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Last April you supported my proposal to integrate the issues of Poverty and Urban stress into our city’s Strategic Plan. We did this because we cannot allow these conditions to rise or fall according to the whims of fate. We may never fully understand the daily reality of those whose lives are shaped by these conditions, but we can readily understand that their numbers have grown and that we are all affected by this symptom of the growing disparity of wealth in America.

Tucson is a special place to live and a special community. Our citizens are caring and involved. They expect us to come together and address these issues. They want to help Tucson from becoming two Tucsons. They want us to make a community that is socially and economically livable and sustainable for all of our citizens.

We must abandon our 19th century model of chasing the symptoms of public safety issues and recall what the Police Chief has stated: “We cannot arrest our way out of this.” The conditions that create today’s lawbreakers will, if allowed to continue, create tomorrow’s problems as well. We cannot simply keep shoveling sand against the tide. Effective prevention, however, can help stem the tide. Certainly we must continue to develop and expand our police and fire services, but we must also create effective, state-of-the-art prevention programs. Symptoms and causes must be addressed concurrently.

Policies and funding levels must be grounded in the ways society actually works. We must ask all providers for budget estimates that will allow our community to really start addressing our problems. Spending on prevention has grown little or has been reduced. We will need to raise funding levels during each 2-year budget cycle for the next ten years.

We cannot be silent or complacent. We must act deliberately to stabilize, strengthen, and better secure the community’s future. To begin this effort we need to evaluate and measure the problems we face so that the tools and solutions are effectively designed, located, and implemented at the right scale. This means focusing on ways to improve the quality of information we use for planning and decision making.
Improved information quality can help in a variety of important ways:

- Assessing the needs of our citizens and community.
- Presenting a clear vision to the community for City priorities and change initiatives.
- Communicating issues and challenges to stakeholders and community members.
- Marshaling and coordinating new resources.
- Encouraging the active involvement and partnering with the County, United Way, and private sector partners.
- Assisting organizations and departments to identify what changes in their budgets would allow us to gain ground annually on identified conditions.

We have tried to ask the right questions and then attempted to format them in the best possible way. There are undoubtedly many questions we have not thought of, including some that might help us understand more deeply the variables around gender and ethnicity. Perhaps there are better ways of formatting that will improve the quality of information we get. In this we ask for your help, to add and to correct this tool.

Data sets have been created, and we will ask the City to update them annually and produce a website containing the information. With this we can then start to monitor and fund efforts that focus on these conditions. We simply have to know whether things are getting better or worse.

Although one purpose of improving the quality of our information is to help determine the full range of effective programs, I believe some priorities are already clear. For instance:

- Develop a school Plus Jobs at every high school. Cost: approximately $6,000,000 for 6,000 more children.
- Avoid regressive taxation and fee structures because of the significant and disproportionate burden it places on the families in question.
- Supplement the valuable JTED program for children with significant job training for many of their parents.
- Develop child care.
- Provide treatment funds for alcohol and drug treatment and rehabilitation.
- Focus on programs that touch single women with children.
- Conduct an annual forum in the fall of each year with providers and stakeholders to evaluate the prior year and plan for the coming year.

Please review the enclosed data. Are the measures presented useful? Could they be presented and formatted in a more effective manner? Are there other measures that
should be included? What important aspects of understanding poverty and urban stress are we missing? Should we add measures, for example, to address the impacts of poverty and urban stress on the lives and health of children, the elderly, and other special populations? I ask for your help and support in this effort. Addressing these and related issues will be crucial in determining whether Tucson becomes a place where all citizens can participate fully in the success of our community.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Leal
Councilmember, Ward V
I want to take a minute and thank a number of people who have participated in our effort to help our community.

Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff  
Capt. India Davis, Pima County Sheriff’s Office  
Chief Richard Miranda, City of Tucson Police Department  
Capt. Kevin Mayhew, City of Tucson Police Department  
Capt. Brett Klein, City of Tucson Police Department  
Lt. Stella Bay, City of Tucson Police Department  
Sgt. Bernadette Eichenberger-Schneider, City of Tucson Police Department  
Roxanne Stead, City of Tucson Police Department  
Autumn Kistler, City of Tucson Police Department  
Judge Patricia Escher, Pima County Juvenile Courts  
Congressman Raul Grijalva, Congressional District 7  
Ruben Reyes, Congressman Raul Grijalva’s Office  
Michelle Crow, Congressman Raul Grijalva’s Office  
Richard Rhey, Southwest Fair Housing Council  
Maritza Broce, Council Aide, Ward 1  
George Pettit, Council Aide, Ward 3  
Max Torres, Council Aide, Ward 4  
Roger Carrillo, Council Aide, Ward 6  
Jim Cameron, City of Tucson Budget & Research Department  
Julie Edmond-Mares, City of Tucson Budget & Research Department  
Ana Kelley, City of Tucson Budget and Research Department  
Anna Sanchez, City of Tucson Department of Urban Planning & Design  
Ron Koenig, City of Tucson Community Services Department  
Fred Gray, City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Department  
Pat McGrath, City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Department  
Andrea Ibanez, City of Tucson Department of Neighborhood Resources  
Les Hunter, City of Tucson Community Services Department  
Art Eckstrom, Pima County Community Services Department – Employment & Training  
Dorothee Harmon, Pima County Community Services Department – Employment & Training  
Neal Cash, Community Partnership of Southern Arizona  
Pat Benchik, COPE Behavioral Services  
Ricardo Jasso, Amistades, Inc.  
Pastor Grady Scott, Grace Temple Church  
Rev. John Fife, Retired  
Eva Dong, Sunnyside Unified School District  
Dr. Raul Bejarano, Sunnyside Unified School District  
Roger Pfeuffer, Tucson Unified School District  
Dr. Vicki Balentine, Amphitheater School District  
Dr. Nicholas Clement, Flowing Wells School District

And with very special thanks to my staff at the Ward 5 office: Barbara Jordan, Mark Kerr, Melinda Jacobs, Abe Marques and with a hearty and huge thank you to Mary Fimbres for working with me to morph, reformat, think through and organize the entire evolution of this document. Her eyes crossed months ago!
This map and other information have been compiled for preliminary and general purposes only. They are not intended to be complete and accurate for any other purposes. Please refer to officially adopted Ordinances and Maps.
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Define problem with precision before fixing it

Our view: Councilman Steve Leal's report gives policy makers sound advice

Councilman Steve Leal and his staff have pulled together a detailed report that shows the parts of Tucson with the greatest social problems.

The report would be invaluable to the city's decision-makers — if anybody takes the time to slog through it.

The report, "City of Tucson Poverty & Urban Stress," is built around the idea of prevention — the premise being that society as a whole can benefit if public and private funds are directed to those areas where there is documented need.

But first, Leal says, with considerable logic, we must come up with the hard data to verify where the problems are so that we can direct public money to programs in specific areas where it will make the biggest difference.

The data collected by Leal's staff is broken down by the city's six wards.

Of course, the evidence that some parts of the city are better off than others is, at least anecdotally, obvious. For example, we typically see fancier cars and bigger homes in Ward 2, which extends roughly from North Swan Road southeast to Harrison Road and East 22nd Street, than we do in Ward 3, which includes the neighborhoods from Flowing Wells east to the Dodge-Flower area, which is notorious for its meth traffic.

It doesn't take a sociologist with a doctorate to confirm the observation attributed to Sophie Tucker (and many others), that "I've been rich. I've been poor. Rich is better." But it does take some digging to show the connection between education, poverty, crime, domestic violence and what it means to be poor, which is one of the important achievements in this report.

Leal has taken the anecdotal evidence and given it some teeth, showing, for example, that households in Ward 2 had a per capita income of $22,644 in 2005, compared with $15,127 per capita in the Ward 3 and $10,518 per capita in Ward 5, the South Side, which includes the neighborhoods that Leal represents.

Using numerous easy-to-read bar charts, the report delineates all of the city's social problems, ranging from high school dropout rates to unemployment rates, broken down geographically.

It shows where most of the city's welfare money is going and which neighborhoods get the most food-stamp assistance.

Not surprisingly, relatively few residents in the upscale Sam Hughes Neighborhood, east of the University of Arizona, are on welfare assistance, but just the opposite is true in the South Side neighborhoods, which have the highest number of unemployed residents.

All of the information in Leal's report was extracted from public sources and much of it reflects previously published data in a city of Tucson document called the Neighborhood Stress Index, released in late 2002 and based on information gathered in the 2000 census.

Leal would like to see the data compiled in both reports integrated in the city's Strategic Plan, which is a blueprint that, more or less, guides political decisions about where and how public money will be spent.

Because of the way this report identifies problems, it should provide an important tool for budget-makers. As Leal said of the report in his cover letter to the City Council, "With this we can start to monitor and fund efforts that focus on these conditions. We simply have to know if things are getting better or worse."

Leal’s motivation for compiling this report was, to some extent, a frustration with seeing the city address social problems using what he called "a 19th-century model," which he defines as "a lot of chasing the bad guy mixed with little charity."

An illustration of this model's imperfections can be seen in the budget for the Tucson Police Department. That budget nearly doubled between 1990 and 2000, moving from $52 million to nearly $100 million, or 14.3 percent of the city's overall budget.

"We cannot arrest our way out of this," Leal said. "You can arrest one batch, even a generation, but if left unchanged, the conditions that created the last group will simply make a new one. We cannot simply keep shoveling sand against the
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The report makes several specific recommendations, including more job training for high school students and their parents, affordable child care in the neighborhoods where it's needed most, more funds for drug and alcohol treatment and rehabilitation, more money for programs that affect single women with children, and more refined statistics that define needs based on gender and ethnicity.

Finally, he proposed the city conduct an annual forum with service providers and others to examine what has been done in the previous year, both to measure and evaluate the success of the city's investment.

This report is thoughtful and provocative. It also represents a rational approach to problem-solving and budgeting and should be used as a basis for future policy decisions.
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CRIME
CITY OF TUCSON BURGLARIES

DATA SOURCE: TUCSON POLICE DEPARTMENT WEBSITE, JANUARY 2007
2003 CITY OF TUCSON BURGLARY PERCENTAGE BY WARD

DATA SOURCE: TUCSON POLICE DEPARTMENT RESEARCH & ANALYSIS, MARCH 2004. CITYWIDE TOTAL: 6,342
Domestic Violence
(UCRs 0413, 0911, 0912, 1412, 2015, 2411, 2416, 2614, 2615)

Data Source: City of Tucson Police Department
REGISTERED SEX OFFENDERS

DATA SOURCE: TUCSON POLICE DEPARTMENT, DECEMBER 2006. THERE IS A TOTAL OF 946 SEX OFFENDERS ON THIS CHART. PER TPD, AN ADDITIONAL 74 HAVE NOT BEEN ASSIGNED.
TPD ARRESTEES (1/1/05 - 12/15/06)

WARD 1
6,665

WARD 2
8,071

WARD 3
10,427

WARD 4
4,086

WARD 5
15,384

WARD 6
12,696

PIMA CO & OTHER JURISDICTIONS
29,111

TOTAL TPD ARRESTEES - 86,440
TPD ARRESTEES DETAINED - 29,875
TPD ARRESTEES FIELD RELEASED - 52,420

PIMA COUNTY JUVENILES ARRESTED
(10/7/05 - 7/6/06)

TOTAL JUVENILES ARRESTED - 2,806
JUVENILES DETAINED - 1,269
JUVENILES FIELD RELEASED - 1,537

DATA SOURCE: PIMA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT, DECEMBER 2006
2005 - 2006 ARRESTEES BOOKED IN PIMA COUNTY JAIL

DATA SOURCE: PIMA COUNTY ADULT DETENTION CENTER,
JANUARY 2007.
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
High School Dropout Rate

Data Source: Arizona Department of Education

* Geographic data based on individual school dropout rates within the respective Wards

81.19% OF WARD 1 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
40.66% OF WARD 2 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
84.52% OF WARD 3 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
39.51% OF WARD 4 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
86.15% OF WARD 5 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
68.08% OF WARD 6 STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH

70.35% CITYWIDE TOTAL OF STUDENTS RECEIVING FREE/REDUCED LUNCH

FREE - 26,262
REDUCED - 4,103
TOTAL FREE/REDUCED - 30,365
ENROLLED IN SCHOOL -(TOTAL CITYWIDE ENROLLMENT 43,161)
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM
FREE AND REDUCED LUNCH REPORT (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARD 1</td>
<td>81.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 2</td>
<td>40.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 3</td>
<td>84.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 4</td>
<td>39.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 5</td>
<td>86.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 6</td>
<td>68.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWIDE</td>
<td>70.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA SOURCE: ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WEBSITE - MARCH 2006
CLAIMS DATA FOR TUCSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, JANUARY 2007.
HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM FREE AND REDUCED LUNCH REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 1</th>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>WARD 3</th>
<th>WARD 4</th>
<th>WARD 5</th>
<th>WARD 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUCED</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>4,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE/REDUCED</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLED IN SCHOOL</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>4,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- 61.84% OF WARD 1 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 11.12% OF WARD 2 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 47.72% OF WARD 3 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 35.22% OF WARD 4 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 70.62% OF WARD 5 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 43.42% OF WARD 6 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE FREE/REDUCED LUNCH
- 45.64% CITYWIDE TOTAL OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING FREE/REDUCED LUNCH

ENROLLED IN SCHOOL - (TOTAL CITYWIDE ENROLLMENT 23,558)
HIGH SCHOOL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM FREE AND REDUCED LUNCH REPORT (%)

WARD 1: 61.84%
WARD 2: 11.12%
WARD 3: 47.72%
WARD 4: 35.22%
WARD 5: 70.62%
WARD 6: 43.42%
CITYWIDE: 45.64%

NUMBER OF TUCSONANS OVER 25 LACKING A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

PERCENTAGE OF TUCSONANS OVER 25 LACKING HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

DATA SOURCE: CITY OF TUCSON DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN, 2000 CENSUS WARD PROFILES - JANUARY 2007 & 1990 U.S. CENSUS. (WARD TOTAL DIVIDED BY CITYWIDE TOTAL TO GET PERCENTAGE FOR EACH WARD.)
16-19 Year Olds, Not in School & Having No Diploma

Ward 1 2000: 15.6%
Ward 2 2000: 8.4%
Ward 3 2000: 20.8%
Ward 4 2000: 9.4%
Ward 5 2000: 20.6%
Ward 6 2000: 4.7%
Citywide 1990: 13.1%
Citywide 2000: 12.8%

FEES / TAXES
PROJECTED ANNUAL CITYWIDE REVENUES: $3,396,360

DATA SOURCE: 3/23/04 ELISEO GARZA EMAIL. ($2 B&B FEE X NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS PER WARD.
TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS = 141,515.)
$12.00 PER MONTH TRASH FEE - $144 ANNUALLY

PROJECTED REVENUE

WARD 1: $3,563,424
WARD 2: $3,604,032
WARD 3: $2,947,680
WARD 4: $4,114,080
WARD 5: $2,802,816
WARD 6: $3,346,128

DATA SOURCE: 3/23/04 ELISEO GARZA EMAIL. ($12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE - $144 ANNUAL X NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS PER WARD. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS = 141,515.)
PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570-90,165 HOUSEHOLDS)

**REVENUES FROM RENTAL TAX, TRASH FEE & BRUSH & BULKY FEES**

**WARD 1**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $1,310,163
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $3,563,424
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $593,904
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $539,904

**WARD 2**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $2,786,446
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $3,604,032
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $600,672
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $600,672

**WARD 3**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $2,980,829
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $2,947,680
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $641,280
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $641,280

**WARD 4**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $1,407,432
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $1,407,432
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $491,280
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $491,280

**WARD 5**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $1,313,315
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $1,313,315
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $467,136
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $467,136

**WARD 6**
- **PROPOSED 2% MONTHLY RENTERS:** $2,661,385
- **TAX ANNUALIZED (CITYWIDE: $12,459,570- 90,165 HOUSEHOLDS):** $2,661,385
- **PROPOSED $12 PER MONTH TRASH FEE:** $467,136
- **EXISTING $2 PER MONTH BRUSH & BULKY FEE:** $467,136

**DATA SOURCE:** 2004 EXISTING & PROPOSED FEES X NO. OF HOUSEHOLDS PER WARD. CITY OF TUCSON DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN, 2000 CENSUS WARD PROFILES - JANUARY 2007
REGRESSIVE TAX INDICATOR

WARD PERCENTAGE OF MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD ANNUAL INCOME

WARD PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CITYWIDE REVENUES COLLECTED FROM TRASH & BRUSH & BULKY FEES.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
CHECK CASHING / PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COMPANIES

CITYWIDE: 93

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO. RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.
CHECK CASHING / PAY DAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COMPANIES BY PERCENTAGE

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO. RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.
BANKS - 2003

WARD 1: 10
WARD 2: 32
WARD 3: 16
WARD 4: 7
WARD 5: 6
WARD 6: 30

CITYWIDE: 101

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO. RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.
BANKS BY PERCENTAGE 2003

CREDIT UNIONS

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO. RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.

CITYWIDE: 35
CREDIT UNIONS BY PERCENTAGE - 2003

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO.
RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.
PERCENTAGE OF CHECK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COMPANIES TO BANKS & CREDIT UNIONS

WARD 1: 20.43% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 9.56% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS
WARD 2: 9.68% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 28.68% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS
WARD 3: 28.68% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 19.35% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS
WARD 4: 6.62% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 5.38% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS
WARD 5: 9.56% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 20.43% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS
WARD 6: 30.88% CK CASHING/PAYDAY & CAR TITLE LOAN COS. 24.73% BANKS/CREDIT UNIONS

DATA SOURCE: 2004 WARD V RESEARCH, TUCSON PHONE BOOKS & PIMA CO. RECORDER JURISDICTION SEARCH.
HOUSING
NUMBER OF SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED UNITS

PERCENTAGE OF SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED UNITS

PREDATORY LENDING
2002 CITY OF TUCSON FORECLOSURES

DATA SOURCE: PIMA COUNTY REPORT FEBRUARY 2004: "THE AMERICAN DREAM LOST" PREDATORY LENDING AND FORECLOSURES IN PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, SOUTHWEST FAIR HOUSING COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 2004
PREDATORY LENDING
2002 APPROXIMATE FORECLOSURE DOLLAR VALUE

WARD 1
WARD 2
WARD 3
WARD 4
WARD 5
WARD 6
CITYWIDE

DATA SOURCE: PIMA COUNTY REPORT FEBRUARY 2004: "THE AMERICAN DREAM LOST"
PREDATORY LENDING AND FORECLOSURES IN PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, SOUTHWEST FAIR
HOUSING COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 2004
Home Ownership Rates

Data Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, American Community Survey 2005
*Based on % Owner Occupied
Median Value Owner Occupied Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, American Community Survey 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollars

- Ward 1
- Ward 2
- Ward 3
- Ward 4
- Ward 5
- Ward 6
- Citywide 1900
- Citywide 2000
- Citywide 2005

Data Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, American Community Survey 2005
Affordable Housing by Ward
(Total # of Units 10,480)

Data Source: City of Tucson Community Services Department
Affordable Housing by Ward
(City of Tucson Units)

Data Source: City of Tucson Community Services Department
Tucson Affordable Housing
(City of Tucson & Local Non-Profit Agency Units)

Data Source: City of Tucson Community Services Department
INCOME RANGES
PER CAPITA INCOME

$13,945
$22,644
$17,244
$15,127
$10,518
$16,610
$18,813
$20,179
$13,177

WARD 1 2000
WARD 2 2000
WARD 3 2000
WARD 4 2000
WARD 5 2000
WARD 6 2000
CITYWIDE 1990
CITYWIDE 2000
CITYWIDE 2005

INCOME

Median Family Income

Data Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, American Community Survey 2005
LABOR FORCE
CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE

WARD 1: 34,196
WARD 2: 42,734
WARD 3: 40,396
WARD 4: 38,390
WARD 5: 33,100
WARD 6: 42,560

CITYWIDE - TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE = 231,376

CIVILIAN UNEMPLOYED BY WARD

WARD 1: 2,146
WARD 2: 1,835
WARD 3: 2,617
WARD 4: 1,699
WARD 5: 3,011
WARD 6: 2,547

DATA SOURCE: CITY OF TUCSON DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN, 2000
CENSUS WARD PROFILES - JANUARY 2007

Civilian Unemployed: Citywide-13,855
WORK STATUS UNDETERMINED

STATUS UNDETERMINED (For this chart the following was subtracted from each Ward Population - Children 0-17 Years Old; Seniors 65 & Over; and the Civilian Labor Force.)

POPULATION & ETHNICITY
CITY OF TUCSON POPULATION PERCENTAGES
(By Ward)

PERCENTAGE
0-17 years (24.6%)
18-64 years (63.5%)
65 & over (11.9%)

CITYWIDE PERCENTAGES

ETRNCITY BY WARD
Population Total - 490,685

POVERTY STATUS
Single Parent Households

Data Source: Census 2000 & 2005 American Community Survey
*Data based on Female/Male Head of Household (HH) with no partner present
Persons for whom Poverty Determined

Data Sources: U.S. Census 1990, 2000, American Community Survey 2005
TUCSONANS LIVING BELOW POVERTY

PERCENTAGE OF TUCSONAN'S LIVING BELOW POVERTY

CITY OF TUCSON INCOME BELOW POVERTY FOR FAMILIES

CITY OF TUCSON INCOME BELOW POVERTY FOR FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER

CITY OF TUCSON INCOME BELOW POVERTY (FAMILIES & FEMALE HH)

- 1990: 21.8%
- 2000: 20.1%
- 2005: 24.8%

NUMBER OF CHILDREN & SENIORS LIVING BELOW POVERTY LEVEL


2000 CITYWIDE TOTALS:
- CHILDREN - 0-17 Yrs of Age (29,258)
- SENIORS - 65 Yrs of Age and Over (6,390)
PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN & SENIORS LIVING BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARD 1</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 2</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 3</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 4</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD 5</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWIDE 1990</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWIDE 2000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWIDE 2005</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOD STAMPS: ANNUALIZED BASED ON JAN '04

CITYWIDE: $59,682,346

WELFARE: ANNUALIZED BASED ON JAN '04

CITYWIDE: $19,393,171

FOOD STAMPS & WELFARE: ANNUALIZED BASED ON JAN 2004

DOLLARS REC'D BY RECIPIENT

FOOD STAMPS (CITYWIDE: $59,682,346)

WELFARE (CITYWIDE: $19,393,171)

YOUTH
KIDCO PARTICIPANTS & EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Yr Participants</th>
<th>Summer Participants</th>
<th>Expenditures (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>$1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>$1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>$1,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL CITY BUDGET - 1995: $616,110,720
TOTAL CITY BUDGET - 2000: $819,555,000
TOTAL CITY BUDGET - 2005: $1,032,327,210

CITY OF TUCSON YOUTH ALLOCATIONS

ONE STOP YOUTH FUNDING HISTORY

FISCAL YEAR

1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006

FUNDING

PIMA COUNTY GENERAL FUND

CITY OF TUCSON SUMMER YOUTH & YEAR RD YOUTH

DATA SOURCE: PIMA COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT, JANUARY 2007
PIMA COUNTY SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

WARD 1 WARD 2 WARD 3 WARD 4 WARD 5 WARD 6 PIMA COUNTY
SUMMER YOUTH APPLICANTS-2,149
SUMMER YOUTH PARTICIPANTS-1,211

MENTAL HEALTH & SUBSTANCE ABUSE
ENROLLEES IN CPSA SYSTEM

WARD 1  Pop:
Adults - 41,899
Kids 5-17 - 12,434

WARD 2  Pop:
Adults - 71,511
Kids 5-17 - 13,374

WARD 3  Pop:
Adults - 41,043
Kids 5-17 - 7,266

WARD 4  Pop:
Adults - 50,401
Kids 5-17 - 14,992

WARD 5  Pop:
Adults - 50,363
Kids 5-17 - 17,566

WARD 6  Pop:
Adults - 47,808
Kids 5-17 - 8,333

ENROLLEES IN SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS SYSTEM
ENROLLEES IN GENERAL MENTAL HEALTH / SUBSTANCE ABUSE SYSTEM
NO. OF KIDS ENROLLED IN CPSA SYSTEM

DATA SOURCE: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA (CPSA) - POPULATION & ENROLLEES PER CENSUS TRACT, JANUARY 2007
NO. OF KIDS ENROLLED IN CPSA SYSTEM

WARD 1 Pop: 41,899 Adults / 12,434 Kids 5-17
WARD 2 Pop: 71,511 Adults / 13,374 Kids 5-17
WARD 3 Pop: 41,043 Adults / 7,266 Kids 5-17
WARD 4 Pop: 50,401 Adults / 14,992 Kids 5-17
WARD 5 Pop: 50,363 Adults / 17,566 Kids 5-17
WARD 6 Pop: 47,808 Adults / 8,333 Kids 5-17

DATA SOURCE: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA (CPSA) - POPULATION & ENROLLEES PER CENSUS TRACT, JANUARY 2007