Call to the Audience Guidelines

- 2 Call to the Audience opportunities
- Must fill out participant card
- Participants called in the order cards are received
- 2 minutes allowed per participant
- CTF Facilitator will call on speakers and manage time
- CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
- CTF cannot take action on matters raised
- CTF members can ask project team to review an item
Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review
2. Call to the Audience
3. * City Attorney’s Office Presentation
4. Review Public Input Report
5. Review/Approve Meeting Summary from July 26
6. Review/Approve Revised CTF Mission
7. Review/Approve Proposed Schedule
8. Review/Approve Listening Session Draft Report
9. RTA Presentation
10. Land Use & Transportation Planning Presentation
11. Broadway Traffic Studies and Analyses
12. Vision and Goals Framework Review
13. Next Steps
14. Roundtable
15. Call to the Audience
16. Adjourn

* Indicates presentation is not to be recorded
Call to the Audience
1st Call to the Audience

15 Minutes

Please limit comments to 2 minutes

• CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
• CTF cannot take action on matters raised
• CTF members can ask project team to review an item
Open Meeting Law – CTF members must avoid any discussion of CTF issues with other CTF members outside of the CTF’s noticed, agendized public meetings.

Officer Requirements for the Broadway CTF – the City Ordinance creating the CTF specifically requires that a Chair and Vice Chair be selected from the CTF membership. A facilitator can still be used.
The Public Input Report contains public comments received by the project team since the last CTF meeting. This report includes input received from June 20 through August 17.
The approved Meeting Summary and audio recording from the July 26 CTF Meeting will be posted to the BBCTF page on the City Clerk’s website within 3 working days.
Overview of Project Approach

The Two Stages of the Planning and Design Process

18 to 24 months

Project Vision and Goals Framework

Evaluation Criteria

General Corridor Development Approach

Subsequent Activities

DCR

Final Design

This is the "DCR Process" which is our current focus
Revise Mission Statement

The Broadway Boulevard project team was asked to redraft the CTF mission to include:

• Incorporate the word “businesses” into the list of stakeholders

• Clarify “urban interface” and “alignment” terms used
Draft 2 – Mission Statement

The Broadway Boulevard CTF has been formed by Mayor and Council to work with the Project Team to evaluate and select alternatives, and to develop stakeholder supported recommendations regarding the project:

• roadway width and location of any widening to the north and/or south of the current roadway;
• roadway cross-section and back-of-curb streetscape designed for all users and modes of transportation, and
• an overarching context-sensitive street design addressing the relationship between the street and its adjacent development and uses.

Task Force members will help provide effective communication between the neighborhoods, businesses, and stakeholders they represent and the Broadway Boulevard Project Team.
Approve Proposed Meeting Schedule

The proposed meeting schedule outlines upcoming Broadway Boulevard CTF meeting dates through early 2013. The Child and Family Resources meeting space is available and confirmed for all proposed CTF and public meetings.
Approve Proposed Schedule of Meeting Dates through March 2013

• No September meeting
• October 4\textsuperscript{th} – Proposed CTF Meeting 4
• October 18\textsuperscript{th} – Proposed CTF Meeting 5
• October 20\textsuperscript{th} – Proposed CTF Workshop 1
• November 1\textsuperscript{st} or 8\textsuperscript{th} – Public Meeting 2
• November 15\textsuperscript{th} – Proposed CTF Meeting 6
• December 13\textsuperscript{th} – Proposed CTF Meeting 7
Approve Proposed Schedule of Meeting Dates through March 2013

- January 17th – Proposed CTF Meeting 8
- February 21st – Proposed CTF Meeting 9
- March 21st – Proposed CTF Meeting 10
- April 18th – Proposed CTF Meeting 11
- May 2nd – Proposed CTF Meeting 12
- May 23rd – Proposed Public Meeting 3
- June 20th – Proposed CTF Meeting 13
Discuss and Approve Listening Session Draft Report

Phil Erickson, AIA, President
Community Design + Architecture
Several new items have been included in the Listening Session Draft Report. The report now includes:

- An analysis table for comment cards and emails
- Analysis of stakeholder input, including concerns and desires of various groups
- Scanned images of all comment cards and emails

These changes make the report more comprehensive but do not change the results or analysis.
Listening Session Worksheet

Broadway Citismen Task Force Members – Listening Session Experience Worksheet

Public participation on the Broadway, East Tucson Corridor project will be a critical factor in a successful design process and product. The Citizen Task Force is a vital component of this participation process. In the coming months, and throughout the Planning & Design Phase, we will develop and refine plans to support outreach and meaningful involvement in this project.

This worksheet is designed to help you put into a written format what you observed and experienced at the public Listening Session, as well as gauge your support for the Draft Listening Session Report. Please send the Draft Listening Session Report and this Fill in this worksheet. Your comments will be incorporated faithfully into the input of stakeholders and design teams.

Please fill this worksheet out by the next meeting, set for August 30, 2012.

1. After reading the Draft Listening Session Report, do you think the report accurately captures and conveys what you heard in the group discussion? Why or why not?

2. Based on your experience at the Listening Session, is there anything you would add to or change about the report?

3. When thinking about the stakeholders you represent and input that is documented in the Draft Listening Session Report:
   a. How do you indicate how well you think the views of your stakeholder group are represented in the report?

   b. Do you think this report will help you represent your stakeholder group?

Discussion of Listening Session Draft Report.
Discussion of Listening Session Draft Report

1. What characteristics in the Broadway Boulevard project area should be preserved?
2. What characteristics in the Broadway Boulevard project area should be changed?
3. What do we fear and hope for in the Broadway Boulevard project area
   - 9 Tables with a total of about 57 participants, and 100-170 comments per question
   - 9 comment cards, 5 emails, and 4 stakeholder group resolutions in report appendices
Discussion of Listening Session Draft Report

• Key Issue Areas
  – Corridor Character
  – Transportation Function
  – Design of the Street
  – Economic Development
  – Process and Making the Vision Happen

• How will Listening Report be used?
  A starting point for public input that will inform all stages of the project
  – Vision and Goals concept process later this evening is an example
## Corridor Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses &amp; Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height &amp; Massing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Character</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic &amp; Significant Buildings</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Identity &amp; Placemaking</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corridor Character

• Existing Identity and Placemaking
  – Result will be loss/death of community (5)
  – Value existing sense of community/place, “it’s not generic” (2+)

• Potential Identity and Placemaking
  – Turn Broadway into a place where people want to be; holistic sense of place (2)
  – Create attractive streetscape, unique to Tucson, sidewalks and retail, restaurant, and buildings close to the sidewalks (1*)

• Preserve Historic & Significant Buildings
  – General (5+3+4)
  – Specific Buildings (11+3)
## Transportation Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Service Access</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access &amp; Safety</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Access &amp; Safety</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access &amp; Safety</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Network</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Broadway Function</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Function

• Traffic Mobility and Volume
  – Improve efficiency of traffic flow, signal coordination (2+4)
  – Improve without widening (1+4)
  – Maintain business access (4)

• Pedestrian Access and Safety
  – Provide more sidewalks and handicap access (2)
  – Maintain business access (4)
  – More pedestrian friendly (17)
## Design of the Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Existing Uses &amp; Community Character</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Mitigation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street R.O.W.: sidewalks &amp; number of lanes</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Broadway Design &amp; Condition</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape and Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design of the Street

• R.O.W. Size—lanes number/width, sidewalks, landscaping
  – Provide High Capacity Transit (13+5)
    • Specific type of transit - light rail (4) or streetcar (3) or BRT (1)
    Provide landscape, trees, shade (13)
  – Provide bus pullouts (8+3+4)
  – Preserve current width (6+2+4)
  – Provide pedestrian sidewalks/walkways (4+3)
  – 8-lanes is too wide (3+3)
  – Widen to some degree, varied opinions on number of lanes (4)
  – Turn Broadway into a place where people want to be; holistic sense of place (2+2)
## Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable &amp; Diverse Housing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impacts &amp; Incentives</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Loss of property value who will buy property in the future?; blight (5+3)
- Tax incentives or grant money for façade enhancements and restoration of historic buildings (2)
## Process & Making the Vision Happen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of Delivering Project</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement in Current and Future Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracity of Data and Analysis</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

• Stakeholder Involvement
  – Find a Plan that pulls community together (2)
  – *What is planned will happen regardless of public input* (2)

• Veracity of data and analysis
  – Need to address perception that transportation and growth projections are out of date (2+3+4)

• Construction and Maintenance Costs
  – *Estimates of construction/acquisition costs are inaccurate and funding won’t be available* (3)
Does the report accurately capture and convey what you heard in the group discussions? Why or why not?
Is there anything you would add to or change about the report?
Listening Session Experience Worksheet

• Feedback on Listening Session format will be discussed as part of the Public Participation Plan discussion at next CTF meeting.

• Is there anything else the CTF would like to share about the Listening Session at this point?
Approve Listening Session Draft Report for Public Review

• Listening Session Report will act as minutes of publically noticed Listening Session

• CTF will be asked to approve Listening Session Report at next CTF Meeting

• Project Team will provide a summary of any public comment received by Sept. 7th and distribute to CTF prior to the next meeting

• Draft Report Update will be posted to the website
Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Presentation

Jim DeGrood, Director of Transportation Services Regional Transportation Authority
RTA Formation

The RTA was formed by the Legislature in 2004 to develop a regional transportation plan through regional cooperation.

People from diverse backgrounds were brought together to form the Citizens’ Advisory Committee and Technical Management Committee to ensure a balanced regional approach.
Public Involvement

All projects in the RTA were vetted by the public as the plan was developed and after it was approved for the ballots through:

- More than 400 group presentations
- 27 open houses

The Citizens’ Advisory Committee met 19 times and the Technical Management Committee met 29 times over this period.
RTA Board Approval

The RTA Board adopted the twenty-year Regional Transportation Plan [“RTA Plan”] on November 30, 2005, through its Resolution No. 2005-01.
Jurisdictional Approval

All RTA local member governing bodies unanimously approved the RTA plan.
RTA Voter Approval

The RTA Plan was approved by the voters of Pima County on May 16, 2006 by a 3 – 2 margin.
Four Elements of the RTA Plan

Roadway Improvement

Transit

Safety

Environment & Economic Vitality
The RTA Plan described the Broadway project as:

RTA #17 Broadway Boulevard, Euclid to Country Club  Widen roadway to 6-lane arterial plus 2 dedicated bus lanes, bike lanes & sidewalks.

RTA funds:   $42,125,000
Committed, Non-RTA funds:  $29,222,000
Other Sources of Funds

“Committed, Non-RTA funds” are:

- $25,000,000  Pima Co. 1997 Bond Program
- $  3,000,000  City of Tucson (Impact fees)
- $  1,222,000  Regional Funds (PAG TIP)

Each fund source has rules for the use of its funds
RTA Board’s Statutory Responsibility

The RTA Board is charged with developing, adopting, supplementing, changing, implementing and administering the RTA Plan

A.R.S. 48-5304 (6) (12) (13) & (16); 48-5309 (A); 48-5314 (A).
Substantial Change Defined

A.R.S. 48-5309(E)

“An estimated cost to complete one or more elements of the RTA Plan that exceeds the expenditure limitations of the RTA Plan . . . by the following or greater percentages:

a. Ten per cent for a single element of the plan.

b. Fifteen per cent for any two elements of the plan.

c. Twenty per cent for three or more elements of the plan.”
What is an Element?

An element is a group of a certain type of transportation projects
[See: 48-5304(3); 48-5314(C)(4); 48-5308(F)]

The RTA Plan is broken into 4 separate elements:

• Roadway Improvements
• Safety Improvements
• Environmental and Economic Vitality Improvements
• Public Transit Improvements
Can the plan be changed?

This statute means that the RTA Board may make changes to the RTA Plan, so long as the “substantial change” thresholds, stated above, are not reached.
Statutory Purposes

The purpose of the Legislature in empowering the RTA Board to make changes to the RTA Plan, without necessitating a public vote, was to ensure that the Board could react efficiently to changing circumstances throughout the RTA Plan’s twenty-year implementation period.
Public officials, like the members of the RTA Board, must use a high level of care in spending public funds. Indeed, it is the highest standard of care, known as a **fiduciary duty** *Op. Atty. Gen. 75-11.*

This is a duty which is owed to the public, and it means, in part, that public officials who have the authority to expend public funds, “have a fiduciary obligation to do so in the most economical and feasible manner.” *Id.* Specifically, they must “obtain maximum return for each dollar spent . . . .” *Op. Atty. Gen. 84-24. Hertz Drive-Ur-Self System, Inc. v. Tucson Airport Authority, 81 Ariz. 80, 85 (1956).*
The Board’s Policy

Immediately after adopting the RTA Plan, the Board adopted its Resolution No. 2005-02, which approved policies for implementation of the RTA Plan. Among these policies was item 2, which read:

“Functionality Not to Be Diminished - The Technical/Management Committee as well as the Citizens Advisory Committee had specific capacity and/or performance improvements in mind when recommending highway improvement projects as well as transit improvements. This functionality should not and cannot be diminished. The voters, in approving the expenditure plan, are relying on the planned improvements actually being implemented.”
Implementing the Policy

The RTA Board Established Committees to Guide Project Implementation

1. **CART** -- *Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation* – Ensures that the RTA Plan is implemented as promised to the voters.

2. **TMC** – *Technical Management Committee* – Advises the Board on specific project implementation and technical matters.

3. **CAC** – *Citizen Advisory Committees* (such as the Broadway Citizen’s Task Force) – Guide implementation of specific projects regarding roadway characteristics, design features, mitigation measures, etc.
Limitation on Spending RTA Funds

When the RTA Board is able to save money on individual projects, be it through value engineering, scope refinement, or market conditions, that money is still restricted, and must only be spent to implement other projects within the RTA Plan.

A.R.S. 48-5307 (E); see A.R.S. 48-5304; A.R.S. 48-5308 (C).
Conclusions

• The public has provided input on all RTA projects, including Broadway

• The RTA Board retains authority to implement the RTA Plan

• The Voters must approve any substantial or elemental changes to the RTA Plan
Conclusions

• The RTA Board has adopted a policy not to diminish individual project functionality

• The RTA Board engages its committees to inform the Board on specifics of project design and implementation

• The RTA Board is bound by its fiduciary duty to the public to use wise discretion when spending the public’s money

• Any RTA funds saved through efficient project implementation must be spent in furtherance of the RTA Plan
Recommendations

• Establish “lines of communication” between the Broadway CTF and RTA CART & TMC
Recommendations

• Establish “lines of communication” between the Broadway CTF and RTA CART & TMC

• Work to identify what “functionality” means on the Broadway Corridor
Questions?

Regional Transportation Authority

www.RTAmobility.com

Improving transportation and bringing economic vitality to our region
Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning Presentation

John Liosatos, Transportation Planning Director
Pima Association of Governments (PAG)
Broadway Citizens Task Force

Regional Transportation Plan

August 30, 2012
How was the PAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) developed?
History

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

• Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962
  • The Three “C”s - Continuing, Comprehensive & Coordinated
  • PAG was formed Dec. 7, 1970

• 1973 Highway Act
  • Funding for MPOs
  • PAG was designated as the MPO on Dec. 14, 1973
Following the Funding

Federal Highway Administration

Obligation Authority

Congressional Budget Committee

Funding Programs including:
STP, HSIP & TA

State Highway Fund

Distribution Formula

Apportionment

Surface Transportation Bill (MAP-21)

Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS)

Arizona Legislature

U.S. Congress

Pima County Region

0.5 Cent Sales Tax

36.4 Cents/Gallon Gas Tax

18.4 Cents Federal

18.0 Cents State

State Fees
Vehicle License Tax (VLT)

Highway User Revenue Fund

Highway Trust Fund
The RTP is the “parent” plan for the region.

The RTP includes short and long range projects.
2040 Regional Transportation Plan
RTP Development

• Identification of existing and future challenges.
• Identification of “reasonably expected” funding available to meet those challenges.
• Jurisdictions provide “candidate projects” to address challenges.
• Candidate projects are prioritized into a draft project list w/ several factors taken into consideration including: extensive citizen stakeholder input, environmental concerns, cost and what type of funds can be used to construct.
RTP Development

• Draft project list is modeled for travel time and congestion using a regional model.
  • Title VI
  • Air quality
• Draft project list is released for public comment and review.
• Adjustments can be made to address public comments.
• Proposed RTP is made available for 30 day public comment period.
• Adoption by PAG Regional Council.
The PAG Model is a regional model that analyzes the projects that we have keyed in under the growth assumptions for the region as a whole.
The model doesn’t recommend roadway projects but rather validates the effectiveness of the projects offered by the jurisdictions.
Traffic Congestion

2040 TUCSON METRO TRAFFIC CONGESTION (MORNING PEAK HOURS, 6:30 AM - 8:30 AM)

2040 NO BUILD

2040 WITH RTP PROJECTS

Average V/C ratio: 0.77
Maximum V/C ratio: 6.35

Average V/C ratio: 0.63
Maximum V/C ratio: 3.94

"2040 No Build" scenario includes projects with committed funding.

"2040 With RTP Projects" scenario includes projects with additional possible funding.

Congestion levels displayed are based on the higher value of the two traffic directions.

V/C (Volume/Capacity) is the ratio of travel demand during a certain time period (volume) to the number of vehicles the street can hold (capacity).
2040 RTP Transit Projects

Proposed Improvements
- Maintenance Facility
- Transit Center
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Circulator Bus
- Express Bus
- Commuter / Intercity Rail
- Streetcar

Existing Bus Routes
(Sun Tran, Sun Shuttle, Express Bus, and Ajo-Tucson service)

Disclaimer:
The map is for informational purposes only. The information included on this map has been compiled from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. Pima Association of Governments makes no representation or warranties, express or implied, as to the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information.

May 17, 2018
Broadway Project Area Traffic Analysis Summary Presentation

Jim Schoen, PE, Principal Kittelson & Associates
Traffic Overview

• Corridor Traffic Planning & Studies
• Roadway Classification and Function
• Existing Conditions
• Future Needs
Corridor Studies

• Broadway Corridor Plan (1987)
  – Transit focus
  – Defined current adopted cross section and alignment

• PAG High Capacity Transit System Plan (2009)
  – Identified Broadway as primary HCT candidate route

• Euclid to Country Club Traffic Study (On-going)
On-Going Study Purpose

• Support design decisions that address:
  – Safety
  – Capacity (lanes, turn-lane storage)
  – Traffic control, signal operations
  – Access
  – Multi-modal facilities
  – Neighborhood protection
Roadway Classification and Function

- Principal Urban Arterial
  - Backbone of urban system
  - Provide regional mobility
  - Connect major employment and activity centers
  - Provide high capacity
  - Allow limited access to adjacent properties
Major Activity Centers

- University of Arizona
- Park Mall
- Downtown
- El Con Mall
- Williams Centre
Physical Features

- 4 travel lanes with continuous left turn lane
- 5 foot bike lanes
- Continuous sidewalk/paved surface (ADA deficiencies)
- 16 transit stops
Physical Features

• 5 signalized intersections

• 4 pedestrian HAWK signals, 1 planned

• 200 access points (driveways & side-streets)
  – 100 ft spacing
Traffic Volumes

Daily Traffic Counts on Major Arterials by Year
(from Campbell Ave. to Country Club Rd.)
Average Weekday Hourly Traffic

Feb 2009 Count
### Transit Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Annual Ridership (2011/2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - Broadway/6(^{th}) Ave</td>
<td>3,182,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - Oracle/12(^{th}) Ave</td>
<td>1,919,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Speedway</td>
<td>1,614,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Alvernon Way</td>
<td>1,339,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - S. Park/N. First Ave</td>
<td>1,283,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Broadway Express</td>
<td>22,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pedestrian Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2011 Pedestrian Volumes (Signal Activations)</th>
<th>Peak Pedestrian Crossing Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During Peak Hours on Broadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ave./Broadway Blvd. (HAWK)</td>
<td>22 (18)</td>
<td>11 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Ave./Broadway Blvd.</td>
<td>19 (11)</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HAWK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Ave./Broadway Blvd.</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HAWK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumer Ave./Broadway Blvd.</td>
<td>17 (12)</td>
<td>14 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HAWK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat Ave./Broadway Blvd.</td>
<td>1 (NA)</td>
<td>1 (NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(marked crosswalk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include peds crossing at signalized intersections
### Traffic Operations Measure: Level of Service

#### Signalized Intersection LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection LOS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>≤10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>35-55</td>
<td>55-80</td>
<td>≥80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Arterial LOS, Speed Limit = 35mph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment LOS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Speed (mph)</td>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>≤10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Standard (1 cycle):** 7.5 min
- **Maximum (Peak Hours):** 10 min, >12 min
# Existing Peak Hour Traffic Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Highland</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Country Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movements LOS &gt; D</td>
<td>EBL, SBL</td>
<td>EBL, NBT</td>
<td>SBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movements LOS &gt; D</td>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>EBL, WBL, SBL</td>
<td>SBL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial</th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Highland</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Country Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel Speed

- **AM** Travel Speed: 20 mph
- **PM** Travel Speed: 19 mph
## Multi-Modal Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing MMLOS</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.17 - 3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C - E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMLOS Criteria</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>% Heavy Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Wait/Travel Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Speed/Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating/Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#Driveways/Sidestreets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Speed/Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk Presence/Width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral Separation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Crash History

Crash data for the 3-year period from January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Highland</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Country Cl.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |        |          |          |        |             | **434** |

Crashes: 434
Future Traffic Demand

- Planned Roadway Network
- Trip Patterns (Census 2010 Data)
- Population & Employment Estimates

PAG 2040 Travel Demand Model

Network Traffic Demand Estimates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Euclid</th>
<th>Highland</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Country Cl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (1000's)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAG 2040</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (1000's)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAG Reduced Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (1000's)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross Section Alternatives

- 4 and 6 through lanes
- Exclusive turn lanes at signalized intersections
### Capacity Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-lane PAG 2040 (30%)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-lane PAG Reduced Growth (20%)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-lane PAG 2040 (30%)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Intersection LOS

- 6-lane PAG 2040 (30%) (30%)
- 4-lane PAG Reduced Growth (20%)

---

**Notes:**

- AM: AM (Morning)
- PM: PM (Afternoon)
- E, B, F, D: Levels of Service (LOS) indicators
- C: Indicates a lower LOS compared to other alternatives

---

**Sources:**

- Regional Transportation Authority
- City of Tucson
- Pima County

**Image:**

- Broadway Boulevard EUCLID to COUNTRY CLUB

---

**Logos:**

- Regional Transportation Authority
- City of Tucson
- Pima County
- Broadway Boulevard EUCLID to COUNTRY CLUB
Arterial Travel Speed

* Does not account for impacts of driveways or HAWKs
## Multi-Modal Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Section</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 lane divided w/ 12 ft multi-use lanes &amp; 6ft sidewalk</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lane divided w/ 5 ft bike lanes &amp; 6ft sidewalk</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 lane divided w/ 5 ft bike lanes &amp; 6ft sidewalk</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Capacity Transit

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) most feasible
- PAG evaluating implementation alternatives
Questions?
Vision and Goals
Framework Review

Phil Erickson, AIA, President
Community Design + Architecture
Introduction of Vision and Goals Framework

• Purpose

– Document public needs, wants, and expectations

– Guide development of design strategies and alternatives concepts

– Shape evaluation criteria and methods

– Highlight key areas of tension in stakeholder opinions
Introduction of Vision and Goals Framework

• Let’s start with Goals Framework and then come back to the Vision Statement

• Ways of addressing issues:
  – Preserve (216 comments)
  – Enhance (71 comments)
  – Change (161 comments)
  – Process and Making the Vision Happen (24 comments)
Introduction of Vision and Goals Framework

• Organization of this discussion of Goals Framework
  – Opportunity for CTF to share key information from Brainstorming Worksheets
  – Slides summarize Listening Session input for each goal concept ordered by number of related comments received
Preservation

- **Distinct Neighborhoods & Districts (72)**
  - Unique and diverse small & local businesses (41)
  - Neighborhoods & residential fronting Broadway (5)

- **Preserve diversity / character of historic & significant buildings (45)**
  - Fear losing historic character & structures (2)
  - Special features (15):
    - Broadway Village (6)
    - 1st Assembly of God Church (3)
    - Miles School (3)
    - Chase Bank (2)

- **Transportation function of Broadway (29)**
  - Preserve current width right-of-way / curb-to-curb (12)
  - Bus access (3)
  - Bicycle lanes (3)
  - East-west traffic flow (2)

- **Complement existing character of Districts & Neighborhoods (26)**
  - *Will become a thoroughfare not a place to be* (5)
  - Sense of community and place, it’s not generic (2+)
Preservation

• **Transportation** related to district character (21)
  – Existing curb to curb / r.o.w. distance (12)
  – Business access and parking (7)
  – Bicycle lanes (3)

• Design roadway to **avoid business impacts & maintain revenues** (16)

• **Compact, pedestrian-oriented activity center** given University & regional context (5)

• **Protect residential areas** from commercial encroachment (2)

• Discourage unnecessary traffic from using residential streets (no comments)
Preservation

• Distinct Neighborhoods & Districts (72)
• Preserve diversity / character of historic & significant buildings (45)
• Transportation function of Broadway (29)
• Complement existing character of Districts & Neighborhoods (26)
• Transportation related to district character (21)
• Design roadway to avoid business impacts & maintain revenues (16)
• Compact, pedestrian-oriented activity center given University & regional context (5)
• Protect residential areas from commercial encroachment (2)
• Discourage unnecessary traffic from using residential streets (no comments)
Enhancement

• Complete & improve **multimodal transportation** network & access (39)
  – More pedestrian friendly (17)
  – More bike friendly (5)
  – Enhance pedestrian crossings (3)
  – Greater connectivity across Broadway & entire area (3)
  – Better overall safety (3)

• **Transportation** related to function of Broadway (12)
  – Better lighting (3)
  – Save money fix potholes (3)

• Ensure **viability of properties** (11)
  – *Fear loss of property value & blight* (5)
  – Removing parking will kill businesses (2)

• **Land use mix to enhance character** of area (7)
  – Control billboards, signage, etc. (2)

• **Enhance access to UofA, 4th Avenue, and Downtown** (2)
Change

- Transportation function of Broadway (80)
  - Make Broadway a **transit corridor** with less frequent stops (15+)
    - Provide high-capacity trans connection (3)
    - Provide light rail on Broadway (3)
    - Provide streetcar (3)
  - Provide **bus pullouts** (9)
  - **Consistent speed** limit, needs to be **calmed** (especially near church and school), narrow lanes (6)
  - **Widen to some degree** but not as much as plan calls for (4)
  - Provide **more sidewalks** / continuous handicap access (4)
  - Design a **smarter, more efficient road** (4)
  - **Reconsider 8 lane expansion** and improve traffic flow without extreme, unnecessary destructiveness (4)
  - Provide **more and safer crosswalks** (3)
  - Add **left-turn arrows** at Tucson intersection (3)
  - **Solve bottleneck** into downtown (3)
  - **Fear of widening to 8-lanes** (2)
  - Remove bike lanes, provide a bike path; or use existing bike routes (2)
  - NOTHING!!! STOP IT!!!; KILL IT!!! (2)
  - Don’t run streetcar down Broadway to Downtown (2)
  - Provide **high-capacity trans connection** (3)
  - Provide light rail on Broadway (3)
  - Provide streetcar (3)
  - Make Broadway a **transit corridor** with less frequent stops (15+)
  - **Consistent speed** limit, needs to be **calmed** (especially near church and school), narrow lanes (6)
  - **Widen to some degree** but not as much as plan calls for (4)
  - Provide **more sidewalks** / continuous handicap access (4)
  - Design a **smarter, more efficient road** (4)
  - **Reconsider 8 lane expansion** and improve traffic flow without extreme, unnecessary destructiveness (4)
  - Provide **more and safer crosswalks** (3)
  - Add **left-turn arrows** at Tucson intersection (3)
  - **Solve bottleneck** into downtown (3)
  - **Fear of widening to 8-lanes** (2)
  - Remove bike lanes, provide a bike path; or use existing bike routes (2)
  - NOTHING!!! STOP IT!!!; KILL IT!!! (2)
  - Don’t run streetcar down Broadway to Downtown (2)
Change

• **Greener and shadier street environment** (24)
  – Provide vegetation (6)
  – More greenery, more scenic, tree-lined streets (5)
  – Provide shade for bus riders (3)
  – More shade, more trees (3)
  – Bury power lines (2)
  – Trees to separate traffic lanes and sidewalks, not in median (2)

• **Leverage strategic location** (15)
  – Improve business appeal to generate more tax revenue (2)
  – Turn into a place where people want to be (2)

• **Green and sustainable development** (14)
  – Widening proposed in the 1987 Plan, does not support goals of livability, sustainability, and walkable, bikeable streets. (4)
  – Increased environmental sensitivity, green infrastructure, less pollution (3)
  – Provide green infrastructure to water trees (2)
  – Fear more pollution (2)

• **Discourage strip commercial expansion / develop pedestrian-oriented mixed use activity centers** (14)
  – Land use planning tied into roadway; mixed land use; walk and bike to work (3)
  – Increase density of development in corridor (2)
  – Build mixed use commercial and residential, if feasible (2)
  – No Overlay! Fear overlay (2)
Change

• Support **development on perimeter** of neighborhoods to protect and enhance quality of life (7)

• **Unify Broadway frontage** (3)

• **Complement historic preservation with compatible infill** development (2)

• Strongly encourage **development of vacant property** throughout University Area (2)

• Good transition between land uses (no comments)

• Create neighborhood gateways (no comments)
Change

- **Transportation function** of Broadway (80)
- **Greener and shadier street** environment (24)
- **Leverage strategic location** (15)
- **Green and sustainable development** (14)
- **Discourage strip commercial expansion / develop pedestrian-oriented mixed use** activity centers (14)
- Support **development on perimeter** of neighborhoods to **protect and enhance quality of life** (7)
- **Unify Broadway frontage** (3)
- **Complement historic preservation with compatible infill** development (2)
- Strongly encourage **development of vacant property** throughout University Area (2)
- Good transition between land uses (no comments)
- Create neighborhood gateways (no comments)
Process & Making the Vision Happen

- **Need to use** up to date data and **create confidence in successful implementation** (15)
  - The project charter constrains the process (4)
  - Planning & design process needs to address perception that it is based on old no longer applicable transportation & growth projection data (3)
  - *Fear that this drags on forever* (3)
  - If you do something, do it right the first time (2)

- **Full and meaningful stakeholder involvement** in current and future decisions (9)
  - Can find a plan that makes everyone happy; bring community together (2)
  - What is planned will happen regardless of public input; will city really listen (2)

- **Build relationships** between organizations affecting the future of the area (no comments)
Vision and Goals

• Next Steps
  – Review and process CTF Brainstorming Worksheets
  – Planning Team will draft concepts and distribute before October 4\textsuperscript{th} CTF Meeting
  – Vision and Goals refinement during October CTF Meetings

• and Beyond...
  – CTF Draft Recommendations reviewed by public in November Public Meeting
  – CTF review of public input and revise if needed
  – Use for scenario development and evaluation
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Next CTF Meeting:
  o Thursday, 10/4/2012, 5:30 p.m. at Child and Family Resources
  o Depends on CTF approval of proposed meeting dates

• Proposed Agenda Items:
  o Finalize CTF-recommended Project Vision and Goals Framework
    o Typical sections discussion
  o Review and discussion of proposed revisions to Project Charter
  o Initial discussion of evaluation criteria
  o Presentations related to historic buildings and land use
    o Historic Buildings Inventory Report
    o Existing Land Use and Urban Form Assessment
    o Significant Structures Inventory
CTF Roundtable

• Each CTF member gets a chance to share
• Feel free to share anything you want
• Feel free to ask any questions you want answered by staff
2\textsuperscript{nd} Call to the Audience
2nd Call to the Audience

10 minutes

Please limit comments to 2 minutes

• Called forward in order received
• CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
• CTF cannot take action on matters raised
• CTF members can ask project team to review an item
Thank You for Coming – Please Stay in Touch!

Broadway: Euclid to Country Club
Web: www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway
Email: broadway@tucsonaz.gov
Info Line: 520.622.0815

RTA Plan
www.rtamobility.com