

Ward 6 Staff



Steve Kozachik
Council Member



Ann Charles



Donovan Durband



Teresa Smith



Bonnie Medler



Diana Amado



Ward 6 – Newsletter

NOVEMBER 23, 2011

A Message from Steve

Arizona Football

There was a party planned in Tempe last Saturday night. One was held, but the guys with Arizona written across their jerseys were the ones celebrating. I'd like to tell you how upsetting it is to me that ASU went down in flames, but honesty forbids.

Congratulations to Coach Kish and to the players. They've held together in what was an otherwise difficult season. And welcome to new Wildcat head coach Rich Rodriguez. He will hit the ground to stay on the day after Thanksgiving, his family to follow soon afterwards.

Sex Trade

There is currently an active and thriving human trafficking enterprise going on throughout our State, and right here in our community.

Domestic minor sex trafficking which is a precursor to prostitution in general has been called the single most under reported, under identified and most severe form of commercial sexual exploitation children are facing today. The exploitation continues on into adulthood to the extent that a young person is engulfed into a subculture that drives her into selling sex.

The fact that demand is not sufficiently deterred by current law is supported by a 2010 report by the Arizona Republic that identified Phoenix as one of the most prolific "sex trafficking" corridors in America. Indeed, reports have indicated that up to 70% of street youth are victims of commercial sexual exploitation and 33% of teen runaways and throwaways will become involved in prostitution within 48 hours of leaving home.

The magnitude of the problem is greater than the capacity of any single agency to tackle.

Phoenix has a well developed task force for dealing with the sex trafficking of minors. Regrettably, Tucson does not have one that deals directly with this issue. What we have is a variety of well intentioned, passionately committed and funding challenged social service agencies. They each do their best to touch one or more elements of this and the broader prostitution issue, but there is no single point of contact agency to take the lead in coordinating the resources that are available to address them.



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

Last week we hosted a meeting at the Ward 6 office at which several of these local social service providers met to discuss how to best tackle this problem. I also had TPD and City Court in attendance. The sad fact is that each of the agencies has lost funding. The good news is that there is a reasonably good inter-agency communication effort that is occurring, the purpose of which is to avoid duplication, and to plug young women into diversion and treatment programs where they exist.

I'll meet again with this group to try to keep the momentum going and to encourage the crucial work they're already doing in our community on behalf of this sorely forgotten group of young people. The Tucson Women's Commission is also engaged with us in this effort. The problem of "survival sex" (when I was doing work in Africa the indigenous people called it "poverty prostitution") is multi-faceted and does not lend itself to a simple one-size-fits-all solution. Drugs, physical abuse, psychological abuse, financial need, and more are involved in the issue.

It is my hope to engage some State legislators in this multi-agency conversation so we can try to work on an inter-governmental/inter-agency manner to touch some lives in a meaningful way. I'm confident, not based on my own expertise, but because I see among the service providers a passion for the young ladies who need the help.

Stay tuned - much more to come.

City/County Courthouse

In last week's newsletter I brought forward several questions related to the funding for the voter approved City/County Courthouse. The intent of the questioning was not to try to quash the project, but to ensure the taxpayers have a very clear understanding about how their dollars are being spent. In the newsletter I commented that the spending was "Rio Nuevo-esque." To the extent that there have been multiple millions of dollars already spent, the building has not been started and now a request for more money has been made, I stand by that comment.

County Administrator Huckelberry has graciously responded to my questions. Here is the letter he sent in reply. I have a few comments of my own.

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/11-23-11ch_response.pdf

The CA describes a process by which the discussions relative to the courthouse project have proceeded. The description may be completely accurate, and yet I am willing to wager that not more than 1% (to pick a number) of the community have been aware that what they voted on in 2004 has been under funding scrutiny and is now going to require more of their money. While the process may be completely appropriate and proper, there is a clear disconnect between how the content of those conversations gets from inside the walls of City Hall and the County Building out into the open. Learning about the change is not a function of my not understanding the process, as the CA suggests. I pay pretty close attention. It's a failure of the bureaucracy and we as elected officials to keep issues like this front and center so they do not constitute surprises to those who are being asked to vote to open their wallets yet again.



Important Phone Numbers

Senator John
McCain (R)
520-670-6334

Senator Jon Kyl (R)
520-575-8633

Congresswoman
Gabrielle Giffords
(D)
(8th District)
520-881-3588

Congressman
Raul Grijalva (D)
(7th 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 Bob Walkup
791-4201

City Infoguide
[http://
sms3.tucsonaz.gov/
infoguide](http://sms3.tucsonaz.gov/infoguide)

The people engaged in those discussions (including representatives of the City - this is not a slam on the County) need to do a better job of informing us at the Council table so we can in turn share information with you as it evolves.

On page 3 of his new letter, the CA suggests that he would welcome it if the City would waive its fees related to this project. I agree. Let's use the taxpayer's money for producing projects, not paying ourselves fees.

Mr. Huckelberry and I will disagree on the point he makes on page 4 related to reduction in scope of the project. Very simply, the 2004 voter approved project was not phased, the size advertised has been reduced and the costs for Architecture/Engineering (A/E) are excessive as a result of the project managers allowing them to design something not envisioned in the original bond package and having to go back and engage in redesign. I do project management so I understand scope-creep. But it is incumbent on the PM's of a given project to control that and keep projects within their original budget.

On page 6 the CA states that "we do not yet have a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for tenant improvements as we do not intend to contract for them at this time." Contrast that with the statement from his earlier letter (Section XII) in which it was stated "the current design, inclusive of all interior build out has been estimated by an outside estimating firm at \$77M." Later, on page 10 he states that "a detailed cost analysis has also been completed for tenant improvements and if included in the present GMP contract would equal \$27M. This includes additional contingency of approximately \$1.4M."

It is not my intention to play gotcha, but it is certainly my point - as I made quite clear in last week's newsletter - that if we are spending the peoples' money, we have got to be clear about where it's going. With his second letter, it is now clearer that the costs gathered for the tenant improvements are based on "an outside estimating firm" and do not reflect a formal Guaranteed Maximum Price. But the mere fact that I had to draw that out makes the point; if we are going to ask you to ante up for more bond money, we cannot leave you with questions as to how the first batch of dollars was spent and how much more the project will in fact cost. We do not know the cost of the tenant improvements - what we have is an estimate.

The CA also 'corrected' my statement that we have allocated \$6.4M to contingency. Well, I've noted \$1.4M from his letter above - the rest comes from the statement "the direct cost of the project has been reduced from \$48M to \$38M which includes nearly \$5M in contingency." Again, all I'm after is for us to be clear about how these numbers are being arrived at.

Finally, he states that the Bond Advisory Committee does not "reallocate project funding" - taking exception to my pointing out that the first letter left me with the impression that they had in fact allocated \$50M to the project. I got that from Section VIII of his first letter in which the statement is made "at their meeting of May 21, 2010, the BAC authorized and initial allocation of \$50M to essentially complete the project, supplementing the 2004 authorization." Words have meaning.

It is not my intention to get into a heated exchange with the County Administrator. It is very much my intention to try to set the stage for a successful Bond election if that is needed, or for a decision at the Council level to move money into this project in advance of a Bond election if that's the direction this is headed and to base either of those actions on a very clear under-

standing of how we got to the point of having to reallocate more dollars to the project. I understand as well as anybody the ignominy involved with being tied to anything "Rio Nuevo," and yet that's the unfortunate history that we're digging out of locally so we have got to make sure decisions made about how the taxpayers money is being spent are made publicly and clearly. Because of that history we have got to be hyper-sensitive to making sure we're communicating at critical steps along the way.

Occupy Tucson

This report can be brief. Properly, the status of the citations being issued is in the hands of TPD, the status of the permits and insurance being required is in the hands of Parks and Recreation, and the Courts are scheduling hearings on what they're going to do with the citations that have already been issued.

There was a sort-of permit request submitted last week by OT. Here's what was turned in:

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/11-23-11_pr_letter.pdf

All that represents is putting in writing what they've been saying since this began. It's no change, and I support the City's position in enforcing the law until the Courts finally get around to hearing these cases and deciding on the merits of the City's Parks policy and how it stands up to Constitutional scrutiny.

We discussed the idea of moving our money out of large banks and into smaller, local banks and credit unions. The City Attorney and City Finance Director shared that there are legal and practical reasons to not go down that road. Some institutions are proscribed by law from the State level, and some institutions don't have the collateralizing capacity to take on our investments anyway. In addition, because of the scale and complexity of the City's banking process, we issue a Request for Proposals for taking our banking transactions and investment work. That RFP is currently under review. While that process is being finalized, the City Attorney and Finance Director will look to see if there are some creative ways we can move chunks of investment dollars into local institutions without losing earning capacity, and without violating the advertised scope of the RFP. They'll report back to us on that.

Finally, there has been a change in the enforcement policy being implemented by TPD. This is a letter issued on Tuesday by the Chief of Police that outlines the change, and the reasons for it:

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/11-23-11occupy_update.pdf

Our Police officers deserve high marks for keeping things non-confrontational in their management of this issue.

Buy Local Ordinance

Adam Smith wrote in *The Wealth of Nations* in 1776, "Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production, and the interest of the producers ought to be attended to only in so far as it may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer."

On Tuesday we gave direction to the City staff to begin meeting with significant stakeholders to begin the process of putting together a "Buy Local" Ordinance aimed at giving a shot in the arm to our local construction industry. The Alliance of Construction Trades reported that this has been an unprecedented past few years and anything we can do to help their members (our neighbors) secure

work in this economic environment is important.

Included in the crafting of the proposed ordinance will be the Alliance of Construction Trades, TUCA, the Arizona Builders Alliance, local Chambers of Commerce and others. The goal is to hear the ups and downs of the idea from those groups and for staff to bring a jobs producing proposal back to us in 60-90 days.

The general outline of what we are after is to ensure that when non-local General Contractors are awarded work in Tucson, they employ a certain number of local tradesmen. There are details to be worked out such as how we measure the percentage (by number of workers, by hours worked during the life of the project, by payroll?), what sorts of verification will be required of the GC's to demonstrate that they made a good faith effort to recruit and hire locals, how we minimize the record keeping and reporting burden on both the GC's and City staff, if there are legal challenges we might face (Privileges and Immunities Clause of the U.S. Constitution) and how we can implement this without an inflationary effect. Even good ideas have challenges to overcome in the crafting of good public policy.

I asked staff to also consider giving local companies an opportunity to submit a Best and Final Offer if their initial bid was within 5% of the low bid on a given product or service. The winning bidder would have that same opportunity. The re-bid idea has been tried in other jurisdictions and has proven to be beneficial to local businesses that came close, but needed to sharpen their pencils a little on the second go-around. This idea benefits the consumer by encouraging more competitive bids, and it has the potential of helping to protect or create more local jobs in the process.

Both of these ideas have merit and I look forward to seeing their effect on our local economy as they are adopted and begin to kick in.

Rio Nuevo

Mediation is scheduled to begin in mid-December. We're still trying to sort out who will represent each side in those meetings. Rio's vote in favor of mediation was to include both Rio Board members and somebody from the Council. The City Attorney was of the opinion that the mediation would be held in an environment more akin to Executive Session on an attorney to attorney basis. After we decide who's going to be at the table, we'll need to decide on the table's shape.

Financials are still puzzling to me and other Council members. Our own finance people have shared with us several times that there is enough money left in the 2008 Bond package that Rio could follow through on their commitment of nearly a year ago when they voted to allocate \$3M to TCC repairs. In addition, the Tax Increment dollars they have received is up considerably. Instead of allocating anything to the TCC or any other project, here's what they have spent your money on instead:

Since the appointment of the new Rio Nuevo Board in March 2010, the Board has employed:

Three different accounting firms (Crowe Horwath, Beach Fleischman, R & A) as well as a Municipal Bond Financial Advisor (RBC Capital), and

Five different legal firms (Ballard & Spahr, Lewis and Roca, Rusing and Lopez, Gust Rosenfeld, Gugino and Mortimer) who have been the recipient of hundreds of thousands of your tax dollars.

They have a CPA on their Board who is now serving as their treasurer. He's also a former State Senator. They have another former State Senator on the Board. They're also now paying \$13K per year to lease space in the State Office building. They could have space for free, but one wonders if these connections to the Legislature have a deeper meaning and effect that is playing itself out in our inability to move ahead with fixes to the TCC and to come to an agreement on the issues over which Rio filed their lawsuit against you.

There's nothing much else to say. The Mayor and Council remain serious about advancing the relationship. The Rio Board is clearly not.

PAG Update

Several weeks ago Council Member Uhlich and I told staff that we wanted more regular and comprehensive updates on what the Pima Association of Governments was doing. Far too often the Council is assumed to be agreeable with whatever direction the PAG is moving and simply willing to concede decision making to our representatives on that Board. In recent newsletters I have tried to show where that is not always a fair assumption (roadway alignments, early acquisition of properties, RTA cost overruns, and more).

On Tuesday there were two new examples.

In our August update there was a brief mention of an I-11 Corridor long range plan that was being treated as a way to avoid overcrowding on I-10. Embedded in the plan though is the longer term goal of "making Nevada the distribution and manufacturing 'Capital of the West.'" I asked why we would support such an effort at the same time that we're at the front end of working with the County to develop our own logistics operations.

On Tuesday we received an update on that plan. Nothing much seems to have changed. The net result of building the I-11 corridor may well be that Tucson's ability to remain in the forefront of a Southern Arizona inland port/logistics effort would be compromised to the extent that the new I-11 highway would by-pass Tucson on its way to Phoenix, and eventually up to Las Vegas. We expressed our concerns and will keep an eye on how this develops. Everybody on the Council made it clear that we're not inclined to be the poor step-child to Maricopa County and see our own economic development lag as a result of this proposed project.

Also troubling on Tuesday was the revelation that the PAG has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a consultant "to develop a Tucson Modern Streetcar Land Use and Development Implementation Plan." The consultant would study the corridor and prepare recommendations for land use plan amendments for property within one-quarter mile on either side of the Streetcar alignment. The consultant would look at many of the same things we have been working on for months, and on which we had public hearings to discuss on Tuesday night.

It was during the discussion of the public hearing on those Land Use Code changes that I raised the concern that having PAG manage the RFP process cannot manifest itself in somebody from outside of Tucson making land use decisions for us. Our concern at the Council table was that we clearly see that some changes need to be made in what is called an Infill Incentive District package that we voted to extend last night. Those changes can be made in the context of the Streetcar land use planning, but they cannot be driven by anybody from outside City staff or M&C.

We do not need the PAG “ensuring land uses in the vicinity” are ready to proceed through our development process, breaking the corridor into distinct segments and concluding on rezoning requirements, refining Land Use Code language or assessing in their opinion the “status of the corridor's key deficiencies” with respect to Land Use issues.

PAG is involved in sponsoring the RFP because they are funding a chunk of it. That funding source is not inappropriate in as much as the Streetcar is largely RTA funded. But the involvement of PAG cannot ignore the fact that there has been a considerable amount of direct interaction between me, my staff, and that of the Wards 1 and 3 council offices with neighborhoods who are now under the PAG RFP scrutiny. We made it clear last night that changes in the IID need to be home grown, and not imposed from another region.

We also made it clear that we recognize the need for changes in the IID, but authorized the three year extension on the overlay with the understanding that it can be tweaked any time during that new cycle.

Downtown Hotel

Some history.

When I was running for office, Bert Lopez of HSL properties financially supported my campaign.

Throughout the campaign, and continuing after my election, I was very vocally opposed to what was then a proposed downtown hotel project. The basis of my objection was the fact that it was wholly publicly funded, contained no downside risk for the developer and had the City (taxpayers) backstopping the debt instruments that would be sold to fund the project.

My simple question at the time was if it was such a hot deal with such a high upside potential, why was there not a penny of private sector money in the mix. Late in 2010, we unanimously voted to extricate ourselves from that deal.

I have always maintained that having more room capacity in the downtown area is a critical element to driving more convention and visitor activity into the downtown core, more fully utilizing the TCC and finally making something positive out of the originally envisioned Rio Nuevo District. The rooms need to be at reasonable price points to match the sort of convention and visitor business we attract, but to the extent we can increase capacity, it could be a good thing.

The Hotel Arizona is owned by Bert Lopez and HSL properties. The hotel is severely underperforming and HSL owes a considerable amount of money on the property as a result. Mr. Lopez has presented several potential proposals for remodeling the property. Until now, I have seen none that I could in good conscience support. I have also told him that in order to avoid any perception of political patronage or 'pay-back' that I would not be taking the lead on any remodeling proposal that he offered.

On Tuesday we were presented with a new proposal for the renovation of that hotel. The agenda item was brought forward by the Ward 1 office. It is my belief that it was brought in a sincere effort to see if a defensible deal could be struck. The basics of the proposal are the following:

- a) No City back stopping of any debt
- b) The City would commit taxes (bed tax, sales tax, rental tax) that would be generated on-site to debt service (tax money that is now minimally being produced since the existing

hotel is financially under water).

- c) HSL would be responsible for locating financing for the costs of remodeling the hotel. The financial backers would be in first position for the purpose of debt service.
- d) The City would not own and operate the hotel
- e) The existing parking garage that is on the site would be deeded to the City (to avoid State Constitutional issues related to the Gifting Clause - we cannot enrich a private entity beyond the value of what the City receives as a part of a given deal.)
- f) The City would commit property taxes to debt service for a period of 8 years.

Those are the very general parts of the proposal. Having participated in plenty of contract negotiations, I understand that during the back-and-forth, you cannot effectively do that in a public forum. And yet, it is appropriate that we as a governing body give to staff some parameters around which we would like to see the talks occur. To that end, we met in executive session, discussed the deal points that were already out in the public forum and gave the City Attorney some direction with respect to further negotiations.

I won't be in the room for negotiations so I have no idea how palatable our parameters will be to the hotel people. If we can, a property whose value will be increased after renovation and the arrival of the Streetcar and if we can incentivize a project with dollars that do not exist without the project coming on line (giving something that we won't have but for the remodeling) and the taxpayers bear no risk if the hotel fails to perform, then it's at least worth talking about.

I'll join the rest of the M&C in studying hard the proposal the City Manager returns with. If we can find a way to make it work that does not violate my commitment to be a watchdog of your tax dollars, and we can end up with a remodeled flag hotel, the remodeling of which will generate nearly 300 local jobs during construction, and hundreds more once they open, then that's a deal that is at least worth considering. Nothing's decided, but on Tuesday we directed the City Attorney to begin the negotiation process.

Also consider this. This is from a report recently released by the Sonoran Institute. Joe Minicozzi is the Vice President of the Asheville, N.C. Downtown Association and new projects director for Public Interest Projects, Inc., a for-profit real estate developer in downtown Asheville. He shared the results of studies that conclude investment in downtown buildings brings the greatest tax benefits to local government and also costs taxpayers less than lower density development further from the downtown's core. All of these factors have got to play a part in how we move on this item.

There's no sense trying to hide the history of this property, the history of Mr. Lopez and prior unsuccessful efforts to engage the City in a deal, or the fact that he was a supporter of mine. I'm not desperate to get a hotel under construction, and yet if the right deal can be negotiated, the jobs created, the rooms made available and the tie-in to assisting the TCC to attract more income generating shows need to be weighed in what is eventually laid in front of us for our consideration.

The City Attorney now has the direction to move ahead towards crafting a proposal. It will have to make sense, or we don't move it forward. Judging that will require that history and personalities are set aside and the data are evaluated in a dispassionate manner.

Reid Park Zoo

As I noted last week, questions as to the wisdom and propriety of moving an older Asian elephant

from Reid Park Zoo over to San Diego have been raised. In a situation such as this, the professionals in the field need to be given a forum - science needs to trump emotion.

To that end, I asked if the Parks and Recreation Director and the Tucson Zoological Society could encourage a representative of the San Diego Zoo to come and share with us about what their facility has to offer and a perspective on what the science says about co-habiting animals who would normally not do so in the wild. They did me one better - they brought two experts in the field from San Diego, plus several members of our own Reid Park Zoo staff to share their insights with us on the topic of moving one of our elephants over to the coast.

Among others, Jeff Andrews from the San Diego facility and Wendell Long from the TZS joined Fred Gray of Tucson P&R in presenting a very comprehensive justification for moving the older lady over to San Diego at the time a new herd is moved to Tucson from their facility. As I noted last week - I'm an animal lover and for that reason I'll defer to the experts in the field and fully support this move when it is appropriate. Giving that deference also includes giving it to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, the accrediting agency for major zoos all over North America. They wrote this letter in support of the plans now in place at Reid Park and San Diego Zoos: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/11-23-11aza_letter.pdf

Thanks to the TZS members for their support of the Tucson Zoo. Thanks to Cassie, Sue, Vivian and the rest of our great staff who make family members out of the animals at our Zoo. Over the upcoming Thanksgiving weekend why not take a few hours out with the family to go and visit. The animals are fun, and the time together with your loved ones will be quality.

Changing of the Guard

Finally, I began speaking about our new head football coach at The University of Arizona. I'll close by noting our new quarterback at the Council.

After having served this community for 12 years, Bob Walkup is voluntarily stepping down. He has been a model of optimism and has brought a "can-do" spirit to the challenges we face as a City. Bob is respected by both sides of the aisle, has the respect of elected officials from all levels of government, and across the Mexican border as well. His departure will be felt.

Enter Jonathan Rothschild, our mayor-elect. Jonathan brings a different skill set to the mix. Not better / not worse - different. I look forward to taking on the many issues we have ahead of us on the Council with Jonathan at the helm. Just as has been true of my working relationship with Bob Walkup, I anticipate a good and productive rapport to exist between me and Jonathan Rothschild. We began to meet and to develop a relationship during his campaign. He did the same with each Council member, and I expect that investment will serve the entire community well as he begins his term in office at our next meeting.

Bob, thank you. Jonathan, welcome aboard.



Sincerely,

Steve Kozachik

Arts and Entertainment Events Calendar

Free Festivals and Events in the Downtown/4th Avenue/Main Gate Area . . .

Holiday Boulevard, Main Gate Square's annual open house on Black Friday, featuring shopping and dining deals, live music, refreshments, children's activities, a scavenger hunt, Santa Claus, and an Ugly Sweater Contest and Parade. Friday, November 25, 11:00am to 8:00pm

1:00pm, High Desert - bluegrass

2:00pm, Jimmy & The Jitterbugs - jazz swing standards

3:00pm, Bunny Kirby - guitar / vocal

4:00pm, Apocalypso - steel band

5:00pm, Jim Howell Band - rock / blues / country / soul

6:00pm, Pep Rally

7:00pm, Jim Howell Band - rock / blues / country / soul

Bear Down Friday

Friday, November 25, 6:00pm

Now in its sixth year, the Bear Down Friday Pep Rally will feature the "Pride of Arizona" Marching Band, Wilbur and Wilma Wildcat, main stage performances, contests with cheerleaders and other spirit activities. Don't miss the last Bear Down Friday of 2011!

This week at the arts, entertainment, and sports venues in the Downtown Tucson and University Area . . .

Rialto Theatre

Saturday, November 26, 8:00pm. **Roger Clyne and the Peacemakers**, with Tramps and Thieves
www.RialtoTheatre.com

Fox Theatre

Saturday, November 26, 7:30pm. Alice's Restaurant
www.FoxTucsonTheatre.org

University of Arizona Football

Saturday, November 26, 2:00pm.
UA vs. Louisiana-Lafayette. Arizona Stadium.

Ongoing

El Nacimiento

Traditional Mexican nativity scene on display at La Casa Cordova
Through the holiday season, Tucson Museum of Art, 140 N. Main Ave.

Who Shot Rock and Roll: A Photographic History, 1955 to the Present"

Through January 15 at Tucson Museum of Art, 140 N. Main Ave.

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

Tucson Farmers' Market at Maynards

Saturdays 9:00am – 1:00pm
On the plaza at Maynards Market & Kitchen. 400 N Toole in the Historic Train Depot

Science Downtown: Mars + Beyond

Thursday through Monday, 9:00am to 5:00pm (until 6:00pm on Fridays and Saturdays, and until 9:00pm on 2nd Saturdays)
300 E. Congress St.
<http://www.sciencedowntown.org/index.html>

For other events in the Downtown/4th Avenue/Main Gate area, visit these sites:

www.MainGateSquare.com

www.FourthAvenue.org

www.DowntownTucson.com