



**Draft Meeting Summary**  
**BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE**

October 21, 2013

5:30 p.m.

Child & Family Resources Angel Charity Building  
 2800 East Broadway Boulevard  
 Tucson, Arizona 85716

The Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force meeting summaries provide a brief descriptive overview of the discussions, decisions and actions taken at the meetings. The summary and the audio recording of the meeting comprise the official minutes of the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force Meeting.

Meeting summaries and audio recordings of the meetings are available online at the City Clerk's web page at:

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

*Requests for CD copies of the audio recordings are taken by the City Clerk's Office at (520)791-4213.*

**MEETING RESULTS**

**1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements**

The meeting was called to order by Meeting Facilitator, Nanci Biezer. A quorum was established and the agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Biezer.

**Citizen Task Force Members**

Present			Absent
Bob Belman	John Howe		Anthony R. DiGrazia
Michael Butterbrodt	Joseph Maher Jr.		Naomi McIssac
Dale Calvert	Shirley Papuga		
Mary Durham-Pflibsen	Diane Robles		
Bruce Fairchild	Jamey Sumner		
Colby Henley			

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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

## 2. First Call to the Audience

Five (5) members of the audience filled out a speaker's card and were called upon to address the task force:

### Ron Spark

"I am Ron Spark, I sit on the steering committee of the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates, as well as the Broadway Coalition. I am also an ex-President of the El Encanto Estates Neighborhood Association. I want to talk to you tonight about necessity of a transit study and to construct a budget for this landscape/ streetscape, specifically on operations and maintenance. I will touch on that. I feel that in order to plan for Broadway, you need quality data on both of these things which will give you vital information for your planners. How can you as a task force designate lanes for transit on Broadway (or off Broadway) without knowing the technical criteria and the financial implications from getting a formal, quality professional transit study?

If you do go forward without a transit study the eventual cost will be much greater later on in several years than when the study is done. It will have to be re-financed and it may not be able to alter what it is that you have planned. So planning Broadway without a transit study will possibly limit high capacity options and add to not only the cost but consequences.

Gene Caywood and others on the SATA have made some proposals about high capacity transit not only on Broadway but even off Broadway, and there has been some discussion of bike highways on Broadway on 9<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street and there are other options that might be uncovered by, again, a professional transit study. So this item must be moved from the backburner to the front burner before you can start to make intelligent decisions. Again, because you will limit options and run up costs.

Landscaping Operations and Maintenance- We have been hearing a lot about landscape, sidewalk, streetscape; look at Broadway . A lot of the landscaping has been removed both for the cost of maintenance and also for right of way. There is currently no budget once you plan a streetscape, or put in landscape there is no budget for the City to maintain or operate those. You have got to know what those costs are. There is a contract with the City (that is Groundskeeper), so there is a budgetary item to help you calculate the cost; but you are obligating the City for certain costs and you have to know that before you make those decisions. I think you should also think in terms of other design elements that you could recommend for shade other than just landscaping. There are awnings, canvas awnings, ramadas, pergolas, and parquet's; working with the City right of way, as well as private partnership to construct adequate shade along the Broadway corridor.

The summary is: you need to know data, you need to know the costs, and you need to know where the money has to come from. I think you need to urge the City and the RTA to come up with these moneys to do these studies. It could be an improvement district, it could be going back to the RTA, but I think it's very vital at this point to put these items in place. Thank you."

*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.RTAmbility.com](http://www.RTAmbility.com).*

**Steward Herzog**

"There was an article in the paper a couple days ago about the 25 million of County bond money. I would like someone to explain what the impact would be if that money is not available, and what the impact would be if it is available, also what are the criteria if it will or will not be available?"

**Laura Tabili**

"Hi. I guess people know me. I am not speaking for the Broadway Coalition tonight, but just speaking for myself. As I was walking up here tonight, for the umpteenth time, the umpteenth 3 hour meeting that interferes with dinner. I am sure that all the task force members are very well aware of that with the amount of time that is being taken by each of these three hour meetings. I am also reflecting on a letter that my neighborhood had wrote to you, that I think is in your packet and we have been really concerned with things that you need to know before you can actually design the road.

Some of us have been really concerned that task force members have been asking for information and not getting it. For instance in May, Colby Henley for information on parking and how parking is going to fit into this. Now, four or five months later that has not yet been produced. Mary Pflibsen has asked about Phoenix's light rail system that information hasn't been produced. Diane Robles, has asked repeatedly for updated traffic counts and projections and that information hasn't been produced. My neighborhood had sent a letter to urge you to put your foot down basically and make sure that that information is produced. We got a letter back from the design team that wasn't very encouraging.

I guess as I was walking up here, I was thinking, how can the task force be proceeding with meetings, two meetings this week (at 3 hours a piece). How can you be proceeding with meetings to design the street when you don't have the information that you need? I was also reminded that in fact, the mayor and council's ordinance had created the task force and that puts you in the driver's seat, right? The task force is supposed to be making decisions about the agenda; the task force (I think) are empowered to not adjourn until you get the information that you need; rather than, in a sense be dragged through all these meetings when you really don't have enough information. I think there are huge costs to this, volunteering for 3 hour meetings that just go on, and on, and on, without necessarily getting the information that you need... so I am just going to suggest to you that you maybe think about putting your foot down on the system and insisting on getting that information and perhaps adjourning until get it so that you can use your precious time efficiently."

**Margot Garcia**

"Good evening, you are to be commended on a very successful public meeting #3. By all accounts, at least 200 people attended and one could see that they were very engaged in each of the small group discussions. They also seem to of sent a clear message, bicycles and pedestrians are important, so is transit for local businesses, and their historic and architecturally significant buildings, and keep the street as narrow as possible. In light of these comments, I wanted to bring to your attention

*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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

a TED Talk, by Janette Sadik-Khan, the transportation commissioner of New York City. Janette Sadik-Khan starts out by saying, "The work of a transportation commissioner isn't just about stop signs and traffic signals. It involves the design of the City and the design of city streets. Streets are some of the most valuable resources that a city has, and yet it's an asset that is hardly hidden in plain sight." She goes on to describe how streets like Time Square haven't changed much in the last 50 years. So she worked to refocus the agenda to "maximize efficient mobility providing more room for bikes, more room for people to enjoy the city for to make our streets as safe as they can be for everybody who uses them".

So they wanted to change the balance and they tried it out in Time Square. People have tried for years to make it better, she relates, by changing signals, lanes, and everything else they can think of, but it was still dangerous and hard to cross. So they tried looking at the street differently and they did a six month project. "We closed Broadway from 42nd to 47<sup>th</sup> street and created two and a half acres of new pedestrian space. Temporary materials are an important part of the program because we were able to show that it worked. I worked for a data driven mayor, as you probably know, so it was all about the data. If it worked better for traffic or better for mobility, if it was safer or better for business we would keep it. If it didn't work no harm no foul and we could put it back the way it was before because they were temporary materials. The results were overwhelming. Traffic moved better, it was safer, five new flagship stores opened. It's been a total homerun. Time Square is one of the top ten retail locations on the planet and this is an important lesson because it doesn't need to be a zero sum game between moving traffic and creating public space".

Sadik-Khan says that one of the big surprises was how quickly people flocked to this space. We put out the orange barrels and people just materialized into the street. She worked closely with business and local merchant groups who maintained the space, moved the furniture, and took care of the plants. Macys was a huge supporter of this approach because they understood that more people on foot is better for business. In this busy metropolitan area, streets crammed with cars. Sadik-Kahn tells how they created over 20 pedestrian plazas in all 5 burrows across the city. They repurposed 26 acres of active car lanes and turned it into new pedestrian spaces. She also brought this new approach to busses. New York has the largest bus fleet in North America and the slowest bus speeds. They built out 6 rapid transit lanes, 57 miles of new speedy bus lanes. She says "I think one of my favorite moments as transportation commissioner was the day we launched City Bike. I was riding City Bike up 1<sup>st</sup> Ave in my protected bike lane; I looked out and saw pedestrians' standing safely, the traffic was flowing, and birds were singing and the busses were speeding up their dedicated lanes. It was just fantastic." Why can't we do that here? The URL was sent out to you. I'll bring it next week if you would like to see it. She is an amazing speaker."

### Ruth Beeker

"I had encouraged two people to attend the September 26<sup>th</sup> public meeting. Both called me the next day. They wondered if I could explain what had been the purpose of the small group activities, they had been totally confused. I doubt that

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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

either will return to another Broadway Corridor public meeting. When the staff presents the analysis of that event to you, I hope that they will have done more than count beans. There needs to be an in depth evaluation of the event itself. A few examples: How can an event start off on time when you anticipate a large crowd which was obviously the case? Some of the tables weren't even set up. You do not create a bottle neck at the registration desk. You give each of the table facilitators a registration sheet to fill in by attendees after they are seated. If you want people to make choices you do not put sub topics. Each list needs to be discrete; each item needs to be discrete so that people's responses have greater depth. You do not roll out a complex matrix that would require the general public hours to digest. You plan activities through the point of view of the participants.

You cannot assume that they come with the knowledge to pick up where staff left off the last time with the last public meeting. You need to provide background in as simple a format as possible. You keep the activities as self-explanatory as possible and simple as possible. Particularly when past attendance has led you to believe that the room will be full, the noise level will be high, and many attendants will be old. I would guess that more than one hearing aid was turned off that evening. I know there are two more public meetings scheduled in this endless odyssey. I've heard the same message from the public three times now, and so have you regardless of what activities staff has assembled for you to do, they still give you the same message at the end. I doubt that message is going to change.

Let's wrap this up as quickly as possible. I would urge you to consider seriously about how much bang for the buck you can actually expect to get out of more public meetings and I agree with Laura. You need to be calling the shots. It's your responsibility not staffs to decide if we are going to have more public meetings. I believe tax payer money could be better spent in the long run on a few more park benches, maybe a table, maybe some attractive signage. Let's get on with it as quickly as possible. I can assure you that the two people that called me on September 27<sup>th</sup> will not have trouble giving you their opinion on that. Thank you."

### **3. Approval of CTF Meeting Summaries for the July 25, 2013 Meeting**

The Draft summary for July 25, 2013 meeting was distributed to the Task Force as part of their pre-reading materials. Facilitator, Nanci Beizer, asked the CTF for their approval of the summaries to submit into public record. The Task Force approved the meeting summary with no requested revisions. All previous meeting summaries as well as up to date project information can found on the project's website: [www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway](http://www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway).

### **4. CTF TakeAways from the 9/26/2013 Public Meeting and 9/27 Open House**

Time was allotted for the Task Force to provide their "TakeAways" from the September 26, 2013 Planning Update and Community Workshop Event and the September 27, 2013 Business and Property Owner Open House. Listed below are the insights and comments provided by the CTF:

*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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

- I noticed that most of the attendees and comments were from people in adjoining neighborhoods and businesses from within the corridor. A few people (three or four) complained to me about the depth of the neighborhood attendance and were concerned that the voice of the larger city was not being heard. I also took away, and the input report reflects this, that there was overwhelming support for a narrower configuration of the roadway. At the Business and Property Owner Open House, I heard many issues that were common to the Grant Road project and elsewhere - delay is deadly, quicker is better; property owners have decisions to make. There is a lot of interplay regarding how this will affect businesses.
- I got mixed reactions from the tables: there was support for both the four lane and eight lane options and it seemed like many comprised on the six lane. I am frustrated with how to get the rest of the city involved and not just the neighborhoods. The City is the hub of the metro area. Marana, and Oro Valley are not represented. I was also concerned that there was no representation from Ward 5; it is not in our best interest to let Ward 6 dictate the outcome of the project, Ward 5 has a stake in the project, as well. I appreciate the work the staff put in and the audience for attending. This was a huge undertaking.
- Due to the venue I had a difficult time hearing. I didn't really take away anything new and heard the same key themes that we have been hearing from the public for a while: make Broadway a destination, create or maintain a good sense of place, provide shade, bicycles and pedestrians are important, increase transit, keep the road as narrow as possible, and let's get on with the project.
- I found the workshop very interesting. I walked by each table and took notes and found that the most prevalent topics discussed were aesthetics and doing the project on a human scale. Additionally, economic viability was a heavily discussed topic - both during construction and through the conclusion of the design process.
- The two main concerns I noticed that were brought up were maintaining a sense of place and a strong preference for a narrower right-of-way versus a wider one. Additionally, I noticed a strong concern for maintaining an environment of economic vitality and local businesses. A woman from Visit Tucson shared that when selling Tucson as a venue for convention that this stretch of Broadway is one of the first things people see and that a sense of

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

place and historic buildings are important to make a good impression. Kudos for the structure of the meeting and for the opportunity for the public to provide input. I think we could have used more group time and less presentation. Some people's voices in the group work were not heard and with so many details and options to look at, the results may have been diluted. During the Business and Property Owner Open House I noticed the key that was brought up was uncertainty and a mistrust regarding the resources that are available and if their property is going to be acquired. There were many kudos from those who attended and had taken advantage of services like MainStreet Business Assistance and Tierra Right-of-Way.

- The facilitators were effective and did a great job of getting people engaged. I found the noise level encouraging as people were talking and listening to each other. I feel we need to look at the connections to other parts of Broadway and how we can work those in to the planning and design phase as well. I did notice some confusion regarding the cross sections and how they might change throughout the corridor. I think we also need to look at the impact climate change can play on the decisions regarding mass transit and transportation.
- I noticed a lot of passionate voices and I think everyone worked well together. It seemed like 80% of the tables had something other than a six lane cross section on it. I enjoyed the comments from the audience at the end - it gave them a voice and more time to speak as the Call to the Audience is usually limited to three minutes per person. We need to keep up what we are doing. I appreciate the staff, they have a hard job because the CTF are not engineers and they have to give us the information so we can understand it. Everyone is trying to do the best job they can.
- It was very interesting to see a wide variety of opinions about the size of the roadway - from keeping it the existing size to spend money on something else such as education or pot holes, to the widest cross sections. Our opinions are still evolving, I noticed the map of the area of where people live and work did not have a large representation of people from outside of the project area. It is important to have more engagement from people not in the area.
- It was difficult for me to hear, as well, but I was encouraged by the turn-out and think it was important for the public to see what we have been doing. I received feedback that there was too much information to understand in a

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

short time and I heard similar concerns at the tables as well. The key themes that I heard were: historic integrity, visual quality, walking/bicycling environment and health benefits, and economic potential. One group made their own category or performance measure - "Road to Nowhere." The following are the concerns that I noticed: water run-off, residence integrity, a place to come to, wide is not better, concerns with buildings being torn down, what it will take to replace businesses and for the economic vitality to bounce back, the lack of destinations to walk to if businesses are lost, working with what we already have instead of building new things. It is evident from all of the discussion that one solution for the entire roadway will not work.

- I noticed an overall sense of preference of narrower cross sections, the desire to create a sense of place, and the desire to protect the local businesses within the corridor. I was impressed by the level of public participation and the turnout. The City is setting a new standard with public involvement; this was one of the biggest turn outs for any roadway project I have witnessed. The participation was from primarily the surrounding areas because they have the most to gain. Jim DeGroot was on the radio and there was a lot of outreach to the surrounding areas and the general public has been offered many ways to participate. In my mind there has not been a gap in outreach and we have been hearing from the right people.
- My compliments to the CTF for their involvement and comments. This is the most difficult project I have ever been a part of and I think the community got a sense of how difficult this project is. There is so much information to digest, yet it has to be done rather than simply giving the project to the planners and designers. I remain optimistic that we can get what we want. I can't wait to get into the alignment design phase. I think we can do the project with minimal building acquisitions and fit in everything we want with minimal disruptions.
- I have also heard comments about the "road to nowhere." This is an issue of community communication. The road to downtown is under construction and the idea is that downtown is a destination and the Downtown Links project will syphon off traffic from Broadway and Aviation Highway. We need to be sure to discuss things like this and ensure that people's ideas remain balanced.

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

- I agree with that statement and there is another part, as well. The extension of eastbound Aviation Highway to the interstate will impact Broadway and downtown as well. The road to nowhere will not hold true in the future.
- Can you please clarify a question regarding funding: can the dollars allocated on this project be spent elsewhere?

*[NOTE - there was not a response to this question provided at the meeting, the following is a response prepared subsequently: The RTA funding could be spent on another project and this would be a decision made by the RTA Board. The County funding could be spent elsewhere through a county-led process described later in item #6 below. The City funding could be used elsewhere and would require an action by Mayor and Council, and this would not be expected to occur unless the RTA and County withdrew their funding.]*

#### **5. Presentation and Discussion: Public Input on Potential Cross Section Concepts and Performance Measures from Public Meeting #3**

Project team member, Phil Erickson led the Task Force in discussion that gave an overview of the September 26, 2013 Planning Update and Community Workshop Event and highlighted results that are pertinent to the Task Force moving forward into the advance planning and design phase. A full version of the report detailing the public input and appendices can be found at <http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/broadway/public-meeting-3>. Listed below is the brief discussion that ensued during this agenda item:

#### ***CTF Questions and Comments with Summarized Project Team Responses (Italicized)***

- **When you state phasing strategy, what exactly do you mean by that?**
- *A phasing strategy for implementation of potential cross section concepts might be that the initial construction would be a six-lane mixed flow configuration and that in the future when demand is high enough and there is funding to support construction and operations two lanes could be converted to transit lanes for some type of high-capacity transit, such as BRT, streetcar, or light rail.*

#### **6. Staff/CTF Discussion: Project Funding, Project Schedule and Tasks, Continued Discussion of Public Input on Potential Cross Section Concepts and Performance Assessment Methodologies, other Studies of Particular Issues (e.g.; Parking, etc.)**

The project team utilized this agenda item to engage the CTF in a free flowing discussion regarding the following topics and areas of concern:

- Project Funding
- Project Schedule and Tasks
- Continued Discussion of Public Input
  - Themes

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

- Key issues of discussion
- Tradeoffs
- Performance Assessment Methodologies
- Initial design alternatives for further design and analysis
- Parking (policies for district parking and non-conformance)
- Economic Framework
- Phoenix - Central Avenue and Tempe - Apache Boulevard Light Rail redesign
- Traffic Growth Projections
- Universal Design

These discussion topics were critical to talk through to lay the ground work for the Task Force to provide direction to the project as to which design alternatives to advance in to further study. The conversation that took place during this agenda is summarized below.

*CTF Questions and Comments with Summarized Project Team Responses (Italicized)*

- I am concerned that the County is not here, I feel I was elected to represent citizens and what they want. The 2006 ballot said 6-8 lanes, yet this is not what people at the public meetings want. We have been told the City has the freedom to alter the project and do what they want as long as it meets the functionality requirements; yet, if they do not do what the County wants, the County will take away their portion of funding from the project. If the CTF decides six lanes is not good for the entire roadway, and this decisions goes to the Mayor and Council, and the County says, if we do not do what the County says they won't provide funding - is the decision we make going to matter? Do you know what that will do to this community? I feel passionate about it, and I'm feeling very stuck, and upset. Is the decision we make really going to matter?

Regarding the comment made by Laura Tabili in Call to the Audience about staff. I am the one who asked for traffic information. After reading Jenn's letter, I realized we get so much information and had forgotten that we were provided the information. I clicked on the link and it did answer my question. It made me understand better how the traffic projections were made.

I don't want to sit on the CTF if what the majority wants won't be followed.

*To clarify the funding question, the funds Pima County has allocated to the project support the project described in the 1997 Pima County Transportation Bond Ordinance, which was approved by voters. The project is described as 6 or 8 lanes in that Ordinance, so there is a constraint on how the monies can be spent. Inherently there is a constraint on the funding: the monies can be used if the design that comes out of this process is either 6 or 8 lanes.*

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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

*There is an amendment process that is described in the IGA agreement between the City and the County that would have to be followed to amend the bond ordinance description, and this is possible. The process would be a public process, since this was a voter-approved local bond project. It would require approvals at public meetings of City of Tucson Mayor and Council, then the Pima County Bond Oversight Committee, and the County Board of Supervisors. Whether the amendment would go through successfully is something we cannot predict and I would categorize as a "political uncertainty".*

*From out of the gate, we have had constraints on the funding from both the RTA ballot language, 6 travel lanes plus 2 dedicated transit lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks, as well as the County bond ordinance for 6 or 8 lanes. However, the contention of the project scope has led to opening up the discussions to ensure that whatever it is we are building, we are building what is right - that it meets the needs of the area, as well as the region, for now and the future.*

- **How can the County take away funds allocated to the project and put them somewhere else?**

*The bond project would have to go through the amendment process mentioned above, if the Broadway project were going to be revised or if it were going to be proposed for deletion. A public hearing would have to be held, and then the Bond Advisory Committee would have to approve the amendment to go to the County Board of Supervisors for a vote. It is quite an involved process.*

- **The \$25 million that the County is providing - what percentage of the funding for the overall project does this comprise? Do we even need the money if we were to only go with four lanes as narrow as possible?**

*Four percent of the total budget will be provided by the City, the County's portion is 36 percent and the RTA will provide 60 percent of the total project budget. There is talk of an improvement district - similar to the Downtown Tucson Partnership - that would be created to help provide funds as well. One issue is that some of the money that has been used for acquisition and the planning and design phase was provided by the County. If they were to rescind their portion of the funding, it is possible the City would have to pay this amount back to the County.*

- **The reality is that there are two big pots of funds that come with strings attached. The public wants as minimal impact as possible. The impetus seems to be to build it because we have the money to do so. I don't want**

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

- that to skew our approach and the way we think about the design of the project - we don't have to build it a certain way just because the money is there to do so.
- The bigger community discussion is how to guarantee to people that what people said in the elections will be carried out. The RTA requires high specificity in what is involved with projects of regional significance with regional purpose. What constitutes functionality? If it is a downgrade in a project of regional significance, then it is not appropriately funded by the regional RTA source - this changes the game. We need to look at different levels of regional mobility, for example transit - keep this mind (as we select alternatives and design). There is a precedent of a bond election that was voted on and approved and then repealed and amended. This occurred with the project that was going to occur on Pima and Swan. The bond ordinance stated that the project would be five lanes; however, through negotiations with neighborhoods, the project morphed into just three lanes. This caused the project to be repealed. We may come to a point and say this is not a project with regional significance and it should not have RTA funding. Ideally, we should come to a solution that meets the standards. We need to go through the process of evaluating the alternatives to determine this.
  - Wasn't the original traffic study used for the bond election flawed? In 1997, many may have voted for the funds so that we would have them if we need them. People may not have believed that the project had to be built as exactly as it was stated in bond package. To have someone coming in and saying it must be built this way is troubling. On the other side, I have people coming up to me and saying, I hope the County withholds the \$25 million so that we do not have to widen unnecessarily. I have no idea what the politics were behind Mr. Huckelberry's letter. *The traffic analysis summary of 2012 looked at the PAG 2040 projections and reduced them by about 30 percent. That is what we have been using for our analysis (the PAG Low or 70% PAG).*

*The current numbers we are using are for 2040. PAG is updating their projections for 2045. The official numbers for 2045 are about 18 months away from being complete. It is a lengthy process because it involves updating the population projections and assigning the population and employment growth to specific locations that are zoned to accommodate new and reuse development, as well as the traffic growth projections. We know from the federal level down that the new projected growth rate will*

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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

*be lower than the current 2040 growth rate. There will be different numbers and that is part of our process, to incorporate the new numbers in. The range we are using, the 70% PAG to 100% PAG range, should encompass these changing numbers. We will continue to monitor this situation as the Broadway project moves forward and provide updates to the CTF.*

- Despite the \$25 million, I advocate that Broadway is a regional multi-modal road, the aorta into downtown - the main road into downtown. On the Major Streets & Routes Plan, it has always been designated and defined as a major corridor. I feel very strongly about this definition.
- To answer the question. I don't know what the right answer is here. I am saying that we need to take a step back and what the whole community wants and look at that and see what to be done. I can understand how you feel and I am aware of the arguments but in reality we have to go back to the law that was passed. At this point, we are not there yet. We are not at the point of recommending anything. I know there are going to be people unhappy on both sides of the aisle and we need to come to a compromise to resolve. We need to have these discussions and go through the analysis and let the process play out.
- Regarding the language in the memo, it is premature to say Broadway is not going to be widened. Has Huckleberry made the decision to pull funding already?  
*As the memo reads, the key word is "decision". When a decision is made, if it does not support the bond language, I read the memo as there is a request to plan for other uses of those funds. I don't feel it is immediate; I believe it is contingent on the design decision.*
- Assuming that all of the money is there, it seems the County's memo is focused more on a physical design, whereas the RTA is focused more on functionality. What exactly does the funding cover? Can we utilize it to fund high capacity transit, bike lanes, or district parking, bike boulevards in adjacent neighborhoods? If the money doesn't go in to specific lanes, but adds to capacity in other ways, how much flexibility comes with those funds, or how much is the funding strictly for pavement?  
*The description of the Broadway project and the project scope is pretty clear. Can we deviate from this strict scope? The legal counsel for the RTA states that ultimately, the Board has a fiduciary responsibility to do what it needs to do to carry out the projects that were voted in as part of the RTA*

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

*plan. That said, they have also pledged not to diminish the functionality. I do not think they are seeing that as a trade-off. The alternative that is presented would have to show that it can accommodate the traffic that was going to be using those 8 lanes with an acceptable level of performance.*

*Regarding your question about the Bus Rapid Transit, there is another element of the RTA Plan that is the Transit element, for capacity enhancement element of the Transit element which includes an expansion component, which is RTA Plan project #46. We will be working with the jurisdictions and the City of Tucson to identify projects that could use this funding.*

- **What type of transit does the ballot language assume will be in the dedicated transit lanes? Are there features of those dedicated transit lanes that can be funded from the RTA that can accommodate High Capacity Transit? Regardless if we have the High Capacity Transit, yet? Actually, I think the ballot language is just "bus lanes". I think we have the freedom to look at how transit could be accommodated in the corridor, once the improvements are made as well as how the street improvements can provide for other transit options in the future. One caveat is that we are talking capital versus operating expenses.**
- **How can the county take funding away without a voter initiative? There will be mutiny if that happens.**  
*Again, I think that is contingent on the design decision in the end. There is a public process the bond ordinance would have to go through to be changed. I would like to suggest that we not let this memo hold up our progress. We need to keep moving forward. I think we need to decide as a group what the next steps are. There are those pressing for a decision to be made now on the project. I would like to ask your thoughts on whether you feel we are ready to make a decision now? We have a project schedule that get through all of the data collection and analysis to be able to make a design recommendation. I think that would be the most prudent way to go. But I think it is important to ask you where you are at.*
- **I am not ready to make a decision. I am optimistic, though, that this is all going to work out. Everyone is going to have to make a compromise. It's not just a one solution fits the entire roadway solution. I am by no means ready to make a final decision.**

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

- Just so I am clear, are you asking us to recommend our decision on cross-section alternatives?

*Yes, we are getting to that. I just wanted to check in and see where we were all at. There is a question out there in the community about the Task Force's readiness to make a decision now. From what I am seeing and hearing, it seems that the general consensus is to continue moving forward with getting more data and analysis.*

- I wanted to clarify what my objection was earlier. I object to declassifying the roadway from a major corridor. I support eight lanes but I am all about compromise. We are going to have to live with our decision for the rest of our lives. This is a golden opportunity for us to make it right, whether it's four, six, or eight lanes. Let's not let Cuck hold us hostage with his memo and move forward.
- Everybody will need to make compromises. There is not just one solution. We need to move forward and continue to keep the public involved. I recently put 150 feet on the road and saw how wide it would be - it would be at the doorstep of my building, which I rent. Road construction is like strip mining: the economic impact of the lost revenue and sales tax combined with eight lanes of asphalt (and no businesses) is not good for anybody. I would like to see the statistics for the sales and property taxes generated by the businesses in the corridor...let's do this right the first time.
- I looked at the chart on page 30 of the Public Meeting #3 report. Every table, 100% of them, chose at least one cross section that was 124 feet or narrower (4+TA or narrower), 76% of the cross section alternatives fall within this range. I propose that we look at the cross sections that fall within this range. This would be options 6A, 4+TA, 4B, 4A, and 4+T SATA.
- This seems reasonable. I do not know where the exact numbers in the cross sections came from - I am not sure that I support these exact cross sections. But we should look at everything that we can fit within 124 feet and go from there.

*I do not want to misstate anything, but generally the only time groups got specific about the width was when referring to the existing conditions. Part of what we would do is talk about what the goal of a 124 foot right-of-way is and design from there. The resulting alternative might be 115 feet or 130 feet - it is important to look at the goal first.*

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

*Since RTA is going to be looking at functionality and comparing it against something, we do need to have a bench mark, which is the eight lane option to measure against. I do not think we could take anything to the general public that did not include at least one eight lane alternative.*

- We need to leave the eight lane option in because that was what was voted on and approved.

*We need to measure alternatives against the functionality of an eight lane concept.*

*We need to remember who we are responsible to - who is going to make the ultimate decision. This is the Mayor and Council. Part of the reason to look at an eight lane option is to figure out what level an eight lane roadway performs at. The CTF's definition of functionality isn't just transportation. The eight lane option also allows you to establish a baseline of performance for transportation, but it also helps you establish a baseline of performance for all the other performance measures. What does it really do to the buildings? What kind of properties are left? What does it do to tax base? How does it perform for transit? If we have 70% of the current PAG levels for traffic demand, or even lower, is it over-performing in terms of transportation functionality? We don't know these answers right now, but you need to be clear with the public if you are advancing an eight lane why you are doing it. The quantitative assessment may change once we get into more detailed design.*

- Part of the reason to keep the eight lane option on the table and to advance into further analysis is to have it for a comparison. We just need to be sure that we indicate that this is the reason why we are keeping it, and that it is not a response to public demand, which does not support eight lanes. Just so it is not confused with that.
- Just out of curiosity, I am probably not the only one who lives out in the county. Is it appropriate to write our supervisors to lay out the ground work and explain to them this process is a lot more complicated than what Huckleberry is saying in his memo?  
*As an individual, that is your choice. That would not affect your role as a CTF member.*
- The reality is that we *all* live in the county and that is part of the issue.

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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

- I absolutely agree with Phil and Diane - we need a baseline to see the good and the bad. I don't think there is any chance that an eight lane design alternative is coming out of this process. I think we want to see how things perform against each other. Things will have different impacts and different considerations. You get a different idea of what a cross section is when the design goes further and you see how it actually fits. Phil was discussing what our goals are - whatever the width is we need to look at the goals in more depth and design towards those.
- From a Miles Neighborhood perspective: prior to adopting our neighborhood plan we voted in favor for the Broadway project. Our plan then went to the planning commission and the City and was approved. Since 2009 a lot of things have changed and more information has come out. Six lanes is a compromise - you could make the extra two lanes into transit. This is where Miles Neighborhood is at. We may not be as vocal but that does not mean we are not concerned. Our plan adopted eight lanes but as we are going through this process we realized we need to look at it again. It is critical that Ward 5 becomes involved in the process. We are all planning for the future through this project - we need to build it right and create a true multi-modal road.

- I understand the need to study the eight lane roadway to set the benchmark. From the models we saw tonight, the danger is that the models will overly support the wider options and not test for the non-transportation measures of functionality. We need to see what the models can do and understand how they work.

*The modeling is generating expected demand on the road and the overall system. It is not necessarily what the lanes are, or how wide the road is but what the demand does. Does it go elsewhere? What is the future demand? Those are the questions the model looks at. The demand for traffic is the same per lane.*

*The demand is the measure of people moving across the region in one trip - from one end to the other. Some of the traffic that would use Broadway may end up on other streets depending on the inputs to get the regional trip in.*

- Is the model sophisticated enough to take into account bike and pedestrian facilities?

*The model for regional traffic demand cannot predict this; however, the modeling we will use to look at the design of the cross section alternatives*

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

*is a little more detailed and will take those types of things into consideration.*

*Also, what we could talk about is on the flip side of this, the questioning of the growth projections. When looking at the model it will most likely show that a four or six lane roadway will have more congestion than an eight lane road. We could look at the information and do an analysis that looked at what proportion of trips are by automobile and see what needs to be changed to arrive at the same level of functionality as an eight lane roadway. Perhaps it is reducing automotive trips or changing the time of day when they travel at, or possibly it is increasing the amount of transit ridership or trips by other modes. The model would not be able to tell us exactly what this would be but we would be able to look at the growth projections and see if any of these are reasonable. You could see, if there was an x amount of reduction in automobile traffic how the roadway would perform. This could help inform your decision making process.*

- We don't know enough about the next phase and what will happen in the next step. It sounds like we have been given the task to define functionality but the model already has a set definition for functionality - in terms of vehicular travel time. Is the right model to use? We have heard about non-vehicular performance measures and this model only seems to look at vehicular travel time. It doesn't seem like we know enough.  
*There are other tools we have to measure the non-vehicular performance measures.*
- Are we going to come to a consensus on a plan or recommendation? Is it a single recommendation or can we recommend 3 options and have the Mayor and Council choose one?  
*This depends on what the group recommends and decides on. The goal is to have one but that might not be realistic.*
- We chose consensus building for our decision making model. What happens if we do not reach consensus?  
*Other groups have used the consensus model for the majority of the project but then switched to a more parliamentary form of decision making to arrive at the final decision. We could do this is the CTF wishes to do so or if we reach a stalemate.*

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

- **What is the goal for the meeting on Thursday? I think that would help us figure out what we need to accomplish with the rest of tonight's meeting. Ideally, by the end of Thursday night the project team would like to know what street section options to advance into further design. Anything over four alternatives gets very expensive so from my perspective no more than four would be ideal. Phil and I have been discussing what we need to take forward and what needs to be refined. We have discussed taking a four lane, one or two versions of a six lane and the eight lane to get the benchmark we discussed earlier.**

*One of the things I have been thinking about is that we have looked at what the community is saying and we have heard what the political constraints are regarding the funding, and we have also heard from you what you would like to see with the cross sections. Ultimately, I expect that were you are going to end with something of a hybrid - something such as more lanes at an intersection or more lanes for a certain segment. If you feel very strongly about transit, there will probably be a location where doing dedicated transit forces another measure to perform poorly. One way to start looking at these tradeoffs is to actually start designing the alignments from the two extremes - the four lane and the eight lane. From this you can get a sense of how they work, how they perform and how much they cost. Once we have learned from that we can look and see what the impacts are and see where we have to be flexible with things such as parking solutions. That way, we learn things as we go along.*

*We need to also hear from you about what you think of the tradeoffs that will help inform our design considerations. Ultimately, by the end of this week the goal is to have a well-enough thought out recommendation from all of you about the types of cross sections you want to look at and the design and analysis process you are comfortable with so we can take it out to the stakeholder agencies.*

- **How will we see "how well" the alternatives perform. I don't understand how the eight lanes won't come out the best. It depends on what performance measure you are analyzing.**

*Quite a bit of data will be produced from the various models regarding the performance measures and other considerations and the models will be run with the standard population projections and the reduced (70%) projections.*

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

*Part of what we will come back to you on Thursday with is a more detailed explanation of the methodology we will be using.*

*Looking at the schedule we will have a meeting in December. We will be able to run some analysis between Thursday and the December meeting and get some initial data to you. One thing we need to know is what performance measures you would like to have more detailed information about. This will help focus our analysis.*

*On Thursday we are going to come back with some options with what we could start our design refinement and alignment studies for and lay out a process of how that takes you through a series of decisions so that you can give enough consideration to a set of options that we could look at further.*

*I would also urge you to spend some time with the public input report, because it includes a lot of issues about how the public input relates to what we need to design and what we need to study. Things like what are the access and parking solutions that would allow us to keep more of the existing buildings.*

- I still don't realize how the eight lane option is not going to come out the best. This is something we don't want.  
*Quite frankly the modeling may show that the eight lane option over performs. Additionally, we are going to be looking at cost and there is the lingering question about whether or not we can actually build the eight lane road.*
- I guess I need to know more about the modeling. I want to know about the non-traffic related measures and how those will be analyzed.
- The eight lane may prove to be the best for one set of performance measure but may perform very poorly on the others. We know it will perform best on the traffic related measures.
- I have three lane configurations that I think we should do, but let's come back and have further discussions on Thursday.

## 7. Second Call to the Audience

Eleven (11) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

### Laura Tabili

Laura ceded her time to another member of the public.

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

JD Garcia

JD ceded his time to another member of the public.

Margot Garcia

"I just came back from Switzerland in September. It is a small county but they are doing a lot of interesting things that I would like to share with you. One of those is parking, they would park half on the road and half on the sidewalk. The spaces were still numbered so they were charged for it. They had trees in the sidewalk and you would park between the two trees. So there are ways of crowding these things in and I think we need to look at them. There were major highways that came through the town. They considered this and tunneled under the city. So when it came to it they could tunnel. I would be interested in knowing if tearing down the north side of Broadway for two miles is cheaper than tunneling under the main part of downtown. I don't know the answer to that. The region observed which is about the same size as Tucson had major rail ways to all parts of the country. Trolleys and local trains that ran every 15 minutes. The headways into the main station were three minutes apart and if one was off everyone was still on time.

The other thing I wanted to share was another TED talk that came from my 2007 from James Howard called *Culture of Civic Design*. He says that we need to understand that the only places worth caring about are places worth defending. He advocates living locally and being good neighbors. He sees that in America the public realm comes mostly in the form of the street. He states the public realm has two roles. It is the growing place of our civilization and of our civic life and it is the physical manifestation of the common good. When you downgrade the public realm you will automatically degrade the quality of the civic life and the character of the enactments of public life. I hope all of you got out for Tucson Meet Yourself, and did you notice what happened to Church Street? They closed it off. It was between Valdez Plaza, the library, the court house, and the street was taken over with the stage, people were sitting on the chairs, and it was an extension of the park. It became part of the public realm that held a wonderful community event. So that's why this part of Broadway is so important. I am glad to hear you talking the way you are, asking the questions you are because I think you got the sense that we have. That this is a part of our public realm and how we treat it speaks immense amounts about who we are and what we treasure in our civic and public lives. We know Tucson can be a great city, let's do it right."

Marc Fink

"As you know from my comments I've had disagreements with Phil about how we should look at things and how things should be defined, but I can say I entirely

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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

agree with what Phil said in the idea that we are defining functionality different and I am really encouraged that most of you have also taken up that idea. That functionality is not just moving people through something. Historically the street is where we conduct public business and it's only been a historic idea since WWII that streets were just designed to move traffic. Given that, I think that it is now time for the task force to actually define the context of what you are trying to achieve. I think by adopting goals and visions, particularly the goals that create the context your thinking about, you can actually do a better job of evaluating the alternatives. I would say that probably, in my opinion, it would be easier to use those performance measures. If you look at it in a different way you might be able to understand and deal with the alternatives differently. On the other hand, another issue I wanted to talk about is that the models ignore the whole phenomenon of induced demand which is what Mary was talking about.

There have been lots of studies in the past ten to fifteen years by very reputable transportation planners around the world talking about induced demand. It sounds like the model just assumes there are all these trips and that all these trips will go down these roads. We would argue that's not necessarily the case. Particularly, and I'm a professional land use planner for over 30 years, it also depends upon the land uses you provide. To talk about transportation divorced from land use in my mind is a big mistake because then you will be looking at patterns that may not exist. Your not only dealing with transit but what uses you put where. The idea of regional significance, I would agree that Broadway has regional significance but we might disagree on what that means. Regional significance is not just the road, it's the place, it's the function, and how it's functioned in the past. The 97 bond language actually called Broadway Tucson's main street and that's how we look at it.

The final point and the one that became kind of distressing during this discussion was what was the meaning of the ballot and, when people voted for the RTA, what did that mean? Some people seemed to assume that people looked at every project on the list and only if they approved every single one as written did they vote yes. That of course is not true. One big example is, my wife voted for it only because of the transit improvements. If they weren't there, she would have voted no. So to assume she supports widening Broadway to eight lanes because she voted for it is not true. In fact, in dealing with this, we know that there is flexibility. We had Jim's comments in August of 2012 and then we know also that the RTA attorneys said that the law was written in such a way as to provide flexibility to take into account changing community desires and new information. So, this idea that you're forced to do this is absurd. Don't worry about Chuck. I know Chuck has this image of being the Tsar of Pima County. I worked for him for thirty years. He's very

*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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

important and has a lot of influence, but the Board makes the decision. Chuck cannot withdraw the money. Only the Board can."

### Gene Caywood

"I'm Gene Caywood from Southern Arizona Transit Advocates and I thought this was a fascinating discussion. First, I want to say that we are very pleased from our standpoint that our option was tied for second. But I want to remind everybody that was never intended to be a standalone option. Apparently the cross-section was never meant to be applicable throughout the whole corridor. In fact that is the way our drawing was. It was probably that the cross-section was good for about half of the corridor but we had widening at the intersections. So we didn't want you to forget that. It's not practical to assume that one cross-section can (work for) the whole corridor. With regard to all of your funding things, I think one question that needs to be answered is, let's say we are going to stick with a six lane/eight lane kind of thing or whatever, the question is, do those lanes have to be directly on Broadway? We presented a second drawing where we had the transit primarily off of Broadway. That to me is an option. This should be considered a corridor, not the narrow entrance of Broadway.

Colby and Jamey mentioned that we should go ahead and decide how we want the roadway design and let the system work out the funding and I agree with that 100%. It's the right approach. Don't worry about the funding. Let other people worry about that, but by all means, lobby your Supervisor because it is a political decision in the end, as Marc just said. Dale said that it's a regional facility just from a transit standpoint. That is one thing we can argue, that Broadway is a significant transit corridor if not the most significant one in the whole region. So, don't think you are going to lose your RTA funds. You ought to get that from the transit element, period, if there is nothing else there. To Bruce and the traffic study; again, don't worry about the numbers, because basically here is how you have to look at it. Light Rail Transit can handle any kind of numbers Jim throws at it, the real key is how do you get people to use transit. So, they have to switch to transit. At what point will the congestion get bad enough that people will then begin to switch to transit. That's the real key. The Light Rail Lines in San Diego that goes down to the border and the blue line in LA both carry over 90 thousand people a day. That's way above any numbers that Jim is going to predict for any scenario. We can handle the capacity. The road is functional from a transportation stand point if you put in transit. So that's the argument, put in the transit and you have a functional roadway. Diane, how can the county take your bond money and spend it somewhere else? I think if you look into it, you'll find the reason is that they didn't put enough money into all of the projects that they promised. What it amounts to is

*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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

that Chuck has a list of other projects that he would like to fund and he will fund them with our money if you let him.”

### Linda Dobbyn

“Broadway is the heart of Tucson and because of that, sense of place should truly be the umbrella under which all of the decisions that relate to this project should be made. It has got to have that heart and soul, it has to reflect that heart and soul. Also because of that, because it’s central to everything that leads to downtown, mass transit - multi-modal transit - is absolutely going to work. It has to work here on Broadway, of all streets. An 8-lane corridor is more appropriate in some cities, it is not appropriate in the heart of a city. So I recommend multi modal and it will induce demand for transit, it will take care of it. I recommend forward thinking, we don’t want to think back to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. We want to move forward and go with a multi modal oriented and a true sense of place.”

### Molly Thrasher

Hello I’m Molly Thrasher and I come to announce more meetings. About a year ago, the Mayor and Council put together a safe harbor working group. The intention was to find strategies that the City of Tucson could implement to help keep businesses vital and stay in business during these rough construction projects. For a year now we have been meeting and coming up with some ideas and now we are vetting those with businesses. All the businesses are invited who are in the current future or past RTA projects. Some of you are business owners or you certainly know business owners, if you could let people know, the meetings are Wednesday evening from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. and Friday morning from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m.”

### Mark Homan

“I just want to thank you for your comments and a number of others here for your refusal to be avoided. Your time and your commitment should be honored, it shouldn’t be threatened. Jamey, your characterization of it as hostage taking, I think that is great. I appreciate your willingness to stand up to someone who is trying to bully this process and also to endorse the idea that Jamey and Phil and Colby and others put out that Mayor and Council have asked you to come up with your best recommendations. Once you do that, that is your job. It is not necessarily to please Chuck Huckleberry. You have a charge from Mayor and Council and I appreciate you recognizing that and moving forward, because the time you guys have put into this is humbling and impressive.

Also, I want to comment on something that Marc said and Jim talked about - project 46. The RTA was a package. There are a boat load of projects. There are a

*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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

number of people who voted for something because it included this or that. It wasn't as if somebody said I'm voting for every one of those specific things. Yes, the RTA package was approved but that doesn't mean that each item on that received a majority of support. I also wanted to point out you may not need to use the entire \$75 million dollars on the project. If you don't spend the \$43.4 million of that, it is not even given to improving roadway, it's only for the acquisition and destruction of property. But again, it comes back to what you think is best and bringing that to Mayor and Council, and let the chips fall where they may. Finally, yes, the RTA had all of this stuff in the package but it did also say that things can and must change, conditions change. There is a fiduciary responsibility there. It's not just spending the money because it's there but spending the money wisely. It's your money, it's my money, it's all of our money and it's our community. Thank you very much."

### Henry Schneiker

"Hi, my name is Henry Schneiker. I am a building owner on the north side. In front of my building there is a chunk of road. It has two west bound lanes, two eastbound lanes, a left turn lane, no sidewalks, no bike lanes, and it is about as narrow as you can get. My parking pavement comes right up to the curb. You drive right off the curb onto Broadway. If they widen the street just five feet, I lose 50% of my parking. Right off the bat. Unless they keep the street the same width, I'm going to lose something. It's a given. It is just the reality. Going back to the meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup>, I was at one of those tables and I can tell you something about the process. When we were picking roadways, we picked them because this roadway looks nice but they were just roadways and we were picking off of a list. Something very important was that we eventually looked at the map and said let's put this roadway down in front of my building and see what is going to happen. The building (unless you stay with the same roadway width) is probably a lost cause. What everyone at the table decided very quickly, because we took the various widths, was that 150ft was just a ridiculous width. The table came to the consensus that somewhere between 115 and 120ft was the maximum width of the roadway and the sidewalks and all of the other stuff. That was the practical limit as to how wide you could make it. Then that would still leave sufficient room after you have torn down the building and rebuilding it to the back of the property, that you could actually do something with the land. If you put a 120ft thing, you have to take the building because the roadway is going to go through the whole building, no matter what you do. It is something that is very important to think about. A lot of the buildings are just going to be lost because, unfortunately, there is no way to avoid it. We decided that you could probably get six lanes in, and Broadway probably does need to be six lanes. Buildings are going to get lost, but at least you have enough land to

*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](http://www.RTAmobility.com).*

redevelop and do something useful with so that you don't have this barren desert on one side of the road. If you have a barren desert, it's that "where do you go?" that everyone keeps talking about. If you're going to have a place to go, you need places to go to, so you need to have enough space."

### Demion Clinco

I'm Demion Clinco, head of the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation and I just wanted to give you an update. We held a modern history event where over 3,000 people attended and really felt that this place matters. People came from Europe, Texas, California, and New York City to our city to experience midcentury modern architecture on Broadway. That had economic power. Doing some rough calculations, \$750,000 to \$1.5 million in economic activity occurred over the course of our event. That's just numbers. This place matters. I came in saying that these buildings matter and it's remarkable that the community said that this is their number one priority. Not the number two or three - in one of the most flawed processes I've ever seen. It was anything but objective. I'd like to actually see the study that shows that this was evaluated as an objective process that would create an evaluation where each criteria were equal and they weren't because we spent over half an hour looking at pages and all these different performance criteria and two of the criteria took the majority of the square inches on the pages. Even during the presentation I actually timed each introduction of each of the performance measures, transportation/functionality bicycle/amenities pedestrian, those all got a lot more time than the other performance measures.

In fact when we talked about bicycles amenities and how important that was, we talked about somebody died even during the course of this process. If that doesn't start to weigh how the community values and assesses which performance measures are more important than others, I don't know what does. The fact that there hasn't been a process that has been evaluated by an outside entity, there are people at the University of Arizona, statisticians who can look at it, even the way the items should be rotated through. Despite all of that, historic preservation was still the number one priority. This was really just outstanding and says this community values this place. If that doesn't ring loud and clear of how we define this roadway and what really matters, than I don't know what else does."

### Steve Kozachik

Three quick comments, functionality, regional significance, and then Chuck's letter. Functionality is not solely defined as the number of vehicle trips down a roadway. Nor is it defined as building a corridor for 22 hours out of the day. Think back to where we began the night. Historic preservation, economic potential, and

*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.RTA mobility.com](http://www.RTA mobility.com).*

visual appeal were the number one, two, and three things that you heard from the community and you continue to hear again and again. I think if there is anything that amazes me over the course of coming to these and going to the open houses is that the message really isn't changing. Now the burden will shift to you. Regional significance, Jamie is right; it's absolutely a regional significant corridor. Dale I'm sorry, that is not defined by the demolition of 115 buildings. So, of course Miles neighborhood supported the original ballot measure because it constituted demolishing the buildings on the north side of the roadway. Ward 5 is absolutely invited to take part in this process, they can come anytime, give them a call. I'll just finish with Chuck's letter. He talked about 6 lanes. What he didn't talk about was the width of the lanes. He didn't identify the 4 lanes plus two transits equals 6. It's still arithmetic. It can meander as Grant Road does. So once you define that cross width you can then work on the alignment. It's not about the number of cross-widths it's about what you do with that alignment. My recommendation to you with respect to Chuck's letter is ignore it. Take it home, put it under the parakeet. Do your job, that's why you're here. Let us figure that out at the end of the day. You're here to come up with the best possible design as you correctly started, throw it out there, and let the rest of the governing bodies take it from there.

## 8. Next Steps/Roundtable

The roundtable presents an opportunity for the Task Force to provide feedback on any aspect of the meeting or the project in general. During the next steps discussion the following comments were made:

- When you do the minutes can you indicate who the comments are from?
- I want to make sure I clarify the comments I made earlier regarding the RTA and the background of the RTA. I don't want you to believe that this is exactly how I feel. That is my understanding of how we got to where we are at, not exactly where we should go. I think there should be something in here about transit and meeting the transit obligations. I do not think some of these factors will be considered at higher levels of government but is up to us to make the case for them.

## Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 9 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>

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.RTA-mobility.com](http://www.RTA-mobility.com).*

## THE NECESSITY OF FUNDING TRANSIT STUDY AND A BUDGET FOR LANDSCAPE O & M

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE: BROADWAY CITIZEN'S TASK FORCE MEETING OCTOBER 21, 2013

RON SPARK, M.D.

### HOW CAN YOU PLAN BROADWAY WITHOUT QUALITY DATA?

#### TRANSIT STUDY

- 1) How can the BCTF designate transit lanes on/off Broadway without knowing the technical criteria and the financial implications from a formal Transit Study?
- 2) If you go forward without a Study, the BCTRF will likely add to the eventual costs:
  - a) Later on, maybe years from now, a study must be done before High Capacity Transit can be planned and financed.
  - b) Planning Broadway without the Study will limit future High Capacity options and add avoidable consequences.
  - c) Consideration of the SATA's proposals, examination of Bike Highways on 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> Street and options uncovered by a formal Transit Study must be moved from the back burner to upfront decision agendas.

#### LANDSCAPING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

- 1) Consider much of Broadway's landscaping has been removed: cost of maintenance and expanded right of way.
- 2) No existing budget for landscape maintenance for Broadway Corridor.
- 3) Actual cost of maintenance per/length of median suggested in current COT contracts with Grounds Keeper. Need to know costs upfront!
- 4) BCTF should seriously look at shade alternative designs for COT ROW and Public-Private Partnership space agreements:
  - a) Canvas awnings
  - b) Ramada
  - c) Pergolas
  - d) Arcades

BCTF needs to know if and where is the money going to come from:

- a) Suggest the savings from non-acquisition and property demolition.
- b) COT Improvement District financing
- c) New RTA initiative

You are to be commended on a very successful Public Meeting #3. By all accounts at least 200 people attended and one could see they were very engaged in each of the small group discussions. They also seem to have sent a clear message; bicycles and pedestrians are important, so are transit and the local businesses in their historic and architecturally significant buildings, and keep the street as narrow as possible.

In light of those comments I want to bring to your attention a Ted talk by Jeanette Sadik-Khan, the Transportation Commissioner of New York City given this month.

Janette Sadik-Khan starts out by saying that “The work of a transportation commissioner isn’t just about stop signs and traffic signals. It involves the design of city and the design of city streets. Streets are some of the most valuable resources that a city has, and yet it’s an asset that’s largely hidden in plain sight.” She goes on to describe how streets like Times Square haven’t changed much in 50 years. So she worked to refocus the agenda, “to maximize efficient mobility, providing more room for buses, more room for bikes, more room for people to enjoy the city, and to make our streets as safe as they can be for everybody that uses them.” So they wanted to change the balance and tried it out in Times Square. People had tried for years to make it better, she relates, from changing signals, lanes and everything else they could think of but it was still dangerous and hard to cross. So they tried looking at the street differently and did a six-month project.

“We closed Broadway from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to 47<sup>th</sup> Street and created two and a half acres of new pedestrian space. And the temporary materials are an important part of the program because we were able to show how it worked. And I work for a data-driven mayor, you probably know. So it was all about the data. So if it worked better for traffic, if it was better for mobility, if it was safer, better for business, we would keep it, and if it didn’t work, no harm, no foul, we could put it back the way that is was because these were temporary materials.... The results were overwhelming. Traffic moved better. It was much safer. Five new flagship stores opened. It’s been a total home run. Times Square is now one of the top ten retail locations on the planet. And this is an important lesson, because it doesn’t need to be a zero-sum game between moving traffic and creating public space.” Sadik-Khan says that one of the big surprises was how quickly people flocked to the space. We put out the orange barrels, and people just materialized immediately into the street.”

She worked closely with local businesses and local merchant groups who maintain the spaces, move the furniture, take care of the plants. Macy’s was a big supporter of this new approach because they understood that more people on foot is better for business.”

In this busiest of metropolitan areas, with streets crammed with cars, Sadik Khan tells how they have created over 50 pedestrian plazas in all five boroughs across the city. They have repurposed 26 acres of active car lanes and turned them into new pedestrian spaces. She also brought this new approach to buses. New York has the largest bus fleet in North America and the slowest bus speeds. They built out six bus rapid transit lines, 57 miles of new speedy bus lanes. She says

“I think one of my very favorite moments as transportation commissioner was the day that we launched Citi Bike, and I was riding Citi Bike up First Avenue in my protected bike lane and I looked over and I saw pedestrians standing safely on the pedestrian islands, and the traffic was flowing, birds were singing, the buses were speeding up their dedicated lanes. It was just fantastic.”

Why can't we do this here?