

**Pima County Bond Advisory Committee
September 19, 2003
8:30 A.M.
Manning House
450 West Paseo Redondo
Tucson, Arizona**

Summary of Meeting

Attendance

Committee Members

Present

Chris Sheafe, District 1

Wanda Shattuck, District 1

Rene Gastelum, District 2

Tom Warne, District 2

Bill Roe, District 3

Lawrence M. Hecker, Jr., District 3

David Lyons, District 4

Alex Rodriguez, District 4

Jesus Gomez, District 5

Carolyn Campbell, District 5

Dan Sullivan, Town of Marana

Bob Jennens, Town of Oro Valley

Paul Diaz, City of South Tucson

Stacey Lemos, Town of Sahuarita

Greg Saxe, Tohono O'Odham

Arlan Colton, County Administrator

Patty Richardson, County Administrator

Absent

Sharon Flores-Madril, Pascua Yaqui

John Neis, Town of Oro Valley (Alternate)

Not Appointed

City of Tucson

Others Present

Pima County

Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator

John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator

Mike Hein,, Deputy County Administrator

Valerie Samoy-Alverado, District 1

Suzanne Shields, Flood Control District

Rafael Payan, Natural Resources, Parks

George Kuch, Natural Resources, Parks

Robie Pardee Natural Resources, Parks

Carlo DiPilato, Natural Resources, Parks

Mike Studer, Natural Resources, Parks

Robert Padilla, Natural Resources, Parks

Mike Tuinstra, Facilities Management

Mary Judge Ryan, County Attorney's Office

Kathleen Mayer, County Attorney's Office

Fran McNeeley, County Attorney's Office

Bob Lutgendorf, Facilities Management

Linda Mayro, Cultural Resources

David Cushman, Cultural Resources

Roger Anyen, County Archaeology

Linda Leatherman, Reinvestment Office

Don Spiece, CIP Unit

Jim Barry, County Administrator's Office

Cynthia Henry, Natural Resources, Parks
Eugene Woodard, Natural Resources, Parks
Judy German, Natural Resources, Parks

Deseret Romero, Administrator's Office

Others

Jim Keene, City of Tucson
Benny Young, City of Tucson
Scott Douhitt City of Tucson
Karen Thoreson, City of Tucson
Chris Kaselemis, City Comprehensive
Planning

Teri Koopman, SACAC/IAC
John Laswick, IAC
Andrew Schlecht, IAC
Lori J. Lustig, SAHBA
Ramon Gaanderse, Tucson Chamber

Walker Smith, City of South Tucson
Richard Saenz, City of South Tucson

Welcome

Larry Hecker began the meeting at 8:35 A.M., with a quorum of members present.

1. Approval of summary of September 4, 2003 meeting

The summary of the meeting of September 4, 2003 was approved.

2. Report from City of Tucson staff

Jim Keene, City of Tucson Manager, reported to the Committee on three actions of Mayor and Council at their September 15, 2003 meeting. First, the Mayor and Council authorized the City Manager to appoint the City's representative to the Committee, who is Albert Elias, with Karen Thoreson named as the Alternate. Second, the City Manager is to return to Mayor and Council within 30 days with recommendations for project requests, taken from the City's unfunded CIP needs, the City's master plan for parks and open space, and requests submitted from each council office. Third, Mayor and Council wants to ensure the City is a full partner, determining 50 percent or an appropriate amount on projects in the County's bond package. Mr. Keene noted that City staff would attend all Committee meetings to answer questions. Karen Thoreson then joined the Committee at the table.

Bill Roe noted he is a City resident. He pointed out that in the 1920's and 1930's, Pima County bought Tucson Mountain Park, which benefits everyone. He asked Mr. Keene whether the City would consider similar expenditures of the 2004 bonds on open space that benefit everyone as part of the City's 50 percent requirement. Mr. Keene said the City will not be hard and fast on the 50 percent. Mr. Roe pointed out that Tucson Mountain Park benefits him as a City resident.

Larry Hecker noted there was a lot of confusion about County bonds and benefits to City of Tucson residents, what is and is not fair, and called the Committee's attention to a memo

distributed to the Committee from the County Administrator. Chuck Huckelberry discussed his memo on how the benefits of the 1997 general obligation and sewer revenue bond programs were widely dispersed and did not only benefit unincorporated areas. Mr. Huckelberry stated the press has gotten these facts wrong. He noted that County bond programs are a collaborative process among all of us and that the Committee best reflects equity in the distribution of projects. Mr. Huckelberry predicted that the Committee would see as much as \$1 billion in project requests and that staff is comfortable with a \$300 million program and gets more uncomfortable when the figure approaches \$400 million, based only on selling bonds in a five year time frame and keeping the secondary property tax rate for debt service at the current rate. Mr. Huckelberry pointed out that the Board has been reluctant to tinker with bond committee recommendations, usually keeping all of the recommendations and only adding projects.

Larry Hecker pointed out to Mr. Keene that the County's 2004 bond program will not include any transportation or HURF projects. Mr. Keene said he would pass that information on to Mayor and Council.

Chris Sheafe noted there are two question -- projects versus control of projects. Karen Thoreson asked that the Committee leave open the question of how projects will be managed and controlled.

Chuck Huckelberry committed to providing the Committee with a detailed report on the 1997 HURF bond program.

Greg Saxe asked whether the Committee discusses timing of projects. Chuck Huckelberry answered that the Committee did so, especially in terms of prioritizing projects (such as the Juvenile Court project from the 1997 general obligation bond program).

3. Presentation of project recommendations by Pima County Flood Control District

John Bernal presented a policy focus on the Flood Control and the Parks presentations. He pointed out to the Committee that the projects to be presented are based on unmet needs, continuation of projects started under the 1997 bond program, and new statutory requirements (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act). An earlier list shared with the Committee has been pared down to meet a 5 to 7 year time frame. Mr. Bernal then introduced Suzanne Shields and Rafael Payan.

Suzanne Shields, Deputy Director for the Flood Control District, addressed the Committee. Ms. Shields presented a background on the District, whose regional goal is to try to reduce risk in the region. Ms. Shields pointed to a federal Emergency Management Agency estimate of \$600 million in private property in Pima County in the floodplain, 41% of which is in Tucson and 45% in the unincorporated areas. This does not include any public infrastructure also in the floodplain. Ms. Shields noted that the District uses several methods for achieving its goals, including prevention of flood risk, recovery and restoration of channels, and acquisition of floodprone lands.

Ms. Shields then presented the Flood Control District 2004 general obligation bond proposal, which has \$60 million in requests for bond funds in four categories: River System Environmental

Restoration projects - \$15 million; River Flood Control, Erosion Control, and Linear Park Program - \$7.5 million; Urban Drainage Infrastructure Program - \$27.5 million; and Floodprone and Riparian Land Acquisition Program - \$10 million. Ms. Shields summarized the four fact sheets distributed to the Committee.

Chris Sheafe asked about the potential overlap between the Flood Control District linear parks and open space projects and overlaps with other bond programs. Ms. Shields agreed there is complimentary overlap, which has been identified with the other effected departments. Ms. Shields discussed what the Flood Control District does with its linear parks and floodprone land acquisition.

Dan Sullivan asked what are the methods for prioritizing the urban drainage projects. Ms. Shields noted that each jurisdiction uses its own methods and that Pima County uses a cost/benefit approach.

Alex Rodriguez asked two questions: 1) is there any forecasting, planning, that goes into the front end of flood control and 2) is the national flood insurance program mandatory? Ms. Shields responded that the District does planning on several levels, such as basin management plans, but a lot of what we have done in the past was in response to flood damages, which reduced damages when flooding occurred again. FEMA mandates that the County does floodplain management, which makes it possible for property buyers to get flood insurance when they purchase property. Ms. Shields also notes that FEMA looks at repetitive damages.

Arlan Colton asked about urban drainage and reference to "potential cost sharing with other jurisdiction," and asked whether this meant we would not do the project if the other funding was not provided. Ms. Shields noted that the additional revenues was assumed in the total cost estimate for the project. She also talked about operations and maintenance costs of flood improvements.

Greg Saxe asked about water harvesting and the possible upstream flooding and pollution impacts to the tribes. Mr. Saxe also noted the flooding that occurred as a result of bank stabilization projects. Ms. Shields described the overall benefits to water quality of water harvesting.

Karen Thoreson asked for an addendum report for the Committee on a five-year projection of tax levy revenues.

Carolyn Campbell asked about whether the Flood Control District open space projects are not related to the conservation bond program. Ms. Shields noted that County staff is making sure there is no duplication of requests and that the District's priorities are different than those of the conservation program.

Larry Hecker asked that the tracking sheet list any potential other funding sources.

4. Presentation of project recommendations by Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation

Rafael Payan presented a background on the Parks department and its major goals. Mr. Payan presented the department's project requests, which totaled \$50,030,000, including Park Build Out Program - \$29,000,000; Parks Infrastructure Development Program - \$7,680,000; ADA Compliance Program - \$2,850,000; Trails System & Connector Trail Program & Campgrounds Development Program - \$4,250,000; and Community Centers Development Program - \$6,250,000. Mr. Payan also presented a supplemental submittal, with projects totaling \$21,300,000, including Swimming Pools/Aquatic Centers - \$11,300,000; Park Build Out, SE Regional Park/Shooting Range and Sports Field Complex - \$7,000,000; and Tucson Mountain Park Municipal Water Line - \$3,000,000.

Dan Sullivan asked two questions: 1) what are the present utilization rates for campgrounds and 2) is a 10-acre per capita standard mentioned by Mr. Payan a recommendation or an average? Mr. Payan responded that typically the campgrounds are full from November to March, primarily by "snow birds." Mr. Sullivan asked for specific data on utilization, which Mr. Payan promised to provide. Mr. Payan responded that the 10-acre standard is a recommendation, based upon a minimum national average, based upon systems that provide the best parks.

Patty Richardson asked where funding for operation and maintenance for these improvements would come from. Mr. Payan answered these revenues would come from the General Fund or user fees. Mr. Payan noted that the fact sheets provide estimates of O and M costs associated with the project recommendations.

Carolyn Campbell asked why the Tucson Mountain Park well improvements are not a Tucson Water cost. Mr. Payan responded that the proposed water line was like bringing service from a Tucson Water line to one's home, where the homeowner is responsible for that cost.

Ms. Campbell asked whether there is survey information on whether the public wants developed parks, like Catalina State Park? Mr. Payan discussed surveys conducted with winter visitors, that show what improvements they would like to see, that would bring them back again, thereby increasing the departments user fee revenues.

Larry Hecker asked whether the department received much user fee revenues from "snow birds." Mr. Payan responded that the department did receive revenues at Tucson Mountain Park when there is an overflow from other campground sites.

Chris Sheafe noted that the department received almost \$60 million in 1997 bonds, but has only expended \$20 million, with still \$40 million to go and is there a back log of work to do. Mr. Payan discussed the remaining \$40 million, noting that the first several years were devoted to a lot of design and acquisition, with projects now ready to go to construction, with a six to eight month time frame. Mr. Payan also noted that the 2004 program is designed to be completed in 5 to 7 years, utilizing fewer consultants.

Wanda Shattuck asked whether there are any repeat projects from the 1997 program in the 2004

bond requests. Mr. Payan noted two projects that are continuations from the 1997 program: a water slide at the new Ajo pool and the Tucson Mountain Park contact building. A request was made to provide the Committee with a list of any repeat projects from the 1997 bond program.

Greg Saxe asked whether the department's proposals are really addressing the needs of rural areas. Mr. Payan noted that two of the community centers – in Amado and in Catalina – would address the rural areas. Mr. Payan discussed other projects that would address needs of residents living outside of the urban envelope.

Karen Thoreson asked whether the department is applying urban Park standards for rural areas. Mr. Payan responded that the national standard does apply to urban and rural areas and that Pima County provides a lot of service to residents within the urban envelope.

5. Presentation of project recommendations by Pima County Facilities Management Department

Mike Tuinstra addressed the Committee, noting that Facilities Management has eighteen projects to present, organized into groups. The first project was the Interagency Victim Advocacy Center.

Kathleen Mayer, a prosecutor with the Pima County Attorney's Office, made a presentation on behalf of an Interagency Victim Advocacy Center, that would provide a single location providing criminal justice and social services to victims and their families. The Center would house the County Attorney Special Victims Unit, Tucson Police Department, County Sheriff, Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, and many non-profit social service agencies. The total cost of this project is \$13 million, with \$11,528,000 that would come from 2004 County general obligation bonds, a \$222,000 CDBG grant from the City of Tucson, and an additional \$1,250,000 in grants to be sought.

Following Ms. Mayer's presentation, the Committee had several questions for Ms. Mayer, on the nature of special victims crimes, degree of repeat offenders, rates of arrest and incarceration, trends in special victim crimes over the past 15 years, how many victims leave the system because of frustrations that could be solved by this center, the relationship of drug and alcohol abuse to special victim crimes. Other questions were raised about how the size of the building was determined, why the proposed location, and whether the cost estimates were based upon drawings.

Carolyn Campbell asked whether Tucson Police Department would be contributing funding to this project. Greg Saxe asked about the availability of bus service. The Committee asked for information on "successful centers" in operation elsewhere. Arlan Colton asked about the added costs of incarceration and who pays if this center is constructed and successfully operated. He hoped that the Sheriff's Department was accounting for these additional costs.

6. Agenda for next meeting

During the previous presentation, Larry Hecker moved, Dan Sullivan seconded, and the Committee approved rolling over the remainder of the Facilities Management presentations to the October 3, 2003 meeting. Based upon this decision, the agenda for the next meeting was set as:

Facilities Management, Wastewater Management, and Solid Waste Management.

The Committee also approved a change in the schedule for the October 17, 2003 meeting, which will include Neighborhood Reinvestment, Cultural Resources, and Open Space.

7. Call to the audience

There was no response to the call to the audience.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.