

**Downtown Links 6/16/2008 Public Meeting
Comment Cards received (verbatim):**

1. Can a combined "03" Aviation option be presented with a "sine wave" option considering the reduced "sine wave" traffic load.
2. Present option "03" and include a 6th St. alignment. Present to CAC bottom line info – If money and "un-resolvable" or "impractical" resolutions or extra costs associated with compromise etc. Presenting "issues" is not an actionable response for CAC.
3. This presentation is clearly based towards 3D. It points out only the flaws of the other proposals and the virtues of 3D. It is not a fair or objective comparison. Maybe all of the plans should be given to a neutral 3rd party engineer to evaluate?
4. Thank you for the mailings on the Links meetings. Please have staff contact me regarding proposed plans of St. Mary's Rd. from Granada to I-10 and how it might affect my residence at 617 N. Brady Ave., west of Davis school. Thank you.
5. If 3D is adopted please consider a much larger DECK for pedestrian/ped connecting downtown and Dunbar Spring on 9th Ave. This could be a location for events such as the finale of the All Souls processions – a true Tucson gem.
6. Curved 6th St. option 3D looks great and I think will enhance Dunbar Springs. Great job!
7. Why is this necessary? Could Toole Ave., if hooked into Church/6th St. intersection, serve this purpose?
8. Win win = Terrence McMahon's design to make the CAC's original 6th St. alignment of 2006 work. Reason: - Keeps neighborhoods, warehouse, and arts district connected to downtown Tucson. – No historic buildings destroyed. – No lawsuits will be needed. – Important that TDOT realize RTA passed because CAC's have equal power.
9. In negotiations with the railroad was the noise issue of the train whistles addressed? I.e. install locking gates and the whistle does not need to be used. If so, what agreements were made? The noise level has been a concern for decades.
10. If the railroad is the issue for many alignments to be voted, it seems to me that railroad representatives should be present at these meetings to speak to these issues. Bearing that documents should be provided and

made public that show the railroad officials vexing alignments and requests.

11. I support the curved 6th (3D) option as the best available.
12. Curved 6th St. – Option 3D looks good. Get it done ASAP.
13. Do not build anything. As soon as this facility is built, it will need to be updated. Wait ten years to see if people are even driving cars. We should build roads and plan our infrastructure based on the future and not the current need.
14. Relocate the railroad tracks to the far south. Have them run parallel with I-10 or maybe even further south. Use the through way where these tracks are for the four-lane road. This will prevent problems in the future related to having a train rip through a downtown. Lower the total project cost, completely avoid disturbing current structures and makes the downtown safer! P.S. I believe this project is entirely over worked.
15. Please decide on the route ASAP; we need to get on with detailed design. Option 3D is the best – some access resolution at 6th Street is probably required (BICAS).
16. Pick the best one and get it built. The public has been waiting 25 years or so and years ago the City Council lost the state funding to finish the parkway. Leadership is needed, not delays.
17. From the rendering of new tremendous bike, ER connecting atop/over the sunken “Curved 3D” route, I believe “platinum bike status” could be possible for Tucson with the completion of this project.
18. The potential 9th Ave. pedestrian/bikeway looks positive and safe.
19. Overpasses: The advantage caters to traffic. We need to discourage more traffic through downtown. We do not want to be like Phoenix. Very unsightly. Dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. Not friendly.
20. The presentation was very informative, as were the before/after posters.
21. For over 10 years we’ve been promised that the alignment would not go north of 6th St., Toole has always been a better route, but subsequent constraints on the south side (court complex) have eliminated that option. Why has that been allowed to go forward with no consideration for the road alignment? I will be unhappy with any route north of 6th St.

22. I feel that insufficient study has been devoted to the following: Relative impacts of Terrence's (Terrence McMahon) study, + 6th street alignment (shoe fly), options for shoe fly for either 6th street alignment, drainage. These concerns are based on tonight's presentation and public comments. These issues need more public input and time.
23. More study is needed on Williams and Dane option 3. It could possibly work with sufficient public input!
24. - Glad overpass option is dead – very ugly.
- Really wish people not commenting was more enforced, so we could have seen all options in a reasonable amount of time.
- The Sixth Ave. curve is best. Let's go forward.
25. If you elect and build 3D the level of resentment generated in this insufficient and un-transparent process will hinder all aspects of the Downtown Links construction. I think this is a shame and you have forced 3D on an affected neighborhood and community (Dunbar-Spring and its residents, friends, allies, and fellow artists) without sufficient or in-good-faith process.
26. The comments I have read so far seem really confused, many blaming the sensible citizens of Tucson for rightly killing bad highway plans. Many seem to assume there is a need for another major highway, parkway, or roadway in downtown, rather than improvements to all the existing roads.

Several people have mentioned the Barraza-Aviation/Rt. 210 traffic. "Aviation highway level of through traffic..." What traffic? That road is HUGELY underutilized, especially north of 22nd. There is no need to connect any more highways to it. A parallel highway to I-10 running through downtown will not serve a purpose. Maybe an alternate route along the Rillito and Pantano, but not a short link cutting off downtown from the rest of the city. These plans will all kill downtown, even more dead than it is now!

So in a nutshell, here's a sensible plan to rejuvenate downtown.

- 1) Improve 22nd street and its Kino interchange and add a westbound exit from Aviation.
- 2) Finish Congress and Broadway, giving up on the failed two-lane, diagonal parking experiment and returning them to their previous configuration. Add some off-street parking garages for shoppers. We are fooling nobody by adding one or two spaces in front of downtown shops. Downtown businesses will not survive on a

couple more customers; they need dozens of more customers with decent sidewalks and bike lanes, not room for one or two more cars.

- 3) Finish the trolley and 4th Ave. underpass and then improve Toole Ave. from Broadway to the old TEP building (University Service Annex). If half the traffic from the new Downtown Links alignment goes that way, the new road would only need two lanes, not even four, never mind 110 feet of concrete canyon!
- 4) Then, all that will be needed for Sixth Street would be a modest 80 foot wide, four lane, 25 mph underpass that would fit in the already approved "thread the needle" design.

Fight the state regulations that mandate a larger road. Those requirements are designed to allow huge 40-foot double trucks to pass. Also, there is no need to replace the current dual 8'X10' drainage culverts with 10'X10' ones for \$22 million. Spend half the money and add a couple more retention basins to buffer the peak flow. Get creative, open up and clean up the Tucson Wash/Arroyo Chico for people to use and enjoy. Then they will be attracted to Downtown. A concrete canyon will never attract people.

Oh, and for all you who blame internal disputes: Wrong! The major reason the old Toole Ave. alignment failed was that the state withdrew from the project, influenced by Phoenix developers to work there instead. It was not NIMBYism, or Tucson's fault.

Come on people, get your heads out of the last century. At \$4/gallon for gas, and more predicted water shortages, Tucson is not growing to need a 110' wide major parkway cutting off downtown, further killing business there.

The three voters mentioned as for the new plan are not thinking about what will be good for themselves. The new "concrete canyon" plan will not rejuvenate downtown, 4th Ave. or keep traffic away from 22nd St. The new plan will kill commerce in downtown, 4th Ave. and cut off 22nd Street residents from everything except South Tucson.

For an example of another piece of concrete canyon engineering, look at Park Ave underpass. Ask the folks in the "Lost Barrio" about how that has improved their neighborhood. Another underutilized road to nowhere!

Get Phoenix out of Tucson! Build small, sensible set of roads, pedestrian and bike paths to increase access to downtown, not cut it off!

27. How much of Dunbar/Spring needs to be opposed to option 3D before it matters? 50%? 75%? 90%? More? Well, you're there. So now what...the public presentation was disappointing because nearly all questions asked of HDR were met with "I don't know" or "We'd have to look into that" The CAC really needs to use its power to ask if any of the "obstacles" on the alternating alignments can be made to work and how. From the audience's questions, it seems clear more thinking it needed. Overall, not a very thought-out presentation! And not at all providing the information requested at the May CAC meeting. When will there be time for this discussion and answering of questions, because it certainly wasn't tonight.
28. HDR should be giving us the information we need about all of the alternatives to be able to make an informed decision. Instead, the alternatives to 3D were casually dismissed with phrases like "we ran into issues" or "there would be considerable cost". It is abundantly clear that HDR and the transportation department have already decided what will be built and came prepared to dissuade and discredit all other options. What is being presented, as a democratic process is truly a farce!
29. Water is the issue of our age. Please use Dunbar-Spring Neighborhood as a model for the City of Tucson in its rainwater harvesting projects.
30. Alternatives are not being examined with enough detail to prove they wouldn't be usable. Dunbar Spring issues are being brushed aside. Process is being rushed and the voice of the citizens hushed. City consultant only found the negatives of the recent options and stopped short of the attributes or flexing to make them work.
31. Shame on you.
32. Support BICAS. Support bicycles. Spend money to get more people on bicycles so they can use their cars less. Cars (as they are) are not sustainable in the larger picture. Bicycles are. Build more bike paths.
33. 3D is still the best option, but please explore the "sine wave" alignments exhaustingly. Those options are appealing in terms of the lessened impact on buildings in the district.
34. Excellent presentations and exhibits. A genuine effort to provide information needed to evaluate options. Respectful of all attendees regardless of their comments or questions.
35. It seems clear that you are choosing to protect the large condo development to the south of the rail as well as future 4th Ave.

development potential over protecting our cherished neighborhood. We already live here! Stop pushing us apart and out.

36. Options 2, 3, and Sine Wave have less impact and should be explored further. All these have fewer community impacts than option 3D.

Downtown Links Comments via Email:

- 5/27/08 – Today's (5/27) front-page story in the Citizen by Teya Vitu should be of interest to everyone in our city. It is also a subject that KGUN should consider getting behind in an extended way, reporting what is going on with Rio Nuevo, perhaps on a weekly basis AND what is going on. The only way to make Rio Nuevo work is to take small steps (as in Vitu's story), then move on to larger things. What do you think?
Name: David Danby
- 6/12/08 – Some unsolicited observations and advice on Downtown Links public relations: I am an artist who lives and works in Dunbar/Spring, sits on the WAMO board, and owns property on the north edge of the proposed drainage way in "3D". That said, I'm trying to be pragmatic about the roadway, and really just wanted to chime in about how I've observed the team at work with the community.

I've been attending Downtown Links meetings for a couple of years and never cease to be amazed how the Downtown Links team makes things more difficult for itself. The quality of the presentations and communication with the community has been generally disappointing. Any neighborhood would react poorly to the huge dark line on the map representing the proposed roadway. Some subtlety in graphic communication, combined with some better verbal communication, would have made this process much easier for the team.

At the May meeting a public outcry for a more transparent process with regard to refining the alignment between 7th Ave. and Main resulted in a commitment from the CAC to review the various community alternatives to "3D" and provide public hearings (and one would assume adequate notice of said hearings).

At the June 9, CAC meeting, the alternatives were presented with only negative feedback from only a traffic-engineering standpoint. Other issues such as number of buildings demolished in the various alternatives were ignored. No attempt was made to show "pros" and "cons" which would have at least thrown a bone to the already skeptical community.

On top of this, some CAC members pushed to accelerate the vote without the promised public/neighborhood review and comment, further setting the CAC up as villains in this process. Setting the June 16th “public meeting” only a week later and inserting an extra CAC meeting only a week after will surely ruffle the feathers of those expecting the process to allow time for presentation to neighborhoods as outlined at the May meeting.

Finally, I personally believe that the “community park” on 9th Ave. was a passive aggressive (and futile) attempt by some to slow progress on the roadway, but the negative PR implications of fencing it in for “public safety” are obvious. Plus, now attention has been called to the extremely toxic nature of the soil to be excavated for the railroad underpass.

My common sense advice: consider your audience, and communicate clearly with them. And keep your word with regard to (additional) public input, even though the 3D option seems to be the way to go. Thanks for all you are trying to do, and for letting me chime in. I hope you take my comments in the constructive way they are intended.
Name: Dirk J. Arnold, Endangered Architecture

- 6/15/08 – I petition planning staff to restart the Downtown Links alternative alignment evaluation for that portion from 6th and 6th to the project’s west end. The taking of the Mat Bevel Institute garnered my attention. The building housing his kinetic art collection was identified in the Stone Corridor as a key part of a historic district. Alignment 3D cuts a swath right through Tucson’s Arts district which is a significant asset to those hopeful of a downtown revitalization. The amended portion of this project is not currently on the PAG 2008-2012 TIP and there would seem to be plenty of time to get this right.
Name: Fred Hartshorn