

**Pima County Bond Advisory Committee  
Parks & Recreation Sub-Committee  
Meeting**

**Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation  
3500 W. River Road  
Thursday, June 7, 2007  
8:00 a.m.**

**SUMMARY OF MEETING**

The following is a summary of the June 7, 2007 meeting. Audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.

**Committee Members Present**

Gary Davidson, Chair  
John Neis  
Thomas Six  
Byron Howard  
Ted Prezelski

**County Staff: Technical Experts Present**

Carlo DiPilato, P&D Division Manager  
Lauren Harvey, Program Manager, NRPR

**Committee Members Absent**

Carolyn Campbell  
Tom Warne  
Terri Hutts

**County Administration**

Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator

1. Meeting began at 8:07 a.m. with a quorum.
2. Mr. Six made a motion to approve, with corrections, the minutes of the last meeting held on May 3, 2007, which was seconded by Mr. Neis. The motion was accepted. Mr. Howard who was not present at the last meeting abstained.
3. Mr. DiPilato reviewed all the projects in District 5, including their scope. Several questions were raised with regard to the shooting sports program site improvements as there is a similar project in District 4. Mr. DiPilato explained that the shooting sports program site improvements covered several ranges in different districts, and also explained the reasons for them. He was also asked about usage, which he will provide figures for later, and specific details about the various ranges. Mr. DiPilato was also asked about what the impact of the ranges would have in deterring wildcat shooting now that shooting and hunting are under consideration to be banned in areas like the Ironwood Monument. He replied that it would greatly reduce the destructive nature of wildcat shooting. It was also explained that this package looks at the needs of the whole community and upgrades the county's facilities to provide safe venues for this sport.

Mr. DiPilato was also asked questions about the BMX Track at Manzanita Park and whether it should be considered to be of regional significance rather than local. There was also an explanation of what was meant by Tournament sites. There were also questions about the priorities where similar projects in other districts had "A" priorities and these were "B's" and "C's". Mr. Davidson explained that with the town the rankings were in order of their priorities, with the county there were many more projects so that there could be something important that would be ranked as B. Mr. Gray also gave an explanation of the City's ranking of projects. Mr. Davidson said all the projects will be given carefully considered taking the various criteria into account and the committee will try to decide which are *the* most important projects.

Mr. DiPilato reviewed the projects in the "All" category. These are all encompassing and impact all the districts and cover projects like ADA upgrades, swimming pool sanitizer upgrades, sports field lighting, playgrounds, reclaimed waterline extensions, flood prone and riparian land acquisitions, pedestrian underpass ramps, etc. Mr. DiPilato was asked whether some of these were eligible for other funding and he said that some could apply for grant funding. It was also noted that some grant funding needed matching funding, therefore there had to be some money allocated to the project for at least the matching portion. Regarding the ADA compliance upgrades, Mr. Davidson asked whether the parks that had individual project sheets and were also listed here would be thus not need to be listed if the larger project was undertaken. He was assured that this was so. Regarding the ADA upgrades, Mr. DiPilato was asked if the county would be compelled to find funding for these projects if the Bond committee did not approve them. It was explained that earlier projects from the 1997 and 2004 Bonds were made ADA compliant, and the county was trying to now make all parks compliant. Also, some parks are over 15 years old and in need of urgent repairs as well. Regarding reclaimed water, the sub-committee was advised that the City owns the reclaimed water lines and the County would work with them to extend the lines.

#### 4. Jurisdictional comments about PC BOS District 5 and "All" projects:

Mr. Roy Schoonover, bicyclist for many years, has been meeting with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, GABA and Pima Bicyclist Association to prioritize the list of projects which they support. BAC has provided the county with a letter and a list explaining their reasons for the projects they support. They emphasize the importance of land acquisition to fill in the gaps and complete a network of shared use, and the importance of river park improvements that would improve the network of shared use paths. Safety, education and connectivity are also very important issues for the BAC.

Mr. Mark Flint – board member of the Sonoran Desert Bicyclist and segment steward and project coordinator of the Arizona Trails project spoke of the importance of trails for recreational and health purposes. Also there is a perception in the community of the county acquiring open space and locking people out, but by building trails and providing access, this counters that perception.

Ms. Sue Clark, President of Pima Trails Association along with Ms. Linda Anderson-McKee, Chair of the Urban Trails Coalition, spoke for the Pima Trails association which works with pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians. They consider the linear parks to be the backbone of the trails system and hence are 100% behind all the projects connected to the river parks. Another project which is important is the Arizona Trail which is a nationally recognized trail system. Also Representative Gabrielle Giffords is promoting the Colossal Cave portion of the Arizona Trail as a scenic destination. Connectivity is another very important issue which could also provide alternative means of transportation.

Mr. Michael Lurie, President, Tucson Children's Museum gave a brief overview of the Museum which is located downtown at the old Carnegie Library. They currently serve of 80,000 people annually and have outgrown their facility and are anticipating building a new 40,000 square foot museum as part of the Rio Nuevo Cultural Complex. The museum serves a wide and diverse group of children of which 50% are Hispanic and 40% low income, fulfilling a need of the community. The new museum is expected to cost 22 million, of which there is a commitment of 10 million from the City of Tucson. When open, it is expected to have at least 150,000 visitors annually.

5. Public comments about PC BOS District 5 projects

James Stevenson spoke on behalf of the Benson Highway Park Project and also hoped the sub-committee would not overemphasize regional projects especially if it would mean eliminating a lot of neighborhood projects. Some neighborhoods would not have access to the regional projects and thus the neighborhoods would continue to have underserved, underprivileged communities. Also since District 2 has almost 50% of unmet needs of the whole community as well as one of the youngest populations, the youth of the area need something better than amusing themselves with vandalism and brush fires.

Richard deBernardis, founder of the Perimeter Bicyclist Association spoke in favor of the Arizona Velodrome Project which will offer training, racing and other opportunities. The Association has prepared a detailed draft plan for this project with market analysis, community benefits, sources of income and concept plans for the sub-committee's consideration.

Mac Hudson, President of the Menlo Park Neighborhood Association and is representing the Friends of 'A' Mountain. Mr. Hudson pointed out an error in the bond funds requested, which is 2.5 million and not 5 million dollars. The Friends have identified other sources of funding for the project. The project is primarily a safety issue. The group is working with the city and other agencies as well.

Margo Hurst spoke in support of all the ADA compliance issues and on behalf of the adaptive recreation center which is the only facility in this community specifically for persons with disabilities. At the moment only the aquatic portion has been completed, and are looking forward to Phase 2 being covered by this bond issue. The center serves many seniors and disabled persons who are a large part of the community.

Tish Finnegan, a parent, spoke of the importance of the adaptive recreation center where the programs are tailored to people with disabilities. Ms. Finnegan spoke of the great need for facilities for disabled kids and adults, of which Arizona is lacking. She realized this when her son Rio was born with a disability and the hardship she and other parents like her face trying to get the optimum benefits for these children and wishes the facility could be expanded for the benefit of the whole community.

Mr. Fred Gray, Parks & Recreation, City of Tucson said he would provide a break down of the projects like the river parks, sports fields, park facility revitalization and safety enhancements to show how the money was being allocated. Also, there have been significant additions to the bond package for land acquisition. Mr. Gray will also provide more details about the specific projects later. Mr. Gray spoke of land acquisition and said they would have to rely on partnership opportunities with YMCA's schools, churches or other agencies in wards where opportunities are minimal. With regard to the four new projects included, Ms. Julie Parizek, Planner for the City of Tucson, provided further details on the

Ormsby Park expansion which would expand the park from 5 to about 30 acres. It would provide connectivity between the Santa Cruz River Park and the El Paso Greenway. Another project is the Sonora Desert Park at the base of 'A' mountain which was formerly a landfill site, and is proposed to be turned into a natural resource park to celebrate and interpret the Sonoran Desert. It is an opportunity for ecological connectivity between 'A' mountain, Tucson Mountain Park and the Santa Cruz River. It could be turned into an important regional attraction. The next project is the De Anza Trail between 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and Congress, which ties into the Sonoran Desert Park as well. The Wildlife and Pedestrian corridor would connect the ecologically sensitive 'A' mountain, Tucson Mountain Park and the Santa Cruz River.

6. Other Business, Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates

Mr. Davidson made suggestions on prioritizing the projects. He proposed that each of the sub committee members prepare a list of the priorities in their district with input from their supervisors, and could also take on certain other types of projects, for example, trails. That person would speak first. The other members could then make suggestions and comment on the project list and then possibly vote on the projects. This would be a 4 level process. The first level will include considering 15 to 25 million dollars of projects per District. Mr. Davidson also requested to re-read the criteria while deciding on their project list and consider the neighborhood issues as well as a balance is needed. The maximum total of this level will be 125 million. Mr. Davidson hopes that each of the 5 members from the 5 Districts will agree to first propose or nominate a 15 to 25 million dollar package of projects from their own District. This will provide local expertise on the highest priority projects in that District. Everyone on the subcommittee will then be free to suggest their own 15 to 25 million dollar package for that District or modifications or adjustments to the proposal. After discussion, a vote on a package for that District could be taken. It could be held in numerical order assuming everyone is present. After the District 1 package is discussed and approved, we will move to District 2, etc. This is suggested to create this first level of priorities on a District by District basis in order to provide a manageable framework to start the process. There are certainly more than enough priority needs in each District to fill this level. However only District interests need not be considered in making proposals as this is a County-wide bond election and all of the criteria that has been agreed upon should be considered including broad community support and regional significance. After completing the first level, the sub-committee can proceed to develop a second level of about 125 million dollars. This package will have no geographic boundaries or other limitations. This will allow the committee to consider some of the larger projects that did not get completed in the first level and to address other high priority unmet needs. He suggested a third and fourth level of about 100 million dollars each. The 4 levels will also represent priorities 1 through 4 so that when the Advisory Committee decides how much to recommend for Parks the projects at a given funding level are already prioritized. Mr. Howard commented that there was no way of knowing how many times projects had been dumped because of lack of the right kind of support, stress indices, etc., and would prefer more dialogue with the committee members. Mr. Neis mentioned that it was very hard to make decisions not knowing the full picture, for example one jurisdiction may ask only for parks and not libraries or other projects, and thus get a smaller share of the funding. Mr. Davidson said that it was the sub-committee's job to set the priorities, as if they did not do that, it would be decided by raw political power which meant that some areas would not get anything even if there is a great deal of need. Ms. Fyffe said that administration could provide more information on selections from other sub-committees which had already made their recommendations. Mr. Prezelski felt that the full committee could handle making the final decisions, instead he would like to know which areas did not get any projects in previous bond elections. Mr. Davidson was asked several questions on why these figures were chosen. He said that this way, the final bond committee will have to choose from at least the top two tiers, which would help ensure that

the district's top priorities have a better chance of being met. Mr. Davidson repeated that these are only suggestions for having a manageable list to work with and the sub-committee could make changes as they go along. Mr. Gray asked a question about county and city-wide projects and how they would be considered. Mr. Six told him that when he went over his project list, he kept a projects of regional significance or city and county-wide projects separately, and that the committee could also keep that in mind when choosing projects.

- Thursday, June 14, 2007 – Prioritization of Tier 1, 2, 3 & 4 projects
- Thursday, June 21, 2007 – Prioritization of Tier 1, 2, 3 & 4 projects

7. Meeting Adjourned at 11:52 a.m.