



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER
130 W. CONGRESS, TUCSON, AZ 85701-1317
(520) 740-8661 FAX (520) 740-8171

C. H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

January 30, 2004

The Honorable Robert Walkup, Mayor
City of Tucson
P.O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

**Re: Answers to Issues and/or Questions Regarding the Proposed May 2004 Bond Election
Raised Through Council Offices or the Mayor's Office**

Dear Mayor Walkup:

First, I would like to thank you for providing me with a copy of questions raised by individuals either to Council offices or your office. These questions are answered in the attached material. We would appreciate it if you could see that the individuals who raised the questions are provided with the appropriate answers.

Many of the questions show a basic misunderstanding of the bond issue and program. However, it is important that these misunderstandings be cleared up, and I believe the attached information will do much to eliminate misinformation and/or confusion regarding the program.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these answers.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "C. H. Huckelberry". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail.

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/jj

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
James Keene, Manager, City of Tucson
Chair, Vice Chair and Members of the Pima County Bond Advisory Committee
Jim Barry, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

(These responses are available at the County's website - www.pima.gov - then click on the link for the "May 18, 2004 Bond Election")

I. Ballot Question 1- Public Safety and Justice Facilities

1. Why is only \$2.3 million for DM Land Acquisition in the "Public Safety" package and \$7.7 million in the "Open Space" package? Shouldn't the entire \$10 million for DM Land Acquisition be included in the "Public Safety" package?

The County Bond Advisory Committee voted to allocate \$10 million to prevent urban encroachment on Davis Monthan Air Force Base. In a later vote, the Committee voted to include \$7.7 million of that amount under the functional category of "open space," which the Committee set at \$180 million, and to include the remaining \$2.3 million under the category of City of Tucson requests. The County Bond Advisory Committee never included this \$2.3 million under their functional category of "public safety." The summary documents describing the Committee's recommendations clearly include the entire \$10 million under the open space category, showing recommended funding for open space at \$182.3 million. County bond counsel and the County Administrator only recommended including the Davis Monthan land acquisition under the open space question. The Davis Monthan Land Acquisition allocation of \$10 million to prevent urban encroachment on Davis Monthan is included in the bond issue under the open space question. It is not included under public safety primarily because legal counsel has provided the opinion that the County does not have enabling legislative authority to acquire lands for Davis Monthan for the purpose of public safety, however, the County does have statutory authority to acquire open space specifically for the purpose of preventing urban encroachment on Davis Monthan; hence the location of the Davis Monthan land acquisition question.

2. Why was the City of Tucson portion of the Consolidated Court building reduced from \$45 million to \$41 million? Should we fund a project like this with a built-in shortfall? We should fund the whole project and get it done.

The County Bond Advisory Committee closely questioned staff regarding cost estimates. Committee member Gomez was specific and deliberate in his discussions regarding uni-price costs associated with County versus City facilities and felt that the amount could be requested even more than the amount ultimately settled on by the Bond Advisory Committee of \$41 million. The County faces similar situations in every bond issue, where citizen advisory committees question prices and costs developed by staff sometimes accurately, sometimes not. Committee member Sheafe moved, and the Committee approved, that the amount of the Municipal Court project to be funded with County general obligation bonds be reduced by \$4 million, a reasonable estimate of the residual value of the property on which the structure currently exists, which City staff says will be demolished after the new facility is open and operational. Mr. Sheafe and others on the Committee believed that the existing property would serve a better economic function for the downtown if it were sold for private use. The final result is that if the facility is built and funds are short, additional funding would need to be provided by the benefitting local government entity sufficient to build the facility or the facility would be rescoped to fit the available funds.

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

II. Ballot Question 2 - Open Space and Habitat Preservation

1. Could we see a map of the specific parcels that will be purchased with this \$180 million? The map should also show who the owners of the parcels are.

The report of the Conservation Bond Advisory Committee contains a very clear map of priority acquisitions for the funds allocated; the specificity of property identification was discussed and debated by the Conservation Bond Advisory Committee. The Committee deferred from specific parcel identification for a number of reasons, primarily associated with price negotiations. The categories are: open space acquisitions related to habitat protection, community "signature properties," and Davis Monthan Air Force Base. A number of properties have been earmarked for acquisition by the County Bond Advisory Committee within the City of Tucson. Those include the Kino and 36th Street property, 36th Street/Tucson Mountain Park corridor and Agua Caliente Wash.

2. How much of the land that would be purchased with the \$135 million for "Habitat Preservation" is owned by the State Land Department and other governments?

There are no lands owned by other governments proposed for acquisition in the recommendations of the Conservation Bond Advisory Committee, except parcels owned and controlled by the State Land Department. The Conservation Bond Advisory Committee identified private land and State Land properties that had high biological values, dividing each category into high priority and secondary priority properties. The Committee's recommendations included 963 private parcels, totaling 108,153 acres and 808 State Land parcels totaling 549,312 acres. The State Land Department properties have received low priority for acquisition due to uncertainties related to, as indicated in Question 3, State Trust land reform and the entire issue of whether or not the Arizona Preserve Initiative is viable due to withdrawals of the conservation related sales such as Tumamoc Hill.

3. The State Land Department and Governor Napolitano are forming recommendations that would allow for conservation of State Trust Lands. Does it make sense to decide now which lands local government will purchase when those lands may be set aside for conservation anyway?

State Trust land reform is simply a legislative concept. Numerous concepts have been proposed before and have failed at the ballot. Waiting to conserve precious resources based on State Trust land reform would be unwise, however, it is also important to understand that the present open space acquisition program does not conflict in any way with any State Trust land reforms that have been proposed. In fact, the State Trust land reforms that have been proposed are very beneficial to Pima County and complement the conservation program, however, there will be no funds spent on State Land acquisition in conflict with State Trust reform.

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

4. How much is still unspent from previously approved Pima County Open Space bond packages?

\$7.2 million remains from the 1997 open space bond program. Of that amount, \$1.4 million has been reserved for the Tumamoc Hill acquisition and approximately \$5.8 million for Arizona Preserve Initiative matching funds for Tortolita Mountain Park expansion. The API reserved bond authorization has been targeted to the easterly side of Tortolita Mountain Park north of Oro Valley. As the Arizona Preserve Initiative continues to fall apart, we are uncertain as to whether or not State matching funds through the Arizona Preserve Initiative will be available to match these funds. In any event, County bond funds continue to be pledged toward this expansion of Tortolita Mountain Park as originally conceived in the bond implementation plan for the 1997 bond program.

III. Ballot Question 3 - Parks and Recreational Facilities

1. Could we see a map of the specific Parks and Recreation improvements? Are these projects widely distributed throughout Pima County?

The specific Parks and Recreational Facilities improvements proposed, as well as all proposed projects, are as indicated in the attached map. They are widely distributed throughout Pima County, and are concentrated most heavily inside the City of Tucson and within the other incorporated jurisdictions. Only a small amount of funding is available for the rural and unincorporated areas of Pima County, which have been largely bypassed with these improvements.

2. Will the specific amounts for each project be identified-or will the funds be "lumped together" and the Board of Supervisors will decide which projects get funded at a later date?

The question is somewhat misleading with regard to projects getting funded at a later date. The practice of the Board is to determine specifically which projects get what funds long before there is an election. For the May 18, 2004 election, project specific bond allocations for Parks projects have been known from the beginning. The County Bond Advisory Committee recommended specific project-by-project funding for Parks projects, with the exception of recommending that the City of Tucson and Pima County allocate lump sums between eligible projects. Pursuant to the December 9, 2003 meeting, the Board Chair wrote to Mayor Walkup requesting that the City of Tucson allocate a lump sum among eligible projects prior to the Board's adoption of the resolution calling the election. The County Administrator's transmittal memorandum recommended project-by-project allocations as requested by the City of Tucson and project-by-project allocations, with increased bond funding, for County projects. These recommendations, as well as project-by-project allocations to Parks projects in other jurisdictions, were the basis for arriving at the \$96.45 million amount approved for Question 4, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and were implicitly incorporated in the Board's approval of

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

that ballot question. We expect that the County's publicity pamphlet for the May 18, 2004 bond election will identify each and every project that is anticipated to be constructed if the bonds are approved. Similarly, the County's Bond Implementation Plan ordinance for the May 18, 2004 bond election will also provide very detailed, specific information on each and every project anticipated to be funded if bonds are approved. That is the purpose of the bond implementation plan. The specific project amounts, description, scope, timing of improvements and other factors are identified in the Bond Implementation Plan and will guide development of the project if approved by the voters.

3. Was the Eastside Senior Center omitted from the Bond Package? If so, why?

At the City of Tucson's request, Question 4 includes a \$6 million bond allocation for an Eastside Sports and Senior Center. We have no reason to assume the City will ask that this project be deleted from the bond package.

4. How much is still unspent from previously approved Pima County Parks and Recreation bond packages?

Pima County voters, through the 1997 bond election, have approved \$131.4 million in Parks projects, \$52.7 million of which were approved in the 1997 election. Of the \$131.4 million in previous authorizations, there is a remaining authorization of \$18.5 million from the 1997 program. Current planning for a potential bond sale in late spring of 2004 could include \$14 million to \$16 million from this remaining authorization.

IV. Ballot Question 4 - Public Health and Community Facilities

1. Is it wise to bundle together hospital, neighborhood re-investment, performing arts centers and library projects all under the same ballot question?

On the advice of bond counsel, hospital, neighborhood reinvestment and other public buildings such as performing arts centers, community centers, and libraries were placed under the same ballot question (Question 5, Public Health, Safety, Recreational, and Cultural Facilities) on the May 20, 1997 ballot. Question 5 received 57 percent voter approval. Projects and programs by voter question are not designed to be organized for political purpose such as the question implies. They are organized based on what is legally permitted under Arizona law, reviewed and approved by independent bond legal counsel.

2. For what purpose are the additions to Kino Hospital? What services does Kino provide now, and how would that change if this bond package is approved?

The bond proposal would allow for expanded psychiatric treatment facilities at Kino Community Hospital, separate from the Hospital itself. Presently, the Hospital provides limited community benefit for the purpose of medical health services. The

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

County is in the process of negotiating the turnover of Kino Hospital to University Physicians, Inc., the largest non-profit physicians' group in southern Arizona and the backbone of the University of Arizona Medical Education Program.

Kino Community Hospital is not directly included in the 2004 bond election, except through associated or collaborating facilities such as the Public Health Center and the initial investment for a separate inpatient psychiatric facility (described previously) connected to the Hospital. The Kino management initiative undertaken by the Board will transition management and control of the Hospital to University Physicians, Inc. for the primary purpose of significantly increasing healthcare opportunities for the residents of Pima County. The Hospital today does not significantly provide services for the surrounding service population, primarily due to a shortage of physicians and other health science professionals. The County, in collaboration with the University of Arizona and University Physicians, Inc., is embarking on a partnership plan that envisions significantly improved and expanded healthcare opportunities at Kino, as well as expanding the fundamental medical teaching mission of the University of Arizona. Arizona is last in the number of nurses per capita, 49th in the number of pharmacists per capita, 43rd in the number of physicians per capita, and last in the number of public health officials per capita. These statistics portray an ominous shortage of healthcare professionals to care for our population, particularly as it ages. Therefore, the proposed mission change at Kino Community Hospital combines a short-term vision of significantly expanding community access to Kino Community Hospital with a long-term vision to provide the opportunity for the University of Arizona to significantly expand their teaching mission and hence increase the basic healthcare capacity of this community.

3. What are all the existing funding sources for Kino Hospital? How does this compare to the way Maricopa County funds its community hospital?

Kino Community Hospital has been funded through a combination of medical charges and related fees, as well as General Fund subsidies. This is the exact same way in which Maricopa County funded its community hospital up until their recent initiative to approve a sales tax to fund a significant component of the operating cost of the Maricopa County Medical Center.

4. Why was the Wilmot Library funding reduced from \$10 million to \$7 million?

The Bond Advisory Committee did not question the \$10 million cost estimate for the Wilmot Library project. Chris Sheafe again questioned whether County general obligation funds alone were necessary to rehabilitate or replace the Wilmot Library. Following the Sheafe analysis, the Committee felt strongly that the existing Wilmot Library could in fact either be reused, avoiding the cost of land acquisition, or was an asset with a value of at least \$3 million that could be marketed and the proceeds allocated to design and construction of a new library. Hence the Committee decided on a 16 to 0 vote to reduce the cost of the Wilmot Library from \$10 million to \$7 million.

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

V. Ballot Question 5 - Flood Control Improvements

1. Flooding issues continue to affect roadway access through streets in the central part of the City of Tucson. Many of these areas are in Supervisor Elias' district. Why are there no City of Tucson projects in this package?

The flooding issues, particularly related to roadway access, are not particularly pressing flood control matters. Flood control investment generally relates to the public investments that insure that property and lives are not endangered by flooding. Street flooding is typically a nuisance problem that occurs sporadically throughout the year and typically a very short amount of time on any particular day. Large portions of the City of Tucson, similar to everywhere else in Pima County, do not have storm drains since Tucson is considered to be an arid environment where storm drains are generally few and far between. The Bond Advisory Committee addressed this issue by including funds for urban drainage. The City of Tucson is certainly eligible to submit projects for funding through the urban drainage program.

2. According to the City's analysis, for many years City of Tucson residents contributed over 60% of the Flood Control District's revenues, but received only about 25% of the Flood Control District's project expenditures. How will you persuade City taxpayers' support for additional District expenditures outside the City of Tucson?

The issue associated with funding by the Flood Control District and the City of Tucson is a myth that has been perpetuated by continuing misinformation on the matter. Numerous studies have been completed that indicate that, while the City constitutes about 46 percent of the tax base of the Flood Control District, it has received over 50 percent of the Flood Control District capital improvements and or funding. It should be remembered that City annexation policy had been to avoid crossing major watercourses such as the Rillito and even portions of the Santa Cruz River for decades, leaving the Flood Control District to install flood control and major bank stabilization along these watercourses, allowing the City to then annex the areas and avoid these infrastructure costs. These annexed improvements become part of the investment the Flood Control District allocated as a benefit to the City of Tucson since, had the improvements not been made, it is questionable whether or not the City of Tucson would have annexed across the particular major watercourse.

VI. Ballot Question 6 - Sewer System Revenue Bonds

1. The Tucson Citizen reports that a majority of the Board of Supervisors is requesting an outside audit of the County Wastewater Department. Is it wise to pursue Sewer System bonds before the audit is completed?

The County last asked for voter authorization for sewer system bonds over six years ago. At that time the major focus was to provide treatment capacity in areas already under development. Outside funding sources such as state or federal grants

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

for sewer projects are virtually non-existent, and a major source of funding for major capital improvements is sewer revenue bonds. The projects proposed for the 2004 sewer system bonds have a greater emphasis on rehabilitation. These projects are necessary and vital to maintaining the integrity of the sewer system. Failure to fund these projects will result in more sanitary sewer overflows, violations of state and federal environmental permits, and potential catastrophic failures of the sewer infrastructure.

An annual financial statement audit was completed by the State of Arizona, Office of the Auditor General in November of 2003. The audit reported that the Wastewater Management Department's cash reserves were depleted during fiscal year 2003 with the investment of a substantial amount of funding for sewer construction projects. In addition, the loss from the State Treasurer's Local Government Investment Pool was also noted. These unanticipated costs resulted in a deficit cash balance of \$12 million for fiscal year 2003. To eliminate the cash deficit, the Department borrowed \$10.9 million from the General Fund and \$2 million from the Department's Solid Waste Division. The retirement of this debt will be undertaken while addressing the debt burden imposed by the proposed 2004 bonds.

2. Sewer rates have increased quickly and at a high rate over the last few years. Where have the funds been spent? Would proposed additional increases in rates make selling the bonds more difficult?

Rates have been increased four times in the last five years and the average rate increase in those five years was 3.8 percent. Even so, the sewer rates in Pima County are among the lowest in the nation. A survey by the City of Phoenix conducted in March 2003 shows Pima County sewer bills fourth lowest among 18 cities in the Southwest. A survey by Black & Veatch Corporation in 2003 shows Pima County sewer bills sixth lowest among 49 cities throughout the United States. Furthermore, a financial survey conducted by the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies says the average residential sewer bill in the United States is \$19.58 per month, compared to Pima County's \$13.11 sewer bill. Pima County's sewer bills are 33 percent lower than the national average.

The three major expenditure categories for the Wastewater Management Department are operating and maintenance, debt service, and capital improvements. In the last three years, operating and maintenance expenses have increased from \$36.4 million (fiscal year 2001), to \$39.2 million (fiscal year 2002), to \$46.4 million (fiscal year 2003). However, \$2.4 million of the fiscal year 2003 increase was the result of emergency repairs to the Northwest Outfall Sewer that was crushed on September 7, 2002. Debt Service has increased an average of 8 percent in the last three years from \$11.8 million in fiscal year 2001 to \$13.6 million in fiscal year 2003. However, construction in progress has increased from \$38.3 million in fiscal year 2001, to \$73.9 million in fiscal year 2002, to \$136.2 million in fiscal year 2003. This increase is a result of several large

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

construction projects: the Ina Road Water Pollution Control Facility Expansion and Process Improvements, Randolph Park Water Reclamation Facility, Green Valley Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion and Northwest Outfall Sewer Rehabilitation.

In the past the Department was criticized for having a large cash balance in the system development fund. The Department's response was that these funds were programmed for capital improvements. Now that several capital improvements have been constructed (or close to completion), combined with the unplanned expenditures for the Northwest Outfall Sewer repair and rehabilitation, the Department is once again under criticism, this time for not having a cash balance. Sewer revenue bonds are paid back with revenues from the sewer system. Therefore, if there are insufficient revenues, bonds are not sold. Bond rating agencies look to communities that have the political and local support to repay the increased debt from bond sales. Failure to increase rates on a regular basis may actually increase interest rates on sold bonds because of uncertainty of rate increase support in the financial market.

3. Supervisor Elias has rightly expressed concern about sewer fees paid by inner city residents subsidizing new development in the more affluent areas of the County. Has Pima County used funds paid by City of Tucson residents to subsidize urban sprawl development in the Northwest and outside the City limits? If so, what percentage of total department revenues has been spent on supporting new development? What percentage has been spent maintaining existing infrastructure inside District 5 and in the total City of Tucson?

The argument that sewer fees are subsidizing new development in more "affluent" areas is unsubstantiated. A review of the CIP project locations would show few CIP projects in the "affluent" areas. Developers build the public sewer infrastructure and pay sewer connection fees. These fees were raised significantly by the Board last year (three-12 percent increases each in April, July and September, 2003).

The County sewer system is operated as a regional system, therefore, operating expenses are used to maintain the overall existing infrastructure. If anything, the sewers in the inner-city areas are more costly to maintain because these sewers are older and require more preventive maintenance, and have been the areas where sewer rehabilitation work has taken place. In March of 2002, staff prepared an information memorandum listing the wastewater projects in District 5.

VII. General Questions

1. All elected officials want a bond package that is in the best interests of the City of Tucson, all the cities and towns and all of Pima County. Does the \$556 Bond Package address the most critical needs faced by the Greater Tucson-Pima County community? For example:

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

- The AZ Daily Star reports that only 10% of our region's major roads have handicap-accessible sidewalks.
- The County has said that our roads "may be in poorer condition and more deficient in capacity to accommodate existing travel than ever before."
- The City Manager reports that per-capita library spending in Pima County is about 45% lower than the national average (\$3.07 vs. \$5.57).
- Tucson recently lost a Level-One Trauma Center.

We agree wholeheartedly that the bond package should be in the "best interests of the City of Tucson, all cities and towns and all of Pima County." We would add the Tohono O'odham and Pascua Yaqui communities to this list. To the question of whether the County bond package addresses "the most critical needs faced by the Greater Tucson-Pima County community," the Arizona Daily Star, for one, has answered "Yes." In an editorial on Sunday, December 7, 2003, the newspaper called the Bond Committee's recommendations a "solid bond proposal" and urged the Board of Supervisors to approve it. In a second editorial, on Tuesday, January 20, 2004, the newspaper again urged the Board to "approve the bonds," and said that the "money is urgently needed for many projects throughout the county, and the package is fairly balanced to serve residents throughout the region."

The Citizens Bond Advisory Committee also believes it produced a balanced, fair and affordable package of recommendations. The 19 members of this Committee, as well as the Conservation Bond Advisory Committee and Neighborhood Reinvestment Advisory Committee, came from throughout Pima County. In fact, more than one-half of these committee members were residents of the City of Tucson.

Regarding the specific community needs mentioned, Pima County was clear from the outset that the general obligation bond packages would not include transportation funding. No one doubts the urgency of meeting our regional transportation needs, but general obligation bonding is not the appropriate funding mechanism for meeting these needs.

On libraries, I would simply note that for the current fiscal year, the Pima County Library District increased its contribution to fund operation and maintenance of the library system by \$736,486 over and above its agreed upon contribution of 50 percent. By increasing our contribution, Pima County firmly supported libraries, while at the same time the City was decreasing its contribution for the same year.

Answers to Questions Regarding the Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

We are fully aware that the region lost a Level-One Trauma Center. Pima County is the only local government, outside of the Tohono O'odham Nation, that directly funds the provision of healthcare, so we were acutely aware of and prepared to help with saving this trauma center. Loss of this center is the strongest argument in support of the bond funding to strengthen and expand the County's public health complex at the Kino Campus.

2. What will Pima County do to assure the public that the projects listed in the bond package will be completed on-time and on-budget? How will Pima County convince the public that it is accountable and trustworthy?

Pima County is the only local government with a "Truth in Bonding" ordinance of the breadth and detail passed by the Board of Supervisors in 1997. The Board of Supervisors has already approved two bond implementation plan ordinances, for the two 1997 bond elections, and is now writing the ordinance for the May 18, 2004 bond election. The County Administrator has stated on several occasions that he expects the bond ordinance for this election to run over 200 pages. County staff will work with all of the local jurisdictions in writing this ordinance. The ordinance will: a) list every project that we intend to fund if the bonds are approved; b) detail the scope, benefits, costs, funding sources, schedules, and expected operation and maintenance costs for every project; c) detail mechanisms for enhancing accountability over the successful model from the 1997 ordinances; d) discuss timing of bond sales and how commitments to keeping property tax rates level or declining will be met; e) identify jurisdictional responsibilities for implementing projects and identify the needs for intergovernmental agreements; f) establish procedures for managing projects for which actual costs are going to be greater than costs estimated in the ordinance; and g) establish procedures for publicly amending projects when circumstances require. Pima County will produce and publish semi-annual progress reports on the 2004 bond election, as well as continue to publish the progress reports on the 1997 bond programs. The ordinances and reports will all be made available on the County's website and whenever requested by the public.

CHH/jj

January 30, 2004

Questions Regarding Proposed 2004 Pima County Bond Package

I. Ballot Question #1—Public Safety and Justice Facilities

1. Why is only \$2.3 million for DM Land Acquisition in the “Public Safety” package and \$7.7 million in the “Open Space” package? Shouldn’t the entire \$10 million for DM Land Acquisition be included in the “Public Safety” package?
2. Why was the City of Tucson portion of the Consolidated Court building reduced from \$45 million to \$41 million? Should we fund a project like this with a built-in shortfall? We should fund the whole project and get it done.

II. Ballot Question #2—Open Space and Habitat Preservation

1. Could we see a map of the specific parcels that will be purchased with this \$180 million? The map should also show who the owners of the parcels are.
2. How much of the land that would be purchased with the \$135 million for “Habitat Preservation” is owned by the State Land Department and other governments?
3. The State Land Department and Governor Napolitano are forming recommendations that would allow for conservation of State Trust Lands. Does it make sense to decide now which lands local government will purchase when those lands may be set aside for conservation anyway?
4. How much is still unspent from previously approved Pima County Open Space bond packages?

III. Ballot Question #3—Parks and Recreation Facilities

1. Could we see a map of the specific Parks and Recreation improvements? Are these projects widely distributed throughout Pima County?
2. Will the specific amounts for each project be identified—or will the funds be “lumped together” and the Board of Supervisors will decide which projects get funded at a later date?
3. Was the Eastside Senior Center omitted from the Bond Package? If so, why?
4. How much is still unspent from previously approved Pima County Parks and Recreation bond packages?

IV. Ballot Question #4—Public Health and Community Facilities

1. Is it wise to bundle together hospital, neighborhood re-investment, performing arts centers and library projects all under the same ballot question?
2. For what purpose are the additions to Kino Hospital? What services does Kino provide now, and how would that change if this bond package is approved?
3. What are all the existing funding sources for Kino Hospital? How does this compare to the way Maricopa County funds its community hospital?
4. Why was the Wilmot Library funding reduced from \$10 million to \$7 million?

V. Ballot Question #5—Flood Control Improvements

1. Flooding issues continue to affect roadway access through streets in the central part of the City of Tucson. Many of these areas are in Supervisor Elias' district. Why are there no City of Tucson projects in this package?
2. According to the City's analysis, for many years City of Tucson residents contributed over 60% of the Flood Control District's revenues, but received only about 25% of the Flood Control District's project expenditures. How will you persuade City taxpayers' support for additional District expenditures outside the City of Tucson?

VI. Ballot Question #6—Sewer System Revenue Bonds

1. The Tucson Citizen reports that a majority of the Board of Supervisors is requesting an outside audit of the County Wastewater Department. Is it wise to pursue Sewer System bonds before the audit is completed?
2. Sewer rates have increased quickly and at a high rate over the last few years. Where have the funds been spent? Would proposed additional increases in rates make selling the bonds more difficult?
3. Supervisor Elias has rightly expressed concern about sewer fees paid by inner city residents subsidizing new development in the more affluent areas of the County. Has Pima County used funds paid by City of Tucson residents to subsidize urban sprawl development in the Northwest and outside the City limits? If so, what percentage of total department revenues has been spent on supporting new development? What percentage has been spent maintaining existing infrastructure inside District 5 and in the total City of Tucson?

VII. General Questions

1. All elected officials want a bond package that is in the best interests of the City of Tucson, all the cities and towns and all of Pima County. Does the \$556 Bond Package address the most critical needs faced by the Greater Tucson-Pima County community? For example:
 - The AZ Daily Star reports that only 10% of our region's major roads have handicap-accessible sidewalks.
 - The County has said that our roads "may be in poorer condition and more deficient in capacity to accommodate existing travel than ever before."
 - The City Manager reports that per-capita library spending in Pima County is about 45% lower than the national average (\$3.07 vs. \$5.57).
 - Tucson recently lost a Level-One Trauma Center
2. What will Pima County do to assure the public that the projects listed in the bond package will be completed on-time and on-budget? How will Pima County convince the public that it is accountable and trustworthy?

Thank you to Pima County and the Pima County Bond Advisory Committee for your work on this proposed bond package.