

Brenda Garcia

From: Tina Lee [tinalee61@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2009 5:28 PM
To: Brenda Garcia; Nicole Ewing-Gavin
Subject: Re: Oversight Committee meeting packet for June 25, 2009.

Hi Brenda, Hi Nicole,

I won't be here next week but I promised I would send in my comments on the Growth Technical paper. So here they are:

1. Overall, the report is well-researched and informative and the benchmarking comparative analysis is helpful to get a general sense of how Tucson ranks among peer communities for various urban form factors.
2. However, I found the pervasive "rah rah" cheerleading tone (that not so subtly supports population growth, e.g., "Growth can be directed differently to our benefit."; "It confirms that solutions exist for our challenges." Etc.) to be annoying. Also, the oversimplification of Tucson's economic/educational conditions created a blatant bias for new urbanism as the magic bullet, thereby masking the potentially 'harder' and more complex choices that Tucsonan's will probably really face (e.g., p. 69: "In reality, we all will have a say."-- really? truly?)
3. As an example of oversimplification, p. 70 "This shows that enhanced habitat protection and urban growth are not incompatible; one does not have to occur at the expense of the other." The enhanced habitat protection model greatly oversimplifies the matter -- saying or claiming an area is preserved habitat does not ensure ecological sustainability of that habitat -- is there connectivity for the wildlife that inhabit the preserved area to other areas? Is the watershed/airshed that supports the habitat sufficiently protected to ensure its sustainability? Are the additional recreational pressures and indirect impacts (air quality, water quantity/quality impacts) resulting from the surrounding higher density communities accounted for in the assumption that preserved areas are truly 'protected'?
4. The recommendations in Section 4 do not include education and communication efforts that will surely be needed to convince the community to make the choices necessary to achieve the significant changes in urban form that are advocated in this White Paper. Neither do they encourage the County to coordinate planning and future development with ASLD.
5. Increasing densities typically require social/economic mitigation measures such as higher recreation or open space resources per-capita and this is not explored in any of the benchmarks for peer or future peer communities. I'd be interested in more info on this.
6. A couple statements made me scratch my head, trying to figure out what was being said. Examples follow:
 - p. 6 of cover sheet, regarding "the County must ensure that future development occurs in the most fiscally responsible manner. This includes adding value to the tax base and ensuring that affordable transportation and housing choices exist for residents such that residents can afford to continue paying for other goods and services." Fiscally responsible to whom? To the residents of the future developments? To the taxpayers paying for the public infrastructure?
 - p. 85 "Link urban form to activity space-time measures to facilitate the understanding of how urban

design strategies may shape individual space-time interactions." Say what????

7. Table 15 on p. 82 (also on p. 4 of cover sheet) needs better explanation, it's not intuitive what it's trying to explain. Also, this table somewhat implies that these 4 strategies or urban forms are mutually exclusive, but I would argue that they are not and I don't think you intend to imply that. This might also need some explanation.

OK! I probably sound like a kvetch, but it's a heroic job the White Paper team undertook and I greatly appreciate the research that went into it. I'm sorry I will miss the discussion, but the beaches of Oregon are calling my name....

Cheers,
tina

On Wed, Jun 17, 2009 at 4:12 PM, Brenda Garcia <Brenda.Garcia@wvm.pima.gov> wrote:

Yes-noted from previous email, but thanks again for confirming!

Brenda Garcia

Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department

Water Study

(520) 740-6845

From: Tina Lee [mailto:tinalee61@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2009 3:31 PM
To: Brenda Garcia
Subject: Re: Oversight Committee meeting packet for June 25, 2009.

Hi B,

A reminder that I'll be AWOL for the next meeting! But I'm reading the report and will send the Nicole's my comments, thanks for checking!

tl

On Wed, Jun 17, 2009 at 12:17 PM, Brenda Garcia <Brenda.Garcia@wvm.pima.gov> wrote:

Dear Oversight Committee Members,

Please find attached the agenda for the June 25, 2009 Oversight Committee meeting and the May 21

and April 23, 2009 Draft Meeting Summaries for your review. As you are aware, the Growth, Urban Form and Cost of Infrastructure Technical Paper is available online for your review prior to the meeting. Last but not least, staff responses to Committee member questions raised at the last meeting regarding the Water Conservation, Stormwater Management and Riparian Protection Technical Papers are also available online at: <http://www.tucsonpimawaterstudy.com/Meetings.html>

If you have not already done so, please send me an RSVP confirming that you are planning to attend the 6/25/09 meeting so I can ensure we have a quorum.

Respectfully,

Brenda Garcia

City/County Cooperative Project

Water & Wastewater Infrastructure, Supply & Planning Study (WISP)

201 N. Stone Avenue, 8th Floor

Tucson, Arizona 85701-1207

Phone: (520) 740-6845

Fax: (520) 622-0135

Brenda.Garcia@wwm.pima.gov