

Ward 6 Staff



Steve Kozachik



Ann Charles



Diana Amado



Amy Stabler



Alison Miller



Caroline Lee



Ward 6 Newsletter

Tucson First

July 8, 2015

In this issue...

Message Parlor Investigation	1
Making Progress.....	3
County Bond Projects	3
Police Department Compensation Package	8
TAA Annexation.....	10
Final Budget Item for this Fiscal Year	10
Ward 6 Art.....	12
Graffiti.....	12
Two Neighborhood Items	13
UA Neighborhood Seminar.....	13
Art Exhibit.....	14
Events and Announcements	15

Message Parlor Investigation

I'm on the outside looking in on the Internal Affairs investigation, as I should be. That process needs to be untainted by any political or personal influence. But I do know a couple of things from what has been reported in the media and from exchanges I've had with some of the press, and I have a couple of thoughts related to them.

First, about 7,000 names were turned over to the media by the City. Truth be known, names were being offered up in the rumor mill well in advance of a list being released. As for the 7,000 names, as far as I understand it they reflected contacts found in phones that were confiscated during the investigation. I don't know if those phones were subpoenaed, or just requested as a part of the investigation by police. What I am told by contacts in the press is that my name is one of those "on the Johns list." If the name of the property manager reported in the Star is accurate, I'm not surprised that mine is one of those included. He and I used to talk and text from time to time and if his was one of the phones confiscated, it's not surprising my name popped up.

So the press is characterizing this as a list of "Johns." That's simply not accurate – Johns are people who buy sex. What they have been given is a data dump of names, some of whom are included in the criminal investigation and a pile of others who



Important Phone Numbers

**Tucson Police
Department**
911 or nonemergency
791-4444

Water Issues
791-3242/800-598-9449
Emergency: 791-4133

Street Maintenance
791-3154

Graffiti Removal
792-2489

**Abandoned
Shopping Carts**
791-3171

**Neighborhood
Resources**
837-5013

SunTran/SunLink
792-9222
TDD: 628-1565

**Environmental
Services**
791-3171

Park Wise
791-5071

**Planning and
Development
Services** 791-5550

**Pima Animal Care
Center**
724-5900

**Pima County Vector
Control**
Cockroach: 443-6501
Mosquito: 243-7999

Continued: A Message From Steve

are not. The reporters who are investigating this have no way to distinguish who's a what from among the thousands of names. We were all just lumped in together. It's now quite a haystack, and several people have speculated that it's hiding some needles that were previously not going to be as difficult to find.

The Star was very careful – and accurate – to say that the names released to them do not indicate any involvement in the criminal investigation. From what was reported and told to me we know that among the many, many names turned over to the press, media people, talk show hosts, civic leaders, elected officials, including City Council Members, and other City employees are on the list. Also over the holiday weekend, it was reported that TPD has turned over the phone records and is not investigating that large list any further. The Internal Affairs work continues on those implicated in the initial criminal issues.

I have shared with our legal people that I don't believe closing down the investigations for City workers is acceptable. If they released a list with my name and others on it, check us out and either clear us or charge us. I'd like to see that same thing happen with everybody who was on the list, but I also understand the time it would involve, so let's limit it to people who are being paid by the taxpayers and let's let those chips fall where they may.

I've gone one step further. I have requested that TPD formally investigate me for my involvement in anything having to do with the massage parlor investigation. Since my name appeared on a list released by the police, I, along with my family, employer, coworkers, and constituents deserve formal closure on whether or not I have anything to do with that whole affair. Here's the reply offered to the press on that request:

There are no charges or even suspicions from which CM Kozachik needs to be "cleared;" instead, it's more accurate to say that there is zero evidence or information connecting him in any way to By Spanish, Daisy's Delights, or any part of the criminal investigation.

If you're giving out names, and some of those names are on your payroll, then close the book one way or another on each of them. I believe the public has a right to that level of finality in this. So do those of us whose names were given to the media, regardless of the caveats about 'not involved in criminal activity' offered at the time. Other public safety agencies named should do the same. There has been gossip going on about people's involvement for months. I've stepped to the front of the line and told the City to either charge me with something or formally clear my name from that gossip list. That has now been done.



Important Phone Numbers

Senator John
McCain (R)
520-670-6334

Senator Jeff
Flake (R)
520-575-8633

Congresswoman
Martha McSally (R)
(2nd District)
(202) 225-2542
Tucson Office: 520-
881-3588

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

Governor Doug
Ducey (R)
602-542-4331
Tucson office:
520-628-6580

Mayor Jonathan
Rothschild
520-791-4201

ZoomTucson Map
[http://
maps.tucsonaz.gov
/zoomTucson/](http://maps.tucsonaz.gov/zoomTucson/)



I thought I'd share some indication that we're making progress as a nation. Now, about those background checks...

County Bond Projects

Last week, County Administrator Huckelberry sent his Board a memo in which he offered up what I believe to be some constructive suggestions for getting the County bond discussion off of repair and maintenance (R/M) issues and back onto the projects themselves – their merits, or not. The same memo showed some frustration with me:

Concerns over Amendments Voiced by the Councilmember Kozachik

These Code amendments, specifically those regarding operation and maintenance, have been characterized by Councilmember Steve Kozachik as intrusive. I have also heard the words "heavy-handed" and "dictatorial." Attached are Mr. Kozachik's June 24 and June 29, 2015 newsletters for your information. Mr. Kozachik also issued a press release on behalf of himself, a Marana Town Councilmember and an Oro Valley Town Councilmember. Given the City's lack of maintenance of key public facilities such as the Tucson Convention Center, Tucson Music Hall, the Eckbo fountains, the Temple of Museum of Art and swimming pools to name a few cases, our Code amendments are both appropriate and necessary to assure voters that new facilities built with bonds will be maintained and adequately operated.

Councilmember Kozachik also seems to imply the County wants to control the City budget by requiring these voter-approved projects to be maintained. If the City is not prepared to maintain these bond projects, they should have never been recommended by the City Bond Project Advisory Committee and requested for inclusion in the County bond program by the Mayor and Council. Perhaps Councilmember Kozachik is not aware that the City Bond Project Advisory Committee was as concerned about operating and maintenance costs as Pima County's Bond Advisory Committee.

I am puzzled by the lack of internal City communication on this matter. We seem to be able to communicate well with their staff on these matters and work out any differences fairly easily, only to be attacked by a Councilmember through press releases.

Please communicate with City staff that I believe they have been very thoughtful and reasonable in their review of the multitude of documents necessary to successfully implement this program.

Also, please continue working with City staff regarding the bond program to ensure they are fully aware of these discussions and have every opportunity to provide suggested or alternative language to resolve any concerns that may arise.



If I were sitting in Mr. Huckelberry's chair, I'd be as frustrated as he is.

Here's why:

One full month before the language in the Bond Ordinance and IGA template were sent to Council offices, it had been agreed to by City staff. I saw it three days before the Board of Supervisors was scheduled to vote on it. If I had negotiated terms of a deal and heard nothing for a month, then three days before our vote some guy sent off some flares objecting, I too would wonder what his motives were. The County has every right to be "puzzled by the lack of internal City communications" on this matter. So am I.

I'll address a couple of specific points and then move onto the substantive parts of his memo. I disagree that City staff had been "very thoughtful and reasonable" in what was negotiated. Giving another jurisdiction the authority to step into our budget cycle and send us a bill for the next quarter of a century is not thoughtful.

I would also point out that it's a bit disingenuous for anybody from the County to be poking fingers at other jurisdictions for not adequately maintaining infrastructure. Take a drive out on a County road sometime and see if you don't agree. We're all struggling with maintenance challenges.

With respect to his comments about the City not being prepared to maintain the Bond projects – he's right, again. Since I raised this issue publicly (because it wasn't being addressed any other way) I have also asked that Staff prepare a comprehensive assessment of each of the City-related projects and show projected R/M costs for each. There are estimates hidden in the pages of each proposed project, but we shouldn't be asking you to go on a hunting expedition to find out how we're spending your cash. If you're being asked to fund a building, you should also know what it's going to cost to maintain it over its useful life. Under the authority of our new City Manager, this is now being done.

Regarding the City's track record – if we cannot maintain current assets, does it make sense to go forward with tens of millions of dollars of new ones without an identified plan of action to keep them ship-shape? Of course not. Should that include allowing another jurisdiction to dictate (not "dictatorial," Mr. Huckelberry) to us timing and use of non-appropriated dollars? No. That's exactly the substantive issue I've been raising. That's

also the point of the plan for R/M that's being put together. Show everybody what the total costs will be (project + R/M) and when we will have to start paying those maintenance costs. Then we and the voters can decide whether the projects being proposed are worth the impact they'll have on our General Fund over time.

I can't speak for the Mayor ("perhaps the Mayor" is concerned) or other Council Members, but Patrick McNamara from the Star correctly quoted me as having said giving access to our budget decisions to another jurisdiction is "an immense shift in policy that's taking place without any public discussion." As was noted in his own memo, the County Administrator correctly points out that other jurisdictions are also concerned with this "intrusive" step.

UNCAC is the United Nations Convention Against Corruption. Included in its principals are codes of conduct for public officials, along with guidelines for transparency in public procurement and public finance. They also refer to the need to adopt measures that ensure public access to information and participation in the public process. I've asked for nothing contrary to any of that. Some folks felt this all should have been taken care of quietly and with no public awareness. (A) that wasn't happening, and (B) it's the peoples' money.



Now it's out there, and I believe Mr. Huckelberry has offered the seeds of a solution.

To refresh you, here's the language the Board of Supervisors adopted that started this exchange:

From Section 3.06.090

- B. Unless waived by the board of supervisors as being in the best interests of the county and warranted by the circumstances of the bond funded project at issue, the intergovernmental agreement shall include, but not be limited to, provisions establishing the following responsibilities of the implementing subdivision:**
- 1. That the implementing ~~political subdivision~~ agency shall operate and maintain the improvements constructed by county bond funds for a period of not less than twenty-five (25) years.**
 - 2. That the implementing agency shall sufficiently fund operations and maintenance of the facility, and identify the estimated amount and source of funding for operations and maintenance of the facility.**
 - 3. That the implementing agency and the County will conduct regular performance audits to determine if facilities built, operated and maintained by the implementing agency are being maintained in good working order and are being used for the appropriate purposes; and that the County may suspend the allocation of County bond funding for other not-yet-built projects if the performance audit results in a finding of unsatisfactory and facilities are not returned to good working order within 120 days.**

There were three primary parts of the Bond Ordinance language with which I took issue. One was locking in maintenance requirements for 25 years for all projects. That's section B1, above. In our HUD 108 loan agreement with the Industrial Development Authority, there's very clear language that says "no loan shall exceed the useful life of the asset being

financed.” That’s not an unreasonable standard. There is now agreement that we should recognize each project has its own unique ‘useful life’ and with that the R/M obligation will reflect those differences. That one’s easy.

Mr. Huckelberry’s explanation of section B2 reads as follows:

Regarding B(2), the additional language simply increases transparency and disclosure by requesting the best estimate of actual operating and maintenance costs, as well as sources of funding for these costs. Prior Bond Implementation Plan Ordinances have been vague regarding this topic. For example, in the Bond Implementation Plan Ordinance adopted for the May 20, 1997 Special Bond Election by Ordinance 1997-35, the operating and maintenance cost requirement for City projects and others was a simple statement that this “cost would be paid for by the City of Tucson through an intergovernmental agreement with Pima County.” The Bond Advisory Committee and others believed this level of disclosure was not adequate and were specifically concerned about the full impact of operating and maintenance costs and ensuring that jurisdictions that had asked for and received project approvals were fully prepared to meet the future operating and maintenance expenses. If they were not, they could simply choose not to request a project.

I addressed this up above. The City will (and each jurisdiction included in this Bond package should) put in place a projected R/M schedule. With that, we can see when individual projects will be built, their anticipated useful life, and anticipated R/M costs over that time frame. I’d go the Bond Advisory Committee one farther and put that information in the Bond pamphlet you’ll receive. You should know not only the cost of the building you’re voting on, but what that’s going to do to our General Fund obligations over its life and when we’ll have to start making those payments. Let’s do the full disclosure thing this time around so people know when each project is scheduled to be built and the full array of costs associated with it. This has been lacking in previous Bond elections.

And here’s how section B3 is described in the County Administrator’s memo:

Regarding B(3), perhaps the most objectionable language for the jurisdictions is the statement “and that the County may suspend the allocation of County bond funding for other not yet built projects if the performance audit results in a finding of unsatisfactory facilities and not returned to good working order within 120 days.” This was expanded from 60 days at the request of City staff. This portion of Subsection B(3) is the enforcement component to address any failure to adequately maintain and operate a previously approved bond capital improvement. The fear is that this is a unilateral decision of the County, with no or little due process to dispute our decision regarding the adequacy measure of operation and maintenance. Such is a valid point and can be further clarified and amplified in the Bond Implementation Plan Ordinance and the implementing IGA with the particular jurisdiction.

A couple of points on that paragraph. First, it’s made clear that the City agreed to the 120 day time period. We should not have. I’ve been in negotiation situations. If your counterpart continues to offer up non-starters and won’t budge, one approach is to simply keep pushing back until they’re convinced that you’re seriously not giving ground. If it comes to it, just get up and walk out and tell the other side to give you a call when they’re ready for a serious conversation. Instead, we gave ground (went from 60 to 120 days) and ignored the more substantive part of the dispute – that is, allowing the unilateral access to our budget.



Here are some suggestions offered up by Mr. Huckelberry to resolve the B3 issues:

Specific Options to Resolve Concerns

The following additional items could be considered and added to the Bond Implementation Plan, as well as the Implementing IGA, if such makes the jurisdictions more comfortable with our actual implementation of B(3) of the Code.

1. Corrective Action Plan. If the 120-day timeframe is of concern, it is likely many deficiencies, if they are noted, can easily be corrected in 120 days. Some, however, cannot. Therefore, we should clarify in the Bond Implementation Ordinance that the 120-day period is for either correction or the development of an acceptable corrective action plan. The corrective action plan would identify the problem and define how it will be resolved. If the problem is a substantial capital expense, it may have to be budgeted for in a subsequent fiscal year. Once a corrective action plan has been filed and approved, no further action would occur, provided the plan is followed through to completion.
2. Maintenance Standard. There is some question as to what maintenance standard would be applied, and standards and judgments would differ from person to person or agency to agency. It is acceptable to define a maintenance standard by any recognized agency as a standard practice or acceptable norm. It should be noted this is not a debate about how often the grass is cut; it is about whether the restrooms in a public facility are available for public use and in good working order. The same is true for lighting in a public park. It is obvious when lighting is being adequately maintained, since the lights either work or they do not.
3. Lifecycles. Certain improvements have lifecycles that may be different than other improvements. It is acceptable to define different lifecycles in the overall maintenance and operation plan for a bond improvement.
4. Remedy for Noncompliance. The remedy for noncompliance states "may suspend the County bond funding." It does not say "shall." Before any suspension of bond funding, the matter must be addressed by the governing bodies of the respective jurisdictions. If it is the City of Tucson, it would be the City of Tucson Mayor and Council, as well as the Board of Supervisors. Hence, the issue would be elevated to the elected bodies to resolve. If not resolved at the elected body level, we can insert an arbitrational clause between the parties, as litigation should be avoided at all cost.

With that as the basis for continuing discussion, I think we're close to closing the deal on these issues.

I've spoken with our new City Manager at length about these issues. I've stressed the need to get the cost projections assembled as soon as possible, and to get the new IGA and Bond Ordinance language on paper quickly. It's July. We should be talking about the projects and whether or not jurisdictions want to pay the costs in order to receive the benefits associated with each. Positions on that will vary, but until the



terms of the agreement are in place, we've got no basis to advance the discussion.

I respect the County Administrator. As I noted above, I appreciate his frustration at how this process was handled. I suspect he equally appreciates that at some point I have to get my oar in the water and speak on my own behalf. That should have happened a month before it did – it's not his fault that it didn't. And it's not mine, either.



In this case, I believe this three-week-long dispute needed to be publicly aired so all of the jurisdictions and taxpayers knew the ramifications of what was being proposed. None of that was getting done following the process that got us into this mess – in fact, the opposite occurred. In the very near future, I hope to be able to share with you the agreed upon language that will allow the conversation to shift back to the projects themselves.

The impact of multiple jurisdictions sharing their common concerns over what was being proposed shouldn't go unnoticed, either.

More Contract Negotiations:

Police Department Compensation Package

In June of 2014, I pulled an item from our consent agenda related to the TPD compensation package in order to make a couple of points. They were pretty basic and straightforward. First, we didn't, and still don't, have extra cash lying around to increase base pay. Second, in order to become more competitive in the marketplace, we keep hearing from TPD that we need to increase their base pay. Solution – entering labor negotiations, have everybody look to move some items from the benefits column into base pay, making sure that each piece of compensation is where it'll do the most good for recruitment and retention.

On Tuesday we voted on the new compensation package for TPD. It moved the equipment allowance and clothing allowance into base pay, but replaced them with new benefits – a wellness program and a new combined (smaller) clothing/equipment allowance. Net to base pay is just over \$1M for all covered workers to share. If what we're hearing about base pay and competitiveness is true, that won't make a dent.

Last year, I suggested we make changes in the “assignment pay” benefit so that we could get more money into base pay, since that is what is always compared to other departments. Under the terms of the new agreement, we will continue to give a 5% pay increase to officers who have added responsibilities on patrol or who are working special assignments outside of their normal patrol assignments. I was looking for the base pay of a regular patrol officer to be made more financially attractive with the new compensation package. That did not happen. Any changes now would need to be made outside of the contract negotiations. There's still some reason to hope.

Big ticket items such as the Sick Leave Sell Back program are left entirely intact. That's

where you can build up unused sick time and sell it back for cash at the end of the year. That program alone costs north of a million dollars to the department annually. It's still on the 'benefits' side of the ledger. I understand the reason why. New employees don't qualify for Sick Leave Sell Back. They weren't at the negotiating table.

We made no adjustments to increase base pay by moving any of the approximately 20 other 'benefit' categories that could have been considered at the negotiating table. And while we're going to save some money on how overtime is calculated, if we continue to run short-staffed, those gains will be lost through simply having to schedule in more workers beyond their normal work weeks.

I voted against the compensation package as negotiated. It's in place for three years. Unless both sides agree to modify the agreement in the interim – possible – or M&C make legislative changes to the contract – highly unlikely – we're going to continue hearing the 'uncompetitive' refrain until we reenter negotiations in 2018. More importantly, we vote on what's in front of us, not on what we hope will happen in the coming months.

I understand the dynamics of negotiating a labor agreement. I did it in an industrial setting for 10 years. I believe this was a miss. It's my hope that officers will see upward mobility as an opportunity unique to TPD that's coming due to upper command staff exiting this year under their deferred retirement program. I also hope we develop a willingness to use what's in the compensation plan and move the items around next time. Let's become the leader in base pay for the region.

I occasionally hear conversations about how our TPD staffing for commissioned officers has been trending downwards for the past several years. Here's the accurate data:

TPD commissioned FTEs

July 2009:

Authorized – 1,113

Actual – 1,023

June 2010

Authorized – 1,113

Actual – 992

FY15

Authorized – 1,002

Actual (current) - 955 (this figure includes 30 new hires currently attending the academy)

We're recruiting, and we're hiring. We should have moved more money into base pay to make that process more attractive to prospects.

Compare those numbers to our overall City staffing levels over that same timeframe:

2009 – 6,028

2015 – 4,782

The City's overall staffing level has dropped by about 21%. The TPD staffing level has dropped by about 7%. Do we need to increase the number of officers on the street? Yes. Did

we improve our chances with these negotiations? Not likely.

TAA Annexation

A very important item slipped by without much fanfare on Tuesday that looked like simply extending the lease agreement between the Tucson Airport Authority and the City. We did that, and it'll help the TAA sign long-term contracts with air carriers. That's good. But the deal contained two more important parts.

One of those is a commitment by the TAA to include in all new and renewed lease agreements for retailers at the airport language that will compel the tenant to sign an annexation agreement if the City decides to move forward with that process. The City owns the land, but it's currently outside of City limits. When we reach the 50% + 1 threshold, we'll be in a position to move ahead with annexation and increase the sales taxes coming into our budget. It's a good long-term revenue generator for the City. We expect to hit the necessary number of tenants in a couple of years.

We're also under a rather complex annexation agreement with Raytheon that commits a portion of the City taxes generated from their site for their use. A part of what we adopted on Tuesday is an agreement to work with both the TAA and the County to secure a buffer around Raytheon. Given the nature of its manufacturing work, Raytheon needs that buffer between itself and surrounding residences and businesses in order to safely operate and possibly expand. Our tax obligation to them is capped at \$8M. Once we secure the buffer, the unspent balance of those revenues will be freed up for City use.

The lease may now be extended for another 50 years beyond 2048. The revenues to the City may begin within a few years, and the regional relationships between the TAA, City, and County are keys to having been able to negotiate this agreement. The result is a win for everybody. That kind of approach needs to serve as a template for other regional agreements, the bond package included.

Final Budget Item for this Fiscal Year

We're now into FY'16. The budget might need some tweaking later this fall when we finally decide on what's going to happen with the transit proposals staff had originally included in the budget, and perhaps again when we see the final revenue figures for the 4th quarter. But we're pretty much done and are looking towards next year's balancing act.

I was given a mention in another Council Member's newsletter last week, and I felt it'd be worth commenting on a few of the points. First, on this statement:

I appreciate my friend Steve Kozachik's protest vote on the budget each year.

My votes on the budget aren't protest votes, unless they're to be viewed as protesting against what I consider to be fiscally unsound decisions. A protest, in my mind, comes in the form of simply saying "no." My intent, trying to move toward constructive solutions, has always involved laying an alternative on the table for discussion. Check the record and you'll see that's what I've done.

He made some suggestions that definitely improved the budget discussion. We agree

on many points, we disagree on technicalities, I feel holding my vote for the budget because I do not like a few specific items is just as irresponsible as not examining the budget at all. [sic]

I agree with the first comment. I disagree that continuing to rely on one-time fixes, holding single elements of the budget harmless to the detriment of all the rest, putting in place pay increases that exacerbate our pension obligations, and hoping to find nuggets of revenue between now and the end of the year to avoid dipping into reserves constitute technicalities. The Bond rating agencies agree with me.

We instituted 90 days of vacancy savings that will result in \$300,000 - 500,000 in cost avoidance for the upcoming fiscal year.

But we didn't eliminate positions. Our personnel costs will increase this year over last year.

We approved some transit efficiencies that will save tax payers about \$988,000. These efficiencies should not affect route alignment or frequency during peak hours.

Staff had proposed \$1.6M in route efficiencies. If we adopt what is coming back to us from the Transit Task Force, the total savings will be \$780K. Last year, staff presented route efficiencies totaling \$2.4M to us, along with fare increases totaling another \$2.4M. We did \$110K of those.

This year's budget has money to augment the road repair we are already doing (300 miles of new roads and counting).

Our General Fund recommended budget for "Streets and Traffic Maintenance" is zero. We're relying on Federal Highway Grants and Gas Tax revenues to do any augmenting we can. We'll be selling more Prop 409 bonds to keep the progress moving ahead. Because our Bond rating was dropped by Fitch, those Bonds will repair fewer miles than they otherwise would have.

This budget includes a tentative plan that shores up police patrol.

See my comments above on the Police labor agreement. We moved zero dollars into patrol units. We did little to improve base pay, and largely left the benefits package in place. We could have done much more at the bargaining table. The budget did nothing to 'shore up police patrol.'

Finally, and very importantly, this year's budget includes capital investment into our fleet vehicles for the first time in several years.

The motion I offered – which did not receive a 2nd – included \$2M for replacement of fire vehicles. We have nothing allocated to public safety vehicle replacement in the FY'16 budget, despite knowing that over 90% of our paramedic trucks would be at end of service if we placed the order today.

I've got no problem with the sparring, and appreciate the civility with which my buddy pre-

sented his thoughts. But we cannot continue to ignore the warnings of the lending agencies and feel if we fix some swing sets and open some pools for the summer that all will be well in the world of financing a budget that's valued at over \$1.3B. That's ignoring the big picture. That's irresponsible.

Ward 6 Art

Change of gears – something more upbeat. We generally have art hanging in the common room at the Ward 6 office. After one recent show we had to repaint the space (thanks to all of the volunteers who joined in that work day) but now we're ready for some new exhibits. You can't sell the work from our building, but you can get your pieces up and in the public eye for a month or so. We have over 100 groups use our rooms monthly so your paintings will get plenty of good exposure.

If you're interested in sharing your work – individually, or if you're with a group – please give us a call at 791.4601 and we'd be happy to walk you through some of what would be involved. There's no charge, but at the end of your show we would want you to retouch the walls so the new paint job lasts.

Graffiti

Graffiti's not art, but we might be able to replace it with something that is.

Our graffiti task force folks have learned quite a bit about the mentality and demographics surrounding people who tag other peoples' property. One thing is that taggers aren't generally associated with gangs. Nor is the profile usually some young kid out just vandalizing as malicious mischief. The profile is a guy in his mid-20s who's out on an ego trip, trying to show other taggers how cool he is for the mess he can make. They post their blight up on Facebook and brag to each other. Quite an impressive bunch.

The other thing we know is that they generally avoid tagging murals or other artwork. I guess it's an unwritten rule respecting legitimate art and not defacing it with a moniker.



The image shown on the left is of a utility box in San Diego. Alison took the shot while visiting last week. If you go online you can find similar examples in plenty of other jurisdictions. It plays into an effort I've been pushing our local utility companies to consider. That is, let's get the boring white/green boxes painted into something like this so taggers would be less inclined to deface them. Eyesores and potential easels turn into something that'd brighten our neighborhoods. There's a group in town (Tucson Arts Brigade) that can enlist the work of youth, or the utili-

ties could contract out on their own. Either way, what you see from San Diego is better than this.

So far I've heard back from Cox, TEP, and our Environmental Services people. They're studying the idea.

I've heard nothing from SW Gas. In as much as the companies pay for their own graffiti removal, it strikes me as pretty much a no-brainer. We'll see what they decide.



Two Neighborhood Items

A while back I wrote about some of the work my office is doing with TUSD administration. We've met on things such as the location of solar panels on school grounds, the sale of existing schools and subsequent uses, and upgrades to existing and operating school grounds. We've appreciated the collaborative spirit with which these exchanges have gone.



Also a while back we began working with TUSD and TDOT on some speed mitigation work around the Mary Meredith School. Through a shared cost agreement, and work with the neighborhood to select the location, the City and District finished that work last week.

Many thanks to Jesse Soto (TDOT) and Marcus Jones (TUSD) for their help in getting this work done well in advance of the start of the fall semester.

UA Neighborhood Seminar

Also in advance of the fall semester, the UA is reaching out to landlords and property managers with a summer seminar that'll present resources they offer to assist in controlling student behavioral issues, and much more. There'll be several UA departments included in the presentation. Those include the Dean of Students Office, Campus Health, Off-Campus Housing, the Office of Sustainability, Student Legal Services, the Disability Resource Center, UAPD, and TPD.

This model of direct engagement on a large scale has evolved well since the unfortunate series of incidents we addressed together last year at the Islamic Center. The relationships built during that time carried over to other meetings with property owners in Colonia Solana and Blenman-Elm, and to the management of student towers and fraternities throughout the downtown area. These are constructive relationships. Property managers have told me they'd like to see this working relationship adopted as a model in other jurisdictions.

In order to get signed up for the upcoming seminar, you can contact Mary Laughbaum on campus at this email address: MaryLaughbaum@email.arizona.edu

The event will be on Friday, July 17th from 9am until 11am on campus. Mary needs to hear from you by the 10th in order to plan space and materials.

Art Exhibit

I'll close with this head's up about an art show that's opening this Saturday downtown. Jeff Ferst runs the Artful Living gallery. He's located at the corner of Stone and Broadway. He self-describes as a 'colorist' and if you carve out some time for the show, you'll see why.

The artists featured in this "Summer Pop-up Show" are all local. They include Sheryl Holland, Eric Jabloner, Rob Waters, Tom Buchanan, and Jeff. There's a reception on the 11th that'll run from 6pm until 9pm. Then the exhibition will run for the remainder of July.

Regular hours for the gallery are Tuesday through Friday from 11am until 5:30pm. It's certainly worth a trip by to see what this group of local talent has produced.



Pop up Summer Show
Opening Reception July 11, 2015
6-9pm



1 E Broadway Blvd (NE Corner Stone/Broadway)
Tucson, AZ 85701
520-203-7004
www.artfullivingbyjefferst.com

Sincerely,

Steve Kozachik
Council Member, Ward 6
Ward6@tucsonaz.gov

Events and Announcements

Friday Night Live! at Main Gate Square

Friday, July 10, 2015, 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

814 E. University Blvd.

Jazz Vocalist Crystal Stark stages an exciting Summer Concert Series performance in the Geronimo Plaza Courtyard at Main Gate Square. Presented by Southern Arizona Arts and Cultural Alliance, the free Friday Night Live! performances, coupled with delicious food from nearby local restaurants, provide a cool way to spend the summer evenings on alternating Fridays through August 21, 2015. Free parking in the Tyndall Garage after 5 p.m., with merchant validation. More info: saaca.org/Main_Gate_Concert_Series.html

Where do you stand on transportation funding priorities for our region?

Please share your voice to help the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) prioritize future investments and multimodal infrastructure options for our region as they develop the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. “Engage 2045” is a web survey that allows you to share your long-term transportation priorities and identify where you believe we should best invest our region’s transportation dollars to improve local transportation infrastructure. The deadline is July 17th.

Take the survey at: gismaps.pagnet.org/RTPEngage.

How to report transportation concerns after storms

Is there a pothole you'd like to see fixed? Is a street sign missing? Is a tree limb hanging too close over a roadway or sidewalk? You can report these issues to the Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT), (520) 791-3154, or email the exact location to tdotsr@tucsonaz.gov.

Tucson Department of Transportation: <http://1.usa.gov/18IdPf8>

Ongoing

Mission Garden, 929 W Mission Ln

Saturdays 8 am – 12 pm, April to November; 12 pm – 4 pm, December to March

A re-creation of the Spanish Colonial walled garden that was part of Tucson’s historic San Agustin Mission. Features Sonoran Desert-adapted heritage fruit-trees, traditional local heirloom crops and edible native plants. *For guided tours call 520-777-9270 and leave message.*

Children's Museum Tucson, 200 S 6th Ave

Tuesday - Friday: 9:00am - 5:00pm; Saturday & Sunday: 10:00am - 5:00pm

www.childrensmuseumtucson.org

Tucson Botanical Gardens, 2150 N Alvernon Way

“Summer Oasis Series” June through August features special hours, early bird weekends and dog admission. <http://www.tucsonbotanical.org>

Jewish History Museum, 564 S Stone Ave

www.jewishhistorymuseum.org

Fox Theatre, 17 W Congress St

www.FoxTucsonTheatre.org

Hotel Congress, 311 E Congress St

<http://hotelcongress.com>

Loft Cinema, 3233 E Speedway Blvd

www.loftcinema.com

Rialto Theatre, 318 E Congress St

<http://www.rialtotheatre.com/>

The Rogue Theatre at The Historic Y, 300 E University Blvd

<http://www.theroguetheatre.org/main.htm>

Arizona State Museum, 1013 E University Blvd

November 9, 2013, through July 2015, "Curtis Reframed: The Arizona Portfolios."

www.statemuseum.arizona.edu

Arizona Theater Company, 330 S Scott Ave

<http://www.arizonatheatre.org/>

Tucson Museum of Art, 140 N Main Ave

May 25, 2015 - September 7, 2015: FREE Admission for Military Families.

www.TucsonMusuemofArt.org

Meet Me at Maynards, 311 E Congress St (north entrance on Toole)

A social walk/run through the Downtown area. Every Monday, rain or shine, holidays too!

Hotel Congress Check-in begins at 5:15pm.

www.MeetMeatMaynards.com

UA Mineral Museum, 1601 E University Blvd

February 7, 2015– February 7, 2016, 10:00 am – 5:00 pm

"Meet the Trilobites – Arizona's First Inhabitants," the new exhibit at the Flandrau Science Center and Planetarium, features world-class trilobite fossils from around the globe. <http://www.uamineralmuseum.org/>

Southern Arizona Transportation Museum, 414 N Toole Ave.

Tuesday – Thursday, Sunday: 11:00am - 3:00pm; Friday & Saturday: 10:00am - 4:00pm

<http://www.tucsonhistoricdepot.org>