

Ward 6 Staff



Steve Kozachik
Council Member



Ann Charles



Teresa Smith



Bonnie Medler



Diana Amado



Ward 6 – Newsletter

FEBRUARY 29, 2012

A Message from Steve

Extremely full agenda at M&C this week, covering some very important issues for the community. Not one of the items we covered should be tinged with partisanship as the undercurrent to how we approached them. And we didn't. So, in case you missed it, let me get the politics out of the way first, and then cover the material we're trying to manage on your behalf.

The Arizona Daily Star ran these two Op. Editorials, side-by-side. They speak for themselves.

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-12bash_op-ed.pdf

<http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-12stevekop-ed.pdf>

With that as a backdrop, I'll share what we covered, and the fact that it's not a political game we're playing will be self-evident.

Rio Mediation



There must have been times when Charlie Brown knew what was coming, but went along with the gag even so. That's where I, along with several other Council members, am now with the Rio Mediation. I don't believe it's on the up and up, I do believe there is legislation being crafted with the complicity of some Rio members to fundamentally change our relationship and/or take the TIF, and I don't expect the mediation to result in the significant, and immediate influx of dollars into the TCC that we need – among other Rio related work.

But, I, and the rest of the Council will kick at the football once again just so we can say at the end of this that we did everything within our power to save the TIF money for this region and that we acted in good faith along the way, even to the point of going through motions that every previous time resulted in our kicking at the air.

Two weeks ago, the Council voted to make public all of the mediation deal points. Those of us who voted in that manner want you to see what we're seeing and what



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

we believe will be compelling evidence that the mediation is not being engaged at a level of mutual good faith. On Tuesday the council voted to rescind that previous vote and allow the mediation meeting that's taking place on Thursday of this week to take place without that being on the table. If there is not progress this week, the Council can revisit the transparency issue next week.

I voted in opposition. The votes to adopt the motion came ahead of my vote and I know the will of the Council was to not send a unanimous message to Rio that we're fine with the way things are going.

The previous motion had two parts. The second part was to call on the Attorney General to make public the results of the audits and investigations that are now into their second year. Let's make all of this public and move forward. That part of our earlier motion still stands.

I'm sure the rest of the Council joins me in hoping to be wrong about this and that Rio pivots in the direction of wanting to work together towards a productive relationship. If we didn't share that desire to see something positive come from the Rio experiment, we wouldn't have taken another run at the football. The burden now shifts back to the Rio Board and to the Legislature who appointed and controls them.

If they want to begin repairs on the TCC, we can all agree on that tomorrow. The Auditor General identified that as our primary concern, Rio agreed to that in their response to the Auditor General, there is bond money sitting gathering dust, and the Arizona Daily Star pointed to our having lost a couple of major events, partially as a result of the condition of the TCC.

With good faith on both sides, this would be so easy. Aaugh!

Tucson Water

Tucson Water is at its lowest staffing levels since the late 1990's. They are managing an aging system and a budget that is heavily leveraged by debt. And they're doing a very good job.

Tucson Water customers (you) are demonstrating your conservation ethic and that is reflected in average residential water use levels of below 10 Ccf's per month. That level is totally unprecedented for the Tucson basin and water sales projections are in a continued downward trend for the near term.

The result is that water sales revenues for TW are decreasing, while capital needs continue to escalate due to the state of the infrastructure. Approximately 75% of TW costs are fixed (mostly debt service) and so while revenues from sales are dropping, costs are not.

Here are a few bullet points to frame the issue of our need to increase rates:

- Conservation trends – good news, saving water. Bad news, revenues are down



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)

- We're no longer just paying Interest Only payments on our debt – good news: paying down debt/bad news: debt payments are higher
- Staffing is lean – good news: cutting operations costs/bad news: service delivery challenges to customers
- We're purchasing our full CAP allotment – good news: we lock in current low CAP water costs/bad news: costs are reflected in TW water sales rates
- We are reducing reliance on debt for operating the Department, but have therefore increased reliance on water sales revenues – good news: getting off the cycle of funding operations through debt cycle/bad news: need to find a balance between income and lower water sales (see 'conservation' above)
- We have an 85 day working capital reserve, more than in the recent past, but other utilities have reserves of from 120-570 days – good news: the figure is an increase from prior years/bad news: the figure is lower than comparable jurisdictions.

We have known since the '80's when several Council members were recalled over the issue of water rates that it is a huge issue in our region. It's our life blood and we need to protect it. And the rates we pay are very, very modest considering the importance the commodity plays in our community.

We approved the TW five-year finance plan on Tuesday. It will call for an increase in water sales revenues of just over 8% per year over the course of the Plan. Our staff has been maligned in the press lately for some abnormally high charges to a small minority of customers. Those customers deserve to have their bills adjusted in a fair and rational manner. But those incidents are not the norm. And they're largely a function of aging equipment (which is being replaced as quickly as possible) and understaffing in critical areas (we're hiring).

I'm hoping to see a new rate structure come back to us that further encourages and rewards conservation; a structure with lower rates for the very low end Ccf users. That's yet to come. What we do know is that TW staff is looking at how to restructure debt, replace equipment, and retool staffing. It's a work in progress, but they deserve credit for what they're doing.

Meanwhile, the RTA is responsible for \$31M in costs having been shifted onto your bills due to utility line relocation costs being moved from the RTA sales tax onto water bills. That's not good news.

Painted Hills

Another item that's water related, and that's not good news is that the Painted Hills area out in the Tucson Mountain foothills is the most recent target of pre-emptive State legislation. I reported on HB2416 last week.

Here is the full text of the Bill – it's only two pages long, but it does a lot of potential damage

<http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-12hb2416bill.pdf>

The Bill affects only two counties in Arizona; Maricopa and Pima. Comparing them is apples to oranges. Maricopa and Pima Counties cover nearly the same number of square miles (9,200 for Maricopa vs. 9,100 for Pima) but the population p/sq/mile is vastly different. In

Maricopa (Phoenix, generally) there are 334 people p/sq/mile.

In Pima County, we have 92 people p/sq/mile. Clearly our situation with respect to protecting open space from unreasonable growth is not at all what the Phoenix area faces. That's the reason we can accurately state that this Bill is aimed directly at the ability of Pima County governing bodies to make decisions related to how and where we grow. Despite the fact that Maricopa fits under the population threshold identified in the Bill, the intent of the Bill doesn't impact the decisions they make.

By way of quick review, the City has prevailed in court protecting our water service policy as it relates to the Painted Hills area. We said we were not obligated to serve a proposed housing development, and with that, we successfully preserved hundreds of saguaros out in the Saguaro National Monument region in Painted Hills. But the Dallas investor who overpaid for the land lobbied Phoenix, and we're now faced with losing both the ability to protect the open space, and possibly more importantly in the long run, to protect our ability to control where, and to whom we have to pump water. It's a very big deal.

From a legal standpoint, the set of facts surrounding the Painted Hills area could be better. We won in court the first time around and the will of the Council is to stand our ground in the face of Legislative over reach and tell them that what they lost in court the first time, we're not conceding legislatively without a fight.

As I noted in my op-ed, we're not elected to play partisan political games. We're here to protect the long term greater good of this community. If that means going toe to toe with the RTA, the legislature or others, I think this M&C is pretty much done with allowing the interests of this region to be steam rolled by others.

With its vote yesterday, the Council directed staff and the City Attorney to work with the County and other interested parties to try to come to a solution that effectively makes moot the Bill. While I agree with, and appreciate the spirit of that motion, I opposed it due to some of what we may be giving up in the process. We'll see how it plays out though, all agreeing that protecting the PH area, and our water policy is paramount.

RTA/Streetcar/Silverbell

I might as well get the rest of the inter-jurisdictional squabbling out of the way. The RTA is our co-manager in the streetcar project. In effect, they are the funding agent. We are the project manager and the owner of the system. With respect to those roles, the final \$20M progress payment was due to the City from the RTA. It was "due." It was not "due" with conditions. It was simply "due."

The RTA insisted on conditions being drawn into the IGA in which they were to deliver that final progress payment. The conditions were veiled references to the opening of negotiations related to ownership and managing the assets. Those may or may not be issues worth discussing, but they're not appropriate for being included as conditions for paying money that's due in the normal course of business.

We had two options. Reject the IGA and put the funding, and therefore the progress of the project at risk, or agree to the final payment with the conditions to keep things moving

along.

Several of us made it quite clear that, while we were happy to allow the RTA to make the payment for which it was responsible, the fact of the IGA having language that opens the door for other issues is a total irrelevancy to us in terms of our taking the money that was owed to the project.

Other jurisdictions should take note of this heavy handed behavior on the part of the RTA Board. If they'll put a \$200M project at risk by trying to extort a negotiating position, they'll certainly try to wield a power relationship with jurisdictions that are less well positioned than we are to take them on. I think there is a growing realization that all this talk of regionalism is good, but it requires a greater level of collaboration, and not so much evidence of efforts to control and empire build than what we're seeing. We sent that strong message by voting 4-3 to take the money, but implicitly reject the conditions attached to it.

We again saw the RTA Silverbell Road widening IGA. Recall that we have now seen this 3 times. We still do not know the final costs and we do not know the funding sources. We do know that any cost overruns will be the responsibility of the City of Tucson.

The RTA has to begin this project by 2016. Until the questions of cost and funding are resolved to a level of much more clarity, I believe it would be irresponsible to support extending more taxpayer money towards the project. I voted "no" on continuing to spend. The County says they'll move ahead with non-Tucson portions. They also don't know the final costs. Taxpayers from outside the Tucson City limits should take note of that.

On March 6th, Council member Fimbres and I have asked for an in-depth look at the RTA Broadway widening project. We will be asking for a full review of the bases on which it was approved, whether or not those projections have developed, how much it is going to cost, where the cost overruns are going to come from, how we're purchasing property in an undefined alignment, and more. On March 27th, Council member Uhlich and I have asked for that same level of discussion related to the rest of the RTA voter approved package. These next few weeks will be instructive in terms of how we engage what I have called a new community wide discussion of how we're spending your dollars on projects that may not be needed, or that may be needed but are costing millions of dollars more than you approved. Stay tuned.

National Institute for Civil Discourse

How about a change of tempo and a good news item.

Former Congress woman Gabrielle Giffords announced last week that she is going to get involved with the UA sponsored National Institute for Civil Discourse. Here is a paragraph that describes the Institute from a recent Release in which that was announced:

The National Institute for Civil Discourse is a nonpartisan center for the research and advocacy of civility in public discourse. Chaired by former U.S. presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, the Institute engages in initiatives to advance understanding of civil discourse among elected officials and candidates running for public office and works to promote awareness of the importance of civil discourse to democracy and effective government.

The op-ed's with which I opened this newsletter demonstrated what I believe to be a current

flaw in our community dialogue of issues. The Institute is formed to allow for vigorous debate of important issues in a manner that allows for a free flow of information from a variety of viewpoints. Its membership reflects that variety, and its role in our current political climate is key to whether or not we continue extending a partisan gap, or we come together and solve some weighty issues. Here's the full article in which the Congress woman's new role was announced:

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-2012gabby_article.pdf

Single Use Plastic Bags

In 2009, the City of Tucson implemented a program to encourage the recycling of plastic bags. The program includes retail establishments of over 10,000 sq/ft, who have more than two local outlets and who sell over 25% of their goods in the form of food, drink and other typical grocery sorts of things.

Each of those stores is required to provide a bin for the collection of plastic carry-out bags in a clearly marked and easily accessible location. They are also required to offer reusable carry-out bags for sale.

Through our second full year of the program, you have recycled the equivalent of over 112 million plastic bags. That's a lot of blight avoided and you should be commended.

Other communities have looked at, and in some cases implemented fees and/or outright bans of reusable plastic bags. Where fees are involved, my discussions with the Arizona Food Marketing Alliance and the Arizona Retailers Association have made it pretty clear that two things are true:

- When adopted, these fees become in essence a food tax; i.e. they're passed along to the consumers

- When adopted, the administrative burdens imposed in trying to track the data associated with the programs are massive

But, both the AFMA and the ARA are working with us to increase the awareness of our current program. Both groups have participated in advancing ideas such as more visible signage, education of store employees, and education in the schools, and partnering with the Green Chamber and our own Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development to further our local efforts at controlling the blight these products can result in.

As noted in a previous newsletter, we at the Ward 6 office will collect your plastic bags and recycle them on your behalf if you want to use us as your point of contact. What you should not do is to place them in your blue barrels. They cause maintenance and mechanical issues with our Material Recovery Facility equipment.

On Tuesday we unanimously voted to form an 11 member stakeholders group who will look at how we can improve on the program that's already in place. That group will report back to us later this year.

Hoops Senior Day

It was nice to end the regular home schedule – Senior Day – with a win over UCLA. Many thanks to Dondre Wise, Alex Jacobson, Brendon Lavender, Jesse Perry and Kyle

Fogg for the work they put in, and the enjoyment they brought to so many in the community.

Win or lose, my wife always cries on Senior Day.

West University Transition Area

On Tuesday we held the Public Hearing related to the creation of an overlay zone that will guide development in the area immediately west of The University of Arizona campus. The perimeter of the West University Zone is Speedway, Euclid, University and Park. The purpose of this zoning change is to create the opportunity to increase density within those boundaries, thereby relieving pressure for student housing in the middle of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Right now, the properties owned within the Zone are 60% State, 37% Commercial, and 3% private residential. I've written about this item before, but the quick refresher is that we need to increase density in appropriate areas in order to accommodate the increased demand the University student population is placing on housing.

I believe what we adopted on Tuesday was a step in that direction. We put in place a multiple step process through which builders would have to go prior to their being allowed to demolish existing historic structures. We put in place building heights that are tallest on the east side of the Zone and lowest on the west side facing the residential neighborhood. The Zone is obviously within walking or biking distance to campus, is within blocks of the eventual streetcar route, and is within blocks of Main Gate retail.

When we see constant increases in student enrollment, when we see that the new District Housing project on 6th Street is already 100% leased (several months before it even opens), when we are on the heels of having settled a potential lawsuit related to "Group Dwellings" in residential neighborhoods, the time is right for us to embrace solutions like this.

There was give and take by all parties. If ending up with a solution that is all of what everybody was after is our goal, we'll never do anything. This reflects grabbing the good, and not holding out for the unattainable perfect.

CBD

During his State of the City address, the Mayor announced that the City is "open for business." A piece of that is putting in place development incentives that will help the private sector to secure needed financing to begin their work.

Last week, we gave direction to staff to bring back to us the boundaries of a Redevelopment Zone in which we can place a Central Business District – within which builders can apply for property tax abatements for the first eight years of their projects while their project moves towards solvency. On Tuesday, staff did that. The eventual map will fall very generally within 22nd Street, La Cholla, Euclid and Miracle Mile. Having identified the general perimeter, staff will now begin a public process of advising property owners that this is under consideration. To be eligible, the area must be characterized by "slum" or "blight." Those are words of legal art and staff is going to look at a variety of economic metrics to see where we'll need to tweak the borders of the District.

We have asked staff to begin the notification process and bring back to us the final boundaries within four weeks.

There is an existing Redevelopment Zone that already exists in the downtown core. I hear anecdotally that there are 4-5 projects sitting and waiting for us to put the property tax incentive on the table, and then they'll be in a position to put together a development proposal for us to consider. It would have been my preference to adopt the existing CBD and get those projects started in the approval/funding process, but the will of the council was to wait for the entire map to be drawn before offering any potential builder the option.

While waiting will change nothing about the selection process or the terms of the actual proposals we will be shown, it leaves the perception that we are not favoring one region over another. Also, staff stated a preference to move the entire map forward at one time and thereby avoid confusing the public as to what we're doing. That's fine. I look forward to seeing the whole area rolled out so we can start to follow through on the Mayor's claim.

Broadway/Rosemont

As you may recall, late last year data was shared with us that pointed to an increase in auto/pedestrian traffic accidents. There were three auto/ped deaths in a very short period of time. Two of those were in locations that I felt warranted traffic studies to ensure the areas involved were properly signed and signaled. Broadway/Rosemont was one of those locations.

This is the link to a letter from TDOT that describes the study that they conducted on this intersection:

<http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-12bwy-rosemontstudy.pdf>

When deciding on what level of signalization is prudent, multiple factors are considered. Those include traffic volumes, traffic speeds, distances between traffic signals, amount of cross traffic, and level of pedestrian traffic. Based on those metrics, a variety of options are considered. Those can include "protected left turn" signals, lag left, leading left, or various other signage/lighting possibilities.

I'm grateful to TDOT staff for having studied this intersection and having come to the conclusion that some level of improved awareness signaling may be helpful. You can read their analysis in the letter. I believe they came to a decision that fairly weighs all of the factors involved.

Prostitution – Trafficking – Lethality Assessment Protocol

Nearly a year ago I toured the City Court building and came away with questions about how we can help to shave costs from their operation. One idea was to look at offenses that carry mandatory sentencing and see if there might be more cost effective ways to address the issue. The crime I focused on was prostitution.

From my layman's perspective, it struck me that we could help the women arrested in a more productive way, and save the Court money if we didn't give jail time for first offenses related to prostitution. So, I was invited on some "stings" (both for the ladies, and

for the “johns”) to get a first hand view of what we’re dealing with. The very simplistic answer to that is that the hooker is a victim on so many levels. Jail is not geared towards her as necessarily a form of punishment but is a tool used to address the many other collateral issues included in that crime.

Those issues include drugs, weapons, Domestic Violence (DV), psychological abuse, underage street kids, homelessness, marketable skills, educational attainment, and more. The women and girls involved in this activity are rarely using it as a means of employment. They’re caught up in selling sex for drugs, rent, food, to avoid being beaten, and other similar factors. Prostitution is the symptom. The prostitute is a victim.

Trafficking can take the form of sex or labor trafficking. We have a task force that meets regularly to try to untangle some of the very intricate issues that are embedded in the trafficking problem. Ours is greater than other regions due to our proximity to the border. Concerned with the prostitution issue, I called a group of non-profits who are engaged in some of the treatment and diversion aspects of this problem together to have a round table discussion about how we can address the issue in a collaborative manner. Mine is a much more focused issue; that is, while TPD’s Trafficking Task Force is looking at the multiple issues under that umbrella, I felt it was a large enough chunk of that to try to make a dent in the sex-for-sale part of it.

I have now met twice with the group (including Emerge!, La Frontera, COPE, Our Family, Southern Arizona against Slavery) and spoken on the issue at a forum held last weekend at Our Savior’s Lutheran Church. The group wants to continue to meet and look at possible ways to apply for grant monies together, as opposed to individually. We will also continue to look at ways to share the modalities being offered by each group so we can avoid duplication, and so we know where to most appropriately direct girls with particular needs.

I’m particularly thankful to Captain Bret Klein of TPD and Sarah Jones of Emerge! who have agreed to look at how we can put into practice a referral tool that may directly reduce severely violent acts against women. The tool is called a Lethality Assessment Protocol – it’s a series of 11 questions asked by a police officer when called to a domestic disturbance scene. Here’s a link to the actual Assessment tool:

http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/sites/default/files/ward6/2-29-12lethalityscreen4pcao_vsd.pdf

The replies to the questions gives the officer an objective tool that will inform his decisions about how and where to refer the victim. Right now, both TPD and Emerge! are looking at whether they have the resources to adopt this new program. They’re in contact, and I’ll be looking forward to how they work together towards a solution.

It’s a long way from my original budget question, but the rabbit trail has led to a very important place. I’m thankful to the many people who are now engaged. And if you think you see any of this going on, there is a National hot line that links you to resources for the victims – [888.3737.888](tel:888.3737.888) – it’s the National Human Trafficking Resource Center.

Alarm Fees

Yet another Public Hearing we held on Tuesday was related to charging a \$20 annual fee to people who own home alarm systems. TPD asked for the fee as a way of recouping their nearly \$1M cost in responding to “false alarms.” Those are defined as being calls to which

they respond and find no evidence of a crime having been committed or attempted. The vast majority of alarm responses fall into that category. In our fiscal year 2012 budget, we added \$1M as a line item anticipating this fee would be implemented.

On Tuesday, the M&C voted to approve the fee. I voted in opposition. There are a few facts on which we can agree.

First, responding to all alarm calls takes up TPD resources. That costs money but they're on the clock anyway.

Second, we are short staffed in our police force right now so we should be encouraging people to do their part in hardening the target of their homes and businesses.

Third, as with the Second Hand Store fee the council adopted in 2010, this is a fee that charges the non-abusers at the same level as those who are responsible for the false alarms. If you and I both own an alarm system, and I can't quite stop triggering false alarms – but you never set off your system in error, you and I now both pay the same fee.

I opposed the Pawn Fee because we are now charging people who use Pawn Shops for legitimate reasons at the same level as those who use them to fence hot goods. The same principle holds true with this new alarm fee.

But, TPD has a budget hole, so M&C just identified a source to fill a small portion of the gap. I'm hopeful that it won't serve as a deterrent to people protecting their investments by getting an alarm system installed. As with all fees (including a plastic bag fee if we ever adopt one of those) the people hit the hardest are those least able to afford it.

Sincerely,



Steve Kozachik
Council Member, Ward 6
www.tucsonaz.gov/ward6

FORECLOSURE PREVENTION WORKSHOP

ARE YOU FACING FORECLOSURE OR LOOKING FOR FORECLOSURE PREVENTION ADVICE?

Free and confidential help is available to you.

Saturday, March 10, 2012

9:00 am - 3:00 pm

Desert View High School (Cafeteria)

4101 E. Valencia Road

Tucson, Arizona 85706

Congressman Raúl M. Grijalva is hosting a Foreclosure Prevention Workshop at Desert View High School. Come meet with lenders and foreclosure experts who will provide objective advice and help you understand options available to you. Lenders will be available to make modification approvals on the spot!

Please RSVP at our website <http://grijalva.house.gov> or contact our office at (520) 622-6788 to find out what documents you are required to bring to get immediate assistance. We look forward to seeing you!

Tucson Parks and Recreation Summer Splash Campaign

Help to open our pools this summer by supporting the Summer Splash Campaign. Donations can be made through the Tucson Parks Foundation, a 501(c)3 at



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

Donations will go directly to helping fund the pools for the 2012 summer season. Help bring back the splash and make the summer “cool” for our community.

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, March 1, 8:00pm. “**Henry Rollins: The Long March Tour**”. All ages.

Friday, March 2, 8:00pm. “**Pink Floyd Laser Spectacular**”. All ages.

Saturday, March 3, 8:00pm. “**That Is All: An Evening with John Hodgman**”. All ages.

Sunday, March 4, 8:00pm. “**Sublime with Rome**”. All ages.

www.RialtoTheatre.com

Fox Theatre, 17 W. Congress St.

Wednesday, February 29, 7:30pm. “**Los Lonely Boys**”

Friday, March 2, 7:00pm. “**Miss Bala**”

Saturday, March 3, 8:00pm. “**Amos Lee & Calexico: Live from the Artist Den**”

www.FoxTucsonTheatre.org

Tucson Convention Center

Friday, March 2 and Saturday, March 3, 10:00am-4:00pm. “**Ages ‘N Stages.**” Exhibit Hall

Music Hall

Saturday, March 3, 7:30pm. and Sunday, March 4, 2:00 “**Aida – AZ Opera Company**”

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

Leo Rich Theater

March 4-11, 19th Chamber Music Festival. Please visit www.ArizonaChamberMusic.org for more information

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 March 3 and runs until March 31

“Arizona Encaustic 2012”

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

Other Community Events**Loft Cinema** www.loftcinema.com/

Wednesday, February 29, 7:00pm. “Film Forward 2012: Advancing Cultural Dialogue”

Saturday, March 3, 7:00pm. “Crazy Wisdom” With director with Q&A after the film.

UA Mineral Museum – Ongoing

“100 Years of Arizona’s Best: The Minerals that Made the State”

Flandrau Science Center

Join the Flandrau Planetarium on the University of Arizona Campus for their weekly Planetarium and Laser Show. Call (520) 621-4516 or visit www.flandrau.org/ for events and information.