

**Gizelle Morales**

**From:** Helen Jentoft [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 18, 2025 6:09 AM  
**To:** District1; District2; District3; District4; COB\_mail  
**Subject:** Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**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.

This amendment looks like you are letting a huge development welch on their agreed to improvement repayments. It is already a great deal for the builder and you want the rest of us to pay for it. We want you to hold them accountable for paying their own bills. 15 years is generous, 25 super generous and then to just say "well if you do not want to pay for it after 25 years we will just call it square. Who are you representing? It isn't us or the people that need help to get from one month to another in this housing crisis that you say you are all for solving! This is another example of hoping no one cares enough to see what is going on. There is no good reason to amend this agreement for the benefit of all Pima County Tax payers. It is your job to protect us all. This does nothing for the majority of us.

" Pima County now wants to amend this agreement and extend the repayment timeline. Of concern is the statement being changed: **Reimbursement from available bond proceeds. They are replacing the third sentence of section 7.4 to now read "The District's obligation to pay for an Accepted Project will expire in 25 years after the project was completed, regardless of whether the entire Acquisition Price was paid."** What??? Rocking K is a huge (4,000 acre) project, and now Pima County is letting them off the hook from paying what they originally agreed to. Someone is making money on this, and it should not be up to us to foot their bill -- this project should pay for what it receives."

Some good financial accountability would be nice for once and from now on.

Thank you,

Helen and Tom Jentoft

Gizelle Morales

**From:** Brenda Marts [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 16, 2025 8:25 PM  
**To:** District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; COB\_mail  
**Subject:** Item #15: Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds

**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.

60,000,000 for 194 units?? How much can you possibly spend? The average 3 bed house in Tucson is about 300K and that comes with dirt. It is cheaper and more cost effective to go and buy 200 homes that are already on the market and it helps everyone except the big non profit that wants to build with our money. Plus the paperwork isn't correct. Facilities is listed in Goodyear. looks like this is cookie cutter planning at our expense. At least be diligent with the details.

*"RESOLUTION NO. 2025 - 28, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the proceedings of the Industrial Development Authority of the County of Pima regarding the issuance of its Multifamily Housing Revenue Bonds (Flats at Ballpark Village) Series 2025 and its Multifamily Housing Revenue Note (Flats at Ballpark Village) Series 2025, in a combined total aggregate principal amount not-to-exceed \$60,000,000.00, and declaring an emergency.*

- This item deserves much more attention. Anything with a \$60-million price tag is a red flag, wouldn't you agree? The project description reads:

**The Project consists of the purpose of financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, development, equipping and/or operation of residential real property consisting of 194 units, all or a portion of which will provide housing for low-to-moderate income tenants, on certain real property located at the Facilities and to be commonly known as "Flats at Ballpark Village".**

There are similarly-named developments in Goodyear, although they are labeled as luxury apartments starting at about \$1900/mo. whereas Tucson Ballpark is described as low/moderate-income tenants. We seem to hear repeatedly about low-income housing projects, and it would be worth knowing exactly how

many are being planned. This is a huge project and we need more definitive details; \$60 million seems quite high."

DATE 8/18/25

ITEM NO. RA 3, 12, 15

33

**Gizelle Morales**

**From:** Jane Orient [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 16, 2025 1:05 PM  
**To:** District1; District2; District3; District4; District5; COB\_mail  
**Subject:** BoS agenda

**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.

#3 data centers

How is noise pollution being addressed in data centers' impact on human neighbors and desert wildlife? What remedies will be available if centers grow and problem is worse than anticipated?

#12 climate impact

Human beings cannot change global climate by reducing emissions of the life-giving gas CO2 , but they certainly can affect local conditions.

How much heat is Project Blue going to generate, even as it devours water resources? Will Arizonans be forced to offset its electricity requirements by reducing their own use?

#15

How much is going to be spent for each "affordable" unit compared with the current market value of existing units? How will they compare in area and rent to be charged.? \$60 million divided by 194 units is nearly \$310,000 each, which is more than three times what units in small multifamily complexes are being sold for.

#33

What exactly does the Health Start program do? And how much is devoted to sticking more needles into children? How is the beneficiaries' health being assessed, and is it getting better?

--  
 Jane M. Orient, MD

[REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

AUG 18 25 PM 05:05 FAX 1 X 05 30 JOM