



## Broadway Boulevard, Euclid to Country Club

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force  
FROM: Jenn Toothaker Burdick, Project Manager  
DATE: June 11, 2013  
RE: **CTF Members Questions and Comments Submitted since 5/30/13 Meeting**

---

Pertinent questions and comments have been shared that would benefit the group as a whole to be aware of. The following numbered items represent questions and comments emailed from members of the CTF, and the project team's responses. (NOTE: A few additional questions and comments do not yet have a response, but will be shared once completed.)

**1. What if we aren't able to address all CTF comments and ideas regarding cross sections and performance measures in our next two scheduled meetings? What happens if we find that we'll need more time to prepare and/or reach consensus prior to the public meeting?**

The public meeting date of September 5 is tentative at this point. However, as those who have organized public events know, securing the event location is critical to ensuring a successful event. Part of the date selection process is driven by availability of the space. The project team reserved Sabbar Shrine Hall for September 5, and worked within their calendar of events for a Thursday evening meeting. This date would allow enough time for Charrette #2 to be held on September 30 and October 3. The project team has requested tentative holds on all Thursdays in September at Sabbar Shrine Hall to provide flexibility in changing the date, if a change in date is warranted.

If more time is needed for the Task Force to prepare and/or reach consensus prior to the meeting, we can discuss that, as well. There are 2 additional dates we have already set with the Task Force, for Monday, September 30 and Thursday, October 3. We could also discuss adding a date in August to meet.

As project manager – and always remembering that there are benefits and trade-offs to everything – I feel it is my duty to bring up that moving the date back is possible, but there are resulting impacts to the project schedule. Additionally, if we need to set an additional CTF meeting, the project schedule could be delayed and there are additional project costs for adding a new meeting. Stating these considerations is not intended to coerce the CTF with moving forward if we are not ready. It's merely to share that these factors need to be considered when discuss moving or delaying anything.

**2. I understand that, based on the input received at the public meeting, the CTF will choose a small subset of design options to carry forward into the more detailed design, alignment and analysis phase of the project.**

**a. What exactly does this mean?**

To achieve the end goal of this Planning & Design Phase – the Design Concept Report – the project team identified a series of tasks. We have talked about them in relationship most

recently to the Public Participation graphic, in the blue boxes. (This graphic is online at: [http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/Plan-Design\\_Brd\\_sm.pdf](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/Plan-Design_Brd_sm.pdf) )

These tasks build on each other, moving things incrementally forward to a decision point – the only decision point in this Planning & Design Phase that commits the CTF to a “final” decision. That decision point is the recommendation to Mayor and Council for the design concept (first Mayor and Council meeting box on the graphic). The Mayor and Council would then indicate their support of the project team moving forward into completing the technical work (engineering, hydrology, landscaping, etc.) needed to pull the Design Concept Report together, along with the 15% completed initial construction drawings. It is possible that the Mayor and Council would send the concept back to the CTF with some recommendations of other issues to consider or desired changes to the concept, and the CTF would have the opportunity to revise their recommended concept.

During the process to create the DCR and 15% plans, there will likely be refinements made. There will be check-ins with the project team as this work is done. When the document and drawings are done, the CTF will come back together to review and confirm that it indeed supports their previous recommendation.

Right now, we are in the process of moving from one set of tasks to the next. We are completing the task “Identify Cross-Section Concepts and Evaluation Criteria (Initial Screening)”. In this current set of tasks since the February 28, 2013 meeting, we have:

- 1) Identified four “families” of cross-section types:
  - 4 mixed-flow travel lanes (3 concepts)
  - 4 mixed-flow travel lanes + transit (3 concepts, including SATA’s)
  - 6 mixed-flow travel lanes (2 concepts)
  - 6 mixed-flow travel lanes + transit (2 concepts)
- 2) Identified an initial set of evaluation criteria - the performance measures, and
- 3) Are in the process of performing the initial screening – using the table to capture assessment results of the cross-sections performance against the performance measures. As of May 30, we have provided only the first run-through, using qualitative data (professional knowledge, judgment, experience, and as available quantitative data such as design guidance on sidewalk and buffer widths, etc.) from the project team. On June 20, we will begin to incorporate the CTF qualitative input (knowledge, judgment, experience) into these assessments and adjustments and refinements will be made with the July 25 meeting providing another opportunity for review before the September Public Meeting (per earlier discussion this could be moved later to allow further CTF discussion, if necessary).

The next task we will move into – “Select and Detail Corridor Development Alternatives (Comprehensive Evaluation)” – will allow us to do more detailed technical analyses, including the VISSIM modeling (a technology that simulates and models different configurations of lanes and traffic behaviors), to continue to evaluate the possible alternatives. We will also begin to look at how the cross-sections and improvements would be located in the project area; including alignment, use of local access lanes, and varying dimensions of some design elements to maximize their effectiveness at different locations along Broadway. And, as stated, refine the performance measures and assessment of the design concepts.

This set of tasks is simply too expensive to run all 10 concepts through, but a smaller quantity can be afforded. Ideally, we would choose a subset of the 10 concepts we have looked at to carry forward for this technical analysis. The subset could include combinations of different elements and design approaches represented by different design concepts that are being considered now.

As project manager, watching the project budget and schedule, I would have difficulty supporting more than 4 concepts moving forward into this level of detailed analysis. Conversely, if there was complete consensus by the CTF to move only 1 concept through, I would have to state my concerns – given the level of scrutiny on the project to date – that we could not adequately substantiate such a selection at this particular point in the project. The next set of tasks – “Select and Detail Corridor Development Alternatives (Comprehensive Evaluation)” – however, **will** allow us to develop more information which could begin substantiating CTF recommendations.

- b. Will we be able to go back and make revisions to the number of lanes, street element widths and right of way in the detailed design phase, or will we be "locked in" to the number and configuration of lanes, ROW's and elements in the prototypes brought to the public meeting? What if public input points to an option we hadn't previously considered, or a hybrid of more than one design? How is that reflected as we go forward?**

The CTF will not be locked into only choosing from the options that are put together heading into the September public meeting. There will be the ability to make revisions, combine elements, to address comments from the public and stakeholder agencies, and to ensure the CTF has an understanding of issues and how to best satisfy goals/performance measures every step of the way in this Planning & Design Phase. The Planning Team will also likely make some recommendations on how to refine the options that go into the more detailed design phase.

Then, even during the detailed design and analysis phase, it will be possible to continue to make refinements to the options.

- c. It would be very helpful to me, as a layperson, to have a more detailed roadmap or flowchart of how the design process moves forward and where the "points of no return" occur.**

The Public Participation Process graphic provides our broadest roadmap. In addition to this, we have the proposed schedule of meetings (with brief descriptions of meeting content), distributed as part of May 21, 2013 meeting materials.

[http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2013\\_05-10\\_CTFMeeting-ProjectSchedule.pdf](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2013_05-10_CTFMeeting-ProjectSchedule.pdf)

The project team has a draft document outlining future meeting agendas that could also be provided.

- 3. Related to the previous point, due to the variation of street width and ROW currently, the best and most context-sensitive solution will likely be a block-by-block design rather than a "one size fits all" solution. At what point in the design process does this level of analysis take place? Does it need to be introduced now, or not until the detailed design process?**

Yes, it is likely that the concepts will change in terms of design details, whether or not there are local access lanes, and possibly even in terms of number of lanes and/or location of transit lanes at

June 12, 2013

different points along Broadway. The “prototypical” cross sections to the east and west of Broadway that were prepared during the Charrette began to illustrate how the design of a concept can vary along the length of Broadway. This variation, in reaction to built and potential future context (buildings, parking, landscape, etc.), as well as variations in transportation function, and other things, will be more fully developed in the next set of tasks, and beyond.

- 4. Will we be able to include Gene Caywood's proposal as a design option to bring to the public meeting if the CTF agrees? My stakeholders have a strong interest in this design and I would like to see it added to the options we are considering.**

Yes, we have prepared illustrative sections, with input from Gene Caywood, and have also prepared an initial assessment of the concept and these are being provided with this mailing to the CTF. The initial assessments can be part of the discussion and refinement of the assessment at the June 20 meeting and beyond.

- 5. Can we get more information about how Phoenix handled installation of their light rail through older downtown areas without significant street widening/property loss? (Not a presentation, just information about how that was done.)**

Yes, we should be able to put together some information about this, including the function of the street for traffic and how that compares with Broadway.

- 6. I would find it helpful to be able evaluate various cross sections against all current (evolving) performance measures together. With performance measures clearly aligned with our vision and goals statements.**

This information is provided in the pre-reading materials.