



Minutes of MAYOR AND COUNCIL Meeting

Approved by Mayor and Council
on June 26, 2012.

Date of Meeting: January 24, 2012

The Mayor and Council of the City of Tucson met in regular session in the Mayor and Council Chambers in City Hall, 255 West Alameda Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 5:32 p.m., on Tuesday, January 24, 2012, all members having been notified of the time and place thereof.

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rothschild and upon roll call, those present and absent were:

Present:

Regina Romero	Council Member Ward 1
Paul Cunningham	Council Member Ward 2
Karin Uhlich	Vice Mayor, Council Member Ward 3
Shirley C. Scott	Council Member Ward 4
Richard G. Fimbres	Council Member Ward 5
Steve Kozachik	Council Member Ward 6
Jonathan Rothschild	Mayor

Absent/Excused:

None

Staff Members Present:

Richard Miranda	City Manager
Michael Rankin	City Attorney
Roger W. Randolph	City Clerk

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The invocation was given by Lois Blei, Eastside Assembly of God, after which the Pledge of Allegiance was presented by the entire assembly.

3. MAYOR AND COUNCIL REPORT: SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager’s communication number 32, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He also announced this was the time scheduled to allow members of the Mayor and Council to report on current events and asked if there were any reports.

Current event reports were provided by Council Members Romero, Cunningham, Fimbres, and Kozachik. A recording of this item is available from the City Clerk’s Office for ten years from the date of this meeting.

4. CITY MANAGER’S REPORT: SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager’s communication number 33, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He also announced this was the time scheduled to allow the City Manager to report on current events, and asked for that report.

No report was given.

5. LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATIONS

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager’s communication number 34, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He asked the City Clerk to read the Liquor License Agenda.

b. Liquor License Application(s)

New License(s)

NOTE: There are no application(s) for new licenses scheduled for this meeting.

Person Transfer

1. Embassy Suites, Ward 6
5335 E. Broadway Blvd.
Applicant: Kevin Arnold Kramber
Series 6, City 99-11
Action must be taken by: February 4, 2012

Staff has indicated the applicant is in compliance with city requirements.

c. Special Event(s)

1. Santa Cruz Parish, Ward 5
1220 S. 6th Ave.
Applicant: Rebecca Marie Lujan
City T126-11
Date of Event: February 11, 2012
(Annual Car Show)

Staff has indicated the applicant is in compliance with city requirements.

2. Coyote TaskForce, Inc., Ward 6
54 E. Pennington St.
Applicant: Bruce Bowden
City T1-12
Date of Event: February 14, 2012
(Valentine's Day Dinner)

Staff has indicated the applicant is in compliance with city requirements.

d. Agent Change/Acquisition of Control

NOTE: There are no application(s) for agent changes scheduled for this meeting.

It was moved by Council Member Romero, duly seconded and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to forward liquor license applications 5b1 and 5c1 and 5c2 to the Arizona State Liquor Board with a recommendation for approval.

6. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Mayor Rothschild announced this was the time any member of the public was allowed to address the Mayor and Council on any issue except for items scheduled for a public hearing. Speakers were limited to three-minute presentations.

Mayor Rothschild also announced that pursuant to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, individual Council Members may ask the City Manager to review the matter, ask that the matter be placed on a future agenda, or respond to criticism made by speakers. However, the Mayor and Council may not discuss or take legal action on matters raised during "call to the audience."

Comments were made by:

Roger Score	Robert Reus	Ken Johnson
Nancy Schlegel	Raelene Kaylor	Carol Hazel
Diana Whitman	James Lacy	Jed Dodds
Billy Lolos	Rudy and Mara (no last name given)	

Council Member Romero requested that the City Manager follow-up with Mr. Lacy regarding his concerns.

A recording of this item is available from the City Clerk's Office for ten years from the date of this meeting.

7. CONSENT AGENDA – ITEMS A THROUGH H

Mayor Rothschild announced the reports and recommendations from the City Manager on the Consent Agenda were received into and made part of the record. He asked the City Clerk to read the Consent Agenda.

a. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-36 CITY WIDE
2. Mayor and Council Regular Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2011

b. INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT: WITH PIMA COUNTY FOR THE 2011 EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM AWARD

1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-37 CITY WIDE
2. Resolution No. 21851 relating to Intergovernmental Agreements; approving and authorizing execution of an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Tucson and Pima County for the 2011 Department of Justice Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award; and declaring an emergency.

c. TUCSON CODE: AMENDING (CHAPTER 27) DECREASING THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT WATER RESOURCE FEE

1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-39 CITY WIDE AND OUTSIDE CITY
2. Ordinance No, 10958 relating to Water; decreasing the Central Arizona Project (CAP) water resource fee; amending Chapter 27, Article II, Rates and Charges, Section 27-36, System Equity, Central Arizona Project, and areas-specific fees; and declaring an emergency.

d. TUCSON CODE: AMENDING (CHAPTER 27) DECREASING THE WATER SYSTEM EQUITY FEE

1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-40 CITY WIDE AND OUTSIDE CITY

2. Ordinance No. 10959 relating to Water; decreasing the water system equity fee; amending Chapter 27, Article II, Rates and Charges, Section 27-36, System Equity Fee, Central Arizona Project, and areas-specific fees; and declaring an emergency.
- e. FINANCE: APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 2011 INVOLUNTARY TORT JUDGMENTS
1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-38 CITY WIDE
 2. Resolution No. 21852 relating to Fiscal Year 2013 primary property tax levy; retroactively approving involuntary court ordered tort judgments from litigation awards from Fiscal Year (FY) 2011; and declaring an emergency.
- f. FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT AMENDMENT: WITH TUCSON REGIONAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES, INC.
1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-44 CITY WIDE
 2. Resolution No. 21854 relating to Outside Agencies; authorizing and approving Amendment Number 4 to the Financial Participation (FPA) Agreement between the City of Tucson and Tucson Regional Economic Opportunities, Inc. (TREO) for Fiscal Year 2012; and declaring an emergency.
- g. INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT AMENDMENT: WITH THE NORTHWEST FIRE DISTRICT FOR DISPATCHING SERVICES
1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-45 OUTSIDE CITY
 2. Resolution No. 21855 relating to Intergovernmental Agreements; authorizing and approving the execution of Amendment Number One (including a new Appendix B) to the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Northwest Fire District for dispatching services that was originally approved by Mayor and Council through Resolution No. 21776 on June 21, 2011 (City Contract No. 17251); and declaring an emergency.
- (This item was considered separately at the request of Council Member Kozachik.)
- h. MAYOR AND COUNCIL: AMENDING THE 2012 MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE
1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-47 CITY WIDE

2. Ordinance No. 10962 relating to Administration; amending Section 1 of Ordinance 10935, which approved a schedule of Mayor and Council regular meeting dates for 2012, to reschedule the regular meeting date of February 14, 2012 to February 15, 2012; and declaring an emergency.

It was moved by Council Member Cunningham, duly seconded, and passed by a roll call vote of 7 to 0, that Consent Agenda Items a – h, with the exception of Item g, which was considered separately, be passed and adopted and the proper action taken.

7. CONSENT AGENDA – ITEMS G

- g. INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT AMENDMENT: WITH THE NORTHWEST FIRE DISTRICT FOR DISPATCHING SERVICES
 1. Report from City Manager JAN24-12-45 OUTSIDE CITY
 2. Resolution No. 21855 relating to Intergovernmental Agreements; authorizing and approving the execution of Amendment Number One (including a new Appendix B) to the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Northwest Fire District for dispatching services that was originally approved by Mayor and Council through Resolution No. 21776 on June 21, 2011 (City Contract No. 17251); and declaring an emergency.

Mayor Rothschild announced the item to be considered separately was Consent Agenda Item g at the request of Council Member Kozachik.

Council Member Kozachik stated he asked for the item to be considered separately in order to discuss it. He said that the City's Information Technology (IT) Department lost a position that dealt with the CAD system essential to the fire district dispatching services. He said his concern or request, once someone was hired through this IGA, was that there be some cross training with the IT department, so that we had sufficient coverage in this area.

Richard Miranda, City Manager, commented that he was in agreement with Council Member Kozachik. He stated that he was aware of the issues in IT and a consultant was brought in to give the City some input and thoughts regarding the department. He said respective to those ideas, a strategic plan would be developed that dealt with resource allocation, training and more importantly the leadership of the department.

Mr. Miranda stated that in the future, staff was looking at providing leadership to the department so that any ideas and/or issues the Council or Staff had to provide a more efficient, effective organization. He commented that the current staff, in the department, was doing a paramount job in getting programs in place; but they were on overload.

Mr. Miranda stated throughout the entire organization, people were retiring with great institutional knowledge and were leaving the City in a vacuum. He added that a new strategic plan would be developed and back up systems for equipment, knowledge and experience needed to run those programs was at the fore front. He said they were looking at what could be done in and out of house.

It was moved by Council Member Kozachik, duly seconded, and passed by a roll call vote of 7 to 0, that Consent Agenda Item g be passed and adopted and the proper action taken.

8. PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING (C9-06-21) DORADO COUNTRY CLUB – SPEEDWAY BOULEVARD, RX-2, O-3, AND C-1 TO RX-2 AND OCR-1 REACTIVATION, FIVE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION, CHANGE OF CONDITIONS

Roger W. Randolph, City Clerk, announced that this item had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

9. PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING (C9-11-12) TOWN WEST – FIRST AVENUE, R-2 TO O-2 AND C-1 ZONE, CITY MANAGER'S REPORT, DIRECT ORDINANCE ADOPTION

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager's communication number 42, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He also announced this was the time and place legally advertised for a public hearing on a request to rezone property located at the southwest corner of First Avenue and Limberlost Drive. He said the Zoning Examiner and staff recommend approval subject to certain conditions.

Mayor Rothschild asked if the applicant or representative were present and if they had any comments to make.

Raul Reyes, the architect representing the owner, stated that they had reviewed the conditions attached to the rezoning request and were in agreement with them.

Mayor Rothschild announced the public hearing was scheduled to last for no more than one hour and speakers were limited to five minute presentations. He asked if there was anyone else in the audience wishing to be heard on the item.

There were no speakers

It was moved by Vice Mayor Uhlich, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

Mayor Rothschild asked the City Clerk to read Ordinance 10960 by number and title only.

Ordinance No. 10960 relating to Zoning; amending zoning district boundaries in the area located at the southwest corner of First Avenue and Limberlost Drive in case C9-11-12 Town West - First Avenue, R-2 to O-2 and C-1; and setting an effective date.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Uhlich, duly seconded, and passed by a roll vote of 7 to 0, to pass and adopt Ordinance 10960.

10. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE LAND USE CODE REGARDING GROUP DWELLINGS

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager's communication number 48, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He also announced this was the time and place legally advertised for a public hearing on a request to for text amendments to the *Land Use Code* regarding Group Dwellings. He said staff wanted to make a few comments before beginning the public hearing.

Michael Rankin, City Attorney, reiterated that the item was scheduled for a public hearing to allow the Mayor and Council to see and review the proposed ordinance, receive public input and to receive any additional information from staff. He said it was not scheduled for adoption for a couple of reasons, one being that there was still a number of comments being received and staff wanted to ensure that the ordinance, when presented to the Mayor and Council for final adoption, was in final form. He stated staff was also wrapping up some related mediation efforts that he would keep the Mayor and Council apprised of.

Ernie Duarte, Planning & Development Services Department Director, gave a few brief comments regarding the public hearing. He said staff was originally given direction on 10/12/11 and that direction was based on the Zoning Examiner's interpretation. It was heard at a public hearing of the Planning Commission on 11/2/11. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the amendment. There were three meetings with community stakeholders conducted and the main issue discussed was how to separate the zoning provisions from rules governing behavior on public nuisances. The proposed amendment recommends changes to the Land Use Code including a definition of group dwellings and what is a non-conforming group dwelling and provisions whereby that use may be continued or discontinued. Mr. Duarte stated that addressing public nuisance issues is to revise the neighborhood preservation ordinance (TCC Chapter 16). The change in this ordinance sets up a nuisance abatement process that is committed to the Land Use Code's provisions of non-conforming group dwellings.

Mr. Duarte said staff recommended that the Mayor and Council conduct the public hearing, receive public input on the proposed amendments, provide any necessary staff direction on any modifications to the proposed ordinance and give direction staff to return with the final ordinance for the Mayor and Council's consideration either the first or second week in February.

Mayor Rothschild announced the public hearing was scheduled to last for no more than one hour and speakers were limited to five minute presentations.

The following people spoke in support of the proposed text amendment to the *Land Use Code (LUC)* regarding Group Dwellings: Ruth Beeker, Stephen Brigham, UA Medical Center, J. Lisa Jones, Jefferson Park Neighborhood Association, Rick Champlin, Diana Lett, Feldman's Neighborhood Association, Linda Phelan, Bob Schlanger, Jefferson Park Neighborhood Association, LuAnn Barr, Sam Hughes Neighborhood Association, Bonnie Poulos, Molly McKasson, Steve Prendergast, Alice Roe, Chris Gans, West University Neighborhood Association President, Martha Seidel Bond, and Cathy Rex.

The following people spoke in opposition to the proposed text amendment to the *Land Use Code (LUC)* regarding Group Dwellings: Kent Simpson, Metro Tucson Chamber of Commerce, Brad Richards, Tucson Metro Chamber of Commerce and Tucson Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

Comments were also made by Gary Hunter and Mike Finkelstein.

A recording of this item is available from the City Clerk's Office for ten years from the date of this meeting.

Mayor Rothschild announced if anyone, at the evening's meeting, turned in a speaker card and did not have the opportunity to speak, they could email any one of all of the Mayor and Council members.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Uhlich, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to close the public hearing.

Vice Mayor Uhlich said she wanted to make a motion on the item, not for final adoption, but for direction to staff. She thanked all those involved in the process and explained that the Ordinance was not changing the *LUC*. She stated that group dwellings were already illegal in R1 and R2 zones. She said she felt she needed to clarify this because people who play by the rules should not be placed at a disadvantage against the very few that ignore the rules.

Vice Mayor Uhlich commended many, specifically the Jefferson Park Neighborhood for bringing this forward a year ago and believing in the Mayor and Council and the City and restoring faith in government.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Uhlich, duly seconded, to direct staff to use the input received from the public hearing and from the Mayor and Council, include the comments on notifications, timelines and tracking infractions and addressing RX-2 zoning to finalize the Ordinance and return to the Mayor and Council for adoption at either the February 7th or February 15th meeting.

Mayor Rothschild asked if there was any discussion.

Council Member Scott asked if there would be an opportunity for all of the participants to see the final version before it is presented to the Mayor and Council.

Vice Mayor Uhlich said that the normal public posting requirements applied and said she agreed with Council Member Scott that participants had ample time to review the draft.

Mr. Rankin responded in the affirmative and said that staff would ensure that participants had the opportunity.

Council Member Kozachik asked if the G5 group would continue to meet and was that the way staff would filter some of the changes through. He also asked how staff wanted to receive comments and questions from the Council.

Mr. Rankin responded that he was not sure they would continue to meet, but they were on the overall email list of stakeholders to receive the documentation. He said if any of the Council Member had questions they wanted to ask, at the evening's meeting, he was happy to reply; otherwise they could submit it to staff.

Council Member Kozachik asked about the language in Item G, page 4, regarding all single family dwellings in R-1 with five or more bedrooms. He said if a dwelling already existed in R-1, would on-site parking be required. He asked staff to explain.

Mr. Rankin said he did not think there was a problem with that; he said what staff was trying to do was eliminate some of the commercial standards for five or more bedrooms where in some instances had caused more problems and problems solved. He said for the ones already existing that complied with the *Code* provisions at the time, they would not be affected.

Council Member Kozachik asked about Item H – if there was one or more structures on the lot, all structures would be considered one dwelling. He said he thought this was for R1; he asked if this needed to happen for R2.

Mr. Rankin responded that staff would distinguish between R1 and R2 in terms of how the dwellings were calculated.

Council Member Kozachik said he understood what Mr. Rankin said, but that was not clear in the language.

Mr. Rankin stated he would make sure that was clear.

Council Member Kozachik stated, in regards to the notifications, the City, in essence, was creating a database of properties to be grandfathered in. He asked how

those people would be notified, how much time they had to respond and at what point did the meter toll for letting the City know.

Mr. Rankin responded that what the City was not going to do was to have a pseudo registration system that required people to come in and establish they were legal nonconforming. He said the way it worked, as with other *Code* enforcement, would be complaint driven. In other words, if there were complaints that reached the threshold as established in the ordinance, staff could then look back in time of the complaints made and at that point make the determination if they fall into the category of legal nonconforming and be subject to the nuisance abatement measures included in the ordinance.

Council Member Kozachik asked, if at the point a complaint is filed, the burden shifts to the owner of the property to demonstrate that they should have been grandfathered in.

Mr. Rankin responded that that was part of it. He said what was established in the *Code* was various ways that could be established, through executed leases or other documentation, establishing occupancy was five or more and what that number was.

Council Member Kozachik asked about Section 6.3.8.3 – the definition of Group Dwelling. He read what was listed in the proposed amendment and asked for clarification if two people could therefore be a group dwelling if they had exclusive rights they agreed upon; exclusive rights to their bedrooms.

Mr. Rankin stated that staff would review that section, but more than likely it would stay because it uses that were rented by the bedroom. He said staff would look further into it to ensure that they were not unintentionally expanding the group dwelling to two people.

Council Member Kozachik stated his final question was in 16-37, Section A. He said the language, unless he misread it, excluded the possibility of a legally zoned group dwelling also becoming a public nuisance.

Mr. Rankin responded that that would not fall under these measures. He said there were other codes that defined other activities as public nuisance and just the standing code provision about the overall general public nuisance that could be group dwelling, single family residents or any type of occupancy.

Council Member Kozachik stated he was in agreement with Ruth Beeker and concerned about the possibility of abuse from people, not necessarily those in the audience, but “frequent flyers” who might want to use this for purposes not in mind. He said at some point, staff needed to keep an eye on ensuring that this was not abused.

Mr. Rankin said he agreed and thought that was why it was important to include a couple of things in the ordinance, particularly in the abatement provisions in terms of

having documentation on repeated violations (citations or charges), that resulted in an actual ticket and not just a complaint. He said also included in the ordinance was the responsibility for staff to return to the Mayor and Council, within twelve months, the progress of the ordinance.

Council Member Romero asked for clarification on the Planning Commission's (PC) recommendation to sunset the ordinance for one year.

Mr. Rankin thanked Council Member Romero for pointing that out. He said that the recommendation was to have a sunset; but as staff put the ordinance together, it was modified to read as a mandatory review and report. He said quite frankly, if the ordinance was to expire in a year, given the timeframes for the establishment of the nuisances and abatement plans by remediation plans, it did not make sense. He stated in that case, staff deviated from the PC's recommendation; instead staff would report back in not less than a year.

Additional comments were made by Council Member Romero. She thanked all those involved for their time and commitment to bring the item forward.

Council Member Fimbres asked, in the context of the ordinance, what it meant for the Board of Appeals and who served on it.

Mr. Rankin stated that staff thought it was important; both legally and equitably, in terms of the enforcement process that there be appeal rights; appeals from a designation of public nuisance or appeals from the remediation plan or other finds during the enforcement process. He said what was done was that staff built in administrative appeals that already existed in Chapter 16 of the *Code*, the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance where these behavior elements were being inserted. He said the reference to the appeal rights would go to the existing Board of Appeals, not the Board of Adjustment, but another body that hears appeals under Chapter 16. He said they were a group appointed by the Mayor and Council and hears appeals from designations such as slums and other types of appeals from technical codes.

Council Member Cunningham stated that there were about three properties in his ward that could possibly be affected by this ordinance. He said he was worried about that and wanted to ensure that they could maintain a working ranch. He asked if those were zoned differently.

Mr. Rankin replied he did not know. He said that they should get together to discuss them and avoid any unintended consequences.

Additional comments were made by Council Member Cunningham about the protection of property rights and value.

The motion to direct staff to use the input received from the public hearing and from the Mayor and Council, include the comments on notifications, timelines and

tracking, and RX-2 zoning to finalize the Ordinance and return to the Mayor and Council for adoption at either the February 7th or February 15th meeting, was carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

11. MAYOR AND COUNCIL: AMENDMENT TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL RULES AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO ORDER OF BUSINESS AND PARTICIPATION BY EMPLOYEES AND THE PUBLIC DURING MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEETINGS.

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager's communication number 46, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He asked the City Clerk to read Ordinance 10961 by number and title only.

Option 1

Ordinance No. 10961 relating to Rules and Regulations of the Governing Body; amending Order of Business; and amending Rules for Participation by Employees and Members of the Public; by amending Sections I.E(1) and Section I.M of the rules; and declaring an emergency.

Option 2

Ordinance No. 10961 relating to Rules and Regulations of the Governing Body; amending Rules for Participation by Employees and Members of the Public; by amending Section I.M of the rules; and declaring an emergency.

It was moved by Council Member Fimbres, duly seconded, and passed by a roll call vote of 7 to 0, to pass and adopt Ordinance 10961, Option 2.

12. BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS: APPOINTMENT TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager's communication number 43, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He asked the City Clerk to read Resolution 21853 by number and title only.

Resolution No. 21853 relating to the Civil Service Commission; reappointing Fred Ronstadt as a Civil Service Commissioner for a six-year term commencing on January 24, 2012 and expiring on January 23, 2018; fixing annual compensation; and declaring an emergency.

It was moved by Council Member Cunningham, duly seconded, and passed by a roll call vote of 7 to 0, to pass and adopt Resolution 21853.

13. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Rothschild announced City Manager's communication number 35, dated January 24, 2012, was received into and made part of the record. He asked for a motion to approve the appointments in the report.

It was moved by Vice Mayor Uhlich, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to approve the reappointment(s) of Eileen R. Warshaw, Ph.D., in the category of Historian or Cultural Anthropologist to the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission (TPCHC).

Mayor Rothschild asked if there were any personal appointments to be made.

There were none.

14. ADJOURNMENT: 7:54 p.m.

Mayor Rothschild announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Mayor and Council would be held on Tuesday, February 7, 2012, at 5:30 p.m., in the Mayor and Council Chambers, City Hall, 255 West Alameda, Tucson, Arizona.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICITY

I, the undersigned, have read the foregoing transcript of the meeting of the Mayor and Council of the City of Tucson, Arizona, held on the 24th day of January 2012, and do hereby certify that it is an accurate transcription.

DEPUTY CITY CLERK

RWR:yl:dr