December 13, 2012
5:30 p.m.
Child & Family Resources Angel Charity Building
2800 East Broadway Boulevard
Tucson, Arizona 85716

The Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force meeting summaries provide a brief descriptive overview of the discussions, decisions and actions taken at the meetings. The summary and the audio recording of the meeting comprise the official minutes of the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force Meeting. Meeting summaries and audio recordings of the meetings are available online at the City Clerk’s web page at:

Requests for CD copies of the audio recordings are taken by the City Clerk’s Office at (520)791-4213.

MEETING RESULTS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review

The meeting was called to order by Citizens Task Force (CTF) facilitator Nanci Beizer. A quorum was established and the agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Beizer.

Citizen Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Belman</td>
<td>Jon Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R. DiGrazia</td>
<td>Diane Robles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Durham-Pflibsen</td>
<td>Elizabeth Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Fairchild*</td>
<td>Jamey Sumner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Henley</td>
<td>Michael Butterbrodt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Eddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farhad Moghimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Papuga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mr. Fairchild has replaced Mr. Nasser on the Citizens Task Force

This Meeting Summary has not been approved by the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force.

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, $2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.
2. **Call to the Audience**

Two (2) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

*Laura Tabili:* Ms. Tabili spoke to the Task Force to address her concerns regarding the presentation on the Historic Buildings Inventory that was given at the November 15, 2012 CTF Meeting. She stated that the presentation, in her mind, gave the impression that you could knock down some historic buildings and just keep some and be able to have a historic district. Ms. Tabili stated that, in fact, this was wrong as you must keep at least 51 percent of the historic building within your district to receive the “historic” designation. She stated that historic districts need to maintain their setting and reiterated that they must retain over 50 percent of their historic buildings or they will be “delisted.” She concluded by stating that the Task Force should take all of this into consideration when making their decisions and recommendations.

*Jude Cook:* Mr. Cook introduced himself as the owner and proprietor of Cook Sign Company. Mr. Cook’s wife, also a small business owner in the Broadway Corridor, recently started the Sunshine Mile Merchants Association which is a collection of 34 small locally owned businesses located on Broadway in between Campbell Avenue and Country Club Road. Mr. Cook wanted to introduce the merchants association to the CTF and to the public to raise awareness. Mr. Cook stated that he was overwhelmed by the support the group had received so far and passed around a flyer for an upcoming “boutique crawl” that the merchants association organized to promote the businesses in the corridor. He concluded by asking the audience and the CTF not to overlook small businesses when making their purchasing decisions.

3. **Public Input Report Review**

Project Manager Jenn Toothaker Burdick led a discussion regarding the public input that had been received since the November 8, 2012 Action Meeting. Jenn gave an update on actions that have been assigned or taken and the resolutions that have been achieved. The CTF had no additional questions or input.

4. **Approve Meeting Summaries from November 8, 2012 and November 15, 2012 CTF Meetings, and from November 10, 2012 CTF Workshop**

The Task Force was asked to approve the meeting summaries from the November 8, 2012 and November 15, 2012 CTF Meetings, and from the November 10, 2012 CTF Workshop. The Task Force agreed to approve the meeting summaries with one small change made to the November 10, 2012 Workshop summary that would provide more information about Miles Elementary and the populations it serves. (This change was subsequently made and the meeting summaries have been posted to the Clerk’s Office.)
5. Discuss/Approve CTF Bylaws

Jenn Toothaker Burdick presented the CTF with a revised set of draft bylaws to review, discuss, and approve. The CTF was asked to either approve the bylaws based on changes request at the November 15, 2012 meeting or move approval of the item to the January 17, 2013 Meeting. After looking over the bylaws and having a brief group discussion, the CTF approved the bylaws. Listed below is a summary of the discussion that took place.

CTF Questions, Comments and Concerns

- What do we do in a situation where we are significantly into the process (i.e. 12-18 months in) and have to add a new CTF member? Do we not add them because we are so far in and the learning curve would be too great for them? Is there a point of “no return?”

- I am concerned with taking a new member “aside” to get them caught up and explain the intricacies of the project to them. Wouldn’t this put us in violation of the open meeting laws?

- Out of the original pool of applicants for CTF membership, were any alternatives identified and have they been to any of our meetings?

Summarized Responses

- The new member’s learning curve will be high but the project team will work closely with any new member who is introduced to sufficiently bring them up to speed regarding the project and the process.

- It is an issue when a new task force member comes in late to the process. We don’t want to risk losing representation for any set of stakeholders.

- The project team can check with the Clerk’s Office about whether the seat would have to be filled or not.

[NOTE: Council Member Kozachik was able to contact the City Attorney, Mike Rankin, during the meeting to ask if it would be required to fill the seat vacated with a new member. Per Rankin, it would not be necessary, so one option would be not to fill the seat.]

- In bringing a new member “up to speed” the project team would not be violating open meeting laws. We would only be talking to one member of the Task Force, not the entire group. Another approach might be to allow time during the CTF meetings for comments to be made during public meetings. This also would not violate the open meeting laws.

- Regarding the selection process, there were approximately 83 candidates who submitted applications to serve on the Broadway Corridor CTF. Of the 13 seats on the CTF, 9 were appointed by the Director of Transportation, and the remaining seats were appointed by other bodies. The 9 seats appointed by TDOT were filled using as much of an objective process as
possible. Each seat had a selection and a “runners up” short list of candidates. This list was reviewed by Wards 5 & 6 before final selections were made and the candidates notified.

The “runners up” list has been used to identify replacements for resignations from the Task Force. This is how Mary Durham-Pflibsen ended up on the Task Force, and how we identified Dave Nasser’s replacement - Bruce Fairchild - was selected.

*At this time Mr. Fairchild was introduced as the replacement for Dave Nasser who had resigned his seat in early November.

6. Introduction: How Needed Land is Acquired for Roadway Improvement Projects

A basic overview of the acquisition and relocation process followed by the City to purchase property rights necessary for public processes was given by Myrlene Francis of Tierra Right-of-Way, Ltd. (Tierra). Myrlene is the Tucson Right-of-Way Project Manager for Tierra and is a member of the Broadway project technical team. Myrlene has 16 years of experience in this field within Southern Arizona and has worked on numerous projects with the City’s Real Estate Office.

Myrlene’s presentation covered the following:

- Real Estate Services for Public Projects
- Acquisition of Property Rights
- Acquisition Regulations:
  - ARS 28-7092 - Public Purpose
  - ARS 12-1116 - Actions for Condemnation
  - Federal Highway Administration 49 CFR, Part 24 - Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs; Final Rule
- Relocation Services
- Relocation Regulations:
  - ARS 28-7142 - Relocation Assistance Advisory Services
  - Federal Highway Administration 49 CFR, Part 24 - Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs; Final Rule
- Relocation Benefits
Listed below is a summary of the discussion that took place following Myrlene’s presentation.

**CTF Questions, Comments and Concerns**

- This is a lot of information to take in all at once. Can we revisit the topic at later dates?
- How is this different than the MainStreet program and how does it fit in with that program?
- I would like more of these “Improving Public Places” brochures for my restaurant; I get asked quite a few right-of-way questions.
- I would ask that Rocco state that the acquisitions are not a foregone conclusion.
- If we are not at the stage of acquisition, why are properties being acquired?
- It is my understanding that the City recently acquired the Panda Buffet restaurant.
- A question about public purpose: how does it relate to consolidated (shared) parking? With the potential to widen the roadway up to the buildings has consolidating land ever been utilized as parking ever?
- Is it possible to have City-owned parking along Broadway?

**Summarized Responses**

- Please keep in mind that this is just a preliminary discussion regarding right-of-way acquisition and relocations services. The right-of-way needs and the cross section of the road are not a foregone conclusion and still need to be determined.

- I want to expand upon the discussion of the 150-foot roadway alignment that was approved in 1987, and again in 2006 with the RTA vote. The planning and design process we are in is not limited to looking only at that 150-foot alignment. We are looking at what is the most appropriate to put in this two-mile stretch that will support Broadway’s function. This process we are in will take us to 15% complete construction plans, and will require a formal recommendation that will go to Mayor and Council. By no means does this recommendation have to be the 150-foot alignment originally planned as part of this project.

- Subsequent to the approval of the 1987 Broadway Corridor Transportation Study, a real estate acquisition plan was authorized by the Mayor and Council. Acquisitions have already occurred under the assumptions of the 1987 Plan, including some using RTA funding. All acquisitions are currently on-hold until it is known what the needed Right-of-Way will be.

- A list of the properties acquired is part of your meeting materials, provided with the December 7, 2012 follow-up memo to you, along with a map of the
properties’ locations. There are 39 taxpayer codes (parcels) that the City has purchased since 1989, which combine to function as 18 properties.

- The Panda Buffet was acquired in 2010, prior to the halt of acquisitions. It was vacant at the time of purchase, and the City leased the property to the restaurant. The business just recently closed.

- TDOT just received approval from the RTA Board at its December 6, 2012 meeting for an IGA that converts RTA funding previously received for Right-of-Way costs to be used for costs related to this planning and design process for the project. The approvals of the IGA demonstrate support by both RTA Board and the City’s Mayor and Council for this phase and our process. Some funding was not converted - approximately $50,000 - in order to cover day-to-day maintenance and operation costs related to City-acquired properties.

- If acquisition is necessary for a project, the City can use that property in any way - trade with a neighboring property owner, place it on the open market, or for parking. The key is that the original acquisition must be for the project and it must meet the “public purpose” requirement.

- In regard to the consolidated parking question: it is essentially an issue of timing. When the Right-of-Way needs are established, negotiations with property owners must occur. The individual property can be deemed as a full or partial acquisition based on the effect that the Right-of-Way acquisition will make to the existing premises. If a property is voluntarily sold to the City, the property could then be traded to another property owner to enhance their property, or in this case, be used for parking. It is complicated and involves an agreement between property owners but it can be done.

- If the City sees making a partial acquisition into a full as a benefit it can happen. Public purpose has to do with eminent domain.

- To answer whether or not it is up to the owner to decide to sell, that is not necessarily the case. It has to do with the public need for the property and the public purpose clause.

- As stated in the December 7, 2012 follow-up memo you all received, RTA is supportive of discussing consolidated parking as part of the Broadway project. The project team needs to discuss with other City staff - such as TDOT and ParkWise - about what restrictions or regulations govern this process.

- City-owned parking can exist on Broadway. From a real estate perspective, the property owner would have to sell their property voluntarily and then would have to create their own separate agreement with other property owners in the area.

- It is my understanding that the City has no mechanism in place that allows City staff to initiate conversations with property owners for potential areas
of consolidated parking. Such discussions need to be undertaken by owners of properties and businesses themselves.

7. Presentation by Southern Arizona Transit Advocates

Gene Caywood gave an informal presentation on the behalf of Southern Arizona Transit Advocates (SATA) to present several recommendations for possible mass transit on Broadway. Mr. Caywood requested the opportunity to address the Task Force and to present considerations for how transit could be addressed in Broadway’s roadway design. Mr. Caywood’s presentation touched on:

- SATA background information;
- Previous plans that address transit and light rail along Broadway;
- SATA’s recommendations to the Broadway Task Force, namely that transit is the most important part of the Broadway improvement project, that the current work needs to provide space for future Higher Speed Transit, and that SATA wants to see the first phase built;
- SATA’s Proposed Guiding Principals supporting its recommendations to the Task Force;
- Information about types of transit that exist, vehicles types, vehicle selection criteria, and more; and,
- Considerations for how to integrate Higher Speed Transit on Broadway.

Below is a summary of the discussion that followed the presentation.

CTF Questions, Comments and Concerns

- In terms of vintage versus modern vehicles: vintage vehicles are cheaper to acquire but are the operation costs lower? It seems like they would be less efficient and costlier to maintain as well as breakdown more often.
- Was the older “trolley” able to the climb the underpass?

Summarized Responses

- Modern vehicles have high costs as well because of the advanced electrical systems they use, but yes the vintage vehicles are older and have parts that are hard to find, San Francisco runs a huge fleet that uses both types of vehicles. However, whatever you use it is going to cost a good chunk of change.
- The trolley would have been able to make it up the hill under the 4th Avenue underpass from a systems standpoint. The problem was that former Mayor Walkup, who was driving the vehicle, did not have much training and the vehicle had to stop and then start on an incline. It would have had to work hard but it would have been able to make it.
8. Presentation on Pedestrian/Bicycle Systems

Emily Yetman, Executive Director of Living Streets Alliance - a 501 (c)3 nonprofit that aims to enhance communities by creating vibrant places to walk, bike, socialize and play - and City of Tucson Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator Ann Chanecka provided a combined presentation to give an overview and introduction to pedestrian and bicycle systems. Their presentations provided relevant information to the Task Force regarding the integration of bicycle and pedestrian amenities into the design of the corridor, and how to design the corridor to create a vibrant sense of place.

Ms. Yetman’s presentation touched on the following topics:
- Pictoral comparisons of Tucson streets with images of other communities’ pedestrian, bicycle, and transit systems and roadway designs;
- Living Streets Alliance’s mission;
- Reasons for why LSA promotes ‘living streets’ - safety, access, transportation equality, health, economy, environment, and because transportation can be ‘place-making’ or ‘place-breaking’;
- How different mode choices require less roadway space;
- LSA’s work in the community; and
- LSA’s goals.

Ms. Chanecka’s presentation touched on the following topics:
- City of Tucson’s Walking and Biking Program - potential that exists along Broadway
- Different types of bikeway facilities that will attract different types of users: standard bike lanes, bus/bike shared lanes, buffered bike lanes, cycle tracks, raised cycle tracks, urban pathways, and bike boulevards.
- Considerations used when designing bike boulevards, and
- Planned Bike and Ped Projects near Broadway.

The brief discussion that followed the presentation is captured below.

CTF Questions, Comments and Concerns

- For clarification purposes what do you mean by driveways?
- Could you speak to how bicyclists and pedestrians interact with transit?
- Is there data available on the economic impact of increased bicycle and pedestrian activity?
• From a safety perspective, how you deal with unexpected actions by bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists? Do you have programs that help modify behavior?

• Your presentation showed a lot of great images of cities that have vertical density but Tucson is so sprawled out. Do you know if we build better pedestrian amenities and sidewalks that people will actually come and use them?

**Summarized Responses**

• Driveways can be access points to both residential and commercial properties.

• Generally an increased amount of transit brings with it an increased amount of pedestrian activity, particularly at crossings. You need to make high capacity transit safe for pedestrians, especially near the transit stops.

• The access to stops or stations and the decisions of how to include bikes on buses are potentially in conflict with each other.

• Providing an increased amount, or enhancing, pedestrian amenities can increase economic activity. ADOT is undertaking a study that will look into this correlation more deeply.

• Crashes, in fact, go down with more usage as bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists adapt to one another’s actions. Additionally, TDOT is working on education programs to promote pedestrian and bicycle safety across the city.

• In addition to the amenities provided you have to look at the land use for the surrounding areas and the destinations that people are traveling to, the two are inextricably linked to one another. So, no, you cannot just build a sidewalk and have people come - that is the challenge.

9. **Next Steps: Discussion and Decisions related to CTF Meeting Schedule through to February Community-Wide Meeting**

Jenn Toothaker Burdick presented the upcoming meeting topics and agendas to the Task Force through the February Community-Wide Meeting. The Task Force was asked to confirm the next two meeting dates (January 17, 2013 and February 7, 2013) and the agenda items for these meetings. They were also asked to discuss opportunities to support CTF members’ work on the Vision and Goals Worksheet, including having one-on-one conversations with the project team, setting another meeting, or creating a subcommittee. Additionally, the Task Force was asked to confirm (with a recommendation to change the date to February 28, 2013) the date for the Community-Wide Meeting in February. The following discussion ensued after Jenn presented these next step items to the Task Force.
CTF Questions, Comments and Concerns

- I know that our time is precious but I really think we should meet again to discuss the vision and goals, preferably as a whole group.
- What is the purpose of meeting again or speaking with the project team?
- Personally, another meeting between now and the January meeting would be hard to do.
- Maybe for the January 17th meeting we should prioritize a more in-depth discussion of the vision and goals.
- I would prefer not to have one-on-one conversations. Hearing the group conversation helps me and if you are having side conversations with Phil, the information will not be shared with the group, and we could lose the opportunity to learn from each other.
- I am trying to understand the process: we have a conversation at the January meeting and then when does the topic resurface? I don’t think we have enough time dedicated to discussing the vision and goals prior to the Community-Wide Meeting.

Summarized Responses

- The intent of the one-on-one conversations is to help those who need more time to work on the development of their Vision and Goals Worksheet prior to the January meeting. The completion of these sheets is pertinent to developing the draft framework we will be discussing at the January 17th meeting.
- Perhaps we can move things around to give more time and structure to the vision and goals discussion so we have an idea of where we are at.
- The conversations are meant to help member grapple the subject matter so they can engage your constituents in an effective manner.
- I hear the need for a compromise: given the timing, having another meeting seems unreasonable (CTF agrees with this), so if we focus time on January 17th, Phil will come to the meeting with a draft Vision and Goals statement. In order to help the Task Force with their sheets and to get ready for the January meeting there will be opportunities set aside to speak with Phil directly.
- Does anyone really feel the need for these conversations? (Many of the Task Force responded yes.)
- If we do have the conversations, we will capture the information that was discussed and provide it the group as whole.

Following this discussion the Task Force agreed to the following:
• To have one-on-one conversations and emails with Phil prior to January 7, 2013 to help better prepare for the vision and goals session on January 17, 2013.

• Focus the conversation at the January 17, 2013 CTF meeting on vision and goals and have the scheduled Context Sensitive Solutions presentation and the MainStreet Business Assistance program presentation moved to a later date.

• Revisit the vision and goals discussion at the February 7, 2013 meeting.

• Move the February Community-Wide Meeting to February 28, 2013 and hold the meeting at the Sabbar Shrine Hall, located at 450 South Tucson Boulevard (just south of Broadway).

10. Call to the Audience
Six (6) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Gene Caywood: Mr. Caywood decided not to comment at this time.

Laura Tabili: Ms. Tabili decided not to comment at this time.

Marc Fink: Mr. Fink introduced himself to the group as a retired planner for Pima County and a volunteer with Imagine Greater Tucson. First off, in terms of the Vision and Goals Framework: I want to reiterate what Emily said is the most important thing for this project, and that is what is the function of Broadway? The CTF has an opportunity to decide what this is. Is it to just move people around and cars or is to create a sense of place?

Secondly, Tucson is a very sprawled out community and just building sidewalks will not work. We cannot continue to grow in this manner - it is unsustainable. This project offers the opportunity to think about how we plan and create spaces and places to go. Finally, I’ll conclude by stating that land use and transportation planning have to go hand in hand.

Corky Poster: The common theme in both Emily’s and Ann’s presentations are that we are at a tipping point. Sixty percent of people out there are nervous about bicycling, I’m sure it is the same for walking. It is the small things that make a difference. I make a decision to bike, walk or drive to work based on little things. For example Highland Avenue: Highland Avenue needed help, it was at the tipping point, and when things are the tipping point the question is how do you change people’s minds? They transformed Highland Avenue to a spacious, bicycle and pedestrian friendly and aesthetically pleasing roadway. Now many people walk it or ride it instead of driving it. So you must look at things when you are designing them and ask yourself, how does this design encourage or discourage pedestrian and bicycle use and how does it help create a sense of place.
Jessica Schuman: Ms. Schuman first thanked the CTF for their commitment, which to her, seems to be ever increasing and then spoke briefly about the Modernism Week events. Ms. Schuman presented drawing produced by Katie Gannon of the Drachman Institute that were sketched out during one of the Modernism Week workshops. The drawings highlighted Broadway as a multimodal roadway, which the Broadway Coalition supports. Ms. Shuman handed out the drawings, which represented different possible cross sections with various roadway design elements, to the CTF and encouraged the Task Force to think outside of the box and design the roadway with multimodal elements without widening the road at all.

Ms. Schuman also expressed her concern that “things” were not being looked at critically enough and that the CTF was not getting all of the information they needed. She stated that the roadway would already support High Capacity Transit and that the Historic Buildings Inventory is not sufficient enough.

Les Pierce: Ms. Pierce addressed the Task force with the following question: “What is the sudden impetus in steam rolling ahead to a draft vision and goals statement?”

11. CTF Roundtable
The following comments were made during the CTF Roundtable:

- I have echoed it many times. Land use is critical and we need to see that through. Every generation changes and we need to think how things will be in the future. We need to think outside of the box. Transportation and land use need to go hand in hand.
- Is there anyone from the project team who can follow-up and let us know what we will need to do to prepare for the vision and goals work? (The project team agreed to follow-up with specifics.)

12. Adjourn
Nanci Beizer called the meeting to a close at 8:45 p.m.

The presentations given at this meeting can be reviewed by visiting the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force web page at: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/broadway/broadway-citizens-task-force

This Meeting Summary has not been approved by the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force.
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