




MEMORANDUM

Date: October 15, 2009

To: Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

I. Summary Recommendation.

Table 1.
County Administrator November 2008 and October 2009 Recommendations Comparison.

Question Category	Subcommittee Recommendation	County Administrator Recommendation November 2008	County Administrator Recommendation October 2009
Open Space, Historic and Cultural Conservation	\$ 363,400,000	\$130,600,000	\$116,100,000
Public Health, Libraries, and Community Facilities	521,279,000	185,015,000	155,195,000
Public Safety and Justice	59,375,000	98,000,000	52,000,000
Parks and Recreation	324,166,000	154,753,000	162,830,000
Flood Control and Water Conservation	89,150,000	34,000,000	23,000,000
Total General Obligation Bonding	\$1,357,370,000	\$602,368,000	\$509,125,000

II. Introduction.

Included in the last report to the Bond Advisory Committee (Committee) was my November 14, 2008 memorandum to the Committee. That communication recommended possible projects and programs for a future bond election. This memorandum updates that recommendation and should provide the basis for further discussion by the Committee. It should be noted that my recommendation is a point of perspective that should be considered, but it should not be the primary consideration in the Committee's deliberations. The work and effort of the subcommittees and your own views of community needs and

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 2 of 10

level of support for particular bond projects or programs should be the primary considerations in developing a bond proposal for future consideration by the voters of Pima County.

III. What has changed in a year?

In some areas, a great deal has changed, and in other areas, nothing has changed. Most importantly, there remains concern regarding economic conditions. (See my October 8, 2009 memorandum entitled *Fiscal Analysis Related to the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds*.) While the situation is certainly more stable than it was a year ago, national, state, and local economic conditions remain precarious. Below are brief overviews and updates of those issues that I addressed with you in November 2008.

- A. The State and Local Budgets and Revenue Picture. The state budget remains uncertain, with current estimates projecting a nearly \$1.5 billion deficit that must be addressed in the near future. Our local revenues remain flat or down with no appreciable increase in state shared revenues expected. State shared revenues for this budget year are projected to be \$88.9 million, which is \$1.5 million lower than the previous fiscal year and down \$18 million from a peak of \$106.9 million in fiscal year 2006/07. Vehicle license taxes are projected to be \$24.7 million, which is \$1.2 million lower than last year and \$2.5 million down from its peak of \$27.2 million in fiscal year 2007/08. The highway user revenue fund for Pima County is expected to be no greater than \$51.7 million: \$2.2 million down from a year ago and \$6.9 million down from its peak revenue in fiscal year 2006/07.
- B. Bond Market Stability. The bond market is more stable than it has been in the past. The most recent sale of bonds attracted seven bidders, as opposed to a year ago, when only two bidders bid, and both of these bidders were either entering bankruptcy or being purchased by another financial institution.
- C. The Urgency of Sewer Revenue Bonds. The urgency of authorizing sewer revenue bonds remains high; however, an alternative financing strategy is under review by the County in consultation with their legal advisers. As an alternative to issuing sewer revenue bonds, the County is considering sales of utility system revenue obligations to provide the funds needed to pay the costs of the regional optimization management plan. As security for its payment obligations, the County would pledge the net revenues from the sewer system in a manner similar to the issuance of certificates of participation. The lender, a trustee bank, would execute and deliver the obligations, which would be sold to investors in a manner similar to the sale of bonds.

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 3 of 10

The utility system revenue obligation financing structure is common in the tax-exempt bond market and, consequently, the obligations would be expected to be sold at interest rates that are substantially similar to the rates the County would get if it sold voter authorized sewer revenue bonds. Several other political subdivisions in the State, including the City of Phoenix, the City of Tucson and the City of Cottonwood, have used this form of financing to finance water and/or sewer system improvements.

- D. Countercyclical Economic Stimulus. Much has been said about the federal stimulus program. The amount of federal stimulus funds received by the County for capital facility development is essentially nonexistent. In the early years since authorization of the 2004 bond issue, the County faced significant amounts of price escalation pressures regarding capital facility development. These increasing cost pressures have actually reversed themselves, and the County is seeing competitive contracting bids lower than have been seen for some time. Furthermore, the County's own bond programs, authorized in 1997 and 2004, have provided very significant and effective local stimulus programs, providing jobs and public project benefits. In calendar year 2008, a total of 122 public works projects, valued in excess of \$349 million, have been let for construction and are either under construction or planned to be under construction by the end of this calendar year.

This total investment is significant as compared to federal stimulus funding received for capital facilities. Federal funding has been estimated to be no more than \$3 million; hence, local bond funding of projects and programs previously authorized has provided a very significant and beneficial countercyclical economic benefit to the community – nearly a 100-fold increase over the federal stimulus program for the County. Furthermore, the value being received by implementing the projects now is significant and beneficial to taxpayers. Architectural, engineering, and other cost estimates associated with project implementation indicate that these projects had been estimated to cost \$251 million. In aggregate, they are now costing \$197 million, a 21 percent price savings or reduction in cost of implementation.

IV. Recommendation Priority Guidance.

In my November 14, 2008 communication to the Committee, I included seven criteria guiding priority of recommending specific bond projects or programs. This priority guidance remains valid today. However, as discussed in the September 11, 2009 Committee meeting, I would slightly revise these criteria based on the Committee's discussion. I have arranged the criteria in what I view as priority order given current facts and conditions facing the community:

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 4 of 10

1. Broad, demonstrated support by the public and regional benefit,
2. regional, jurisdictional and geographic balance,
3. partnerships and other funding sources or matches,
4. phasing of the project implementation,
5. education and workforce development,
6. advance Board-adopted principles of sustainability and conservation,
7. the previously authorized large-scale bond projects or programs that are now short of funding, and
8. regulatory mandates.

Using these criteria, the following sections of this report provide my modified recommendations and a discussion of projects or programs that are not fully funded or not funded at all. (See Attachment 3 – Project Tables.)

A. Open Space

As discussed in my October 8, 2009 memorandum to the Committee, I have indicated that specific bond proposals over the years have, from time to time, emphasized certain projects or programs depending upon stated community desires and specific needs of the County based on particular circumstances at the time. I continue to recommend this program be funded; however, at amounts that are less than desired by the Conservation Acquisition Commission and less than I recommended in November 2008. Significant progress has been made by the County in acquiring critical open space with the 2004 authorization. The last, large privately owned property in Pima County of significant size is under contract for purchase; however, that contract was spread over two additional nonrecourse options. This acquisition is known as the Marley Ranch Conservation Area, and the two nonrecourse options to fully purchase the remaining 106,300 acres of the Marley Ranch require \$80 million. For this reason, I would recommend \$80 million in the Habitat Protection Priorities component of the open space acquisition program. I would, however, reduce Community Open Space and Archaeological Site Acquisition from \$20 to \$10 million, the purchase of the Davis-Monahan Approach Corridor open space from \$10 to \$5 million, and flood-prone land acquisition from \$10 to \$5 million. These reductions are recommended to make the bond program more manageable with regard to the financial conditions facing the County, as I stated in a previous report to you regarding the County's financial capability to support future bonding indebtedness under the conditions of voluntary

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 5 of 10

secondary property tax rate cap and our declining secondary assessed value in the near term.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$110 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$100 million (Table 1).

B. Historic Cultural Resource Preservation and Conservation.

I have revised my recommendations contained in my November 2008 communication to the Committee downward to primarily concentrate on several well-known historic and cultural sites, including the historic Fort Lowell Park and Canoa Ranch, in order to complete other projects begun in the 2004 bond issue, such as Steam Pump Ranch, Dunbar School, and the Performing Arts Center. In addition, the historically significant and architecturally noted Ajo Curley School Gymnasium and the Town Plaza are included because of their historic and architectural significance.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$20.6 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$16.1 million (Table 1).

C. Public, Private and Nonprofit Partnerships.

I have placed considerable emphasis on funding public, private, and nonprofit partnerships and believe they are essential. My recommendations are generally the same.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$79.95 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$75.35 million (Table 2).

D. Neighborhood Reinvestment Housing.

I have increased my allocation to this category from \$15 to \$20 million by adding \$5 million to the Affordable Housing Program. These allocations are a third of those requested; however, I also believe of all of the federal stimulus programs, housing has received more allocations at the local level than capital facility development. For example, \$3 million has been received from the National Stabilization Program, and a grant application for another \$22 million has been filed; hence, the reason for my reduced recommendation in this category.

In order to improve accountability and stretch neighborhood reinvestment program funding, a condition of program eligibility will be cost sharing with the jurisdiction in

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: **Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010**

October 15, 2009

Page 6 of 10

which the neighborhood reinvestment project is located. Today, neighborhood reinvestment pays all implementation costs, including project administration, planning, design, and construction administration. These costs, in aggregate, generally approximate 30 percent of the project cost. Hence, to increase the financial performance of neighborhood reinvestment programs, a 30 percent local match (or the local jurisdiction being responsible for all soft costs, including administration, planning, design, and construction management) should be required.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$15 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$20 million (Table 2).

E. Public Buildings and Libraries.

Again, I have reduced overall funding to this program based on a need to lessen the overall cost impact of the future bond election. Funding has been increased, however, for two projects:

1. Pima Animal Care Center Reconstruction and Expansion. Complete program evaluation has been undertaken regarding the center, and total estimated cost to improve the facility to a modern standard is estimated at \$22 million and is appropriate, since investment has not occurred at the center since its initial construction in 1968, except for recent bond financed modifications and renovations of the existing facility and a slight expansion of kennel capacity.
2. Green Valley Performing Arts and Adult Learning Center (Green Valley Performing Arts/Learning Center III). I am now recommending full funding for the Green Valley Performing Arts and Adult Learning Center. This full funding will complete the expansion and development of the center.
3. Marana Health Center Expansion. Since I recommended funding for all of the Catholic Community Services area clinics, it is appropriate that the Marana Health Center receive funding for their expansion. While I did not recommend funding in November 2008, I now recommend allocating \$3 million to this project.

The total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$83,565,000. Today, I am recommending total funding in the amount of \$63,845,000 (Table 2).

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 7 of 10

F. Justice and Law Enforcement.

It is in this area where the largest modification to my November 2008 recommendation is made to modify bond funding amounts to specific recommended categories and to delete one major project that was recommended in November 2008. Based on present cost estimates and the need to make additional improvements to other County facilities to accommodate the relocation of the Superior Court adult probation function from the Eighth Floor – allowing new courts to be constructed for the Superior Court – the bond fund allocation for this project is increased from the November 2008 recommendation of \$8 million to \$12 million. I am deleting the Northwest Regional Justice Center from my recommendation and concentrating on the modest recommendation to fund the partially funded joint municipal and justice court facility.

At the meeting of September 11, 2009, a more detailed explanation of this project was requested. I am including as Attachment 1 the March 10, 2009 memorandum to the Board of Supervisors regarding this project and its cost of implementation. In 2004, the original bond allocation was \$76 million, based on an anticipated structure size of 261,000 square feet. In architectural programming, the size of the structure deemed necessary ballooned to 413,000 square feet. The project has now been divided into phases, and according to the most recent cost estimate by the Facilities Management Director, the total funding necessary to complete the phase of the project that will accommodate the court's needs through 2018 is \$148 million, which is an increase of \$72 million, including \$11.5 million dollars in contingency. The current status of architectural design of the 260,000 square feet first phase of concept plan is underway (See Attachment 2, September 18, 2009 memorandum from the Facilities Management Director). We will continue to seek other funds, including federal stimulus funding and fair share court fee funding. For this reason, I am recommending that the November 2008 recommendation be reduced from \$80 million to \$40 million.

The project was initially conceptualized for the 2004 program. Archaeological costs were estimated to be in the range of \$1 to \$2 million. The actual cost for mitigation is \$16.8 million. Utility relocation from abandoned streets needed to assemble the land for the courts cost \$1.65 million, and the cost to acquire the property not originally included in the court site was \$4.865 million, including \$2.1 million to acquire property owned by the State of Arizona. These costs, totaling nearly \$21 million, were not anticipated. This is a significant component of the original \$76 million bond funding. The basis of my recommendation is for supplemental Phase Two funding, as I now believe the court complex, in even its ultimate size, should be phased for future

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: **Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010**

October 15, 2009

Page 8 of 10

bond funding. The first phase, which was authorized in 2004, paid for the archaeological mitigation, utility relocation, land acquisition, design, and a portion of the construction. The \$40 million now recommended to the Committee, coupled with a desired fair share court filing fee, should cover the first phase of construction, with the expanded ultimate size of the facility to be paid for in a third phase future bond issue.

Fair share court filing fees have been discussed with the courts. While not desirable from the court leadership perspective, it is necessary to consider such given the severe funding constraints now being experienced by state government. Concern of the courts regarding filing fees is that full and open access to the courts should not be restricted due to filing fees; hence, the need for a modest fair share proposal. In the \$32 million of funding that remains, \$11.5 million could simply not be required since it is a contingency allocation, leaving approximately \$20 million of fair share court filing fees to supplement bond funds. Of the total project cost, the first phase construction and completion is now estimated to be nearly \$150 million. This filing fee would be equivalent to 10 to 15 percent of the total cost; hence, a modest and appropriate fee. However, state enabling legislation would be necessary in order to establish such a fair share fee.

The one project I recommend deleting from future consideration is the \$28.9 remanded juvenile detention facility. Such a facility is no longer necessary, as appropriate plans and agreements have been made between the Superior Court and Sheriff to relocate remanded juveniles, now housed at the Adult Detention Center, to the Juvenile Court Detention Center, which is significantly underutilized. This relocation will eliminate the need for a separately constructed juvenile remanded detention facility for the foreseeable future.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$98 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$52 million (Table 3).

G. Parks and Recreation

I am recommending an actual increase in the bonds recommended for parks and recreation programs in the community. There have been slight modifications or adjustments to the original recommendations of November 2008.

The following adjustments are recommended:

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010

October 15, 2009

Page 9 of 10

1. An increase of \$2 million in the allocation to the BAJA Senior Sports Complex, bringing the total funded to \$4 million;
2. a decrease in the Sahuarita Pool and Recreation Complex allocation from \$8 to \$6 million;
3. a decrease in the Pima County Softball Tournament and Recreation Park from \$10 to \$5 million;
4. an increase in River Park Acquisitions and Development Countywide from \$4 to \$15 million; and
5. an increase in Sports Fields Countywide from \$4 to \$15 million.

I believe these last two increases are justified based on the popularity of the urban river park system on the Rillito and Santa Cruz Rivers as well as the Pantano and Cañada del Oro Washes. This additional funding should permit significant acceleration, connection, and development of these river parks within the urban area. In addition, increasing the Countywide sports field allocation should accelerate the development and provision of sports fields – baseball, softball, and soccer – throughout the County.

In addition, I would add two projects not included in November 2008: the Avra Valley Watchable Wildlife site in the amount of \$750,000 and the Arizona Velodrome Center for \$3.5 million. The Velodrome Center is being promoted for development at the Udall Park Regional Facility in partnership with private funding sources and will more likely be allocated to the Public, Private and Nonprofit Partnerships.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$142,253,000. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$163,830,000 (Table 6).

H. Flood Control.

I have recommended modifications to the flood control projects, including the deletion of the neighborhood/access drainage improvements and the Pantano Wash, Speedway to Tanque Verde. These projects are to be constructed using other funds, including Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) agency flood repair funding.

I am also recommending one project that was not recommended in November 2008, that being the Santa Cruz River, Rillito River, and Cañada del Oro Wash Confluence, funding this project at \$5 million as opposed to \$15 million.

Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

Re: **Updated Recommendation Regarding Funding Of Certain Programs and Projects for a Possible General Obligation Bond Issue in November 2010**

October 15, 2009

Page 10 of 10

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$34 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$23 million (Table 4).

I. Solid Waste.

I am recommending no funding for the Solid Waste program, as the Tangerine Landfill closure is less eminent than was contemplated in November 2008, and there is no need to develop a separate landfill in the community of Ajo.

Total amount of bond funding I recommended in November 2008 was \$5.5 million. Today, I am recommending total funding of \$0 (Table 2).

V. Itemized Discussion of Projects or Programs Not Recommended

Due to a lack of time, I was unable to provide details on specific projects or programs that were either not recommended or recommended with substantially decreased funding. If the committee would still like to have this information, please let me know and I will provide it to you soon.

CHH/mjk

Attachments

c: The Honorable Chairman and Members of the Pima County Board of Supervisors


ATTACHMENT 1



MEMORANDUM

Date: March 10, 2009

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: Design Status of Joint Consolidated Justice and Tucson Municipal Courts

On June 27, 2008, I communicated with the Board and indicated project cost implementation far exceeded funding made available through the 2004 bond issue (Attachment 1). Since that time staff has been reviewing design projections regarding the number of courtrooms and space necessary to meet future needs and re-examining fundamental facility design to determine if the building can be appropriately designed to accommodate a future expansion. As the Board will recall, the original scope included 42 courtrooms and 9 hearing rooms, with a total building size of approximately 415,000 square feet at an estimated construction cost of \$117 million.

By re-examining project design parameters, it has been determined that the facility can be significantly downsized to accommodate courtroom needs through 2018, with an initial phase of 26 courtrooms and 6 hearing rooms being constructed and the balance of the courtrooms to be constructed prior to 2028 in a second project phase.

This downsizing will allow the size of the first phase of the building to be reduced to 255,800 square feet with a future second phase to be 132,200 square feet, down by about 10 percent from the original building size design of 415,000 square feet.

More importantly, the initial construction cost can be reduced to less than \$70 million if constructed next year. A PowerPoint presentation showing the discussion and decisions reached in this building phasing and downsizing is attached at Attachment 2.

The amount of funds allocated to be spent on various project components from voter-authorized bonds of \$76 million in 2004 is as follows:

Project Spending Summary

<u>As of 2/28/09</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Spent to Date</u>
Architectural/Engineering Fees	\$18,905,000	\$ 6,605,750
Land Acquisition	4,782,104	4,782,104
Archaeology Work	16,906,000	12,097,912
Demolition, Abatement and Utility Relocations	1,626,600	1,576,607
Court Complex Construction	27,518,296	0
Equipment and Furnishings	2,000,000	0
Project Administration/Permits/Public Art	1,646,000	149,884
Project Contingency	<u>2,616,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Project Expenses to Date	\$76,000,000	\$25,212,256

Subtracting the funds spent or obligated for the above referenced purposes leaves an unobligated balance of \$27,519,000 in 2004 voter approved bonds. In addition, design of additional Superior Court courtrooms on the 8th floor of the Superior Court Building has been underway, utilizing the balance of 1997 voter-authorized bonds for courtroom development in the Superior Court. Design will exhaust available 1997 general obligation bond funds, leaving approximately \$10 million in construction costs unfunded. This cost is higher than normal since by constructing additional courtrooms on the 8th floor, Adult Probation functions will need to be relocated into additional downtown space, more than likely space now vacated in the Health and Welfare Building.

Total costs associated with finishing the construction of the Joint Consolidated Justice and Tucson Municipal Court to meet needs until 2018 and to construct additional courtrooms in the Superior Court Building and relocate administrative Adult Probation functions will cost a total of \$80,000,000, leaving a presently unfunded courtroom development amount of \$52,500,000.

Funding the Gap

Funding of this capital gap can occur through a variety of sources. Neither the County or City are in a position to contribute General Fund monies for this purpose and will probably not be in such a position for a period of five or more years. Hence, this capital gap funding will not be funded by General Fund appropriations of the City or County. A likely scenario for funding this capital facilities grant is to ask the voters to approve funding for this gap in the next general obligation bond issue of the County, which may occur in November of 2009. However, a bond election in this time frame appears to be more and more unlikely; therefore, the earliest possible date would be November of 2010.

The most promising and innovative way to fund this gap would be to have both the City and County, through the Board of Supervisors and Tucson Mayor and Council, enact a facilities fee surcharge for all case filings that occur within the co-located Justice and Municipal Court facility. It is estimated that a \$10 surcharge per case would generate more than \$6 million in new revenues per year. Using a 3.5 percent interest rate, 15-year payback period, and applying the appropriate capital recovery facility, a \$6 million per year revenue sum will retire an initial debt of approximately \$70 million. Hence, the new facility can be financed using both remaining available voter authorized bond funds and a \$10 facilities fee surcharge per filed case.

Court Review

On Friday, February 27, 2009, the Joint Court Design Review Team, consisting of court representatives of the Superior Court, Justice Court and Tucson City Court, both judges and administrative staff as well as facilities staff of the City and County, reviewed and approved the phased conceptual plan developed to reduce overall costs and improve implementation. Hence, the courts have endorsed this phased approach toward facility implementation.

The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Design Status of Joint Consolidated Justice and Tucson Municipal Courts
March 10, 2009
Page 3

Next Steps

Moving capital construction of this facility forward this year will depend on the ability of the City and County courts to enact a facilities fee surcharge for cases filed in these courts. If they are unable to enact these fees it is likely new court construction cannot occur until 2012 at the earliest (2010 bond election and first sale of capital construction bonds in 2012).

CHH/jj

Attachments

- c: The Honorable Jan Kearney, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
- The Honorable John Leonardo, Superior Court Judge
- The Honorable Maria Felix, Presiding Judge, Pima County Justice Court
- The Honorable Antonio Riojas, Presiding Magistrate, Tucson City Court
- The Honorable Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff
- The Honorable Steve Leal, Council Member, City of Tucson
- Mike Hein, City Manager, City of Tucson
- Reid Spaulding, Facilities Management Director
- Lisa Royal, Pima County Justice Court Administrator
- Joan Harphant, City of Tucson Court Administrator


Attachment 1



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 27, 2008

To: The Honorable Chairman and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: Joint Justice and Municipal Court Project

The Joint Justice and Municipal Court Project has been the subject of several news media articles related to project development and implementation. The project is located in downtown Tucson on property acquired by the County between Toole on the north, Stone on the west, Alameda on the south, and Grossetta on the east, a total of approximately 4.1 acres. The project expenditures to date have been for land acquisition, utility relocation, archaeological mitigation, and design/engineering through Design Development. These costs total approximately \$30 million. In May of 2004, a bond issue was approved by the voters of Pima County to construct a new Consolidated Municipal and Justice Court at this location. The amount of bonds approved was \$76 million. The total estimated cost to construct the project as now programmed for a structure of 413,000 square feet would be \$157 million, (less parking garage) or \$81 million in excess of remaining revenues (Exclusive of any potential cost sharing between the City of Tucson and the County for shared land acquisition or shared site development cost to date. This cost also includes over \$11 million in anticipated inflation and \$3 million for furnishings.) Questions have arisen as to: A) how did the project cost increase, and B) what alternatives to implementation are available for consideration?

I am attaching a memorandum from the Facilities Management Director dated June 25, 2008, that outlines the historical evolution of this project since originally studied in 1997. At that time the project envisioned an approximate 261,000 square foot building with 29 courtrooms. By the bond proposal of 2004, the project had increased in size to 337,000 square feet, and 38 courtrooms, with a total estimated cost of \$91 million. After bond approval of \$76 million, architectural planning and programming was initiated through a committee process chaired by the then Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, John Leonardo. This process resulted in the programming of a building of approximately 413,000 square feet, with 42 courtrooms. This is an increase in building size from that originally envisioned in the bond issue of 2004 of 23 percent.

In addition, there have been several programmatic costs not originally anticipated in the bonds. These relate primarily to the archaeological mitigation costs. These costs were originally estimated to be in the vicinity of \$500,000. Due to the discovery of historic graveyards dating to the original presidio, a total of approximately 1,100 bodies have been recovered through archaeological excavation for documentation and reburial, and archaeological mitigation costs have increased to approximately \$16 million.

The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Joint Justice and Municipal Court Project
June 27, 2008
Page 2

In addition, since the project was originally estimated in 1997, the cost per square foot for construction has increased from \$160 per square foot to today's estimate of \$242 per square foot, for an increase of 66 percent. The recent reported action in the media was related to the County clearly indicating to the project design team that the programmed facility size of 413,000 square feet could not be afforded and that continued design and engineering efforts for such a facility with no new revenue source would be a waste of resources. Hence, final project design at the size programmed was deferred. That is the only action that has occurred to date.

After final project design for this size of building was suspended, County and City staff were requested to appear before the Mayor and Council Subcommittee for Neighborhood and Public Safety to provide an update on the project. Such occurred on Thursday, June 12. At this meeting the City Court Administrator was requested to report on a number of items and/or matters. The County has received a copy of Council Member Leal's memorandum on this subject to other members of the Mayor and Council Subcommittee. This memorandum is attached. The communication is somewhat confusing. However, I will endeavor to answer the two fundamental issues apparently raised in Council Member Leal's memorandum, and provide a copy of this memorandum and supporting documents to City staff for their use in the Neighborhood and Public Safety Subcommittee meeting.

Relocation of the Pima County Jail to the Downtown

It appears the communication from Council Member Leal suggests relocating the Pima County jail. This matter was discussed by the Bond Advisory Committee in 1996 in preparation for the 1997 Bond Program, and rejected. Presently the size of a facility that would need to be constructed in the downtown to house inmates currently detained in the Pima County Adult Detention Center would be a facility housing at least 3,000 beds. Based on present space allocated to the Consolidated Justice and Municipal Court, it is likely such a facility could not be constructed on the present parcel.

In addition, our experience with a number of downtown jail facilities, including the City and County of Los Angeles, would indicate that the facility would be between 15 and 20 stories, and cost approximately \$500 million to construct, without considering any of the ancillary court supported facilities. The present cost to construct a jail detention facility is approximately \$150,000 per bed.

Adding these court support functions, which go beyond the simple lower courts of Justice and Municipal but also into the felony disposition courts of the Superior Court system, it is likely that to construct additional supporting courts in such a complex would cost at least another \$500 million, and require a land footprint of approximately 20 acres. Today, only 4.1 acres are available. Clearly, relocating the Pima County jail to the downtown as possibly suggested in the memorandum from Council Member Leal is impractical and unreasonable.

Relocation of Courts to the Existing Pima County Jail Site

Another possible interpretation of Council Member Leal's memorandum would be to relocate the courts to the Pima County jail. Unfortunately, the courts in discussion in the 2004 Bond Issue are the lower courts, which are the Municipal and Justice Courts, which deal very little with detained inmates in the Adult Detention Facility, except for preliminary hearings and/or arraignments. This option has been studied previously in the attached report dated February 20, 2007. The possibility of relocating the criminal Superior Courts to the Mission Road Complex surrounding the jail was explored earlier in 2007. This report concludes that the cost of relocating simply the criminal courts and supporting prosecution and defense functions would cost \$166 million (Appendix F of February 20, 2007 report).

It should be noted that this action would not address the function for which the 2004 Bond Issue was authorized, that being the lower courts or Municipal and Justice Courts where a number of civil and lesser criminal matters are adjudicated, as opposed to those criminal offenses for which individuals are retained in our Adult Detention Facilities.

Consolidated Versus Dispersed Courts

Another issue raised by Council Member Leal that the City Court Administrator is to address is the issue of the dispersal of court functions, particularly at the municipal level. Such is an appropriate issue for the City Court Administrator to address. However, for County Justice Courts this matter has been studied previously. It is clear that a consolidated court system is the most practical and most cost-effective to support for local taxpayers. To proliferate, a diverse set of sub-regional courts simply costs substantially more in support services and duplication of effort. While we have no jurisdiction over the form of the City Municipal Court, either consolidated or dispersed, a decision was made some time ago that a consolidated Justice Court is the most cost-effective for our taxpayers and will not be evaluated further.

Options for Co-Located Justice and Municipal Court

Given the current project cost in developing a desired and programmed Joint Municipal and Justice Court System of \$157 million, of which only \$76 million is available, the following options are apparent.

1. Develop the Court System in a phased approach and build only what is possible with the available bond funds of \$46 million. Such will likely require a total overall cost increase. However, the practical reality is recognized regarding the availability of funds.
2. Have the City and County jointly contribute additional capital funds to complete the project as programmed. Such will require an approximate additional capital contribution of \$41,300,000 from the City of Tucson and \$39,700,000 from Pima County based on the square footage of the building used by each jurisdiction.

The Honorable Chairman and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Joint Justice and Municipal Court Project
June 27, 2008
Page 4

3. Ask voters to authorize supplemental bond funding to complete the project as now programmed.
4. The building as designed essentially continues the individual autonomy of City Municipal and County Justice Courts. This autonomy causes a certain amount of space duplication. If co-location, which has been the programmed architectural design objective, is replaced with a functional consolidation model, it is possible the overall size of the building could be reduced and costs reduced proportionately.
5. The City of Tucson, pursuant to apparently a request from the Neighborhood and Public Safety Subcommittee, is discussing the dispersion of their Municipal Courts to various geographic locations throughout the City. Such would obviously reduce the square footage of the consolidated downtown facility and hence reduce overall project implementation costs.

Summary

Clearly, relocating the Pima County jail to downtown Tucson is impractical for a number of reasons:

1. The substantial additional cost;
2. Relocating the criminal courts to the present location of the Pima County jail also is cost prohibitive and would not address any of the space issues associated with the lower courts of the Justice Court or City of Tucson Municipal Court System; and
3. There are insufficient funds to build the combined co-located Pima County Justice Court and Tucson Municipal Court System. Hence, alternatives to this presently unaffordable alternative have been enumerated in this memorandum.

CHH/jj

Attachments

- c: The Honorable Jan Kearney, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
The Honorable John Leonardo, Superior Court Judge
The Honorable Maria Felix, Presiding Judge, Pima County Justice Court
The Honorable Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff
The Honorable Steve Leal, Council Member, City of Tucson
Reid Spaulding, Pima County Facilities Management Director
Lisa Royal, Pima County Justice Courts Administrator
Joan Harphant, City of Tucson Court Administrator

Attachment 2

ATTACHMENT 2



Memorandum

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

DATE: September 18, 2009

TO: Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator

FROM: Reid H. Spaulding, R.A.
Facilities Management Director

SUBJECT: Status Report for Joint City - County Court Complex

Pursuant to your request, the following information outlines the current status of the above referenced project:

Design status:

In March of 2009, the Joint Court Management Team (JCMT) unanimously agreed upon a revised, phaseable concept plan. The agreed upon scheme considered updated demographic information as well as revised caseload and staffing projections consistent with a leveling off in population growth and downturn in the economy. The resulting concept plan allows for a phased site build-out, lowers the initial construction cost, improves site vehicular circulation and captures the aesthetic opportunities afforded by the site.

Subsequent to unanimous JCMT consensus, Pima County then modified our consultant's agreement to consequently proceed into the Design Phase of the revised scheme with emphasis on translating those previously agreed upon design elements, i.e., Courtroom layouts, floor-to-floor stacking relationships, room square footages, into the new conceptual footprint.

The JCMT is next scheduled to meet October 21-23 with subsequent milestone dates established as follows:

Schematic Design complete	Jan.2010
Design Development complete	Sept. 2010
Construction Documents complete	July, 2011
Bidding complete	Feb. 2012
Construction complete	Mar. 2014

Analysis of Existing Bond Funds Spent or committed:

2004 GO Bonds	\$76,000,000
Land Acquisition	(4,784,734)
Abatement, Demolition, & Utility Relocation	(1,631,638)
Archeological Excavation & Reburial	(16,800,000) ¹
Professional Services (A/E, Geotech, CM, Cost Est.)	(6,696,589)
Relocation & Remodel of 8 th Floor Superior Court	(11,500,000) ²
Project Administration	(163,642)
<hr/>	
Balance of 2004 GO Bond Funds Remaining	\$34,423,397

Projected Funding Requirement Based Upon Conceptual Plan Estimate:

Land Acquisition	\$ 4,865,000
Abatement, Demolition & Utility Relocation	1,650,000
Archeological Excavation & Reburial	16,800,000
Professional Services (A/E, Geotech, CM, Cost Est.)	20,500,000
Relocation & Remodel of 8 th Floor Superior Court	11,500,000
Project Administration	1,765,000
Construction Cost	77,000,000
Equipment & Furnishings	2,000,000
Contingency	11,500,000
<hr/>	
Projected Funding Requirement	\$147,580,000
(Less Current Project Funding)	\$ 76,000,000
<hr/>	
Projected Shortfall:	\$ 71,580,000

It is my understanding that the options with regard to construction funding remain the same – additional bond allocation from a future authorization, Federal stimulus funding, court imposed fee filing revenues, or a combination thereof. At this time, it is our intent to move forward through the complete design and documentation phase. This approach will position the project as ready-for-bid should any of the previously referenced funding mechanisms result.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

1 Projected through final re-burial @ All Faiths Cemetery
2 Transfer of funds pending final approval by PC Board of Supervisors
C:\Documents and Settings\mkwiatkowski\Local Settings\Temporary Internet
Files\Content.Outlook\7FL3KCQ9\091809_chh_StatusReportJointCityCountyCourtComplex_rs.doc

**ATTACHMENT 3
PROJECT TABLES**

Dept	ID	Table 1 - Open Space, Historic & Cultural Conservation Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendations	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
OS	1	Davis Monthan Approach Corridor Open Space Acquisitions	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000
OS	2	Habitat Protection Priorities & Associated Lands	213,750,000	70,000,000	80,000,000
OS	3	Community Open Space and Archaeological Site Acquisition	71,250,000	20,000,000	10,000,000
FC	2	Floodprone and Riparian Land Acquisition	-	10,000,000	5,000,000
PR	80	Canoa Ranch Historic Rehab & Master Plan (Parks and CR project)	14,900,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
HP	101	Ajo Historic District Churches Façade/Roof Repairs	300,000	300,000	-
HP	102	Anza National Historic Trail	2,000,000	2,000,000	-
HP	103	Archaeological Site Acquisitions (moved to Open Space)	15,000,000	-	-
HP	104	Canoa Ranch Historic Rehab (partially funded in PR80)	5,000,000	-	-
HP	105	Empirita Upper Ranch Buildings Rehabilitation	2,000,000	1,000,000	-
HP	106	Historic Pima County School Houses	300,000	300,000	-
HP	107	OS Repair and Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings	2,000,000	1,000,000	-
HP	108	Site Interpretation/Preservation	2,400,000	2,000,000	-
HP	109	Vail Area Historic Sites	500,000	500,000	-
HP	110	Honey Bee Village Archaeological Preserve	250,000	-	300,000
HP	111	Steam Pump Ranch Rehabilitation	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
HP	112	Marana Church Rehabilitation	350,000	-	-
HP	115	Historic Ft. Lowell Park - Master Plan Implementation	5,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000
HP	122	University Indian Ruin/House Rehab	1,000,000	-	-
HP	123	Palo Alto Ranch House & School Rehab	500,000	-	-
HP	124	*City of Tucson Dunbar School and Performing Arts Center Rehab	3,500,000	2,500,000	Split Projects
HP	127	**Other COT Recommended Projects (sub com. recomm. lump sum)	11,400,000	-	-
Newly Added					
HP	124	Historic Pima County Churches (\$650,000)	-	-	-
HP	125	Ajo Curley School Gyn & Town Plaza	-	-	1,300,000
HP	126	Dunbar School Rehabilitation	-	Split	1,500,000
HP	128	Performing Arts Center Rehabilitation	-	Split	1,000,000
Total			\$363,400,000	\$130,600,000	\$116,100,000

Color Coding:

	Changes in Recommendation
	Newly Added Projects

* HP124 City of Tucson Dunbar School and Performing Arts Center Rehab is now:

HP 126 Dunbar School Rehabilitation

HP 128 Performing Arts Center Rehabilitation

** HP127 Other COT Recommended Projects - Subsommittee recommended \$11.4 million, not \$6.5 million.

Dept	ID	Table 2 - Public Health, Libraries & Community Facilities Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendations	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
FM	1	One Stop Career Center	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
FM	6	Las Artes Dust Control and Fire Suppression System	500,000	-	-
FM	8	Arizona Sonora Desert Museum - Education Facility Phase III	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
FM	9	Green Valley Government Center Master Plan Implementation	8,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000
FM	11	Pima County Community College Healthcare Campus	45,000,000	45,000,000	40,000,000
FM	18	Replacement of County's Financial Management Systems	15,000,000	5,000,000	-
FM	34	LSB - Asbestos Abatement and Fire Sprinklers	8,197,000	4,000,000	2,000,000
FM	35	West Valencia Branch Library	6,225,000	-	-
FM	39	North Marana Library & Multi-Generational Community Center	29,400,000	-	-
FM	45	Sahuarita Branch Library	6,675,000	6,675,000	6,675,000
FM	48.2	Joyner-Green Valley Library Renovation and HVAC	1,660,000	1,660,000	1,660,000
FM	49	Columbus Library Expansion and Remodeling	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
FM	51	Flowing Wells Library	2,910,000	2,910,000	2,910,000
FM	54	Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) Improvements	15,000,000	15,000,000	22,000,000
FM	62	New Facility for Fleet Services Department	8,660,000	-	-
FM	65	Titan Museum	1,200,000	-	-
FM	72	New Pima County Nursing Home and add Adult Day Care	68,800,000	-	-
FM	73	Pima Motorsports Park	280,000	-	-
FM	74	Southern Arizona Kart Club	600,000	-	-
FM	77	Fairgrounds Infrastructure Improvements	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
FM	79	Colossal Cave Mountain Park	535,000	-	-
FM	82	Multi-Jurisdictional Emergency Operations Center and 311 Center	12,000,000	6,000,000	-
FM	84	Marana Health Center Expansion	4,000,000	-	3,000,000
FM	86	Kino Sports Complex North Side Maintenance Facility	550,000	-	-
FM	87	Kino Teen Center Service Coordination and Expansion	775,000	-	-
FM	88	Amado Food Bank/Community Building Expansion	550,000	-	-
FM	92	Ajo Country Club and Golf Course	370,000	370,000	-
FM	96	Art of the American West - Tucson Art Museum	10,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
FM	97	Theresa Lee and Tuberculosis Clinic Relocation	7,792,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
FM	98	Primary and Specialty Physician Care Site Expansion	45,000,000	10,000,000	-
FM	101	Remodel and Expand Emergency Dept UPH at Kino	15,000,000	-	-
FM	102	Picture Rocks Community Center Expansion	1,600,000	1,600,000	-
FM	103	Catalina Community Services Building	750,000	750,000	-
FM	104	Catholic Comm Services - Sahuarita-Green Valley Clinic	700,000	700,000	700,000

Dept	ID	Table 2 - Public Health, Libraries & Community Facilities Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendations	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
FM	105	Catholic Comm Services - Vail Area Clinic	700,000	700,000	700,000
FM	106	Catholic Comm Services - Quincy Douglas Center	700,000	700,000	700,000
FM	107	Tucson Children's Museum	6,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
FM	108	East Side Government/Comm. Ctr: Library, Pool, Park, Sheriff	21,800,000	10,000,000	-
FM	109	Pima Air and Space Museum - Cold War Hangar	-	4,000,000	4,000,000
FM	110	Elections Equipment	-	5,000,000	5,000,000
FM	111	Elections Building	-	5,000,000	-
PR	75	Green Valley Performing Arts/Learning Center III	16,397,570	5,000,000	16,000,000
PR	106	New Tucson Girl's and Boy's Chorus Building	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
PR	235	Freedom Park Adult Learning Center	3,600,000	3,600,000	4,000,000
CD	1	Affordable Housing Program	30,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000
CD	2	Neighborhood Reinvestment Program	30,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
CD	3	Pima County Comprehensive Housing Center	1,350,000	-	-
CD	4	Affordable Housing (Marana Request)	1,250,000	-	-
CD	5	Neighborhood Housing Stock Retention Fund (Marana Request)	750,000	-	-
CD	7	Affordable Housing Land Acquisition (S. Tucson)	5,000,000	-	-
CD	8	Targeted Neighborhood Reinvestment (S. Tucson)	1,000,000	-	-
CD	9	Targeted Neighborhood Reinvestment (Marana Request)	750,000	-	-
SW	1	Tangerine Landfill Closure	6,000,000	5,000,000	-
SW	2	Ina Road Landfill Development	6,000,000	-	-
SW	3	Sahuarita Landfill Development	4,800,000	-	-
SW	5	Ajo Landfill Development	500,000	500,000	-
TR	1	Transportation Safety Program	50,000,000	-	-
		Total	\$517,676,570	\$185,015,000	\$158,195,000

Color Coding:

 Changes in Recommendation

Dept	ID	Table 3 - Public Safety & Justice Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendations	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
FM	15.3	Superior Court 8th Floor Tenant Improvement (Alternative 3)	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$12,000,000
FM	53	Northwest Regional Justice Center	20,700,000	10,000,000	-
FM	95	Pima County Remanded Juvenile Detention Facility	28,900,000	-	-
FM	99	Drexel Heights Sheriff's Sub-Station	1,775,000	-	-
FM	112	Joint Municipal and Justice Courts Facility	-	80,000,000	40,000,000
		Total	\$59,375,000	\$98,000,000	\$52,000,000

Color Coding:



Changes in Recommendation

Dept	ID	Table 6 - Parks and Recreation Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendation	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
PR	4	Udall Park Expansion	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
PR	5	Jacobs Park Recreation Center	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
PR	6	Reid Park Zoo	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
PR	11	Clements Senior Center Expansion	2,500,000	-	-
PR	13	Southeast Regional Park (Esmond Station Regional Park)	2,350,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
PR	18	El Pueblo Center Improvements	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
PR	19	Freedom Center Expansion	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
PR	20	Reid Park Improvements	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
PR	28	Lincoln Park Improvements	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
PR	29	Purple Heart Park Expansion	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
PR	34	Trails, Urban Pathways and Riverparks (City of Tucson)	4,000,000	-	-
PR	35	Sports Fields (City of Tucson)	4,000,000	-	replaced by PR279
PR	37	Amphi Middle School Community Park Development	870,000	-	-
PR	38	Partnership Projects	5,950,000	-	-
PR	41	Cherry Avenue Center Expansion	1,000,000	-	-
PR	42	Quincie Douglas Center Expansion	1,000,000	-	-
PR	44	Oury Recreation Center Improvements	900,000	-	-
PR	46	Kennedy Park Improvements and Expansion	800,000	-	-
PR	47	Reid Park Soccer Field Replacement	750,000	-	-
PR	51	McCormick Park Improvements	500,000	-	-
PR	52	La Madera Park Improvements	500,000	-	-
PR	71	Urban Fringe Parks and Land Acquisition	8,000,000	-	-
PR	77	Shooting Sports Program Site Improvements	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
PR	79	Southgate South 6th Avenue Park Development & Land Acq	12,300,000	-	-
PR	83	Sports Fields & Security	5,473,000	5,473,000	-
PR	84	Environmental Compliance	5,000,000	-	-
PR	86	Lawrence Community Center and Swimming Pool	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
PR	87	Park Facilities Renewal and Improvements	4,000,000	-	-
PR	88	Park ADA Compliance Upgrades	4,000,000	2,000,000	-
PR	93	Yaqui Park Community Center	2,000,000	2,350,000	2,350,000
PR	95	Flowing Wells and Kino Swimming Pool Renovations	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
PR	96	Model Airplane Parks	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
PR	97	Avra Valley Watchable Wildlife Site	750,000	-	750,000
PR	99	County Ranch Improvements	620,000	-	-
PR	103	Rillito Racetrack - Conversion	12,250,000	14,000,000	14,000,000

Dept	ID	Table 6 - Parks and Recreation Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendation	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
PR	109	Curtis Park Skateboard Park and Improvements	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
PR	110	George Mehl Family Foothills Park	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
PR	115	Ted Walker Park Sporting Dog Training Site	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
PR	116	Lawrence Park Improvements	1,250,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
PR	119	CDO River Park Corridor Acquisitions	2,600,000	-	-
PR	122	Rillito River Park Corridor Acquisitions	900,000	-	-
PR	124	Tanque Verde River Park Corridor Acquisitions	1,000,000	-	-
PR	128	Pantano River Park Corridor Acquisitions	4,300,000	-	-
PR	130	Santa Cruz River Park Corridor Acquisitions	600,000	-	-
PR	137	BAJA Seniors Sports Complex	5,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
PR	138	Benson Highway Park Development & Land Acquisition	5,326,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
PR	140	Ajo Detention Basin Park	2,200,000	2,200,000	-
PR	141	Robles Community Park	1,630,000	1,630,000	1,630,000
PR	142	Rillito River Park Safety and Maintenance Enhancements	15,000,000	-	included in PR278
PR	144	Rillito River Park - I-10 to La Cholla	3,000,000	-	-
PR	147	Rillito River Park - La Cholla to Oracle Road	2,000,000	-	-
PR	151	Robles Pass Trails Park Staging Area	750,000	-	-
PR	152	Arizona Trail – Sahuarita Road Trailhead	700,000	-	-
PR	153	Chalk Mine Trailhead-Public Access for Tortolita Mtn Park –	750,000	-	-
PR	154	Arizona Trail – Pistol Hill Road Trailhead	475,000	-	-
PR	157	Sweetwater Preserve Trailhead	400,000	-	-
PR	165	Tucson Mountain Park – King Canyon Trailhead	300,000	-	-
PR	181	Sahuarita Pool and Recreation Complex /YMCA	12,652,000	8,000,000	6,000,000
PR	185	Coronado Middle School Athletic Fields Upgrades	2,850,000	2,850,000	2,850,000
PR	188	Flowing Wells High School	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
PR	189	Flowing Wells Junior High	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
PR	196	Hohokam Middle School	1,750,000	-	-
PR	201	Oury Pool Renovations	620,000	-	-
PR	210	Bureau of Reclamation Sports Park	17,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
PR	217	James D. Kriegh Park Upgrades	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
PR	219	Hardy road/Overton Road Property Acquisition	6,000,000	-	-
PR	220	Adaptive Recreation Center Expansion	12,000,000	-	-
PR	225	El Casino Park	850,000	-	-
PR	226	JVYC/Ochoa Gym	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
PR	228	Lawrence Hiaki Pathway	500,000	-	-

Dept	ID	Table 6 - Parks and Recreation Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendation	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
PR	231	Arizona Velodrome Center	5,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
PR	234	Arivaca Junction Land Acquisition for Future Civic Needs	175,000	-	-
PR	237	Flowing Wells District Park Expansion	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
PR	239	Corona Foothills School & Sycamore School Sports Fields In	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
PR	246	Old Vail Middle School Sports Fields Improvements	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
PR	255	Land and Open Space Acquisition	6,000,000	-	-
PR	256	Park Facility Revitalization & Safety Enhancements (COT)	6,975,000	-	-
PR	259	Tortolita Middle School	2,850,000	-	-
PR	262	Altar Valley Watershed Restoration Project	3,500,000	-	-
PR	264	Hohokam Community Sports Fields and Hohokam Park	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
PR	266	PC Southeast Regional Park (Fairgrounds) - Horse Racing F	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
PR	267	Sentinel Park - A Mountain Park Improvement Project	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
PR	268	Sonoran Desert Park	17,000,000	-	-
PR	270	Ormsby Park Expansion and Trail Connectivity	3,500,000	-	-
PR	273	Pima County Northwest BMX - Concrete Bowl Bike Park	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
PR	274	Indoor Sports Complex Curtis Park - formally Kino Regional	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
PR	276	Pima County Ice Skating Arena	4,800,000	-	-
PR	277	Pima County Softball Tournament and Recreation Park	10,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000
PR	278	River Park Acquisitions and Development Countywide	-	4,000,000	15,000,000
PR	279	Sports Fields Countywide	-	4,000,000	15,000,000
FC	7	Canoa Ranch Ecosystem Restoration/Groundwater Replenis	1,000,000	-	-
FC	12	Big Wash Linear Park and CDO Wash Linear Park	7,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
		Total	\$324,166,000	\$154,753,000	\$162,830,000

Color Coding:

- Changes in Recommendation
- Deleted Projects

Table 4 - Flood Control & Water Conservation					
Dept	ID	Recommended Projects	Sub Committee Recommendations	County Admin November 2008	County Admin October 2009
FC	10	Twin Peaks Drainage (Marana Request)	\$1,000,000	\$ -	*
FC	14	South Tucson: S 7th Ave (28th to 29th St)	2,500,000	-	-
FC	17	Pascua Yaqui Stormwater Improvements	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
FC	42	Green Valley Drainageways #3, 6, 9, 13, and 17	3,000,000	-	-
FC	43	Black Wash Detention Basin	6,000,000	-	*
FC	44	Reclaimed Water to Protect Cienega Creek	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
FC	46	Reclaimed Water for Canoa Ranch	3,000,000	1,000,000	*
FC	50	Columbus Wash	10,700,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
FC	52	Canada del Oro Wash Floodplain and Open Space Acquisition	5,000,000	-	-
FC	53	Chalk Wash in Oro Valley	1,000,000	-	-
FC	56	Neighborhood / Access Drainage Improvements	10,000,000	5,000,000	-
FC	57	Pantano Wash: Speedway to Tanque Verde Rd., Rillito to Tanque Verde Rd.	12,950,000	10,000,000	*
FC	58	Santa Cruz River: Rillito and CDO Confluence	15,000,000	-	5,000,000
PR	176	Reclaimed Waterline Extensions	9,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
		Total	\$89,150,000	\$34,000,000	\$23,000,000

Color Coding:

- Changes in Recommendation
- * Deleted Projects
- FC10 Twin Peaks Drainage (Marana Request)
- FC43
- FC46
- FC57