

From: john wakefield <jwakeart@gmail.com>
To: Nanci Beizer <nbeizer@dakotacom.net>
CC: Beth Abramovitz <beth.abramovitz@tucsonaz.gov>, Jennifer Toothaker <Jennifer.Toothaker@tucsonaz.gov>, "Ewing-Gavin, Nicole" <Nicole.Ewing-Gavin@tucsonaz.gov>, Rebecca Ruopp <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>, Rick Kaneen <rick@kaneenpr.com>, "Dreier, Genna" <Genna@kaneenpr.com>, Judith Anderson <Judith.Anderson@tucsonaz.gov>, Matt Kopec <Matt.Kopec@tucsonaz.gov>
Date: 8/25/2015 11:43 AM
Subject: Re: Grant Road Revised Draft Vision Red-Line Version Posted - Comments due Friday 8/28

Hi Nanci, I am concerned that the so-called "red-lined" version of the report has been emailed on August 24 - allowing only 4 days for us to correct numerous stylistic, tautological and other errors before August 28th. Do you think you could extend the deadline so that we can carefully review the revised document?

Also - could you please explain the meaning of the "red-line" notations? The red-line "strike-throughs" presumably indicate deleted words: but what is the significance of the words underlined in* blue and red*?

If the red-lined passages are deletions then considerable progress has been made, but there is still a crucial need for re-writing - to take just one of many examples:-

"at the same time, some of these centers have active retail uses that are serving community needs, and some in the community would be happy with improvements to the pedestrian environment with minimal change in use."

In a very tight race, this is a strong contender for the most annoying and redundant sentence in the report. "At the same time" is pure padding and completely superfluous. "Active retail uses" can be better called "shops". "Centers that have active retail uses" are "Shopping centers". "That are serving community needs" is better expressed as "that serve the community" (but how many shopping centers do not serve the community (are there some in Tucson that only serve Martians for example?)). Then, in a confusing shift of topic, the subject changes abruptly in midstream and we are informed that "some in the community would be happy" (who are these unspecified but potentially cheerful citizens? - maybe you mean to say "some workshop participants") would be happy with "improvements to the pedestrian environment" (isn't it less pretentious to say "better sidewalks") - "with minimal change in use" - minimal change in use of what? - minimal change in the pedestrian environment or minimal change in the centers (which have active retail uses) ("shopping centers") - if you mean "minimal change in use of the shopping centers" - do you mean that minimal changes will be made to the zoning, for example from retail to office? The puzzled reader is left to guess.

The sentence is a "syntactical train-wreck" - too meaningless and confusing to be submitted to a busy mayor. We are again forced to conclude that a deliberate effort is being made to bamboozle unsophisticated readers by using long words when short ones would be clearer.

[image: Inline image 1]

If the strike-throughs are deletions then I see, from the above, that progress has been made (in more limited locations) but someone needs to sit down with a cup of strong coffee and a seriously sharp red pencil - I am volunteering to channel E.B White and my buddy Prof. Steve Pinker to help translate this report into English.

regards

ps Also - (just a very minor example of a pervasive problem of verbal redundancy) why are you continuing to pad the report with the superfluous, self-aggrandizing adjective "incremental" after I carefully explained to you that "all construction is necessarily incremental"?

John Wakefield
Artistry in Glass Inc.

3423 E Grant Road, Tucson AZ 85716
520-320-0104
jwakeart@gmail.com
www.tucsoncabinetglass.com
www.tucsoncrystalandchinarepair.com
www.tucson tabletops.com
www.shelfsupports.net
www.mirrorsupports.net
www.caviarstaircases.com <<http://www.tucson tabletops.com>>

On Mon, Aug 24, 2015 at 2:43 PM, Nanci Beizer <nbeizer@dakotacom.net> wrote:

> Greetings Task Force Members:
>
> On August 14th, the project team sent you the email below letting you
> know that the revised Community Character and Vitality Corridor Vision was
> available for review and that comments are due this *Friday, August 28,
> 2015*. Please provide any comments you may have to Rebecca Ruopp at
> Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov or 520-837-6973. This email is both a
> reminder of the opportunity to take another look at the document and a note
> to let you know that the red-line version of the document, which some
> members of the Task Force had requested during the July 16th Task Force
> meeting, is now posted along with the revised Corridor Vision at
> <https://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/grant-road-land-use-planning>.
> This red-lined version shows where changes were made to the June 2015
> Draft of the Corridor Vision following modification recommendations
> approved by the Task Force at the June 16, 2015, meeting.

> As always, please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

> Thanks everyone,
> Nanci and the Grant Road Improvement Project Team

>
> -----

> *From:* Nanci Beizer [mailto:nbeizer@dakotacom.net]
> *Sent:* Friday, August 14, 2015 3:27 PM
> *To:* 'Nanci Beizer'
> *Cc:* 'Beth Abramovitz'; 'Jennifer Toothaker'; 'Nicole Ewing-Gavin';
> 'Rebecca Ruopp'; 'Rick Kaneen'; 'Genna Dreier'; 'Judith Anderson'; 'Matt
> Kopec'
> *Subject:* Grant Road Revised Draft Vision Document Posted for Review

> Greetings Task Force Members:

>
> The Grant Road Community Character & Vitality Corridor Vision, with
> further revisions from the June 2015 Draft version, is now posted for
> review on the Office of Integrated Planning (OIP) website at:
> <https://www.tucsonaz.gov/integrated-planning/grant-road-land-use-planning>.
> * We will provide the red-lined version on Monday.

>
>
> *REVIEW PERIOD & COMMENTS SUBMMITTAL: **The two-week review period will
> extend through Friday, August 28, 2015.* Please provide any comments you
> may have to Rebecca Ruopp at Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov or 520-837-6973.

>
>
> *MAYOR & COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:* The Corridor Vision document is
> currently scheduled for Mayor and Council's consideration for adoption at
> its September 9, 2015, meeting. Comments received from the public will
> be shared with the Mayor and Council prior to the meeting. We will
> forward the meeting agenda when it is posted for your information and so
> that you can see the order of the item in case you would like to attend the
> meeting.

> *SUMMARY OF REVISIONS MADE:* The revisions undertaken were informed by
> public comments received on the June 2015 Draft and reflect recommendations
> made by staff and approved by the Grant Road Citizen Task Force at its July
> 16, 2015, meeting. Following is a summary of those recommendations and
> how they are addressed in the current version of the Corridor Vision.

>
> · *A stand-alone Executive Summary that is more reader friendly
> and that highlights major elements of the Corridor Vision. (See pgs. 1 –
> 8)*

>
>
> · *Note:* While a 5-page Executive Summary was suggested, the
> revised Executive Summary is a bit longer given that the map exhibit was
> enlarged to a full page for readability and an additional table exhibit was
> added, as well as several images. Also while the Executive Summary is
> included as a section of the document, it is written so that it can be
> produced as a stand-alone document.

>
>
> · *Undertake limited further copy editing: (Undertaken
> throughout document.)*

>
> · *Note:* The copy editing undertaken worked to balance the desire for
> greater readability with the need to honor text that was the product
> multiple years of work with the Task Force and the public through a
> variety of outreach activities. Additionally, a variety of grammatical
> and term consistency issues were addressed and several errors in several
> maps addressed.

>
> · *Move background information, e.g., Chapter III, Factors in
> Development of Corridor Vision, into an appendix. (See Appendix, which is
> 21 pgs.)*

>
>
> · *Note:* This was done.

>
>
> · *Add some additional illustrative materials and photos if
> available. *

>
>
> · *Note:* This was done in the Executive Summary; in Section I, Project &
> Process; and in the Appendix. Section III, Corridor Vision Components,
> already had extensive illustrative materials, so additional illustrative
> materials and photos were not added.

>
>
> · *Combine and revise 4th and 5th bullets on pg. 66 (now pg. 40)
> to read:** “Revitalize the remnant parcels that remain following the
> widening of Grant Road with new development, which could include
> combinations of buildings, landscaped areas, architectural elements, buffer
> walls, and walking paths. This new development should be compatible with
> and enhance surrounding properties, and be designed to ensure there are
> appropriate buffers between Grant Road and the existing residences and
> provide comfortable environments for living and working.”*

>
> · *Note:* This change was made.

>
>
>
> Thank you in advance for your consideration of this revised document, and
> please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

>
> Nanci and the Grant Road Improvement Project Team

>
>
>
> *"To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, recipients of this
> message should not forward it to other members of the public body. Members
> of the public body may reply to this message, but they should not send a
> copy of the reply to other members."*

>
>
>
>
> -----

> [image: Avast logo] <<http://www.avast.com/>>

>
> This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
> www.avast.com

>
>