

Broadway - Fwd: Re: too many options for CTF public meeting

From: Jennifer Burdick
To: Broadway
Date: 6/17/2013 12:47 PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: too many options for CTF public meeting

>>> On 6/17/2013 at 12:32 PM, Jennifer Burdick wrote:

Dear Laura,
Welcome back - I hope your travels were successful in all regards.

Yes, absolutely, you may second his concerns and I am "hearing" them, via your email. I want to understand them better, and know that the upcoming meeting discussions will focus on what the approach will be to share the 10 concepts that make up the 4 concept "families" at the public meeting.

I will add both of your emails to the Public Input Report, so it is logged and shared with the CTF. (The printed report has already been distributed for this month's meeting, but we are continuing to work towards an online version.)

Sincerely,
~Jenn

>>> On 6/15/2013 at 5:23 PM, "Tabili, Laura - (tabili)" <tabili@email.arizona.edu> wrote:

Dear Jennifer,

May I second Professor Garcia's concerns about the number of options the team plan to present?

As a teacher, i would never expect a class to be able to absorb and compare so many different ones-- particularly in such a limited time and with virtually no preparation.

I would think four or five maximum would be better.

Laura

Thank you for your response to my op-ed.

>

I was not aware that the CTF had made the decision as to how many options they would present. I must not have been present when they did.

>

> I believe it is a bad decision to present a public, which knows only little about the issues and technical aspects, to then offer meaningful opinions after two hours, opinions that your memo states would put

too much pressure on even a well briefed CTF having studied the issues for several months. Such a process is poorly designed, if you were seeking meaningful input from the public; of course, if the open house is not intended to seek input...

>

I urge you and your team to rethink the process, and to involve the CTF in that discussion.

>

JD Garcia

>

> Good morning, Dr. Garcia -

>

> I read your well-stated op-ed today. I personally appreciate the positive manner in which the article was oriented. Such an approach, as opposed to derogatory or meanly adversarial - which you and the Coalition have not been, allows us to stay focused on finding solutions. I value that, and think it will lead us to productive, respectful conversations and, my aim and hope, a great project in the end.

>

> I saw one thing that I felt was important to connect with you on: the September public meeting will not bring 2-3 semifinal design options to the public meeting; however, it will help with the narrowing of the design options that will occur after the September meeting. Currently, we have 10 design concepts, within 4 "families" (4-lane, 4-lane plus 2 transit, 6-lane, and 6-lane plus 2 transit). It has always been - and remains - our intention that those are what will be presented to the public. The narrowing of design options to a smaller number will occur after the public meeting, and I have not put a number to options that will be selected except to share that more than 4 would give me cause for concern in relation to project cost and delays.

>

> Your assumption of bringing 2-3 options to the September meeting leads me to believe that the Broadway Coalition is expecting the CTF to make a decision on 2-3 options before the September meeting, OR that stakeholder agencies will be asked to do so. I could be misunderstanding or overthinking your comment. But if I am correct, I believe this assumption puts more pressure on this stage of our project - or, more specifically on the expected outcomes of our next June, July, and September meetings - than is anticipated.

>

> The project team plans to discuss all of this in more detail with the CTF at next week's meeting. I understand you will be there, as well, and I hope it will be useful and perhaps less concerning. I felt that it was important to communicate this information with you immediately. If I have misunderstood the assumption I read, please let me know. I didn't want there to be a chance that this misunderstanding exists and not proactively address it.

>

> Respectfully,

>

> Jenn