

Comments Regarding Draft Performance Measure Assessment

Below are comments from the Broadway Coalition on the Draft Performance Measure Assessment. The purpose of the comments is to provide alternative interpretations of the measures; and to suggest a process in which to evaluate the measures and analyze the various scenarios.

The Citizens' Task Force has reached the most important phase of the process; it has worked long and hard to get to this point. What the CTF accomplishes here will influence everything that occurs afterwards. Therefore, it is vital that the CTF spends whatever time is necessary to insure that the analysis and its results truly reflects the views of the CTF and the community.

A. Definitions:

1. General Comments

How the individual performance measures are defined and clearly understanding the assumptions used in evaluating each of the measures is the core of the analysis; the definition determines the rating. Each measure needs to be defined clearly, in non-jargon language (for example, define albedo) and with all assumptions and how it is to be used clearly delineated. This needs to be done for both those measures being evaluated and those that may not be (in order to better determine if, in fact, the particular measure can be evaluated). One should not have to look at other references (e.g. ITE manuals) to find information; it needs to be included in this document.

In addition, the definition of the various measures must be done in context of the vision and goals. Many, if not all, of the measures are context neutral. Therefore, any discussion of the individual measures needs to be done in relation to how the particular scenario implements the applicable parts of the vision for Broadway.

Related to this is the need to clearly spell out why a particular measure is given a particular rating. Further, it also needs to be explained why those measures not being evaluated cannot be evaluated, especially given the fact that over half of the measures are not rated in the draft assessment and many of these measures reflect important aspects of the vision and goals. Not incorporating these other measures may skew the evaluation of how well a particular scenario implements the vision and goals. For example, Options 6B (152 foot ROW) and 6 + TB (174 foot ROW), both of which will eliminate existing development on the north side of the road, perform very well on the measures used (the first has only one negative, one high construction cost and seven neutrals; the second has three negatives, two high construction costs and four neutrals). Yet, if impacts related to sense of place, economic vitality, and other categories are included, the assessment would look very different (even assuming that the existing ratings are not changed based on a re-evaluation of the definitions).

As much of the analysis is qualitative, many of the unevaluated measures can be assessed as to how they further the vision and goals. For example, for those scenarios which will require destruction of many of the businesses and other uses along Broadway, it seems obvious that there will be a negative impact on the various measures relating to Broadway as a destination and retention of businesses.

Finally, there needs to be an evaluation of each measurement category (sense of place, pedestrian access and mobility) as well as a discussion of what each category demonstrates. This is particularly important if there are measures not being evaluated in order to create a more complete picture of how each scenario implements the vision and goals. Further, this will

provide a better means of communicating information to the public as opposed to relying on over 50 individual measures.

2. Comments on Individual Measures

The comments regarding the individual measures are intended to provide alternative interpretations of the various measures and to raise concerns regarding how they are defined and the assumptions use; as well as to provide suggestions on why many of the measures not used can be used in evaluating the individual scenarios. The list is not intended to be exhaustive, but illustrative of the issues involved.

Overall Comments: The overall assumption for the assessment is that both the design speed and posted speed will be 30 MPH. While this might be true if the subject area remains four-lane, this would not be true if the road is widened (the rest of Broadway has a posted speed limit of 40 MPH). Usually design speed is 10 mph higher than posted speed. If the roadway is widened and is a straight section of roadway such as this segment of Broadway, the design speed and posted speed are essentially meaningless. Drivers will travel at the speeds they feel comfortable with on a wide 6 to 8 lane roadway and what they feel that they can get away with. The 85th percentile speed will likely go up over 40 mph, which of course means 15 percent of drivers are traveling at an even higher speed.

There is no discussion of impacts from the various options onto other portions of Broadway. Further, it seems that the discussion should incorporate the fact that this a two-mile portion of a much longer corridor that has issues that will remain (and may be exacerbated) regardless of what occurs along this stretch.

While the measures being assessed deal primarily with movement through the corridor, few of the measures deal with Broadway's current context (especially land use) or that which is implied from the vision and goals. As a result, the assessment does not provide a comprehensive assessment of the various options. (Note: the numbers associated with each measure is the identifying number for the measure in the assessment)

1. Pedestrian Access and Mobility:

1a. Functionality of Streetside for Pedestrian Access: It is not clear what information is being provided and what is being rated; nor is it clear why the different scenarios receive different scores. The information from the ITE manuals should be summarized here rather than requiring people to search for the documents. In addition, pedestrian access implies that there are destinations to access; if not, no one will use the sidewalks. Therefore, the extent to which a scenario supports businesses/destinations would rate higher in terms of pedestrian access functionality.

1f. Vehicle/Pedestrian Conflicts at Driveways: It is not clear why a wider sidewalk will provide more visibility for drivers. Visibility would only be increased if there are not side obstructions blocking views, so the assumption must be that all landscape and street furniture is kept well away from the driveways. Further, it seems to make more sense to design the street to help control speeds and the wider the street, the faster the traffic; therefore, greater risks to pedestrians. Also, pedestrian safety will be increased by reducing the number of curb cuts (egress/ingress), which implies links to land use and creative ways to handle parking.

1h. Walkable Destinations: We would suggest that this measure evaluates how the various scenarios support or reduce destinations on Broadway and should be included in the assessment. Several of the scenarios will remove most of the buildings on the north side of

Broadway. From a qualitative perspective, it is not difficult to determine how a particular scenario will support the creation and maintenance of destinations on Broadway.

2. Bicycle Access and Mobility:

2a. Separation of Bikes and Arterial Traffic: In order to encourage more people to bike on a major arterial like Broadway will require more aggressive measures than a 7-foot bicycle lane). Separated bicycle facilities such as one-way cycle tracks, elevated bike lanes, or buffered bike lanes such as those planned for Grant Road and currently existing on Mountain Avenue should be evaluated.

2b. Bike Conflicts with Crossing Vehicles: It is not clear why options with dedicated transit lanes in the middle get a + if one assumes that there will still be local buses in the outside lanes. Further, it is not clear why options that require buses to cross over bike lanes are neutral; it seems that the potential for crashes is increased.

3. Transit Access and Mobility:

3b. Transit Stop Facilities: It is not clear what is being assessed with this measure. If it is convenient, comfortable, and shady transit shelters, then it seems that any alternative can provide excellent facilities. On the other hand, BRT in the middle of the street, especially if the street is very wide, could create safety issues for potential riders.

3c. Corridor Travel Time: It is unclear whether what is being evaluated is transit travel time through the corridor or all travel. If transit, then the analysis needs to look at what types of transit are being provided (if rail is to be provided, there is no reason to differentiate among those options as the rail will travel on its own tracks). It also assumes that dedicated transit (whether rail or BRT) will be successful regardless of the land uses provided and will be successful even if driving is made easy or easier. It also ignores the fact that other jurisdictions have developed successful rail systems without increasing the number of travel lanes (for example, Phoenix).

If all travel is being considered, then there are several issues. First, induced demand is ignored; the criteria assume that more lanes equal better travel. Widening this corridor would induce single occupant motor vehicle use; trends nationwide show that driving has stabilized and driving by the age group 16 through 34 has declined significantly. It also ignores the idea of Broadway as a destination and place and the fact that slower travel time will better support commercial development and local businesses.

3e. Frequency and Hours of Service: One could make the assumption that those options which negatively affect land uses will also reduce frequency and hours of service because of the decrease of places and destinations for people to travel to and reduces the ability to create higher density residential development.

3f. Accommodation of High Speed Transit: This measure may be substantially redundant with 3c. It is unclear what is meant by the last sentence relating to 6+TB (ie, "...with implementation of the concept.") The definition also ignores the option provided by Gene Caywood which demonstrates that transit can be provided within both the existing roadway and ROW, and the option also provides two travel lanes in each direction. And, it ignores the fact that Phoenix has implemented a very successful light rail system with little, if any widening of its major streets (including Central Avenue which runs through the middle of downtown).

4. Vehicular Access and Mobility: In general, this stretch needs to be evaluated within the larger Broadway corridor, especially given that Broadway is six lanes at Country Club (with no plans or money to widen east of Country Club) and Broadway/Congress in Downtown are 4 lanes.

4a. Movement of Through Traffic: The definition ignores induced demand and assumes that the current condition is a negative, which is arguably not the case (and may not be the case in the future if people continue to drive less). Also, a significant component of vehicle mobility is related to the design of the intersections, less so on the through-lanes between intersections. Because intersection design is not a part of these concepts, it would be difficult to rate the cross-sections to the detail shown (multiple minuses and pluses).

5. Sense of Place: Measures that assess land use mix and design (e.g. land use mix (#6f) and walkability and bikeability (#6c) should be included in this category.

5b. Visual Quality: There is no definition provided. In general, the assessment is primarily based on what is to be achieved. If Broadway is to become a destination, then options that reduce development should be rated negatively.

5c. Broadway as a Destination: This measure relates to place-making, and any option that reduces land uses should be rated as a negative. Even if some uses are theoretically possible from remnant parcels, the expanded ROW's would have serious impacts on place-making as opposed to another arterial strip development as exists further east on Broadway.

5d. Gateway to Downtown: Despite the reference to community character (undefined), it appears that what is being assessed is an option's ability to move people through the Broadway Corridor; it does not assess the Corridor's relationship with Downtown or how Broadway can compliment Downtown. This is clear by the fact that the option with widest right-of-way and the biggest impact to existing development is rated as the best option as a gateway. A true gateway should provide for a transition into the now emerging high-transit/highly-walkable downtown environment.

5e. Conduciveness to Businesses: Again, it seems that it's possible to determine if an option will have a positive or negative impact on business conduciveness, with options eliminating commercial uses and opportunities as having a negative impact.

5f. Walkable Community: Walkability can be defined as, "The extent to which the built environment is friendly to the presence of people living, shopping, visiting, enjoying or spending time in an area." In other words, walkability is related to place making. There are institutions which have developed means of measuring walkability. Two such efforts are Walk Score, a company which calculates a score based on proximity to various types of establishments (grocery stores, movie theaters, restaurants, etc); and the University of British Columbia, which has developed a Walkability Index which looks at residential and commercial density, land use, and street connectivity. In contrast, what is provided in the Draft Assessment relies primarily on movement through the corridor, with some notice of historical resources (why historical resources but not other land uses?). This explains why the options with the biggest negative impact on existing development (destinations) are rated as neutral.

5g. Certainty: This measure has been defined in presentations before the CTF as how well an option will "get it right the first time." On the other hand, certainty can be defined as how likely a

particular option can be implemented or how closely an option reflects the vision and goals. In any case, this measure does not really belong in the Sense of Place category. More importantly, the definition provided is very unclear on how the measures combined have anything to do with any definition of certainty.

6. Environmental / Public Health

6c. Heat Island: The definition essentially says that wider roads help fight the heat island effect. This is based largely on the assumption that new roads will be paved with high reflectivity treatments. This is highly unlikely as such treatments are rarely used, are much noisier and probably much more expensive. Further, such treatments do darken somewhat and still create heat sinks. Therefore, also provide examples of actual paving materials with high albedo.

6e. Walkability / Bikeability: Same issues as with Walkable Community (#5f), and that measure is one of the inputs into this measure. Again, it seems that options that significantly reduce places and destinations will have a negative impact on walkability and bikeability, yet these options are rated as neutral.

6f. Land Use Mix: It is unclear why this measure is considered one that cannot be evaluated as it seems that options that require the removal of existing development would have a negative impact on the land use mix. Further, as wider roads and higher traffic speeds have a negative impact on local businesses, those options, by encouraging non-local businesses (where there might be an opportunity to develop or redevelop) would again have a negative impact on the land use mix. On the other hand, options that allow for redevelopment and revitalization would have positive impacts.

7. Economic Vitality: None of the eight measures in this category are evaluated. However, it seems that options that reduce land uses and eliminates or reduces commercial activity would have negative impacts on sales and property taxes, jobs, economic potential, etc, whereas, those options that would retain existing commercial activity and allow for increased activity (residential and commercial) would have potential positive impacts. In other words, place-making has positive economic results.

It has been suggested that the remnant parcels have economic potential. However, it needs to be demonstrated that this economic potential equals the potential of retaining the existing businesses and ownership, as the reduced size of the parcels will affect their development potential (while increasing the potential of negative impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhoods). Most likely, the City would have to take the lead in developing these properties as the existing structures would be removed to implement the wider ROW's), supplanting the existing ownership. Further, the wider ROW will have a negative impact on the existing character of the area (small, locally-owned businesses in a potentially more human-oriented scale); and wider roads and higher travel speeds encourage the loss of local business in favor of chains. And, as studies have demonstrated, locally-owned businesses have a more positive impact on the local economy than chains.

8. Project Cost: We would suggest that operations / maintenance costs be one of the measures, as this will be a significant cost over time and responsibility for these costs will fall on City residents. As is well known, the Tucson region is only maintaining streets at about 10 to 15 percent of the level that they should be maintained. This is leading to a major crisis for infrastructure, with no relief in sight even with the relatively modest City bond approval for street maintenance. There is no clear funding strategy for maintenance at the local, state or federal levels so building larger and larger roadways results in an even more severe deficit.

8c. Income For Reuse of City-Owned Properties: It is not clear why this measure is not evaluated, as options that encourage / allow for redevelopment of City properties would have a positive effect on income to the City, while those options that would reduce or preclude development of City properties would have a negative impact.

3. Options

It appears that the Existing Conditions option assumes no changes; this is a misinterpretation of what this option should be. Instead, the option should assume that the existing roadway and right-of-way remains unchanged (or virtually unchanged), but that improvements, including light rail (as shown on Gene Caywood's scenario), streetscape improvements and redevelopment can occur.

If the above changes are made, then Option 4A provides a ROW that is less than occurs along any section of the Broadway Corridor (the smallest row is 70 feet along two blocks on the western end of the corridor). As a result, this option does not seem to provide a viable alternative, even for discussion. Further, if the Existing Conditions alternative is viewed as we suggest, then that alternative works better as representing an option utilizing minimal ROW.

Option 6A for the section east of Campbell is shown as a 138-foot ROW; the difference from the western section is the addition of a local access lane and parking. This needs to be reflected on the assessment chart.

Given the variation of ROW's along the two-mile corridor, any discussion should look at a block by block analysis.

There should be options that incorporate four lanes plus two outer shared bus/bike lanes, basically similar to Broadway east of Columbus minus two regular travel lanes. This option, would include a green center lane within the bus/bike lane that includes frequent bike symbols on it. Long Beach has a lane like this.