



**GRANT ROAD CORRIDOR PLANNING TASK FORCE**  
**THURSDAY, October 19, 2017, at 5:30 p.m.**  
**Donna R. Liggins Recreation Center**  
**2160 North 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue**  
**Tucson, Arizona 85705**

**\*REVISED\* Legal Action Report & Meeting Summary**

\*

[*Note: This document was prepared using audio recording of meeting as primary resource.*]

---

**1. Introductions**

---

Rebecca Ruopp, City of Tucson Planning and Development Services Department (PDS), acting as the meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order shortly after 5:30 p.m. A quorum was established and information handouts were distributed to the Task Force.

**Citizen Task Force Members**

Present		Absent
John Anderson	Alice Roe	Roy Garcia
Deirdre Brosnihan	Beverly Rutter	Jim Hogan
Dale Calvert	David Sunderman	Linda Marie Small
Andrew Jones	Robert Tait	John Wakefield
Shannon McBride-Olson		Moon Joe Yee

---

**2. Introductions**

---

*Discussion held. No action taken.*

The Task Force and the Project Team introduced themselves. Project Team members present included:

- Daniel Bursuck, COT PDS
- Rebecca Ruopp, COT PDS
- David Burbank, COT Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)
- Jim Rossi, COT Real Estate Division

Staff also invited members of the public in attendance to introduce themselves.

---

**3. Review & Approve Revised March 2, 2017, Meeting Summary**

---

Task Force Member *Alice Roe* moved and Task Force Member *John Anderson* seconded that the meeting summary of March 2, 2017, be approved. The motion was approved by a voice vote of 9 – 0.

---

**4. Department of Transportation Update** (included Construction of Phase 2; Remnant Parcels in Phases 1&2; Call to the Audience)

---

*Discussion held. Action taken related to confirmation re proceeding with basin amenities. Note: Slides 4 – 19 of the PowerPoint presentation related to the Transportation Update. PowerPoint presentation can be found at [https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/pdsd/projects/Grant-Road/Presentation\\_to\\_Grant\\_Road\\_Taskforce\\_Meeting\\_10.19.17.pdf](https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/pdsd/projects/Grant-Road/Presentation_to_Grant_Road_Taskforce_Meeting_10.19.17.pdf)*

**4a. Construction of Phase 2**

*David Burbank, TDOT Project Manager for Grant Road Corridor Improvement Project, reviewed the status of the construction for Phase 2 of the project. Using PowerPoint slides 6 - 14, Mr. Burbank reviewed the milestones to date; work completed to date; current work; future construction activities; basin amenities; and update on Phases 3&4 (Palo Verde to Swan).*

Basin Amenities: In talking about the detention basin being constructed, David Burbank explained that the order for the amenities specified for the basin, as part of the overall approved plan for Phase 2, had been put on hold due to some issues that had been raised by the public. Mr. Burbank went on to explain that before placing the order for the amenities, the project team would like to hear whether the Task Force still supported the amenities. *[Shown on PowerPoint slide #13 as steel edging; pre-manufactured bench; shade structure and foundation; precast concrete picnic table; bottle refilling station; and brick pavers.]*

Task Force Discussion on Basin Amenities: *Facilitator* posed the question to the Task Force and indicated that through a consensus process, the Task Force should indicate whether team should proceed with the ordering of the amenities or not.

*Task Force Member:* Asked if the Task Force could be filled in on why there were controversies regarding the amenities.

*Facilitator:* Responded that she believed some of the issues had come up before, but that there were members of the public who asked that the amenities not be installed and that the funding for the amenities be used for walls or landscaping elsewhere. The understanding is that any monies saved from not proceeding with the amenities would go back into the project, but couldn't be specified for anything in particular. The RTA has provided in writing confirmation that RTA funds cannot be spent on noise walls, unless warranted, or on screening walls.

*Task Force Member asked* whether this was the area about which there were some questions about the type of sun shade.

*Facilitator* responded "yes," and went on to say that the Task Force might remember that some years ago there were a number of meetings regarding this issue [basin]. She then indicated a display board at the front of room that showed a rendering of the basin with landscaping and amenities.

*Task Force Member* asked if the Task Force had ever come to any kind of resolution whether there were going to be shade structures rather than the canvas flappy type – or a more permanent type.

*Project Manager:* The shade structures will be the canvas type.

*Task Force Member* thought that the Task Force had come to a consensus that we were not fans of canvas and thought that fewer, permanent structures would be preferred.

*Task Force Member* thought canvas would not last too long.

*Task Force Member* noted that in original meeting Task Force had asked questions about colors, whether the shade structures were metal, whether the benches were precast concrete and how many, where the brick pavers are located.

*Project Manager* responded that brick pavers were in picnic table area and noted that's where the shade structure would be as well.

*Task Force Member* questioned whether the brick pavers had a long life.

*Project Manager* indicated that brick pavers being used are salvaged

*Task Force Member* said, "Oh, so you are reusing them?"

*Project Manager* responded, "Yes."

*Task Force Member* asked if the brick pavers would be set in concrete.

*Project Manager* responded, "no."

*Task Force Member* remembers the same of discussion about whether project should go forward with shade structures. Indicated Task Force members were concerned about the longevity of the type of material.

*Facilitator* asked whether that was everybody's memory.

*Task Force Member* stated concept of having amenities was approved, but the type of amenities wasn't approved.

*Task Force Member* thought, in terms of the type of amenities, Task Force was going to defer to the neighborhood that was right next to it and would be using it as a park and that they would get input. Now if they don't want it and think they will get the money for something else that's another matter. This is part of the public process for the public roadway. It's an amenity needed for the visual look for everybody who drives by; it's not just theirs.

*Task Force Member* asked if there was a sketch or diagram.

*Facilitator* showed rendering displays.

*Task Force Member* indicated that there previously had been discussion about the number of benches, and a discussion of the concrete area. Is that now brick pavers?

*Project Manager* clarified.

*Task Force Member* asked if the plan was now just down to the two shade structure.

*Project Manager* responded, "Yes."

*Task Force Member* asked what the material was in a particular section of the basin.

*Project Manager* said it was stabilized decomposed granite.

*Task Force Member* asked if it has to be ADA compliant.

*Project Manager* responded, "Yes."

*Task Force Member* wondered if now at this point it was shade structures that are fabric sails

### **Task Force Input on Whether to Proceed with Basin Amenities**

*Facilitator* asked each member of the Task Force to share what their thoughts on whether to proceed with the amenities for the detention basin.

Task Force Members:

- I agree with what was just said; the only real issue at this point is the shade structures. Yes, I think we want to keep the amenities. The RTA has a long history starting back with the very first project that they weren't going to put walls in unless they met sound ordinances, and they have steadfastly refused to do that for twelve years, so I think we better take what we can get. The other side to it is I am willing to say that I think maybe we ought to see if we can delay and see if we can make a permanent structure rather than a fabric shade structure. I don't know whether that's doable – can be found in the budget, because I expect a permanent structure is more expensive, but I think we ought to throw that question back to the City and see what they can come up with. But as far as the other amenities, I support them.
- Support them; think we have to have them.
- Should be more stable structure.
- Definitely think we should have amenities, but just go back and revisit the type of shade structures.
- Agree with amenities. Have concerns about bricks, but guess reasonable where it is. Highly doubt the shade structure -- the canvas -- is over the long term any less expensive than metal structure. Pay now or pay later; you're going to pay.
- Abstained because he wasn't part of the original basin discussion.
- Support the idea of doing a more permanent shade structure; would be less maintenance for the City later on. Don't love the brick; understand you're reusing it. The exchange of the stone wall and the other amenities -- that would be on the other side of the road - correct? *[Another Task Force member responded that it would be farther down the road, but on the same side of the road.]* You put it in a public art piece recently. That's area where homes were removed and it's pretty exposed. Do you have landscaping plans to help screen the neighborhoods? *Project Manager* responded that landscaping would be installed there. *Ms. Brosnihan* indicated that's the area where walls come up. *[Another Task Force Member said that the proper term is "neighborhood protection walls;" not a sound wall.]*
- In agreement that the amenities are needed. My recollection from the discussions is that the contractor was pushing the idea that this was the sort of shade structure that was used further west on Grant and they wanted continuity of look and feel. But considering that there are only two in this park, I don't see that that's really going to make any difference, and if there's a more permanent material that can be used than canvas or screen, it's going to be more permanent / less costly in the long run.
- Agree with everybody else. My point on the shade structure is that when we had that meeting, we were saying that the rain or the wind or somebody with a pocket knife – all it would take would be 5 minutes and that thing would be destroyed. So something

more permanent has got to be looked at whether it's aluminum or something else – there are all kinds of possibilities

Consensus Reached on Basin Amenities: At the conclusion of the Task Member input, the *Facilitator* summarized that there was a consensus on the amenities, with a request that the shade structure materials be reconsidered for something more permanent. *Project Manager* agreed to look into, and *Facilitator* said staff would let Task Force know results.

*[Note: Member of Audience asked whether they could speak. Facilitator said that they could speak at the First Call to the Audience. Member objected saying that the decision was already made. Facilitator explained that the Task Force was confirming a decision already made.]*

#### Task Force Additional Questions and Observations:

- Asked about the elevation of the detention basin exit pipe. *Project Manager* described where pipe would be located. *Task Force Member* then asked whether the detention basin was truly a detention basin. *Project Manager* responded that's if it's less than a heavy rain event, it will act as a detention basin.
- Asked if amenities are not acquired, whether the money just goes back into the general fund. *Project Manager* responded that was what staff had been told. *Task Force Member* asked if that mean any place along Grant Road where it was decided a long time ago that amenities were going to happen, that those funds can't be used in any kind of creative way. *Task Force Member* went on to say an amenity is an amenity whether it's a picnic table in a park or a screening wall. *Facilitator* noted that RTA had said they would not fund screening walls. *Task Force Member* asked what if the money was not used for screening walls, but for some other kind of amenity whatever it might be? Is this list up here it *[indicating the list presented in PowerPoint slide #13]*, either for this portion of the project or some future portion? *Project Manager* said that the future portion had not been determined yet, but in this case there is a contract in place, and it's really difficult to switch. *[Facilitator noted that the Task Force has asked that the shade structures be looked at, and indicated that the Project Manager would need to determine whether there is a shade structure that would be more permanent that would fit in the budget.]*
- Memory was that contractor came in with one option, which was the canvas or fabric shade structure, and that the majority of Task Force members weren't excited about the option, but there were no other options given at the time.
- Memory is that originally the remnant parcel didn't really exist – that there were only five homes, but Task Force came to the conclusion that taking all twelve homes and turning it into a basin to solve the problem of storm drainage was needed in the area. Said the amenities weren't included from the very beginning, so wondered if it was always in the budget to have shade structures at the basin location. *Facilitator* responded that it evolved; that her memory was that there was some concern about the basin being too stark. *Task Force Member* agreed and went on to say that the funds were found for the amenities, but if they went away it would just be plain land, clean and simple. Guess the amenities would help.
- The 30% plans didn't include the basin. When the engineer was designing the 60% plans, came to the realization that there was a flooding problem in front of the McDonald's, and he came back with a proposal and it was added into the plan at that

time, and then it was bid after the 100%. My memory is that people felt it was very empty and they were trying to figure out how to dress it up a bit.

- Remember there being general public input that they would like it to be a park. I am sure it would be in the Grant Road Task Force minutes. *Facilitator* said staff would look at minutes.

Phase 3&4 Update: *Project Manager* continued presentation reviewing Phases 3 & 4 (Palo Verde to Swan) progress and schedule. Noted that 60% plans were expected by January of 2018. Concluded by saying the construction period would be Fiscal Year 2023 – 2025.

#### Task Force Additional Questions and Observations re Transportation Issues:

- Will there be a chance to discuss 60% plans? *PDSD staff* noted that they were anticipating holding a Task Force meeting in early 2018 at which the 60% plans and the next UOD update could be presented.
- Driving down Grant Road see there are all these bus pullouts that cars whiz by, people are sitting in a cloud of dust, and there is construction equipment inches behind them. Is there a better, potentially safer way for these people to have perhaps a portable bus station? The people further down at 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue in front of the Fry's are sitting ducks. Is there another, safer way to handle these bus stops? *Project Manager* said staff has looked at it every which way and eliminated the mid-block crossing at which people would have to cross traffic to get to the other side. Trying to accelerate the sidewalk to help alleviate the situation. *Task Force Member* wondered if it would be problem to get some of the blue cactus bus shelters and move them during construction to where they are needed to help protect people from cars. *Project Manager* responded that those shelters built from scratch are \$7,000.
- Asked about using temporary Jersey barriers at the bus stops. *Project Manager* said they would look at.
- Asked if the 2023 – 2025 schedule for Phase 3&4 was pushed back from when it was originally scheduled. *Project Manager* responded that he believes so though he had just started working for the City in January. When are they talking about real estate acquisition? Pointed out RTA expires in 2026. *City Real Estate Division Representative* responded saying that the City was currently beginning acquisition on Phases 3&4. Explained there's not a full influx of money to allow City to buy every property. City is strategizing; trying to spend without going over budget for next eighteen months.
- Asked if City expected after eighteen months acquisition would continue until construction start. *Real Estate Representative* explained City has \$7,000,000 to spend until the next Fiscal Year, which is July 2018; then believe there is a similar amount for the next six months. Don't get a double digit million dollar influx of money until 2019. Looking at possibly acquiring properties adjacent to buildings that are not directly impacted by project, which could provide parking and access and leave certain buildings in place to try and stretch available funding as far as we can stretch it.
- Asked about time frame for Phases 5&6. *Project Manager* said design work for Phases 5&6 hasn't begun. (Another *Task Force Member* said 2023 -2025 was the previous time period for Phases 5&6.)

- In neighborhood between Tucson Boulevard and Country Club and in Phase 6, there has been a recent acquisition of a property a little east of Treat. What is going on? *City Real Estate Representative* explained that was an advance acquisition request that went to Mayor and Council, and the Real Estate Division received direction to proceed. *Task Force Member* said this was way out there, what were they doing that for? Nobody told the Task Force or the neighborhood; had been told acquisition wouldn't start until 2024. *City Real Estate Division Representative* explained there is an advance acquisition manual that qualifies people for advance acquisitions. There was a point at which City said no more full acquisitions because of timing, funding, potential delays. But just prior to the RTA and City of Tucson saying they weren't going to spend any more money on full acquisitions, a couple of property owners had gone to Mayor and Council for consideration, and Mayor and Council directed staff to proceed with full acquisition. In looking at building on one property, City staff determined that it was going to be expensive to maintain building, so decision was to demolish it. *Task Force Member* noted that the neighborhood was now left with a vacant property and wondered what would happen given that the Phases 5&6 won't be undertaken for a long time.
- Question about the time line being extended.
- *Task Force Member*, who indicated he had been with the Task Force since the beginning, said that when the recession hit the budget got thrown out the window. Every year there is less sales tax than expected, so time line gets pushed back.

#### **4b. Remnant Parcels in Phases 1&2**

*Jim Rossi, City of Tucson Real Estate Division*, provided an update on the disposition of the remnants from parcels that were acquired for the roadway project for Phases 1&2. During the discussion Mr. Rossi referred to PowerPoint slide 17, which presents a map of the remnant parcels for Phase 2. He noted that all the remnant parcels in Phase 1 have either been sold or traded.

Following is a summary of what Mr. Rossi explained regarding the Phase 2 remnant parcels, with each parcel being referred to by map number.

Parcel 1 [south side of \*Grant\*] - Going to go up for open bid; quite a few interested parties. Should be opening sealed bids in November [2017].

Parcel 2 [south side of \*Grant\*] - A parcel that was going to be set aside for an RFP/RFQ process through the Planning and Development Services Department. The adjacent former Harley Davidson property is now being marketed a bit more intensely now that the roadway is under construction. If owner gets a good offer and needs some additional area, City is going to discuss and bring back to Task Force the possibility of working with the broker and whoever is bidding on that property to see if we can do a joint sale for a larger, higher quality development by assembling the parcels.

Parcel 3 [north side of \*Grant\*] - A small remnant property; it is not developable on its own. City has approached the adjacent property owners, but have had no luck in convincing them to buy that property.

Parcel 4 [north side of \*Grant\*] - Will be marketed to the general public. Parcel not being actively marketed right now. Until the north side starts taking shape, City is going to hold off pursuing bids. Will put up a "For Sale" sign.

Parcel 6 [north side of \*Grant\*] - At Fontana. Have a verbal agreement to sell that remnant parcel. Parcel doesn't have any direct access off either Fontana or Grant Road.

Parcel 7 [north side of \*Grant\*] - Is similar to Parcel 3. City is approaching adjacent property owners about buying this surplus property.

Parcel 5 [south side of \*Grant\*] - Another property to go through RFP/RFQ process. Have had a couple of inquiries recently. If somebody gets to a point are serious about it, will bring it back to Task Force.

Parcel 8 [south side of \*Grant\*] - Put on market early and received some low ball bids. Kept it on the market; received two offers. Last month Mayor and Council approved the sale of it to an Asian restaurant operator.

Parcel 9 [south side of \*Grant\*] - Combination zoned parcel. Have not strategized a marketing plan yet.

Parcel 10 – [south side of \*Grant\*] - Another RFP/RFQ parcel, about which Real Estate Division is getting input from Planning and Development Services Department.

*[Other parcels]*

Parcels between Park and Santa Rita on South Side of \*Grant\* – Areas that are in public right-of-way will be landscaped by project. The remnant pieces will not be landscaped by project. There is a movement to get some money to develop some park-like amenities on those properties. The City has agreed with the RTA to not market those properties until Phase II is substantially complete. At this point in time those properties are on the shelf waiting to see if funding becomes available to create the park amenities. If the funding becomes available, the City is committed to working with the RTA to allow those amenities to go in. *Task Force Member* asked about the size of these properties. *City Real Estate Division Representative* responded 36,000 sf per block. *Task Force Member* asked about dimensions. *Member of Audience* responded that they were 42' x 350'. *Real Estate Division Representative* said that sounded a reasonable range. *Task Force Member* asked about the zoning. *Real Estate Division Representative* responded that it is NR1.

#### Task Force Questions and Observations:

- *Is it possible to spend RTA funds outside of the right-of-way. Concerned about Parcels 3 & 7 that don't seem to be attracting much interest. Asked if while City has a landscape contractor, irrigation, and grading equipment out there, could they tidy those spots up, put down some DG [decomposed granite]. Project Manager responded that he didn't know the answer, but could research and get back.*

#### 4c. First Call to the Audience

Minette Burgess: Talked about the Grant Road Coalition Central Segments, which she explained was an organization formed to assist the City in complying with the original Vision for the Grant Road Improvement Project. Noted there's a lot of good language in that document about how this process should happen and how to involve the neighborhoods. Explained Coalition is primarily involved between 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Tucson Boulevard, which is area designated as the "Central Segments" in the Vision document. Those are the primary R1 zoning along Grant Road. Jefferson Park, which is a portion of that, is zoned NR1, which is the Neighborhood Protection Zone. So then we have the greater concern about protecting the neighborhood. Last spring the Coalition came up



with a recommendation and a proposal – “Grant Road Heritage Landscape Corridor.” It’s a document presented to RTA, but apparently didn’t get to Task Force. It’s on Coalition website. (*Note: Task Force Members indicated they received link, but couldn’t print out. City staff said they could provide hard copies.*) Speaker then described the boundaries of the neighborhoods within the area represented by the Coalition, including Jefferson Park Neighborhood, Samos Neighborhood, Grant-Campbell Neighborhood, and Catalina Vista. Those are the neighborhoods that make up the Grant Road Coalition, and the Coalition has proposed the Grant Road Heritage proposal. Went on to say the remnant lots that the City wants to sell are lots that are not viable to those neighborhoods. These lots are subject to challenge by a future owner to change the zoning because the future owner potentially will say that these lots are not viable for R1. Coalition seeks to have the remnants turned into an urban linear park. Have a commitment from the RTA that it will waive the funds from the City. We’re working with the City. We’re trying to make the Vision happen. It’s important in the age of urban development that neighborhoods are respected in terms of influencing what happens around them. This is why we are going back to the Vision document and saying this is what was envisioned; we want the City to do what it says it is going to do. In addition, the Coalition has thought out Grant Road and the City has actually applied for grants – two different grants to provide these amenities. The City has an entity known as Tucson Clean and Beauty that is devoted to those goals; they are willing and able to take over the properties as long as it is maintained as a park. There was for a long time a misconception among a lot of people that there was a law that the remnants had to be sold. So asked what is this law. It turned out there was no law of any kind. There is an RTA policy that if you can sell the property, we’ll get our money back. Wish you would review our proposal. This parkway would start at 1<sup>st</sup> and Grant -- this is the basin, which came on late in the project. Our idea was to continue the park throughout this section and then as road continues to continue on north side down to Tucson Boulevard. Those are the primary residentially zoned properties. We would be happy to talk to any of you after this meeting or whenever it’s appropriate.

*[Note: Facilitator noted that Coalition provides dates of their meetings to staff, and staff forwards that information to Task Force]*

Joan Daniels: Like to think carefully about the word “amenities.” In terms of the basin the Coalition two years ago (you can go on line and see it) talked with the businesses around there about what they thought of the park. They said there is no parking lot. So we talked to the former Project Manager and asked if there was a parking lot. Response was “no.” Then who is it for? Just for the people who are right there, or is it for the neighborhood to walk? If you driving by, what’s an amenity. Is a bench an amenity, or more landscaping? If neighborhood feels landscaping is better buffer, then give it to the people who are there because other people can’t get there. Then there is concern about transients. The theme of the linear park – and we’ve dealt with Banner on this, too – is that people need to get out and walk. We’re talking about a linear park that allows people to walk and bike and have the landscape. The big canvas thing; who can go use it? Wish you would revisit that.

Pete Chalupsky: The intersection at 1<sup>st</sup> and Grant has lots of problems with pedestrians crossing. 15% of our residents who don’t own cars, and they are trying to get to the grocery store, and I am getting lots of reports. Would put a fire under the contractor. Not sure what can be done; perhaps carrying flags.

*Audience Member [name missed]:* This is a very pedestrian area now. Neighborhood people walk all the time. Pedestrians aren't taken into account on this project. Are there going to be trees? The neighborhood needs to be protected from the pollution and dust. I know there are not going to be walls, but are there going to be trees or is it all shrubs? *Project Manager* responded that there will be trees. *Audience Member* asked if there would be enough to make it shady. Have picnic tables out there; whose going to go sit there? *Project Manager* responded the shade structure sits over the picnic tables. *Audience Member* responded that it's in the middle of a huge, unfriendly area; feel it would be nice to know how many trees there are going to be.

*Audience Member [name missed]:* Don't know what obligation the City or the RTA has to be transparent about their budget and schedule. Really concerned about change in schedule. If Phase II gets done in 2018 and the next one doesn't start until 2023, that's five years. What's going on in the project? Is it just real estate acquisitions happening in that period? Think it's unreasonable for that to not be more transparent. *[Note: Facilitator said that she would recommend that a future Grant Road update include an explanation of the changes in the timeline. Audience Member asked about also providing budget. Facilitator said she would ask about.]*

*Audience Member [name missed]:* Please consider that air pollution has risen like crazy. Live on Edison. It's not only noisier, there's lots of pollution. People who live next to freeways don't live as long as other people. Please put a lot of trees if you can't do a wall. A berm would be really nice. Thinking basin should turn into a little arroyo with trees on outside and inside.

---

**5. Grant Road (Oracle to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue) – Land Use Planning** *(included UOD Status Update; Feedback from Public and Task Force Members; Feedback from Internal Review; Next Steps; Call to the Audience)*

---

*Discussion held. No action taken. Note: Slides 20 - 34 of PowerPoint presentation related to the Land Use Planning. PowerPoint presentation can be found at [https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/pdsd/projects/Grant-Road/Presentation\\_to\\_Grant\\_Road\\_Taskforce\\_Meeting\\_10.19.17.pdf](https://www.tucsonaz.gov/files/pdsd/projects/Grant-Road/Presentation_to_Grant_Road_Taskforce_Meeting_10.19.17.pdf)*

**5a. Feedback from Public and Task Force Members**

*Daniel Bursuck, Planning and Development Services Department, provided an update on the Urban Overlay District (UOD). Began with reminding Task Force what the purpose of a UOD is. [Slide #21]*

*Recap of UOD effort to date. [Slide #22]*

Regarding the public review of the draft UOD, received comments from 5 people, some Task Force members and some others, for a total of 79 comments; all are posted at <https://www.tucsonaz.gov/pdsd/grant-road-land-use-planning>. Mr. Bursuck provided an overview of the comments:

- Re Group Homes – UOD should not stray from the current policy to require a special exception for group homes.
- Re Historic Preservation Zone & Neighborhood Preservation Zone Regulations: Currently there aren't such designations in area between Oracle Road and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue,

but feedback was to leave regulations in UOD in case there are such designations in the future.

- Re Adaptive Reuse: There should be a clear definition of adaptive reuse and should account for 2 points. There is a point structure for sustainable options that needs to be met to get an approved application; one is for adaptive reuse.
- Re Term “Story”: Remove use of “story” and replace with exact height.
- Re Historic – Be careful about not putting too much emphasis on historic, could lead to lack of creative design / innovation.
- Re Reliance on Landscaping for Screening and Shade: While landscaping may provide some visual barriers, it needs to be maintained and takes a while for it to grow and become mature. Additionally, doesn’t block a lot of noise; does provide some noise mitigation.... TDOT concerned about long-term maintenance. Looking at other ways to provide shade.
- Re Pervious Pavement: Concern about cost to maintain pervious pavement.
- Re Establishments that Serve Alcoholic Beverages with No Protection: Majority of zones in the area of the UOD, currently allow serving of alcoholic beverages.
- Re Balconies: Some comments said that balconies should be allowed because they break up vertical mass of a multi-story building; other comments raised concern about behavioral issues and having balconies facing residential areas.
- Re Best Practice Options: Remove best practice option. Seen as a loop hole. Mr. Bursuck explained this was more of an innovative strategy -- not something necessarily in our code, but something being practiced elsewhere in the country. Would go to the design professional, who would review option to see if it makes sense for the project.
- Re Non-exact Language: Concern about non-exact language such as “may” and “reasonable.”

## **5b. Feedback from Internal Review**

Mr. Bursuck provided a high level overview of how an overlay is approved. Explained it was sort of like a rezoning process though shorter. Applicant submits the UOD application to a Design Review Committee. Gets the initial application approved, including the design and whatever kind of flexibility wanted. Once that’s completed, development package is submitted for zoning review and sent to PDSO for plans review. Once that approval is received, building plans are submitted. Staff has mapped out the entire process and found several ways to make it easier on the applicant, the public, and staff. Found there was a breakdown in communication and things would be missed and when project started to be built it wasn’t exactly like what was in elevation. So staff is building in processes so that everything that is approved makes it all the way through the process. Internal findings included:

- Need to standardize the overlay document as much as possible. There could be something similar along Broadway, maybe Grant Road Phases 3&4; need to make sure we aren’t reviewing for lots of different overlay documents.
- Repurpose existing Design Review Board with ad hoc neighborhoods members. Staffing lots of different Design Review Board may be difficult, so figuring out how

to take existing Design Review Board and then having ad hoc neighborhood members from local area to be part of committee.

- To address breakdown in communication, looking at changing review model.
- Looking at Project Manager model, where someone shepherds the project through the entire process.
- Provide checklist for applicants to make sure everything is being reviewed for.
- Ensure that everything in document are things we can review for.

*Mr. Bursuck* then reviewed how some of these issues would be included in the next draft of the UOD.

### **5c. Next Steps**

*Mr. Bursuck* noted that key anticipated steps included: staff completion of revisions to the Draft UOD based on the public and internal review comments; distribution of the revised draft UOD to the public in December 2017 for an approximately one-month review period (may be adjusted to accommodate holidays); staff review of the comments received during the public review period; and the return to the Task Force with a revised UOD document in January 2017. *Mr. Bursuck* thought this would be about the same time as the 60% plans are ready for review.

### **5d. Second Call to the Audience**

Nobody asked to speak at the second Call to the Audience.

---

## **6. Task Force Round Table**

---

*Discussion held. No action taken.*

- One thing that concerned me was the transparency of the flexing of the dates. Think there needs to be some discussion about that. There is also an issue that is not being talk about a lot, which is where the RTA is going; are they going to make the budget? If they are not going to make the budget, how does that fit in with the reauthorization? I think that anybody involved in this process should take the strong position that any projects not finished should be the first projects of the new RTA. It's technically ten years down the road, but needs to start five years in advance, so they should be start talking about reauthorization in the next three to four years. And I think what you are seeing here with the timeline is directly related to that discussion.
- I totally agree. I am just really concerned that we have stretched this out. There are many good reasons for it, but all of a sudden as the public -- we do represent the public -- we are kind of blindsided.
- How long does it really take to build a road? Moves with such incremental slowness. *Task Force Member* addressed audience and thanked them for sharing comments during the Call to the Audience; helps to have people keep our feet to the fire and keep us on task and subject. As personnel shifts and make-up of our committee, sometimes directions can shift and we need to be aware of that and keep us true to that Vision statement, which was originally move the progress of Grant Road -- a beautiful road, a safe road, a road for all kinds of users -- pedestrians, bicyclists,

something that had wonderful features. From time to time we need to say we really need to take a look at the Vision.

- That was a lot of what I was going to say. Thanked the audience.
- Phoenix has done twelve intersections on the 101 in less time than it takes us to do one. Just blown away at this whole concept that now it's literally 2028/2030. Grant Road is getting more and more risky to live on, work in, walk on. I have TPD constantly. I'm devastated. Let's do it like Speedway; let's get it done; I'm tired of the Grant Road project.
- Well I've been on the other side of the table before as a consultant. Lived in the Grant Road reach for 27 years; been a consultant for 20 years. Part of the challenge to the City's credit is that it takes the neighborhood input very seriously. Most communities don't do that. It's a challenge to bring neighborhood voices forward. Consultants lose sight, project managers change out.... From where I sit, the City does an honest job of trying to include neighborhood input. When you are trying to force a six-lane road through a neighborhood, continue to carry traffic, and not interrupt utility service, it's quite a challenge. We ran out of money; there was no money, which of course is going to delay something as expensive as this. Second point, and with complete respect to the Coalition. I love landscape and I think landscape is a great amenity. I am on the Task Force to represent alternative modes. I've seen how fraught with danger pedestrians lives are – the deaths have doubled as compared to last year. Drivers just are not looking for pedestrians. Don't think anybody is going to want to walk or bike next to a six-lane noisy thoroughfare. Concerned about the vision. Mixed use or a more urban feel provides a safer environment for pedestrians.
- We've run out of money for the later phases, so the next issuing of the RTA has to start with those. I think it would be a beneficial to get a more detailed response on why this shift has happened, whether it's budget, utilities and how it will affect later phases. There was some talk of budget – and that should make it out to us. And protection of the neighborhood is a valid point. Finding ways to preserve the feel and integrity of our neighborhoods.
- Did a good job on UOD presentation. Understand how good a UOD can be to help development go in a good creative way – that is good for everyone. It helps sell properties and make nice, walkable places.
- One of the disadvantages of being the last one to talk is everybody stole my thunder.

*Facilitator:* For this next meeting it might be helpful to have someone talk about the timeline. We'll try to get something out before.

---

## **7. Adjournment**

---

Approximately 7:45 p.m.