

Ward 6 Staff



Steve Kozachik



Ann Charles



Diana Amado



Molly Thrasher



Amy Stabler



Evelyn Romero



Ward 6 - Newsletter

TUCSON FIRST

November 14, 2013

Veteran's Day



We were a day off of our regular schedule this week due to Monday having been Veteran's Day. It's fitting to open with a tribute to those who have, and who are serving in our armed forces – and their families. We all gain as a result of the sacrifices they make in support of our Country.

SB1070

On Wednesday we had two really significant issues. One was immigration law and the other was our budget condition.

First, immigration.



First let me lay out my voting record on SB1070 and related positions we have taken over the last 3 years since it was adopted by the State.

When it was passed, I voted with the rest of the Council to oppose it. The vote was symbolic since we cannot pre-empt State law in this case, but based on the predictable impacts it was going to have on our local law enforcement's relationships with the Latino community, the fact that it allows anybody to sue us, the impact on our Commercial relationship with Mexico, and the trust issues it was going to produce, we all said "no" to the law. In doing so, we spoke with one voice alongside our Chief of Police. He has also steadfastly opposed the law – but is sworn to enforce it.

Next we voted on whether or not to join an existing lawsuit against the State over 1070. I voted against joining the suit, taking the position that since a suit had already been filed we shouldn't expend our local resources in duplicating that effort. That was the wrong position to take. Since that time I've learned how important our legal voice is in taking on State driven statutes that impact our ability to govern. We bring a lot to the table, and if that vote were to occur today, I'd vote in favor of joining the suit. Live and learn.

Next, we adopted a resolution in support of the Arizona Accord. I've shared the text of that a couple of times in these newsletters. It's a broad statement that sup-



Important Phone Numbers

Tucson Police Department

911 or 791-4444
nonemergency

Mayor & Council Comment Line

791-4700

Neighborhood Resources

791-4605

Park Wise

791-5071

Water Issues

791-3242

Pima County Animal Control

243-5900

Street Maintenance 791-3154

Planning and Development Services 791-5550

Southwest Gas

889-1888

Gas Emergency/ Gas Leaks

889-1888

West Nile Virus

Hotline

243-7999

Environment Service

791-3171

Graffiti Removal

792-2489

AZ Game & Fish

628-5376

Continued: A Message From Steve

ports principles of respecting the dignity of all people, support of local law enforcement, and working for comprehensive immigration policies at the Federal level.

Finally, the M&C adopted an “Immigrant Friendly City” resolution. I also voted against that based on it being tied to a “Dayton model”. That model includes sections through which their governing body directed law enforcement on how to prioritize their work as it related to the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. We don’t have that legislative authority, and that fact was affirmed by our City Attorney. My vote was the legally correct one. And yet, we now have a couple of years’ track record with the implementation of the law and it’s time to revisit it to see how we might affirm our opposition to the law, but do so in a legislatively appropriate manner.

On Wednesday we were asked to consider recommendations from the City Manager and an additional four-part motion brought by Councilmember Romero. That four part motion included one part that was to establish a community outreach plan to engage the public in an ongoing community dialogue related to SB1070. Hopefully that will help to bridge some of the divide the law has caused between our law enforcement officers and residents. Another part of the motion was to direct TPD to begin to develop a more comprehensive stop-data base than what they now have. Last week I had asked Chief Villasenor for some data and learned that we don’t compile it in ways that can answer some of the important questions we need to answer related to duration of stops, how long it took CBP to arrive and other measures. Evidently other council members had also requested similar information and were told that it really doesn’t exist in ways we can use. These two parts of the motion were no-brainers.

A third part of the motion stated “Individuals calling to report allegations of officer misconduct to TPD or to the Independent Police Auditor in the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs should never be questioned about their legal status”. Phrased in that manner allows for the procedural distance between M&C dictating police procedures versus us stating our policy preference by use of the word “should”. We want people to feel uninhibited from making any sorts of contact with our local law enforcement staff, on whatever topics they need to discuss.

The final part of Regina’s motion addressed the issue of focusing investigations on suspects, not victims and witnesses of crimes. It stated “language be incorporated (into General Orders) stating as strongly as possible under the law that the priorities of the City and TPD are to protect the overall safety and the constitutional rights of all members of the community; to focus on the investigation of a suspect or arrestee, rather than on the immigration status of a witness or victim; and to encourage the participation of victims and witnesses in reporting crime”.

In preparation for this study session item I reviewed a couple of hours’ of the training DVD offered to all police officers commissioned in the State of Arizona. In the section dealing with section 1051 of SB1070 it states “nothing in 1051 suggests it’s appropriate at any time to ask a witness or victim in criminal investigations about their immigration status. Section 1051 deals solely with suspects in situations of stop, detention and arrest”. If the State training instructs us to refrain from doing status checks on victims and wit-



Important Phone Numbers

Senator John
McCain (R)
520-670-6334

Senator Jeff
Flake (R)
520-575-8633

Congressman
Ron Barber (D)
(2nd District)
520-881-3588

Congressman
Raul Grijalva (D)
(3th District)
520-622-6788

Governor Janice
Brewer (R)
Governor of Arizona
602-542-4331
Toll free:
1-800-253-0883

State Legislators
Toll Free
Telephone:
1-800-352-8404
Internet:
www.azleg.gov

Mayor Jonathan
Rothschild
791-4201

City Infoguide
[http://
cms3.tucsonaz.gov/
infoguide](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/infoguide)

nesses, our own General Orders should do likewise.

There was also discussion about whether we should question juveniles without the presence of an attorney or parent/guardian. Border Patrol is right now adjusting their policies and may adopt such a policy. I don't think we need to wait on them to make that decision for us. I proposed that we adopt that policy at the local level and let CBP do what they want with their own policy.

Here are the recommendations coming from the City Manager. It's nuanced, but it's also important to note that the M&C is not dictating the language of the General Orders, but is expressing policy direction and leaving it up to Staff to consider what we suggested be done.

1) Possible revisions to the TPD General Orders to:

a) emphasize further that in the context of criminal investigations and arrests, the officer will focus on the suspect/arrestee in the investigation of the underlying reason for the stop and/or detention, rather than on the immigration status of witnesses or victims. This direction would be consistent with existing provisions of the G.O.s that provide that the operational needs of the agency and the overall safety of the community necessarily take priority when deciding how best to use limited department resources; and that recognize the need for victim and witness cooperation in investigations;

b) state that in instances where the impound of a vehicle is discretionary, rather than mandatory, the officer will use reasonable efforts to allow the vehicle to be removed by another person to avoid impound;

c) add to procedures relating to the investigation of juvenile offenders, and express that when an officer detains a juvenile and the officer has reasonable suspicion to believe the juvenile is unlawfully present, the officer will not question juveniles regarding their immigration status without the presence of an attorney or guardian;

All of that was fine – and I support those changes. But it's my sense that by continuing to target the implementation of the law and not go after the law itself, we're focused on the impact of a bad piece of legislation, not on the legislation itself. To that end, I did some homework on the parts of the law that have so far survived court challenges, compared them to our Police department's General Orders (that's how they're instructed to implement various laws – 1070 in this case), and thought about those in relation to peoples' right to due process. This is not simple "yes/no" stuff.

First, here's a statement that summarizes the courts position on the most vexing portion of the law; Section 1051(B). It's the part that requires an officer make a 'reasonable effort' to determine immigration status if there is 'reasonable suspicion' to believe the suspect is here unlawfully.

13-1509; 13-2928(C); and 13-3883(A)(3), described above] are preempted by federal law. However, all of the justices upheld the provisions of A.R.S. § 11-1051(B), requiring that an officer make a reasonable attempt to determine the immigration status of a person stopped, detained or arrested if there is a reasonable suspicion that the person is unlawfully present in the United States; and requiring verification of the immigration status of any person arrested prior to releasing that person. Importantly, however, the majority opinion cautioned that a practice of detaining or prolonging a detention of individuals solely to verify immigration status raises constitutional concerns; and that the Court's decision did not prevent future legal challenges (on preemption or other constitutional grounds) based on the actual implementation of the laws.

Note that the word "reasonable" appears a couple of times. I'll come back to that. Also, the Court left open the option for future legal challenges once jurisdictions had developed a his-

tory of how SB1070 was being implemented.

Here's our General Order that instructs TPD officers on how to implement 1051(B.)

G.O. 2320 addresses lawful stops and detentions, and situations where the officer develops reasonable suspicion to believe a detainee is unlawfully present. This G.O. includes the statutory requirement that the officer make a reasonable attempt to determine the person's immigration status; but also identifies and explains the exceptions to this requirement, namely when it is not practicable to do so and/or when the determination may hinder or obstruct an investigation. The G.O. expressly prohibits consideration of a detainee's race, color or national origin, except that an officer may ask about a person's citizenship after arrest or in other appropriate circumstances, such as when race is part of a suspect's description. This policy explains that if the detainee provides presumptive identification, no further investigation is necessary absent additional facts that cast doubt on the person's lawful presence. This G.O. further describes what constitutes reasonable suspicion.

One might ask – and several of us have – what behaviors a person would have to demonstrate to create “reasonable suspicion” that he/she was here illegally. If race cannot be used as a criterion, then what actions raise that red flag. It strikes me that if I'm expected to obey a law, it should be clear to me what's expected in order to avoid creating that suspicion. There's a legal principle that addresses the idea. It's found under Due Process and is called the “void for vagueness doctrine”.

The void for vagueness doctrine encourages the government to clearly distinguish conduct that is lawful from that which is unlawful. Under the Due Process Clauses, individuals must be given adequate notice of their legal obligations so they can govern their behavior accordingly. The idea is that when individuals are left uncertain by the wording of an imprecise statute, the law lacks standards and can be abused.

The original SB1070 complaint/lawsuit was filed back on May 17, 2010. Here's some language that relates to the issue I'm wrestling with:

*Section 2 of SB 1070 permits state and local law enforcement officials to seize, detain, and transfer individuals without appropriate procedures, thereby depriving Plaintiffs of their liberty without due process of law. Furthermore, the terms “reasonable suspicion,” “reasonable attempt,” “unlawful presence” and “determine the immigration status” are vague and fail to provide meaningful guidance to law enforcement officers implementing this provision. **This creates an unacceptable risk of arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.***

So I thought it might be worth going after the law as being unconstitutional on its face – until I remembered that the 4th Amendment to the Constitution also uses the word “unreasonable”. It's vague both in 1070, and in the Constitution. And it's vague by design to allow discretion. Our issue was framing our policy preferences in ways that don't obliterate the opportunity for police discretion, but to also address the tensions we're now seeing in the community. I think we did that.

As for the more broad issue of what a lousy law SB1070 is, all of the legal folks I've asked about taking it on from a Constitutional standpoint advise me that that'd be a dead end. So, we'll keep an eye on how to balance our legislative policy preferences with what we see happening out on the street and hope for a legislative flip at the State level so re-

peal is possible.

In my world (layman – not lawyer) laws should be understood not only by those persons who are required to obey them but also by those persons who are charged with the duty of enforcing them, in this case TPD officers. Statutes that do not carefully outline detailed procedures by which police officers may perform an investigation, conduct a search, or make an arrest give wide discretion to each officer to act as he or she sees fit. That's not an indictment of our police personnel. It's simply saying that when vague, overly broad words are left in either the Statute or in the General Orders, nobody quite knows the standards by which they're supposed to act. Precisely worded statutes are intended to confine an officer's activities to the letter of the law. But I can't justify pushing a Constitutional challenge to a bad piece of law having been told by some pretty savvy legal folks that it'd be a loser. I don't mind swinging for the fence, but I'd also like to do it with a prayer of making contact.

But we made some changes in terms of policy implementation on Wednesday that will hopefully ease some of the tensions that exist out in the community. We'll keep the other idea warm for possibly acting on later.

Pensions

As a lead into the Budget section I wanted to share with you what the voters in Cincinnati recently decided. As you'll recall there was a failed attempt in Tucson last election cycle to get a pension reform initiative on the ballot. That would have closed our current plan and started a new one along the model of a 401K. Without going into all of the details again – I've outlined them pretty extensively in previous newsletters – the net result would have been a significant financial drain on our General Fund. Had it gotten to the ballot, you'd have heard a ton more on why it would have been bad for our particular plan.

A very similar proposal did make it to the ballot in Cincinnati. You may also recall that the group pushing this in Tucson was not local, but is going around the Country trying to get it on ballots in multiple jurisdictions. It's ideology to them, not a plan geared to addressing the issues related to individual pension plans / all of which face unique challenges. One size does not fit all. In Cincinnati the voters overwhelmingly rejected what was called "Issue 4" by a 78%:22% margin. The City leaders did a good job of educating the electorate.

Peter McLinden, Cincinnati-area Regional Director at AFSCME Ohio Council 8, released this statement:

Today's vote will be heard beyond Cincinnati and sends a message for those on the ideological extremes who think it is ok to impose their agenda on an entire city. Had this passed, outside money and political extremists would have cost Cincinnati taxpayers more money, with less services. ... That said we all are dedicated to working together moving forward to fix the pension system in a way that is in the best interest of Cincinnati public employees and taxpayers."

So is this M&C.

The Cincinnati amendment would have required the city to pay off its \$872 million unfunded liability in the current pension system within 10 years. In addition, the amendment would have changed the plan for new hires to a Defined Contribution plan (same as the proposal headed for our ballot,) and placed caps on the City contributions as well as cost of living adjustments for recipients.

Cincinnati's pension plan has a large unfunded liability, due mostly to the economic crash of 2008 that affected the system's investments, along with rising healthcare costs. That's exactly what we're facing. And as the market readjusts, the underfunded liability will self-correct to a degree. It will also self-correct as the ratio of payers to recipients changes (right now at 1:1.)

We have work to do, but as Cincinnati's voters just said, closing the plan at this point isn't sensible. I mention it here because it won't be a huge surprise if they came back in 2014 and tried to get it back on our ballot. The education process starts here, now.

2013 Year End Budget Results

Our Fiscal years end on June 30th of a given year. Fiscal year 2013 ended last June. On Wednesday we were given the final results of that year end. It takes a while for all revenues and expenditures to clear – they now have.

The main point for us to consider as we enter the FY' 14 budget cycle is that we still do not have a structurally balanced budget. As I've noted many times, we "balanced" our FY' 13 budget in large part by authorizing restructuring some of our debt. We learned on Wednesday that that restructuring never really occurred, and that instead, staff reduced our Assigned Fund Balance by enough to get the books balanced.

Fund balance is how we maintain our creditworthiness. It's also our rainy day fund that would kick into play if we got some surprise legislation from Phoenix or suffered another economic melt down as happened back in the 2007-2008 timeframe. We're not where we need to be yet, but we're making progress towards putting a rainy day fund in place that meets our M&C established policy. And yet, over at least the past six years we have used one-time revenues to help pay for City services. That's not sustainable and we have to remember it as we go forward later this year into studying the FY' 14 budget, revisiting the issue of compensation increases and generally talk about how to get the budget into structural balance where revenues meet or exceed costs. Staff will bring back that compensation increase item right after Thanksgiving.

We just had to float \$100M in road bonds because the roads are in such bad condition. While there were issues related to drops in gas tax money coming from Phoenix that helped create that problem, we also have to acknowledge that deferring maintenance on the roads only served to increase our present day repair costs over what they'd have been if repairs had been handled sooner. That's not so much a criticism of past Mayors and Councils – we've gone through some very tough economic times – but it's a red flag to us that setting priorities often doesn't result in the sexiest of spending decisions. In anticipation of having to make those tough decisions near the end of the year, I asked Staff to get out to us as soon as possible a comprehensive list of deferred maintenance issues that we're going to have to figure out how to fund. That's both existing repair/replace needs, and the larger long term capital needs list. It'll be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Again this year none of the budget decisions are going to be simple. We'll see new costs (Streetcar O&M, PCWIN communications system, pension cost increases, money out the door when cops exit through the deferred retirement program in 2015) – then promoting from within to fill those slots (we do, and should give pay increases when people are promoted from within the organization.) We'll get through it again, but it's becoming more critical that we turn the corner and establish a budget in which expenditures meet revenues and stop with the one-time fixes.

Update on Upgrades to the TCC



Last week the Rio Board approved hiring on Concord Construction to be our General Contractor as we move closer to beginning work on TCC remodeling. On Wednesday members of the City Planning/Design and General Services area gave us an update on how that project is moving along.

We've got a preliminary list of elements we're going to try to fund within the \$7.8M budget that Rio has offered to the project. Now Concord will work with the architects (Swaim and Associates) and the working group I'm a part of to see how the parts fit together in consideration of the money we have to spend.

This is the same process I work through in capital projects with the UA athletics department. You first identify a needs list, do some fund raising to finance the work, and then pull the team together to design to the budget, making value engineering changes where necessary. We'll know soon where, if at all we'll need to scale back on our current project scope.

The work as it now stands will include new seating, work on concessions stands and restrooms, some lighting, scoreboard and audio in the arena. We're also looking at the possibility of work in the breezeway outside of the main arena to enhance the fan experience as they enter the area. All of what we're looking at doing is directed to fan experience. While there are locker room issues, loading dock issues, and other back-of-house items we could tackle, the first priority is making changes that you will experience when you come to the TCC after the work is done. We know there are plenty of other areas in which we could invest in upgrades, and those will come. But for now our working group is focused on managing this work efficiently and demonstrating that we're in a new day as the City/Rio relationship is concerned.

As is true with capital projects in McKale Center, the TCC is an operating space and so the work will have to take place around the events they're hosting. That means phasing, and necessarily spreading out the time frame. But if things progress as we intend, you'll start to see seating installed early next spring, and other parts of the work described above shortly after that.

We're also checking into our ability to issue a new proposal for running concessions. The menu is old and not real exciting. If our current vendor would like to talk about upgrades to that, we might be able to extend their current agreement. We'll know that very soon. We'll also know the direction we will take with respect to outside management of the TCC and possibly other venues in the area. So, lots of possibilities for changes in the next calendar year. Stay tuned – this is going to be a good news story as it continues to unfold.

Rio Nuevo Revenue Collections

By State Statute, the Rio Nuevo District is funded by tax dollars collected from businesses that operate within the District. That's an area bounded by downtown and running out Broadway to just about Wilmot. If you're a business in that area, a portion of the taxes you already pay goes to help fund the Rio Nuevo work we're managing.

One of the concerns related to collecting those revenues is that in some cases the business operator doesn't properly fill out the tax form. There is a code that is supposed to be filled

in on each sales tax form businesses submit. It is that code that alerts the Arizona Department of Revenue to take a portion of the taxes being paid and allocate it to the District. If no code is filled out then all of the money being paid goes into the normal State coffers and is doled back out as per State law.

The City has a direct interest in keeping close tabs on whether Rio is getting all of the Tax Increment Finance money that's owed to them. Why? Because in the past we've backed their debt. We want them solvent.

To that end, I asked our Finance people what steps we're taking to help ensure businesses are filling in the tax forms correctly – or if we're losing money into the ADOR black hole up in Phoenix. Here are the steps we're taking through our tax audit division to assist:

- Work with Arizona Department of Revenue to request and reconcile tax increment finance (TIF) and ensure appropriate revenue is remitted from the State
- Track all businesses within the District
- Ensure that businesses are recording information correctly
- Monitor for new business activity in the District
- Provide training to new business in the District
- Audit and correct miscoding errors

In addition, our Finance people and those from Rio work with the audit staff to inform them of new businesses in the District. It all takes a bunch of unnecessary labor when the easy fix would be to pre-code the business tax forms. Several of us will be asking the State to change the reporting forms so the business operators don't have to go through that one added paperwork step. I'll keep you posted.

Moms Demand Action – Texas Style

Last month I hosted a forum at the Ward 6 office with Moms Demand Action to speak about the connection between Domestic Violence, lethal exchanges between Intimate Partners and the presence of guns. The emphasis was to continue the discussion about the need for universal background checks. Here's some of the data that supports the need:

- 61% of intimate partner (IP) murder-suicide perpetrators used a gun to kill their partner (source: Koziel-McLain, et al, 2006)
- 25% of IP murder (no accompanying suicide) perpetrators used a gun to kill their partner (source: Koziel-McLain, et al, 2006)
- Also, the study found that 16% of homes where domestic abuse was occurring had guns available in the home. However, 52% of the homes where IP murders took place had guns available in the home. (source: Koziel-McLain, et al, 2006). Another study found that perpetrators in “femicides” had access to a gun in 65% of cases, verses the 24% in homes where abuse occurred but no murder took place (source: J. Campbell, NIJ VA-WA R01 DA/AA156)
- Nationally, since 2002, 52% of “femicides” were shootings (69% of these were handguns), 22% were stabbings, 13% were bodily force (including strangulation), 7% were blunt objects, and 6% were other means (drowning, arson, etc.). (source: Adams, 2012)
- During a study of 31 IP murder perpetrators in Massachusetts (study done by David

Adams), 14 of the 31 shot their IP. Of these 14, 11 (78%) said they would not have used another weapon (e.g., they would not have killed her if they had no access to a gun) because the gun allowed them to depersonalize the violence (vs. stabbing, strangulation, etc.).

- Of the 14 IP murderers in Adam's study, 7 obtained their gun legally, 4 obtained their gun illegally and 3 were supposed to have surrendered their gun due to prior conviction but failed to surrender it to authorities.
- Murders using guns are more likely to have multiple victims (Adams)
- 6 of the IP murders in Adam's study stabbed their partner. Of those, 4 (66%) said they would have used a gun if it was available to them, and 2 (33%) said they would not have used a gun since "it would have made too much noise".
- Only 1 of the 8 IP murders who strangled their partners said they would have used a gun if it was available.

With those data sets, it's hard to argue that the presence of guns escalates DV incidents into lethal ones. One would hope that would bring the sides together to push for at least some level of background check that would prevent DV perpetrators from gaining access to a gun. But in Dallas, Texas last week, their chapter of Moms found out that the issue isn't quite that unifying.



A group of 40 gun advocates gathered and waited outside a restaurant where they knew Moms were holding a meeting. Pulling up in the parking lot, they took out their weapons and waited for the "group" to come out of the restaurant. The Moms were inside the Blue Mesa Grill when members of Open Carry Texas (OCT) pulled up in the parking lot and started getting guns out of their trunks. The group then waited in the parking lot for nearly 2 hours for the four MDA members to come out.

The restaurant manager was aware that they were outside hold-up in his parking lot. He didn't call 911 for fear of "inciting a riot". After about 2 hours the brave souls with the guns headed over to a local Hooters, probably to brag on their machismo.

Last weekend I was asked why I do this job. My answer was that I'm not willing to allow the loud and shrill ideologues to stifle legitimate debate on subject such as this. I applaud our local Moms group for their work, the Dallas Moms for theirs, and will continue to help them get out the message in the weeks ahead.

Some Dog Stuff

Next Tuesday, November 19th from 6pm until 8pm, No Kill Pima County will host a free community meeting to discuss issues surrounding what's happening at Pima County shelters (PACC in particular) and how you can help by adopting, spaying, neutering and otherwise being a responsible pet owner. Also a part of the presentation will be identifying some of the challenges to the No Kill solution and what some other communities are doing to address the problem.



This is all about reducing the number of animals who are euthanized at shelters and the role you can play in reducing the numbers. They're way out of control. The meeting is out at Handi-Dogs, 75 S. Montego / a block east of Broadway and Kolb. If you'd like more information you can check them out at <http://nokillpimacounty.org>.

November is Adopt-a-Senior Pet Month. They'll have some adoptable senior dogs from PACC at the meeting.

...and while nobody was paying much attention, buried in the midst of their last South Tucson City Council meeting was a vote that effectively overturns the will of the South Tucson voters related to injecting racing greyhounds with steroids. Last month the Director of the Arizona Department of Racing sent them a letter in which he took the position that the State is the one who decides what "medications" are to be given to racing animals, not the voters. An unelected bureaucrat whose budget is funded in large measure by the industry he's overseeing was successful in getting the South Tucson legislative body to concede Home Rule without a whimper.

The testimony from the legal advisor to the South Tucson City Council said this:

"Based upon my research of the law, preemption and the unequivocal conflict existing between the supreme State law over municipal law, the State regulations on the injections



of greyhounds preempts our ordinance. So my suggestion would be to amend solely the enforcement provision as it applies to the intergovernmental agreement that we have with Pima County Animal Control."

Never mind that the law was passed by the voters over 5 years ago and has gone unchallenged by the ADOR until now. Why? Because until now the Tucson Greyhound Track had been allowing their dogs to be trucked into the City of Tucson and be injected here – until we adopted a protective ordinance that banned steroids in Tucson. If this were truly an issue of pre-emption of State law over local control, that issue would have been raised back at the time of their election.

But nobody from the community was there to object when they took their vote last week.

To close the loop on how transparently phony this move was, Director Walsh and I have had several exchanges since our own vote and at no time has the pre-emption issue been raised. He has also had multiple exchanges with local media since our vote to ban the injection of anabolic steroids and in not a single one of the related stories was the issue of pre-emption mentioned.

The dogs are the losers – the will of the people of South Tucson is a loser – the will of us as Mayor and Council is a loser – and "governmental ethics" is made an oxymoron in how this has been achieved.

In addition to No Kill Pima County, there are greyhound adoption groups all over Pima County. There are multiple ways you can get involved.

Bridget Barrett Honored by NCAA



The NCAA recognizes top student-athletes for their successes both on and off the field/court. The awards are announced following the last year of the student's eligibility. This year the top athlete named nationwide was our own Bridget Barrett – silver medalist in the most recent Olympics. That performance marked the first time since 1984 that a female Collegiate athlete has medaled in the Olympics. She is also a six-time NCAA track and field national champion, both indoor and outdoor, a seven-time All-American competing in indoor and outdoor track and field, the collegiate record-holder for women's high jump and was the 2013 United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) National Field Athlete of the Year.

Then there's that academic thing. Barrett was a two-time Capital One Academic All-America team member and the 2013 University of Arizona Ruby Award winner for excellence in academics, athletics and personal development. She was an active member on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and was the president during the 2012-13 school year. She ended with a 3.54 GPA in Theater Arts.

I might also add that Bridget is the only student athlete listed in the Top 10 who competes for a school even remotely close to the west coast. She has a lot to be proud of.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve Kozachik". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "S" at the beginning.

Steve Kozachik
Council Member, Ward 6
ward6@tucsonaz.gov

“Fancy Pants”

Please consider participating in the “Fancy Pants” undergarment clothing drive to support the children of Sojourner Center, a domestic violence shelter for women and children.

Many abused children arrive at the Sojourner Center with only the clothes on their back. When they come via the police department or hospital, many arrive without even that – socks and undergarments are often confiscated as evidence.

You can help bring a sense of “community, peace, and pride” to these young victims of domestic violence by dropping off donations of new, packaged undergarments or socks for boys or girls ages 4-14 at the Ward 6 office anytime before November 22nd.

For more information: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/ward6/Sojourner_Center_Request_Letter_110713.pdf

Events Calendar

What’s happening this week in the Downtown, 4th Avenue, and Main Gate areas . . .

Fox Theatre, 17 W. Congress St.

Friday, November 15 5:00 pm VIP; 6:00 pm show **TPOA Battle of the Bands**

The TPOA Battle of the Bands to Benefit Kids and Cops Christmas. A day of music featuring, A Day of Fire, Broken Romeo, Fatal Funnel, Funky Bonz, and Southern Reins.

www.FoxTucsonTheatre.org

Tucson Music Hall 260 S. Church Ave

November 15, 2013 - November 17, 2013 **Dancing with Glass and Beethoven**

The Tucson Symphony Orchestra presents Andrew Grams as guest conductor, with Tim Fain on violin and Wendy Sutter on cello, as part of the TSO Classic Series, at Tucson Music Hall.

Fri., Nov 15 at 8:00 PM and Sun., Nov 17 at 2:00 PM

<http://tucsonsymphony.org/>

Ongoing

Loft Cinema, 3233 E. Speedway

www.loftcinema.com/

Rialto Theatre, 318 E. Congress St.

www.RialtoTheatre.com

Tucson Museum of Art, 140 N. Main Ave.

www.TucsonMuseumofArt.org

Jewish History Museum, 564 S. Stone Ave.

The Jewish History Museum presents "Cowboys, Merchants, Miners, & Booze," an exhibit that celebrates the lives of Tucson's Jewish pioneers.

www.jewishhistorymuseum.org

Children's Museum Tucson, 200 S. 6th Ave.

Tuesday - Friday: 9:00am - 5:00pm; Saturdays & Sundays: 10:00am - 5:00pm

www.childrensmuseumtucson.org**Arizona State Museum**, 1013 E. University BlvdNovember 9, 2013, through July 2015 **Curtis Reframed: The Arizona Portfolios**www.statemuseum.arizona.edu**UA Mineral Museum**, 1601 E University Blvd

Ongoing "100 Years of Arizona's Best: The Minerals that Made the State"

Southern Arizona Transportation Museum, 414 N Toole Ave.

Explore regional transportation history, and see a freight trains passing by, or ring the locomotive bell at the Southern Arizona Transportation Museum every Saturday, year round.

Tuesday – Thursday, Sunday: 1100am - 3:00pm; Friday & Saturdays: 10:00am - 4:00pm

<http://www.tucsonhistoricdepot.org/>**Sacred Machine Museum & Curiosity Shop**, 245 E Congress St<http://sacredmachine.com/>**Meet Me at Maynards**

A social walk/run through the Downtown area

Every Monday, rain or shine, holidays too!

Maynards Market and Kitchen, 400 N. Toole Avenue, the historic train depot

Check-in begins at 5:15pm.

www.MeetMeatMaynards.com**For other events in the Downtown/4th Avenue/Main Gate area, visit these sites:**www.MainGateSquare.comwww.FourthAvenue.orgwww.DowntownTucson.org**“Money for the Funny” Show to Benefit
Tucson’s FIRST Improv Comedy Theater**Tucson’s Improv Comedy Troupe “Not Burnt Out, Just Unscrewed” (NBOJU) presents **MONEY FOR THE FUNNY** - An improvisational comedy fundraiser to benefit Tucson's FIRST non-profit, improv entertainment venue: Unscrewed Theater.

One night only: Saturday, November 23, 2013, from 7:00-9:00 p.m. (cocktail hour 6:00-7:00 p.m.) at the Loft Cinema, 3233 E. Speedway. Tickets are \$20, sold online and at the door.

SAVE THE DATE!

**Not Burnt Out
Just Unscrewed**

PRESENTS

MONEY

...for the...

Funny!A special fundraising show to support
the opening of Tucson's first nonprofit
entertainment venue dedicated to
improvisational comedy**unscrewed
theater**

Comedy! 50/50 Raffle! Live Auction!

Sat Nov 23, 2013 · 7-9pm

6-7pm Pre-show Reception

CO-PRESENTED BY

The Loft Cinema

3233 East Speedway, Tucson Arizona

Tickets only \$20

520-861-2986 · unscrewedtheater.org[facebook.com/unscrewedtheater](https://www.facebook.com/unscrewedtheater)