APPENDIX

Examples of Common Problems with Citizen Commissions

DOWNTOWN LINKS

–Demolition of COT owned buildings in advance of roadway design, as on Broadway and Downtown Links, has a demoralizing effect in creating an aura of inevitability about one design option over others. It also produces blight, diminishing the appeal of preservation.

–Downtown Links Bicycle & Pedestrian sub-committee has called repeatedly for improved bicycle and pedestrian amenities, but the Design Team continues to furnish plans meeting minimum safety standards only.

--Features such as the Downtown Links Deck Park and Grant Road bicycle and pedestrian amenities negotiated by Citizens’ commissions and favored by stakeholders have been challenged as “too expensive” in the Value Analysis process.

22ND STREET

--Neighborhood Associations on 22nd Street including Santa Rita-West Ochoa and Barrio Santa Rosa were excluded from a Fall 2013 neighborhood/business meeting.

--Medians are now under construction between Kino and Park, even though the 22nd Street CTF is adjourned and has not finished designing the roadway.

RONSTADT TRANSIT CENTER

–Public input in to the proposed Ronstadt Transit Center development process was essentially ignored in preparing the rfq/rfp.

WEST UNIVERSITY

Downtown neighborhoods have been alarmed by the manipulation and bad faith shown toward West University neighborhood:

The IID which brought us the District (and Iron Horse the Junction) is a gift of elements of a rezoning without developers actually having engage the citizens impacted. There is only one required meeting and the comments are not recorded by COT staff but by the developer. Only comments relating to specific MDR's (Modification of development Regulations) are considered. WU reps/residents had many concerns and constructive criticism/solutions which were ignored because of how city staff narrowly drew the overlay. No mechanism for real public engagement, no guidelines that protect surrounding neighborhood areas it's a gift to developers because they don't have to do messy things like a rezoning and the give and take that can happen in that process. The
IID Task Force has been meeting for a year to address all of the holes in the process. Neighborhood reps are part of this TF and it was started because we put pressure on WARD 6 & 3 to follow up on M&C's promise to revise the IID.

--The Main Gate Rezoning-- COT staff came to us in spring 2010 wanting to talk about the Transition Area--we asked when- they said fall 2010. No word, then Spring 2011 COT starts the process with all of the promises - inclusive, open, can work on uses, heights, historic etc. meetings for 6 months with no headway for WU concerns of height, uses and historic. At the neighborhood plan amendment meeting many people from WU spoke to the promises, lack of process and lack of compromise on anyone's part--except for the neighborhood. WU developed an alternative plan that had heights up to 120 feet, multi generational population, a true transition to single story bungalows--couldn't get Ward 6, other Wards , COT staff or developers to work together. M&C vote is 7-0 to change our NP. Because the private developer Campus Acquisitions was paying for writing the rezoning they were given the pass for their 2 projects--160 feet and 1000 students. The referendum follows--12,000 signatures to stop the giveaway--thrown out by a technicality. A 7-0 promise by M&C to carve out 1 block to make a better area to transition to single story. Meetings follow, agreement is in place and council is prepared to vote. At that August 2012 meeting a flurry of activity is happening and a secret deal is made to give Bill Viner an extra 40 feet height because he needed more money. The 3rd tower at 130 feet was created- and already has violated the design process that was created to ensure the building was built to the plans the Design Review Committee approved in a so called binding review process.

--Entertainment District-- Late 2010 Donovan Durband Ward 6 and Christina Parisia COT met with neighborhoods about the ED making great promises that were in violation of the state statute and promised more meetings would soon follow. Fast forward to 2014- no meetings have taken place, COT staffers Chris Kaselemis and Camila Bekat start the process again at the urging of M&C with a particular push from Ward 6. Three obscure meetings were held in Feb. --WU was not notified of any of the meetings. 10 days before M&C study session we are notified of the new boundaries (totally changed from 2010) and the WU board votes to ask M&C to exclude our primarily historic residential neighborhood from the ED. (ED GO HOME). Item is pulled from study session and WU along with COT staff organize an April 17 th meeting for neighborhoods and the ED. 30 people attend and the overwhelming sentiment is the ED does not belong in residential neighborhoods. Many strong comments and constructive were given to staff. The 30 attendees exceeded that of all three February meetings combined.

BROADWAY

> --Members of the Broadway Citizens Task Force have not received documentation they have requested to aid in their deliberations, sometimes repeatedly. [see attached letters from ACNA and RHNA]

> --At the 25-JUL-2013 CTF meeting, neighborhood representative Mary Durham-
Pflibsen requested information about the light rail system installed in Phoenix, since parts of that project were built without extensive demolition and this case study could prove useful to CTF deliberations. This information was produced only in early 2014—and then ignored by the Design Team in producing crosswidths for the 4th public meeting scheduled for May 2014.

--Colby Henley, north side neighborhood representative, asked on 15 November 2012 for updated traffic counts. These were not produced until 10 May 2013. [see attached document]

--At the 25-JUL-2013 CTF meeting, business representative Diane Robles asked again for up-to-date traffic figures, since Pima Association of Governments (PAG) had recently revised their traffic projections downward. Not only has this information not yet been produced (despite assurances at the 18-APR-2013 meeting that it would be made available), the Project Team presented at the public open house (26-SEP-2013) projections known to be outdated. More recently the CTF were informed updated projections will not be available until months hence, yet the same outdated projections were used to select crosswidths for development.

--CTF chair Mary Durham-Pflibsen first asked in November 2012 that the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation be scheduled to present to the CTF, and she was fobbed off repeatedly. Demion Clinco of the THPF was finally allowed 20 minutes in a meeting in early 2014.

--Despite repeated requests, data on successful shallow-lot redevelopment has not been produced.

--In spite of a chaotic and blatantly manipulative process, the 26 September 2013 Neighborhood meeting yielded overwhelming sentiment from over 200 stakeholder attendees to preserve Broadway’s historic streetscape and existing small business sector. Yet in the meeting of 24 October, the consultant, Phil Erickson, pressured the CTF to disregard this input in selecting roadway cross-sections for further study.

--In the Broadway meetings, Mr. Erickson has repeatedly talked over and even raised his voice to CTF members. It is our understanding that the consultant works for the CTF, and not the other way around. This occurred with CTF member Colby Henley on several occasions and Diane Robles, south side business representative, in the 7 March 2014 meeting.

--On 6 October 2013 and again 7 March 2014 Broadway CTF’s major decision of the evening, selecting which crosswidths to recommend for further analysis, occurred more
than 30 minutes after the posted end of the meeting—and over 3 1/2 hours after the start time. As a consequence, nearly all stakeholder observers, including COT staff, had left the meeting by this point, defeating the purpose of a public process. (Unlike staff, Commission members and public observers do not get comp time for meetings that run until 9 or 10 at night: they need to get up and go to work the next morning.)

--Broadway CTF Mission & Goals have never been finalized

--The Design Team has misrepresented the acquisition process to the CTF.

–An attempt is currently (May 2014) being made by the Mayor to sabotage the Broadway process altogether and substitute a road design developed by a hand-picked Technical Advisory Committee.