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: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/clerks/boards?board=100.

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. The agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Beizer.

2. Call to the Audience (5:30 p.m., 15 minutes)
Four (4) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Councilmember Steve Kozachik - Councilmember Kozachik addressed the CTF regarding clarifying the Open Meeting Law, funding of the project and confirming the purview of the Task Force.

Gene Caywood - Introduced himself as a representative of the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates and spoke in support of rail transit.

Laura Tabili - Ms. Tabili ceded her time to J. D. Garcia and did not address the CTF.

J.D. Garcia - Introduced himself and spoke about Level of Service (LOS) as an inadequate analysis method for considering multiple modes.
3. City Attorney’s Office Presentation

Dennis McLaughlin presented information to the CTF regarding two topics:

1. The CTF must have a Chair and Vice-Chair, per the creating resolution. The duties of these entities can be determined by the CTF as long as they fall within the guidelines of the creating resolution. The CTF can use a facilitator.

2. Under the Open Meeting Laws, it is the advice of the City Attorney’s Office that CTF members not discuss CTF business with each other outside of a publicly noticed CTF meeting. This advice is due to two factors. First, each member cannot know what another member will do with the information they share, such as pass on to another CTF member. Second, when discussions are started with less than a majority, these discussions can morph into a majority discussion.

By following this advice, CTF members should avoid any violations of the Open Meeting Law.

CTF members asked about enforcement of these laws, previous action taken against violators recently and whether or not Task Forces are formed using a standard procedure. The CTF decided to address this issue further at the next CTF meeting.

4. Overview of Public Input Report Process

Jenn Burdick led a discussion on the process of compiling input submitted by the public and providing it to the CTF for review. A spreadsheet report and related attachments were distributed to the CTF for their review prior to the meeting, along with an overview of the proposed process for handling input, updating the report, and distributing it to the CTF. The following process was presented, discussed, and approved:

- Input comes in via multiple channels
- Input is logged on a spreadsheet by the TDOT project manager
- Input is categorized into four action categories – no action required, research required, forward to CTF, or forward to third party (or a combination)
- Spreadsheet and copies of input are distributed prior to CTF meetings for CTF review
- Keywords and issues in the summary enable relevant input to be addressed at appropriate CTF meetings
- CTF can address input, raise issues, or submit questions prior to or during CTF meetings
- Spreadsheet will be updated in between each CTF meeting
- Spreadsheet and input will be provided to the CTF earlier than the next meeting, via the web or electronically, if more than 10 pieces of correspondence are received
- Spreadsheet will be changed to include who the input is from, what neighborhood/stakeholder group the commenter represents, and dates for when action was taken.
5. **Approve Meeting Summary from July 26, 2012 CTF Meeting**

The CTF approved the Meeting Summary from the July 26, 2012 CTF Meeting with the following changes:

- Gene Caywood’s name needs correction.
- Rocco’s input on the definition of success as a CTF member needs inclusion.
- “Handouts”, or materials collected from speakers during Call to the Audience should be attached to the minutes.

6. **Discuss and Approve Revised CTF Mission**

Nanci Beizer led a discussion on the CTF Mission, including how the revisions that were requested were made. The CTF approved the following as the CTF 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:

- 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.”

7. **Discuss and Approve Proposed Meeting Schedule**

During the Nanci Beizer-led discussion on the proposed meeting schedule, the Task Force approved the schedule with the following notes:

- November 8 is preferable to November 1
- October 20 workshop date will be revised by poll

In a brief discussion, the Task Force expressed low levels of support for Saturday meetings and shorter meetings, preferring more frequent Thursday meetings when needed, and suggested holding some meetings as study sessions or informational meetings.

8. **Discuss and Approve Listening Session Draft Report**

Phil Erickson led a discussion regarding the Listening Session Draft Report, including:

- The role of the report as the first public participation opportunity
- Analysis of comments collected on comment cards and in emails
- Analysis of stakeholder input
- The addition of comment cards and emails to Appendix A

The CTF discussed the Listening Session Experience Worksheet, with general agreement that the draft report accurately reflects the experiences of the CTF at the listening session, the input received, and public sentiment. Discussion about the format of the
meeting was held and focused on the location, noise level, staffing (facilitators and scribes), how input to the questions could be provided, and how full-group interaction might be achieved. The project team committed to involve the CTF in setting future public meeting agendas, activities, and formats, and to investigate whether staffing might be supplemented with trained facilitator volunteers from the community. The project team will also involve the CTF in debriefings after future listening sessions and public events.

Suggested edits to the document included adding page numbers to the report and making sure the subthemes shown in the tables are accurately listed under the themes on pages 13-14. The Task Force endorsed additional time to review the current draft Listening Session Report and additional discussion and/or approval at the October 4 meeting.

9. Regional Transportation Authority Presentation

Jim DeGrood from the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) presented an overview of the RTA role in the project. This presentation covered:

- RTA formation and structure
- Overview of the RTA Plan
- How the Broadway project was presented to and approved by voters
- RTA funding agreements for the Broadway project
- The RTA statutory responsibility to implement the Plan
- The definition of “substantial change”
- The RTA fiduciary responsibility to voters
- RTA Board policy not to diminish functionality
- RTA Board-established committees that guide implementation
- Limitations on spending RTA funds
- Public input has been received on all RTA projects, including Broadway
- Collaboration between RTA representative Doug Mance and the Broadway CTF

A lengthy question and answer session followed the presentation. CTF members raised a number of questions and concerns, which are included below. A summary of the responses provided by Mr. DeGrood and project team members are also noted.

CTF Questions and Concerns

- We are looking for direction from the RTA Board on whether we are moving in the right direction. What we can and can’t do. Is what we are talking about taking us in the right direction?
- Will the RTA provide feedback if the CTF is getting off-track? What if the design is different from the voter-approved scope (6-lane arterial plus 2 dedicated bus lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks)? Will RTA withdraw funding?
- Is it fair to say that the 1987 Broadway project plan was based in faulty traffic projections that don’t hold up today, and did not come to fruition?
- Does the RTA Board have authority to make changes and not send the entire plan back to voters?
- Does CTF get to define the definition of functionality?
• Hate to see if CTF brings broad community vision, support (through this body (CTF) to the RTA Board, and it is thrown out.
• What is your best interpretation as to what the RTA Board understands functionality to be? Metrics?
• Can we assume studies undertaken thus far (traffic, historic) reflect the values of RTA Board regarding functionality?
• Was functionality language on the ballot?
• Has any part of RTA Board policy ever been changed by the Board?
• Is there any reason the Board could change their policy since original assumptions didn’t pan out?
• What does it mean - mandate, funding, implementation of the plan?
• What does 10% threshold mean? Is it by specific projects, or all the roadway improvement projects in aggregate? (In aggregate)
• Are members of CART or TAC compensated? Is the list of members on the website?
• Is the Grant Road Improvement Project a template for how to communicate with RTA?

**Summarized Responses**

The RTA supports the Citizens Task Force and the work on this project. Guidance on whether the project is moving in the right direction will lie in how the resulting design adheres to the definition of functionality, which includes level of service, travel time, and other measures. The policy adopted by the RTA Board in 2005 emphasizes that “functionality shall not and cannot be diminished”. The functionality language was not on the ballot. This policy has been in place since 2005 and guides the implementation of the RTA Plan. No changes to it or the other policies have been proposed since adoption in 2005, but any changes would have to be approved by a vote of the RTA Board.

As the project progresses, any proposed modifications to the project will need to address functionality. The definition of functionality for Broadway will be defined in coming months. The RTA Technical/Management Committee and CART Committees were all involved in determining the functionality of projects included on the RTA Plan. They will need to be part of conversations moving forward. City of Tucson’s Mayor and Council and the project Technical Advisory Committee will be important contributors to this work, as well. The CTF can be part of defining functionality. Any modification to the definition of functionality and/or to the project scope will need be well-reasoned.

Changes to projects are allowed and the RTA can make them. The RTA plan would be required to go back to the voters if an element of the RTA plan (such as the ‘Roadway Improvements’ element) were to go over the allotted aggregate budget for that element by 10% or more.
The members of the RTA CART committee and the Technical/Management Committee are appointed. They are not compensated for their roles on the committee, but some members are employed as consultants or are employees of local jurisdictions. A list of members is available on the RTA web site (www.rtamobility.com). NOTE: CART committee member Doug Mance provided a handout to the CTF during the Call to the Audience, which is attached to this summary.

10. Land Use and Transportation Planning Presentation
John Liosatos from the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) presented an overview of modeling used by PAG in land use and transportation planning. Due to time constraints, this presentation was condensed into a shorter timeframe. Liosatos covered the following topics:
- History of the PAG, Transportation Improvement Program, and Regional Transportation Plan
- Federal and state requirements for transportation planning
- Funding mechanisms for transportation projects
- Development of the Regional Transportation Plan
- Growth and employment projections through 2040
- The PAG model - its assumptions, inputs, and outputs
- How information and assumptions are reflected in the traffic models
- How information and assumptions are reflected in the transit and bike/pedestrian models

A question and answer session followed the meeting. John Liosatos answered questions regarding:
- How driving patterns are incorporated into the models
- How the model assigns traffic onto roadways
- How the regional model looks at Broadway specifically
- How the congestion map is interpreted in the Broadway project area

11. Broadway Project Area Traffic Studies and Analysis
Jim Schoen with Kittelson and Associates was unable to present due to time constraints. A future presentation is planned and a traffic analysis summary and a report were handed out to the CTF to review.

12. Vision and Goals Framework Review
Phil Erickson with Community Design + Architecture presented an abbreviated overview of the next steps in the process to adopt a vision and goals for the Broadway project. The CTF discussed how to complete the Vision and Goals Worksheets, including considering area and neighborhood plans, the draft goals outlined and the stakeholder groups each CTF member represents. The overview included an outline of how the public will be involved in setting the Broadway project vision and goals, the need for the design process to help set the vision and goals and how the vision and goals process was used on the Grant Road process. The project team committed to providing an example of the Grant Road Guiding Principles to help the CTF envision what the Vision and Goals for Broadway will look like.
13. Next Steps

*Please note: the second Call to the Audience was held prior to this agenda item to conform to the 8:30 p.m. timeframe indicated on the public agenda.*

Jenn Burdick led a discussion regarding the October 4 CTF Meeting. Because the meeting agenda ran longer than planned, the project team will bring back a recommended agenda for the next meeting. The CTF discussion that ensued addressed the CTF meeting lengths and formats, placing emphasis on getting good information and having the opportunity to ask questions. Holding study sessions and avoiding Saturday meetings were also discussed.

14. Roundtable

Nanci Beizer led a roundtable discussion that included a brief discussion on functionality as a multimodal concept and thanking the citizens for participating. A number of comments were made regarding the CTF meetings, including the need for punctuality (start and end on time), and the desire to have complete presentations so that good information is heard and absorbed by the CTF and opportunities for questions and answers exists. These comments are related to some that occurred during discussion on Agenda Item 7.

The project team committed to sharing agendas in advance with the CTF, with timing included, and if more time is expected by the CTF members, they can let the project team know.

The project team committed to come back to the Task Force with recommendations on how to address the following:

1. A different date for workshop/field trip planned on October 20, 2012.

2. A manner in which to ensure that agenda items stay on time, are allowed a complete presentation and discussions, and that CTF meetings end on time.

Suggestions made by Task Force members included:

- Budget enough time on agendas for presentations and discussions.
  - Let the CTF weigh in on whether items have enough time for discussion by sending out the agenda in advance.

- Nanci, as facilitator, should help the CTF stay on time.
  - Limiting the number of questions per person may keep the items on time.
  - If questions from a single CTF member are “excessive” she will check in with CTF to manage time.
  - When an item is running out of time, she should let the CTF know.
  - If it appears that more discussion is needed on an item, perhaps that item can be scheduled at the next, or a future, CTF meeting, as is appropriate.

- Consider scheduling more meetings instead of packing agendas so tightly.
  - Saturdays are tough - often the one day off a week the CTF gets.
  - Additional Thursdays could work, if needed.
Consider using “study sessions” to focus on issues that are more charged or will require more time and discussion.

3. A reconcile meeting schedule, based on what was approved earlier in the meeting and what the project team develops in light of the discussion, to help keep the project on track and the meetings punctual.

15. Call to the Audience (8:30 p.m., 15 minutes)

Please note: This agenda item occurred prior to Agenda Item 13.

Eight (8) members of the public addressed the Task Force:

Jessica Schuman - Introduced herself and spoke out against using Level of Service as a metric for functionality.

Laura Tabili - Ms. Tabili spoke about Open Meeting Law and stated that two or three people speaking with one another does not constitute a quorum, and a quorum must be avoided.

Doug Mance - Mr. Mance left the meeting by this time, but provided a document regarding the RTA CART Committee for the CTF (attached to this meeting summary).

Marc Fink - Introduced himself and presented several ideas for the CTF to keep in mind. He spoke to functionality as a product of purpose, models are only as good as their inputs so inputs should be updated to reflect smart growth and alternate modes, and level of service as an inadequate evaluation metric. He indicated he would forward his comments in writing.

James Angel - Mr. Angel spoke regarding influencing growth patterns through development, the widening as a mistake, and in favor of high capacity transit.

Tres English - Introduced himself and spoke about defining functionality in a way that creates a Broadway area into something more accessible, more convenient and making a place we want to have. He suggested asking PAG for numbers as planned versus current conditions and attending the Sustainable Tucson meeting.

Gene Caywood - Mr. Caywood encouraged the CTF to define functionality and then take their definition to the RTA Board. He also spoke in favor of high capacity transit, mentioning it costs money but serves a larger “ridershed.”

James McAdam - Introduced himself as a representative from the Mayor’s office and mentioned that he is a bike commuter in the Broadway project area and resident in the Rincon Heights neighborhood.
16. Adjourn
Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 9:13 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.

Citizen Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Scott</td>
<td>Farhad Moghimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Butterbrodt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Eddy</td>
<td>Colby Henley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Belman</td>
<td>Michael Jamey Sumner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R. DiGrazia</td>
<td>Jon Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Nasser</td>
<td>Mary Durham-Pflibsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Papuga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation (CART) Committee

The CART's mission is to ascertain that the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) plan is implemented as presented to the voters of Pima County on May 16, 2006. Implementation includes project delivery, review of revenue projections and project expenditures. The CART reports directly to the RTA Board.

The CART is composed of individuals serving 4, 5, or 6 year terms. Staggered terms allow two-thirds of the CART members to remain on the committee at the end of each term. During their term, CART members cannot be removed from the Committee except for violations of law or public trust. However, multiple unexcused absences may result in the removal of a member. A CART member may voluntarily resign if unwilling or unable to serve on the Committee.

The Committee will meet at least bi-annually and shall hold more frequent meetings as deemed necessary. All meetings of the CART will be open to the public and conform to the Arizona Open Meeting Law. Minutes of the meeting will be treated as public record and available for public inspection.

The CART may form sub-committees to analyze specific issues as they may arise. The sub-committee(s) shall report to the full Committee any findings or recommendations. Sub-committee meetings also will be subject to the Open Meeting laws.

The statutes require that the RTA provide an annual report to the public, published in at least two newspapers of the County by January of each year. This report should include project status, project budget variances and provide an overview of the coming year's expectations regarding project starts and completions. The Committee will play an integral role in review of the report prior to publication.

There are two additional levels of citizen input that occur outside the CART. Planning for each major corridor will necessitate citizen's input through a Corridor Planning Committee. Citizen involvement at this level will help determine right-of-way alignment and substantial features of the corridor within the scope of the voter approved plan. There also will be citizen involvement through a Citizens Advisory Committee on specific projects contained within corridors. Input on the project level may include landscaping features, accessibility, and land use issues. Care will be taken to ensure these three levels of involvement do not duplicate each other's efforts.
Citizens group a chance to steer transport plan

OUR VIEW: RTA board will pick committee members; let's hope it chooses wisely

The regional transportation plan that voters approved in last week's election will make a difference to local traffic if the proposed improvements are implemented in a timely fashion. There's a better chance of that happening if citizens hold the decision-makers' feet to the fire.

In last week's election, the community essentially gave the Regional Transportation Authority a checkbook that will accumulate $2 billion over the next 20 years.

Members of the public can have a hand in seeing that the money is wisely used by offering to serve on the RTA's watchdog group, called the Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation Committee.

The RTA is accepting applications from interested people. They're due by 5 p.m. next Wednesday. Those interested can get an application online at www.rtamobility.com or pick one up at public libraries or at the Pima Association of Governments, 177 N. Church Ave., Suite 405.

The oversight committee can refer its questions or concerns about the transportation plan to the RTA board, which is obligated to respond. The RTA board is composed of one elected official from each of Pima County's eight jurisdictions, a member from the State Transportation Board and one from the Pima Association of Governments.

A story by Andrea Kelly in Wednesday's Star notes that each of those elected officials chooses one member for the citizens monitoring committee, and that the other 13 members will be selected by the board as a whole.

That process has already been criticized as useless and self-serving. Mark Poston, one of the critics, said in Wednesday's story that the committee is selected "by the very people it's supposed to be keeping an eye on. It's like picking your own judge and jury."

That is, of course, a potential problem if the RTA board stacks the citizens committee with tame sycophants.

But it is presumptuous to assume that's the inevitable course the RTA board will take.

The underlying message to take from Poston's comment is that the RTA board's process for selecting members of the advisory committee must itself be monitored.

It is, of course, important that the RTA board take a judicious approach to the creation of the watchdog committee. It will be interesting to see if any of the more vociferous critics of the RTA plan—Bill Heusler, John Kronko, Molly McKasson, Ken O'Day and Bill Risner—offer to serve on the committee.

In putting together the citizens committee, the RTA board should not dedicate too much time to trying to stifle dissent, but the board must remain sensitive also to the need for not bringing in individuals who might paralyze the work at hand.

It would not benefit the community as a whole to have a citizens group that spends half its time rehashing the issues that were debated before the RTA was approved in the May 16 election.

The broad outline of what needs to be done to alleviate the traffic mess in metropolitan Tucson is known. A citizens group should be composed of people dedicated to seeing that the projects are implemented in a timely manner and that funds are not diverted to projects unrelated to transportation improvement.

For those who supported or opposed the plan, this is an opportunity to get involved in a constructive manner.