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CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. We're going to call the meeting to order. We do have some more chairs coming. It might thin out a little bit as we start the session. So let's start with the pledge.

Cody?
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Michele, will you call the roll.

MS. BETTINI: Jannie Cox?
MS. COX: Here.
MS. BETTINI: Chris Sheafe?
TREASURER SHEAFE: Here.
MS. BETTINI: Fletcher McCusker?
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Here.
MS. BETTINI: Mark Irvin?
SECRETARY IRVIN: Here.
MS. BETTINI: Jeff Hill?
MR. HILL: Here.
MS. BETTINI: Cody Ritchie?
MR. RITCHIE: Here.
MS. BETTINI: And Alberto is on his way.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And Mr. Moore, we think is on his way. We haven't heard otherwise. But we have a quorum, so we'll get started.

You've all seen the transcript from the October 1st meeting. Any comments, questions, changes?

If not, we need a motion to approve it.
SECRETARY IRVIN: So moved.
TREASURER SHEAFE: So moved.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye -- wait a minute. I got two motions, not a second.

SECRETARY IRVIN: I'm happy to be second. TREASURER SHEAFE: It was your motion, my second. CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. So all in favor, say aye.
(Ayes.)
(Mr. Moore entered the proceedings.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We just approved the minutes, Alberto. You haven't missed a thing.

Thank you for coming. This is a new format for us, I think the first time we've done a study session. The hope is that we will be a little bit more communicative and interactive, particularly with the presenters.

This is an open meeting. And by law, everything we say and do will be transcribed. If we take any action, Members, it will require a motion, second, and majority vote.

So even though it's designed as a study session, we can still take Board action on any of the items we've so
indicated in the agenda.
We're going to provide our presenters to come sit with us, conference style. And then we'll be able to listen to your presentation and ask questions and opt to take action or not.

So first up's the Rialto Theatre. Do you want to come up and have a seat? Come on down.

TREASURER SHEAFE: You guys all come down.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And before you start, if you will introduce yourself and title. And make sure that our transcriptionist gets it correctly since he's -- backs will be to you.

MR. PARKER: I'm Hubert Parker, I'm president of the Rialto Theatre Foundation.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: The mics are fine. You don't need to reach to them.

MR. McCRARY: Curtis McCrary. I'm the executive director of the Rialto Theatre Foundation.

MR. VOLPE: Kip Volpe, treasurer of the Rialto Theatre Foundation.

MR. McGRATH: Good morning. Michael McGrath, counsel for the Rialto Theatre.

MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Justin Martinez, commercial lender at National Bank of Arizona and the Foundation's banker.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Thank you. So we do have an advance proposal. Do you want to walk us through that? I think you have kind of an update to give us. You know, last meeting, we heard the presentation. We had a couple of questions.

So if you want to just pick up, maybe, where you left off?

MR. PARKER: Well, I would like to -- you have our proposal, and I would like to give just a few minutes -CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And are there copies, Michele, for the audience?

MS. BETTINI: No.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Since there are none in the room, go ahead and walk through it so the public can follow it.

MR. PARKER: I'll just -- I'll read you our proposal.

On the 10th anniversary of the party's lease and IGA, the Rialto Theatre Foundation, called the Foundation, proposes to the Board of the Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facilities District, Rio Nuevo, that the Foundation, along with Rio Nuevo, jointly explore the possibility of a purchase by the Foundation of the historic Rialto Theatre, known as the Theatre.

And this goes -- a little bit background. In 2004

1 with financing from Rio Nuevo, the Foundation undertook the rehabilitation of Tucson's long-neglected and sorely underutilized Rialto Theatre. Rio Nuevo modernized the Theatre's air-conditioning system while the Foundation was equipping the Theatre with state-of-the-art sound and lighting equipment.

Today, under the Foundation's stewardship, the Theatre has been restored to a fully functional, appropriately comfortable venue attracting musical tours, as well as local and out-of-town patrons to our resurgent Downtown.

More importantly, with critical funding from Rio Nuevo, the Foundation has implemented programming at what is now a nationally acclaimed music venue. Rio Nuevo's sponsorship of the Theatre is an unqualified demonstration for Rio Nuevo's performance in driving economic development in Downtown Tucson.

With the unveiling of the $R$ Bar during the summer of 2014, the Foundation has developed an additional source of income and attraction to the Herbert Alley area which furthers our joint mission of increased programming and traffic for business in the Downtown redevelopment district.

In the last year, the Rialto's hosted more than 200 nights of entertainment in the Theatre, as well as other venues like the Fox and the TCC. The Theatre consistently

1 ranks among the top 60 venues of its kind worldwide.

The lease provides that the District can, at any time, deed the Theatre to the Foundation. Alternatively, the Foundation has the option to purchase the Theatre at the end of the lease with the price reduced to zero after 40 years of lease payments.

A sale of the Theatre to the Foundation would be a signature accomplishment for before both parties. Ownership of the Theatre will be vested in a private, not-for-profit entity. Rio Nuevo will have completed redevelopment of an historic asset, fulfilling it's mandate to revitalize Downtown Tucson. The Theatre asset will thus be monetized, allowing Rio Nuevo to redeploy the funds toward other priorities.

Our proposal, the Rialto will secure third-party financing for a purchase. The amount that can be borrowed for such a purchase is not known at this time. But the Foundation is regarded as credit worthy by its bank, National Bank of Arizona.

Should Rio Nuevo have an interest in this option, we suggest it be undertaken as a joint exploration of the financing possibilities. While the parties explore the feasibility of a purchase, the Foundation requests a continuation of the existing monthly rent amount of $\$ 3,690$. And if you'd like, I'd like to walk through a
little information.
You know, I think it's important we talk about where we've been, where we are, and where we're going. And all of this leads directly into the Rialto Theatre's economic impact on Downtown Tucson's vitalization.

No. 1, I want to discuss where we've been, what we've overcome, and the results of our efforts.

Since the first amendment to the IGA, we've restructured our management team. We've expanded our board to emphasize fundraising. We've established a strong banking relationship with a line of credit. All this was accomplished during probably the worst economic conditions of our lifetime.

Oh, by the way, in case my memory serves me, there was a little construction going on at the time.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Downtown?
MR. PARKER: Downtown. Yeah. I've been accused of --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Read something about that.
MR. PARKER: You did?
You know, accomplishing all of this allowed us to focus directly on our mission which is bringing quality entertainment to the Tucson community and more patrons to Downtown.

Since the first amendment to the IGA, we've

1 increased the number of shows by 50 percent, to 210 this

The last four years, the Rialto Theatre has brought over 382,000 people to Downtown Tucson. This translates into an economic impact of over 13 and a half million dollars being the spent in Downtown Tucson.

We increased our revenue from just over 2 million to almost 3 million. Our highest ever -- 3 and a half million. Sorry.

So where are we now? We consistently rank in the top 60 of Pollstar's top 100 club venues worldwide. And every year since 2004, with the help of Rio Nuevo, we have been voted Tucson's best place to see a show by the Tucson Weekly.

This increase in the number of shows has also led to an increase in Rialto's employees. Currently, we employ, both full and part time, around hundred pleas. What does this do? People live close to where they work, and they spend their entertainment dollars close to where they live.

So where are we going?
Our vision. In 2020, the Rialto Theatre will be 100 years old. We want to be a destination venue, a tourist attraction for Tucson.

We have goals. We have a five-year plan leading up to our 100-year anniversary.

We want to be self-contained. And let me explain a little bit about what that means. Currently, we rent the building behind the Rialto for our office and our green room. We would like to build out a green room below the stage area -- below the stage in the Rialto. Also, we want to build a modular office off stage side. All of these are doable.

What that would do? That would eliminate the need for us to rent the building saving us around $\$ 3,600$ a month.

And we want to capture our share of the growing but underappreciated concert music venue tourism. We are working on that, and we will stay ahead of the curve. And that will dovetail perfectly with our 100-year anniversary celebration.

So I'd like to just -- if I can paraphrase a little of the work of Richard Florida, which, our success helps bring in the creative class. That in turn helps Tucson attract businesses and entrepreneurs leaving a lasting legacy for Rio Nuevo and the Rialto Theatre.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Questions for the group?
MR. PARKER: And if you have questions on our finances, we have Justin Martinez with --

MR. RITCHIE: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Go ahead.

MR. RITCHIE: A comment. I think you guys are the true success story of Downtown. I -- I -- I'm here 220 nights a year. I drive by there, and I see that marquee sign. I've been to concerts there myself.

I think the board's fantastic. I think that you guys cast a wide net, you know, shows for the 18-year-olds and the shows for the 70-year-olds. I think it's fantastic. I think our whole goal and mission has been to get people Downtown and fill up the restaurants.

And I want to thank you personally. Because I have some experience from the guys who started before you, Curtis and with Jeb and Paul. And those guys worked really hard and you guys just took the torch. And it's just an unmitigated success story.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Jannie.
MS. COX: And I would like to echo what Cody had to say. And I met with Hubert the other day to learn more. And I'm really impressed with what you've accomplished.

And I can't tell you how many Monday nights I drive into Downtown at 4:30 in the afternoon and the line is around the corner to get into the Rialto on Monday nights. And I know that's not the only place they're spending their money.

So I really commend you for what you're doing,

1 what you aspire to do. I have the same question that I -- maybe Curtis could address, or anyone, that I asked Hubert the other day, is, to my knowledge, there are very few music venues such as your own across the country who are able to survive without subsidy. And if one or two of you could speak to that, I would really be interested.

MR. McCRARY: Well, I can address that. We're unique in the sense that there's not a venue like ours that's a nonprofit that does the kinds of things that we do. Typically, our type of venue is something along the lines of a House of Blues which is owned by Live Nation, the largest concert promoter in the world or, you know, the similar club venues of that -- of our size. And that seems to be sort of the sweet spot between 1,000 and 2,000 capacity.

And as opposed to a beautiful venue, like the Fox, which is more akin to a performing arts center and does the performing arts center style programming, which is a sort of different system than when we operate under.

But what I can say about that is that the -the -- in my opinion, the live music business is very robust. And there's been lots of disruption in the rest of the music business in general. We talk about recorded product and downloading music and how music essentially is free now as far as recorded music is concerned. But we aren't seen anything like that in the live music business.

People want the authentic experience of being there in person to see their favorite artist perform. And, if anything, we've seen the opposite of -- of -- I mean, we -- you know, we struggled quite a bit, as you all are well aware, in recent years. But over the last two and a half years, with the rebound of the economy, the headwinds turned into tailwinds, essentially.

And the basic model of live music as a -- or live entertainment as a viable going concern $I$ think is fully in tact and will be into the future because it's something that cannot be artificially reproduced. It's the only way that you can have that experience, is by going to venues like ours where the artists appear in person.

And so, having weathered the headwinds, I feel like going forward that we have a bright future and, in general, the business itself is very strong.

MS. COX: And are you aware of other venues -- I'm sure you have communication with others --

MR. McCRARY: Sure, yes.
MS. COX: -- in your field. And are they thriving as well? Do they have the same tailwind that you do?

MR. McCRARY: Yes. That's my general sense with discussions that $I$ have with colleagues. You know, we -there's a lot of note comparing that we do with some of the venues. I talk to people at, for example, Cain's Ballroom
in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Coach House, I'm a friend of the programmer there.

There's the Hard Rock Cafe on the strip in Las Vegas. And they're an interesting entity because there's so much competition and they recently opened up a venue in Las Vegas called the Brooklyn Bowl Las Vegas and -- with a really, really aggressive attention to live music. And it seems clear that what they're trying to do is attract tourism, musical tourism.

People in -- people go to Las Vegas for, you know, the big Vegas style shows. And live music has kind of traditionally been an afterthought. And now with the opening -- and I encourage you to check it out because it's actually a really cool venue. It's a bowling alley with a great restaurant, but it's a 2,000 capacity concert venue. So you can bowl and see a show at the same time.

MS. COX: No, thanks.
MR. McCRARY: But -- but, you know, I mean, it's like chocolate and peanut butter in my opinion.

But anyway, to me that's an example of the faith in live music. I mean, they're -- they're -- you know, we'll have the same acts at the Rialto, but they'll be programming them for two nights or four shows. They'll do -- they'll do four shows consecutive. And it seems to me that their goal is to attract tourism based on live music.

And as a matter of fact, I'm going there in November to see a band called Tame Impala from Australia with a friend of mine. And bands from out of the -- you know, we'd love to get them at the Rialto, but they have limited visas for when they can be here. So usually they skip over smaller markets.

So it's generally my sense, in talking with colleagues and colleagues at the Echo and the Echoplex in Los Angeles, colleagues in Seattle, San Francisco, that basically everywhere, the live music business, especially at our level, is thriving.

MS. COX: Thank you.
MR. MCCRARY: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mark?
SECRETARY IRVIN: So, Curtis, first, I just want to say thank you for your efforts over the last four-and-a-half-plus years that I've had the chance to work with you.

You know, I was asked to kind of be the liaison with the Board with the Foundation. I think you guys have done a really, really good job.

I support the proposal. I think it's a smart move for us to take and repurpose that money. I don't think we need to be in an ownership position. I'd love to see you guys on the pathway to success. And $I$ just really

1 appreciate what you guys have done from before you started, where you're going. Now you have a lot of other challenges.

And I think back to four and a half years ago when we had to put on some boxing gloves, and that wasn't a lot of fun. So I think it's nice to see what you guys have done, the way that you have built your board.

And really just, every time I turn around, I'm reading another really good article about how you guys are positioned, not just in our community, but nationally. I think you've done a super job. And I'd love to take the money and repurpose it and set you guys to the path of success.

So I appreciate, also, you taking the time to educate the Board individually on what you guys are trying to do because I'm not able do that for you except in open session. So I think it's great that you had a chance to reach out and explain to people, you know, kind of what you guys are all about and really educate those people that don't know a lot about you.

Just a question for Justin. So you know, we haven't gotten to price; we haven't gotten to those kinds of things. Walk us through, kind of in your mind, what the process would be for you guys to step up and make a solid commitment and what those timetables would be.

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, yeah. That's why I thought

1 it was important that $I$ come down here and David Lyons as well.

But you know, we've had the opportunity to do some credit with Rialto over the past couple of years. I've seen them go through the construction period. I've seen the trends. We find them creditworthy and bankable.

As far as arriving at, you know, purchase price, which is the first step and for us then backing into a commitment, in my opinion, it would make sense for Rio Nuevo Board to probably order an independent appraisal as a first step. It's probably -- that's just my opinion.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Is that going violate any of your regulatory requirements? I mean, you're not going to be able to take an appraisal that we order and do anything with it. Seems like that's a process that you as a bank should handle, not us as a Board.

MR. MARTINEZ: And we also -- well -- yeah. We also have to order our own appraisal before we can do the commitment. But the first step is for you guys to negotiate a purchase price. And that's not for me to do.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And in that regard, it seems like it would make sense for the bank to appraise it and, then, we operate off of that value. I guess if we had any questions about the independence of that appraisal, we might order our own appraisal for comparative purposes.

But let's talk about the economics for a moment, as $I$ understand it. If you just continued to lease this theater, you will own it in 40 years.

MR. PARKER: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So it's not a matter of if you're going to own it, it's a matter of when you're going to own it.

And if you purchase it early, we get the present day value of that money. And then we can do something else with that money. So all we're really talking about is accelerating the option to purchase.

And then the question would be, and to your point, is how do you determine the value?

So I guess the first question for us, is there anybody on the Board that would not want to sell the Rialto to the foundation?

SECRETARY IRVIN: One other question I might also have is -- Curtis, you talked about this as well -- there are some things that need to occur there, you know, repositioning out of the green room, trying to bring as much as you can back to the theater so that you're not renting space and spending, you know, $3-$ or $\$ 4,000$ doing that.

So obviously, I'm assuming, that when you go to the bank and you talk about money, it's not just a purchase price but probably there's some monies that you need to have

1 allocated to doing the repurposing of some other spaces in there to utilize for a green room and back office and that kind of stuff.

So am I correct in, when you guys looking at that, that you're thinking about those improvement, as well, going forward?

MR. PARKER: We would look at that. That would be one of the options. We would certainly consider all of them. There's a -- we can do a capital campaign while we stay renting the office space we have. So have a lot of options. We certainly want to explore everything that we can.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any other questions for the Foundation?

What's you're pleasure, Mr. Hill?
MR. HILL: Obviously, the value's important to determine the asset. But also, I was curious as to if there is any way of knowing how much money Rio Nuevo has actually invested in the theater as a figure for us to weigh against what we settle for and covering our losses for breaking even.

As I remember, the rent schedule, you mentioned doesn't it ratchet up in steps?

MR. PARKER: Yes, it does.
MR. HILL: And that type of thing? I think those

1 are pertinent to the discussion.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Do you know today, here an know, what the Rio Nuevo investment to date is?

MR. McCRARY: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Go ahead.
MR. McCRARY: It's 2.2 million. And that's 1.5 million for the purchase price, several hundred thousand that was provided in matching funds for the renovation that we did. And then I don't know exactly how that parcels out. And then, $I$ think about 300,000 for air-conditioning in 2006. And so all those things collectively add up to 2.2 million.

The strike price, according to the IGA, the original IGA, is just reduced over the next 40 years -CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: To zero. MR. McCRARY: -- by -- yeah -- by $\$ 4,300$ a month. And all that is, is 2.2 million divided by 480.

And then as far as the rent escalation, that's something that we had sort of had preliminary discussions. We knew that it was coming to where it was going to change to where it was 3 percent of our gross revenues. And there was some things that were excluded and things that were included in that. From -- from what is, actually, a gross -- there'd have to be an adjusted gross number to make that determination.

What we would -- what we would point out is that there's no guarantee -- the -- the IGA calls for the greater of 3690 or 3 percent of our revenues. But $I$ guess the idea that -- is there that there's -- there's inherent risk in that circumstance.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: But all that's moot if we opt to sell.

MR. McCRARY: That's true. All of that -- all of that is irrelevant.

MR. RITCHIE: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Go ahead.
MR. RITCHIE: Can I make the motion to honor the request to keep the rent at 3690 while we explore all these other options?

MS. COX: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. So we have a motion and a second to stand still on the rent. I guess we can deal with that first.

All in favor say aye.
(Ayes.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed, nay. (The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. So the big question then is, how do you want to proceed on determining the
value?
So we need a motion to proceed on that course. And we can either order our own appraisal, or we could wait and see the bank's appraisal.

MR. McGRATH: Mr. Chairman, the Rialto is prepared to underwrite the expense if the bank does the appraisal if that's of assistance to the District.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yeah. I think the question to for is, do we view that as independent enough to arrive at a fair value; or would we want to see two appraisals, ours and theirs.

Go ahead.
TREASURER SHEAFE: In trying to look at this from your perspective, are we talking abut a net present value discounted to present value dollars kind of a . . .

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: No. You're talking about a hard asset appraisal and negotiated sale.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Well --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We can look at the present day value of the lease. But that's not what they're proposing.

MR. VOLPE: Well, I -- excuse me. We -- we would look at -- I think any appraisal is going to look at two -they're going to look at the income stream and the value of the real estate measurement. And then you've arrived.

As you may understand, this is a limited-use

1 property. You may have a higher value based on the net present value of the base payments.

In -- back in 2000-and-whatever, when you originally purchased it for a million-five, $I$ think that it didn't have the tentacles it has now. I mean, it's not going to be the expansion of the cadence. You know, this is going to remain a theater. It's a historical designation. So I think that an appraiser will tell you that the most valid value probably is a net present value with your lease payments. So -- but I'll leave that up to them. Usually they do both, and then they decide on number.

SECRETARY IRVIN: They're going to have a hard time -- I agree. They'll look at both of those. And they'll have a hard time finding comparable sales and data. MR. VOLPE: Exactly. SECRETARY IRVIN: So I think they're going to look at those two methods (sound interference -- coughing) to value that.

You know, it would seem to me -- and I, you know, don't want to jump in your stuff, Justin, because I know your stuff has to be independent. Typically, you go to these guys and say, we've got 3 appraisers, A, B, C. This guy's a dollar, this guy -- you know, so they don't know who the people are. They just pick them.

So I'm not sure what sort of issues -- and, Dave,

1 maybe you want to chime in on this -- that you guys have with that. I do agree with Fletcher, that I think we almost have to kind of get two snapshots of value. And then, you know, have maybe you guys do one independently, we do one independently, and then we kind of get together and compare notes and maybe have the appraisers get together as well.

I mean, I think it's an open and transparent way to do it. And then ultimately, you guys can decide if the two appraisers we've got are enough.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Why don't we do that? Why don't we -- we'll order an appraisal; let them order an appraisal; and, you know, we'll sit down and compare the two.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Yeah. I'll make that motion. TREASURER SHEAFE: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: The motion is that both parties will order an appraisal. We'll look at the comparative appraisal, and we'll sit down and negotiate a purchase agreement with you guys.

MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, I would speak the opposition. I think that it's premature when we can see what their proposal says and weigh that if we need to do another one rather than spending the taxpayer dollars if, in fact, it just duplicates or nears what they come up with. It makes for a premature expenditure. And I don't know if
that's value for the taxpayer.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: You surprised me there. Okay.
TREASURER SHEAFE: That's the first time.
MR. HILL: I'd make a substitute motion, Mr. Chairman, to the one that's on the table. The proposal for us, at this point in time, to be able to revisit certainly in the future, on our experts on the Board to exam said appraisal from the Rialto and to explore the issue at that time.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Somebody can substitute Jeff's substitute motion which would mean we would not order an appraisal.

MR. RITCHIE: I substitute Jeff's motion.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So we have a motion and a second on the substitute motion that we would not order the appraisal; we would first review the Rialto Foundation proposal.

MR. HILL: Call for the question.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Call for the role, Michele, please.

MS. BETTINI: Alberto Moore?
MR. MOORE: Supportive.
MS. BETTINI: Jannie Cox?
MS. COX: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Chris Sheafe?

TREASURER SHEAFE: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Mark Irvin?
SECRETARY IRVIN: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Jeff Hill?
MR. HILL: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Cody Ritchie?
MR. RITCHIE: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Fletcher McCusker?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. Go get an appraisal.
TREASURER SHEAFE: I've got one question before you leave. How'd the Clowns work out last night? Interesting venue.

MR. McCRARY: Yeah. You know, we -- the -- voiced mixed feelings when the Insane Clown Posse comes to town.

MS. COX: Insane Clown Posse?
MR. McCRARY: Yeah, yeah.
(Inaudible crosstalk.)
MS. COX: I will next time.
MR. MCCRARY: You know, some of that show, they paint their faces in clown makeup. So you must have been wearing a clown makeup disguise. That's how you got in with me knowing.

MS. COX: And you think you know me.
MR. McCRARY: No. Everything went well. We actually had real great cooperation with the Tucson Police Department. We take great pains to make sure that our neighbored aren't impacted when we have a show like that.

And so we rented fencing to kind of contain them when they were in line. We rented portable toilets so that they wouldn't be bothering our neighboring businesses to uses their bathrooms and, you know, just cause them any trouble. And everything went off without a hitch, at least for the most part.

I was a little worried. I heard a -- we hired some additional security in beyond our own stuff from A-Team Security. And actually, a gentleman that worked for A-Team had a heart attack last night. But it turns out he was working a different event, he was working at a fashion show that was taking place at Connect. And I haven't heard how -- how he is, and so $I$ shouldn't make fun of it. But I heard that a security person had a cardiac arrest and the ambulance came. And I was like, oh, no. I hope that's not at the Rialto.

And as it turns out, it was not.
TREASURER SHEAFE: The purpose of the question, frankly, is to complement you guys.

One of the things that the Rialto has done is
created a really diverse venue. And last night it was sort of like you had oil and water going on at the same time. And you pulled it off.

MR. McCRARY: Yeah. It's true.
TREASURER SHEAFE: And there was no disturbance next door, which was really a good thing because that also was an important event for Tucson.

MR. McCRARY: Yes.
TREASURER SHEAFE: And I think it speaks -- I didn't realize that you had done some of the prep that you were saying.

MR. McCRARY: Yes.
TREASURER SHEAFE: But that just shows one more way that you have added a great deal to the downtown. Both the economics, but also the ambience.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: They actually had it -- they booked the Insane Clown Posse on the second Saturday a year or two years ago.

MR. McCRARY: Yeah, yeah.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: So you had a real mix of things going on.

MR. McCRARY: And that was actually -- that Saturday there was the pride parade happening as well. And we were successful again, successfully able to contain diversity at its max.

TREASURER SHEAFE: All right.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Irvin?
SECRETARY IRVIN: Just real quickly.
And, Mike, $I$ don't know if you're the best to answer this or not. Do you have a sense of timing on the appraisal, and do you have a sense of who you're going to be asking to do that?

MR. McGRATH: We have been having discussions with Dave Lyons and Justin Martinez on that very topic. I would hope that before the end of the year we could be back with a proposal to set in front of you for further study.

Dave, Justin, is that realistic?
MR. MARTINEZ: Yep.
MR. McGRATH: That's our goal, to get this moving as promptly as possible.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Agenda's up for December.
MR. McGRATH: That would probably be fine, and we can contact you if there's going to be any delay. But I think a December date with you again would be terrific.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: If there are any issues, the executive officers can work through that with you before they bring it back.

All right. Appreciate everything you do. Thank you very much.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: All right. The January 8th Memorial folks, come on down.

We do have an advance packet from them.
Michele, are they out there? We're going to go through a PowerPoint presentation.

Don't forget names and titles for the transcriber.
MS. CHRISTENSEN: We will do that. We're about to lose one of our board members. She's at the door. I'll have her identify herself.

MS. SIDLES: Good morning. I'm sorry I have to depart early. My name is Darla Sidles. And my day job is (inaudible). Thanks for hearing us today.

MS. SIMON: I'm Pam Simon, survivor of January 8th, former staff member of Congressman Giffords and board member since the inception of this January 8th Foundation.

MR. ROWLEY: I'm Jim Rowley. I am a board member of the Memorial Foundation.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: And very active in the development committee.

My name is Karen Christensen. I am the president of the Memorial Foundation as of June of this year. And sitting next to me is --

Michelle?
MS. CROW: Michelle Crow. And I'm serving as the

Foundation manager.
MS. SMITH: Angie Smith from Smith and Dale serving as campaign counsel.

MS. KRET: Dot Kret with DK Advocates. And I'm honored to be on the January 8th Memorial Foundation board.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Also sitting in the audience is Jodi McCloskey who is with the County and sits on the January 8th Memorial Board and Jacquelyn Jackson who has been working as a volunteer with us.

We have a huge number of volunteers. And not all the other board members were able to come, but they would have been delighted to be here to respond to your questions.

I'm sorry the we weren't here -- that $I$ wasn't here for the first presentation, but I understand that there were a number of questions. I'm not going to repeat what was presented already.

You know, obviously, what January 8th means in Tucson terms. It's a historic event and something that the Memorial Foundation was created both to memorialize what happened on that they but also to celebrate the way Tucson came together afterwards and the way in which our vision has stated to be, together we thrive.

And coming out of that, we have done a lot of study looking at other tragic situations -- Oklahoma City, Flight 93, part of the 911 events, and other places -- where

1 we looked at how did other cities deal with these tragedies and what did they do.

The answer is they've created memorials. There's something deep within us that, as a community, we want to go to remember, weep, heal, and maybe inspire some people afterwards to know that tragedy is going to lead to something bigger and better for the community.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: If I might, to help focus today's conversation, we love the idea of the memorial. You can relax. However, we're not a charitable foundation.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: We understand.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: The questions were around our role in participating in economic development, the return on investment we could anticipate from the traffic that you'd create. And in today's Rio Nuevo world, we're syndicators. So we're very eager to know who the partners are and what level they're contributing. And the days of Rio Nuevo being the sugar daddy for all projects are long gone.

So that's kind of the focus and the sentiment of the Board.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So that's really why we
(inaudible) not out of lack of interest or respect for the idea. But really, how do you see our role, vis-a-vis economic development, and who are the other participants and
what is their level of participation.
MS. CHRISTENSEN: I --
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: You've given us some background --

MS. CHRISTENSEN: And I've given -- I've given you a snapshot, and I'll go through a brief presentation.

Because, absolutely, your goal of creating a vibrant downtown is exactly consistent with what it is that we are proposing to have done here. And that's why the City and the County stepped up because this is both about the memorial as well as a renovation of Presidio Park, which is an historic civic center of downtown.

And our plan, which is to have a master plan concept for that park as well as the memorial, will absolutely animate that part of the Downtown. We're convinced of it because we've studied other memorials in part of what we've done in the past two years.

One of the things that we've looked at is, what -based on those other memorial sites, what can we say to you about the number of visitors. And we believe, looking at other memorial sites, we anticipate approximately a hundred thousand visitors a year.

We think that that would result in a minimum of 2 to \$3 million. And that would be in sales from beverages, food, shopping in the downtown areas, which would mean, in

1 terms of revenue back to Rio Nuevo, something in the area of 2 112- to $\$ 168,000$ a year.

We looked at -- and we didn't just pull that number out of a hat -- or those numbers out of a hat. We looked at the other memorials. The average visitor spending in those memorials is $\$ 53$ a visitor. We also looked in -at recent and local economic data.

The Fox -- which you'll be hearing from in a little bit, you're probably very familiar with the economic impact study that they've had done -- shows that the average person coming to the Fox spends between 20 and $\$ 35$ during that Downtown visit.

The Tucson Pima Arts Council has participated for years in Americans for the Arts. They have extensive economic data on their website. Their website -- and that economic impact, it's, arts means business, in their terms -- also show something about expenditures about people participating in those events of 25 to $\$ 30$.

And there's a recent Visit Tucson study showed that travelers here spend, on the average, $\$ 488$ a day. And that, of course, includes the lodging in addition to the other expenditures.

We think that a hundred thousand visitors a day -a year -- excuse me -- a hundred thousand visitors a year for coming to this renovated El Presidio Park, which will

1 include the January 8th memorial, is a very conservative
2 estimate at $\$ 53$ million $--\$ 53$ a person, it will be a very 3 substantial return for Rio Nuevo.

Looking at Oklahoma City, the city there -- and there were obviously federal funds involved because it was a federal building -- invested $\$ 29$ million in creating that memorial. It's had a return of $\$ 276$ million. To that local economy, the return there is something like 9, point -$\$ 9.50$ for every dollar invested. They've had, since the memorial opened, 4.4 million visitors and they average about 350,000 visitors every year, an estimated, say, $\$ 50$ million annual impact on that.

There's something about -- there are tourists who come here to come to the Rialto. There are tourists who come to areas for the cultural tourism, and historical tourism is as part of that. What we're talking about is creating a cultural destination that people will want to come to.

We already hear about people going to the Safeway wanting to see where these events happened. And we know from our conversations that people are going to want to come to Downtown. We're not overestimating these numbers.

In Shanksville, Pennsylvania -- a very, very rural area where Flight 93 went down -- in the first two years since they created a memorial there, they've had $\$ 17$ million

1 in visitor spending. It's a little more than 150,000
2 visitors every year. You really have to want to go to
3 Shanksville to see that memorial, and people do. We believe
4 that -- in a similar way, that people are going to want to 5 come and see the memorial here.

We've made a request for $\$ 75,000$. I'd love you to vote today and hand me a check for that amount. We are also suggesting that another way of doing this would be to break that into two pieces. To -- what we're asking you to do is support the selection and the design process for the -- for the renovation, the master plan concept, as well as for the memorial.

We did -- as part of our thinking about where the memorial would be placed, we looked at a number of other places. We considered the Loop. We considered the Ina and Oracle intersection. It was suggested to us it shouldn't be Downtown because Downtown is where people want to come. It's -- it references, for us, the Congress on your Corner, that civic engagement.

In fact, when we talked to Councilwoman Regina Romero, she got it immediately. She said, this is a First Amendment celebration. This is a celebrating of people coming together, the right to deal with their elected officials. And of course with the -- in the El Presidio Park, you have the historical courthouse, where we would be

1 adjacent to, as well as the City offices.

It represents the kind of place, like Congress on your Corner, where people come together whether they agree with each other or not, they come there because this is the place, it is the center and the soul of the City. And I guess, $I$ could say it's sort of a eat, shop, learn experience.

We believe that -- in addition, we didn't set out to -- to make this an economic attraction. But we understood, with the work that we're doing, that, in fact, this is the way that memorials function and why we feel very comfortable coming to Rio Nuevo and asking you for that kind of investment.

The slide here shows -- and I believe that you may all have a map -- what the master plan concept area is, the El Presidio Park area. And the yellow dotted line shows the area in which the memorial itself would be located. The RFQ which we had issued indicates that the master plan concept creates that planning concept for the memorial.

It's a refinement of the public spaces there. That area's used now. Some of you went down to Tucson Meet Yourself a weekend ago and just see how that area's being used and how -- probably how it can be enhanced. Anybody who looks at this will say, I'm sure we can to it better. And it could be improved so that there really is a much more

1 engaged and more animated use of that space.

The master plan concept will provide for the future renovations of the park, which are planned by the City and the County. And as you've seen from the letters that we've submitted, both the City and the County have committed funds to doing that.

And then, we say in the RFQ -- and this will be part of what we talk to the designers about -- this is an important link between the park and the other urban downtown areas, including the Stravenue, connecting up to -- with that pedestrian pathway over -- going past the Garrett Eckbo landscape design, to the Convention Center to The Music Hall.

It is really that cultural corridor that is going to be vitalized by the work that you've already authorized at the Convention Center and the Eckbo, as well as the -this northern bookend, if you will, in that area. And then connecting on to the historic warehouse arts district as well.

Here's a slide that shows what our involve in this has been. I don't think I need to go over exactly how we got here. Our strategic time line though is that we are launching the capital campaign. And I'll describe that in a couple of minutes who those partners are going to be.

We will present next February. The master plan

1 concept that has been chosen and the design will take place during 2015. We hope to begin the construction of the memorial in February of 2016 and have the dedication of it in 2017. And I think that those are all very realistic timelines.

Our campaign goal is $\$ 4$ million. This is a very conservative goal. We estimated there -- we know what the expenses of the selection and design process are. We indicated that for the designers, the fees there and the travel expenses. So we know that that will be up to $\$ 50,000$. And then the $\$ 90,000$ commission for the designer who is selected. The -- in the RFQ we have indicated that the memorial expense we believe, to construct it, will be up to $\$ 2$ million.

And then we've layed out where our revenue sources are. You'll see that it's a very well-rounded and a very diverse set of revenue goals, both corporate, private donations, state, and federal. We do have an application pending now before the National Endowment for the Arts for part of that design commission fee. And then, we have the commitments from Pima County and the City to help in this phase of the process. So the seed money, if you will, the investment of Rio Nuevo is more than matched by other public funds as well as private donations which we're seeking. We are looking to also establish -- and I'll

1 describe, in a second, the fundraising plan. We have a number of community partners that we have involved in this. The University of Arizona, we've worked with a number of the humanities scholars there as well as the special collections division.

The Arizona Historical Society is very involved with some of the tribute materials that we have. They will be having special Dia de los Muertos exhibition using the tribute materials that have been left. And that will open on October 29th, and I invite you all to go there. They have been very excited about working with us.

The Sundt Corporation has provided the space for our archives to be kept at this point. And Archive Advantage, working with Dot Kret, they have been helping us to create digital inventories of those materials.

Your Community Foundation of Southern Arizona has been very helpful with us strategizing and helping us. Jim Rowley, one of our board members is on the Community Foundation board.

I had hoped that Clint Mabie would be here this morning. Clint, when Pam and I met with him to present a proposal two weeks ago, he was so -- speaking so enthusiastically about the importance of this civic center, the large vision for what El Presidio Park and the January 8th memorial component, I wish that we could bottle

1 it and tape it and bring it with us.

Clint's authorized me to say that the Community Foundation of Southern Arizona is interested in the memorial and larger vision for creating a civic center that would bring people to the center of Tucson as well as spur greater economic development. The Community Foundation will share this opportunity with donors.

And, in fact, we have already spoken with one of the major donors. The Community Foundation has supported January 8th in the past and is indicating that a six-figure donation would be -- would be very forthcoming.

I should say Mary Ellen Wooten from the Tucson Pima Arts Council is also here.

I think you -- it was -- we knew at time of the last meeting, we've had 60 designers submit their applications for -- for this master plan concept and for the memorial. 30 of them are from Arizona. 27 of them are from 12 other states. And there were, in fact, 3 international designers.

We know, just from the fact that those designers have submitted those kind of applications, we're being looked at. This memorial and the park will be looked at and will become the kind of significant cultural attraction that -- that we believe it's going to be.

We are very confident that we are going to be able

1 to raise the funds. We have a very diverse plan. We're 2 looking at major gifts and foundations. We will have a 3 grassroots component as well as the public sector funds and 4 corporations.

One of the things that's hard -- and we've been very careful about how we've approached this. It's been a very thoughtful board. We haven't come to you until this time even though when we talk to people, they say, well, what about Rio Nuevo? They're interested in Downtown. This is something that they should be interested in.

We weren't ready yet. We've been putting together the building blocks to be ready. We are now at that stage. And so we are ready to have you help us. You understand that seed money is sometimes necessary. When we go out and do that public sourcing campaign, it's going to be helpful to have that design the designer is going to be showing us some sometime in February. We're going through a very comprehensive, thoughtful process to choose that design. And we know that once we have it that will also be helping us launch that next very public phase of the fundraising campaign.

I hope that I described why we believe that what your goals are, to create that kind of vibrant Downtown, is in direct line with exactly what we're doing with the master plan concept and with the memorial within that.

We believe that we will be bringing both tourist dollars as well as other dollars into this downtown area. And we are totally convinced that this is going be a very successful project. It's going to result in increased use of that area.

The -- I'm sure if you ask El Charro and La Cocina and Cafe a la Carte and the Little Cafe Poca Cosa and all the restaurants in that area, would you -- would you like to have a hundred thousand more visitors coming down to this area, $I$ can't imagine that any of them wouldn't say yes, to say nothing of the businesses in the other area.

Pam and I sometimes talk about how, in 2017 or 2018, we're going to be sitting in that -- in that park and what it's going to be like. And I was just -- I was imagining people, for example, being at the Convention Center and having their bags. And they'll have this little walking map of downtown.

Tucson is a very walkable downtown. And given all the development that has happened here, it's going to be exciting. They're going walking around. I can also see them picking up their -- their smart phones and listening to an audio tour that describes the -- this is what the area was like; this is the urban revitalization that happened; this is the history of the Garret and Eckbo design. And here, at the El Presidio Park, one of the first historic,

1 most deeply layered historic areas of the City now includes also the January 8th memorial.

School kids coming down. And I'd like to say that at some time it would be a special celebration. We'll all be sitting there and toasting each other and saying, thank you to Rio Nuevo for investing in this. Because this is -really has the potential to be a historic civic center of Tucson that you have helped to -- to renovate and is part of this public-private partnership that we've developed. We're really a major capital improvement project in the City of Tucson.

I'm happy to answer any questions. And any of the other board members would be pleased to respond to you also. CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mark?

SECRETARY IRVIN: So, Karen, first of all, thanks for coming down to visit with us and spending some time kind of addressing what (coughing interference) from the last meeting. As you know, I also appreciate that you've reached out to the other board members because they're not all -- I mean, obviously everybody's up to speed with the thought process on the memorial. But I don't think they had the history that maybe I do since I've been involved and working with Steve Brigham trying to identify sites for a long time.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Right.
SECRETARY IRVIN: And, you know, I asked Fletcher

1 some time ago, several years ago, to help brainstorm. And I

2 know we've walked and talked about a lot of stuff. So I, personally, am ecstatic to see you folks downtown.

And, you know, I think a $\$ 75,000$ investment by the District generates, you know, a $\$ 4$ million memorial. It also generates, the best $I$ can tell, you know, some serious money coming back into the District every year. And I support it.

And I'm glad that you've taken the time to assemble an all-star cast to come down and visit with us. And I look forward to other Board Members questions. But I just appreciate you coming down.

And I'm really tickled to see that, all the places that the memorial could have been, that you guys really thought it through. And I know you spent a long time trying to figure out where it should be, why it should be there, and what have you. And so $I$ just commend you on getting to that decision.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Well, thank you.
And it was -- we did look at other places. But the place that really resonated with us was the El Presidio Park because of that civic center and the historic nature of it. So we feel very strongly that this was absolutely the right decision and are very excited about the process.

Jannie?

MS. COX: Karen, thank you for an outstanding presentation. And I think you've made it very clear, the economic impact, which is what we're about.

So you've done a really good job. I appreciate all the work that all the board has done and the partnerships that you put together with the other entities. And I'm very impressed. And I, too, feel very positive about supporting this endeavor to make sure it happens.

I do have one question. Let's -- can we look, for a moment, at worst case scenario, that you launch a capital campaign and you get a great start and you're all excited for a $\$ 4$ million goal, and you get to 2 and a half million dollars, and something happens and it doesn't happen.

What -- what if?
MS. CHRISTENSEN: That's a perfect -- that's a perfect storm of -- we haven't mentioned, I -- we -- some of the construction money, there is actually, at this point, $\$ 1.5$ million for the construction of the exterior memorial in the bond package. So let's say the perfect storm is that either the bond isn't put forward or the bond, if put forward, doesn't pass, so we don't have that County money.

We feel very confident, in the -- in the revenue and sources that we've looked at, that it can happen. We've created $\$ 4$ million over, basically, an 18-month campaign. So if it doesn't -- we have to extend that, we well. There

1 are also other places that we can cut back.

But one of things that will absolutely happen is the memorial will be built. The dollars will go to construction of that memorial. And we feel confident, in terms of the numbers of people that we've talked to, people that we've gone to for seed money and understand now that we may be coming back to them for very significant capital campaign gifts, $I$ can tell you that we are very confident that the funds will be there to create the exterior memorial.

We'll be -- will we be able to fully fund an endowment that -- to -- for operations and management immediately? That might be something that we'll have to continue to build on.

One of the things that we've talked about with the fundraising council on a number of occasions is the fact that we are -- we're going to create this gift to the City, create the endowment for the management of it, and then it's not an every year, coming out to -- to you or to private donors and saying, please support us, please support us.

It will exist there. The City and the County will manage that, that property. And we feel it will take care of itself. So I think we've been very cautious in coming up with the expenses that we put forward. And we could cut back if we needed to. I don't believe we're going to have
to.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: What's your pleasure?
MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Hill?
MR. HILL: I still think that there's some unresolved issues. And rather than give you the whole lot of them, I think that recent news stories about the Pima County supervisors expending their office accounts to 501 (c) (3) charities has been presented with a lawsuit by the Goldwater Institute, who has a very enviable record, and I think they've never lost any such effort in protecting the taxpayer dollars.

So I think, if not today, down the road we would be sued, appropriately so. And this money would have to come back or some other sanctions would happen to us as Board members.

What we're all talking about here is the City of Tucson -- and I'm talking about their $\$ 30,000$ accounting, our 75,000, it's not our money. It's not the City's money. It's the taxpayers' money. That's why the constitution says we cannot give gifts to private entities. A very strong concept from 1912.

As far as the financial comparisons, you're doing apples and oranges. You know, I've been to Oklahoma. And, you know, I went there for a convention. But, frankly --

1 and I don't mean to insult the people from Oklahoma City, there's not much else going on unless you're an oilman so -or a Will Rogers fan. So $I$ can see why that would be a great source of tourism, their memorial.

And the site out in the middle of a corn field also is devoid of other attractions. I would suggest this location is not a primary site for tourism. It's an auxiliary site, at best. So that's, I think, a specious argument that we'll get all this extra money.

But the crux of this issue is, Rio Nuevo -- and reading the newspapers over the years prior to my coming on the board -- went through $\$ 260$ million of the taxpayers' money, not Rio Nuevo. Actually it's State sales tax funds. The only thing that $I$ can recall that was built to fruition was the illegally constructed fire station with Rio Nuevo money.

The rest of it was all seed money, startup money. Did you hear the similarity here? Seed money, startup keeps coming back and forth. That is what Rio Nuevo invested in. And they have nothing to show for it except an illegally built fire station.

We have got to stop the trend of funding every type of organization that comes here looking for revenue. We are no longer, as the Chairman said, a sugar daddy.

And, in fact, the letter from the City of Tucson

1 is signed by Kelly Gottschalk. Why isn't it the mayor? Kelly Gottschalk cost the taxpayers millions of dollars in legal and accounting fees when she headed the finance department and obfuscation of the records before they turned them over to them. It took a two-year process. And that's who they have sign the letter wanting to -- they said they spent $\$ 30,000$ of the City of Tucson's money.

The City of Tucson has no money. It's the taxpayers' money. And it's unconstitutional. And the Goldwater Institute I think will make that a permanent case against the country as it does in the past whenever anybody's trying to violate the constitution and give taxpayer money to private entities. It's just not legal. Notwithstanding the fact that it's a goal, a good project. Although I think it's -- it's a jive and shuck for the County and the City to build El Presidio Park and this is how they lead into it and to get the money and they don't have it, obviously for reasons of their past behavior. But still, it is just not doing to work. We have no business giving this money. And, in fact, if we do, my feeling is, it will come back to haunt us from the attorney general, via a lawsuit from the Goldwater Institute.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Let's address the constitutional issue, Mark. I'm going to need you to help me here.

We've, in fact, been to court over the constitutional clause issues. And I believe the Court held that we are, in fact, exempt from the constitutional gift clause.

Mark, will you address that?
MR. COLLINS: Certainly.
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, there was the -- what I'll call the Kromko case. And the trial court held that we were not subject -- we, the District, was not subject to the gift clause. That's -- the amendment to the Arizona constitution specifically excludes tax-levying improvement districts, and that's what the District is. So the gift clause doesn't apply to the District.

That said, and I -- in light of Member Hill's comments, you ought to be mindful of a couple things.

There are two revenue streams, really, that you folks have. One of them is the TIF revenue pursuant to 42-5031. And then some other revenue that you get from rental of the Depot Garage and that sort of thing.

Both of those revenue streams are subject to
limitations. They are -- they both can only be spent -- and I'm quoting the relevant portion of the applicable statute -- to finance and promote the use of multipurpose facilities and other structures necessary for the full use of multipurpose facilities and to do all things necessary or

1 convenient to accomplish those purposes.

That's kind of broad. Kind of broad.
And it's not only limited to the primary component, which is the Tucson Community Center, but -- or Convention Center, but your secondary component.

The TIF funds -- I believe, as Mr. Hill has said in the past, TIF funds the only be utilized on public property. And so there's that additional limitation on that revenue stream.

Finally, based on the 2011 amendment to the IGA, if you were to commit $\$ 50,000$ or more, you would need City approval because any expenditure of more than $\$ 50,000$ requires City approval. So you do have --

MR. MOORE: Not just City approval, but mayor and council approval.

MR. COLLINS: Yes.
By that, I mean mayor and council. Agreed. So it's a little bit broader than you asked, but there you are.

MR. HILL: I just want to address the point on the constitution. I understand there was a court case that said we're exempt. However, usually judges and legislation cannot change the constitutional provision.

I think that the Goldwater Institute also would have good standing to have that case overturned. Judicial law is judicial law. It's good at that time, maybe perhaps

1 that circumstance. Circumstances are different. that circumstance. Circumstances are different.

I think, broadly speaking, the constitution is very clear. No gifts are allowed. And I certainly, in good conscious -- and I took an oath to uphold the constitution for 12 years. I don't think we had to do that. But as far as I'm concerned, that oath is binding on me. And I think it's just wrong for us to give taxpayer money to a 501 (C) (3).

MR. RITCHIE: Mr. Chairman, I hear what Mr. Hill is saying. And when I joined the Board, I was outraged at some of the past actions, where some of the money went for bridges to nowhere, millions and millions of dollars to consultants and what have you.

However, since my time on the Board, I didn't take an oath to the constitution because I was never an elected member of the legislature, but I have to look myself in mirror as a citizen of Tucson, Arizona and this community. So since I've been on the Board, I was very adamant and vocal about reducing some costs internally that we were paying. And I think we accomplished that. I think that I've -- on other issues, that I've tried to protect the taxpayer money. I look at this as a worst-case scenario that $I$ think in your report you said it will generate up -well, your report said it will generate 120 -some-thousand dollars back in taxpayer money.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: 112 to 168.
MR. RITCHIE: 112.
So in my business, what $I$ usually do is I forecast out worst case -- even a worst case scenario than that. So if we were to reduce that 30 percent or something, we could get back at least our $\$ 75,000$ seed money investment for economic activity back to a public area.

So I believe that the $\$ 75,000$ would be well spent. I think that it's something that we, as community members -maybe it won't be the driving force of tourism, like a Saguaro National Park. But I do know that I've driven down to Tombstone on several occasions and there's a curiosity factor about a gunfight that went on over about a hundred years ago -- or over a hundred years ago.

So I make a motion that we grant the seed money of $\$ 75,000$ and limit it to $\$ 75,000$. That you wouldn't come back and ask us for anymore money.

MS. COX: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Collins, let's deal with the legality of this. I certainly don't want to preside over something is that might, in fact, be illegal or subject to Goldwater scrutiny.

Is there a way to better confirm for all of us, the constitutional issues? I think it's beyond even this particular conversation because we have a number of

1 not-for-profits that we have relationships with. We've done, you know, arrangements with particular developers. And you know, the Pima County taxpayer suit was not about a gift to a not-for-profit. It was about a gift to a developer --

MR. COLLINS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: -- which has even further implications to us, I think, in the future.

MR. COLLINS: Correct.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: But I believe the case was specific to the gift clause.

Is there precedent there that we can rely on? Can we seek an AG's opinion? How better can we protect ourselves legally?

MR. COLLINS: To Mr. Hill's point, that decision was a trial court level. It was not appealed. Different judges have different opinions. Different levels of judges have different opinions.

Is there a way to absolutely, finally determine that? I don't know that there is.

You can request an attorney general's opinion. That can be done. But that's simply -- and the case law talks about it -- just another lawyer's view. I mean, so you can do that. We can do that. We can try to expedite that. I mean, the AG is in this building. So you can
certainly do that.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: One of the things you might add to the motion is that we confirm its legality before we write any checks. So almost that the motion is subject to some sort of legal --

MR. RITCHIE: I would like to amend the motion, subject to the legality of the issue.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: That would require us to have some third-party objectivity.

You seconded that?
TREASURER SHEAFE: Yeah. I'd second that.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Who seconded that?
MS. COX: Second. I did.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And that's okay with you?
MS. COX: Yes.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. So we have a motion on the table to grant the Foundation's request for $\$ 75,000$ subject to confirmation that it's, indeed, not illegal for us to do.

Michele, call the roll.
MS. BETTINI: Alberto Moore?
MR. MOORE: No.
MS. BETTINI: Jannie Cox?
MS. COX: Yes.
MS. BETTINI: Chris Sheafe?

TREASURER SHEAFE: Yes. MS. BETTINI: Mark Irvin? SECRETARY IRVIN: Yes. MS. BETTINI: Jeff Hill? MR. HILL: No. MS. BETTINI: Cody Ritchie?

MR. RITCHIE: Yes. MS. BETTINI: Fletcher McCusker? CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yes. (The Board voted and the motion was carried.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So don't go spending the money just yet.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Well, the process will continue. The selection panel is going to be looking at those 60 applications and coming up with the five finalists. Those finalists will be coming in to the City to meet with interested people and to tour the site, to develop it, to come back. After that, we'll apply the concepts and appoint the selection panel to make a final determination.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay. Quick question. Can you say, what is the criteria that you're going to use to select the finalists out of the very large number of applicants you have?

MS. CHRISTENSEN: I actually have what is listed

1 in the RFQ -- and I'm happy to read this -- it's the capability of achieving aesthetic excellence, inventiveness and creativity, ability to address the opportunities and limitations of the El Presidio master plan, the capability of designing an original and unique memorial, responsiveness to the Foundation mission, responsiveness to the goals of honoring the individuals, involved in designing a space for contemplation and conversation and for the use of festivals --

It's a big challenge.
-- and capable of designing of memorial space that is distinct but still a part of El Presidio Park, and sensitivity to the unique historic considerations of the overall site.

And I believe that the selection panelists were named the last time. So you can see that we really found people who have the sort of professional credentials to be making those kinds of judgments and applying this criteria.

It's a challenging space. We really do want to honor the historic nature of it and at the same time create a space that has meaning for remembrance, for inspiration, for education, and for January 8th.

And I envy, in some ways, the people on that selection panel. It's going to be a fascinating process. And we'd be happy to come back as we have those finalists
and report to you on that and show you what the process is going to result in.

We very much appreciate your support. In some ways, Congress on your Corner was meant as a place for people to get together to have a kind of civil discussion even though they may not always, each of us, agree with each other. And we appreciate the conversation this morning and your level of support. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Thank you.
Okay. Fox Theatre. I saw Craig, Mr. Holmes.
So once again, please introduce yourself. Make sure the transcriber gets your name and title.

MR. SPEAR: Tony Spear, board member of the Fox Theatre Foundation and chairman of the marketing committee.

MR. PIERSON: Nick Pierson, member of the Fox Board Foundation, and also cochair on the development committee.

MR. HOLMES: Bill Holmes, chair of the Fox Theatre Foundation.

MR. SUMBERG: Craig Sumberg, executive director of the Fox Tucson Theater Foundation.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Dan Cavanaugh, member of the board of directors of the Fox Theatre Foundation and former liaison for Rio Nuevo at the Fox Theatre.

MR. FORD: Bill Ford, member of the Fox board and the building committee.

MS. MARCH: Nancy March, member of the Fox board.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Thanks for coming down.
We do have a proposal that I think you handed out. Everybody got one of those?

Mr. Holmes?
MR. HOLMES: I'll read for you what we prepared. And I'm here to answer questions to it.

So, Dear Chairman McCusker, as instructed at the last Rio Nuevo Multipurpose Facility District Board, Rio Nuevo meeting, we have prepared what we think is a fair and equitable plan that will allow us to exit our tax credit relationship with the NTCIC as well as the bank of America, and that will, in the long run, benefit both the Fox Tucson Theatre Foundation, the Fox Foundation and the Rio Nuevo.

As we presented a couple weeks ago, the Fox Foundation has, in the past two to three years, made significant strides in turning around our operation of the theater. This is true whether one looks at earned income, contributed dollars, number of attendees, annual cash flows from operations, and other measures.

Our seven-year relationship with NTCIC is scheduled to wind down no later than next spring. And we're coming to the Rio Nuevo this morning to request that the Rio

1 Nuevo Board cover the costs of our exit from the tax credit 2 relationship.

We're currently waiting for a final determination from our representatives at the NTCIC regarding the amount necessary to terminate the relationship but have received a preliminary determination from them that the amount will be in the 330 - to $\$ 360,000$ range. We now hereby request the Rio Nuevo Board to make this payment on behalf of the Fox Foundation.

And in return, we suggest is the following:
One, the Fox Foundation will be granted a period of three years during which no payment would be due to Rio Nuevo. This would allow us to continue our positive financial and programmatic trends and contribute to the Foundation's overall fiscal health.

And, two, beginning in 2018, the Fox would begin to pay Rio Nuevo $\$ 89,045$ annually for a period of not longer than 30 years. That total would be $\$ 2,671,351$. This is the amount we are currently responsible to pay the NTCIC each year, the priority return, and of course would go towards paying down our debt to Rio Nuevo.

And we look forward to your positive response.
And we're ready to answer questions now.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I think we should clarify that this comment that our relationship is winding down.

In the event the put or call are not exercised, they maintain a lease for another 30 years, 35 years.

MR. SUMBERG: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So if we don't take the amount or we don't have the money to take that amount, they remain a tenant of that theater well beyond our lifetime.

MR. HOLMES: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Collins, that's your understanding?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, if the Trust is not removed through the put/call process, they will stay part of the structure, which I believe you all have seen, throughout the rest of approximately 35 years left, I think.

If you were to take the Trust out, it would -- it would result -- you'd have to put it into a contract -- but it would result in a simplification of the various structures that operate the Fox.

MR. SUMBERG: Yeah. I spoke with our representative yesterday and confirmed that that obligation to pay them continues until we're able to exit the relationship.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And that's a window, right, from now through September --

MR. SUMBERG: Well, that's the -- that's the
contractual window. But if we don't pay, the obligation would continue.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Right.
Mr. Hill?
MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, obviously, this letter has to be short. And I just -- Mark, if I'm missing something chime in.

But it talks about the three years of no payment. I'm assuming that three years of no payment is geared to the 330,000 or 360,000 we'd have to front fund to buy out this entity. That's correct? Wouldn't relieve you of any other current obligations to Rio Nuevo or anything like that.

MR. SUMBERG: Correct. We're asking you for -- to fund this exit. And then we're asking you for a three-year standstill to begin paying you just being we're on -- our trends are all positive.

MR. HILL: Right. I just didn't want us to be mucking with the current contract because this really didn't address that because of the verbiage.

MR. SUMBERG: Sure.
MR. HILL: Unfortunately, the lawyer and $I$ have to read the law.

MR. SUMBERG: Right.
MR. HILL: And what is it? Something in the detail -- the devil's in the details, Mr. Lawyer?

MR. COLLINS: I concur with that.
MR. HILL: Okay. So I just want to be sure we weren't mucking with that.

Okay. And then -- so then we start receiving 89,000 that would normally have gone into the other entity --

MR. SUMBERG: Correct.
MR. HILL: -- would come to us. Now, I know that we had the issue some -- some years ago, you had a payment of one-point-something million and you didn't have it.

So I would hope -- and I think we're -- I think this is a good idea, Mr. Chairman. I don't think we have any other choice.

But I would hope that when the first 89,000 is due, somebody doesn't come down here and say, we don't have it.

It would kind of rankle --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: One of the advantages we would have, Jeff, of putting ourself in first position, is if there's a future that they didn't pay, we can kind of enforce that.

MR. HILL: Oh, I like that, Mr. Chairman. All right.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Now, we have zero enforceability.

MR. HILL: Understood that.
Mr. Chairman, I would move the -- this motion to this proposal.

SECRETARY IRVIN: I second.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: All right.
Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: I was just going to ask, what is the payment now to the . . .

MR. HOLMES: It's the 89,000.
MR. MOORE: It is.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: This is the exact amount.
MR. SUMBERG: Yes, yes.
MR. RITCHIE: So you're basically offering to give us that money instead of them after a three-year period.

MR. HOLMES: Correct.
MR. MOORE: Why can't you give us this now? Once the put is called, just continue making the payment?

MR. HOLMES: Well, as we stated here, what this does, it gives us that ability to continue to move the Fox forward. Although, we are showing very positive in trends, we're still digging out of a very deep hole that we've had over the last few years.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Let's be a little more blunt. What would you do with the money?

MR. MOORE: That you save.

MR. HOLMES: That we save.
Well, initially, we -- what we have is a lot of payables that we want to bring everything current. And I think Craig can speak to where else we'd --

MR. SUMBERG: Yeah. Well, there are building needs that we need to continue. For example -- little things -- our air conditioning went out this summer. We had to get that covered. Our rugs needed to be -- there's building operations. There's the ceiling in the lobby that needs to be painted. I mean, there's significant building needs we've not been able to do because we've been digging out of a financial hole.

So we feel great about our trends and where we come from. But there are needs of the building that we need to do right now.

MR. HOLMES: Also it provides some financial backstop for us. Then, when we look at booking an act that we think is appropriate for the Fox and would generate considerable revenue for us is, oftentimes, we can't book them because we don't have the financial resource to put it up for them.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Collins, I believe if this motion's approved, it would need a new set of documents, a new written relationship with the Fox.

MR. COLLINS: I concur with that. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And that would address the debt, the rent, whatever relationship we want to have. We could also, then, identify the use of proceeds for this forgiven amount.

MR. COLLINS: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.
TREASURER SHEAFE: I was going to add that as a substitute motion. So is that essentially --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All we got to do is to direct counsel to include that in the negotiations with the Fox.

As Mr. Hill suggested, and I think Mark's concurred, what we would do is approve this item. The devil is in the details. We would have to take out the Trust. But when the Trust goes away, there would have to be an entire new relationship that come back to us for approval as to a permanent relationship with the Fox.

Also, is there an issue with the District's sunset? As we're committing, can we commit to terms beyond 2025? I think we've resolved this issue. That somehow, someplace --

MR. COLLINS: I think you can commit to that at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Let's confirm that.
MR. COLLINS: Okay.
But if -- to accomplish what you're talking about doing, there's going to be a lot of documents done and
analysis done to unwind this deal or to simplify this deal. And we can address that in that process.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: The first step would be you would notify the Trust that you're exercising the put.

MR. SUMBERG: They are working on a --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And they would calculate --
MR. SUMBERG: -- now, on an actual exit analysis.
I want to just clarify the timing. There will be some savings, needs to be confirmed exactly how much. They'll figure it out before the end of the year. That could be between 5- and \$25,000.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: That's why you have a range. MR. SUMBERG: Yeah.

MR. HOLMES: Correct.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And I think the motion approves the range.

MR. HILL: Yes. The motion is inherent with the other discussion.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Ms. Cox?
MS. COX: I -- I think it's good that you want to use these funds to bring all your accounts current. How -what is -- what are those accounts? I mean, how large a debt do you have right now that you need to get out these payables to vendors, or . . .

MR. SUMBERG: It's in the -- our debt, in two

1 places, other than your debt to Rio Nuevo, it's in accounts payable and it's in our TIGDA liability account, booking shows in the future that we are paying current bills with. That's around $\$ 400,000$ altogether. It hovers between 300 and $\$ 400,000$. It's tightest in the summer.

And we're committed to erasing that debt and trying to build in some other funds with a campaign within the next year.

TREASURER SHEAFE: At any given time, how much money do you have out in seed capital to buy the shows to assure that you have the bookings going forward?

MR. SUMBERG: Between 50 and 150 .
TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay.
MR. SUMBERG: It depends on the size of the shows we're bringing.

TREASURER SHEAFE: I mean, is that per show?
MR. SUMBERG: No, no, no. That's all together. All those deposits.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay. That's not -- you put 20 out to this and 10 out to that and whatnot.

MR. SUMBERG: Yep.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Have you lost good venues because you didn't have enough money to --

MR. SUMBERG: You mean, lost the shows?
TREASURER SHEAFE: Yeah.

MR. SUMBERG: Sure.
I mean --
TREASURER SHEAFE: Is that common or not common?
MR. HOLMES: We -- there's a lot of other venues here that we compete with. And so, for instance, the casinos can write a check at, you know, any amount. And if we get into a bidding competition with them, oftentimes we lose.

MR. SUMBERG: I want to clarify my "sure."
We, by and large, don't lose a show because we can't put down a deposit. And I negotiate the lowest deposit $I$ can. Sometimes the deposit is a certain amount. Two deposits, one when we sign a contract and one 30 days out from the show when we have more cash from the show.

So we've managed to accommodate our schedule. Were we financially healthier, we could do more shows and be, I think, more successful.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: All right. We have a motion and a second on the floor.

Michele, call the role.
MS. BETTINI: Alberto Moore?
MR. MOORE: Yay.
MS. BETTINI: Jannie Cox?
MS. COX: Yes.
MS. BETTINI: Chris Sheafe?

TREASURER SHEAFE: Yes.
MS. BETTINI: Mark Irvin?
SECRETARY IRVIN: Yes.
MS. BETTINI: Jeff Hill?
MR. HILL: Aye.
MS. BETTINI: Cody Ritchie?
MR. RITCHIE: Yes.
MS. BETTINI: Fletcher McCusker.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yes.
So by 7 to 0, the motion passes.
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Let's get notification to the Trust. And then get back to us -- or get back to Mr. Collins, I would say, on the amount that it would require.

If it's in that range, it's pretty easy to manage it. If it's outside that range, you'll have to come back to the board.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thank you.
MS. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say before -- we are going to have a -- obviously a long term relationship with the Fox.

And I don't feel like I know a whole lot about the Fox and how it operates. And I would appreciate some
time -- maybe with you, Craig -- to --
MR. SUMBERG: You weren't here when I -MS. COX: I was not. I was listening on the phone.

MR. PIERSON: We'd love to invite you to our event this Tuesday. We've reached out several times to the Rio Nuevo Board to attend our events. And it's partly just getting acquainted with each other. So we can get you to --

MS. COX: And I have attended them.
MR. SUMBERG: We'll be doing an update on the Fox on Tuesday evening if anybody is available. The event is from 5:30 to 7:30.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And we'll make sure that you're here more regularly.

TREASURER SHEAFE: At least quarterly.
MS. COX: I think a quarterly report would be really helpful for me. And I would appreciate some personal time with you over the next few months just to look into some of the details. We want you to be successful. But I feel like we have a big responsibility here too. And I don't know enough about it -- and I'd like to learn more.

MR. SUMBERG: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Thank you very much.
We're going to monkey with the agenda a tad just because we're going to lose some Board members. Cody's on
his way out. Alberto needs to leave. We clearly need to take some action on the TCC stuff.
(Mr. Moore left the proceeding.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So, Elaine, if you can just -we'll just stay right here where we are. And we'll come back to -- where is she?

While Elaine's setting up, just, I think for us to acknowledge and celebrate, the Arena is probably 80 percent complete. Disney on Ice was really the first artist to appreciate the new venue, sound, lights, concessions, restrooms. The reviews were ecstatic, not only from the promoter and fans, but the end users of the TCC.

We did a media preview of the venue. All the TV stations were there. All the print media was there. I think to a person, they were very complementary. In fact, one of the articles I think that Michele's passed around, they used the word we were striving for a year or so ago when we started, is that it does have, indeed, the wow factor.

So we're very appreciative, Elaine, of the work that's gone in there. And we know we're very close.

Today we're going get an update from Elaine with some photos. There are a couple of items that are above our authority regarding change orders that have to do with things that we've discovered during the process, including

1 some asbestos. But we remain well within our contingency budget. We should finish the project with some extra funds, which we can decide, then, on what we might want to do with.

Elaine, we're ready.
MS. BECHERER: Yes. I'm just opening a couple more documents. Sorry.

Okay.
MR. MOORE: There's more than one of you?
MS. BECHERER: No.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: No. Elaine's equal to about four.

MS. BECHERER: Good morning. Elaine Becherer, Rio Nuevo TCC Arena project manager.

And I first wanted to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opening remarks on the project.

I would like to share with the Board, as well as the audience, some really spectacular photos. There's only 14 so I'll go quickly.

And I think, for the most part, these speak for themselves. But I saw this photo and, you know, some initial comments were, you know, it looks like a real arena. So this is ice that was going in for Disney on Ice.

All new -- the 4,923 fixed seats in the bowl, those are all in.

As Mr. McCusker stated, we're approximately

180 percent done with construction. You can see on the spot booths, towards the ceiling, we have new video boards that will be used for upcoming events. Menus. A close up of the photographs. To the left, you can see the Arena ceiling which has been blacked out. So it's no longer white. It's not an eyesore. All new ceiling tiles and lights.

The new concession stands. In coordination with SMG, we also have cat 6 cables at all points of service in all five concession stands. And we're getting new point of sale machines. So Disney on Ice was the first event to actually take credit cards at the TCC, which is a huge step in the right direction. So they -- previously, they were only accepting cash. So revenues were increased just off of the one event.

Another photo of the Arena. These are the restrooms. You can see the floors have been redone, all new partitions, accessories, plumbing fixtures. The escalator treads from the original escalator, back lit with LED lights. This is the mezzanine restroom.

This is the new arena entrance with full glass doors so you can see into the Arena. This is going downstairs to the mezzanine level.

An overall of the concession stands. The digital signage -- or the illuminated signage identifying that it's a concession stand is not up yet. But you can see the new

1 video board that also has the digital menus on it.

That's another photo of the restrooms. And that's a close up.

And then I just want to show you one last photo. And so, now, it looks like a hockey arena. We're getting set up for ice hockey, as we speak. And I believe there's, if not a game, practice this week.

SECRETARY IRVIN: I was down there yesterday, Elaine. And the -- had a chance to -- they were cranking up the sound system. And our Woodstock system was gone and the new thing was in. And $I$ was in the outside area. And they only had it cranked up 50 percent. And it was crystal clear. And you could hear it perfectly sitting outside in the little repurposed foyer. It was excellent.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yeah. I think it was a great example of wise money spent. We're already seeing returns for this, not only in terms of the reputation of the Arena. And SMG announced globally that they're now the management to a rounding applause. We expect to see bookings increase and expect to see revenue increased.

Of course, anything that's there is a TIF payer. So this is clearly coming back to Rio Nuevo.

So there are a couple of items. I think you want to update us on the budget and then go into the change order.

MS. BECHERER: I do. I want to go through the project tracking sheet.

Is it the Board's pleasure to hear a brief update on the signs since it is one component of the change order?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yeah. Let me touch on some of the controversy that's associated with our signage.

I think you all know that we've always anticipated and planned for monument signs on Granada and Church. There's never been any way to know what's going on in the TCC, historically. You drive by and you see a full parking lot, but you don't have any idea what's going on there.

So we designed and bid out monument signs. They are outside the sign code authority. So we've sought a variance for those. They did come in at a little more expensive than what we had budgeted. That's one of the change orders.

But we've also attracted a lot of attention from the -- what I'm going to call the stargazer community, objecting to the new light that the monument signs would throw out.

So we have a sign commission hearing that was postponed for this week. Next week, we're starting the variance request. So this money that we would approve for the additional signage will be subject to us getting through the sign commission and ultimately the City Council.

Staff have recommended approval of our request. But there is a lot of opposition. And I don't think it's specific to our project. But I think the professional and amateur astronomy communities object, generally, to anything that emits light and interferes with our ability to gaze at the stars. So we will work our way through that.

So I think, Elaine, the message is that if somehow that gets disrupted, it will affect these numbers. Correct? MS. BECHERER: Mr. Chair, I missed that. Sorry. CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: So in the event we don't get approval, we cant -- we would spend less than what we're asking for today because we've had to downsize the sign.

MS. BECHERER: That is correct. So the hearing has been postponed to November 12th at 2:00 p.m. And if the variance as Rio Nuevo as the owner has submitted, if it is not approved by SCAAB, the Sign Code Advisory and Appeals Board, then Rio Nuevo would have one of two options.

They could accept the variance as approved by the board or the appeals process would be to go to mayor and council.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Let me ask a question. Can I?
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Mm-hmm.
TREASURER SHEAFE: The dark sky ordinance does not, in any way, eliminate the ability to do the kind of sign -- you're an architect, so you've go to help me here --
it has to do with the direction that the light is directed.
So is it not possible to have a design that does everything we need for the person coming by, by lifting it up a little bit so that it's message can be downcast, and then you comply with dark sky?

MS. BECHERER: So the --
TREASURER SHEAFE: So our variance would be more the location of it rather than actually it's adding the light.

MS. BECHERER: So to answer your question, it depends on who you ask that question, that there's some subjectivity to it. And those electronic message boards that we have in the project, they are code complaint. And that is one of the most important messages that $I$ am sharing with you and with also the staff and the community. The sign code allows these type of electronic message boards.

The dark skies community, it might be fair to say that they don't appreciate or value any type of signs, any type of electronic message boards. So it may not matter what or how big the electronic message board is, the dark skies community would never support it.

So, yes, through good design -- which I think this monument sign is good design -- it can minimize the light to the dark skies.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Well, yeah. Let me just be

1 more specific because this issue comes up quite a bit.

MS. BECHERER: It does.
TREASURER SHEAFE: And light pollution is a big deal because, in the astronomy community here, which is a real economic piece of our overall economic base, is an important consideration.

However, the technology now is well understood. And, you don't get light pollution if you downcast the light. That's what we're doing all over the place.

So I'm just asking the question, is this not an easy problem to solve technologically? You know, the technology is certainly available. Are we kind of in a -you know, a popularity contest here where some people just aren't going to be reasonable? In which case there's mechanisms in place to maybe not give them as big a voice as they would like to have. The realty is we can't shut off everything just because . . .

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: We've also talked about a curfew on the lights. So we are trying to find ways to accommodate the astronomy community.

I think Elaine is right. They would object to a flashlight pointed at the sky. So we can address the technology and shield the night sky. We can turn the lights off.

We're removing one sign, putting in two new signs.

1 So the net light effect is probably not significant. And that's ultimately the commission's role, is to look at those facts and determine if, in fact, they want to approve a variance.

We are oversized, which is the only reason we have to go through the sign board.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay. Well, I'm -- and I'm just asking because each time when $I$ come in contact with the dark sky ordinance and really try to accommodate it, it's always been a technical question. It's never been a zoning-type question where you're trying to just get people to agree.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: The opposition here is more concerned about the precedent.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Yeah. I was wondering if it was a precedent. Okay.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Right. That the -- a variance would accomplish would establish for the entire community and then invite others to build oversized signs. So that is ultimately what the variance -- so we're not trying to railroad it.

We are meeting with the stargazer community. We are working with the board. We will try and accommodate them. Ultimately they'll make a decision. We can appeal that to the mayor and council.

The budget request is for the signs at our variance request. In the event we choose to downsize those, it would only be cheaper.

TREASURER SHEAFE: And is that the 150.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: That's the 150.
So, Elaine, walk through the four items on the change order request.

MS. BECHERER: Sure.
This is the change order that I reviewed at last night's board meeting. The one -- the first item is Change Order 6 -- Change Order Request 6. And that is for $\$ 61,349.24$.

So the same application that you saw in the restroom floors -- the concrete overlay, epoxy, polyurethane wax -- I am proposing that we apply that same technique to the floor of the breezeway to add it -- to add to that wow factor and give it a sense of a new look, some color, and just some visual interest.

I think with all of the wall/ceiling treatment of the north and south wall and the new ceiling and the new light fixtures, it's only going to take us so far. Similarly to the restrooms. So that's \$61,000.

If the Board does not feel that that -- you know, that we should proceed with that, then the existing concrete floor would stay as is.

The site signage is as Mr. McCusker just stated. That amount, the 153,000, that also includes additional campus signage. So after two iterations of trying to value engineer the entire signage package, we get it down to as lows as we could.
(Mr. Moore returned to the proceeding.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And these are -- this is a bid amount not an estimate. So this --

MS. BECHERER: This is a bid amount. So this is a change order for Concord's contract.

The third item is for some new automatic door openers and panic hardware. So the new Arena doors, with the full glass, those are new doors. It came with all of this new hardware. But there are four sets -- five sets of exterior doors that have old hardware. And I think that it would be an added benefit to replace those doors and get the new automatic door openers.

And then the 49,000, that is for asbestos abatement in the escalator lobby.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Not really something you have a choice with.

MS. BECHERER: Correct.
MS. COX: I have a question about the site signage. \$153,000 in addition to what you had planned for signage?

MS. BECHERER: In addition to, yes.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: So what's the total signage budget with the changes?

MS. BECHERER: I don't have that number right in front of me. That's a really good question. I apologize.

MS. COX: It just seems like a lot of money. I mean, how does it compare with --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: It's not just the monument signage. It's every sign.

MS. COX: Right.
MS. BECHERER: So what it is, is it's a total of four -- two monument signs, two directories, five or six different rewrap of parking identification lots, as well as exits. And then, all of the interior signage. And I --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: These -- these are high definition video. So not just

MS. COX: I guess I'm just -- my question --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: But it is expensive. In fact, we bid it three times.

MS. BECHERER: We did. We got a bid. And then it just was just way too high. We redesigned the monument signs and scaled them down in the height and size, everything. And we removed signs. And our initial estimate, Jannie, was just too low for the site package. MS. COX: Okay. That was my question, really.

Okay. So it was just your initial --
MS. BECHERER: Our initial number was just --
MS. COX: -- prediction on what that would cost was just off.

MS. BECHERER: It was. It was off.
MS. CoX: Thank you. That's what I wanted to know.

MS. BECHERER: So that is Change Order No. 7. And then I think that prior -- before I go through the next change order, I would like to review this document with you before you make any motions so you know you have a very clear understanding of what's going on.

MR. HILL: I want to warn Mr. Chairman, we're going to lose a member.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yeah. Let's deal with that change order. Just -- if there's any further conversation or someone would make a motion to approve.

SECRETARY IRVIN: So moved.
MS. COX: Second.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Motion and a second to approve the change order for $\$ 301,074.17$.

All in favor, say aye. (Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed, nay.
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Okay. So there you go. MS. BECHERER: Great.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Now, overall, where are -MS. BECHERER: What about -- there's a second change order before we lose another Board member.

So the second change order is for the escalator lobby renovations. So we always had intended to renovate the escalator lobby because it's critical to how you enter the lower level Arena. As one of the value-engineered items, we recommended that scope.

About three or four months ago, in this document that I'll review with you afterwards, I started to, as a part of the owner's contingency, set aside some potential money that could be used to renovate the escalator lobby. This change order is to do that.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: This is the entrance to the Arena from the north.

MS. BECHERER: Right.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So if you come in from the north, you go into that lobby, you go down the escalator. This would be the primary entrance to the Arena other than into the breezeway.

MS. BECHERER: Correct.

So we received the design drawings late last week. And then we have -- this is the estimate from Concord.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And these are bid numbers again.

MS. BECHERER: These are bid numbers. The change order would be that it would not exceed $\$ 50,000$. This is just over. And I have to go through this estimate with a finer . . .

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Just quickly, while Cody's here, if we approve these $\$ 350,000$, where are you on the contingency and the overall budget?

MS. BECHERER: So in the owner's contingency, there would be approximately $\$ 30,000$. And in the remaining GC contingency for number -- GMP1 and GMP2 as well as the GC -- general contractor's contingency, there would be an additional $\$ 70,000$. So the project still has $\$ 100,000$ in terms of funds.

TREASURER SHEAFE: For more cushion if you need it.

MS. BECHERER: Yes. Right.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. Anybody want to move to --

MR. HILL: Yes. I move the change order for 50,000.

MS. COX: So moved.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Hill's motion, second from Mark. All in favor, say aye.
(Ayes.)
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)
(Mr. Ritchie left the proceeding.)
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: All right. Anything else you need to do or say?

MS. BECHERER: That was my point of this document.
So if there's not any other questions, no, I'm done.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Timingwise, we're still on schedule?

MS. BECHERER: We are on schedule to be complete by the end of December. We have the Beach Boys coming in on the 3rd. And one of the last items will be the new video boards. And we are making sure that we'll have enough cushion to vent them out, training, and --

## Yes?

TREASURER SHEAFE: Yeah. What is your hearing date on the sign?

MS. BECHERER: So we go back -- we go to the board on November 12th at 2:00 p.m.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay.
MS. BECHERER: Yep. And what we'll be doing in
the next month is that we'll be meeting with the dark skies community. And we'll be reassessing, you know, what we can do, what are some option for us.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I think we should mention that all the neighbors that are directly adjacent have supported the sign.

TREASURER SHEAFE: That would be a real nice addition.

MS. BECHERER: So this document, if you want to just look at it on your own later, the second page does spell out the 12 adjacent neighbors. And no one has come out, to date, to oppose the signs. So I think that is critical to the messaging.

And I think Cushing -- pardon me -- Church is a different story in terms of can an electronic message board be on the south. But $I$ think what is critical to the success of the TCC is Granada. And with the streetcar, we need an electronic message board on both sides.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Thank you, again, Elaine. Great job.

MS. BECHERER: Great. Thank you.
Thank you all.
MS. COX: Yeah. Great job.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Keith, you ready?
MR. KEITH: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: If you'll remember from the last meeting, we had a presentation regarding the streetscape. This is the money we're allocated to spend as part of the global settlement with the City.

There are some questions about the project and its benefits and kind of improve the businesses. And, Michael, we asked you to come back. And reintroduce yourself to the transcriptionist.

MR. KEITH: My name is Michael Keith. I'm the CEO of the Downtown Tucson Partnership. And with me today is Elaine Becherer, as you know quite well, with the City of Tucson and the project manager. Elaine's going to talk first about the organizational chart.

MS. BECHERER: So I have some extra copies of the org chart. And the org chart is up on the screen as well.

So as Mr. Keith mentioned, he and I will be comanaging this project together. And in working together, what we've laid out for you is we wanted to show you -before the project starts, we wanted to show you the level of organization and how we plan to proceed as a team.

MS. BECHERER: So as coproject managers, we will be reporting to the City of Tucson, as well as to Rio Nuevo. If your expectations are that we come to you monthly to give you an update, that's what we'll do, just as I've been doing on the TCC Arena. And then also to the Downtown Tucson

1 Partnership, we'll be reporting back to.

To the left of the org chart, there's the City departments that we'll be working in coordination with the improvements. So every one from transportation, economic initiatives, as well as procurement, through contracts, things like this.

And then, we'll also be coordinating with property owners, merchants, and special events in terms of when we have to shut down a street, if a sidewalk is closed, sharing that information with the community and the downtown businesses. That's critical.

And then, to the far right, the consultants. And that will consist of some type of architect or landscape architect and then a general contractor.

Michael and I are in the center. And you can see to the -- off to the right, project information and communication will be coming through us. And then we will both be signing off on invoices.

In terms of the project tracking, we can do something similar. It's probably not going to be as complicated as this. But in terms of a level of transparency and rigor for, not only you, but the community. With that • •

MR. KEITH: Yeah. Any questions on the organizational chart part?
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I'm going to talk a little bit about the cost once again. And I'm looking at the budget sheet.

We have met with the City of Tucson. And they have suggested some things for us to consider, changes that they would like to see.

The first part of the budget, the top bracket, the Scott Avenue, Pennington to Congress, section remains pretty much unchanged. You'll see the total amount there plus a contingency of 65,000 for the total amount of 473 .

The second item on that list, which was the next section of Scott Avenue on the east side between -- between Congress and Broadway, it's also still as we presented to you.

The Arizona Alley portion, I'm going skip down first to there. The City asked if we'd consider as much as $\$ 50,000$ to put into that pot for their negotiations with TEP, Scott Stiteler, Gibson Market for the final solution Arizona Alley. I feel pretty strongly about Arizona Alley. I think most of you know, I've been pushing for a solution for that for more than a decade, but certainly the four and a half years of the Partnership.

But we would like to see, and I would like to see, in particular, what those negotiations are with TEP, exactly how that money would be spent. That 25,000 that we had in there initially was for the undergrounding of the poles in

1 that alley so that we could create a picture somewhat similar to one that you'll remember for the presentation.

And we don't expect the current owners and people in that -- in that alley to honor this drawing or to execute this drawing. But you get a sense. But there's holes in how active and how important a north-south corridor this could be.

So I'm going to ask for some flexibility here on this budget. That called into question the Broadway -- the stretch of Broadway between 6th and Arizona Alley as to whether that could still be funded if Arizona Alley was completely funded.

And if you skip all the way down to additional suggested projects, you'll see that the City was also interested in eleven shade structures. That would be at intersections, key intersections downtown that would allow some respite from the sun, crossing -- kind of a longer, delayed crossing times at intersections. We will take this into consideration as well as we move forward.

But this is -- the scope of work is primarily unchanged except for the addition of the sidewalk structures and a little bit more money for Arizona Alley. But we'll work through that as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Michael, this is in priority order, so you would start with Scott Avenue, and then . . .

MR. KEITH: Kind of yes and kind of no. Because the smaller items on the bottom, as you see, some of those, which can go quite quickly, say, the banners for TCC and the Mercado, we can start that right away. We would probably work back and --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: For the money, that seems to have unbelievable visibility, you know, versus some of these other larger projects that are on less visible streets.

MR. KEITH: I'm sorry?
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: The Arizona Avenue.
MR. KEITH: The Arizona Avenue, I think is a key component to that entire quadrant. And as we talked about, once Ronstadt Transit Center -- if that does go forward and get redeveloped, then that's a continuation of Arizona Ave. It goes right through Ronstadt Transit Center. So that north-south, bike-ped, that ability to do festivals and events, to do economic development for the restaurants. You know, there's a distillery going on in that alley, a microbrewery right around the corner. So it's an important corridor.

I just -- if you don't like committing money until I see what the plan is for that alley and that all of us are in agreement, that that's well spent. I have no problem with the 25,000 . But that additional 25 would be expensive.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: What we could do is -- is
we're suggesting here is that Rio Nuevo contract with the Downtown Partnership to manage these streetscape funds. That's one action.

MR. KEITH: Correct.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And then the budget, not unlike the TCC budget, we could approve the budget. And then it may move --

MR. KEITH: Right.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: -- depending on what you see as you -- as both of you get started.

MR. KEITH: As all of you know from the exercise that you just went through -- I must add my compliments -you've already heard me during the walk through the other day -- but what you did on that Arena is astonishing.

And if I had any concerns about Elaine Becherer is the perfect partner for this, that was dissolved immediately when I saw the treadmill light fixture in the bathroom. I mean, this -- I think we have the perfect team here to move forward.

But you know we're going be in a design, build, design, build process. We're going to find problems on Scott that we can't anticipate. We're going to realize that we could do something a little bit different for a shade structure for a lighting option.

So we would like to be able to set this up to
start with the Scott Avenue project. And then, as we move forward and do additional additions and subtractions from this workload as we go forward.

But, yes, Arizona Avenue is a key piece. And that money would probably need to be distributed fairly early in this process.

MS. BECHERER: So in addition to the scope of work being presented to you today, as a part of the settlement, we will also be seeking approval from the City of Tucson mayor and council. And if legal can make sure that I'm, you know, stating that accurately, but --

MR. COLLINS: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: What they have to do is concur.

MS. BECHERER: That's what I asked prior to this and --

MR. MOORE: That's a very important word from our perspective.

MS. BECHERER: That's what I said to legal, and I was corrected. So I'm not -- is it concur?

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: What does it say exactly?
MR. COLLINS: City approved.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Approved.
MR. COLLINS: City-approved streetscape improvements within the downtown --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: How did we let that slip by, Mark?

MR. MOORE: Does that include matching funds, then?

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: They have much every dollar that we spend.

MR. MOORE: Well, I just wanted to make sure of that.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: There's nothing specific in this settlement language as to matching this particular project.

MS. BECHERER: And I will say that the scope of work has been vetted out with the City and with economic initiates and working with Michael. And so the next step would be that we would, you know, take the scope as we're presenting it to you today to mayor and council.

MR. KEITH: Oh, sorry. Just one more thing just to add to this soup. One thing you won't find is a management fee for the Partnership.

I would propose that there be a 5 percent management fee added to this contract as a performance -- as a performance standard. Which is to say that if we were to perform and do this project to your satisfaction, that you would come back and award the Partnership a management fee.

I can tell you that we will be intimately involved

1 in this from start to finish and we will have to lay off --
2 we will have additional costs to do that, to the
3 Partnership. So we would like to see -- we'd like to
4 perform first and ask for that compensation after. And that 5 if that's. . .

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Does that mean it would -you'd have to bring the project in under the budget?

MR. KEITH: We'd have to bring it in under the 750. But it might be 750, and you might be asked to come with -- what would that be? -- thirty-seven-five additional to the 750,000 that would be paid directly to the Partnership.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Moore?
MR. MOORE: Two things. How about the merchants in the corridor, have they approved what you want to do?

MR. KEITH: We've talked to a good deal of them already. They -- this has been an ongoing subject forever about that street, about the darkness, about the narrowness of the sidewalks.

We have talked to -- I've talked to four of them already. But this is a -- sort of a Downtown impact corridor since the number of -- Pennington Garage is the largest garage downtown. People that walk out of that walk all through Downtown to go to festivals and events. We have a huge safety --

MR. MOORE: Who owns the Pennington Garage?
MR. KEITH: The City owns the Pennington Garage. We had a hundred thousand people down here last weekend. And that garage was sold out. It is used all the way up to two, three o'clock in the morning. In is probably the most underserved corridor in Downtown.

As we mentioned in our overview last week, we can do a number of things here really well, including make that street ADA compliant, do economic development, sustain investment on that street, provide a safe corridor for people coming out of the garage, and then begin to actually activate Pennington. And this is, of course, the corridor that people are going to use to get to Library Plaza and the item you saw earlier today the, you know, January . . .

MR. MOORE: One other question. I notice that the City is now increasing their charges for parking on the street with meters and everything to a dollar.

MR. KEITH: Correct.
MR. MOORE: Are we going to see any of that revenue go towards the street enhancements and so forth? It sames to me that that kind of money should be applied to --

MR. KEITH: I can't speak for the City, as you know, since $I$ am with the Partnership. Donovan Durband is here. And he can answer that question. But I would expect that that money would go back into ParkWise's budget for

1 other improvements.

MR. MOORE: It seems to me it should go on to what we're all trying to do, to enhance downtown.

MR. KEITH: Yeah. That's way past my grade code. MR. MOORE: Well, how do we get that?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: This -- I think this is particular to the settlement. This was negotiated with the City primarily between myself and the mayor. You know, part of our negotiation strategy was, you know, you pay us the money for the garage, you deed these lands over to you. We'll do a couple of things. We'll do some work on the Arena. We'll invest in some street improvements for the City of Tucson. And I think this is consistent with that.

I think there's an ongoing conversation, Alberto, with the City on how they use the bid money, how they use ParkWise money, you know, whatever to continue. Because this is -- the $\$ 750,000$ is going to go pretty quickly. And there is still a lot of things, $I$ think, that we would like to accomplish together. And I think it's appropriate that we have some conversation with the City above and beyond this particular settlement.

Now, we should also mention that $I$ think it's not entirely clear where we left things off with Scott Stiteler and streetscape obligations to him. That conversation never came up in the context of the settlement. And like many

1 things that -- from the old Rio Nuevo Board that predate us, it's not entirely clear what our obligations are to the geography around his projects regarding previous commitments that have been made to him regarding streetscape.

But I would argue that that's an entirely separate conversation as well. But one we're going to have to have. And Mark's there. He's nodding.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, yes, I think you will ultimately have to have that just to fill in the blanks.

Back in 2008 the Rio Nuevo Board entered into an amended agreement for the development of the Depot Plaza. That agreement includes language such as, City-constructed public infrastructure improvements to support the use of the project shall include full City and/or District funding for sidewalk, street, open space, and plaza improvements at the Depot Plaza.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And this is -- this is specific to the Depot Garage surface level geographies.

MR. COLLINS: It -- it --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And, Michael, is there any overlap in your --

MR. KEITH: No. We're not near -- both of those -- in fact, $I$ can't any of anything on this project that's going to get close to that except possibility some

1 banners and maybe some shade structures at the intersection some distance away from there. But, no.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Okay. So is the point of your question that --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: You're going to spend --
TREASURER SHEAFE: -- at the end of the day, we're going -- we will satisfy all those other requirements along with completion of this?

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: I think you have two issues that we have one very clear obligation toward, a signed settlement with the City and the District. That's what this proposal addresses.

There's a very vague misunderstanding regarding how things were left between Rio Nuevo, the City, and Stiteler that may, in fact, obligate us for some further streetscape work.

I think Mr. Irvin's point was, can we put all that together in one package and deal with it at once?

I don't think you can because they are totally separate geographies. And, you know, I don't know that we would get City approval if we try to satisfy the District's obligations to Stiteler by using streetscape money for that.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the other thing is a little bit off this particular topic. But we still -- have we gotten deed for the West Side property from the City?

MR. COLLINS: No.
MR. MOORE: I mean, it seems to me that that's also part of the settlement agreement. We're supposed to go forward with spending 750,000 --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I'd be happy, if you wanted to make that a condition of this.

MR. MOORE: I do.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. So we need a motion of some sort with a little string attached, then.

TREASURER SHEAFE: I think we're getting close.
MR. MOORE: Well, I'd like to make a motion that --

TREASURER SHEAFE: I just want to ask Mark if -Mark, could you just quickly assess -- we've had the documents going back and forth. Are they back on Mike's desk, or are they --

MR. COLLINS: No. They're -- they're in WLB's hands right now. They're finish up the -- the ALTA so that we'll have the right exhibits to attach.

TREASURER SHEAFE: We must be within days of getting that back because they've had that, for what, almost 30 days.

MR. COLLINS: I couldn't tell you, Mr. Sheafe. But that's about right.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Wouldn't hurt to put a little
fuel in the fire.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Yeah.
SECRETARY IRVIN: So I guess my point in all of that, Mr. Chair, was I just wanted to ensure -- I hadn't looked at that agreement for a long time. But I sure remember it from my memory that there was some, you know, potential contingent liability there.

And so I guess what I would ask of any motion -- I think this is a great bit of work, Michael, that you put together.

But I just would hate to see us all of the sudden spend this and then all of the sudden find out we have to go spend about this amount as well on Stiteler's project. And I think any motion we ought to make should just, you know, address the fact that we probably need to spend a few minutes sitting down with Scott Stiteler and the folks of the City to ensure that we're all on the same page as far as any liability in that area.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Mr. Moore, were you going to make a motion?

MR. MOORE: Well, I make a motion that we add that provision regarding the deed to the West Side property.

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And approve the --
MR. MOORE: And approve --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: -- the contract and budget
with the Downtown Partnership.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any further discussion?
MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, just verification. Approving the budget and acting on these projects does satisfy our $\$ 750,000$ commitment under the settlement.

MR. COLLINS: I would suggest to the Board that if you go forward with this motion that it be memorialized in a tri-party agreement so that you are assured that the City has approved what it is you're doing. Because you do need City involvement in this. It would be the District, Downtown Tucson Partnership, and the City.

Yes?
SECRETARY IRVIN: So how would you also suggest that we address this potential other issue as it relates to the Stiteler's property.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I -- it's my opinion that you folks have limited resources. And I respectfully disagree with the view that the language of the settlement agreement is somehow different from the risk that the District has under the old Depot Plaza improvements.

I would suggest to you that you'd want to deal with both of those things, at least explore it. That agreement that I quoted from specifically has a provision for trying to work out any last minute problems and to sit
down at a table like you're doing now and resolve it.
So I would suggest that it might be prudent for you folks to at least explore that before finalizing the contract that you're talking about now.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. So the motion, however, is to approve the contract and the amount. It's not linked to the Stiteler project.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Not yet.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: It would take an amendment or something to do that. Counsel suggests that we would also enter into a written agreement with the City so there could be no question that they've approved this.

MS. BECHERER: After we go to mayor and council.
MR. KEITH: Mr. Chairman, would it -- is it also appropriate at this time with this motion to -- to include a performance payment to the Partnership in excess of the 750?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Moore, it's your motion. MR. KEITH: This will be -- this will be totally based on this Board's discretion that we have executed this to the standards that we say we will and this -- and the problem here for the Partnership is that --

MR. MOORE: I think it should be part of the budget, the 750 .

MR. KEITH: Well, the City may or may not agree with that assessment.

MR. MOORE: So, well, I mean, you know, that's up to them to make that decision.

TREASURER SHEAFE: He's saying we need to take a position first, and then the City, then, would match it. So he's asking you to maybe amend your motion to say that the motion can include a fee to the Downtown Partnership as long as it doesn't exceed the overall budget at the discretion of a performance review.

MR. MOORE: The overall budget being 750,000.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Yes. Whatever we do is going to require City approval.

MR. MOORE: That's fine.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Have you amended your budget -your motion?

MR. MOORE: Just what you just said, my friend.
TREASURER SHEAFE: So I second that amendment.
SECRETARY IRVIN: And then is there any discussion about the issue relative to potential liability to Stiteler, or are we just going to pass that over.

TREASURER SHEAFE: I would like to handle that in a separate motion.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. So the motion, to paraphrase, that's on the table is that we approve the Downtown Partnership's proposal to engage them,
contractually, to manage the streetscape improvements from the settlement; we approve the budget, subject to the City concurring; and we direct council to draft the documents.

MR. MOORE: And the deed. And the deed.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And it's tied into our receipt of the deed of the West Side.

TREASURER SHEAFE: And Elaine wants to address . . .

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: You don't get a vote.
Any other questions, comments, regarding the motion as it stands?

All in favor, say aye.
(Ayes.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed, nay?
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Okay. So we now know where we're going.

Elaine?
MS. BECHERER: When -- when the motion states that it's a contract with the Downtown Tucson Partnership, contracts, we were anticipating to go through City of Tucson procurement. So just --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: But then how do you . . .
MS. BECHERER: Execute the process?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: How you execute it is left up to your devices.

MS. BECHERER: Okay. I just wanted to make clear so that --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And counsel can address that if we end up with a tri-party agreement, you should be allowed to use your open contract.

MS. BECHERER: I didn't want to proceed and then you be surprised. So that's just for clarification.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: No.
MS. BECHERER: Okay. Great. Thank you.
MR. HILL: We're never surprised, just
disappointed.
MS. BECHERER: Well, $I$ hope not to disappoint you.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Now, while you're on the subject, you want to do anything specific with the Stiteler -- the Stiteler contingent liability?

MR. MOORE: Table that?
MR. HILL: Is that on the agenda?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. Well, it's really not agendized, is it, Mr. Collins?

MR. COLLINS: Correct. It's not on the agenda.
MR. HILL: We best avoid it, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I do whatever Jeff tells me.
He's my --

MR. HILL: I'm the law.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. Annual audit, Jim, thanks for hanging around.

Let's get Dan up here to do the quick chief financial officer report. And then Beach is ready with their annual audit. And if everybody's fine, we just stay right here and keep up.

MR. MEYERS: I'm Dan Meyers. And I'm the CFO for Rio Nuevo. This will be our monthly cash update as of the end of September.

So in our Alliance Bank operating account we've got $\$ 5.5$ million. Our Alliance Bank account, we just kind of let that sit there and accumulate. We got a little over \$5 million.

In the Bank of Tucson operating account, we've got approximately $\$ 286,000$ in that.

The City of Tucson still has some of our funds that are being used to make payments on the TCC renovation. The balance in there now is a little under $\$ 1.1$ million. I anticipate that money being gone and spent this month.

So the total cash on hand at this particular time is 11.9 million.

We've got about $\$ 10.7$ million in remaining commitments, one of which is about $\$ 4.3$ million for the parking garage which isn't going to happen for a couple
years.
So that would leave us with approximately $\$ 6.3$ million of commitments.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: You'll see that item, we have historically not considered that a commitment. But you'll see that item addressed in the audit. They do believe the Board's action committed us to those funds. So it will show up in the audit as committed funds. So we're going to start including it in the presentation that Dan makes. It's committed.

We're not obligated to expend those funds until that project is completed. So it is probably a couple of years out. But this is probably the proper accounting treatment.

MR. MEYERS: Right.
I just want to point out, as far as the TCC renovations go, our costs incurred to date are about $\$ 5.2$ million. However, there'd be 240,000 and some -- the last two pay applications from Concord should be paid this month. And that's 1.7. So we only really expended about \$3. 3 million on that project thus far.

Any questions?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Jimmy?
BeachFleischman has done our audit for the last three years. They always present it to the Board before

1 it's published. Do today we'll go through it. We can ask any questions.

If we're okay with it, we would accept the audit. And then it would become a matter of public record.

MR. LOVELACE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, we appreciate the opportunity to be your independent auditors. As so noted in your agenda, you are statutorily required to have an annual audit.

We are prepared to issue a clean opinion. I would just like to say congratulations to the District and the Board. This is your third year in a row for a clean opinion.

Just in summary, I would add to that, the current year engagement was a pretty straightforward engagement, unlike in prior years where we certainly had our challenges. To render that clean opinion, again, it will be your third year in a row.

Again, I'll just add a couple of quick comments.
There was no significant audit adjustments that were proposed. We did book some financial statement reclassifications.

For example, your land held for resale, we carved that out and itemized that on the statement balance sheet. Presumably, if that does sell, that would be a gain in the subsequent year.

But, again, there was no major adjustments to propose as your independent auditors to get to your --

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Let's talk about that for a minute. It's on page -- the balance sheet, which is page, what?

MR. LOVELACE: I believe that would be page 3.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So what he's talking about is the Arena Lot which was transferred to us as part of the settlement, which we value as $\$ 973,000$, right? That's the correct item?

MR. LOVELACE: That is the value on the books, yes.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So the current proposal to sell that, you'll remember, is for $\$ 5.6$ million. So, indeed, we will record a gain of four and a half million dollars when we close the sale of that property.

MR. LOVELACE: In the full accrual financials, not the fund financials -- but in the full accrual, yes, sir, that would be correct. You would report that gain.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Go ahead.
TREASURER SHEAFE: I'm not sure I quite understand the difference.

MR. LOVELACE: Well, in the world of governmental accounting, sir, you have two measurement models. One is the fund account, which is what's referred to as resources

1 available. And it's modified accrual as opposed to full accrual. So it's really just liquid assets, current assets, current liabilities, per se.

As opposed to the full accrual, which, again, would have long-term assets, long-term liabilities. And it's more of a for-profit model.

GASB 34's been on the books for a number of years now. But, again, when we talk about the gain, that would be on Page 3 of the full accrual financials.

On a cash flow basis, it's still the same thing irrespective of the modified accrual or the full accrual. Upon sell, assuming it's an all-cash deal, it would wind up in your bank account.

So, again, $I$ just wanted to emphasize, it was a very straightforward year. Again, in prior years, that's not always -- we've not always had that luxury. But it is the third year in a row for a clean opinion other than some financial statement reclassifications, that being one of them.

We are prepared to issue a clean opinion. We will need to update our subsequent events, both Dan and legal counsel, loose ends of that nature.

We will need to obtain our management representation letter, which again would include the Chair; the treasurer; and Dan, the CFO.

I would like to just, in closing, make one quick point. Due to the size of the District, and I'll just say the staff available for the District as large, while we are required under the Yellow Book auditing standards to look at your internal control, we didn't issue any material weaknesses. But I would like to remind the Board and emphasize the importance of your role in overseeing the financial affairs.

Again, we did not issue any material weaknesses under that responsibility. But, again, I'm just reminding the Board, because of the size of your staffing operationally, again, I'm emphasizing the importances as it relates to your governance and fiduciary responsibility to oversee the affairs of the District.

TREASURER SHEAFE: But along that line, are you reviewing the process under which we're now setting up our ability to understand what our income stream is?

MR. LOVELACE: We look at it, sir, from, I will say, all the internal controls around revenue, receivables, cash receipts, purchases payable, cash disbursements. You don't really have inventory. Although, you do have property, plant, equipment, fixed assets. You don't have a lot of payroll, but we look at the controls around payroll as well.

Again, we're not reporting any material weaknesses

1 in you policy and procedures --

TREASURER SHEAFE: The question goes to the fact that we've now set up or are in the process in -- I think you probably made some overture of how you're getting the information from the State as to what the total revenue base is, potentially, available to the District.

And in the audit, I would assume that you got involved in that, in making sure that we have a good tracking mechanism for our ability to really know where those dollars are coming from and do they represent the full potential of the dollars actually received by the State through their tax revenue.

MR. LOVELACE: I will tell you that we do look at the processes around these streams of revenue. And as it relates to our opinion, sir, we believe it's reported in our annual GAP financial statements. They are materially accurate. And that is part of our responsibility when we render that opinion.

Could there be a different model? Absolutely. But as it relates to the policies and procedures around those revenue streams, yes, sir, we do look at them.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: What they confirm, which is really not auditable, is that the money the State sends us ends up in our bank.

MR. LOVELACE: And is reflected in those
statements --
TREASURER SHEAFE: That's actually why I was asking.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: They really don't --
TREASURER SHEAFE: -- because right now, it's handed out of a black box.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Right. They really don't review or speak to the accuracy of those wires.

That's -- but I think the broader point -- and it's important, specifically, to you and I -- we've escaped Sarbanes-Oxley kind of challenges by having a very involved Board in the financial procedures of the organization with a two-person company. It's very hard to provide the checks and balances and oversight that an auditor would require.

So if, for some reason, you or $I$ or some future Board members decided not to provide the level of oversight that we do -- two signatures on every check; you know, review of the invoices and procedures -- this organization would have some challenges meeting those standards. So we serve in a quasi staff role that made it a lot easier for them to audit this business than if we didn't follow that oversight.

And I think it's an important message for our voluntary member members that we have to engage in the financial oversight of this organization, or it makes it

1 really hard to be audited.

MR. LOVELACE: I would say all material receipts are pretty much wired to books. And so the primary concern we have ensuring that the statements are, again, in accordance to GAP in all material respects is -- as Mr. Chairman spoke to, is your oversight for the expenditures.

And, again, because of the limited size of your staff, we're reminding the District and the Board of record to continue -- it's very important to continue that governance role.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Well, I think we're committed to that, Jim. And we know that money isn't filtering away without two of us being very aware of where it is.

So the issue really -- where the District has a wide open vulnerability in the past has been we had no idea whether we were getting our appropriate fair share of the tax revenue that was paid over to the State or not.

Now, we're in the process of getting that. Because of the legislation, we have the ability to go see those records. Probably in the next round it will be a review process to make sure that that actually reflect -accurately reflects the full volume of income the District is entitled to.

MR. LOVELACE: As it relates to the revenue

1 stream, I absolutely believe that that new ability will certainly enhance the District's comfortability of knowing that the completeness of these receipts are even better ensured. I do.

TREASURER SHEAFE: Well, it's a compliment to the current County staff of one and the excellent job being done. Efficient, really.

MR. LOVELACE: It is, in that regard, yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay, any questions for Beach?
We can take this home and ponder on it. But then it wouldn't get published until the next meeting. Or if you don't have any reason not to --

TREASURER SHEAFE: I'd like to move for approval.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: -- move to approve.
MS. COX: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I have a motion to approve the audit as presented and a second.

All in favor, say aye.
(Ayes.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed, nay.
(The Board voted and the motion was carried.)

CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: Okay. So we'll sign the rep letter, Jim.

TREASURER SHEAFE: You'll get us a rep letter?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We have it. There you go. MR. LOVELACE: Lydia and Michele are on top of it as usual.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Jim, thank you very much. MR. LOVELACE: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Lydia, thank you.
Okay. The Arena Lot, Mr. Collins, just an update on where we are with the protest and negotiations. And then we also have an item on here as action. But $I$ don't believe we, in fact, have any action. So just update us on the status of the Arena Lot procurement.

MR. COLLINS: The -- Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, there was a protest, as you all know. There was a decision by the contract officer finding against the protester. There was no appeal. So the protest is over.

We are now awaiting an outline, at least, of what the -- what Nor-Gen wants so that we can proceed with the negotiations.

Any questions?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: West Side Parcel, we discussed it, but it's on the agenda. I guess that's really not related to the deed as it is to the hydro chem.

MR. COLLINS: Right, right.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So in your packet, we actually approved this in the last meeting, but as part of the WLB

1 request, WLB has come back to us and said they really don't have the expertise or equipment to do an adequate job testing the Arena landfill and soil issues.

They referred us to Hydro Geo Chem. And that proposal's in the packet. Since we've not had a relationship with them, we would need the Board to approve that contract.

Again, this is to drill and test the status of the landfill on the West Side Parcel, both the depth and type of material in the landfill, and then the current production of methane, which we can't do anything with that property without knowing both of those items.

Mr. Sheafe?
SECRETARY IRVIN: Mister --
TREASURER SHEAFE: May I ask a question?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Go ahead, sir.
SECRETARY IRVIN: Go ahead.
TREASURER SHEAFE: Well, I have not had a chance to look at this. But $I$ see they are giving us an approximate cost of $\$ 61,000$ to run these tests. And the -I guess I'm amazed that we don't have this information.

The City has spent an awful lot of time and money out there running the exact same tests.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: It's not current. So if you don't do it in realtime, we can't provide any assurances
that what we want to do over there is doable today.
We know what it was ten years ago. We know what it was five years ago. There's no current information on -TREASURER SHEAFE: You mean -- do we absolutely know there's no current information?

SECRETARY IRVIN: Well, I'll tell you what I did -- and, Alberto, chime in here.

But I think four years ago or three and a half years ago, we got a report. That report was ten --

Was it ten years old?
MR. MOORE: Yeah.
SECRETARY IRVIN: At least ten years old. At least ten years old. I don't think there's anything -- I haven't seen anything current since.

MR. MOORE: Well --
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: There's nothing --
MR. MOORE: -- had to do something.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Yes. Well, that's well north.
I mean, this is just exclusively on the southern tip.
MR. MOORE: But they had the same problems.
That's all I'm saying.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: And this would be exclusive
to --
MR. MOORE: -- have to do with the railroad -CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: -- and it would be current.

MR. MOORE: -- the streetcar.
CHAIRMAN MCCUSKER: So there's really no way you can advance the project without a current one.

MR. MOORE: Could I ask that we defer this to the next meeting just to do a little bit of exploratory question of the staff over there?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Make a motion to table it.
TREASURER SHEAFE: I would put forth a motion to table this issue.

SECRETARY IRVIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We have a motion to table this item and a second.

All in favor, say aye.
(Ayes.)
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed, nay.
(The Board voted and the motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. We'll put it back on the agenda for the next meeting.

And the only thing left, Michele, is call to the audience. Do you have any?

MS. BETTINI: No.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

SECRETARY IRVIN: So moved.
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25 CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor, say aye. (Ayes.)
(The meeting concluded at 11:40 a.m.)
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