

**Pima County Bond Advisory Committee
Meeting**

**Herbert K. Abrams Public Health Center
3950 S. Country Club
First Floor, Conference Rooms 1104, 1106 &1108
Tucson, AZ 85714
June 17, 2011
8:00 a.m.**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Committee Members Present

Larry Hecker, Chair
Carolyn Campbell, Vice Chair
Pat Benchik
Pete Delgado
Brian Flagg
Rene Gastelum
Kelly Gomez (left at 9a.m.)
Terri Hutts
Wade McLean
Rebecca Manoleas
Ted Prezelski
Patty Richardson
Dan Sullivan
Tom Warne

Committee Members Absent

Peter Backus
Donald Chatfield
Gary Davidson
Harry George
Jesus Gomez
Byron Howard
David Lyons
A.C. Marriotti
Chris Sheafe
Thomas Six
Greg Wexler

MOTIONS

MOTION: Tom Warne moved, seconded by Patty Richardson, to approve the March 4, 2011 meeting summary. Motion approved 14-0.

MOTION: Mr. Warne moved, seconded by Dan Sullivan, that the Velodrome project is a priority for the region and the Committee. Motion approved 14-0.

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moved, seconded by Wade McLean, to request that the County Administrator research the issues associated with the Rio Nuevo proposal to initially fund the Velodrome, in order to provide the Committee with more information to make a decision. Motion approved 14-0.

MOTION: Vice Chair Campbell moved, seconded by Ms. Richardson, to form a subcommittee to review the aerospace/defense corridor bond project proposal. Motion approved 13-0.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Mr. McLean, to tentatively approve PR280 School District Partnerships for the future bond program. Motion approved 13-0.

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moved, seconded by Ms. Hutts, to approve the County Administrator's recommendations in total, including projects highlighted in yellow, blue, and not highlighted, for the future bond program. Motion approved 13-0.

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome

Meeting began at 8:15 a.m. with a quorum.

2. Approval of the March 4, 2011 Meeting Summary

MOTION: Tom Warne moved, seconded by Patty Richardson, to approve the March 4, 2011 meeting summary. Motion approved 14-0.

3. Committee deliberation regarding 2012 bond election planning

A. PR231 Arizona Velodrome Center

Tom Warne, Chair of the Velodrome Financing Subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee felt that the Velodrome should be an extremely high priority project, that it builds upon the strengths of this community as a biking community, and that one of the options for accelerating the construction of the Velodrome is that someone else build it and the County use future bond funds to refund them. Committee Chairman Larry Hecker read the proposal from Chris Sheafe to remove the location restriction from the Velodrome project.

MOTION: Mr. Warne moved, seconded by Dan Sullivan, that the Velodrome project is a priority for the region and the Committee.

The Committee discussed what "a priority" meant. County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry clarified that during the drafting of the bond ordinance, certain projects will be placed in the first implementation period to be built ahead of projects that have later implementation periods. Nicole Fyffe, Assistant to the County Administrator, reminded the Committee that two votes were taken by the Committee at their November 19, 2010 meeting: approval of \$5 million in future bond funds for the Velodrome, and a separate vote to place the Velodrome on the Kino campus and if the location was to change, to bring that change back to the Committee.

A call to the audience was held on this item:

Richard DeBernardis, President of Perimeter Bicycling and a proponent for the Velodrome project, reminded the Committee that they already

voted to support \$5 million for the project. He further stated that one option to accelerate financing that was discussed by the subcommittee was to have Rio Nuevo finance it, and cited a recent economic impacts study of outdoor recreation in Arizona.

Roy Schoonover, representative for the County bicycle committee, spoke in support of placing the Velodrome downtown in the Rio Nuevo district, near disadvantaged youth and along the Interstate.

Terri Hutts asked about the difference between the Kino campus and downtown locations. Mr. Schoonover repeated that the downtown location would serve disadvantaged youth in the area and be adjacent to the Interstate. Ms. Hutts asked whether the proponents first started with placing it in the Rio Nuevo district. Mr. Schoonover replied yes many years ago, but at the time there was not space.

Dan Eckstrom, former County Supervisors, spoke in support of the Kino location and stated that there would be no cost for the land at the Kino campus, whereas there may be a cost for the City land downtown.

Motion approved 14-0

Chairman Hecker requested Mr. Huckelberry's input on next steps. Mr. Huckelberry stated that the option of Rio Nuevo funding for this project, with refunding from future bond funds, was one of six options discussed by the subcommittee. The issue is that Rio Nuevo can only fund projects built in their district, which is why the issue of changing the location to downtown is being discussed.

Mr. Huckelberry outlined the following next steps:

1. Need assurance that the land downtown will not cost anything so that all of the bond funds can go towards construction. This is probably a City Council decision.
2. Is the Rio Nuevo Board in support of advancing funding in anticipation of a future GO bond replenishment?
3. There is a legal question as to whether the Board of Supervisors can make a commitment to Rio Nuevo before the bond authorization takes place.
4. Then finally the Board of Supervisors has to agree with all of this.

Mr. Huckelberry noted that the legal question is currently being researched since it is the same issue facing the acceleration of the Joint Courts project. If it is legal, then the same proposal could be made to advance funding at the Kino site, but not with Rio Nuevo funding.

Pat Benchik spoke about all the construction and activities going on at the Kino campus and nearby the Campus, and why the Kino campus

would make a great location for the Velodrome. Brian Flagg concurred with Mr. Benchik.

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moved, seconded by Wade McLean, to request that the County Administrator research the issues associated with the Rio Nuevo proposal to initially fund the Velodrome, in order to provide the Committee with more information to make a decision.

It was clarified that about 9 acres of land was needed, 4 acres of which was for the actual facility.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Mr. Flagg moved, seconded by Vice Chair Campbell, to reaffirm the vote to support the Velodrome being located at Kino campus.

It was explained that the November 19, 2010 vote stated that the location would be at Kino campus and that if the location were to change it would have to come back before the Committee. It was also clarified that the legal question concerning committing future bond authorization would also assist with the acceleration of the project at Kino campus. It was requested that Mr. Flagg withdraw the substitute motion and just direct the County Administrator to conduct the research as stated in the original motion. **Mr. Flagg withdrew his substitute motion, with Vice Chair Campbell concurring.**

Original motion was approved 14-0.

B. Aerospace/Defense Corridor

A memorandum providing an update on this project was provided to the Committee prior to the meeting. Vice Chair Campbell posed the following questions and comments that she felt needed to be considered:

1. Does the Committee want to pursue this?
2. It appears most of the incentives mentioned in the memorandum were state incentives, not local.
3. The dollar amounts being proposed need to be examined.
4. What is the best way to package this in a future bond program (economic development, open space, and/or transportation)?

MOTION: Vice Chair Campbell moved, seconded by Ms. Richardson, to form a subcommittee to review the aerospace/defense corridor bond project proposal. Motion approved 13-0.

Chairman Hecker requested that Committee members contact Nicole Fyffe if they would like to be on the subcommittee.

C. PR280 School District Partnerships

Carlo DiPilato, Natural Resources Parks and Recreation (NRPR), updated the Committee on the development of this program. The

program, as proposed, would provide \$15 million to construct joint public/school use park facilities at nine potential school sites. Initially the County had set an expectation that the facilities would have to be maintained by the schools. The schools expressed concerns about this. The County Administrator asked NRPR to develop a uniform formula to address the maintenance issue at each school. NRPR's proposal is that after the bond election, during the drafting of the IGA with each school, the County and the school agree to (1) the hours of use by the public versus the schools, and (2) the cost per unit of maintenance of the facilities. Then the schools would actually maintain the facilities and submit reimbursable requests to the County for the costs of maintenance per the agreed upon cost schedule. NRPR then surveyed the schools to see what they thought of the proposal. The response from the schools has been positive.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Mr. McLean, to tentatively approve PR280 School District Partnerships for the future bond program. Motion approved 13-0.

D. Deliberation on Remaining Projects

A memorandum was provided to the Committee on this subject prior to the meeting. Mr. Huckelberry stated that he did not make many changes to his prior recommendations. The changes that he did make included recommending the following projects:

- HP107 OS Repair and Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings - \$500,000
- PR140 Ajo Detention Basin Park - \$2.2 million
- PR225 El Casino Park - \$850,000
- PR105 River Bend Conservation Education Center at Brandi Fenton Memorial Park - \$1 million

His changes also included deleting six projects totaling \$80 million because they either have been completed or are no longer necessary. The majority of the \$80 million was the County Nursing Home project.

He stated that he continues to not recommend the rest of the remaining projects.

Vice Chair Campbell asked why less funding was being recommended for PR105 River Bend Conservation Education Center. Mr. Huckelberry responded that he hoped the project could be phased.

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moved, seconded by Ms. Hutts, to approve the County Administrator's recommendations in total, including projects highlighted in yellow, blue, and not highlighted, for the future bond program. Motion approved 13-0.

4. Future Agenda Items and Next Meetings

The next meeting will be held on September 16, 2011 at the Manning House. Agenda items will include:

- End of year status report – 1997, 2004 and 2006 bond programs
- Bond ordinance amendments if necessary
- Update on the debt liability of the County
- Continued deliberation regarding 2012 bond election planning

There was discussion as to whether the request for proposals for the alternative uses of several surplus TUSD schools was closed and whether the County has submitted any proposals. Mr. Huckelberry stated that staff would look into the status of this.

5. Call to the Audience

No one spoke at this time.

6. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

A tour of the new psychiatric facilities at the Kino campus funded with 2004 and 2006 bond funds took place after the meeting.