

Ward 6 Staff



Steve Kozachik
Council Member



Ann Charles



Teresa Smith



Bonnie Medler



Diana Amado



Ward 6 – Newsletter

FEBRUARY 8, 2012

A Message from Steve

SB1484-7 / Relating to Union Activity

I'm going to open with State Legislation, and close with it, too. The issue of unionization is going to underscore all of our budget talks, and our relationships with our workers for the foreseeable future. The topic deserves to lead this week's newsletter.

Before I began working for The University of Arizona Athletics Department, I worked for 10 years in the private sector / ASARCO / in labor relations and H.R. That work put me in daily touch with trade unions (USWA, IBEW, Teamsters and IUOE). I worked for a manager whose attitude was such that the relationship between the Company and the Union was always contentious. The result was a strike every three years.

That characterization does not reflect our relationship with the unions who represent the City workers. In the past few budget cycles, the union has recognized the need to step up to the plate and sacrifice for the greater good of the community. We have implemented furlough days (with the result that you suffered losses in service) and we have reduced some of the benefits that our public safety workers used to receive. We have made ourselves less than competitive with other jurisdictions when it comes to our ability to retain and recruit police and firefighters. The same is true for I.T. the 911 system, and all throughout the employment rolls. During this time, the Teamsters (drivers for Sun Tran) received pay increases while City workers took cuts. Let's be clear – those pay increases came as a function of collective bargaining between PTM and the union in the private sector. Recall that there was a strike in effect that shut down the local transit system. That leverage to bargain and go on strike does not exist for City workers.

Now the State Legislature has suggested four separate bills that will effectively eliminate public sector unions at the local and State level. The bills relate to collection of union dues, pay for conducting union work on the clock and the most basic "meet and confer" relationship that employees exercise in the private sector when organized into a bargaining unit. This trend of union-busting was started last year in Wisconsin. Oddly, the first U.S. State to permit collective bargaining by public employees was Wisconsin, in 1959. Collective bargaining is now permitted in three fourths of U.S. States.

George Meany was the founding president of the AFL-CIO. Critics of public sector unions often quote him as having advocated against public sector collective bargain-



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

ing. In fact, he advocated in favor of public sector collective bargaining as an alternative to strikes. This was largely in response to multiple strikes that took place right after WWII.

Anti-unionists, such as those who are sponsoring the four bills in the State Legislature often quote Meany correctly for his criticism of government worker strikes. What they ignore is the fact that he made his statements to defend collective bargaining as a means of avoiding them. The sponsors of the bills up in Phoenix need to study their history a little more closely.

Our arrangement with the City unions does not allow for them to go on strike. What it does allow is for their bargaining agents to meet with City staff in a “meet and confer” relationship to discuss wages, hours and working conditions – the same as is done in the private sector. The fundamental difference is that in the private sector, the workers can walk. That’s not the case with our employees.

There are two issues that are often raised trying to differentiate between private and public sector employee relations. One is that in the private sector, unions negotiate with the owners, but in the public sector, the “owners” are the taxpayers, and they don’t have a say in how the bargaining goes. In fact, in the private sector the owners are the Stockholders. The unions don’t negotiate with “owners” but rather with those hired by the owners, management. If managers negotiate bad contracts, they can be fired. Similarly, in the public sector, where elected officials are the managers and voters the “owners,” if we adopt a budget that gives away the store, you can “fire” us at the next election.

Another argument is that public sector unions have forced untenable pension benefits on the taxpayers. It is absolutely true that pension benefits are going to have to be addressed. They are not at a sustainable level and that is true not only in Arizona, but also in States that do not have a collective bargaining arrangement with their workers. But bargaining does not lead inevitably to under-funded pensions; bad governance does. States without union bargaining have also failed to adequately fund their pensions. The Center for Economic and Policy Research has stated that there is no statistical relationship between unionization and pension under funding.

The Legislators in Phoenix who think they’re going to bust the unions and fix the pension system issue ignore the fact that the pension levels are governed by Contract law. Each person’s pension is an individual contract, and once it has been entered into, the government is bound by its terms. We can change the benefits for future hires, and we must, but it would be an act of bad faith – not to mention illegal – to open the existing contracts and make changes.

The more productive way to address budget issues with employees is to sit with them in a collaborative manner and show them the numbers. Our workers aren’t stupid – they can add and subtract. And they care about the level of service we should be providing to the taxpayers. Busting the labor associations will lead to a contentious relationship between workers and management. I’ve “been there/done that.” There’s a better way, and we at the Council/Staff/Union level have demonstrated that over the course of the past two years.



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 Jonathan
Rothschild
791-4201

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

Arizona Greyhound Rescue

I don't like Greyhound racing. The way the dogs are housed breaks my heart. But the track is outside of the City limits, and I tried but was unsuccessful in getting Grey2K to join me in trying to approach the track and get some changes made in how the animals are kept. Grey2K wanted to work at the State level.

But there is a wonderful group who is working locally to take the dogs that are no longer racing and find homes for them. Arizona Greyhound Rescue (AGR) uses one of the Ward 6 meeting rooms to recruit volunteers to help them in their work. I dropped in on their last meeting and came away impressed with their commitment.

When a racing dog is no longer "profitable" for the owner, they get rid of the animal. In track parlance, they call it "petting" the dog (i.e. making a pet out of their previous commodity). That's where AGR comes in. They take the dogs and immediately begin working on finding either a permanent home, or a foster home for the dog while they search for the permanent family.

Currently they have nine of the rescue dogs they're trying to house. They'll be at 2nd Saturday's this weekend with all nine of them, hoping to adopt them out. If you can help, either keep an eye out on Congress on the 11th, or contact Jean Williams at jeanw@azgreyhoundrescue.org.

Community Projects

Another week, and more compliments to the Albert Elias group in Housing and Community Development.

HUD allocates funds annually for a variety of community projects. The HUD policy is that they want to see their money used efficiently and not just be left laying around gathering dust. With the March 31st timeliness deadline approaching, Albert and his staff combed through the list of shovel/hammer ready projects that are scattered throughout town and have selected several that qualify for use of these CDBG funds. In Ward 6 we will see the following work begin nearly immediately:

- Several bus shelters will be constructed
- The HAWK light I wrote about a few weeks ago for 22nd Street and Lakeshore Drive
- Catalina High School Skate Park / ADA compliance work
- Catalina Park (900 N. 4th Ave) / ADA compliance work
- Reid Park / ADA compliance work related to restrooms

Again, Albert's people out in the community making him look good! Thanks from Ward 6 constituents.

Post 9/11 GI Bill

If you're a veteran who served post September 10th, 2001, Congress just changed the menu of benefits for which you're eligible. The options are expanded.

Initially, the education benefits covered just degree granting institutions. That left out certificate and training schools that offer course work other than that found at Colleges and Universities. Some examples are aircraft dispatch, flight training and aviation technology – each of which may be pursued at training centers here in Tucson.

If you are a post 9/11 vet who was honorably discharged after having served at least 90 days

in aggregate, or 30 days with a service related disability, you should check out what's now available.

You can do that by contacting the Department of Veterans Affairs or calling 888-442-4551.

And thank you for serving.

Your Money

Got your attention?

1997 County Road Bonds. 2006 RTA Road Projects. 2004 County Bond projects – including City/County Joint Courthouse (about which you've read plenty in past newsletters). Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) which is money that should be used for local road projects. Streetcar – using RTA, FTA, private developer and as-yet undefined other funds (they'll come from you, one way or another – the government has no other source but the taxpayers).

I have in mind the need for a broadly based community discussion on how all of those dots connect. For example:

When we are under funded for a Bond project, where do we get the money to fill the void?

When the assumptions made to sell you on a project don't develop in the way you were told, how do you get a chance to reconsider projects under those circumstances?

If HURF dollars are supposed to go to road maintenance, what protocols are in place to ensure they don't get shifted to cover funding shortfalls in other areas, at the expense of the condition of your roads?

When County Bond money is earmarked for a "match" of RTA funds for a City project, and the County refuses to fork over the dough when it's needed – and the RTA then refuses to do the "City portion" of the project, how do we make those facts known to you so you can weigh in with the people playing those games with your cash and City travel infrastructure.

Are you aware that the City routinely signs IGA's with the RTA that makes us obligated to pay for any project costs above what the RTA pays?

Did you know that Tucson Water ratepayers are paying more every month because back in 2008 the RTA voted to shift utility line relocations out from under the RTA tax obligation and onto the jurisdictions' utilities? (And why isn't Metro Water joining me in objecting to this cost shift?)

Those are just a few questions related to regional capital improvement projects, and how your dollars shift from one pocket to another, and who makes those decisions. Rubik's Cubes are straight line decisions in comparison.

The word floating around is that certain members of City Staff are not happy with the questions I raise. Evidently, it's being viewed as "anti-City." My perspective is a bit different. You fund the City. You have a right, and all Civil Servants have an obligation to

address the tough questions related to how we spend your money. That's not "anti City." It's simply fiscally responsible.

We begin projects without clearly defined costs or funding sources and become committed to finishing them, regardless of the collateral opportunity costs associated with moving money around to fill gaps.

That was the reason I voted against the Silverbell Road expansion on Tuesday. We know neither the cost, where the money is coming from (other than from you) nor the final design of the project. Saying "go-ahead" under those conditions, with your money, would be irresponsible. It's a blank check drawn on your checking account.

We have another RTA project that is about to form a Citizen's Task Force for the purpose of review and comment as we near the design development phase. That project is the widening of Broadway.

First it needs to be said that the traffic volumes upon which the RTA sold you the project are in question. I have asked for an update on those data. If the traffic volume shows the work is justified, we still need to decide on road alignments. If the traffic data does not track with the earlier estimates, I would like to see the project be used as a test case for allowing the public to weigh in again and voice their opinion on the best use of the funds approved for the work. Maybe they'd say to go forward in anticipation of future growth. And maybe not. But we never slow down to reconsider whether there might be better uses of the funds, given current conditions. And this is but one example of RTA work that might qualify for a second look based on changed conditions, and funding issues. There are others. The moving party on generating that community revisit has to be the County Board of Supervisors. At least a public hearing some evening would be a good start at that dialogue.

February 3, was the deadline for applying for the Broadway Citizens Task Force. Staff will wait another week for applications to arrive by mail, and then will begin the process of reviewing the applications, including sorting the applicants between residents, business owners/managers and specialty members.

When M&C approved the 13 member Task Force, we agreed to the following make-up:

- 4 members from neighborhoods along Broadway
- 4 members from businesses along Broadway
- 1 member from Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
- 1 member representing alternate modes (Bicycle Advisory Comm. has submitted an application)
- 1 member representing special needs
- 1 member representing regional interests (RTA has been requested to nominate someone)
- 1 member from the Planning Commission (application received)

The project is only two miles in length and there are a number of neighborhood associations that will be impacted, but not all will be able to have a seat on the committee. This is why we are really trying to stress that resident committee members need to consider the concerns of all, not just their own neighborhood.

There is a clear history in this region of financial decisions being made by, and for, reasons

that do not always result in what might be considered for the greater good (when was the last time you went to a baseball game out at Kino Stadium? Who's paying the O&M for the Streetcar? Does it make sense to spend over \$25M to build a ¾ mile road extension?) I'm going to continue to urge the decision makers to shift that culture and strive to work together in a manner that you deserve. And I'll conduct that conversation quite publicly, believing that sunlight is the best disinfectant, believing the best in the players and hoping we can come together and be more effective in treating your money as though it was our own. It's an important enough topic to at least let you participate in the discussion.

Rio / TIF

Tax Increment funds have increased every month for the past 13 months. They are now in excess of Rio Nuevo debt service by over \$3M annually. Those dollars belong in your community, for the purpose of redevelopment of your community. They do not belong in Maricopa or Pinal County.

Last week we were the target of an unprecedented "Concurrent Memorial" from the State Legislature that essentially pointed an inaccurately directed finger at the City Council saying we needed to begin to show good faith and come to terms with Rio.

For the record – we voted unanimously in December, 2010 to do just that. Rio walked away from that deal. We voted unanimously mid-last year to enter into mediation, shortly after Rio filed intent to sue you for \$47M. We still hope mediation ends in the successful allocation of your dollars into your community.

And yet – when we see bi-weekly missives from Rio that are both factually challenged, and suggestive that the City is not acting in good faith and when we see those words echoed from the Legislature, it makes one wonder if there isn't an already identified end game in mind that is being crafted.

I believe that if that end game is the Legislature pulling your tax dollars out of the community and shifting them up to Phoenix for reallocation to other parts of the State, the community is the loser.

Since the new Rio Board was appointed by the Governor and Legislature, the City has taken the lead role in doing what Rio was originally intended to accomplish; i.e. revitalize downtown. Here's a very brief list (I promised Diana and Bonnie that I'd shorten these newsletters)

- The City has put over \$15M into renovations to the TCC
- We implemented an infill incentive package specifically aimed at the Downtown Core
- We have worked with TREO on implementing a Primary Jobs Incentive Program
- We have standardized our Development Agreement template
- Our Development Services staff has facilitated the opening of the Bodies Exhibit, Sparkroot, The Hub, The Playground, and many more small locals along Congress.
- We voted unanimously to move ahead with Term Sheets – an act that was nullified by the Legislature.
- We voted unanimously to move into mediation – despite having been served a \$47M lawsuit
- We invited Rio to tour the TCC and put together a subcommittee to work on repair

followed by a Notice of Default served by Rio.

And I could go on – but you get the point.

I'm going to continue to call for the two groups to work in a positive fashion together so your dollars are spent wisely in your community. The mediation will continue, and until either that ends, or the Legislature makes their move, I'll keep my hope alive in a positive outcome. But I'm not naïve either. And I'll do my best to continue to lay out the facts so you're current on the gamesmanship that is taking place.

This is not about who gets credit. I don't care if I or the Council is the pilot, sitting in First Class, Cabin or is in the baggage hold. The goal is moving forward with your tax dollars in the manner you deserve. If the Legislature pulls your TIF, it will not be because the City Council and City staff was being uncooperative. It will be politics, pure and simple – just as is the case with so much legislation coming our way from up north.

Graffiti

Without the active involvement of the groups who care deeply about the quality of life in their neighborhoods, we would not be able to keep up with the many issues that challenge us as a community. One example that we all see daily is graffiti.

On Tuesday, Council Member Uhlich asked for an agenda item for a thorough review of what the City is doing in response to that issue. We had TPD, the Courts, Prosecutors, Housing and Community Development and other staff there to give us an update. The Downtown Tucson Partnership was there, as were neighborhood representatives. The diversity of the group that was present speaks to the breadth of how this issue impacts the City.

I brought two main areas of focus to the table. First, we need to begin billing the utility companies (TEP, Cox, USPS, SW Gas, etc) for the abatement we perform on their property. The City spends in excess of \$1M annually on abatement. If you're a mom and pop business, you pay for your own abatement. Large utilities can do the same.

The other area about which I'm concerned is what happens to offenders when they finally appear before a judge. If TPD does their job and get taggers into court, but the court creates a revolving door at the entrance, the work of the police is wasted, as is the work of the community volunteers who abate this mess from their neighborhoods. Each department involved with getting this under control has to be pulling in the same direction.

Also, last Saturday, the Alvernon Grant Initiative team hosted a Graffiti Action Forum at the Ward 6 office. My estimate is that 40 people came, representing neighborhoods all over the City. Also in attendance were Jack Wooldridge, Jim Webb, and Paul Tosca (all TPD officers who work the issue,) Andy Quigley (Asst. City Manager who has this under several of his direct report departments) and Ronni Kotwica, Barbara Lehman and Don Ijams, the neighborhood leaders who called for and led the Forum.

The Forum meeting broke the issue down into five areas of concern: taggers, tagging targets, tagging supplies, the courts and a policy/research group to look into what other jurisdictions are doing to police the problem. The Forum will reconvene in eight weeks and bring forward suggestions for us to consider at the M&C level. In the mean time, M&C were clear with staff that we want taggers to understand that we're serious about upping the ante for them and cleaning up our community.

Budget

Normally, the budget would be at the top of the list for reporting back to you. In fact, a few weeks ago following a briefing from city staff, I shared that we were going to begin this fiscal year with a projected \$30M shortfall and a \$46M General Fund contribution to transit.

That was a few weeks ago. On Tuesday, the picture that was painted had changed. It changed based on some assumptions that were not included in the first briefing. Those include dipping into the reserve fund, assuming 3% growth in the economy, and pushing out debt service again. I appreciate staff working the numbers to get us beyond the Chicken Little start to the process that is the norm. Yet we have got to ensure the assumptions we're adopting are realistic and that we're prioritizing core service dollars appropriately so we don't come up against the end of the fiscal year having to scramble for either dollars or personnel we might lose to other jurisdictions if we fail to remain competitive. The two staffing areas in which we invest the greatest in terms of training are police and fire (and toss in 911 dispatch, now under TFD).

I've already shared my thoughts on HURF money and how we have got to put a priority on road repair. That will be a part of the on-going budget discussion. In addition, while we were able to hire some police officers through Federal Grant money, that bill will come due in a couple of years. We can't ignore that we're facing that fiscal cliff and dip into our reserves too aggressively now just to avoid making tough decisions today – potentially backing ourselves into a corner in a couple of years.

We will need to buy busses. That fleet is running on fumes in many cases. It also represents an area we can't ignore in the interest of making easy decisions today, ignoring the real costs we're going to face next year and the following year.

The State can still hurt our projections by what they do in their own budget talks. I've read that they do not plan any more "sweeps", but they also have not indicated they're going to return our HURF or LTAF money. That translates into them paying the debt on the lease-back of the Capital Building while you dodge potholes on roads that are safety hazards. Let them know – they're still in session and have not yet finalized their budget.

Staff will be back in about a month with an update. In the mean time, M&C are to share our thoughts with them. You've just read some of mine. I'm interested in your input, as well. I'm in the process of scheduling another Ward 6 budget presentation from our City Manager and City Finance Director – as we did last year – so you can see what we were presented on Tuesday and form your thoughts based on that information. When it's scheduled, I'll be sure to get the word out.

Outdoor lighting

Since 1971, the City of Tucson has had an outdoor lighting code put in place to protect the immensely important astronomy investments that have been made in our region. Aside from tourism, that field attracts hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development to this area. Remember the Mars Lander and how proud we were of the people from our community who worked on that project.

Periodically, we update the code in order to ensure it's current with growth patterns, and

the state of lighting technology. By way of example, last season, we installed new lighting on Arizona Stadium. The result was greater light on the field and far less spillover into the sky. That technology didn't exist in that application a decade ago.

So we took another look at revising the Outdoor Lighting Code and adopted it following a public hearing. It was the first update since 2005.

During an earlier study session on this topic I raised a few concerns over some of the language that appears in the new code. It assumes the "most restrictive" interpretation if there are conflicting specs in the Code, it calls for a complete lighting and site inventory for improvements to property of less than 25% of the area, and it assumes automatic denial of a "temporary exemption" request if the City doesn't act on the request within five days. Before our vote, City Staff clarified each of those concerns.

There was another concern raised related to monument signs. We deleted that language from the ordinance and will have staff return with a slight rewrite soon.

My thanks go out to the many people who worked on coming to the current language (Tucson Metro Chamber, Southern Arizona Chapter of the Arizona Sign Association, Pima County DOT, TPD and PCSD – and the local astronomy community, to whom we all owe a debt of gratitude for their fine work in and around our community). What we adopted tonight is a huge move in support of this very important clean industry that draws tourism, research dollars, top notch professors and more into our community.

Rogers Elementary School

As a part of the TUSD effort to find new uses for some of their facilities, one proposal that has gotten lots of support from the surrounding neighborhood relates to Rogers School. The idea is to convert some of the school grounds into a Sustainability Resource Center at which they would produce food for use in the TUSD system, and to the surrounding neighborhood (as supplies last).

They will establish training programs to teach a variety of urban food production methods, community gardening and small scale conventional farming. Think how convenient it will be when you can eat your own front yard and never have to go to Safeway! Well...

The proposal also includes developing some curriculum content that could potentially be used in math, science and for other tech. training areas.

There will be a public meeting to review the proposal on February 15th at Booth Elementary School – 450 S. Montego Dr. They'll begin at 6:30pm, so if you'd like to weigh in on the idea, please arrange to join them. In case you don't have the time, you can still take a look at the proposal by visiting the Abundant Communities proposal, which you can find at <http://www.tusd1.org/contents/distinfo/csproposals2012.asp>

State Legislation

HB2675 amends Section 15 of the Arizona Revised Statutes. That Section relates to the activities of the Arizona Board of Regents – the overseer of the Tri-University system in the State. That group sets policy, reviews tuition levels, reviews contracts, and generally serves as the facilitating body for Higher Education in Arizona.

Last year, the Legislature was considering doing away with that Board and bringing the

Last year, the Legislature was considering doing away with that Board and bringing the function in-house. Thankfully, that idea failed. So this time around, here's what is being proposed:

AMENDING SECTION 15-1626, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING TITLE 15, CHAPTER 13, ARTICLE 2, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING SECTION 15-1626.01; RELATING TO UNIVERSITIES.

1. EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION B OF THIS SECTION, EACH STUDENT 35 WHO IS A FULL-TIME STUDENT ENROLLED AT A UNIVERSITY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF 36 THE ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS IN FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 SHALL PERSONALLY 37 CONTRIBUTE AT LEAST TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR FOR 38 TUITION. A STUDENT MAY NOT USE ANY OTHER SOURCE OF PUBLIC OR PRIVATE 39 FUNDING, INCLUDING GRANTS, GIFTS, SCHOLARSHIPS OR TUITION BENEFITS OR OTHER 40 TYPES OF FUNDING ADMINISTERED BY OR THROUGH A UNIVERSITY OR AN AFFILIATE OF A 41 UNIVERSITY, TO REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THAT STUDENT'S CONTRIBUTION UNDER THIS 42 PARAGRAPH.

If you're a part time student, they'll pro-rate the \$2K. If you're on a merit scholarship or you're an athlete, you don't pay. Amazingly, the bill has 24 sponsors.

The money given out for tuition assistance by the Universities does not directly impact the State of Arizona General Fund. What it does do is make Higher Education less accessible to medium and low income people, who make up the majority of the residents of Tucson. In-State tuition at the UA is now over \$12K per year and out of State is over \$25K. If Universities get an extra \$2K from students, the Legislature can reduce funding by that amount and call it even.

I'm certain that there was little research, running algorithms, and doing "best practices" analyses to arrive at the \$2K cost. It's random and punitive. And, what I don't think these legislators had in mind was the Arizona State Constitution. Just for fun, it says this:

6. Admission of students of both sexes to state educational institutions; tuition; common school system

Section 6. The university and all other state educational institutions shall be open to students of both sexes, and the instruction furnished shall be as nearly free as possible.

Businesses looking to relocate consider the quality of the workforce, workforce training and the quality of the educational system. I don't see how making access less of an option based on income, and not on ability or readiness makes a whole lot of sense. Charging an extra two thousand dollars, irrespective of ability to pay is not consistent with the clear language of the State Constitution.

Your advocacy on these bills I share with you each week is important – and I'll say, even if you disagree with me, let the Legislature know how you feel. They all have email. You can find them by going to Arizona State Legislature and following the links.

British Royalty

I might as well end on a bit of a light note. I'm not star struck, and I don't have much time for "Royalty." So, I was amused when I saw this trailer running across the CNN screen related to the British Queen celebrating her anniversary date of holding that title:

"Queen celebrates 60 years on the thrown"

I hope she's ok.

Sincerely,



Steve Kozachik

Tucson Gem and Mineral Show - January 28 - February 12

This Saturday will kick off the two week annual event "The Gem and Mineral Show." People come from all over the world to participate in this exciting event. The shows takes place all across the city at more then 40 locations, including hotels, resorts, and exhibit halls. Most of the shows are free and open to the public. For more information on specific shows or transportation, visit

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



Tucson Parks Foundation Million Dollar Hole in One Contest

Starting on February 9, 2012 the Tucson Parks Foundation will be hosting their Million Dollar Hole in One Contest. This year's recipient is the 20/30 Club Highland Vista Park in Ward 6. This will help fund a shade structure over the playground equipment, which will ensure that children have access to the equipment year round.

You can help make this happen and experience a beautiful February day at the golf course at the same time. Tickets to participate in the Hole in One Contest are only \$10.00 per entrance or a book of 15 for \$100.00. Each ticket gives you 10 shots to get closet to the tee and the top three will advance to the semifinals. For more information and to purchase tickets, please visit

<http://www.tucsonparksfoundation.org>



Arts and Entertainment Events Calendar

This week and next week at the arts and entertainment venues in the Downtown, 4th Avenue, and Main Gate areas . . .

Rialto Theatre, 318 E. Congress St.

Thursday, February 9, 8:00pm. “**Jake Shimabukuro**”. All ages.

Friday, February 10, 8:00pm. “**Metropolitan Klezmer**”. All ages.

Saturday, February 11, 6:00pm. “**Powhaus at 2nd Saturdays Presents: Arizona Gem**”. All ages.

Sunday, February 12, 8:00pm. “**Zappa Plays Zappa**”. All ages.

www.RialtoTheatre.com

Fox Theatre, 17 W. Congress St.

Friday, February 10, 7:00pm. “**The Centennial Soul Celebration**”

Saturday, February 11, 1:30-3:30pm. “**A Special Chat with Noted Tucsonans of the Past**”

Saturday, February 11, 7:00pm. “**Planet Jam**”

Saturday, February 11, 8:00pm. “**SambaDa**”

Sunday, February 12, 1:00pm. “**Secret Agent 23 Skidoo**”

www.FoxTucsonTheatre.org

The Screening Room, 127 E. Congress

February 17-19 & 24-26, 1st Annual “**Out in the Desert, Tucson’s International LGBT Film Festival**”

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

Tucson Convention Center

February 9-12: Tucson Gem and Mineral Show. Tucson Arena and Exhibit Halls

Music Hall

Friday, February 10, 8:00pm. “**TSO Classic Series – AZ Centennial Celebration**”

Saturday, February 11, 8:00pm. “**TSO Concert Special – Midori**”

Sunday, February 12, 2:00pm. “**TSO Concert Series – AZ Centennial Celebration**”

<http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/tcc/eventcalendar>

Ongoing

Tucson Museum of Art, 140 N. Main Ave.

Ongoing exhibition, Opening Saturday, January 28 and ending Sunday, June 3:

“**Frida Kahlo, Through the Lens of Nickolas Muray**”

www.TucsonMuseumofArt.org

Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA), 265 S. Church Ave.

Current exhibition: **Armando Miguélez: Legislate Crazy**

Hours: Wednesday to Sunday, 12:00 to 5:00pm.

www.Moca-Tucson.org

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

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

www.childrensmuseumtucson.org

The Drawing Studio, 33 S. 6th Ave.

Ongoing Exhibit, Opens Saturday January 28 and runs until February 25

“Bridges II, US – UK Artist Collaboration”**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

Santa Cruz Farmers’ Market

Thursdays, 4:00 – 7:00pm.

Mercado San Agustin, 100 S. Avenida del Convento

Science Downtown: Mars + Beyond

Thursday through Monday, 9:00am to 5:00pm (until 6:00pm on Fridays and 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

Tucson’s Arizona Centennial Celebrations: February 10-12.

Friday, February 10 at 4:00pm, Mayor Rothschild will open the Arizona Centennial festivities and these events will continue all weekend. Many events will be free and there will be something for everyone. There will be music, performances, and fun for children throughout Downtown lasting the entire weekend.

For more information on all the events, visit

<http://www.2ndsaturdaysdowntown.com/>

