

ADDENDUM MATERIAL

DATE 11/4/25

ITEM NO. ADD4

Aliza Barraza

From: Julie Dittmer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 8:30 AM
To: COB_mail; civildivision@pcao.pima.gov
Subject: Public Comment for November 4, 2025 BOS Meeting – Project Blue / Request for Counsel Review
Attachments: Julie's Public Comment 10_21_25.pdf

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Good morning,

I hope everyone at the Clerk's and County Attorney's offices is well. Could you please forward the attached comment to the Board?

I respectfully request that it be included in the record and, if possible, made available to Supervisors prior to their executive session discussion on Project Blue.

Please find attached my updated public comment for the November 4, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting. This comment was originally written for the October 21 meeting but remains relevant today, as the issues it raises continue to impact the County's handling of Project Blue.

I've stayed closely engaged with every step since the last meeting, and I imagine the Board and County staff are as weary from this process as many of us are.

At this point, I'd like to respectfully request clarification on how a member of the public can make a formal request for the County to consult outside or independent counsel. This is not to interfere, but to ensure the County's long-term interests are fully protected. My prior memo and public comments were meant to highlight areas I believe merit that additional legal review. If there is a specific mechanism or agenda process for submitting such a request, I'd appreciate being pointed toward it.

If my comments were unclear before, I want to make it known that I do not blame the County Attorney's Office or this Board for how Project Blue has unfolded. I don't see it as a matter of competency or good faith, but of capacity. The time and legal depth required to truly investigate a deal like this would have been enormous. That is the crux of the imbalance: the County should not have to play detective or take a developer's word on trust. There needs to be counsel or expertise brought in that matches the specialization of those on the buyer's side.

I understand that Board members can't discuss details of active matters, but I want to offer myself as a resource if staff or counsel wish to review any of the public records or materials I've gathered. I'd be happy to meet and share information directly, or simply provide documentation for the County's consideration.

I also want to say that I am genuinely appreciative of the work this process has inspired. It has shown how committed so many people are to protecting this county, and I hope what we've all experienced here becomes one more reason to establish clearer boundaries and expectations for future projects. There are other issues I'd like to explore as well, but I truly hope this chapter leaves us all with stronger governance tools and a shared sense of what vigilance and collaboration can look like at their best, even under pressure.

Thank you,
Julie Dittmer
Tucson, AZ

I want to start by saying I recognize everyone on this Board, and in the County Attorney and Administrator's offices, are doing their best in a difficult role. Thank you for that. I believe there are representatives from Project Blue who appear sincere, like they truly want to make this work for us. But I also see the toll this process has taken on Pima County, on Board members, on staff, on neighbors, on people taking off work week after week, and on constituents who come here for help with personal crises unrelated to Project Blue.

When a deal devours this much energy, something feels off. And any deal that pulls attention away from things like safety, housing, and addiction concerns me. That's not on you personally; it's what happens when a process becomes unbalanced. We were handed three puzzle pieces out of five thousand and asked to trust that the rest forms a picture that's good for us.

My worry is that we've seen this pattern before. In the 1990s and 2000s, drug reps brought free lunches and perfect promises of relief for real pain, often with opioids like OxyContin. I believe many practitioners who prescribed it saw people they cared for in pain and had good intentions. But the formula of both the meds and the system itself contributed to addiction and left communities with homelessness and death. That's the public health crisis pattern I'm asking you to guard against now.

Last weekend I reviewed about 1,300 City of Tucson emails from a public records request. They show repeated involvement by Amazon and AWS, names that weren't shared publicly, or with City Council, for months. And on the Purchase and Sale Agreement, Akin Gump appears as a cc to the buyer, not a listed party to the PSA, but present. Public filings also show Amazon.com retained Akin Gump for federal lobbying in 2023. Akin Gump also collaborated on a tool built on Palantir Foundry, and Palantir runs on or integrates with AWS.

I don't like bullies - and the worst kind is the one who lets you sit at their table like a friend, then turns sideways to laugh with the people they truly answer to. That's what "trust us, it'll be great" feels like when details are tight and the analysis relies in part on buyer-provided numbers.

You weren't wrong to want relief for Pima County. But when we know better, we do better, and I believe we do now. And given that, I have full confidence this Board can get this right. Thank you.