058	34,26
NP - Schlossbert, Ed	1,023	33.13
NP - Green, R. Jeffrey	1,007	32,61
TUCSON ESTATES VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Spacklin, Walter Absalom	1,110	25.95
NP - Murray, Len	550	12.86
NP - Drexel, Joseph H.	1,178	27.54
NP - Nickelson, John W.	1,075	25.13
NP - Jorgensen, peggy	364	8.51
WHY VOLUNTEER FIRE DISTRICT		
BOARD MEMBER		
NP - Hoge, John n.	42	100.00
PROPOSITION 100		
Yes	68,398	34.18
No	131,692	65.82

	COUNT	PERCENT
PROPOSITION 101		
Yes	59,440	29.74
No	140.393	70.26
PROPOSITION 102		
Yes	73,624	36.17
No	129,952	63.83
PROPOSITION 103		
Yes	56,399	28.37
No	142,401	71.63
PROPOSITION 104		
Yes	52,661	26.63
No	145,085	73.37
PROPOSITION 105		
Yes	71,800	36.70
No	128,817	63.30
PROPOSITION 106		
Yes	93,351	47.37
No	103,696	52.63
PROPOSITION 107		
Yes	95,124	48.72
No	100,115	51.28
PROPOSITION 108		
Yes	78,163	39.67
No	118,880	60.33
PROPOSITION 109		
Yes	79,427	39.44
No	121,939	60.56
PROPOSITION 110		
Yes	76,044	37.18
No	128,476	62.82
PROPOSITION 200		
Yes	79,259	38.33
No	127,511	61.67
PROPOSITION 300		
Yes	99,555	50.25
No	98,563	49.75
PROPOSITION 301		
Yes	96,535	47.38
No	107,229	52.62
PROPOSITION 302		
Yes	97,600	48.63
No	103,108	51,37
PROPOSITION 400		
Yes	124,816	62.80
No	73,936	37.20

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Walker, seconded by Supervisor Yetman, and unanimously carried, the Board receive the Canvass of the General Election, certify the results as presented, request that a certified copy of the returns be forwarded to the Secretary of State, Rose Mofford, and the candidates for County offices heretofore shown by such canvass to have received the highest number of votes cast for their respective offices be declared elected and the Clerk issue to each successful candidate a certificate of

election upon the filing of the candidate's expense statement; further the results of the elections held in the various school districts of Pima County be forwarded to the Superintendent of Schools (Anita Lohr) to that she may issue certificates of election to the successful candidates for positions of school board trustee or member of the board of education.

4. ADM-ASSESSOR: OS

On recommendation of Administrative Assistant (Dan Felix), it was moved by Supervisor Yetman, seconded by Supervisor Lopez and unanimously carried to accept report and recommendations from the Assessor regarding Board of Equalization.

5. H&SA-STATE BEHAVORIAL HEALTH PLAN

Assistant County Manager (Jim Murphy), explained the criteria governing the RFP proposal for an administrative agency for the Behavorial Health Plan, and pointed out that as a contracting entity, the County cannot act as the administrative agency. He also noted the State has yet to clearly define "chronic" care for drug and alcohol abusers.

On his recommendation, it was moved by Supevisor Yetman, seconded by Supervisor Walker, and unanimously carried, the Board submit the proposal as outlined by staff.

6. RECESS

As there was no objection, the Chairman declared a five minute recess. The Board reconvened and upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Katie Dusenberry, Member Sam Lena, Chairman Pat P. Lopez, Jr., Member E. S. "Bud" Walker, Member David Yetman, Member
Absent:	None
Not in attendance	Eugenia W. Wells, Clerk

7. ROADS-M: HAPPY VALLEY-REDINGTON

The Director of the Transportation Department and Flood Control District (C. H. Huckelberry) presented for Board decision the question of maintenance of Redington and Happy Valley Roads, pointing out that neither one is a dedicated County right-of-way and the necessary improvements required to continue adequate maintenance will cost approximately 1.6 million dollars. He added the roadways serve a few ranches in the area and some hunters during the season, and one owner has contacted the County Attorney in regard to the County's legal liability relating to road hazards due to negligence. He recommended that Pima County immediately return maintenance responsibility to the Forest Service for Happy Valley Road and their portion of Redington Pass Road and to the State of Arizona for its portion of Redington Pass Road by authorizing the Chairman to execute a letter to each entity outlining this action.

Bob Feather, Forest Service engineer, stated that everything which had been said about the road condition is true and added the road was build by the County in 1912 under a special "Use" permit. The Director of Transportation Department suggested the County Attorney be requested to submit a recommendation regarding a formal action by resolution to cease maintenance operations on the two roadways.

ATTACHMENT 2

OFFICE OF THE
Pima County Attorney
Civil Division
32 N. STONE
SUITE 1500
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1412
(602) 740-5750

STEPHEN D. NEELY
PIMA COUNTY ATTORNEY

OPINION NO. 90-1

TO: Enrique Serna, County Manager

SUBJECT: Rillito Race Track Initiative Measure

DATE: January 4, 1990

QUESTION PRESENTED:

Does the Rillito Racetrack Initiative Measure prevent the Board of Supervisors from conveying title to a portion of the property that was the subject of the Initiative?

CONCLUSION:

No.

FACTS:

The citizens of Pima County adopted the Rillito Racetrack Initiative Measure in the November 6, 1984, General Election. The Measure stated:

> AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN OFFICIAL PLAN PROVIDING FOR THE USE, ACTIVITIES AND STATUS OF THAT CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS OWNED BY PIMA COUNTY, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY EIGHT-EIGHT (88) ACRES, GENERALLY KNOWN AS "RILLITO RACE TRACK."

SECTION 1. Pima County hereby declares that said land shall be utilized for recreational and historic uses, including horse racing approved by the Arizona State Racing Commission, for the benefit of the citizens of Pima County.

Rillito Race Track shall be administered under the Pima County Parks and Recreation Department.

SECTION 2. Pima County shall lease Rillito Race Track, pursuant to A.R.S. 11-256. The lease provisions shall provide, at least, that commercial horse race meets, horse shows, rugby, soccer, softball, entertainment, community and charitable activities, restaurants, and all forms of legal commercial activities may be conducted on the premises by the lessee for a period of twenty-five (25) years commencing January 1, 1985.

SECTION 3. Pima County hereby designates Rillito Race Track as the official Pima County race track for County horse race meets for a period of at least twenty-five (25) years from January 1, 1985.

SECTION 4. Pima County hereby declares its full support of the petition filed with the Arizona State Historic Preservations Office, seeking to have the Rillito Race Track designated a state historic site.

In the event a petition is filed seeking to have Rillito Race Track designated a national historic site, Pima County hereby declares its full support of that petition.

In furtherance thereof, the improvements on the land shall be maintained.

SECTION 5. The Pima County Board of Supervisors does not have the right, power or authority to change or amend this Ordinance.

The Measure was approved by a majority of the votes cast on the Measure, but was not approved by a majority vote of the qualified electors.

124,816 voted Yes (62.80%) and 73,936 voted No (37.20%).

There were 301,469 registered voters in Pima County at the time of the Election. A majority of the qualified electors (50% of the number of registered voters plus 1) was 150,736. The percentage of qualified electors who voted Yes was 41.40%.

Because the number of Yes votes was less than half of the number of registered voters in Pima County at the time of the Election, the Measure was not approved by a majority vote of the qualified electors.

The Board of Supervisors is now considering the exchange for other lands of approximately fourteen of the approximately 88 acres subject to the Initiative Measure.

LEGAL ANALYSIS:

General Rule: Initiative May Be Amended or Repealed

The leading American case on the power of a legislative body to amend or repeal an initiated measure is an Arizona case: *Adams v. Bolin*, 74 Ariz. 269, 247 P.2d 617 (1952). It is the leading authority cited in the *Annotation*, 33 A.L.R.2d 1118, and by 42 Am.Jur.2d, *Initiative and Referendum*, § 58, for the rule: "Generally, initiated or referred measures can be amended or repealed." The *Adams* opinion surveys the law of other jurisdictions and that of Arizona and concludes that a measure enacted by the citizens as an initiative may be amended or repealed by a legislative body unless a specific constitutional or charter provision prohibits the amendment or repeal.

Limitation on State Legislature

Willard v. Hubbs, 30 Ariz. 417, 248 P. 32 (1926), held that the Legislature could repeal, alter or amend an initiated measure adopted by the voters unless the Constitution limited that power. Prior to 1916, the Arizona Constitution, Article 4, part 1, section 1(6), only prohibited the Governor from vetoing an initiated measure. After 1916, Section 1(6) limited the power of the Legislature to amend or repeal initiated measures "approved by a majority vote of the qualified electors."

> Up to that latter date, there was no inhibition placed by the Constitution on the power of the legislature over a referred measure approved by the people. It was subject to amendment or repeal in the same manner as any other statute . . . .

Willard, at page 421.

The *Adams* case concluded that even after the adoption of Section 1(6) the Legislature had the power to amend or repeal an initiated measure if it was passed by only a majority of the votes cast, and less than a majority of the qualified electors. It rejected the appellant's contention "that an initiated measure, once adopted, can only be repealed in the same manner in which it was adopted, i.e., by an initiated repeal . . . ," and overruled previous cases to the extent they held that all initiated or referred laws could not be amended or repealed. *Adams*, at page 275. The *Adams* court stated:

> To interpret and enforce this constitutional provision according to its terms will not create an impossible or unworkable situation, nor will it result in absurdity. To enforce it according to its terms will mean that only those initiated and referred measures which receive the majority vote of the qualified electors will be immune from legislative amendment or repeal. We are fully aware of the stated reasons actuating the constitution makers to reserve to the people the right to enact laws and refer measures enacted by the Legislature. We are also cognizant of the mischief it was felt the reservation of these powers would reach and the objects and remedy that was contemplated. But with the advent of the initiative and referendum there was no general concept that initiated and referred measures were sacrosanct.

No Limitation on the County

Many states give protection to initiated measures, at least for a period of years. The Arizona Constitution gives protection against amendment or repeal by the State Legislature for some initiated measures, as described above. But without such a specific limitation provision in a constitution or municipal charter, initiated measures have no special protection. In the absence of constitutional or statutory limitation, the governing body of a municipal corporation has the power to amend or repeal an initiated ordinance adopted by the electors. 6 McQuillin, *Municipal Corporations*, § 21.03 (3rd Ed.1988). The Arizona Supreme Court stated:

> It would appear from the reported cases many constitutions and municipal charters contain express inhibitions, absolutely or for

> a specified time against repeal, abrogation or amendment by the Legislature or municipal councils, of initiative or referendum measures. The examination of these constitutional provisions and the reported cases referring to constitutional and charter prohibitions plainly depict that there was no universal or general concept of the inviolability of initiated or referred measures.

Adams, at page 275.

Constitutional provisions relating to limitations on amending or repealing initiated measures apply only to those initiatives described in the provision. Article 4, part 1, section 1(6), the only Arizona constitutional limitation on the power of a legislative body over an initiated measure, applies expressly only to the State Legislature, and only then in the rare cases described above. There is no corollary provision for the board of supervisor's power to amend or repeal county initiatives. The Arizona Supreme Court has stated:

> What was the plain purpose for which this limitation was put upon the power of the Legislature to amend or repeal initiative or referred measures? Was it to extend to all initiative or referred measures enacted and approved? The constitutional provision suggests that the answer is no.

Adams, at page 276.

State Rules Do Not Apply to County

State initiative statutes do not apply to local governing bodies except for procedural matters in the conduct of elections. *City of Scottsdale v. Superior Court*, 103 Ariz. 204, 439 P.2d 290 (1968). That case held that the Legislature's power to refer a referendum to the voters (Arizona Constitution, Article 4, part 1, section 1(8)), did not give that referral power to a city council. Even though A.R.S. § 19-141 et seq. provides that if a city or town has not adopted its own rules for initiative elections, the State initiative statutes will be used, this only applies to procedural matters, such as the duties of the city clerk being the same as the secretary of state, and does not enlarge or limit the powers of the governing body.

However, even if Article 4, part 1, section 1(6) were to apply to the Rillito Racetrack Initiative, the Measure was passed by only a majority of the voters, and not

by a majority of the qualified electors, and could still be amended or repealed by the Board of Supervisors. *Adams, id.*

No Local Limitation

Pima County Code § 11.08.040 governs the initiative procedures for Pima County. It does not prohibit the Board of Supervisors from amending or repealing an initiated measure.

Initiated Measure Same as Board Ordinance

Without a specific limiting provision, initiated measures and laws adopted by a legislative body are coequal. The *Adams* court, at page 275, pointed out that the initiated measure in *Willard* was passed before the Constitutional provision limiting the power of the Legislature was adopted, and therefore "[I]t was just as if the measure had been enacted by the Legislature." *Willard*, at page 421. For purposes of amendment or repeal, it is as if the Rillito Racetrack Initiative Measure had been enacted as an ordinance by the Board of Supervisors. *Adams*, at page 275.

The Arizona Supreme Court has described the place of initiative in the legislative process as follows:

> Although it is true that many worthwhile general ideas are incorporated in initiative measures, it is also true that they do not have the advantage of open debate and analysis, and oftentimes incorporate provisions that are out of harmony with and contradict the general scheme of legislation. If the people think that any legislative repeal or amendment of initiated law is not desirable, five per centum of the qualified electors can force a referendum against it and the people will again have an opportunity to express their opinion thereon.

Adams, at page 275.

Initiated Measure Cannot Prohibit Amendment or Repeal

The Board of Supervisors has the express power to adopt, amend and repeal ordinances. A.R.S. § 11-251.05. Although Section 5 of the Rillito Racetrack Initiative Measure states: "The Pima County Board of Supervisors does not have the right, power or authority to change or amend this Ordinance," this provision is invalid.

The Board of Supervisors can amend the ordinances of the County. "The governing body of every municipality ordinarily possesses the power to amend as well as enact ordinances. Indeed, the power in a municipality to legislate on a subject implies, in the absence of a provision in the grant of power to the contrary, a power, at any time after enactment of legislation on the subject, to change or alter that legislation in the mode prescribed for, and subject to any limitations imposed on, the exercise of the power." 6 McQuillin, *Municipal Corporations*, § 21.02 (3rd Ed.1988). "A municipal legislative body ordinarily cannot restrict the power of its successors to amend ordinances." McQuillin, *supra*, citing *Levi v. State*, 136 Fla. 806, 187 So. 600 (1939).

The same is true for repeal. "A municipal corporation which has the power to enact ordinances has by implication the power to rescind ordinances." *Kempton v. City of Safford*, 140 Ariz. 539 (App.), 541, 683 P.2d 338 (1984), citing 6 McQuillin, *Municipal Corporations*, § 21.10 (3rd Ed.1980); Rhyne, *The Law of Local Government Operations*, § 8.8 (1980).

It is settled law that an ordinance may not limit the legislative powers of the government by prohibiting amendment or repeal. *Higgins' Estate v. Hubbs*, 31 Ariz. 252, 264, 252 P. 515 (1926); *Blotter v. Farrell*, 42 Cal.2d 804, 270 P.2d 481, 485 (1954); *Levi v. State*, *id.* McQuillin, at § 21.10, describes the common law rule:

> A municipal corporation cannot abridge its own legislative powers by the passage of irrevocable ordinances . . . . Accordingly, in the absence of a valid provision to the contrary, a municipal council or assembly, having the power to legislate on or exercise discretionary or regulatory power authority over any given subject may exercise that power at will by enacting or repealing an ordinance in relation to the subject.

An action which interferes with a public officer's freedom of action in the exercise of the officer's powers and restricts the unbiased discharge of the officer's duty to the public in the exercise of the office is against public policy and unenforceable. A public officer has a fiduciary duty to the public. A public officer's powers were conferred by law for public purposes, and the exercise thereof, involving a matter of future policy subject to change to meet future conditions, cannot be restricted. *School District No. 69 of Maricopa County v. Altherr*, 10 Ariz.App. 333, 338, 458 P.2d 537 (1969).

Conclusion

The Rillito Racetrack Measure is subject to amendment or repeal in the same manner as any other ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may therefore convey title to the land subject to the Initiative by repealing the Measure or by amending any restrictions in the Measure.

Other Issues

This Opinion does not discuss two issues which may be of interest:

1. Whether all or a part of the Rillito Race Track Initiative Measure is a proprietary action of the County, not a legislative action, and thus is an improper use of the initiative power and invalid. See *State v. Wilkinson*, 88 Conn. 300, 90 A. 929, for the proposition that initiative and referendum are not available for administrative and ministerial functions, such as the leasing of property.

2. Whether all or a part of the Rillito Race Track Initiative Measure is a zoning ordinance, and therefore not validly adopted by an initiative. See *City of Scottsdale*, *id*, and *Transamerica Title Ins. Co. v. Tucson*, 157 Ariz. 346, 757 P.2d 1055 (1988), holding that the adoption of zoning by initiative violates the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, U.S.C.A.Const. Amend. 14.

Respectfully Submitted,

STEPHEN D. NEELY
PIMA COUNTY ATTORNEY
By: Albin Krietz
Albin Krietz
Deputy County Attorney

APPROVED:

/s/ David Dingeldine
David G. Dingeldine
Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney

ATTACHMENT 3

this project, and their submitted Request for Waiver was denied. Meridian exceeded the goal at 14% and Granite met the 9% goal. Funding Source: 1997 HURF Revenue Bond Fund. Administering Department: Transportation.

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Day, and carried by a four to zero vote, to approve the Award of Contract.

17. **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: REQUEST FOR ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT INITIATION**

Staff requests direction to initiate and advertise Pima County Zoning Code Text Amendments to modify Chapter 18.03 (General Definitions) and Chapter 18.07 (General Regulations and Exceptions), regarding Wireless Communications Facilities. (All Districts)

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Carroll, and carried by a four to zero vote, to direct staff to initiate and advertise the Zoning Code Text Amendment.

18. **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: FINAL PLAT WITH ASSURANCES**

P1205-049, Windmill Ranch, Lots 1-24. (District 3)

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Day, and carried by a four to zero vote, to approve the Final Plat with Assurances.

19. **NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT**

Presentation by Dr. Julio Betancourt of the U.S. Geological Survey and Travis Bean of the University of Arizona on management of Buffelgrass in Pima County.

Without objection, this item was continued to the Board of Supervisors Meeting of August 21, 2006.

20. **NATURAL RESOURCES, PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT**

Report by the Pima County Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee regarding the long-term public use of Rillito Regional Park.

Gary Davidson, Chairman of the Pima County Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee, stated the committee was comprised of a very diverse group of citizens representing many factions. Presentations were made to the committee by a variety of different groups who gave them good information and recommendations. He summarized the key recommendations of the Committee, thanked the Board and requested serious consideration of the Committee's recommendations.

Supervisor Day thanked the Committee and stated they had developed excellent recommendations that reflected the Committee's interest in both horse racing and the need for other sports facilities. She agreed there was a lack of space for sport fields in the County. She felt there needed to be an Intergovernmental Agreement with school districts to make more fields available.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

1. Tim Kelly
2. Julie Neff-Encinas
3. Patricia Dunham
4. Geronimo Ramirez Jr. M.D.
5. Ebie Aldaghi
6. Lisa Balcer
7. Joyce Hannes

The speakers provided the following comments:

1. The Horseman's Association was concerned with the 2010 deadline for moving horse racing out of the Rillito Regional Park.
2. Concern was expressed about the facilities being ready for the next horse racing season.
3. Youth sports save kids and all fields provided would soon be filled.
4. The soccer community considered this a partnership and pledged to do their part in bringing in tournaments to support merchants and tourism in the community.
5. Horse racing is a viable industry that has not been tapped and should be considered for bond funding.
6. The Board was thanked for their assistance in getting more soccer fields for the community.
7. Soccer fields at the Rillito Regional Park are currently under-utilized.

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Day, seconded by Supervisor Bronson, and carried by a four to zero vote, to accept the recommendations of the Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee's Report as follows:

Recommendations

1. All existing uses at Rillito continue until a suitable replacement facility is established for horse racing;
2. The replacement facility should be established no later than 2010;
3. Consistent with the planned relocation, and in order to sustain the horse racing community, Pima County maintain the horse racing facilities at Rillito until these activities are relocated;
4. Any improvements to the horse racing facilities at Rillito are the responsibility of the lessee;
5. The Town of Marana's proposed Western Heritage Park, located on hundreds of acres including rodeo and equestrian facilities is the future site of horse racing in Pima County;
6 Pima County include funding to support the development of racing facilities at the Marana site in the next bond package with the intent that this project be included in the first implementation period;
7. If for any reason Marana is unable to develop the Western Heritage Park for horse racing, that a suitable alternative site be identified for horse racing and that the site must be acceptable to the Pima County Fair Horse Racing Commission;
8. The horse racing community is actively involved in the design and development of the new facility;
9. Rillito be fully developed, as currently planned, including the addition of soccer fields, lighting, parking and the removal or the relocation of stalls to accommodate these improvements;
10. Once horse racing has moved from Rillito, the facility be developed as soon as possible as a soccer tournament and practice facility with 18 full-size lighted soccer fields and additional facilities to support soccer tournaments. The local areas need for football and lacrosse practice facilities can also be accommodated, if needed, by these fields; and,
11. Pima County include funding to support the development of the 18 field Rillito soccer facility in the next bond package with the intent that this project be included in the first implementation period.

Further Recommendations

1. Pima County, in cooperation with other jurisdictions, identify properties for future sports and recreational uses and develop a bond question for the next and subsequent bond packages that is specific to the development of tournament and practice facility sites for the following sports:
   - Softball/Soccer
   - Football/Lacrosse
   - Baseball/Other Sports
2. In developing tournament sites, local players and their need for conveniently accessible practice fields, should be a very important consideration;
3. Pima County should identify funds and pursue property acquisition and additional concept development to establish these facilities. The 120 acres of City and County owned land in the vicinity of the Roger Road facility should be specifically considered if the present wastewater treatment facility is either relocated or reduced in size; and,
4. Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation staff should study the possibility of forming a Sports Authority.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

*Requested Board Meeting Date:*_____

ITEM SUMMARY, JUSTIFICATION &/or SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The Pima County Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee was established on September 6, 2005 to study all aspects and any alternatives for the long-term public sue of Rillito, and make recommendations on same to the Pima County Board of Supervisors.

The attached document is the Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee's recommendation which was unanimously approved during their June 29, 2006 meeting.

CONTRACT NUMBER (If applicable):

STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S):

The Recommendation is respectfully presented for the Honorable Board Members for review and evaluation.

*CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS:*_____

JUL 19'06PM02:25PC CLK OF BD

CLERK OF BOARD USE ONLY: BOS MTG. _____

ITEM NO. _____

PIMA COUNTY COST: n/a *and/or REVENUE TO PIMA COUNTY:*

FUNDING SOURCE(S): n/a *(i.e. General Fund, State Grant Fund, Federal Fund, Stadium D. Fund, etc.)*

Advertised Public Hearing:

		YES	*XX*	*NO*

Board of Supervisors District:

1		*2*		*3*		*4*		*5*		*All*	*XXX*

IMPACT:

IF APPROVED:

The recommendations contained in the attached document presented by the Pima County Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee will be implemented per the Committee's recommendation.

IF DENIED:

The above recommendations will be implemented..

DEPARTMENT NAME: **Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department**

CONTACT PERSON: **Evelyne R. Thorpe** *TELEPHONE NO.:* **877-6230**

PIMA COUNTY
RILLITO REGIONAL PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Gary Davidson, Chair

Ebie Aldaghi

Jon Baker

Lisa Balcer

Steve Brody

Fred Gray

Ed Moore

Rafael Payan

Zeno Pfau

Geronimo Ramirez, M.D.

Patti Shirley

Tom Tengler

Pat White

Carol Whittaker

Report

The Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee was formed by the Pima County Board of Supervisors on September 6, 2005 to study all aspects of, and any alternatives for, the long-term public use of Rillito, and make recommendations on same to the Pima County Board of Supervisors. The Advisory Committee, made up of 14 members representing horse racing, equestrian and field sport interest groups, has met monthly since November 2005. Meeting agendas were established to allow the Committee to gather information on all potential uses at Rillito and their impact to the community. The following is a list of presentations made to the Committee:

Dec. 6, 2005	History of site, historic designation, facility issues
Jan. 12, 2006	Racing and non-racing equestrian sports
Feb. 9, 2006	Soccer and field sports including tournament opportunities, economics, and field demand
Mar. 9, 2006	Special events, softball and other field sports
Apr. 25, 2006	Town of Marana's proposal for horse racing at Marana
May 18, 2006	Committee discusses Town of Marana proposal
June 29, 2006	Review Committee's DRAFT recommendation

The presentations highlighted the overwhelming need for additional facilities for all sports and recreational users in Pima County. They also highlighted the economic benefit of horse racing and the potential to attract additional millions of dollars in tourism revenue by establishing sports tournament facilities. Therefore, despite the charge to provide recommendations solely for the use of the Rillito Regional Park, the Committee feels compelled to expand their effort inasmuch as their recommendations for this facility may have a broader impact on the entire sports community. The following findings and recommendations reflect the committee's compelling interest in both the Rillito facility and the need for sports facilities County-wide.

Findings

The residents of Pima County have diverse interests in a variety of sports, recreational and outdoor activities. It is the desire of this Committee to maintain that diversity. No sport should be eliminated for the benefit of another. The Committee recognizes the evolving interests of the community and that facility recommendations need to address current as well as future needs. The Committee unanimously agrees that horse racing should remain in Pima County. It is also understood that while horse racing is a

significant part of Pima County's history and an important entertainment attraction for our community, there is an enormous need for additional sports fields and related facilities throughout Pima County. The Committee unanimously agrees that every effort should be made to expeditiously address this need.

Recommendations

The Committee unanimously recommends that:

1. All existing uses at Rillito continue until a suitable replacement facility is established for horse racing;
2. The replacement facility should be established no later than 2010.
3. Consistent with the planned relocation, and in order to sustain the horse racing community, Pima County *maintain the horse racing facilities at Rillito until these activities are relocated;
4. Any improvements to the horse racing facilities at Rillito are the responsibility of the lessee;
5. The Town of Marana's proposed Western Heritage Park, located on hundreds of acres, and including rodeo and equestrian facilities, is the future site of horse racing in Pima County;
6. Pima County include funding to support the development of racing facilities at the Marana site in the next bond package with the intent that this project be included in the first implementation period.
7. If for any reason Marana is unable to develop the Western Heritage Park for horse racing, that a suitable alternative site be identified for horse racing, and that the site must be acceptable to the Pima County Fair Horse Racing Commission;
8. The horse racing community is actively involved in the design and development of the new facility;
9. Rillito be fully developed, as currently planned, including the addition of soccer fields, lighting, parking and the removal/ relocation of stalls to accommodate these improvements;
10. Once horse racing has moved from Rillito, the facility be developed as soon as possible as a soccer tournament and practice facility with 18 full-size lighted soccer fields and additional facilities to support soccer tournaments. The local area's need for football and lacrosse practice facilities can also be accommodated, if needed, by these fields; and
11. Pima County include funding to support the development of the 18 field Rillito soccer facility in the next bond package with the intent that this project be included in the first implementation period.

Further Recommendations

The Committee unanimously recommends that:

1. Pima County, in cooperation with other jurisdictions; Identify properties for future sports and recreational uses and develop a bond question for the next and subsequent bond packages that is specific to the development of tournament and practice facility sites for the following sports:
   - Softball
   - Football
   - Baseball
   - Soccer
   - Lacrosse
   - Other Sports

* *"Maintain" is defined as" retain" per the July 29, 2006 meeting of the Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee.*

2. In developing tournament sites, local players and their need for conveniently accessible practice fields, should be a very important consideration;
3. Pima County should identify funds and pursue property acquisition and additional concept development to establish these facilities. The 120 acres of City and County owned land in the vicinity of the Roger Road facility should be specifically considered if the present wastewater treatment facility is either relocated or reduced in size; and;
4. Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation staff should study the possibility of forming a Sports Authority.

Although we understand that the Rillito Regional Park Advisory Committee's purpose is fulfilled with the submittal of these recommendations, and that the Committee is disbanded unless otherwise directed by the Board of Supervisors, the individual members that make up the Committee are dedicated to the successful implementation of these recommendations. Therefore, we, as individual members of the community, vow to work with other interested parties to establish a coalition to support the development of additional sports facilities in Pima County, which includes horse racing, and will advocate for additional funding for those facilities.

It has been our pleasure to serve in this capacity and we are honored at the opportunity to make a difference in our community.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Davidson, Chair	Fred Gray	Patti Shirley
Ebie Aldaghi	Ed Moore	Tom Tengler
Jon Baker	Rafael Payan	Pat White
Lisa Balcer	Zeno Pfau	Carol Whittaker
Steve Brody	Geronimo Ramirez, M.D	

ATTACHMENT 4

PIMA COUNTY
NATURAL RESOURCES
PARKS & RECREATION

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 20, 2016

To: CH Huckelberry, County Administrator

From: Chris Cawein, Director

Subject: Scheduling of Special Events, Soccer and Horseracing at Rillito Regional Park

In response to your memo dated January 20, 2016, we have reviewed the comments made by Gary Davidson from the BOS meeting of January 19, 2016 specifically referencing the issues of a "unitary calendar" for the use of Rillito Park.

I am unaware of any inconsistencies in the scheduling process for Rillito Park. The Natural Resources Parks and Recreation Department has been and continues to be the schedule coordinator for all activities associated with the Rillito Regional Park. I am uncertain where Mr. Davidson obtained his information indicating that the "parks department is no longer in charge of making a unitary calendar." We do maintain a calendar for all activities scheduled at Rillito Regional Park including sports use, horseracing, and special events

We will continue to strategically balance the use of the Rillito Regional Park facilities as appropriate and directed and in accordance with the adopted site use hierarchy. We will also continue to monitor activities at the site closely, including contracted activities, to ensure that all vendors who are authorized to use facilities at Rillito Regional Park in accordance with a contract, do so in accordance with those contract conditions.

C: John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator
Nanette Slusser, Assistant County Administrator