

FROM: Grant Road Coalition co-chair, Jefferson Park, Joan Daniels

TO: Grant Road Citizen's Task Force

13 June 2021

On behalf of the neighbors in Jefferson Park and the coalition I wish to thank the Task Force for requesting community input at the 30% stage of the project. Additionally we appreciate the traffic engineers' response.

A. PHASE 5/6 and the CENTRAL SEGMENTS- THIS IS NOT THE SAME GAME. No other section of the Grant Road project has long stretches of private homes being destroyed and others exposed to the 6 lane highway. The 5/6 plan must allow for a greater sensitivity to private citizens, their property values, their quality of life, and the long-term effect on our city's sense of community.

These inner city neighborhoods spent years of advocacy and personal donations to create neighborhood plans, establish Historic Districts, and Preservation Zones all in the pursuit of quality and preservation to make the neighborhoods and Tucson a better place

This is the one and only opportunity for Grant Road project to help preserve community for these neighborhoods.

B. FUNDING – ID#18 We are assured that "the city and RTA are committed to securing funding" --- That is , we don't know how much or how little, funding will be available. So let's add the details for the "highest and best outcome" for the citizens most effected by the project. If the final funding level is lower, deal with it then. Items to address:

1) Catalina Vista's request for a "safety wall" ID #6 : Why do we plan for Catalina Vista to get a 9" curb instead of a safety wall 4' ? The front yard of those homes **FACE** the six lane road. A wall that reflects the treatment of Campbell on their west boundary preserves the essence of that neighborhood, protects property values, and intercepts veering vehicles. **Fund it in the plan.**

2) Greenspace - say it like you mean it!

a) Use affirmative language (ID#4) Why is "intent" and "other project purposes" used related to green spacing the remnants? So vague.

When green space showed up in the 30% plans as "possible" we were elated. The term "possible" now haunts us, and begs for clarity on the part of TDOT. Devil's in the details – Let's get it down on paper.

ID#12 remnants will be "stabilized" and existing vegetation preserved. Norris is getting a "potential basin". So vague

ID#52 Define "stabilized" What exactly is the role of the contractor in "stabilizing" the sites and "caring" for the first 2 years.

- Does "stabilizing" involve grading?---with a plan? Who gives the contractor the plan? Can there be planned swales and berms?
- "Caring" by the contractor includes watering the existing vegetation? If it stops in 2 years where is the irrigation? It's part of the "opportunity" for the neighborhoods?-if so say so.

- Landscaping outside ROW is an “opportunity” for neighborhoods . The “opportunity” is more or less opportune depending upon how the land is left.
- Support item 4c on the agenda. Increasing landscaping in the residential area. That is not the same as “stabilizing existing vegetation”

b) Define the process to make it happen. SAY SO.

a) Commit in clear terms to the items of the first stages of the greenspace—so that neighborhoods can understand what will be left for them to do.

b) Direct, in writing, the formation of a committee to guide neighborhoods in the steps to fully finish the graded remnants after the contractor leaves. **Fund the city personnel** to assist that committee.

HISTORY NOTE: The city had grading plans for the health and heritage trail, Phase 2, but did not furnish those to the contractor before he left the scene. Better planning can avoid those costly errors.

There was a white paper that guided Jefferson Park for the now ALMOST completed Health and Heritage Trail. The trail is already much used and a positive addition to Tucson. Additional trees will soon be added free from *Trees for Tucson*, and planted by volunteers. With a **plan** and partnerships neighborhoods can make “possible” a reality. We are in this together. **Fund the city’s (TDOTs) involvement** in planning.

c) Important Question - Do neighborhoods still have to make the case to RTA for greenspace to be the “highest and best” use? Can we assume greenspace is a “done deal”?

3) Mitigation, noise and visuals, for the north side of Grant – SAMOS neighborhood. (ID#’s 11 & 25). This long uninterrupted residential strip needs to have those items addressed. **Fund earth** for the contractor to add berms when “stabilizing” remnants. That applies to all the remnant parcels. Triangle park already has strong visual mitigation in form of mature vegetation. Let’s **make it happen for the entire stretch**.

D. MOUNTAIN AVENUE: ID#1,2,3,

Complex problem which needs collaborative problem solving. The traffic load on Mtn Ave has become greater and greater with the expansion of UofA and use by emergency vehicles going to Banner. It is common for a three block back-up on Mountain at the Grant Road light. Bike/car accidents are comparably very common. This needs further discussion and future- looking planning . If green arrows save bikers’ lives, and Mountain has more bikers than Tucson Blvd, **fund them!**

(ID#1) Yes, there probably was no higher traffic use on Park after phase 2 completion--they all went to Mountain.

IN SUMMARY:

Phases 5/6 are critical to the stability and quality of Tucson’s inner city neighborhoods. We ask the Task Force to direct the project team to return to the community before the 60% plans are finalized.