
From: Gilbert Williams
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 1:51 PM
To: JIM PORTNER; K. J. Harper-Beckett
Cc: Carolyn Campbell; Jed; Paul Green; Anna Benninghoff; Beth Wosoba; Betsy Kanto; Hans Deweerdt; Lori Foster; Mike McDonougs; Pam Siebrandt; Rolf Ziegler; Ron Becket; Roy Crawford; Traci Roberts; Gary Raymond; Robert Boianos; Emmett; Ann Campbell; District1; Shirley Lamonna; DIST2; District3; District4; District5; Robin Brigode; Chris Poirier; Arlan Colton
Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, Co7-13-06

Mr. Portner,

I, too, understand your position and your need to move in that direction. We are indeed blessed to reside in a country where everyone may pursue their dreams.

Ours was, and continues to be, based on the Comprehensive Plan remaining as it is.

Gilbert Williams

From: JIM PORTNER
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 7:51 AM
To: Gilbert Williams ; K. J. Harper-Beckett
Cc: Carolyn Campbell ; Jed ; Paul Green ; Anna Benninghoff ; Beth Wosoba ; Betsy Kanto ; Hans Deweerdt ; Lori Foster ; Mike McDonougs ; Pam Siebrandt ; Rolf Ziegler ; Ron Becket ; Roy Crawford ; Traci Roberts ; Gary Raymond ; Robert Boianos ; Emmett ; Ann Campbell ; Ally Miller ; shirley.lamonna@pima.gov ; District2@pima.gov ; Kiki Navarro ; Ray Carroll ; District5@pima.gov ; Robin Brigode ; Chris Poirier ; Arlan Colton
Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, Co7-13-06

Gilbert, Katherine:

I thank you both for your emails of yesterday clearly stating your position against any amendment to the comprehensive plan. I hear your reasoning loud and clear. I have a healthy respect for the public process, and as such respect your positions as you've articulated them as well as you making sure that they are heard clearly by the Board of Sups members.

You are correct in saying that our newly developed configurations for set-asides and buffers are being offered within the context of our still pursuing a plan amendment that would ultimately allow us to seek subdivision development on the remaining acreage that is greater in density than the current SR zoning. For our part, we believe this makes sense for a variety of reasons. That being said, though, I can fully understand how participation in further discussions with us could be construed by some, as you've mentioned, as tacit agreement with the ideas.

From: JIM PORTNER
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Ron Beckett
Cc: Gilbert Williams; K. J. Harper-Beckett; Carolyn Campbell; Jed; Paul Green; Anna Benninghoff; Beth Wosoba; Betsy Kanto; Hans Deweerdt; Lori Foster; Mike McDonougs; Pam Siebrandt; Rolf Ziegler; Roy Crawford; Traci Roberts; Gary Raymond; Robert Boianos; Emmett; Ann Campbell; District1; Shirley Lamonna; DIST2; District3; District4; District5; Robin Brigode; Chris Poirier; Arlan Colton;
Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, Co7-13-06

Hi Ron:

You are correct on all of the procedural points you mentioned. All continuances are granted solely at the discretion of the Board.

I simply have to plan ahead and give people proper advance notice of a neighbor meeting in the case the Board decides to grant our request.

Your positions are clearly understood.

jp

On Jan 15, 2014, at 10:12 AM, Ron Beckett wrote:

Hello Jim,

Thanks for your communications. I do not envy you in this process.

I just needed to echo a few themes that you've heard from my wife Kathy, neighbor Gilbert and others.

1) A continuance has yet to be granted. This cannot be assumed. That seems to be the first step and an unnecessary one at that, as meeting with our community and others does not need to take place until the BOS make its decision regarding the comprehensive plan modification question.

2) If the continuance is NOT granted and the comprehensive plan modification is NOT approved at next week's BOS meeting, it would be enlightening to hear about your group's ideas on setbacks etc within the current SR zoning constraints. The property CAN be developed tomorrow in this scenario. That would seem attractive to a developer as the economy is less than predictable (note recent downturns in property values etc.) and if another downturn occurs, the property will sit idle again.

3) If the continuance is granted there would be NO need to meet with you, as articulated by Kathy, Gilbert, and others, as we would not know what we were meeting about. That is, a decision on a modification to the comprehensive plan would not be made. We are all quite busy (yourself included) so time spent looking at 'what if's' is pointless. Thus, the delay in letting the BOS make its decision is pointless.

To be clear:

- 1) We are totally against a continuance of this issue.
- 2) We are against a modification to the Comprehensive plan and find the existing plan to be more compelling than any change. The comprehensive plan was made with a great vision for the future of our town and county. Very wise indeed. There are NO compelling reasons to change this plan.
- 3) We support your developer moving ahead with planning within the existing comprehensive plan SR zoning and would be happy to hear their ideas regarding setbacks etc within the SR guidelines.

Thanks you,
Sincerely,
Ron Beckett

On Wed, 1/15/14, JIM PORTNER

wrote:

Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, Co7-13-06

To: "Gilbert Williams"

"K. J. Harper-Beckett"

Cc: "Carolyn Campbell"
Green"

"Jed"

; "Paul
Beth Wosoba"

"Anna Benninghoff"

; "Betsy Kanto"

; "Hans Deweerdt"

; "Lori Foster"

; "Mike McDonougs"

; "Pam Siebrandt"

; "Rolf Ziegler"

"Ron Becket"

; "Roy Crawford"

"Traci Roberts"

"Gary Raymond"

"Robert Boianos"

; "Emmett"

"Ann Campbell"

"Ally Miller" <District1@pima.gov>, shirley.lamonna@pima.gov,

District2@pima.gov, "Kiki Navarro" <District3@pima.gov>, "Ray Carroll" <District4@pima.gov>,

District5@pima.gov, "Robin Brigode" <Robin.Brigode@pima.gov>, "Chris Poirier"

<Chris.Poirier@pima.gov>, "Arlan Colton" <Arlan.Colton@pima.gov>

Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2014, 7:51 AM

Gilbert,
Katherine:

I thank you both for your emails of yesterday clearly stating your position against any amendment to the comprehensive plan. I hear your reasoning loud and clear. I have a healthy respect for the public process, and as such respect your positions as you've articulated them as well as you making sure that they are heard clearly by the Board of Sups members.

You are correct in saying that our newly developed configurations for set-asides and buffers are being offered within the context of our still pursuing a plan amendment that would ultimately allow us to seek subdivision development on the remaining acreage that is greater in density than the current SR zoning. For our part, we believe this makes sense for a variety of reasons.

That being said, though, I can fully understand how participation in further discussions with us could be

construed by some, as you've mentioned, as tacit agreement with the ideas.

I just wanted you to know that, while your positions are clear and may be shared by many of your neighbors, I will still be proceeding with setting up neighbor meetings for all (including yourselves, of course) who still may wish to attend.

The YMCA got back to me yesterday and informed that none of the dates they thought might work were available. That left us scrambling but we found a room at a better location, I believe, at Tortolita Middle School.

The school district is confirming to me this morning the specific date, but it is now looking like it will be during the last week of January, approximately two weeks from now.

As mentioned before, I'll be doing a reply-all to this email once the specific time/date for the meeting is set so that all on this email string are informed and invited to attend. Also, and even though there'll be overlap, I'll send out mailed invitations today to all who spoke at the November Board of Supervisors meeting and to the heads of the HOA's in the area.

jp

On Jan 14, 2014, at 9:31 AM, Gilbert Williams wrote:

Mr. Portner,

Thank you for your input related to our recent correspondence. Your message suggests that you understand our sentiments and frustrations. I will speak for myself and my wife in this response, although I do believe a majority of my neighbors share our feelings. I would invite them, here, to provide their own input, whatever that may be.

We are not interested in new configurations, set-asides, or buffers.

Such concepts suggest that amendments to the current Comprehensive Plan are already being considered, along with subsequent rezoning. Participating in discussions regarding new configurations, set-asides, or buffers suggests tacit

agreement with such amendments and rezoning. Stated simply, my wife and I are opposed to amending the Comprehensive Plan. We purchased our property assuming that the Comprehensive Plan would be followed, allowing 3 homes on each of 3 10-acre plots behind our home. We have always endorsed this approach. We are not opposed to development. Once a decision is made to maintain the Comprehensive Plan as is, we would then entertain discussions regarding configurations, set-asides, or buffers related to these 30 acres.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Williams

From: JIM PORTNER

Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 7:14 PM

To: Gilbert

Williams ; K. J.

Harper-Beckett

Cc: Carolyn

Campbell ; Jed ; Paul

Green ; Anna

Benninghoff ; Beth

Wosoba ; Betsy Kanto ; Hans Deweerdt ;

Lori Foster ;

Mike

McDonougs ; Pam Siebrandt ; Rolf

Ziegler ; Ron Becket ;

Roy Crawford ; Traci

Roberts ; Gary Raymond ; Robert Boianos

; Emmett ; Ann Campbell ;

Ally Miller ;

shirley.lamonna@pima.gov

; District2@pima.gov

; Kiki Navarro

; Ray Carroll ;

District5@pima.gov

; Robin

Brigode ; Chris Poirier

; Arlan Colton

Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN,
Co7-13-06

Ms.

Harper-Beckett, Mr. Williams:

Thank you for copying me on your emails. I understand your sentiments and frustrations. The process is difficult, especially for the neighbor side of the equation. We are working to accommodate the Board's instructions to develop new configurations of additional natural areas and set-asides. As I've mentioned, this exercise takes time and we needed to complete it before being able to sit down with the neighbors and the Coalition for any meaningful dialogue.

I am proceeding with setting up the neighbor meetings as described in my prior email and will be sending out the invitation letters this week. The Northwest YMCA informed me today that my originally requested evenings of February 4, 5 & 6 are not available, so they are seeing if they can make adjustments to some of their other scheduled activities so as to offer the meeting room on alternative dates the week prior. I am told I will hear from them tomorrow (Tuesday, 14 January) and will send out invitation letters as soon as I do. I will also do another reply-all email that will notify all of the above addresses you included in your email.

Jim Portner

On Jan 13, 2014, at 5:42 PM, Gilbert Williams wrote:

Kathy,

Thanks for the additional information and your thoughtful response to

Carolyn's e-mail. The Board needs to hear that we are not happy with the delayed game playing which seems to be happening.

Here is a link to an interesting article which appeared in Sunday's Arizona Daily Star regarding Mr. Huckleberry:

http://azstarnet.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/kid-from-flowing-wells-grows-up-to-be-county-s/article_83fb3678-e259-5b2b-9d10-5e56b03badc5.html

It is very positive, and enlightening, especially related to the

following statement in the article "His singular dedication to creating the Sonoran Desert

Conservation Plan, perhaps the hallmark of his career, put him at odds with the area's powerful developers."

As the creator of this plan, it seems to me he should be dedicated to maintaining it, preserving it's integrity, and supporting our desire to keep it as is.... not allowing amendments.

Bel and I are looking forward to our meeting tomorrow evening.

Doc

From: K. J.
Harper-Beckett
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 5:02 PM
To: Carolyn
Campbell
Cc: Jed ; Paul Green ;
Jim
Portner ; Anna

Benninghoff ; Beth
Wosoba ; Betsy Kanto ; Gilbert Doc
Williams ; Hans Deweerdt ;
Lori Foster ; Mike
McDonougs ; Pam Siebrandt ;
Rolf
Ziegler ; Ron Becket ;
Roy Crawford ; Traci
Roberts ; Gary Raymond ; Robert
Boianos ; Emmett ; Ann Campbell ;

District1@pima.gov
; shirley.lamonna@pima.gov
; District2@pima.gov
; District3@pima.gov
; District4@pima.gov
; District5@pima.gov
; Robin.Brigode@pima.gov
; Chris.Poirier@pima.gov
; Arlan.Colton@pima.gov

Subject: Re: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN,
Co7-13-06

Hello, Carolyn,

Thank you for your email and your information re: a
planned meeting with

Mr. Portner. I regret that we will not be included,
but I respect what

you and Dr. Green are planning and I appreciate you
letting me know.

The continuance that Mr. Portner has requested is
unacceptable. He

was given two months to set up the meeting with you to
negotiate. Less

than two weeks before the planned January 21 meeting, he
has decided to

request another month. He has told Supervisor
Miller's office that

he will be holding meetings for the neighborhoods, as he
stated in the email

to you, copied to me and others on January 10. In
that email he wrote

"By

the point we were well into that exercise, it was the
run-up period to the

holidays, when it's not a smart time to try and ask
people to sacrifice an

evening for a neighborhood meeting when everyone already has lots of other familial and personal obligations going on." The property owners were not considered in Mr. Portner's assumption and we stood ready to meet with him. Per Ms. Lamonna's email after the continuance request, Mr. Portner "will

host small-group meetings with interested neighbors to discuss revised buffering and setbacks." I admit that I am very "green" when it comes to some of the process going on with the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan, but I was under the impression that buffering and setbacks occurred AFTER rezoning had transpired. The Plan has not yet even been amended and now he wishes to discuss buffering and setbacks?

A
continuance, as I have stated before, will be an added hardship for those of us who have day jobs and must again miss work. My husband and I modified our work/travel schedule after last November's continuance to assure that we could be here for the January 21 meeting. My neighbor, Dr. Ann Campbell, is a veterinarian and she has hired another vet to cover her office that day that cannot be cancelled. These are only two examples of how a continuance will negatively impact those of us that have acted in good faith.

My husband, Ron, and I will not be able to attend the February meeting if a continuance is allowed, nor will we be able to attend Mr. Portner's beginning of February planned neighborhood meetings. We have scheduled trips/work for those times. None of the property owners have been given any notice of his planned meetings other than the fact that he is

planning them per his

January 10 email. Our lives are very busy and full,
too, and I consider

it disrespectful for Mr. Portner to ascertain that his
time is more valuable
than mine.

We

all have obligations, and Mr. Portner did not follow
through with the Board's
direction given to him on November 19.

I

look forward to seeing you at the meeting on the
21st. I sincerely hope
that the Board of Supervisors will consider the
constituents and not again put
off this decision for another month to accommodate Mr.
Portner.

Respectfully,

Katherine

Harper-Beckett

On Fri, Jan 10, 2014
at 2:05 PM, Carolyn Campbell
wrote:

Hello Katherine and Jed,

I

spoke with Mr. Portner yesterday afternoon. He did
state that he is
requesting a continuance until February, in hopes of
putting forth a
proposal that will be acceptable to both the neighbors
and the conservation
community, on all 4 parcels. I believe that the property
owners got a clear
message from the Board of Supervisors that they would

like common ground to
be reached. We do feel that a continuance could be a
good thing, if it
results in a proposed land use plan that can be
supported by the Coalition
and/or the neighbors.

As you know, the Coalition's specific request
is that the property owner respect and comply with the
conservation
guidelines that the Board of Supervisors adopted more
than a decade ago,
which, in this area, equals 95% natural open space
set-aside (nous) of the
Important Riparian Areas, and 80% nous on the remainder
of the parcels. This
is a different scenario that you and your neighbors are
requesting, which is
no up-planning and upzoning, or perhaps many fewer
units, as I read
it.

As such, Dr. Green and I will be meeting with RedPoint and
Mr.

Portner next week to review any changes that they have
made on all 4
parcels, since our concerns are essentially the same
on all four. Which
80 or 95 percent is also a concern to us, which is why
we would like to meet
with Mr. Portner to review the updated proposal.

Mr. Portner clearly
stated he was planning meetings with concerned neighbors
on each of the 4
parcels separately, and soon. I am cc'ing Jim
Portner on this message, and
will pass his contact information on to you again:

Jim Portner, Principal
Projects International Inc.
Mailing
Address:
P.O. Box 64056
Tucson, AZ 85728-4056
Street/Delivery
Address:
10836 E. Armada Lane
Tucson, AZ 85749-9460

And of course, please forward
this message to others
as you feel appropriate. I hope we can keep in
touch,

Carolyn

On 1/8/2014 4:05 PM, K. J. Harper-Beckett wrote:

Dear Ms. Lamonna,

Thank you for your email response to my letter to
Supervisor

Miller. I had spoken with Jennifer in Supervisor
Miller's office

earlier today to schedule an appointment with the
Supervisor.

Jennifer told me about Mr. Portner's new request
at that time, and I

appreciate your further clarification. Am I
correct in assuming that

we will still be on the agenda on January 21, in spite
of his request, and

that we will be able to speak as usual? Jennifer
had assured me that
would be the case.

Mr. Portner was given two months to have
meetings. He chose not

to do so and now is making a request to continue the
decision, less than

two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting on January
21. One might

believe that he is hoping none of us will attend the
21st meeting or the

2/18/14 meeting should it be continued. It was
made very clear to

Mr. Portner by the Board of Supervisors at the
November meeting that he

was to schedule meetings over the last two months to
"negotiate" as he
stated that he did not plan to change his request

since he was
representing the owners of the four parcels.

I have acted in good faith, as have my neighbors,
attending meetings
as required to express our concerns on the impact of
our homes and lives
should this amendment be granted. This has been
a hardship for many
due to work being missed. There have been many
letters written to
the Board of Supervisors and City Management as
well. The Maya
Estates neighborhood and Homeowners Association at no
time have offered to
discuss buffers/setbacks and have made it very clear
that we do not want
the Plan changed to allow for Medium Intensity Urban
zoning to occur on
the 30 acres to the West of our neighborhood. It
was zoned Low
Intensity Urban when we bought our homes and we do not
want this
changed. Nine homes can be built there
tomorrow. Changing the
Plan to allow for 300 homes is not acceptable.

To date, we have not heard from Carolyn Campbell
regarding any
meeting being scheduled and she has stated that she
will let our
Homeowners Association know should that happen.
It will be
interesting to see if Mr. Portner follows
through.

Thank you again, Ms. Lamonna, for your prompt
response to my
letter.

Respectfully,

Katherine Harper-Beckett

On Wed, Jan 8,
2014 at 2:40 PM, Shirley Lamonna
<Shirley.Lamonna@pima.gov>
wrote:

Dear Mrs.
Harper-Beckett,

Thank you for sharing your
concerns regarding the
proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Co7-13-06 on
W. Hardy Road.

As you are aware, the Board
voted to continue the
discussion until January 21, 2014, to:

allow discussions between the
Coalition for Sonoran
Desert Protection and the property owners.

secure a traffic impact report
from the Pima County
Department of Transportation and

secure input on capacity from
the Marana School
District.

While the four Comprehensive
Plan amendments are
still scheduled for the 21st, Mr.
Portner (Projects
International, Inc. on behalf of Red Point
Development, Inc.) has
requested that they be moved to the Board of
Supervisors meeting of
February 18, 2014, to allow sufficient time for
these outreach
activities. The Board will vote at the January
21st
meeting whether to allow or deny this request.

In response to the comments
and direction received at
the November 19th Board meeting, Mr.
Portner has further
advised us that he has a meeting scheduled with Ms.
Campbell during the
week of January 20th to review open space
set-asides.

Subsequent to that, he will host small-group meetings with interested neighbors to discuss revised buffering and setbacks. Those meetings are anticipated to be held during the last week of January and the first week in February, with invitations extended prior to January 21, 2014.

I can assure you that Supervisor Miller will keep your comments in mind – as well as those of the other property owners in Maya Estates - as she evaluates her decision.

Thank you again for your input.

Shirl LamonnaResearch
Analyst

Supervisor
Ally Miller, District 1Pima
County Board of Supervisors130
W Congress St 11th FloorTucson,
AZ 85701

P:
(520) 724-8599F:
(520) 724-8489www.pima.gov/bos/dist1

Sign
Up for the District 1 Newsletter!

From: K. J.
Harper-Beckett

Sent: Tuesday,
January 07, 2014 12:08 PM
To: District1
Cc: Robin
Brigode; Chris Poirier; Arlan Colton; Jed; Carolyn
Campbell;
Subject: REQUEST TO AMEND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN,
Co7-13-06

January 6,
2014

8775 N. Maya Ct.Tucson, AZ 85742

Supervisor Ally Miller,
District 1Pima County
Board of Supervisors130
W Congress St., 11th FloorTucson, AZ 85701

Supervisor Miller:

I am writing regarding the
upcoming meeting of the
Board of Supervisors scheduled for January 21,
2014. On the agenda
will be the continuance of issues from the November
19, 2013, meeting
regarding Jim Portner with Projects International
Inc. who represents
Red Point Development in its request to amend the
Pima County
Comprehensive Plan for four different parcels.

In my previous letter to you,
dated November 8, 2013,
I expressed my concern about the proposed change by
describing in detail
many aspects of the impact should the plan be
amended. I will
attach that letter for your information.

As you know, Mr. Portner chose
to request the
amendment for four different parcels at the same
time, utilizing maps of
the areas in question. He stated in his

presentation that he was
requesting the amendment on all four parcels because
they were all
similar, although the property behind Maya Estates
is not on Thornydale
nor is it surrounded by commercial properties. The
parcel behind Maya
Estates is Co7-13-06. It is currently zoned
Low Intensity Urban
0.3 (LIU 0.3) and the request is to amend the
Comprehensive Plan to
Medium Intensity Urban (MIU). He neglected to
mention that the
properties immediately to the North of Maya Estates
are zoned and have
been developed as LIU 0.3.

To group these four parcels
together was considered
at the Planning Commission meeting after a
suggestion by Mr.
Huckleberry. Fortunately, the Commission noted
that each of the
parcels was different and should be considered
individually. The
attempt to consider all four parcels as one was for
the convenience of
Mr. Portner, and the Planning Commission
acknowledged that this was not
an equitable way to approach the proposal.

During both the Planning
Commission meeting on
September 25, 2013, and the Board of Supervisors
meeting in November,
many of my Maya Estates neighbors, neighbors from
the other parcels
involved, Carolyn Campbell, and Dr. Paul Green spoke
regarding the
proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan.
While the
consideration of each of the parcels being addressed
was to be done
individually, the consensus among the property
owners in attendance was
that that was not the approach taken by the Board in
November.

The Board voted to continue
the discussion regarding
the four parcels collectively until January 21,

2014, so that Mr.

Portner and Ms. Campbell could meet to negotiate re:
the property
abutting the Audubon Society's Mason Center.

The property owners
spoke both during the meeting and afterwards with
you, Supervisor
Miller, regarding the perception of our being
excluded from any further
discussion until the January 21 meeting takes
place. We were
reassured that we would be informed of any meetings
regarding our parcel
in the interim.

Ms. Campbell and Dr. Green
have been supportive and
in contact with us since the November Board of
Supervisors meeting as
well as prior to the Planning Commission meeting in
September.

They plan to let our neighborhood know if any
meeting is scheduled with
Mr. Portner. While Ms. Campbell and Dr.
Green are willing to
consider the 80/20 option, the Maya Estates
Homeowners' Association,
represented by President Jed Benninghoff, has
clearly stated at the
Planning Commission Meeting, November's Board of
Supervisors meeting,
through letters and petitions that we do not support
that option for the
parcel behind our neighborhood. It is zoned
Low Intensity Urban
0.3 (LIU 0.3). We bought our homes fully aware
that the property
could be developed at that level of intensity.
The Association
does not support amending the Comprehensive Plan to
allow potential
development at Medium Intensity Urban (MIU).

The reasons for not amending
the Comprehensive Plan
are many, including the pristine desert comprised of
many ironwood
trees, very old Saguaros, chollas, palo verdes, and
multiple other food
sources for the numerous animals that traverse the
30-acre corridor of

space behind our properties. Many property owners have addressed concern regarding traffic, noise, crime, and the impact on local schools during the meetings should the Plan be amended.

Our homes were purchased in good faith, knowing that 9 homes could be built behind our backyards. Red Point Development could begin selling homes/lots tomorrow if they choose to do so.

Please assist us by voting not to amend the Comprehensive Plan for parcel Co7-13-06.

Thank you, Supervisor Miller, for your representation. As we have discussed with you in the past, you are welcome to visit our neighborhood anytime. Many of us would be happy to walk the property behind our homes with you to further exhibit why the Comprehensive Plan should not be amended.

Respectfully, Katherine Harper-Beckett

Cc: Robin Brigode Chris Poirier Arlan Colton Jed Benninghoff Carolyn Campbell Paul

Green

Jim Portner, Principal
Projects International Inc.
Mailing
Address:
P.O. Box 64056
Tucson, AZ 85728-4056
Street/Delivery
Address:
10836 E. Armada Lane
Tucson, AZ 85749-9460

Jim

Portner, Principal Projects International

Inc. Mailing

Address: P.O. Box

64056 Tucson, AZ

85728-4056 Street/Delivery

Address: 10836 E. Armada

Lane Tucson, AZ

85749-9460 Office

Jim Portner, Principal
Projects International Inc.

Mailing Address:

P.O. Box 64056

Tucson, AZ 85728-4056

Street/Delivery Address:

10836 E. Armada Lane

Tucson, AZ 85749-9460