

Notes from the May 19 meeting with Tucson OIP

Attending: Steve Prendergast, Joan Daniels, Suzanne Trappman, Bob Schlanger, Barbara Miller (Samos), Vicki Hart (Samos), Judith Anderson (Ward 3), Rebecca Ruopp (OIP), Nicole Gavin (OIP)

Purpose of meeting: To discuss the process for Phase 2 of the Grant Road Project.

1. OIP is an intermediary between stakeholders and the different departments of the City government and also coordinates among those government departments. Nicole Gavin is the head of OIP and is our contact person.
2. OIP said they want us involved in the process. They did not take the position that the Task Force represents us and there are to be no side meetings.
3. N. Gavin believes that there will not be an overlay for the whole Grant Road corridor. It will be done in segments to reflect the vision for that segment. There was not much discussion of our desire to opt out of the overlay. That needs to be discussed more in the next meeting.
4. The Phase 2 map will be 90% complete in the next two weeks and will be distributed to the Task Force. We will not see it before they do. OIP will “try to get us copies”. It would be helpful if we could take the updated maps to our May 31 meeting.
5. We discuss the Task Force
 - a. We asked for an opportunity to speak at the Task Force meetings when they are addressing matters relating to JPN. It is not enough to have an opportunity to speak in a Call to the Audience at the end of the meeting. Too late for meaningful input. Bob suggested that we be able to speak **during** the discussion by the Task Force.
 - b. We commented that it is our understanding that one of our key representatives on the Task Force is not making the meetings. Could we have a substitute who could sit in if he is out of town? They will consider it
 - c. We told them that we will have representatives at the Task Force meetings and asked to be told once the date of the next meeting is set.
6. Repeatedly they said that just because Beth Abramovitz says something it does not necessarily mean that is where we will end up.
7. Bob raised the original directive to “preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods.” Was this directive adopted by City Council? How can developing remnants preserve and enhance JPN?
8. Nicole described the four land use tools:
 - a. Remnant parcel usage. The City Real Estate Department wants to do a sell off of the property to the highest bidder. OIP is saying it should be driven by the Corridor Vision. “Remnants” refers to excess property, and does not assume that the buffer will not extend from the curb to the alley.
 - RTA wants to maximize immediate cash while OIP speaks of long term benefit.
 - Beth A. says no walls, but that has not necessarily been determined.
 - “If RTA will not pay, maybe City will”
 - Rebecca gave the example of a coffee shop, but we mentioned the Coffee Exchange experience,
 - b. Economic incentives
 - c. Overlay
 - Neighborhood reps will be included in the design process
 - d. Regulatory changes
 - Parking, setback, shared parking
9. We discussed the payment of the fees for changing the historic district boundaries.
 - a. We said that since they have created this strange situation where the work that borders JPN will be 5 or 6 years apart, they should pay for two projects to change the district boundaries on Grant, and the City should pay for both.

- b. We also said that Phase 2 will leave us with 23 non-contributing properties, and we cannot afford to wait until sometime after 2020 to get the district border changed.
 - c. They suggested that we make the Grant and Banner changes to the boundaries of the district into one project. We said that Mabry has said that is not a good idea. They will look into it.
 - d. We asked who we should send our letter to, and were told Nicole. The letter will request specific information about who will pay the fees.
10. We will meet monthly going forward with the next meeting on June 16th at 10-12::00. We will set up meetings in July and August on the third Tuesday unless they conflict with the City Council meetings. They will get back to us on that.
 11. Bob raised the point that the utilities would have to be moved to develop the remnants, and the cost of moving them might make the significantly reduce the benefits from selling the remnants rather than use the space as buffer.
 12. We emphasized that we have worked hard over the past five years to get protections in the form of the NPZ and the group dwelling statute. We don't want that wiped away by the sale of remnants and the rezoning to allow mini-dorms. They assured us that would not happen.
 13. They assured us that we will have a voice, and that there will be regular meetings with us to get our input.
 14. We told them that we are working on creating a green loop around JPN, including working with Banner, the Park Avenue project, the basin east of Hampton and the green areas along Campbell. Nicole found this concept interesting as a reason for having a wide buffer.
 15. We maintained that fall was too late for the charrette meetings to discuss the use of the remnants. It would be an intensive workshop. The timing was not decided but we can raise again at our next meeting in June.
 16. Discussed name for our group. Campbell First Coalition was suggested. Need to make a decision and get back to OIP.
 17. We raised the issue of closing Hampton off. They said that we need to submit a petition to get it closed.
 18. With regard to the space between Hampton and Park, we asked what the plans were for maintaining it going forward. They will get back on that.
 19. The artist has been chosen, but the sites will not finalized until they know what he can produce.
 20. There was discussion about including Mountain First in our group.
 21. They said that they will try to get us answers to questions before our meeting on May 31. They were told to send all notes to SP and he will distribute them to the JPN group. They will also send notes to Bam Miller of Samos.