

**From:** "Garcia, Jose D - (jdgarcia)" <jdgarcia@email.arizona.edu>  
**To:** Jennifer Burdick <Jennifer.Burdick@tucsonaz.gov>  
**CC:** "jdegrood@pagnet.org" <jdegrood@pagnet.org>, "rick.ellis@pima.gov" <rick...>  
**Date:** 10/18/2013 10:39 AM  
**Subject:** RE: EEEHA Letter and Response

Dear Jenn,

I hope your vacation was wonderfully relaxing. Thanks for taking time to respond to my letter.

We envision that the Broadway CTF should be free to investigate any reasonable avenues that they believe will enhance their understanding of ways to accomplish the vision and goals of the Broadway Boulevard Project. That was the basis for our letter: we perceived that CTF members had asked for information, the information seemed quite important and relevant to their task, and they have to-date received no reply.

This gives to an outsider, particularly one who has attended many of the CTF meetings, the appearance that the CTF is being channeled down a particular path, towards a particular outcome, with no deviations permitted, and only information relevant to that path is allowed. That would completely negate the purpose for having a CTF.

In the interests of transparency of process, it might be better to respond to such specific requests for data and information by the CTF directly, in a timely fashion, with either the information or a reason. This can be done by indicating, for example, that the information fits better at a different time in their deliberations. The CTF would then have the option of wishing to see it anyway. But at least they would know it is forthcoming.

I know from my work with committees that were responsible to a public-type body or group, that transparency is essential in making the results of the committee's efforts credible and acceptable.

Thanks for all your work on the Project.

JD Garcia  
President, EEEHA Board

---

From: Jennifer Burdick [Jennifer.Burdick@tucsonaz.gov]  
Sent: 16 October 2013 05:44  
To: Garcia, Jose D - (jdgarcia)  
Cc: jdegrood@pagnet.org; rick.ellis@pima.gov; Albert Elias; Andrew McGovern; Broadway.PWPO1.PWDOM2@tucsonaz.gov; Carlos de Leon; Daryl Cole; David Higuera; Diana Rhoades; Jonathan Rothschild; Karin Uhlich; Katie Bolger; maddy.byernes@tucsonaz.gov; Mark Kerr; Mayor1.CHPO3.CHDOM2@tucsonaz.gov; Nicole Ewing-Gavin; Paul Cunningham; Regina Romero; Richard G. Fimbres; Shirley Scott; Steve Kozachik; Tamara Prime; Teresa Olson; Ward1@tucsonaz.gov; Ward2@tucsonaz.gov; Ward 3; Ward4@tucsonaz.gov; Ward5@tucsonaz.gov; Ward6  
Subject: Re: EEEHA Letter

October 15, 2013

Subject: Letter from El Encanto Estates Homeowners Association dated October 14, 2013

Dr. Garcia -

I am currently in Europe, and saw your email with the letter on behalf of El Encanto Estates Homeowners Association. You are requesting information by next Monday, and because of the time-sensitive nature of your requests, I wanted to respond to you quickly. I have received two similar letters, and will provide the

same answers to you as I have to the Rincon Heights Neighborhood Association and Arroyo Chico Neighborhood Association. As with the other letters, I am concerned by your charges of what I would consider negligence to our Task Force members and selective compliance to the open process we have striven to develop throughout this process. I would like to provide some clarification, in the hopes that this will alleviate some or all of your concerns.

This week, while I am gone, the project team is preparing information for the Task Force meetings on October 21 and October 24. This is a planning charrette, not a design charrette, which has been clarified before. (We are nearing a point in which we will have a design charrette, once we have results from analysis in this next segment of work with the Task Force.) The original intention of the discussions and meetings is to identify what cross section alternatives to move forward into further analysis by the consultant team. This decision is first step of many to come in the alternatives analysis. Please remember that the planning and design schedule will bring us to an initial recommendation on the project design – after studies and additional data are collected – by Fall 2014, and this initial recommendation will come to the Mayor and Council at a public hearing. The Council will be provided regular updates, however, before then. (The public participation plan for the project can be found online at [www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway](http://www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway) under ‘Public Participation’.)

Based on the discussions at the October CTF meetings, the next segment of the work we will be doing with the Task Force includes running various studies on the street configuration/cross section alternatives selected, discussing results at future meetings, making refinements, and running additional studies. Following this, the Task Force will work with the project team on developing a corridor development approach for the whole 2 miles of the project area which will also require analysis. Within these refinements and milestone decisions, there will be Task Force meetings, updates to City Manager’s Office, Mayor and Council, RTA CART and T/MC Committees (as desired), and the Pima County Bond Oversight Committee. There are also 2 more community-wide meetings planned inviting the community to participate as was done for the meeting on Sept. 26.

The items you are requesting be addressed at the October 21, 2013 Citizens Task Force meeting are not part of the meeting agenda, for the following reasons:

- 1) Given recent media attention to the issue of the County funding, a portion of the meeting on October 21 will necessarily focus on this issue. Representatives from the different agencies will be at the meeting to talk with the Task Force and answer questions. Given the concerns that have been raised by this issue, I believe enough time needs to be allowed to ensure quality conversations with the Task Force.
- 2) To your first point regarding the information requested by Colby for parking information, his request was for a map of parcels with non-compliant parking issues. At the meeting, staff advised that we would have to look into whether this would be possible. There are legal issues, which were thought to be present, with providing a map of non-compliant properties. In a meeting with staff from Department of Transportation, Planning & Development Services Department, ParkWise, and Information Technology, it was clarified that some property owners have gone through a review process to be determined by Planning and Development Services as “legally non-compliant” with the current City Code. Others have not. Putting the requested information into a map may have a number of negative unintended consequences for property owners. Creating negative issues for the current property owners is not something I believe Colby was intending and for that reason, staff and the project team have discussed how to respond.

Given that this information will be part of the alignment alternatives analysis that is part of the next segment of work described above, it is expected that we can provide the information and avoid the negative consequences at that time.

- 3) Regarding Phoenix light rail, this information takes time to gather and we have been doing so, in addition to the planned work we have been doing. To clarify, the initial request was for analysis of Central Avenue and then Phoenix light rail; however, there are many segments to the light rail system, and comparable segments to Broadway are being reviewed. Tucson Department of Transportation deputy director Carlos de Leon worked in Tempe for 17 years, on the light rail project, and has been able to give

staff assistance with his experience and knowledge of the development of the segments and appropriate contacts to make to obtain the right information. Staff has initiated contact with different staff in Phoenix from both the Metro Authority, Phoenix Department of Transportation, and Reinvent Phoenix. Additionally, I and others from the project team have been to Phoenix to take pictures and gather information.

Again, this is information that relates to the next segment of work planned with the Task Force and how it factors in to the next segment of work can be discussed with the Task Force at the October meetings.

4) Regarding the updated projections, the projections we have been using for the project are currently correct for where we are in the project process. In August 2012, the project team developed a range within which to approach our work regarding projections on the project to accommodate concerns that the projections being used overestimate future demand (pg. 4, Summary of the Traffic Analysis: Broadway, Euclid to Country Club, August 30, 2012, found online:  
[http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2012\\_08-30\\_TrafficSummary.pdf](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2012_08-30_TrafficSummary.pdf))

The range of projections we are currently using includes a low growth rate of 70% to high growth rate of 100% of Pima Association of Governments (PAG) projections for 2040. A follow up to the traffic study analysis was also provided to the Citizens Task Force at the May 21, 2013 meeting. This follow-up provided additional information about the PAG projections model, the role it plays in our work and in our community planning process. It also indicates that as we continue to move forward on this project, we will continue to use a range of projections.  
[http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2013\\_05-10\\_TravelDemandOverview\\_Fin.pdf](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2013_05-10_TravelDemandOverview_Fin.pdf)

We know that the Federal projections received by the State of Arizona are projecting less population for our region. It is my understanding that PAG has been in the process of developing the new projections, and as we move forward on the project process, we will use the most current projections available, in the range that we are committed to using. If there is new information PAG has available that will aid our process, we will incorporate that.

As an aside, this approach of using a range has subsequently been supported by the U.S. PIRG report, as proposed in the report conclusions on pgs. 41-42 of "A New Direction: Our Changing Relationship with Driving and the Implications for America's Future."  
<http://uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/A%20New%20Direction%20vUS.pdf>

This is a challenging project with many different layers to it, and what seems like a race against time to address it all. This is one reason to allow time for the process to continue. I assure you that I and the team remain committed to doing everything we can to aid this decision process. If we are thorough in our approach and process, I believe we will develop the information that will help us all engage in conversations that consider all the different angles.

Thank you for your letter and opportunity to provide some additional information.

Sincerely,  
Jenn Toothaker Burdick

c: The Honorable Mayor and Council Members  
The Broadway Citizens Task Force Members  
Albert Elias, Assistant City Manager  
Nicole Ewing-Gavin, Assistant to the City Manager  
Daryl Cole, Director, Tucson Department of Transportation  
Carlos de Leon, Deputy Director, Tucson Department of Transportation  
Jim DeGroot, Director of Transportation Services, Regional Transportation Authority  
Rick Ellis, Administrator, Engineering Division, Pima County Department of Transportation

>>> "Garcia, Jose D - (jdgarcia)" <jdgarcia@email.arizona.edu> 10/15/13 11:32 AM >>>  
Dear Jenn,

The EEEHA Board has authorized me to send the attached letter on their behalf.

Thanks.

JD Garcia

President EEEHA Board