

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee
Meeting

Friday, September 11, 2015
8:00 A.M.

Arizona River Park Inn
350 South Freeway
Tucson, Arizona

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Committee Members Present

Larry Hecker, Chair
Carolyn Campbell, Vice Chair
Lynne Birkinbine
Joe Boogaart
Ed Buster
Gary Davidson
Tom Dunn
Brian Flagg
Rene Gastelum
Terri Hutts
Michael Lund
Wade McLean
Ted Prezelski
Patty Richardson
James Ward
Tom Warne
Greg Wexler

Committee Members Absent

Kelly Gomez
David Lyons
Chris Sheafe
Matt Smith
Dan Sullivan
John Sundt

MOTIONS

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Gary Davidson, to approve the March 13, 2015 meeting summary, with one correction. Motion approved 17-0.

MOTION: Tom Dunn moved, seconded by Terri Hutts, to accept the bond program updates for the 1997, 2004, 2006 and 2014 bond programs. Motion approved 17-0.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Rene Gastelum, to accept the bond program updates from the City of Tucson. Motion approved 17-0.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Rene Gastelum, to accept the bond program updates from the Town of Sahuarita. Motion approved 17-0.

MOTION: Gary Davidson moved, seconded by Joe Boogaart, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved 17-0.

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome

The meeting began at 8:02 a.m. with a quorum. Chairman Hecker welcomed Lynne Birkinbine as the new representative for the City of Tucson. A moment of silence was observed for in memory of the victims of September 11.

2. Approval of the March 13, 2015 meeting summary

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Gary Davidson, to approve the March 13, 2015 meeting summary, with one correction. Motion approved 17-0.

3. End of Fiscal Year Bond Program Update for 1997, 2004, 2006 and 2014 Bond Programs

Per the County's Truth in Bonding Code, materials were provided to the Committee providing the status of the 1997, 2004, 2006 and 2014 bond programs. This included written reports from the City of Tucson and Town of Sahuarita. These materials are also available on the County's website. Mary Tyson, CIP Program Manager for Pima County Finance, provided an overview of the bond programs as of the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 2015.

Mr. Prezelski asked if the remaining bonds had been sold but not spent. Ms. Tyson replied that the remaining bonds are a combination of bonds that have been sold in anticipation of spending the funds soon and unsold bonds, but that neither amounted to much.

MOTION: Tom Dunn moved, seconded by Terri Hutts, to accept the bond program updates for the 1997, 2004, 2006 and 2014 bond programs. Motion approved 17-0.

Mr. Flagg requested an update on the 22nd Street, I-10 to Tucson Boulevard project, and specifically the Kino to I-10 section. City of Tucson Transportation Director Daryl Cole and Fred Felix, responded. A citizen's committee will be asked to begin meeting again on this segment.

Ms. Hutts asked about Phase 3 of the Houghton Road: Golf Links to I-10 project. John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Pima County Public Works, responded that Phase 3 is a segment of the larger City/RTA project that is not bond funded and is therefore not shown in the report.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Rene Gastelum, to accept the bond program updates from the City of Tucson. Motion approved 17-0.

MOTION: Terri Hutts moved, seconded by Rene Gastelum, to accept the bond program updates from the Town of Sahuarita. Motion approved 17-0.

4. 2015 Bond Election Update by County Administrator

Mr. Huckelberry reminded the Committee that the Bond Implementation Plan Ordinance for the 2015 bond election is scheduled for the September 15, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting, including a public hearing. 43 responses were received in request for comments and many of those responses were incorporated into the Bond Ordinance. Mr. Huckelberry then summarized a recent memorandum to the Committee concerning the use of State required estimates versus County estimates of growth in assessed property value projections and how the difference between the two impacts tax rates and the amount of funding that can be sold annually. Mr. Huckelberry also stated that the schedule for project implementation is our best estimate as of today, but that we know from experience that some projects will not be ready to go as soon as expected, and instead projects scheduled later in the implementation schedule may be accelerated to spend bond dollars sold for a project that cannot perform on time.

Mr. Prezelski asked what the formal process was for such changes. Mr. Huckelberry responded that a formal bond ordinance amendment would be necessary for project delays, but not for starting a project earlier than scheduled.

Mr. McLean asked if projects would be accelerated if not all propositions are approved. Mr. Huckelberry responded, yes, and that if one or more are not approved the Committee would be asked to consider amendments to the bond ordinance concerning the schedule for the remaining projects.

Mr. Lund asked what would happen to bond funding for a project if it is later determined to be not feasible. Mr. Huckelberry replied the bonds for that project would not be sold and the debt not incurred. This is a significant change from past bond programs.

Mr. Warne asked if the County's credit ratings would be impacted if the growth in assessed values was greater than the conservative estimates in the bond ordinance. Mr. Huckelberry replied that the rating agencies are more concerned by the ability of the County to repay the bonds and our fund balances, than by the bond sale schedule.

Mr. Huckelberry spoke about the Road Repair and Preservation Program that is proposed for funding under Proposition 425. Chairman Hecker asked if this was about filling potholes. Mr. Huckelberry explained that the selected roads would receive full pavement treatments, not just the filling of a pot hole.

Vice-Chair Campbell asked if the implementation schedule has been determined for individual jurisdictions for the road repair program and the role of the Bond Advisory Committee. Mr. Huckelberry replied that it makes sense to remain flexible regarding the schedules that will be proposed by the individual jurisdictions. Regarding the Bond Advisory Committee, the Committee will oversee the program just as they do the Neighborhood Reinvestment, Affordable Housing and Open Space programs, but the committees specifically responsible for those individual programs would be responsible for the details.

Mr. Flagg asked if there was something behind the fact that Oro Valley looks like they have more miles of roads identified for repair compared to District 2. Mr. Huckelberry said

that Oro Valley's roads are much newer than those in District 2 and therefore Oro Valley is planning less intensive and less expensive repair treatments, which means they can repair more miles at a lower cost than older roads requiring more expensive treatments.

5. Next meeting

The Committee set a tentative date to meet on December 4th, following the bond election, to receive an update on the election and discuss next steps.

6. Call to the Audience

Kristen Almquist submitted a speaker card but had to leave early. The card stated, "Thank you for your years of work. This is a true Community effort and a Yes vote on all "7" is appropriate."

Karla Van Drunen Littoy announced that the Eckbo Landscape had recently achieved status on the National Register for Historic Places.

Jack Shafer submitted a card but asked not to speak, stating that he supports all of the bond propositions, especially Proposition 428.

7. Meeting Adjourned

MOTION: Gary Davidson moved, seconded by Joe Boogaart, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved 17-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 a.m.