The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ruben Suarez at 6:00 p.m.

Item 1: Roll Call
In attendance: Ruben Suarez, John S. Jones, Project Director
   Corky Poster, John Updike, Project Manager
   Alice Eckstrom, Kay Gray, Finance Director
   Olivia Hernandez, Elisabeth Sotelo, City Attorney's Office

Absent:

Item 2: Approval of Minutes  It was suggested that approval of minutes of the last meeting
   be delayed until the next meeting.

Item 3: Briefing on Legal and Financial Aspects of the District Board

In attendance: Jim Blandford, Kay Gray
   Bill Hicks, Bill Davis

A presentation was made by Mr. Blandford based on a handout provided at the meeting.
Prior to issuance of bonds, a more formal analysis of the potential district site revenues
would be required.

Date of first incremental capture of revenue to be based on maximizing income to the district.
An analysis was cross-checked with a different methodology employed by City of Tucson
Finance Department staff.
The Board was advised that the preference is to attempt to issue tax-exempt bonds wherever
possible.
Alternative available types of bonds were outlined to the board by Mr. Blandford (see tab D).
Use of some of the noted bond options may require other governmental action or approval of
the electorate.
Various options exist regarding city match related debt financing and their source of repayment.
The board requested an overhead projector for future meetings for audience involvement.

Bill Hicks Presentation:
1) Defined the funding source
2) Defined requirements contained in the State Legislature
   -Election
   -District site selection
   -Redirection of revenue stream to District
   -Secondary component definition.
$200 million threshold (construction cost) of public or district owned facilities within the site.
The City must match funds on a dollar for dollar basis.

- The City may audit/review ADOR data with respect to revenue calculations within the District site.
- An outline of powers and duties of the District Board was provided. Conflict of interest issues were outlined.
- The use and receipt of tax increment funds was outlined.

Secretary Corky Poster asked if any annual or montWy targets were developed to enable the Board to determine if revenue stream is as projected. Monitoring of revenues will be ongoing by City staff.

Chair Suarez asked how conservative are the economic projections? Estimates were both "realistic and conservative."

- Construction sales tax revenue also qualifies as a revenue generator for District, city audit process would capture the District’s share.

Item 4: Administrative Arrangement and Staffmg Plan - Kay Gray

Review Presentation of December 14, 1999 memorandum from the City Manager.
Review of Project Interim Financing handout.

Item 5: Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement

IGA approval
Resolution 1999-003
moved for approval by Secretary Poster
seconded by Alice Eckstrom
Motion passed 3-0 (O. Hernandez absent) Resolution 1999-003 approved.

Item 6: Selection and Composition of Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. John Jones outlined the Citizens Advisory Committee (C.A.C.) proposal contained in the December 14, 1999 memorandum from the City Manager. It will return to Mayor and Council February 7, 2000 for discussion. Mayor and Council will make the ultimate decision with respect to the composition and role of the C.A.C.

Secretary Poster asked for comments on the Rio NuevBroadway corridor coalition proposal. Diane Hadley spoke elaborating on the background of their proposal and of discussions with the Natural and Cultural Heritage Alliance. Dian Magie spoke regarding the Alliance’s perspective and background to the proposal.
Valerie Vidal noted that additional discussions with neighborhoods should take place prior to the Mayor and Council discussion, thus the date of February 7, 2000 was selected.

Mr. Jones noted that a draft action plan is under development, which would be brought before the Board and when the C.A.C. is formed, to that CAC.

T. Van Hook asked how the proposed C.A.C. would integrate with other existing committees, commissions - Mr. Jones replied that the proposed C.A.C. simply is in addition to existing committees and does not supplant those existing committees.

Ms. Chris Tanz asked if there was a precedent for a large committee. Mr. Jones noted that the Sonoran Desert Protection Plan committee is similarly sized.

Mr. Keith Walzak asked about discussions regarding upcoming Master Planning needs. Mr. Jones indicated a draft action plan would address many of Mr. Walzak’s concerns. Mr. Walzak noted the design review process may be somewhat unique. Mr. Jones again referred to the Master Planning process as the vehicle to address that concern.

Secretary Poster noted concerns regarding the City Manager’s proposal.

Ms. Angie Quiroz noted again that meetings should be held after 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Dian Magie referred to a 2:1 match issue as related to museums. How do museums participate in master planning and financing process? Ms. Gray noted that the museums in some instances might have their own financial and operational issues to manage themselves.

Secretary Poster asked who would own the land on which the projects lie? Mr. Hicks noted either the City or the District would likely own and lease the property.

Ms. Magie noted other funding sources and concerns relative to ownership rights should be considered. Ms. Gray agreed.

Item 7: Call to the Audience:

Mr. Brian Flagg noted that IDA bonds might be available for the use of housing purposes. Mr. Hicks and Mr. Blandford indicated many guidelines would have to be adhered to.

Mr. Jones stated that an IGA to outline item #4 would be forthcoming. Ms. Quiroz asked about priorities of projects. Mr. Jones responded, alluding to existing brochures and upcoming master plan process.
Ms. Quiroz referred to barrio preservation issues, expressing a concern that those issues be addressed. Ms. Gray responded that those issues would be addressed in the master planning process. Ms. Quiroz asked about living wage issues. Ms. Gray noted that the Board would likely follow City procurement guidelines.

Ms. Jeannie Shaw noted support for Secretary Poster’s comments regarding C.A.C. composition. Ms. Tanz echoed the comments of Ms. Shaw. Secretary Poster noted that the actual siting of private projects within the District site is not under the purview of the District Board.

T. Van Hook noted that any neighborhood “clusters” be well defined, with specific criteria. Ms. Magie noted individual concerns within clusters may be an issue.

Item 8: Date, Time and Location of next meeting:

February 9, 2000 was noted as a possible time for the next meeting.

Item 9: Adjournment

Secretary Poster moved for adjournment, seconded by Alice Eckstrom, unanimously approved.