

MINUTES, FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BOARD

JULY 28, 2009

The Pima County Flood Control District Board met in a special final budget adoption meeting in the regular meeting place of the Pima County Board of Supervisors (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

All Present: Richard Elías, Chairman
 Ramón Valadez, Vice Chairman
 Sharon Bronson, Member
 Ray Carroll, Member (Telephonically)
 Ann Day, Member
 Lori Godoshian, Clerk

1. **FINAL BUDGET ADOPTION**

Adopt Flood Control District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.
If approved, pass and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 2009 – FC 6

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5 to 0 roll call vote, to close the public hearing and adopt Resolution No. 2009-FC6 in the amount of \$12,227,360.00, with an effective tax rate of \$0.2635.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

MINUTES, IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD

JULY 28, 2009

The Pima County Improvement District Board met in a special final budget adoption meeting in its regular meeting place at Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

All Present: Richard Elías, Chairman
 Ramón Valadez, Vice Chairman
 Sharon Bronson, Member
 Ray Carroll, Member (Telephonically)
 Ann Day, Member
 Lori Godoshian, Clerk

1. **FINAL BUDGET ADOPTION**

Adopt Improvement District Final Budgets for Fiscal Year 2009-2010 as follows:

- A. Resolution No. 8 in the amount of \$57,817.00 for Hayhook Ranch Improvement District.
- B. Resolution No. 13 in the amount of \$20,627.00 for the Mortimore Addition.
- C. Resolution No. 16 in the amounts shown below for each of the following Districts:

DESERT STEPPES	\$ 2,982.00
HERMOSA HILLS ESTATES	\$ 2,559.00
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 1	\$ 5,287.00
LONGVIEW ESTATES NO. 2	\$ 6,185.00
ROLLING HILLS	\$ 10,090.00
MAÑANA GRANDE B	\$ 4,332.00
MAÑANA GRANDE C	\$ 7,113.00
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 1	\$ 5,118.00
LAKESIDE NO. 1	\$ 4,060.00
CARRIAGE HILLS NO. 3	\$ 1,961.00
CARDINAL ESTATES	\$ 7,850.00
ORANGE GROVE VALLEY	\$ 4,380.00
PEPPERTREE	\$ 5,439.00
LITTLETOWN	\$ 16,255.00
MIDVALE PARK	\$ 7,291.00
PEACH VALLEY	\$ 2,554.00
OAKTREE NO. 1	\$ 13,103.00
OAKTREE NO. 2	\$ 10,286.00
OAKTREE NO. 3	\$ 13,749.00
SALIDA DEL SOL	\$ 8,384.00

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson and unanimously carried by a 5 to 0 roll call vote, to close the public hearing and adopt Resolution Nos. 8, 13 and 16, and adopt the Improvement Districts final budgets, as listed, for fiscal year 2009-2010 as listed.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

MINUTES, LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD

JULY 28, 2009

The Pima County Library District Board met in a special final budget adoption meeting at the regular meeting place of the Pima County Board of Supervisors (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

All Present: Richard Elías, Chairman
 Ramón Valadez, Vice Chairman
 Sharon Bronson, Member
 Ray Carroll, Member (Telephonically)
 Ann Day, Member
 Lori Godoshian, Clerk

1. **FINAL BUDGET ADOPTION**

Adopt Library District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.
If approved, pass and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 2009 – LD2

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Chairman Elías, and unanimously carried by a 5 to 0 roll call vote, to close the public hearing and adopt Resolution No. 2009-LD2, in the amount of \$37,483,152.00 with a tax rate of \$0.2635.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

MINUTES, STADIUM DISTRICT BOARD

JULY 28, 2009

The Pima County Stadium District Board met in a special final budget adoption meeting at the regular meeting place of the Pima County Board of Supervisors (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

All Present: Richard Elías, Chairman
 Ramón Valadez, Vice Chairman
 Sharon Bronson, Member
 Ray Carroll, Member (Telephonically)
 Ann Day, Member
 Lori Godoshian, Clerk

1. **FINAL BUDGET ADOPTION**

Adopt Stadium District Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.
If approved, pass and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 2009 – SD 2

On consideration, it was moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Valadez and carried by a 3 to 2 roll call vote, Supervisors Carroll and Day voting “Nay,” to close the public hearing and adopt Resolution No. 2009-SD2 in the amount of \$5,055,529.00.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CLERK

MINUTES, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING

JULY 28, 2009

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in a special final budget adoption meeting in its regular meeting place at Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

All Present: Richard Elías, Chairman
 Ramón Valadez, Vice Chairman
 Sharon Bronson, Member
 Ray Carroll, Member (Telephonically)
 Ann Day, Member
 Lori Godoshian, Clerk

1. **MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Chairman requested that all observe a moment of silence on behalf of the Aldecoa family for the loss of Paulina and Sebastian Aldecoa.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. **TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §42-17107, the Board of Supervisors must conduct a public hearing regarding Pima County's intent to raise the primary property taxes over last year's level.

- A. Adopt final budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.
 If approved, pass and adopt:

 RESOLUTION NO. 2009-170

- B. Adopt Debt Service Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

Chairman Elías opened the hearing and requested that Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, offer introductory comments relative to this hearing prior to opening the floor to the speakers.

Mr. Huckelberry explained that this hearing was mandated by Arizona State Revised Statutes if there is a raise or increase in the amount of levy revenues in primary property taxes over and above last year's tax levy. This year, 14 or 15 counties, with the exception of Greenlee County, will hold a Truth and Taxation Hearing. To put Pima County's dollar amount into perspective, Maricopa County

(which has already held their Truth and Taxation Meeting) reported an increase of approximately \$30M in primary property taxes collected. He reported that Pima County was the only County in Arizona to meet and exceed the standards of Truth in Taxation 3 years in a row. He concluded his presentation and offered to discuss the general budget and budget recommendations later in the meeting.

The following speakers addressed the Board regarding this item:

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Bob Hancock | 17. Carol Campbell |
| 2. Richard Tracy | 18. Bill Washburn |
| 3. Robert Reus | 19. Diana Roche |
| 4. Lou Tenney | 20. Marilyn Malone |
| 5. Randy Graf | 21. Daniel Ives |
| 6. Barbara Jackson | 22. Ryan Huber |
| 7. Roy Warden | 23. Vicki Davis |
| 8. Tom Vana | 24. Tom Branch |
| 9. Keith Van Heyningen | 25. Barbara Jimenez |
| 10. William North | 26. William Bernett |
| 11. Gloria Alvillar | 27. DeAnn Hatch |
| 12. Walter Wilson | 28. Steve Koch |
| 13. Ed Slentz | 29. Dave Oman |
| 14. Ken Rineer | 30. Sylvia Maresca |
| 15. Ann Downey | |
| 16. Sunny Turner | |

The following is a summary of their comments:

- A. The Board of Supervisors should oppose a spending increase and table this item until County spending is reduced.
- B. The proposed property tax increase is too high and should be opposed.
- C. Retirees are suffering due to dwindling retirement funds. There is no mechanism for an increase in income to offset the increase in cost of living, unemployment and the negative impacts of the current housing market.
- D. Reduce the proposed tax rate or drop it completely.
- E. Green Valley, Sahaurita and the surrounding mining industry do not reap sufficient benefits from Pima County now to warrant an increase in their property taxes.
- F. Approving this tax increase will further hurt small businesses who are already suffering due to the economy.
- G. This increase appears to be "taxation without representation."
- H. It was asked what steps Pima County is taking to reduce their debt.
- I. Town hall meetings should be held to discuss future spending. In addition, proposed budget increases need to be advertised with time for public review.
- J. Past and proposed property tax increases are making it difficult for those individuals who have paid off their homes, prior to retirement, to continue residing in those homes.
- K. Adult education and other education programs are good in general and promote a better community and quality of life for its residents.

- L. Concern was expressed about declining real estate prices and the impact to their quality of life and inability to continue contributing to charitable agencies.
- M. Ever-increasing taxes not only have an immediate impact, but also have a negative financial impact for many years to come.
- N. The current economy requires retirees to return to work for health insurance and stockpile resources due to concern about survival in the future.
- O. Decrease the property tax rate by 4.3%, cut County programs and manage the County budget like people have to manage their household budgets.
- P. It was asked why it takes two years to assess lowering taxes, but only one year to assess tax increases.
- Q. Property owners are being unfairly punished by raising property taxes. Continuing to raise property taxes will increase foreclosures.
- R. Taxpayers are being forced to financially support outreach programs that they do not personally support.
- S. Concern was expressed over current unemployment and the loss of homes.
- T. Make a 10% cut across the board and put more effort into eliminating unnecessary expenditures.
- U. Spending priorities should be limited to police and fire protection, repairing potholes and removing graffiti.
- V. A spending moratorium should be implemented. More effort needs to be expended in making Pima County debt free and balancing the budget.
- W. Arizona needs a Proposition 13.
- X. There appears to be inequity in the assessment of property taxes within Pima County.
- Y. Families are currently unable to purchase all of their basic needs; therefore, they cannot afford an increase in property taxes.
- Z. Concern was expressed over high charges, inadequate service and additional funds being allocated to University Physicians Health Hospital.

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson, to close the Truth in Taxation Hearing. The motion carried by a 3 to 2 vote with Supervisors Carroll and Day voting “Nay.”

* * *

Supervisor Bronson requested, before adopting the budget for fiscal year 2009-10, that Mr. Huckelberry explain the three recommended adjustments to the Board-adopted Tentative Budget, as outlined in his Board of Supervisors Memorandum dated July 28, 2009. He offered a summary of the following three items and spoke to the addition of the largest expenditures as they relate to Federal Stimulus Funding and the Help America Vote Act:

Recommended Adjustments to the Tentative Budget

1. Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation – I have directed the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department to close several community centers and parks, and to cease publication of the Leisure Times. Additionally, staff is currently in the

process of identifying a new operator for Sportspark. It is estimated that these actions will result in a cost savings of \$739,796.00. In light of the continued uncertainty regarding the state budget, I am recommending that this amount be placed in the Budget Stabilization Fund for possible future assignment. This recommendation will have a zero net effect on the overall County budget.

2. Graffiti Abatement Program – I have directed the Transportation Department to reduce the Graffiti Abatement Program by half, from \$250,000.00 to \$125,000.00 thus reducing the General Fund subsidy for same. In light of the continued uncertainty regarding the state budget, I am recommending that this amount be placed in the Budget Stabilization Fund for possible future assignment. This recommendation will have a zero net effect on the overall County budget.
3. Juvenile Court and Superior Court – The finance divisions of the Juvenile and Superior Courts have been consolidated for the past two years or so but, for various reasons, the budgets for the operations had not been combined. At the request of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, I have directed Budget staff to merge the budget of Juvenile Court into Superior Court as they relate to the finance function. This recommendation will have a zero net effect on the overall County budget.

Supervisor Bronson stated she anticipated Pima County will experience substantial transfer of costs, as well as some revenue reductions, this year as the State tries to balance their budget. She asked Mr. Huckelberry to address what impacts this will have on the County budget and what current contingency plans are in place relative to the current budget and delivery of service. She also asked him to verify that Pima County has experienced a continual tax decrease over the last four years and a reduction in General Funds.

Mr. Huckelberry reported that last year the State, in an effort to balance their budget, ultimately transferred \$15M of costs that had to be absorbed by Pima County. It is anticipated that this year, Pima County can expect cost shifts from the State ranging anywhere from \$6M to \$12M. If the State adjustments reach the upper end of the scale, Pima County will be looking at further reductions mid-year which will include additional cuts across the board and outside agency funding; consolidating administrative functions of approximately 30 departments; decreasing non-mandated services such as Parks; and targeting specific programs for more significant reductions (i.e. courts, public health services, as well as law enforcement which were basically held harmless during the last cuts).

He confirmed Supervisor Bronson's statement that Pima County had been the most fiscally conservative County in Arizona and also reported that there had been a continual reduction in property tax rates over the last four years. Pima County is currently experiencing its lowest tax rate in 30 years, and the General Fund has declined approximately \$7M over the last 10 years. He also noted that it is important to understand that the County portion appearing on individual tax bills only represents approximately 30% of the entire tax bill. The remainder falls under 84 other tax jurisdictions. Therefore, although property taxes have been and will continue to decrease on the County side, this does not necessarily mean that individual tax bills will be lower.

In response to a question by Supervisor Valadez as to what Pima County has done

to tighten our belts, Mr. Huckelberry responded that in constructing this year's budget it was anticipated that Pima County could experience a significant loss of revenue resulting from cost transfers from the State, together with a loss in shared revenues resulting from a reduction of assessed property valuations (over the next 2 to 3 years) that could potentially reach as high as \$47M. With these factors in mind and recognizing that if this happens, all discretionary type expenditures will have to be significantly reduced or eliminated. This year's budget development process began with a preliminary 5% reduction. It also included an aggregate 10% decrease of department and agency expenditures, and a 10% decrease in outside agency funding (the agency list on the agenda reflects that decrease).

In response to a request by Supervisor Valadez, Mr. Huckelberry addressed the Transportation Reduction Program. He explained that out-of-state travel, conferences, seminars and training had been reduced about 65% early in the process; and, there may be room next year for an additional 20% reduction. Supervisor Valadez issued a directive to staff and the County Administrator to prepare a report of all travel and who approved the travel for this calendar year (inclusive of elected officials and roll officers and exempting law enforcement and criminal prosecution).

Supervisor Valadez also asked Mr. Huckelberry and Chris Straub, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, to verify that this Board has no latitude to vary the statutory requirements for assessing valuations for the current fiscal year using data from 2 years prior. Both concurred, and Mr. Huckelberry explained that because determining assessed value for an individual owner can be affected by numerous factors including initial appraisals by the Assessor's Office, tax appeals, and centrally assessed property which is assessed by the Arizona Department of Revenue (DOR), this can be a complicated process as it relates to Truth in Taxation.

Regarding commentary on the radio relative to the declining tax rate and General Fund balance, Mr. Huckelberry verified that Supervisor Valadez was correct in stating that the primary property tax rate has dropped to \$0.78 per \$100; and that General Fund expenditures have dropped by \$6.8M.

Supervisor Bronson spoke briefly to the debt service and asked Mr. Huckelberry to verify that most of the County's debt, with the exception of Kino Community Hospital (UPH), directly correlates to voter approved bonds and revenue bonds related to the wastewater system. When voters approved those bonds (HURF Revenue, General Obligation or Sewer Revenue Bonds), the Board committed to keeping the secondary rate to \$1.00 or less. Pima County was not only successful in meeting this requirement and keeping the rate to a dollar or less in this year's budget, but was also able to secure a better interest rate by using Certificates of Participation.

Mr. Huckelberry verified that the debt, in large part, is directly related to voter authorized expenditures. Pima County by law, is obligated to make those improvements. The pledge in the 1997 Bond Issue, mandated a cap of \$1.00 per \$100 of assessed value. The cap has dropped to \$0.7100 and is significantly below

the pledge. Additionally, voter approved General Obligation debt is normally retired in 10 to 12 years. Since Pima County was able to secure a lower interest rate, this debt will be retired in a shorter period of time.

Supervisor Day stated that property tax valuations should be lower because of the decline in property values. She requested that Bill Staples, Pima County Assessor, explain the practice of going back further than the traditional 2 year time period to determine property value and asked how much of the net assessed value relates to that practice.

Mr. Staples explained that statutorily, limited valuation represented on tax notices by law is calculated to increase a minimum of 15% per year until it reaches Full Cash Value (FCV). The Assessor's Office has no control over that portion of the process. In addressing Supervisor Day's question, about if and how widespread the use of 2006 and 2007 values was for this year's assessment, he responded that the Assessor is charged with assessing the FCV of property. If adequate samples of sales data in residential areas are not available, they go back and look at sales and "time adjust" the data. Mr. Staples stated that the practice could have been more widespread in those geographic areas where current sales information was not available. He went on to say that valuation notices for fiscal year 2008/09 (2009 is the basis currently in front of the Board) declined 10%. In February of 2009, it is anticipated that statements will reflect a 10 to 20% decrease in the FCV assessment for next year, depending on the area.

Supervisor Day expressed her concern over reducing property taxes but increasing the tax levy and sympathy for those people who appeared at this meeting who are obviously struggling. She emphasized the need for the budget to be structurally balanced for fiscal integrity and survival during difficult times to ensure that re-occurring revenues do not exceed re-occurring expenses.

Supervisor Bronson asked Mr. Huckelberry to confirm that Pima County stands out as being fiscally responsible. He concurred and offered that had it not been for UPH's need for additional funding, Pima County would have exceeded the taxation standards by \$3M this year as well. Supervisor Bronson stated that she believes that budgeting is being done prudently and sustainably. However, the next several years will continue to be challenging as Pima County works to maintain a structured and sustainable budget as it faces rising demands in services due to the economy, challenges of UPH, and addressing the impacts of the City of Tucson Safety First Initiative. She asked Mr. Huckelberry to explain how these issues were being factored into this year's and next year's budgets.

Mr. Huckelberry stated that State cost shifts, potential revenue losses from property tax revenue, and the impact of approval of the potential sales tax referred to the ballot, are being factored into the current and future budgets. UPH is in the middle of a very comprehensive review by CHARTIS, which is also a participatory process with Pima County. A report of this review will be presented in September and include suggestions on how potential and future obligations can be diminished; and, recommend actions that can be taken by the Board to help minimize the potential of

destabilizing the County budget. The Public Safety First Initiative relates to the submittal of a petition from the public to substantially increase the number of officers at the Tucson Police Department, and issue minimum performance standards for Fire Department response time. If that initiative passes, it is anticipated that 75% of the criminal justice system costs will also increase. The costs associated with this initiative will push the County over budget and may require an override election in 2010 or 2011.

Chairman Elías confirmed that the Public Safety First Initiative does represent unknown costs and stated that approximately 55% of the General Fund is already allocated to public safety. He emphasized the importance of Pima County maintaining their position in health care and try to continue providing services in this area to those in need, to the best of our ability. He also mentioned that the \$9M in Federal stimulus money relative to energy, transportation projects, and foreclosure mitigation will be a major factor for consideration. He stated that the Board has created a judicious budget which protects our residents in the areas of public health and safety. He acknowledged that in light of all of the problems that face the Country right now, it is vital to maintain services so more problems are not created in the areas of health care service, juvenile detention, jail costs, and domestic and relationship violence, which are all on the rise. He went on to express his thanks and appreciation to County employees for their patience in not receiving raises for the last three years.

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson, to close the public hearing and approve items A and B as recommended. Supervisor Day indicated that she would like to vote on Items A and B separately. It was thereupon moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson, to close the public hearing, adopt the Final Budget for fiscal year 2009/10 in the amount of \$1,387,871,873.00 with an effective tax rate of \$3.3133 along with Resolution No. 2009-170, and the recommendations as outlined by the County Administrator in his memorandum dated July 28, 2009. Upon the roll call vote being taken, the motion carried by a 3 to 2 vote, with Supervisors Day and Carroll voting "Nay."

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías, seconded by Supervisor Bronson, to close the public hearing and adopt the Debt Service Budget for fiscal year 2009/10 in the amount of \$110,138,905.00 with an effective tax rate of \$0.7100. Upon the roll call vote being taken, the motion carried 4 to 1, with Supervisor Carroll voting "Nay."

Supervisor Valadez asked that Mr. Huckelberry confirm that the bottom line was the General Fund was going down \$6.8M and the property taxes would also be going down. Mr. Huckelberry concurred with this statement.

Supervisor Bronson indicated that as the State attempts to balance their budget, leaving uncertainty about the impact of costs transfers to the County budget, she would request that the County Administrator come to the Board for any new funding requests/changes.

4. **OUTSIDE AGENCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010**

Community Services

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Catholic Community Services dba Community Outreach Program for the Deaf	Community Support for Persons with a Hearing Loss	18,142
Interfaith Coalition for the Homeless	Implementation Coordinator for the Plan to End Homelessness	16,460
Interfaith Coalition for the Homeless	Transportation to Succeed	13,275
Our Family Services	Community Mediation	16,815
RISE Inc. dba Pima Computer Recycling	Pima Computer Recycling	17,346
Southern AZ Association for the Visually Impaired	Adjustment to Blindness	26,549
Southern AZ Legal Aid, Inc.	The Pima County Homeowner and Tenant Protection	25,930
	Total	134,517

Emergency Food & Clothing

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Arivaca Coordinating Council/Human Resource Group	Emergency Food and Clothing	35,101
Caridad-de Porres	Caridad Feeding and Training	13,275
Catalina Community Services	Clothing Bank	27,434
Catalina Community Services	Emergency Food Bank	26,549
Catholic Community Services dba Pio Decimo Center	Emergency Food and Clothing	22,925
Community Food Bank	Food Assistance	352,661
TMM Family Services	Community Closet	18,761
	Total	496,706

Parenting & Family Support

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
AZ Children's Association dba The Parent Connection	Parents as Teachers	18,452
Casa de los Ninos	Great Beginnings	21,018

Catholic Community Services dba Pio Decimo Center	Child Care for the Working Poor	14,602
Chicanos por la Causa Parenting Arizona	Parent Education and Life Skills Program	19,912
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Father to Father	13,275
Child and Family Resources, Inc.	Tucson Center for Adolescent Parents (TCAP)	57,524
Tucson Urban League	Parent to Parent	13,275
	Total	158,056

Senior Support

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Administration of Resources and Choices	Elder Shelter	39,823
House of Neighborly Service	Senior Programs	22,567
Interfaith Community Services	Transportation Services for At-Risk Seniors	13,275
Interfaith Community Services	Special Diet Meals for At-Risk Seniors	14,602
Marshall Home for Men	Marshall Home for Men	13,275
Mobile Meals of Tucson	Mobile Meals of Tucson	17,699
Our Family Services	Senior Companion	13,275
PPEP	Elderly Service	20,885
San Ignacio Yaqui Council	Old Pascua Senior Nutrition and Socialization	22,920
St. Luke's Home	Senior Resident Diet	16,637
Tucson Urban League	Senior's Breakfast and Transportation Services	26,549
Volunteer Center of Southern AZ	Experience Corps	22,125
	Total	243,633

Support Services, Shelter & Domestic Violence

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Casa de los Ninos	Family Respite Care	24,779
Green Valley Assistance Services, Inc.	Emergency, Temporary Monetary Assistance	17,699
New Beginnings for Women and Children	Roof, Job and Beyond	28,054
Our Family Services	Common Unity Program	17,080
Primavera Foundation, Inc.	Relief and Referral	25,664
Primavera Foundation, Inc.	Catalina's Men's House	35,399

Primavera Foundation, Inc.	Casa Paloma Drop-In Center and Transitional Shelter	19,912
San Ignacio Yaqui Council, Inc.	Emergency, Employment and Social Service Program	33,187
Southern AZ AIDS Foundation	HIV/AIDS Services, Support and Volunteer Enhancement	101,772
TMM Family Services, Inc.	Emergency Housing Assistance Program	13,275
Tucson Center for Women and Children dba EMERGE	Domestic Violence Services	111,506
Tucson Urban League, Inc.	Case Management Emergency Assistance Services	35,399
Wingspan	Anti-Violence Project	16,815
Young Women's Christian Association of Tucson	Women's Counseling Network	13,275
Homeless Prevention		37,412
	Total	531,228

Mortgage Default Prevention

(This category is a sub set of Support Services, Shelter and Domestic Violence)

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Administration of Resources and Choices Catholic Community Services dba Pio Decimo Center	Mortgage Default and Foreclosure Assistance	16,372
Chicanos por la Causa	Mortgage Default and Foreclosure Assistance	19,912
Family Housing Resources, Inc	Foreclosure Intervention and Default Counseling	35,399
Southwest Fair Housing Council	Mortgage Delinquency Counseling	28,761
	Don't Borrow Trouble-Pima County	22,832
	Total Mortgage Default	123,276
	Total Support Services	654,503

Youth & Young Adult

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Altar Valley School District 51	CSAAC Community	13,275
Arizona Children's Association	Las Familias Angel Center for the Treatment of Childhood Sexual Abuse	22,125
Arizona Youth Partnership	Rural Middle After School	30,974
Catholic Community	Youth Education and	

Services dba Pio Decimo Center	Enrichment	42,744
Chicanos por la Causa Child and Family Resources	Corazon de Aztlan	13,275
House of Neighborly Service	Pre-Adolescent Diversion	14,336
House of Neighborly Service	After School Education and Prevention	49,204
House of Neighborly Service	Alternative Youth Leadership Through Self-Es-Team	13,275
House of Neighborly Service	Second Chance	17,699
International Sonoran Desert Alliance	Ajo las Artes	37,169
New Beginnings for Women and Children	Homeless Kids/Children's Program	20,089
One on One Partners	Mentoring Services for At-Risk Youth	13,275
Open Inn	Truancy Outreach	30,974
Our Family Services	School-Based	26,549
Our Family Services	Skrappy's Youth Center	22,125
Pima Prevention Partnership	Pima County Teen Court	13,275
Sahuaro Girl Scout Council	Community Girl Scouting for Underserved Girls	13,275
Tu Nidito Children and Family Services	Children to Children, Grief Support	13,275
Tu Nidito Children and Family Services	Pathways	13,275
Tucson Center for Women and Children dba EMERGE	Child Advocate	13,275
Tucson Urban League	Tutoring and Mentoring	20,089
Tucson Urban League	Jump Out! Prevention and Intervention	15,487
University of Arizona Pima County Cooperative Extension	4-H Challenge: Youth Leadership Development	13,275
University of Arizona Social Justice Education Project	Social Justice Education	17,699
VOICES: Community Stories Past and Present	The 110 Afterschool Magazine	8,850
Volunteer Center of Southern AZ	Youth Now Collaboration	26,549
Wingspan	Eon Youth	17,699
Youth On Their Own	Monthly Stipend	57,524
	Total	610,636

General Services Programs

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Catholic Community Services dba Pio Decimo	Case Management for Working Poor	40,672
Child & Family Resources	Healthy Families	42,367

Community Food Bank	Ajo Summer Lunch	21,615
COPE	AZ Woman's Conference	6,595
El Rio Health Center	El Pueblo Health Center - TCE Program	172,491
Jewish Family Services: Loan Chest	Loan Chest	41,502
Metropolitan Education Commission	Operating Costs	53,264
Metropolitan Education Commission	College Access	33,629
Non-Profit Industries dba Social Serve.Com	Housing Search.com	18,026
Pima Council on Aging	Elder Rights Benefits	152,821
Pima Council on Aging	Family Caregivers	19,454
Pima Council on Aging	Home Delivered Meals	11,240
Pima Council on Aging	Retired Seniors Volunteer Program	32,639
Pima Council on Aging	Neighbors Care	60,523
Pima Assoc. of Governments	Operating Costs	263,721
Pima/Tucson Women's Commission	Operating Costs	33,892
Planned Parenthood	Protection Connection	27,612
Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center	Southern Arizona Children's Advocacy Center	58,500
Tucson Clean & Beautiful	Operating Costs	42,367
City of Tucson	Tucson Pima Historical Commission	8,474
University of Arizona	Rural Health Office - Mobile Health	47,768
University of Arizona Pima County Cooperative Extension	Coop Extension	38,129
United Way	Pro-Neighborhoods	84,732
United Way	Earned Income Tax Credit	17,293
	TOTAL	1,329,326

This fiscal year funding for two programs will be discontinued. These programs originally were approved for ONE year funding only: Alzheimer's Association Community Awareness Campaign and the Southern Association for the Visually Impaired Youth Adaptive Sport Equipment Program.

**FY 2009-10 Economic Development and Tourism Programs
Total Fund Reduction \$32,659**

Organization	Program	FY 09-10
Tucson Botanical Garden	Operating Costs	38,475
El Tour (Perimeter Bicycling)	Operating Costs	27,000

Ajo Chamber of Commerce	Operating Costs	21,375
Tucson Pima Arts Council	Operating Costs	117,306
Tucson Children's Museum	Operating Costs	38,475
JobPath	Operating Costs	51,300
	Total	293,931

OUTSIDE AGENCIES GRAND TOTAL

\$3,921,308

On consideration, it was moved by Chairman Elías to increase University of Arizona's Rural Health Office – Mobile Health budget allocation by \$10,000.00 to \$57,769.00; and, to increase the Job Path's proposed operating costs budget of \$51,300.00 to \$124,000.00. Motion failed due to lack of a second.

Supervisor Bronson suggested that these changes be visited at a later time. Supervisor Day stated that outside agency funding should not be arbitrarily increased due to the fact that an Outside Oversight Committee made the recommendations in order to meet the 10% decrease in funding. Their recommendations should not be overruled.

It was thereupon moved by Supervisor Bronson, seconded by Supervisor Valadez, and carried by a 3 to 2 roll call vote, Chairman Elías and Supervisor Carroll voting "Nay," to approve the item as presented.

5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

The Chairman inquired if anyone wished to address the Board and the following people appeared: to speak about their concern over the use of glyphosate to eliminate buffelgrass:

- A. Ann Rose expressed concern over the use of and the lack of research supporting the safety of using glyphosate.
- B. Barbara Warren, M.D., opposed aerial spraying of glyphosate and was concerned about the cost of this application, as well as human and environmental safety.
- C. Donna Branch-Gilby opposed the use of Roundup to eliminate buffelgrass and cited several articles that stated that this herbicide product could potentially be dangerous to humans.
- D. Robert Reus addressed his issues with University Physicians Healthcare Hospital's invoicing and service.

6. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.