

**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
April 13, 2012

The following draft Public Facilities and Infrastructure goal and policies were generated based on comments provided by the Public Facilities and Infrastructure Working Group at the meeting of March 16, 2012. Please review and provide any observations or additional goals and/or policy ideas that are not still reflected on this draft. *Please print clearly.*

DRAFT GOAL AND POLICIES	COMMENTS
<p><b>GOAL:</b> Meet Tucson’s public facilities and infrastructure needs in a coordinated, cost-effective manner, focusing on the ability to resolve current deficiencies in serving underserved areas and maintaining the condition of existing facilities and infrastructure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not sure that coordination of (?) faculties and infrastructure is adjusted</li> <li>▪ Who decides the “greater” good?</li> <li>▪ Who gives word to build bridges or other infrastructure rather than having a political or emotional answer or question?</li> <li>▪ Who decides what the needs are?</li> <li>▪ How will “underserved” be defined?</li> <li>▪ Who decides priorities, who decides equity</li> <li>▪ What to keep, what to divest? *Reality first</li> <li>▪ Fair, sustainable funding source</li> </ul>
<p>1. Develop and maintain a Public Facilities and Infrastructure Asset Management Plan for current assets that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. maintains an inventory of assets (e.g., acquisition costs, original service life, remaining useful life, physical conditions, maintenance needs);</li> <li>b. comprehensively integrates financial strategies for the sustaining of assets;</li> <li>c. focuses on assets’ life cycles, specifically strategic points for maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement;</li> <li>d. focuses on public facilities and infrastructure that have a high risk of failure due to limited or deferred maintenance, age, and the largest community impact if failure occurs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Repurposing- What about fac. No longer necessary or did not meet expected needs?</li> <li>▪ Stop the gifting of public tax dollars to the private section – use public monies for public amenities – i.e. irresponsible if not illegal gifting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Depot restaurant subsidy</li> <li>○ Senior housing land giveaway on west side of Santa Cruz River</li> <li>○ El Campo land lease for 50 years(16 million) – many times the purchase price</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Who does this; who “integrates” the needs?</li> <li>▪ For the good of public, or good of staff?</li> <li>▪ How do you build the leadership that makes the requirements? How do you educate? Why not spend more on this?</li> <li>▪ How do you take buildings, structures out of service? How do you build the consensus to build “new” public buildings?</li> <li>▪ Look specifically at historic, or 50yrs+ buildings etc.</li> <li>▪ Lights turned out, or copper theft?</li> </ul>

**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
 Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
 April 13, 2012

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Where is source of funds?</li> <li>▪ How will this plan be used? Who will use it?</li> <li>▪ (?) (?) costly</li> <li>▪ What are the gaps? Future think?</li> <li>▪ Basic for funding</li> <li>▪ Prioritize building longer lasting infrastructure over short term</li> <li>▪ Annexed infrastructure costs will different – repurpose public and private infrastructure policy</li> <li>▪ Look at (?) multi-purpose 24hr use</li> <li>▪ Smaller government – not political, economic</li> <li>▪ Reduced level of service       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unavoidable-critical mass</li> <li>○ Cost outside our control and driving upward</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Revive economic engine (Let market decide? Encourage market/consumer forces – Homegrown/otherwise)       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Industry</li> <li>○ Manufacturing</li> <li>○ Research</li> <li>○ Tourism/History(1.Environment 2.History 3.Culture 4.Climate 5.Quality of life)</li> <li>○ “Anchor Tenants”</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ I thought COT DOT was already doing this for transportation infrastructure. Tucson water?</li> </ul>
--	---

**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
April 13, 2012

DRAFT GOAL AND POLICIES	COMMENTS
<p>2. Conduct a Public Facilities and Infrastructure Assessment for service expansions where significant infill is contemplated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. addresses documented disparities;</li> <li>b. includes a phasing plan with measurable progress;</li> <li>c. develops partnerships among all levels of government, the research community, other professional organizations, and private investors;</li> <li>d. facilitates the formation of assessment districts to finance new public facilities and infrastructure, upgrades, and maintenance;</li> <li>e. establishes investment priorities, based on level of service, innovative financial mechanisms, service delivery models promoting technology transfer and equity, and sustainable urban development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is assessment district? Good to include definition in glossary</li> <li>▪ What is “significant”?</li> <li>▪ Not sure what these are(referring to “d.”)</li> <li>▪ Possible? Lots of variables</li> <li>▪ Use money saved to – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Keep pools open in summer for kids</li> <li>○ Buy while cheap the Mervin’s closed dept store Broadway and Craycroft for midtown city hall and end lease? Of Diamond building? Next to Santa Cruz River.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Sustainability – if water is our gold, then why ½ our water is treated and then sent down the Santa Cruz River – and why 6500 for Rosemont mine?</li> <li>▪ Who does this? How do these things relate to advancing technology? Who makes the decisions and moves forward? Is there an “underlying” direction of commitment that the city was and follows, as a guideline?</li> <li>▪ This seems unlikely to be successful when greater community benefits, hard to convince property owners to pay for upgrades and maintenance (referring to “d.”)</li> <li>▪ Other funding options? Really like the assessment districts.</li> <li>▪ Inventory of gaps/shortfalls</li> <li>▪ Transportation departmental budgeting/ planning Transportation jurisdictions budgeting</li> <li>▪ Why? Restricted capital funding? Define what assessment districts could look like, i.e. non-geographic? (?) (?) districts –</li> <li>▪ Public service assessment first <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Private vs. public responsibility</li> <li>○ Golf ? Pools</li> <li>○ Trash service?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
April 13, 2012

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proactive vs. reactive actions             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Graffiti</li> <li>○ Weeds</li> <li>○ Roads</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Sustainable means what gets spent is based upon what comes in, or what we create for ourselves</li> <li>▪ Bad policy – Must live within our means</li> <li>▪ Conduct integrated Urban Form facilities waste, to identify opportunities to reduce infrastructure needs.</li> <li>▪ Develop CIP plan to achieve maximum reduction in facilities capacities.</li> <li>▪ Do not plan for facility expansion beyond projected, current revenue sources</li> </ul>
<p>3. Elected officials and the community are to be provided with clear information on public facilities and infrastructure assessments and management and their impact on the community for informed decision-making processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Move city’s parks and recreation out of Reid Park to make more park for public–Move it to land east of Alvernon and north of D.M. drainage channel</li> <li>▪ Elected officials support whatever gets them elected – PGT protects highly important</li> </ul>



**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
April 13, 2012

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Work backwards- What does the group not want for the city and from its government?</li>   <li>▪ Promote alternate modes</li>   <li>▪ Develop comprehensive assessment of opportunities to reduce need for public infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Don't want second class city</li> <li>▪ Don't want micromanagement</li> <li>▪ Don't want to be like Phoenix – Uniqueness Character</li> <li>▪ Don't want to lose history</li> <li>▪ Don't want business as usual</li>   <li>▪ Complete streets</li> <li>▪ Bike blvds</li> <li>▪ Sidewalk network</li> <li>▪ Bus network</li>   <li>▪ Examine (?) between urban (?) to identify opportunities for reductions in capacity</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainability separate topic, now included in planning – Walkable, bikeable improvements for existing neighborhoods</li> <li>▪ Community gardens – don't replace parks however</li>   <li>▪ The new PAG building – has data shown it to be cost-effective?</li>   <li>▪ A lot cheaper to build bike path to UofA from 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., downtown than \$200million streetcar or multimillion dollar snake + basket bike bridge no one uses.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Also a park and bike route from El Con to UofA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each provider shall evaluate existing and future service needs. Each shall estimate the cost of new service needs every two years.</li> </ul>

**SMART GROWTH FOCUS AREA:  
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Draft Goal and Policies – Exercise Worksheet**

Responses  
April 13, 2012

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop a coordinated water service and conservation plan among the water providers.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developers shall pay the full cost of onsite improvements and of impact on demand for water, sewer, and roads</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Who authorized the very low use parking garages near the Congress Hotel (Chris Layton?) – Where are the stats to justify such huge an expenditure (17million + 6million)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Also smaller buses – that cost a lot less</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Strengthen Access Management (revisit MS&amp;R)</li> <li>▪ Systematically eliminate all public subsidies for additional infrastructure demand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Allow neighborhood access to business w/o getting on major streets</li> <li>▪ Remove curb cuts during redevelopment and/or rezonings</li> <li>▪ Reserving R/W good idea but allow parking variations to address utility of parcel</li> <li>▪ Develops standard for services to existing infrastructure use</li> <li>▪ Require “voluntary” impact fees for 100% cost recovery of all public infrastructure expansion beyond minimum required to provide adopted loss for existing infrastructure users</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support Transit Oriented Development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land use along major transit corridors should be intensified</li> </ul>