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CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I will call the meeting to order.

And, Mr. Marquez, you can lead the Pledge.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Brandi, you call roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Here.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Here.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Here.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Here.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Here.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And Mr. Irvin is on his way, we understand.

We have a quorum. We'll go ahead and start the meeting.

For the people in the audience, be mindful that we typically go straight into executive session.
So with today's agenda, it will probably be 45 minutes or an hour before we come back. So smoke them if you got them.

You have the minutes transcribed from the November 13th meeting. Unless someone has a change or correction, we need a motion to approve it.

MS. COX: So moved.

MR. MARQUEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.

MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And I need a motion to recess to executive session.

MS. COX: So move.

MR. MARQUEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.

MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. We'll see you as
soon as we can.

(The Board met in executive session from 1:01 p.m. to 2:07 p.m.)

(Mr. Irvin present.)

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I can entertain a motion to reconvene.

MR. IRVIN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Second, please?

MS. COX: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.

MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We're back in regular session. Thank you for your patience. You're learning it takes us about an hour to go through executive session. We tend to do that first and try and get back out here as quickly as we can. Mr. Marquez is on his way.

I will -- in order to accelerate the process, there's not a lot I want to say. I do want to encourage you to drive west on Cushing and look at the copper facades that are going up on the Caterpillar
building. It's really quite spectacular.

So I think we're scheduled to turn the keys over to them this month. And I think they've indicated to the County that they intend to take occupancy by March.

Dan, do you want to give us your financial record?

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

Dan Meyers, the CFO for Rio Nuevo.

Kind of a quiet month from our perspective for outflows for taking place in November. We've got about $4.7 million in available cash, unrestricted funds.

We've got solid commitments for about 3.7 within the next year, leaving about a million dollar excess at this time.

Notoriously, August, September are our worst months for collecting funds from our share of the transaction privilege tax that's taking place.

We had 940,000 in August, I think, when -- 900,000, probably, at the most for September, from what I've heard. We expect that to pop up once October gets here and the holidays and the tourism time comes in.

Again, like I said, we have very few
outflows of cash for our commitments in October.

However, in November we paid out 75 percent of our $400,000 for arena football, which included the turf, dasher boards, and quite a bit of equipment.

So any questions?

Okay.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Dan, thank you very much.

Okay. Item Number 7 I'm going to table.

Just a quick note on what we're thinking. Presidio, of course, is that kind of northwestern section of downtown and the Rio Nuevo District.

You may remember, we've authorized a little under a half a million dollars to renovate the duplex adjacent to the Presidio museum that's Rio Nuevo owned. That will hopefully bear some retail fruit.

We see a lot of opportunities to enhance the Presidio District with the way things are developing, the IDA lot, the so-called platform lot.

But we're going to table this and continue to meet with the stakeholders in and around that section of downtown.

Caliber Hotel, I think, Mr. Collins, suffice it to say that conversation in the exec was to
basically encourage you to continue to negotiate some
of the finer points with Caliber and then bring that
back to us.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Board, that's true. I think we ought to have a motion
in the public session to do that.

MR. SHEAFE: I move that we authorize
counsel to continue negotiations with the Caliber group
towards putting together a final agreement on the
hotel.

MR. IRVIN: Second.

MR. COLLINS: And I would ask you to amend
your motion to say "In accordance with instructions I
received in E session."

MR. SHEAFE: So amended.

MR. IRVIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. The motion is
seconded to instruct counsel to complete -- to continue
negotiations with Caliber per our instructions in
executive session.

All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.
MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Motion passes.

And Item 9, Keri, Sloane, you're up.

The Volvo site, if you're not from around here, of course, is a site just east of downtown, the former Volvo site.

Sloane owns the extraordinary Welcome Diner and is the awardee, is what the government would consider him, for the parcels that surround the Welcome Diner on that site. And we've obviously expressed an interest in helping enable further retail on that site.

So, Sloane, Keri, whenever you're ready.

MS. SILVYN: Start with introductions while getting the technology going.

I'm Keri Silvyn, 5983 East Grant Road.

Sloane is here with me, McFarland. We want to thank you for the opportunity to come back after last month's meeting.

We're very excited about the project that you may see in a minute, or you might not.

I do have hard copies of the presentation. I have enough for you all and a few for the audience.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Let's distribute those
just in case we can't get the PowerPoint up.

MS. SILVYN: Okay. I'm going to rock and roll.

The vision for this project is, I think a lot of you know, is to really build up what Sloane and his partners have been doing with the Welcome Diner, being respectful in honoring what's out there and also providing some really cool and exciting commercial hospitality, residential, and recreational opportunities that are going to serve both the existing and hopefully future folks who want to come to Tucson.

The vision fits perfectly within the Sunshine Mile. It is at the western terminus of the Sunshine Mile.

If you go to -- I think it's the fourth page. There's a little bit of -- we all know where we are. It's the old Volvo site.

The property in red is what the ownership -- the private ownership currently has, which is 1.68 acres, and then in yellow you'll see the additional 1.8 acres, which is what they're purchasing from the City of Tucson.

The existing zoning is C3 along Broadway and down Park a little bit of the ways, and then the
As I think a lot of you know, that is the highest intensity commercial zoning. It's also, obviously, industrial zoning.

So a lot of the uses we're going to talk about in a minute are actually permitted under the underlying zoning.

The reason that we have a commitment with the City to go through a PAD is that our zoning code in the city of Tucson encourages a very suburban form of development.

And on this site it really -- and most of the infill projects are looking for infill development standards. So the PAD is going to give us an opportunity to create those infill standards.

So we are getting -- in this presentation getting just a little bit ahead of the actual PAD process, which is the entitlement process.

But the uses we're talking about are pretty much permitted in the underlying zoning, so I'm not getting ahead of the use discussion. It's just the form of the development which we'll be establishing in the PAD.

The next page is the Rio Nuevo Business District. I was asked to just point that out.
The McKey Street, alley -- named alleys and streets are sometimes one and the same in the city -- the McKey runs through the middle of it. The northern edge of McKey is actually the edge of the Rio Nuevo District on the site.

The next page you'll start to see kind of the vision for the project. Sloane is an artist, so this is an artist's rendition of the types of uses that are going to be on the project.

The next page is really the -- I'm not going to call it a site plan, but sort of the beginning of the vision for the uses on the project.

So the team has worked on a number of concepts. As you can see, based on that map, a lot of the TPT-generating uses are actually north of McKey.

You know, there's sort of the "know your audience." I'm standing here in front of the District, so the question of whether we did that on purpose, the answer is it actually worked out that way because it makes sense to put the TPT-generating uses up along Broadway, which is our major arterial, and Tyndall and Park, and to pull some of the non-TPT-generating portions of the project down to the south.
It also ends up being a really good transition into the southern area and some of the neighborhoods as you go further south.

The types of uses we're looking at, retaining and enhancing the current Welcome Diner. So there will be investment back into the Welcome Diner as the things -- as the development occurs in and around it.

Additional eating establishments branded with the Welcome concepts that are up on -- they're Numbers 2 and 3 on the project. It's another 4,000 square feet, in addition to 5,500 square feet of the Welcome Diner.

Retail event/meeting spaces, about 37,500 square feet in that northern area.

Smaller-amenity hotel and residential, you'll see there's a 5-A and 5-B down in the southern portion. Those don't really generate TPT, but they put people there who will help to encourage the use of the retail up on the northern site.

We're also looking at a hotel hospitality, the 130-room hotel. That is 5-C, which is in the northern portion.

Whether or not that's part of Phase 1 or Phase 2, you'll see in the next -- when we have the
spreadsheet that we've -- we're being very conservative
in thinking that it may be two phases. What we're
hoping is that it's all in one phase.

The 130-room hotel -- the actual hotel
rooms are not TPT generating, but what we want to do no
matter what in our Phase 1 is bring forward some of the
more retail amenities that will be incorporated into
the hotel in Phase 1.

So that's all front loaded, as you can see
in our spreadsheet.

The -- as I said, the hotel and residential
on the south side and a lot of the outdoor/indoor event
space, while it is a little bit TPT-generating, it's
not substantial. And that's down in the southern
portion of the site, again, a good transition.

And now I'm on the last page of the
presentation, so our timing is perfect.

The -- I can start over again if you really
want me to.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: No, ma'am.

MS. SILVYN: Just kidding.

This is the last page of the spreadsheet
with the investment and the numbers, so we've worked to
determine the hard- and the soft-cost investment in the
Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project. Again, we're
hoping that it's all a single phase. We also estimated the gross sales, annual TPT in construction, TPT for these two phases. We were conservative. We are really hoping to blow the top off a lot of these numbers but felt we needed to be conservative coming in here today.

The total investment, land and construction and soft costs for Phase 1, as you can see, are about 9-and-a-half- to $10 million. For Phase 2 it's 14-and-a-half. So the total capital investment is 24- to 25 million, again, conservative estimates.

Construction TPT, doing the math, which I made Sloane do the math, because you generally don't want me to do the math, the Phase 1 TPT is a one-time 200- to 300,000; Phase 2 is 350- to 400,000.

So the total is 550 to about 700, just over 600 on our estimate for the one-time construction TPT.

The retail TPT, we, as I said, excluded any of the hotel and residential. There may be some, but we excluded it to be as conservative as possible.

We calculated it out starting at 2021 through 2025. So that total is between 4- and 5 million. And, again, most of those TPT-generating
are all north of McKey, which is within the District boundaries.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: That's total TPT; that's Rio Nuevo, State, City, everybody combined, or is that our portion?

MS. SILVYN: That is -- I think that's Rio Nuevo's portion.

MR. McFARLAND: Yeah.

MS. SILVYN: Yes, that's Rio Nuevo's portion.

MS. COX: Does that include the TPT that we're already receiving on the Welcome Diner?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: It's a million two of that number.

MS. SILVYN: It's a very small portion of that number.

MR. MARQUEZ: It's a fourth, I believe.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: If you look at your -- if you can get the spreadsheet up so the public can follow us.

I'm assuming that Concept Map 1 is the Welcome Diner, and that ties in to the full-service restaurant.

Now, maybe there's some additions to that, because there is an investment. So maybe that's
incremental.

But I think the question is, what is the current Welcome Diner producing in terms of TPT tax, so we can look at the incremental TPT tax.

MS. SILVYN: It is current.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I'm sorry. You're ahead of us.

So it's the million two less than the

406?

MS. SILVYN: Yes. As new TPT, yes.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Can you pull that up?

To summarize for the record and for the public, because it's hard to see even on the board what Sloane and Keri are proposing. Phase 1 is basically a $10 million addition to the current site. You're repurposing the existing buildings.

So I know the neighbors have been very concerned about what happens to the current structures. These are adaptive reuses, which adds restaurant space, a bar/lounge, outdoor mercado, outdoor public space, retail, artisan retail, and creates about, over the period, a little north of $3 million of Rio Nuevo-based tax.

And if you do Phase 2, the construction costs go up. There's not a lot of retail associated
with the hotel.

So Phase 1 is the home run for us, because it produces such new incremental retail along the Sunshine Mile corridor.

And, Mr. Collins, Keri, you probably know, but to ask again, are the investment conversations that we're having with you, I think it's 800,000 of equity and $2.1 million loan against the project?

MS. SILVYN: 1.3 and 8 and then potential TPT sharing as well, yeah.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: What's the Board's pleasure? Any questions for Keri or Sloane?

Thank you. This is very well done.

MR. SHEAFE: Let's move for approval of the concept as proposed. I think we've got a long ways to go to get these tied down to the final documents.

Counsel?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Sheafe, yes, the concept, I believe, is that the District would enter into a loan agreement -- actually, a development agreement, to use that term, but where the District would agree to do the loan upon the closing of the purchase of the Volvo site, and we can put that together pretty quickly.
There's a lot to be done after that. The question becomes the District's -- the District has to own the property if it's going to be a rebate to Sloane, or the City can do it, but it's got to be a government-owned property.

So we do have some things to do, but to allow Sloane and Keri to proceed forward, what we would need to do as our first step is authorize the preparation and execution of a loan agreement that also wraps in the $800,000 equity piece.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Just to help conceptually, the $10 million project -- we're putting up roughly two -- it's five times leverage. But the really interesting piece is the retail components of that, because it's almost all retail. We get twice our investment back in Rio Nuevo site-specific sales.

MR. SHEAFE: So I amend the motion to authorize preparation of the documents for the loan, for the other related documentation to move this project forward, which would move forward the possibility of funding the equity portion of it, counsel to complete that work, and have the executive officers approve it once it's complete.

MS. COX: Second.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. What that will do is allow you to complete the documentation with the developer and allow the executive officers to execute those documents.

Everybody got that?

MR. MARQUEZ: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Marquez.

MR. MARQUEZ: What -- so, obviously, this hasn't been built yet. This is conceptual. What is our collateral on the loan upon closing, just the land?

MR. SHEAFE: No. We own it.

MR. MARQUEZ: We're just going to own the land?

MR. SHEAFE: Yeah.

MR. MARQUEZ: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: Well, it will probably be a leasehold interest. It will be a lien on a leasehold interest.

MR. MARQUEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: But under the (undecipherable) that will be Rio Nuevo property.

MR. COLLINS: True, but there's going to be some financing money, too. So it's going to be very similar to a lot of other deals we've done.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any other questions?

We have a motion and a second.

Brandi, call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.

And that unanimously passes.

Sloane, congratulations.

MR. MARQUEZ: Good job, Keri.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Keri, thank you very much.

I think I'm on Item 10, TCC improvements.

MR. SHEAFE: Did you skip over Caliber?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I did skip over Caliber. No, I think we talked about instructing counsel to move ahead for E session. That was your
motion, actually.

MR. SHEAFE: Oh, you're right.

MS. COX: Never mind.

MR. SHEAFE: Never mind.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Item Number 10, TCC.

To refresh everyone's memory, we have had a special hearing regarding the TCC so-called capital improvement projects list.

And that totaled about $42 million, roughly. It was prepared by City staff and presented to us. Not only did we take -- not take anything off the list, we talked about projects that would add to that cost, conceivably as high as 70- or $75 million.

The key next step for us in that process is to, of course, finance that. So what we want to do now is authorize the solicitation of financial proposals from various lenders, banks, builders, whomever, to finance something in that neighborhood.

And, also, I think we talked about issuing a request for qualifications to see what construction firms might be interested in a project of that scale.

Is that oversimplifying the --

Mr. Collins?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, no, it is not.
It's really a couple of tracks. One is soliciting funding to find out what the cost of money is going to be and how much you can access.

The second is the RFQ process, which would be soliciting qualifications for people who are interested in doing the building.

But there's one more piece, and that is the design team. And so I think you ought to be thinking about engaging an architect or some such professional to work with the preparation of the RFQ that you're talking about.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So it's really a three-piece kind of conversation: Rise to authorize the District to retain an architectural firm. That's a professional service, so it does not have to be competitively procured.

MR. COLLINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Item Number 2 would be solicit financial proposals. And we can use the financial advisor to do that. That's a professional service. It does not have to be competitively procured.

MR. COLLINS: Precisely.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And the part that would
scope under procurement would be the construction firm contractor RFQ.

MR. COLLINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So we might want to think about three motions.

MR. IRVIN: I think we've already done a motion to approve the executive officers to move forward on financing. Am I missing something? We're okay on that one.

MR. COLLINS: You haven't specifically addressed financial advisor, and I would suggest that you do.

And so I would -- that would be my suggestion is that you -- the executive officers be authorized to engage a financial advisor to work with the executive officers to determine how much can be borrowed and at what cost.

MR. SHEAFE: Would that be done through a financial advisor, or are we doing that through an RFQ?

MR. COLLINS: You can do it through a financial advisor. You're a governmental entity. You do not have to procure that advice. As the chairman indicated, that's a professional service. Plus, you're a governmental entity.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: The last time, Chris, we used Piper.

MR. SHEAFE: Yeah, that's why I'm thinking -- okay.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Someone like that that we can interview, retain. Same thing with the architectural firm, we can entertain and hire whomever we want.

MR. COLLINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So let's look at three motions: Authorization to hire an architect, authorization to hire a financial advisor, and authorization for counsel to release a construction management RFQ.

MR. COLLINS: To Mr. Irvin's point, I think the last one of those you got covered last time. I believe I was instructed --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Never have too many motions.

MR. COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SHEAFE: Well, we're kind of doing this in reverse, just for everybody's benefit. We're starting off with a number and saying, "Let's figure out if we can get a pile of money. Now, what will we use it for, and how will we build it?"
So let's go back to the first portion. The motion is to authorize the executive officers to engage financial resources for -- to guide us in how we would raise money, what it would cost us, and under what circumstances.

MS. COX: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay. And that's a motion to procure -- not procure, but to hire a financial advisor.

Brandi, call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.

That's unanimous. You're on a roll, Mr. Sheafe.

MR. SHEAFE: Now, the second motion is what
are we going to build, and the motion is to hire an 
architect to help define what it is that we would build 
in the TCC to make improvements to meet our goal, which 
is fill all the hotel rooms.

So, succinctly, the motion is hire an 
architect to guide us through the process of 
establishing the improvements we want to put in to the 
TCC.

MS. COX: The executive officers would do 
that?

MR. SHEAFE: And the executive officers are 
authorized to complete that engagement.

MS. COX: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. That's a 
motion to hire an architect and allow the executive 
officers to execute on that agreement.

Brandi, call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: Aye.
MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.

That one passes unanimously.

Mr. Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Now, the third one -- the only reason we would do this at this point is because the CM at risk relationship may help us better cost engineer the improvements and understand, really, what we're doing.

So it would be authorizing the executive officers to engage, when the timing is necessary, appropriate construction resources for the cost review of those improvements. The architect helps us reach the conclusion about what we're going to build.

Is that clear enough?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: No.

MR. SHEAFE: You were looking at me like --

I can do that again, if you want.

MR. COLLINS: Sure.

MR. SHEAFE: Authorize the --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I move --

MR. SHEAFE: You do?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: No, no, no. Recite after me: I move --

MR. SHEAFE: I'm trying to get him on an airplane.

I move the executive officers are authorized to hire construction resources for the cost engineering of improvements that are determined for improvements to the TCC.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Somebody say --

MR. MARQUEZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: To be clear, this is regulated by Title 34 of the State procurement code.

MR. COLLINS: It is.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: So this is an RFQ. It is released competitively. It's addressed. They're evaluated. And then Rio Nuevo selects someone from that process.

MR. COLLINS: Just as Mr. Sheafe indicated, that allows you to value engineer it.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All right. Brandi, call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.
MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.

Thank you. That's unanimous.

To paraphrase -- is Chris DeSimone here?

To paraphrase, what we want to do is improve everything that the City has asked us to do.

We've also considered the addition of a parking garage on the east side of the TCC, some 450 spaces. We've also included opportunities for parking and perhaps a second sheet of ice to develop a public ice rink on the west side of the TCC.

None of that's been properly estimated or scoped, and the architects will indeed help us do that.

At such time, we'll have a better idea of the cost, and we'll have an idea of what it would take to finance that, and we'll have the opportunity to hire a construction firm to help us do all that.

I think, from our perspective, we want to
get after this posthaste. We could pay as you go and dribble money at the TCC for the next 10 years. That's really not our intent.

Our intent is to invest in that so it becomes, frankly, our Lincoln Center. And we can do that, we believe, in a space of about two years.

We'll move on to Item 11.

Mr. Collins, this is mostly technical, but we're kind of backing into some agreements that we've made historically (undecipherable) on this project.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.

The Arizona Hotel project was originally approved by this Board at its October 25th, 2016, meeting. A revised approach was authorized at its May 30, '17, meeting.

We've had a few hiccups along the way. Nothing has been memorialized. But now the developer is ready to complete the improvements consistent with the Board's previous authorization and with a discussion that we had in executive session.

So I am requesting from you a motion directing me to complete that process as I was instructed in executive session.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Hello?

MR. SHEAFE: So moved.

MS. COX: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any other conversation?

Any questions?

Brandi, call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Aye.

And that passes unanimously.

Mark, thanks for the hard work there.

Item 12, west-side parcel, this is a conversation we're going to hold in public session. I think maybe the first time we've done this regarding the A Mountain landfill, the challenges and
opportunities there.

Just to refresh everyone's memory on how we came to own this parcel, the 27 acres or thereabout south of Mission Lane in and around Mission Garden was deeded to Rio Nuevo as part of the settlement with the City of Tucson in 2013.

I don't think anyone understood at the time how toxic a landfill we really inherited. Had we known that, we might have taken a different position with the City, who was settling a variety of financial issues with us.

We did some engineering on that site in 2015 to see what the possibilities and challenges were. We also had to address the same landfill to the north when we remediated that for the Caterpillar site.

We had to, simply put, take the trash out of the old landfill, put it in dump trucks, and haul it to Los Reales.

As simple as that sounds, that cost us about $6 million, or roughly a million dollars an acre.

The City took advantage of our heavy equipment there and elected to remediate the northern section of the landfill that's City owned. They
spent about $8 million remediating the sections around what is affectionally called Tucson Origins Heritage Park.

So these northern sections have indeed been remediated. Simply put, the trash is scooped up and hauled off to the dump.

The southern section, the Rio Nuevo section, however, has not been remediated. And we estimate the cost of that to be somewhere north of $30 million.

So we've been historically stymied on that parcel. If you look at the engineering report we've distributed recently -- it's back up on the website -- it's some 190 pages.

It basically suggested that we not tinker with the landfill. Don't pave over it. Don't cap it. Don't build on it. Don't penetrate it. Moreover, don't irrigate on it for fear it would leach into the aquifer.

So we have some real liability now as the owners. We're not the polluters. The City of Tucson is, in fact, the polluter. But Rio Nuevo owns it. So we probably share some legal liability regarding its toxicity.

In my mind, it should be remediated. It
should be rectified. The only way any of us are ever
going to have clean earth to deal with over there,
whatever happens over there, is to find some way to
afford and pay for the remediation of those western
lands.

There have been some off-and-on-again
conversations about doing something on top of the
landfill. I think that's incredibly risky, given what
we know about its toxicity and just the difference in
grade.

So we've kind of taken the position
historically that we really can't do anything.

A number of west-side residents are
advancing a proposal, my words, to reforest those
27 acres as Sonoran desert.

The County, as we now know, is considering
dredging the Santa Cruz along that section of the river
and will have several tonnage of fill.

And it was suggested that we could put
that on top of our landfill and perhaps have enough
buffer between the methane and the opportunity to
reforest that it might be converted into a Sonoran
desert park.

There's some real challenges with that
plan. One is the landfill itself. It's toxic. It's
going to continue to produce methane. We can't irrigate it.

And it doesn't matter how tall you make the dirt; you still can't put water on it. So it would have to be irrigation free. It doesn't lend itself to a very lush park, for sure.

We can't build on it. We can't put a structure on it. We can't penetrate it. We can't build a building. You can't pave it if you wanted to park on it. So we're just kind of stuck with the status of it.

The other challenge is that I don't think the County really intends to do this, based on the input we've received from west-side residents.

And I can tell you, we've received over a hundred e-mails and letters encouraging us to consider this.

We met with the County manager on Friday, and he said that the County has absolutely no intention of putting the river dirt on top of a landfill. They'll find some other place to put it. So we remain kind of stuck, in my opinion.

I'm happy to allow a spokesperson, Raul or somebody who wants to kind of tell us, Diana, what you guys are thinking, or if you have some new information,
I think we would be happy to put you on the record. And we'll allow the Board to discuss it and arrive at some democratic position going forward. But, from my perspective, and I'm only one vote, I don't think you can do anything without remediating the land.

Mr. Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: First of all, I would completely concur in that. And I think any other community that had the opportunity to have 30 acres sitting right at the base of A Mountain downtown with landfill or not, we would be, I think, derelict in our duties just to cover it up with dirt and think that we can make a park out of it.

I'd like to see us at some point in time actually seek a planned area development, go through a PAD zoning on that, and determine what we'd like to do on that.

Obviously, we would need a lot of input from stakeholders and others. I personally don't have any interest in this being some big park.

I think we would be shot by those that appointed us if we did that. I think we've already gone through that issue and that battle.

So I'd like to see us right now do nothing
with it until such time as we feel that we can advance
a planned area development to really sit down with
stakeholders and decide what's possible there.

But until then, I just don't see me
supporting throwing dirt on top of that and creating an
additional problem. I just don't think it works.

MR. MARQUEZ: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Marquez.

MR. MARQUEZ: I can definitely understand
where Mr. Irvin is coming from. It's $35 million to
remediate this landfill. It's a lot of money.

Obviously, you have to go $35 million of
expense before you even got to actually building
something and developing something.

It is a unique opportunity if the County is
wanting to or has the will to place that sediment and
silt and sand on top of this property just to make it
more attractive.

I think it's a pride issue, especially
the west side. My family comes from the west side.
We'd like to have some pride in our area to make sure
that we have a livable place, a nice-looking area,
instead of just a, gosh, surface-of-the-moon-looking
landfill.

The question is whether or not the County
is willing to do that. In our report that we did read through the 190 pages, there's an opportunity for there to be some dirt on top of the property with some desert vegetation, zero irrigation so you don't mess with the water table or the water underneath reaching.

There is some opportunity, but I guess it really comes down to whether there's political will by the County to even present this to us. And from what I'm hearing from my fellow Board members is there's not.

But I think, as Rio Nuevo, if the County does present something to us, I think we should be open minded and listen and at least see what Chuck or the rest of the County has to say.

MR. IRVIN: Just to be clear, the County may want to do or may not want to do it, but before they can do anything, they have to have this Board's permission to do that. They can't just go and start popping dirt on top of there.

MR. MARQUEZ: Of course not.

MR. SHEAFE: Let's hear what we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Raul, Diana, come on up.
State your name and if you represent anyone.

MS. HADLEY: Diana Hadley, and representing Friends of Tucson's Birthplace, and a resident of the west side.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Thank you.

Raul?

MR. RAMIREZ: Raul Ramirez, resident of west side, and also on the board of directors for Menlo Park.

They did send a letter in terms of support for the plan. So from that perspective, I'll also be talking about that.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Go ahead.

MS. HADLEY: So at this point we have letters of support from four or five of the adjacent neighborhoods to the A Mountain landfill. And there is very much popular support in general for the ecological restoration of this park.

And in the past few weeks we made a visit to two landfills in the Phoenix area that have been remediated through capping and with all of the landfill left in place.

And one of them is in Chandler. And the one in Chandler is 60 acres, I believe. I think we
sent you a report on that landfill. 60 acres, and they have archery, walking trails, basketball court.

What else was up there?

MR. RAMIREZ: Dog park, yeah, disc golf.

MS. HADLEY: Disc golf and parking on -- without pavement underneath the parking area. It's graveled over. And it's a huge cultural amenity to the city of Chandler.

We went to another park that was --

MR. RAMIREZ: Horseshoe Park.

MS. HADLEY: Horseshoe Park.

And that has not been remediated. It is under development. And they have equestrian trails next to a huge equestrian barn. And it's a really important amenity for that portion of the Phoenix area.

There are several others that we heard about that we didn't visit. And throughout the United States, there are landfills that have not had the landfill material removed, and they are being used as major cultural amenities throughout the United States and Europe and in Asia, actually.

So what we understand from Pima County Flood Control, they have done an excellent job on the dredging of the portion of the Santa Cruz between
Speedway and Grant, leaving the vegetation that's adjacent to the banks in place and only dredging the center channel of the river so that they increase the flooding capacity without disturbing the vegetation. And they did that in order to avoid nesting season, and that is what they want to do on this portion of the river from 29th Street to Cushing Street. So that means that they need to start doing the dredging promptly.

The -- what -- they have a landscape architect on their staff, and they have an ecologist on their staff.

And two of the things that they do is to remove all of the herps and all of the living wildlife from the river.

They would do the same thing from the A Mountain landfill area if you all select to have the dredged material stored there.

They have made a design for berming and swaling of the approximately four feet of landfill that would be spread throughout the -- four feet of soil material dredged from the river would be spread on top of the 27-acre landfill, and it would average some three to four feet in height.

And they have a plan in place for berming
and swaling that material, which Mr. Marquez saw yesterday.

And it would serve as passive water harvesting without any artificial -- without any outside water being placed on top of the landfill. And they would save all of the large trees that are currently growing on top of the landfill. And there are some 40 trees that are over a caliper of 12 to 24 inches. So there's some big trees growing out there already.

And this soil material from the river would create a space for passively encouraging native vegetation.

Also, the brittlebush is blooming out there right now. So if you want to go see something blooming out of season, it's pretty amazing that it's there.

In any case, it seems to me that this is free fill. It is -- it's free soil material that would provide additional capping for the landfill, which was capped already when it was closed in 1961.

When it was closed in 1961, that makes it almost 60 years closed. And the limit of concern for landfills, apparently, is 30 years. So we're way beyond the period of concern.
And the engineering report states that it will continue to create small amounts of methane but that it is not a problem for anything except structural placement, which would cause cracking from the subsidence that will naturally take place.

In any case, they've done -- we would get free soil material, free trucking. And they have a free design for berming and swaling the entire landfill, which is in place and ready to go.

And it seems to me that it would be a huge waste of money to leave the landfill in its current condition when it could be so easily improved, even if it's just on a temporary basis.

If something came along that would be more desirable for Rio Nuevo, then that -- it wouldn't be in --

MR. SHEAFE: Would you mind if I ask you a question, Diana?

MS. HADLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. SHEAFE: I'm trying to understand. Is there room in the thinking that this property might have more uses than just simply an open space?

MS. HADLEY: Not on the west side.

MR. RAMIREZ: Well, you know, it's 27 acres. And one part of it, the north side, buttresses
against the Carrillo house. So it could be a nice lead-in to the Carrillo house.

And I know that you're all committed through the settlement to build the Carrillo house, although I don't know what the timetable is. I think there's opportunities.

You know, the -- if you look at the landfill, the problem areas are basically on the north side and the east side bordering the river. And -- because I did read the report, and it does -- and I agree that it does have a lot of challenges.

But I think we're in a unique position right now to cross roads where we can kind of take advantage of several things that are coming up.

And one of the things from my side and from the neighborhood's side that's sort of been pushing this is the plans with the County flood control. Another one is the City of Tucson and the -- and introducing reclaimed water into Santa Cruz.

All of those things, saving the area in terms from flooding the remediation water is going to improve the area and really will probably be a boom for development on the banks of Santa Cruz.

I agree with Mark in his statements in the sense that what I would recommend, honestly, is that
you get the right folks at the table.

And one of the people that you do want is the folks that put together the 2015 report, because in conversations -- I don't know if you're aware of it, but I'll go ahead and share it with you.

The trip to the Phoenix area included two representatives of that firm, the hydroageal (phonetic), Kim -- I always get confused with the names.

And they thought that even though there was problems with the A Mountain, that there was opportunities. And I do see an opportunity here.

So I would say that, you know -- and I want to thank you for putting it on the agenda, because I think it shows, really, that these are the same concerns as we do in terms of Tucson and wanting to see something viable there.

But the people that really have to be also is those people that you trust that put together the report, because us telling you we think this and, you know, we saw this, we're suspect, because we're laypeople, honestly. Okay?

Our concern is for the neighborhood. We're very dedicated to the history of the area, the connectivity between Tumamoc, A Mountain, and Tucson's
We see possibilities, and we see -- and I know that County flood control also wants to push forth, and we were hoping someone from their department would be here or someone representing the County would be here to talk about what could be done.

But it would seem that we all should have a second look at this, honestly. And that's what I would recommend. And I hope that you would act in that direction.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Raul, Diana, thank you very much.

The reason it's on the agenda is because of the challenges we face collectively. I think the risk, if we do something abruptly out of context, that it could dismantle any future plans.

Parking is going to be a huge issue there. If indeed the City builds the Convento and S-Cuk Son and the chapel, where are those visitors going to park? And if we forested this and we made it five feet higher, it's almost not usable for parking.

What would be interesting, and I would be happy to ask the County, if they put the dirt there and we'd like them to take it back, will they pay to remove it, because if the cost is the same, we just deferred
the cost. You know, and maybe there's other kind of
conversations that we have.

But I think both of you are kind of saying
the same thing: In the absence of a plan, none of
these things make any sense.

The other thing that's really challenging
for us, the days of Rio Nuevo funding a park died in
2010. The reason that we got extended was because the
investments we're making in retail and the
opportunities we have to create sales tax.

Remember, under the new law, I have to go
to the legislature anytime we advance a project over
$500,000.

And I cannot imagine the scenario, Raul,
where I'd go to them and say, "We would like to invest
in a Sonoran desert park, and it has zero return on the
investment."

You can make all the ecotourism arguments
you want, but if you just saw what we did today, these
are direct dollars returning on investments that we're
using of your state tax dollars.

I think there's a way to do some of that.

I think there's a way to have a park and some retail.

I think there's portions of the Tucson Origin Heritage
Park -- we've talked about this -- that could have
retail components. And then we've got to adjust the parking situation.

I also challenge the County manager if collectively all of us couldn't come up with some ground-fill fund. The City can't because they're the polluters. But Rio Nuevo and the County might have access to some federal ground-fill dollars.

We've talked to Tohono O'Odham about this. Nobody wants the land in its toxic condition.

What Mr. Huckelberry's decision was was not anything having to do with the engineering or the dredging or what the Santa Cruz looks like, but the liability that comes to the County if they put dirt on our landfill -- I'm using the collective "our" -- and somebody's exposed to methane gas.

Now, the County is as liable as we are for that toxicity. So I think we're all fine kind of sitting down and trying to figure something out, talking to the County about the timing of all this, if we let them store -- use the word store, if they store the dirt there, and we don't want it anymore, will they remove it if we change our mind, is there a way to do something temporarily, is there a way to berm it.

I agree with them, and it's tragic, its current condition. But we are truly, truly stuck.
But, you know, we wanted to get this in front of the Board. If anyone wants to take any specific action today, you're certainly allowed to do that. You're in a public meeting.

MR. IRVIN: Raul, I'll just say to you, I think some of the components that you guys are advancing are probably things that we would probably support.

My concern is probably twofold. First, I get very concerned about us doing something where the legislature looks at us and says, "You guys are done."

And I'd say something that was a pure park would be one that we would be absolutely done. And it also, then, precludes us from other types of uses.

And then the dirt that's free, first off, it's dirt out of the river bank. You can't build on it. It doesn't support anything. It's not like you can mix it with something and do something with it.

It's dirt that when we do something with this site, we'll have to haul all that stuff off of that site anyway.

So I'm not really a big supporter of just a one-off. If there's a collective idea to come -- and
you guys could be a part and push this. So I commend you for just bringing it to you (verbatim), because we look at this acreage all the time and ask ourself what could we do with it.

And we've all said -- and hindsight is 20/20. The Rio Nuevo Board, way back in the day, would have invested that money and remediated that site. They would have got at least something to show for it, which we don't have now.

So I support us having continued discussions about it. But due to that it's a one-off 30-acre park won't get my support.

MR. MARQUEZ: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Marquez.

Thank you, Diana and Raul.

MR. MARQUEZ: So good news is, Pima County is not charging us for any of this if they did put the sand or silt on our property. It would be free. They would pay off to do the grading plan. They would also pay -- I didn't know this, but Pima County has a desert plant nursery, so we could actually choose low-moisture plants or bushes that could be on the site that would not need irrigation.

I would like to see -- we don't even know whether or not it's official or not Pima County wants
to do this, because there's no one from Pima County in
the room. I would like to see us --

MR. IRVIN: John just walked in.

MALE VOICE: I don't know.

MR. MARQUEZ: You work in flood control?

MALE VOICE: That's not my area.

MR. MARQUEZ: Okay. I would run out
quick.

So I would like to see us at least have a
conversation to find out to see if there is an
opportunity, or maybe Chuck tells us no.

I would like to move that we authorize
myself, Jannie Cox, Fletcher McCusker, to have a
conversation with leadership at Pima County to find out
if there are options.

MR. IRVIN: I don't think you need a motion
for that. If you want to talk to them, just go talk to
them.

MR. MARQUEZ: Okay.

MR. SHEAFE: You know, one thing, just to
comment, it's very obvious here that we really don't
know what we're talking about.

And this is a big asset. It's a big
piece of property. We really probably deserve putting
in a little more time into trying to come up with a
concept that we can think of in terms of long term that
might be quite acceptable to the neighborhood, but also
meet some of the other conflicting goals that we've
got.

So as this thing goes forward, I really
appreciate the fact that it's on the schedule. I think
we can leave it at that.

And let's kind of task ourselves with
getting educated so we learn how -- or figure out what
we can do that's positive. It's quite an asset.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We're certainly not
going to stick it in the drawer. I'll put it on the
agenda every month if we have a reason to talk about
it.

It is concerning to me that County
gineers have a plan and grading plan and berms, and
no one's talked to us about that.

And when I met with the County manager, he
goes, "No, there's no way we would do that."

So, you know, there's obviously a lot of
factions to that. We're like the least political
people in the room, and, you know, we'll just sit down
and figure this all out.

So let's keep talking. We'll try to
advance it. We'll try and do something -- you know,
one of the things, I think, for the west side to think
about, and this is true of any negotiation I've been
involved with, not everyone is going to like the
result.

Everyone is going to be a little bit
unhappy. And if that's the case, we probably
accomplished something that otherwise we could not have
accomplished.

MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion
before us, and I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Marquez made a
motion to -- he did make a motion for Jannie, Edmund,
and I to be appointed to continue the conversation
with the County. You now have a second to that
motion.

Any conversations, questions?

MS. COX: I just want to thank, again,
Diana and Raul for bringing this forward and being so
eloquent about your presentation that you had no chance
to prepare for. It was very, very well done and very
compelling.

I'm especially interested in the report you
said you had about this particular landfill having --
about a landfill having a 30-year life, that it was
non- -- became less toxic after 30 years.
That's something I didn't know. And that certainly was not in the report that we got, was it? I don't think. So that's --

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I was going to call for the question. We have a motion and a second. So unless there's further questions, Brandi please call the roll.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Edmund Marquez?

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jannie Cox?

MS. COX: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Chris Sheafe?

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Mark Irvin?

MR. IRVIN: No.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Jeff Hill?

MR. HILL: Aye.

MS. HAGA-BLACKMAN: Fletcher McCusker?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: I would vote no. But the motion is going to pass four to two. So we'll appoint the three of us to continue to talk to the west side and the County and anyone else that's interested in this parcel.

Thank you for your time and attention.

MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman, point of order?
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Sure.

MR. HILL: We often have in situations when people come up and testify before a public body, that they're supposed to be registered lobbyists. And a lot of people don't know that.

So when they say they represent somebody and they haven't registered with the Secretary of State, they walked into a felony.

So I'm urging that if you come before a public body, say you're a resident. Don't say you're representing such and such a company, particularly if they're a legal entity. You can get in a lot of trouble for that.

Counselor, you may (indecipherable) eloquent if you would, but that's my recollection.

MR. COLLINS: No, I think you're right.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And I see them as residents. I think we respect many of the west-side residents as residents.

MS. HADLEY: Thank you for not sending us to jail.

MR. HILL: Let the minutes reflect, Mr. Chairman, that they're residents, and it was a slip of the tongue that they were representing some association.
CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Mr. Hill, thank you.

That's why you're a lifetime member of the Board.

Sunshine Mile, I think there's no action required there. We can table that.

The next two items, 75 East Broadway and the Cushing Street lot, these are County-owned properties where we have options to acquire. We're still in the process of working through both of those.

And I think, Mr. Collins, you have some language that would allow us to maybe get an extension of time before we have to execute the option.

Mr. Collins?

MR. COLLINS: We've -- with respect to 75 East Broadway, we have exercised the option. There is ongoing negotiation. But I think we're pretty close to having ground lease that is agreeable to both the District and the County and a sublease that's agreeable to the County, the District, and the developer.

We got a little timing question, and I believe we've come up with a language for that.

I don't think you have to take any action today on the 75 E. Broadway parcel.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Okay.
MR. COLLINS: Cushing Street, there is an option agreement that is virtually identical for that property sometimes called the Theresa Lee lot. We are -- we have asked the County for an extension of the option to develop that property.

That hasn't been finalized yet.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: We would need a motion to that effect.

MR. COLLINS: Correct.

MR. SHEAFE: So, so moved that we authorize counsel to execute paperwork for the extension of our option on the Theresa Lee lot.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And authorize the executive --

MR. SHEAFE: And authorize the executive officers to approve it.

MS. COX: Second.

MR. IRVIN: Second.

MR. SHEAFE: You may not have heard it, but I started off with "I move."

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.
MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Any opposed say nay.

Thank you for that.

Hilton Hotel, Mr. Collins, anything --

MR. COLLINS: You have -- Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, you have previously authorized proceeding forward with this project in accordance with a summary that was discussed in executive session.

I, yesterday I believe it was, received the draft of the agreement from the hotel. I will work with the executive officers as previously authorized to finalize that. I don't think you need anything else.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: And nothing earthshaking there; that's moving along and looks good?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. I've got to bring it back to you once we get it finalized, but I would expect that to happen at the January meeting.

There are some key terms that need to be resolved, but I'll get that resolved with the executive officers.

MR. SHEAFE: Just to comment, that whole area, we're going to look back on that in a few years
and just be astounded at what has been accomplished.
And this hotel is stepping into a pot of gold.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: 17, let's do that offline.

Brandi, if you'll just continue to work with us, we'll get dates and publish them. We have time set aside to call the audience.

MR. COLLINS: Are you going to establish a date, or no?

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: No. We're going to do that offline. I don't have time to do that.

And we do have a couple of cards.

Beryl Baker. Did I pronounce that right?

MS. BAKER: Thank you for letting me speak.

We grew up in the Menlo Park area, and we saw the landfill which you've previously talked about be made, and we watched the progression of nature --

MS. COX: We need your name for the record.

MS. BAKER: Beryl Baker.

MR. COLLINS: Address, please.

MS. BAKER: 2723 South Mission.

MS. COX: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you.
MS. BAKER: I now live on the other side of A Mountain, but I grew up in Menlo Park.

This is an ill-conceived plan to save money for the County, not truly save the wildlife corridor which already exists.

It's like saying all those mine dumpings from the Rosemont Mine will save the environment.

It has taken almost three human generations for nature to rehabilitate the landfill with all its diversity of life, including microbes and insects, as well as many different kinds of plants that exist there.

This wildlife corridor did not just happen overnight. Driving heavy equipment on the landfill around what trees are pretended to be saved will hardpack the soil around the roots, piling dirt around the trees that will probably eventually slide down. The trunks will eventually smother or kill them.

Water harvesting put the water around the trunks, which might then stand around the trunks and may rot them.

So the only things this plan proposes to save the trees actually will be in holes that will kill them.

And then there is the intricate ecosystem
that has taken decades to establish, making this a wildlife corridor so admired by writers who ID themselves as Friends of Tucson's Birthplace.

No matter how great plans look on paper, it will take decades again for nature to again heal herself in this area, even with a little help from humans.

Why not -- and you've already answered this question, actually. If the soil is so good, which you've just said it wasn't, and land needs to be raised for commercial buildings, instead of put this soil on the land northward waiting to be developed, Rio Nuevo gets its land raised for free, and the wildlife corridor stays what it has become, a refuge for wildlife and plants.

If the river soil is not so good for compacting but good for growing, then give it to developers who traditionally have stripped off good land soil before they build and will resell it for soil and make a profit.

I urge you not to put the dredge on the landfill. If the intent is to preserve, secure, promote aesthetic natural current plant growth, this plan does not do that. This plan destroys. It should remain open wildlife space in its current state.
I would just like to also speak for Josephine, who had to leave for family reasons. Some of the things she has said to me, she also protests the landfill -- covering a landfill with river sand.

She has suggested returning the land to the nature and saving it for spiritual reasons and protection of the healed land. She would not like to see the destruction this landfill proposal would cause.

And I understand you guys are all about money, but open space helps your development, because it's contingent or beside all of your development which provides the River Park and et cetera.

So I really strongly urge you to stop thinking in terms of this is a terrible thing that we have to develop, into this is an amenity that we could potentially use to enhance what you're already doing to the north.

Thank you very much, all. I'm an environmentalist, a farmer, and I'm a long-time resident of the west side.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Thank you very much. I think that's the only one, Brandi, right?

Entertain a motion to adjourn.
MR. IRVIN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: Second, please?

MS. COX: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: All in favor say aye.

MR. MARQUEZ: Aye.

MR. SHEAFE: Aye.

MR. IRVIN: Aye.

MS. COX: Aye.

MR. HILL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McCUSKER: See you in January.

Happy Holidays. Have a prosperous 2019.

(The proceedings concluded at 3:20 p.m.)
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