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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, $2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.
Following the Call to Order, Project Manager Jenn Toothaker Burdick shared that announcements were added to this portion of the agenda to accommodate brief updates and announcements from the Task Force members and the team that come up between meetings.

Doug Mance, member of the RTA CART Committee, was invited to introduce himself to the Task Force and to present background information on the RTA and the CART Committee. Mr. Mance is a 2nd term member of the CART. He is excited about the Broadway Project and the process, and he appreciates the manner in which the Citizens Task Force has connected to the project. He looks forward to helping the project by being an active liaison between the CART Committee and the Broadway Citizens Task Force. Jenn Toothaker Burdick will provide an introductory presentation to the CART on January 22, 2013 meeting, and he will propose that Broadway project become a standing agenda item for future CART Committee meetings in order to help keep the Committee informed.

Mr. Mance extended an invitation to anyone from the Task Force to attend the January 22, 2013 meeting, and any of the CART meetings in the future.

2. Broadway Project “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQs)

Jenn Toothaker Burdick gave a brief presentation to provide some information on specific topics that were brought up. The team also felt it was important to invite the CTF to think about any questions or concerns they would like answered by the team, that they think members of the public have about the project, or that they think would be good to answer at the upcoming February 28, 2013 community-wide meeting. Her presentation addressed the following topics:

- **Broadway project scope: alignment and cross-section.** Following a December 18, 2012 Mayor and Council Study Session presentation by Demion Clinco, president of the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation, about the historic buildings, architecture, and character along the Broadway project corridor, discussion turned to the Broadway project design process. Staff was encouraged to convey to the Task Force and the public that the original scope for the project (6 travel lanes, 2 dedicated bus lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks) was not the only option for the future roadway design.

  Toothaker Burdick emphasized to the Task Force that the design process they are going through will not only look at the original scope, but other options for the cross-section and the placement of the future roadway improvements.

- **Impacts on Rincon Heights Historic District (and surrounding historic districts, and potential future historic district).** Concerns about the historic properties along Broadway and the impacts of the roadway’s future improvements have been mentioned since the project kicked-off in June 2012, and even prior to that. Also of concern is the impact on the surrounding historic districts, and any future historic district. It has been said by members of the public that the *Land Use, Urban Form, and Significant Structures* report was commissioned with the purpose in mind of identifying what buildings to demolish.
Toothaker Burdick clarified that:

- The *Land Use, Urban Form, and Significant Structures* Report and its related *Historic Buildings Inventory Report* were commissioned to develop an initial basis of information and existing conditions. This type of information is traditionally compiled for use when plans are being made for improvements.

- Historic districts must retain 51% contributing historic properties of the total properties within the district boundaries in order to maintain their National Register of Historic Places designation.

- The only National Register historic district that actually includes properties along the corridor is Rincon Heights Historic District. As evaluated by the City’s Historic Preservation Office staff (Jonathan Mabry and Jennifer Levstik), the loss of buildings along Broadway will not threaten Rincon Heights’ historic district status.

- The *Historic Buildings Inventory Report* provides an overview of historic buildings that could be part of a future historic district. These buildings, as shown on the maps used for the cross-section exercise done at the November 8, 2012 CTF meeting and in the *Land Use, Urban Design, and Significant Structures* report, are clearly marked so that they remain in our consideration as we move forward in the project.

- **Role of reports and studies.** All the reports and studies were commissioned in order to assess the existing conditions. They have been done to inform the design process.

Listed below is a summary of the conversation that followed the presentation:

**CTF Questions and Comments**

- I asked before if the City was still buying properties and the answer I received was no. But what about the properties, the historic properties, that have already been purchased? What is the City’s intent regarding those properties?

- How much jogging of the road can be done to accommodate the First Assembly of God Church? Is jogging a possibility? How much of that is possible?

- Section west on Broadway on the map from *Plan Tucson* is marked as a highway, is this true?

- Problems can be seen differently how they are applied east and west of Campbell. Do we look at them as disparate areas or not?

- It is hard to respond to questions about what our stakeholders have questions about. I haven’t been able to go out to my stakeholders to talk to them. You asked if we would like materials a couple of meetings ago, and I am waiting to get that information before I go out to talk to anyone so I can give correct information about the project and answer their questions. When will we be at a point to get these and talk to our stakeholders to present the correct information them?
Summarized Responses

- The City is not planning to demolish properties until it is clear what Right-of-Way is needed for the project. The Broadway Coalition has offered to help the City try to find tenants for some of the vacant properties, and that is underway. However, some of the properties are not readily usable and are in a state of serious disrepair. There are costs and issues with keeping these properties and that needs to be discussed. No decisions have been made to demolish anything.

If part of the question is also about what happens to the already purchased properties if the alignment changes, whatever property is leftover and whatever property is no longer needed would likely be treated like excess property. The City can determine if it could be used for a public use or open space; whatever is no longer needed by the City can be put up for sale.

- Please send us any comments you may have to add to the FAQ’s.

- When we get further into discussions on roadway design, we will look at the placement of the roadway. Jogging the roadway is an engineering solution that is definitely a possibility. There are constraints on how that can be implemented. (Jenn’s EDITOR’S NOTE: This discussion requires a review of the placement of the roadway, i.e. does it go only to the north side, or only to the south, or some combination in between.)

- The Plan Tucson map was incorrectly labeled. (A revised map is available and being used by the Plan Tucson team.)

- Character differences exist and with some of the regional transit planning, it seems there are some functional differences as well. This may be something we need to think about when we look at alternatives.

- The project team will work to get materials to you as soon as possible to help you communicate information about the project to the public.

3. Regional Planning Efforts: Imagine Greater Tucson

Mike Holmes, executive director, and Matt Stuart, planning manager, presented information about Imagine Greater Tucson (IGT) their regional planning efforts to the CTF. Mike Holmes opened with an introduction of IGT to the CTF. IGT started a little over 3 years ago. It is a non-governmental organization dedicated to protecting and enhancing our quality of life in the greater Tucson region. It is also a group that can lobby. IGT’s goal is to involve the people of greater Tucson in creating a shared vision for our region’s future, and to catalyze the development of strategies to realize this vision. The organization has been working with the community through a variety of mediums to develop a shared set of values, and a shared vision for the future of our region.

Matt Stuart shared the process through which the shared values and vision were developed, and what the results were. The presentation covered the following topics:
- IGT’s three phase approach: “Talk + Think + Act”
- Participation by the community in IGT’s work to date (map)
- Shared Regional Values (Talk)
  - Participation results used to develop the Shared Regional Values
  - List of Shared Regional Values
- Shared Regional Vision (Think)
  - The Future Growth Trend Scenario (map)
  - Type of participation offered to the community and participation results
  - Resulting Preferred Future Scenario (map)
- Preferred Future Scenario and Broadway Boulevard
  - Land Use/Development Models and Transportation Preferences along Broadway between Downtown and Craycroft Road (map)
  - Description of the relevant development models identified along Broadway
  - Preference: Mixed-Use
    - Vertical vs. Horizontal
  - Transportation and Growth: Participants’ responses regarding how future funding for transportation improvements should be prioritized
- IGT’s next phase: ACT!

Matt Stuart or Mike Holmes welcomed the Task Force, and the attending public, to contact them with specific requests for data or help clarify information, as well as answer questions.

Emails: Matt.Stuart@ImagineGreaterTucson.org or Mike.Holmes@ImagineGreaterTucson.org

IGT Web site: www.imaginegreatertucson.org

The following discussion took place after the presentation.

**CTF Questions and Comments**

- What are the demographics of participants from the IGT regional mapping exercises and those who responded to the surveys?

- In the densification forms that might be envisioned for accommodating growth and density along Broadway, and also elsewhere along other corridors, when we look at the horizontal mixed-use form, we are still only talking about one-parcel deep from Broadway, right?

- I am concerned what will happen to businesses, and how the density of transportation development in corridor will impact the remaining neighborhoods, the overall quality of life, the historic districts, and other considerations. Mike mentioned that the IGT vision has to be translated into the planning process. How will that happen, and, specifically, what role can the CTF play in translating the IGT vision onto Broadway?

- Are there other tools that we can bring into this process? For instance, it would help to have visuals to show people, such as the Joesler center at Broadway and Country Club, that help them to understand what we are talking about.
The pieces at mapping exercise were useful as they explained what the land use planning terms mean. When you use the terms, it can mean something different to everybody. Will IGT provide such tools for us to use?

How many of us (Task Force members) have participated in the IGT process?

I am concerned about the pace and scale of change regarding land use, mixed use. Correct pace and timing need to be part of the conversation.

IGT provides a regional perspective and plans for the entire region; and Plan Tucson looks at the more city-wide perspective. The next level down is Task Forces like ourselves looking at the community level.

For the February 28 Community-Wide Open House we have an opportunity to provide examples of ideal mixed use, City Center and neighborhood concepts, see what ideal mixed use center might look like, integrating it with a the regional perspective.

Having tools available through you, IGT, will greatly benefit the work we do. I am anxious to hear what the neighborhoods and community have to say about mixed-use development and what they want to see for this corridor.

The last slide ended on a peculiar thought: more people equals more congestion. What is the general consensus in the surveys your received about what kind of transportation they want to see? What ideas related to transportation trends were brought up that led to this conclusion (will people bike, walk more)? Was downtown, was Broadway, was City Center specifically brought up?

Growing horizontal consumes more land. Why not look at high-rises? Region needs to think vertically on certain corridors.

Summarized Responses

There was shift in the demographics during phase two. We have demographic breakdowns for the participants by their age and zip code, among other categories. There are also datasets and maps available online, and the map near the beginning of the presentation shows where the participants live.

Overall, we can say that there was a large number of young people and of older people, and a fair number of what is known as “soccer moms”. All in all, the people who showed up were those that felt they had a stake in the future growth of the region. We feel we got a broad swath of the community.

To back-up the results of the IGT process, the data we gathered fit the current national trends of younger professionals wanting urban environments with a multitude of amenities within walking distance.

Yes, “horizontal” mixed-use assumes only going one-parcel deep from the corridor. The chip sets that were used for the exercise which were ¼-mile long. When they laid the chips down, the participants were assuming it would only be ½-mile stretch of corridor. The assumption is based on the pedestrian model.
that uses the ¼-mile rule for how far a pedestrian is willing to walk from a transit stop, or where they live or work.

IGT provides an overall vision, holistically. Plan Tucson will provide more of an in-depth vision for where things ought to go. IGT works at this by trying to get the individual jurisdictions to get that vision accepted for their own general plans. We have been very successful with Pima County, and are very pleased with Plan Tucson.

We are not here to say what an area should look like. You’re spot on that there will be tradeoffs and compromises in your process. We can make the roadway 6-8 lanes like the voters approved in 2006; or we can make it like people said they want through our process; or, maybe we can try to find something in between. That’s the tough question you are trying to answer.

We are working within legislative realities. The voters voted for it. But there does seem to be some wiggle room.

We have to look at what the reality is, and what the concept is, and then work backwards. It’s like a concept car; you make this beautiful, sexy, model and then realize that nothing will fit in the backseat, so it’s back to the drawing board.

- IGT would be happy to provide any tools desired. While IGT does not want to enter into contentious discussions, Mike Holmes would be willing to develop a response regarding what the data says about developing along Broadway.

Downtown Links and Grant Road are examples of different ways to address the one-parcel deep approach to horizontal mixed-use.

Has anyone done an assessment of the impacts on the tax base and the loss that would occur if we did build the full roadway? To me, that would be a pretty significant factor.

- We developed close to 700 maps through our efforts. I think 699 of those generated identified this exact stretch of Broadway as a mixed-use corridor. People from across the region indicated they wanted the retail and mixed use here. I think your point is really well taken: what do the people in this 2-mile chunk really want to see? I think that is your challenge, and balancing that with what the rest of the City wants to see.

- To answer your question specifically about how to address increased need for transportation:
  - Do people want to walk, bike and live in an urban area? I refer to Living Streets Alliance, a peer organization that does that kind of research.
  - We at IGT are seeing that people want to bike, walk, and use transit now, especially with younger generations. Many of them do not prefer to drive.
I spent all of November using the bus to see what it is like. You see mostly older people and the younger generations. Many people are making decisions about where they live based on transit options available near the location.

- IGT will be embarking on a transportation study beginning in February and lasting through the Spring.
- IGT is planning for the future.
- It is up to the individual plans and corridor projects whether to go vertical or not. It is natural to have multiple stories, but ultimately it is up to the residents in that area to decide this.
- Going back to 9 shared regional values, does going vertical fit in with these principles? With respect to character and using setbacks, using horizontal buildings accommodates density and fits within the fabric of the neighborhoods that they are in.

4. 2/28/2013 Community-Wide Meeting Format (please note that this item took place after item 7 - Call to the Audience)

The project team shared with the Task Force their proposed format for the upcoming February 28, 2013 Community-Wide Meeting to have an early conversation with the Task Force about the meeting format. The project proposed a format that included a brief introductory presentation followed by an open house-style layout with individual stations covering topics, based on the reports and studies compiled to date, the vision and goals framework, and public participation plan.

The following summarizes the Task Force members’ comments, and the responses provided:

**CTF Questions and Comments**

- Will there be a different topic at each table?
- I concur with Ruth Beeker’s Call to Audience comment. CTF attendance is mandatory at the community-wide meeting and we must play an active role. I think it would be good to introduce ourselves, our interests, who we represent and why we are on the CTF so people can identify us and come to us with questions or concerns.

It is critical for CTF members to be at the stations, hear the public’s comments and have direct contact with public, to actively listen. Also, if the organizations and individuals or organizations that have presented to us over the past couple of months could also be there in person to present the information that has been presented to CTF, so public can know what we have been learning.

It is important to get the staff’s perspective but it is more critical that the CTF be a presence and even participate, and to hear what they have to say. I think that is important that we play a direct role and physically be there.
• I am advocating for a direct role with the public, not filtered by staff. Not necessarily at a presentation level, but at least directly interacting.

• Stakeholders with different interests could be at different stations. Whoever represents the interests related to the station topic can be present. This would be a way to start connecting with stakeholders and have them share their views.

• I “third” Ruth’s format proposal. The CTF is a direct link with the public, and as a full body, we all need to hear what they are saying. We need to give the public the framework for what we are asking. What is the most helpful for us to hear from the public, and what do people want to see? Regarding existing conditions information, I am concerned about laying out Traffic and Engineering reports as fact. I would like to share the CTF’s questions and concerns regarding information presented to date. We should blend all of the formats we have been talking about: introductory presentation, listening stations, and open microphone at the end.

• I am concerned regarding open microphone and a public hearing style meeting. One person can dominate the whole room. It seems a very inefficient use of time. We should put out the framework and information and let’s not let one person from the audience dominate the conversation and prevent progress.

• I am going to echo what was just said. I like the idea of the open microphone, but it is susceptible to the public’s emotion. At the very least there has be good organization and a summary of events and feedback given.

• Whether we do an open microphone, let’s do summary of comments at the end of the event to collect what has been said. What is it we are asking the public?

• We need make the presentations brief and be sure to add a debriefing session for the meeting.

• How will the community-wide meeting be advertised?

• We need to understand and come to agreement regarding the purpose for this Community-Wide Meeting. An Open House format is appropriate in certain situations; if we use that format then it is OK for public to write comments on comment cards. If it is Public Hearing – then open microphone format is appropriate. It is a mistake to combine the two. We should listen to what our stakeholders and the public want.

• What is the goal? To present information to the public? To obtain feedback from the public? Or both?

• A public hearing is not an appropriate format for the stated goals of the meeting (progress report and obtain feedback on Vision & Goals). I suggest we do an open microphone another time.

• Comment cards are still beneficial.

• We are trying to cram too much into one meeting. For the February meeting we should layout the current information then go back, after working on the vision
and goals more, to a meeting where we hear input. Otherwise we will have a conflicting message. And, it would give us more breathing room.

- I agree in some respect to that comment. Maybe it is too early for the vision and goals, but I still think an underlying goal of the meeting is to hear what the community goals are for the project. I don’t want to lose out on the opportunity to hear feedback.
- It is a pretty good format for discussion. We have a responsibility to show what progress has been made on the project, even if it is just a starting point.
- I agree we need to show something.
- It is important that we have enough time to get public input. We all need to get the same input from the speaker’s mouth.
- That’s the point of the debriefing session.
- We should encourage the use of comment cards and get direct feedback from individuals.
- Can I advocate for very brief presentations?
- The goal topics can be seen as goal areas.

Summarized Responses

- The stations could also be based on what stakeholders are interested in.
- The reports and studies, and the Vision and Goals, are all a work in progress at this stage.
- We are going to continually address the questions raised throughout the process. We have options about how to present the data at the meeting, including presenting both what has been published to date, and remaining questions or concerns that have been raised, and what will be addressed as we move forward.
- It is possible that we could do a blend of all the methods we have talked about: presentations, stations, and an open microphone session.
- The community-wide meeting has already been advertised to businesses along the corridor with the Save the Date card by RTA’s MainStreet Business Assistance program. We will do a mailing, send eBlasts, and encourage you, the CTF, to get the word out to your stakeholders. We will also utilize the media to help promote the event.
- I think the answer to what the purpose is of the event is that people want a chance to check in on what is happening. We have not been out to the public since last June. This meeting gives us a chance to check in with them, sharing what the collection of data says, and what we have done so far, and get thoughts and comments. The draft vision and goals is really the first outcome of our work so far, and I envision that particular questions could be focused on getting their feedback on them.
5. Drafting the Vision and Goals Framework

Project team member Phil Erickson led the CTF through two exercises designed to help develop a more refined draft of the vision and goals framework. The flow of exercises began with conducting a 15-minute review of the goal statements provided in the Excel table format, in which members were asked to circle their top 5 goal statements that were most important to them; then, the members got into small groups to work for 20-minutes to review their selections with each other, combining onto one sheet all of their individual selections (using different colored pens), discussing them as group, and trying to identify the group’s top 5 goal statements; and last, each small group reported back out to the larger group their top 5 and any important information about the nature of their discussions.

The information that was collected from the Task Force will help the Project Team further refine the goal concepts and help to create draft the initial vision and goals statements. The discussion that took place following the activity is summarized below, organized by group table.

Table 1:

- The top five goal areas we agreed on were: recognize and support the distinct character of the corridor, protect adjacent neighborhoods, businesses, appropriate development to fit the existing context, and multimodal street design.
- Overall there were a lot of commonalities, the one difference we did have was that some said the road shouldn’t be widened and some feel it should.
- Also, with the blending of the goal topics we found a lot of them to be the same and consistent with one another. For example the two goal topics “encourage development on an appropriate scale” and “nurture existing business in place” seem to be very similar.

Team 2:

- We had a disparity of opinions at our table but the things we did agree on were creating a multimodal corridor and doing the project well with the least amount of impact possible. If we do the project right businesses will come.
- We have the opportunity to do something right and serve the community.
- We agreed that eventually there should be rail, if possible.
- We didn’t touch on neighborhood issues much, but there are three different topic areas that address linkages of north and south areas and those should be combined.
Table 3:

- We had a more diverse set of opinions and not much overlap.
- The top area of agreement among us was on “recognize and support the distinct character of Broadway and its context”.
- There are two areas we couldn’t come to agreement on, and in talking with Phil, we realized that we probably won’t be able to find agreement until we are further along in the process. The areas we couldn’t agree were “protect all historic sites”, and “minimize widening” and “widen Broadway”.
- Historic
- Businesses. We thought that the four things within “business” area could be combined, with the statement up higher. They all say the same thing.

Following the group report out a brief discussion took place.

**CTF Questions and Comments**

- They’re a few things we need to figure out. It seems like we are talking about goals to get the vision. This seems backwards like a puzzle but we don’t know what we are putting together. Could we develop the vision and go into goals.
- I was approaching it from the vision, too. How do you create goals without a vision? How can I truly create a vision statement representing my stakeholders until I get out there and talk to them? Phil helped me understand that these are draft vision and goals, and we can take these out to our stakeholders.
- I went back to the Listening Report and the statements made and I can see a clear vision from those. It may help the process if we think of vision statements. When I look at the 17 pages in that, I start to see a vision.
- Comparing a vision statement to Grant Road’s, it is not just a one-sentence we are going to come up with. Their vision was more like a paragraph.
- From the project team what was the overall thought process about how we would get to that vision?
- I really want to step back and think about IGT and not worry what is written on paper but take a moment to think about what we want the corridor to look like and feel. Let that drive what we put forward as a vision statement.
- Can the visioning process be an ongoing process, where we continue to re-examine it? I need it to continue percolating in my mind.

**Summarized Responses**

- I have been approaching this because what we heard from the public are goals and they are very diverse. There could be 14 different visions because of the diversity of opinions.
- If you have an idea of vision statements, please send them to us.
• My thought was to take the draft goal statements in February to the community-wide, not a vision statement.

• If we took a vision forward in February, it might be the beginnings of it. It might be the first sentences of it, but not the full paragraph.

• Yes, the nature of all of this is that we will come back to it and rework it.

• People think differently and arrive at different outcomes so if someone has a strong inkling of what they want, that can be presented. I would be open to those that feel like they have a kernel of what we should start with, that they share those with us. We can talk about that at the CTF meeting on February 7th. But again, we have to be clear at the public meeting that this is an iterative process and will be ongoing for quite some time.

In conclusion, Phil provided the following thoughts about the next steps:

- The CTF take their sheets home and think about the meeting.
- Send Phil their 11x17 sheets next week, by January 24th.
- Phil will use the information, and the small group work, to develop a re-draft of the Vision and Goals statements.
- Phil will work to get the re-drafted version to the CTF by Feb. 4th, to give you a chance to read before the Feb. 7th CTF meeting.
- The CTF will discuss the re-draft at the Feb. 7th meeting.
- Following the Feb. 28th meeting, he will take the public input received and develop suggestions for how to incorporate it into the Vision and Goals statements, and bring that back to the CTF at the March meeting.
- The CTF can take that back to your stakeholders in March and then, in April, it will be reviewed again.

6. Broadway Public Participation Plan

Time was originally set aside to present and review the initial outline of the proposed Public Participation Plan; however, to allow the Task Force more time for the vision and goals activity this agenda item was moved to a future meeting.

7. Call to the Audience (please note the call to the audience was held prior to item number 4 - 2/28/2013 Community-Wide Format)

Five (5) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on:

Marc Fink - Mr. Fink addressed the Task Force with the following comments. I would have said earlier, if there had been a Call to the Audience earlier in the meeting, that opposed to doing what you did here today, don’t start with the goals first. It would be like designing something without knowing if you are building a house or a factory. If you would have asked us for our visions we would have given them to you. You only asked us for things at the goal level. The 1997 Pima County Bond project, which
partially funds this project, calls Broadway Tucson’s Main Street. Main Streets are the focal point for neighborhoods and town’s activity. It is a destination. Use that to guide your decisions you make. Are you building a Main Street? Think about it. Marc concluded by stating that two minutes is not enough time per audience member. It is standard at Mayor and Council and other call to the audiences to give three minutes. I suggest that you allow speakers three minutes.

Gene Caywood - Gene Caywood expressed the following to the Task Force: I am interested and please with the IGT slide that stated that 50 percent of the public regionally supports rail transit. That is what Southern Arizona Transit Advocates support here on Broadway. I hope that you all support that. I am pleased that one of the goal statements supports this. We should do rail on Broadway or somewhere else like 5th/6th Street. I am glad to see that it is on the list and I hope that it stays in as one of your final goals and in your vision.

Laura Tabili - Ms. Tabili first stated that the remarks captured in the previous meeting summary about what she said about the Historic District were not quite right. She reiterated that you have 50 percent plus one of your buildings in the district considered as historic to receive the designation. She stated that the CTF needs to hear from Jonathan Mabry about historic districts and Demion Clinco about the Modernism Week events. The Task Force needs to take their time when establishing the Vision and Goals Framework and there needs to be a diversity of goals. Ms. Tabili stated that she hears a lot of consensus and a lot of people agree, and that a meeting of the minds can occur to design a roadway that is not 150 feet wide. The Mayor and Council clarified that the roadway does not need to be 150 feet and it can be less. The Major Streets and Routes Plan is not chiseled in stone has been amended all the time, and the title page of the plan for Broadway had the word “Recommendations” on it and “Chiseled in Stone”. It can be amended “AFTER the Task Force makes its decision”. [* * Statement has been corrected by an email request from Ms. Tabili on January 22, 2012.]*

Ms. Tabili concluded by stating that the City owns a lot of historic property that is deteriorating. The properties can still be redeveloped on the back portion of the building. However, she stated that the residents do not want to see vertically large buildings with multiple stories as that would drive residents out.

John O’Dowd - Mr. O’Dowd offered the following statements to be considered by the CTF: Sam Hughes neighborhood is also one of the oldest and most successful Neighborhood Associations in Tucson. It is an impacted neighborhood and should be considered as such, just as Rincon Heights Neighborhood. The biggest problem I see is having this type of committee determine the alignment and the type of land use. Corporate and business interests need to be served as well. I think that needs to be addressed. Widening will affect the health of the neighborhood residents and more vehicles come and create more congestions and air pollution. This issue of health should be considered.
Ruth Beeker - Ms. Beeker stated that two minutes is never enough time for the public Call to the Audience and then went on to state the following: I have questions about the February 28th meeting. If it is for the CTF to find out information about how the community feels, then the CTF has to be in a position to hear everything. Stations are not appropriate for this. I would hope that the staff’s role is diminished as much as possible. Further, the comments made during the meeting should not be summarized by staff because there is not enough trust for the public to trust staff summaries. They are often biased and sanitized. The process should be totally transparent.

8. Next Steps
Time was originally set aside to present and review next steps for the project and the agenda for the February 7, 2013 meeting; however, to allow the Task Force more time for the vision and goals activity and discussion of the February 28, 2013 Community-Wide meeting this standing agenda item was tabled.

9. CTF Roundtable
At each Task Force meeting time is set aside for CTF member to discuss and give feedback about any aspect of the project or process to the project team. One comment was made during the January 17, 2013 roundtable.

- I suggest we give each audience member at least three minutes during the call to the audience as was requested today.

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

The presentations given at this meeting can be reviewed by visiting the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force web page at: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/broadway/broadway-citizens-task-force
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 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 Heisler, John Kromko, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Costs Per Plan</th>
<th>Other Agency Funding</th>
<th>Authorized RTA Funding</th>
<th>RTA Funding</th>
<th>Scheduled Construction Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangerine, I-10 to La Canada</td>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>74,215</td>
<td>28,890</td>
<td>45,325</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino de Manana, Tangerine to Linda Vista</td>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>15,665</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>6,165</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>7,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Peaks Rd., Silverbell to I-10</td>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>76,422</td>
<td>45,670</td>
<td>30,752</td>
<td>12,749</td>
<td>29,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cholla, Tangerine to Magee</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>48,333</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>42,233</td>
<td>21,704</td>
<td>6,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverbell Rd., Ina to Grant Rd.</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>57,053</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>42,653</td>
<td>23,754</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Overpass @Ina</td>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>54,383</td>
<td>20,165</td>
<td>34,218</td>
<td>34,218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magee/Cortaro Farms, La Canada to Thomydale</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>29,570</td>
<td>30,151</td>
<td>22,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Rd. Silverbell to I-10 to River Rd.</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>22,764</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthrauff @I-10/RR Overpass</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>59,364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59,364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cholla, River to Ruthrauff</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>14,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada, Calle Concordia to River</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>41,731</td>
<td>14,066</td>
<td>27,665</td>
<td>29,561</td>
<td>25,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magee, La Canada to Oracle</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ave., Orange Grove to Ina</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>7,256</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ave., River to Grant</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>74,398</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>71,398</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Underpass @Grant</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>37,701</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>37,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Links, I-10 to Broadway</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>84,874</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>76,134</td>
<td>78,669</td>
<td>18,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, Euclid to Country Club</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>71,347</td>
<td>29,222</td>
<td>42,125</td>
<td>37,245</td>
<td>3,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, Oracle to Swan</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>166,850</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>160,850</td>
<td>66,222</td>
<td>19,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd St., I-10 to Tucson Blvd.</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>107,952</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>104,952</td>
<td>131,045</td>
<td>15,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barraza Aviation Parkway, Palo Verde to I-10</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, Ajo to Mark</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>38,157</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>15,057</td>
<td>7,071</td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington, Santa Cruz River to east of I-10</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, I-19 to Alvernon</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, Alvernon to Kolb</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>46,298</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>43,298</td>
<td>43,871</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia, Kolb to Houghton</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>34,862</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>25,862</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolb Rd., Connection with Sabino Canyon</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>9,284</td>
<td>6,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanque Verde, Catalina Hwy to Houghton</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>12,833</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,833</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>10,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedway, Camino Seco to Houghton</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>17,127</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>11,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, Camino Seco to Houghton</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>9,571</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd St., Camino Seco to Houghton</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>9,066</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Golf Links to Irvington</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton, I-10 to Tanque Verde</td>
<td>City of Tucson</td>
<td>160,642</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>95,342</td>
<td>45,105</td>
<td>19,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot, North of Sahuarita Rd.</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahuarita Rd., I-19 to Country Club</td>
<td>Sahuarita</td>
<td>40,756</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>30,756</td>
<td>32,484</td>
<td>11,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Rd. (I-19), Continental to Canoa Rd.</td>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>3,959</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Plan Element</td>
<td>1,503,312</td>
<td>334,422</td>
<td>1,168,890</td>
<td>683,353</td>
<td>241,429</td>
<td>441,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Improvements

### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Costs Per Plan</th>
<th>Other Agency Funding</th>
<th>Authorized RTA Funding</th>
<th>RTA Funding</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>108,152</td>
<td>48,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF PIMA COUNTY
## PROJECT STATUS REPORT
### (000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Costs Per Plan</th>
<th>Other Agency Funding</th>
<th>Authorized RTA Funding</th>
<th>RTA Funding</th>
<th>Scheduled Construction Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>19,616</td>
<td>10,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Pullouts</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,109</td>
<td>12,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>11,575</td>
<td>9,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>5,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>169,098</td>
<td>71,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways &amp; Pathways</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>49,099</td>
<td>33,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Linkages</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>32,609</td>
<td>29,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Plan Element</td>
<td></td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>88,308</td>
<td>67,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Evening Service Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>312,375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,717</td>
<td>21,773</td>
<td>9,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Service Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,169</td>
<td>10,389</td>
<td>5,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency &amp; Area Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178,232</td>
<td>50,273</td>
<td>12,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs for Elderly and Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>108,836</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108,836</td>
<td>23,353</td>
<td>3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Circulators</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,863</td>
<td>24,727</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Service Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62,581</td>
<td>13,832</td>
<td>5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Streetcar</td>
<td></td>
<td>162,727</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>87,727</td>
<td>74,237</td>
<td>44,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>12,801</td>
<td>8,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Plan Element</td>
<td></td>
<td>608,801</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>533,801</td>
<td>231,130</td>
<td>106,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>3,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Plan Element</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>-3,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,413,113</td>
<td>408,422</td>
<td>2,003,691</td>
<td>1,174,871</td>
<td>464,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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