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

In facilitator Nanci Beizer’s absence, the meeting was co-facilitated by project team members Jenn Toothaker Burdick and Phil Erickson. The meeting was called to order, the quorum established, and the agenda for the meeting reviewed by Jenn Toothaker Burdick.

Citizen Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Belman</td>
<td>Elizabeth Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R. DiGrazia</td>
<td>Diane Robles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Durham-Pflibsen</td>
<td>Jamey Sumner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Fairchild</td>
<td>Michael Butterbrodt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Henley</td>
<td>Farhad Moghimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Howe</td>
<td>Shirley Papuga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

**JD Garcia:** Mr. Garcia addressed the CTF with following remarks: “Hello my name is JD Garcia, I am with the Broadway Coalition and I am the President of the El Encanto Home Owners Association. I have put a yellow memorandum on the desk that you can look at, at your leisure. I just want to commend you guys for the progress that you have made and for your statements at the public input meeting on February 28th. I thought that was a great meeting and I enjoyed what I heard all around, there was good information.

We have written this memo to you to emphasize the fact that the Broadway Coalition is very interested in a “livable city” and the city is livable if Broadway retains its destination features. We really want Broadway to be a destination and not just a freeway to somewhere else because that is what all of our cities should be, they should be a destination. In order to cause that to happen, there are businesses that are currently on Broadway and have a hard time deciding whether the city is going to tear them down or not (whether they are going to be condemned or not). The early decision by you would keep Broadway a more livable place and so I urge you to make a decision on the width of the roadway so that people know whether their business in included in the tear down or not, as soon as possible, and much earlier than the two year final decision time. So I urge you to think about that, take a look at our memo and we have more data too.”

**Marc Fink:** Marc Fink provided the following comments to the CTF: “My name is Marc Fink and I am also with the Broadway Coalition I am a retired planner, I just live three blocks up the way so I love the fact that these meetings are held here. I just want to piggy-back on what JD said, I was at the June meeting where you had the vision exercise and I was at the public meeting last February. It seems real clear that there is as much of a consensus as you are ever going to get in a public process, of what Broadway should or should not be. It seems really clear as JD says, and that it’s not really just the Broadway Coalition but the community that wants Broadway to be a destination and a place - not just some place that you drive through to get somewhere else, but a place that you go to; which has all sorts of implications in terms of the design. Where you would want...more or less the existing right-of-way there could be some slight changes and you may want to look at, what are the design features that are needed to create some place where people would want to go to. There is a good start with the Sunshine Mile. They had their event a couple weeks ago and I think the task force has a real opportunity to build on that, to really create something really good, and to be a leader for the community.

Also, just sort of serendipitously, a publication has just come out that was jointly published by the Urban Land Institute and the American Planning Association. One of the authors is Reid Ewing, who if any of you have been here a long time remember him, he used to live here and he is one of the leading planners on urban
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3. Approval of February 7, 2013 Meeting Summary:

Jenn Toothaker Burdick asked the Task Force to approve the meeting summary from the February 7, 2013 CTF meeting. The Task Force approved the meeting summary with no changes requested.

4. Public Input Report, and Reports on Project Presentations & Outreach

Time was set aside for a quick briefing on what outside presentations have been made, to whom, and general impressions or comments that were received; what presentations have been scheduled; and if there are any new requests for presentations that have been made, and what outreach has been undertaken by CTF members. Described below are quick discussions on the Public Input Report, a presentation to the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee, and the RTA CART Committee.

Requests for new presentations can be made via email between meetings and
• **Public Input Report:**

  Jenn Toothaker Burdick distributed the most current Public Input Report to the Task Force which covered input from January 27, 2012 until March 28, 2013. Ten (10) items were received from the public during this time. The next Public Input report will be distributed prior to the April 18, 2013 CTF meeting. The below listed conversation ensued after the Public Input Report:

  **Summary of CTF Questions and Comments**
  
  o Does anyone know where the map that is included in the report came from?
  o There is a better version of the map online that is bigger. Can you show the link to the map so that audience knows where to find it?

  **Summarized Responses**
  
  o The map was created by HDR Engineering. The map shows the current Right-of-Way widths, and roadway alignment widths. We can place the link to the map on the project website homepage.

• **Tucson-Pima County Advisory Commission (BAC) - Beth Scott:**

  CTF member Beth Scott, also a member of the BAC, gave a report of the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s presentation that was given last month by Jenn Toothaker Burdick and Ann Chanecka. Jenn gave an overview of the project and what has been accomplished so far and discussed what some of the avenues are for making public comment. Ann talked about what some of the existing prioritized projects that would interact with Broadway are. The BAC’s main concern is to understand how alternative transportation would be included into the design. One of the issues that was discussed was pedestrian active crossings and the example of Treat and Broadway was highlighted.

• **RTA Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation (CART) Committee - Doug Mance:**

  Doug Mance gave a brief summary of the previous RTA CART Committee meeting and the topics that were related to the Broadway project.

  Mr. Mance congratulated the team on the success from the public meeting/open house. He invited everyone to the next CART meeting on April 4th at 11:30 am. He handed out an article about the naming of Broadway in 1890 and explained, as mentioned in the article, Broadway is a destination and that it always has been. Doug stated that the CTF and the project have
done an excellent job so far and motivated them to continue doing what they are doing. Doug concluded by saying that he felt the Broadway Improvement Project has the potential to serve as a model for similar projects in the future.

Following Doug’s report, Jim DeGrood, RTA Director of Transportation Services, answered a question from the CTF regarding the legality of a jurisdiction altering the scope of an RTA Plan project. Mr. DeGrood stated that this information will be presented at the next RTA CART meeting. Additionally, project manager, Jenn Toothaker Burdick, asked if some of the other RTA roadway improvement projects were receiving similar levels of scrutiny and opposition, and if so how that affects the overall RTA Plan. Mr. DeGrood responded with the following statement: Each project has its own character and its own set of questions/concerns from stakeholders, etc. An example given related to the project Mr. Kozachik referenced in his Call to the Audience statements. The County recently asked the RTA to take over the Kolb/Valencia improvement project. An interim solution has been identified to help congestion at the intersection while the project design, widening from 4 to 6 lanes, is completed. The basis of the interim project solution is that the RTA would later do the widening with an adjacent product phase. They are recommending deferring the project widening construction and tying it to the 6 lane widening from Kolb to Houghton, which allows other cost savings.

5. Presentation: RTA MainStreet Business Assistance Program

RTA’s MainStreet Business Assistance Program provides a variety of free services to qualified businesses in and around the Broadway project area. Since June 2012, the project’s primary contact, Jan Waukon, has been delivering packets of information to the 400+ businesses that are located along and near Broadway in our project area and getting contact information. She has also been letting them know that the project planning and design phase is underway, and providing information to allow them an opportunity to attend CTF meetings.

While decisions on Broadway’s design and placement have not been made yet, and construction is not expected until 2016, businesses can still access the services available to them to get “construction-ready”.

Britton Dornquast, program manager, introduced the program in general, and touch on the specific ways that MainStreet is - and will be - involved as the Broadway project progresses. His presentation included the following topics:

- Transportation Improvement Project Impact Facts
- Typical Business Needs
- Minimizing Construction Impacts
- MainStreet Overview
- Program Exclusions
- 5-Year Highlights
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- Business Assistance Areas (within the Broadway Project Area)
- Business Outreach
- Lessons Learned
- You Can Help: Construction isn’t forever... Communities are. Please support businesses in “The Zones”.
- Questions

The following conversation took place following his presentation:

Summary of CTF Questions and Comments

- Do you have anything on paper with analysis or statistics that show how MainStreet has helped each business during construction projects? Do you have anything that shows perhaps how a particular business did better with the help of MainStreet’s Business Assistance Program? Can you tell us about how you go from the ten (10) year plan and policies to implementation and effective change on the ground that you can see?
- Do you have any documented statistics about how many businesses are successful by using your services?
- Have you seen construction signs that flash and notify drivers of relevant information, similar to what they use in the town of Oro Valley? Do you recommend the use of these signs?
- Oro Valley businesses arranged something similar to a ‘Flash Mob’, called ‘Cash Mob.’ Is that something you [MainStreet] did? Can that be done here on Broadway, and do you recommend that?
- What aspects of road construction/design are associated with the most impact on businesses?
- What do I do if one of my stakeholders is interested in learning more about MainStreet’s services?

Summarized Responses

- In order to have the data that you would like to see, it would almost require a control group that included businesses that received no help from MainStreet. We visit every business and at the very least provide them with information, and so it is up to the business as to whether or not they receive the consulting services that are available through the MainStreet program. I can share story after story about successes we have heard from businesses that chose to take advantage of our consulting services.
- Not a single business has gone out of business as a result of construction when they have taken advantage of the program’s services and completed their modules in entirety.
- There have been a number of these projects that have used signage, for example the Tucson Modern Streetcar. Sometime signage is a direct result of community support groups that have essentially put things in place.
Things such as Flash Mobs - or the Cash Mobs you mentioned - are an excellent grassroots idea that can help support each local business that is affected by project construction. MainStreet has not organized those.

Full [street] closures are the most impactful on businesses. MainStreet allocates additional consulting hours for businesses that are impacted with full closures.

Start by giving them our name and we will make a visit to their business from there.

6. 2/28/2013 Community Input Meeting Debrief, Initial Input Results, Public Participation Plan ad Stakeholder Outreach

The CTF engaged in a debriefing session with the project team regarding the 2/28/2013 Progress Report and Community Input Event. Topics such as what worked about the event, what could have been better, and what the CTF took away from the event were discussed. The initial results and analysis of the input received at the event was presented and briefly discussed. In total the project received 114 written comments, 29 written comment cards, and 4 video booth recorded comments for a total of 147 total comments submitted. Many of the statements were related to existing goal topics and reiterate statements that have been made prior. Additionally, several comments prompted the project team to recommend some new goal statements. Following this initial analysis the project team will compile a detailed event report and present it to the CTF for review prior to the April 18, 2013 meeting.

The draft Broadway Public Participation Plan (P³) was also be presented to the CTF for review. The P³ will be presented to sponsoring/reviewing agencies for their awareness and discussion. Project manager, Jenn Toothaker Burdick, stated that it is important to note that this document is meant to be a living document that will be added to as the project moves forward and the subsequent public participation activities take place. Additionally, the agency review and approval process was discussed in detail.

Finally, Stakeholder outreach and the recently created CTF Toolkits were also discussed. Listed below is a summary of the debriefing as well as the discussion of the other above mentioned topics.

Summary of CTF Questions and Comments

- Elizabeth: I feel that it was effective that they got back up on stage at the end of the event and summarized what they had heard from others.

- Colby: I think that the team did a great job this time and that overall it was more successful than the first event that took place for Broadway.

- Diane: There are more audience members in tonight’s meeting and that that must be a result of the success of the open house. I believe that the task force gained more trust in listening and responding directly to people and their concerns.
Bruce: The people that I spoke to believed that they had a voice in this process.

Elizabeth: I heard that station organization was a little bit awkward with too many topics moving back/forth and everyone just sort of centered around the room; however, I feel that given the setup I would have ended up having different conversations with individuals that I may not have otherwise.

The venue was a good place to host the open house.

Found the video commentary very powerful and I wish that there had been more comments like that.

I will submit the comments I heard during the event to the project team.

I have already reached out to several businesses along the corridor and that regardless of what my specific interest is that I represents, want all stakeholders to know that they can come to me and receive the help that they need.

I agree with the concept of cross-pollination and think that it will be effective in helping to better educate the public.

Often times you may be talking directly with business operators instead of owners and it is important that we also make the effort to directly contact the property owners to ensure that they are fully informed about what is going on.

How do I reach the property owners?

I suggested that as people approach businesses they make suggestions to the business operators that they pass information along to the business and property owners.

I think that most tenants would pass information along to owners, as they would want to know what is going to happen.

Will it be certain if Mayor and Council approve the project plans that we will see something similar take place that the task force has been hoping to achieve or will it be something completely different?

Some of us are very adamant about road being widened while some of us are not. How are we going to come to a consensus? I don’t want to be selfish in this and I want to really try to consider other ideas.

Are there examples on other projects where the task force has suggested recommendations that have been rejected by the Mayor and Council?

Some of the communication that takes place within the Downtown Links task force meetings illustrates how the design team and the task force can sometimes go back and forth, but our process is 180 degrees different from their process because they have been going through value analysis and afterwards have had changes proposed to the design details. So bringing design considerations into the process earlier and having them reviewed by the agency stakeholders makes completes sense. This could help prevent the
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back and forth that has occurred on the Downtown Links project after the design phase was complete.

- Bruce: What about funding at the end of the project? What if it’s not there?

Summarized Responses

- It was brought to my attention that there were some verbal comments that were expressed at the open house to CTF and project team members that may not had been written. These verbal comments also need to be addressed and included in our analysis. If any of you (addressing the CTF) heard comments not represented by what is included in our written analysis, please provide them to us.

- Project outreach Toolkits were distributed at the event for the CTF so that they could identify stakeholders and share information about the project with them. Have any of you used the toolkit or begun to provide outreach to your stakeholder groups?

- We have made one mass mailing to the property owners we have in our data base and we will continue to try and make more contact moving forward. They may not receive the same level of outreach that the businesses are; however, we will continue to make the effort to keep them informed.

- The property owner data that we receive comes from the County Assessor’s Office. Sometimes that information is not always up to date, so it is a constant struggle to keep that information up to date.

- If you are out talking to people, please share information with the team about any change in management, etc. Encourage them also to go to the website and to enter their information so we can maintain as accurate of information as possible.

- This conversation relates to the Public Participation Plan (P³). (At this point the Public Participation Plan was distributed to the CTF and reviewed.)

- There is a need to keep everyone in the loop as early in the process as possible. That is why we have programmed several agency reviews at significant junctures in the project schedule. This is to arrive at having agency-supported and publicly-supported design recommendations. Having these reviews will help move the project forward and ensure that when we do arrive at our end goal of a Design Concept Report (DCR) that our recommendations are accepted.

- What goes on during this review process is keeping all of the decision makers informed. The initial review with Mayor and Council at the end of this design process will be to present the CTF-recommended cross-section, alignment, and design concepts. When these are approved, we would create the DCR. After this, the RTA typically reviews the DCR and performs a value analysis that may take out design considerations. What we will recommend is at least having them perform an initial analysis so that the back and forth that occurs during this process can occur prior to the final design
recommendations being made - so that what I actually built is closer to what you all ultimately recommend.

- There is a lot more technical discussion that will be held moving forward that will help you make your decisions in the future.

- The recommendations from the Grant Road Task Force were approved by a 6-1 vote by the Mayor and Council. The DCR was then finalized and afterwards the value analysis happened. This analysis had recommendations proposing some changes to the cross section and the design. There is a range of opinions within the project team and Task Force whether or not these changes are substantial. The City has taken the position that the changes that the value analysis recommends will be looked at on a segment by segment basis. So that will be an ongoing process but part of the reason for this is that some portions of the roadway won’t be constructed for another ten years. The Broadway project will be different as the construction time frame will not be as elongated. For Broadway 100 percent design plans will occur for the entire alignment at the same time.

- That I am aware of, and I am new to transportation, I have not heard of any plans being rejected, or the design concepts, by the Mayor and Council. When these items come to Mayor and Council, the electeds should feel they know enough about it to support it. They do not want to be put in that position of not supporting something like that, or being surprised. We should be have given enough information and have support enough for the plans before we bring it to them at a Council meeting.

Also, I think on the Grant Road project the land use design concept is different than the construction design concept and that is where the debate is. We have yet to get to the point in our project where we are discussing the land use topic but we will get there.

- It is important to talk costs early on and continue to do so as we move forward so that, for example, we do know what a linear foot of asphalt will cost the project given our design considerations.

- In terms of funding being available, that has been an ongoing topic of conversation and everything that the RTA and County have said states that the commitment for funding is still there. The funding partners have guaranteed that the funding is there for the project. There is one constraint; however, and that is the budget. We need to produce a design recommendation that will fit within the constraints of our budget so that it is approved.

7. Group Discussion of Project Planning and Design Schedule (please note that this agenda took place after item 9, Second Call to the Audience, which took place at 8:05 PM)

Time was set aside to review the overall project schedule with the CTF, to help describe the tasks that will be undertaken with the CTF to reach their ultimate goal
of creating a Design Concept Report and Initial plans that will be reviewed by the Mayor, Council, and other funding agencies. The results of this discussion will influence the schedule of the technical work required to reach the design recommendations needed at the end of the project.

Pre-reading material distributed to the CTF shared the project team’s recommended schedule to get through the selection of a cross-section and alignment. Phil Erickson led the CTF through a discussion of this recommended schedule and the different options that were presented to the CTF to possibly accelerate the schedule. The project team also discussed the critical decisions points that were listed in the memo sent to the CTF. The discussion that followed is listed below:

CTF Questions and Comments

- Can we just go around and say which proposals that we are in favor of?
- Some of these ideas/topics have already been addressed and we have been exposed to the information already. Perhaps those ideas could somehow be presented online, that way the project team could leave the future meetings open for topics that are new and that have not already been addressed. Climate change and the Local First Arizona are both topics that we did not get enough information on but could be presented after we do our initial cross section alternatives design work. It is our responsibility to go through a thoughtful process but if there time savings that we could make, let’s do it! I think that the recommended charrettes and other ideas presented are a good way to go about doing so.
- I agree with the previous statement and the idea of speeding up the process. Businesses need to know what is going to happen so my question is where on this continuum will our business owners know? Is it at the end of the timeline?
- Let’s speed up the process and get answers.
- I agree with this too. We need to do whatever possible to expedite the pain and suffering of business owners and help them out as quickly as possible.
- This helps with the big picture and how to get to the end product. Any combination of the options to expedite the process will work for me. It is important to get to a decision, but we have to be diligent to take the time to educate ourselves so when it comes to design the task force understands one another.
- I agree with the idea of having a common knowledge base. By not having so much time in between meetings I feel as though you are able to stay in the game more. All of the parking lot issues are useful. I support expediting the schedule.
- Agreed with all that had been said.
• Ditto, but it’s important not to self-censor ourselves as we state opinions, and while it’s great to recommend what you think would be ideal, I believe that if the recommendation does not have a chance of getting through Mayor and Council then we are all just wasting their time.

• I disagree a little with some of the other opinions. I am not in a huge rush and am willing to work more evenings, but I really want to work through this, know all of the information and do it in a group setting. I understand that there is a time crunch but I do not want to throw out any information that would be valuable. I don’t have a problem working more.

• I’m willing to work more, as well. I want to be a knowledgeable as possible, and I want Colby to have the Historic Preservation presentation because he agreed to have MainStreet.

• Ideally, it would be good to have most of the information (especially with the parking lot items) in advance of doing the design work.

• It would be great if the task force could agree on topics to cover before meetings (also to prioritize them in terms of importance).

• I don’t know how these presentations came into the parking lot, or what’s been said or promised, but I would be reluctant to say that we don’t want to hear from someone.

**Summarized Responses**

• I would have to say that the decision regarding the alignment will not be made until the end; however, if the public, CTF, and decision makers agree on the number of lanes and alignment when the project team recommendations are presented, it could happen earlier we could accelerate when business owners get to know.

• Most of the topics that really needed to be addressed were included toward the beginning of the timeline of the meeting schedule.

• I suggest that everyone think about what topics they believe needed to be heard at a CTF meeting, and the timing you want it - before the selections of cross-section alternatives or after - before we finalize the meeting schedule. We will follow up by email after the meeting to get your input, and use your response to revise the project schedule and see where we can accelerate it.

8. **CTF Resignation and Chair Vacancy** (please note that this agenda took place after item 9, Second Call to the Audience, which took place at 8:05 PM)

Jenn Toothaker Burdick announced to the CTF that the Task Force Chair, Steven Eddy, submitted his formal resignation from the Task Force on February 28, 2013. Steven had to step down from the Task Force as he and his family moved to a new outside of the city limits which disqualified him from remaining on the Planning Commission. Because he represented the Planning Commission on the CTF, he must also resign from the CTF. The Planning Commission will select their new
representative to the CTF at their next meeting on April 3, 2013. This new representative can be appointed to the CTF before the April 18, 2013 CTF meeting. Jenn also reminded the Task Force that as the Vice Chair, Mary Durham-Pflibsen, is the current interim Chair.

Following this, Jenn asked the Task Force members to share how they would like to proceed. A very brief discussion ensued in which the Task Force agreed to table the item until the next meeting when the new Planning Commission representative would be present. This item will be placed on the April 18, 2013 CTF Meeting Agenda.

9. Second Call to the Audience
Four (4) members of the audience filled out a speaker’s card and were called upon to address the Citizens Task Force.

Gene Caywood: Mr. Caywood addressed the project team and the task force with the comments below:

“Good evening everybody. I thought that this was an interesting discussion that you were just having and I didn’t really have anything else to say tonight but I will talk for a minute. I have been involved in what is now the Downtown Links Project for many years (around 20) and we might finally get the end of it built. The worst case scenario that you were talking about…I think is the 4th avenue underpass. Not only did it go into a process like this and did it go to final design, but it was bid out and the construction estimates came out too high (way above the engineers estimate). So the city decided to go back and to re-design in order to keep the costs down. At that point a developer came, twisted the arm of the city manager, and the whole project was re-designed. The underpass was moved further to the west that was basically built right where the existing underpass is, which put it too close to Toole Avenue and created the nightmare of an intersection that we have there now.

The other feature that was included in the original design and the reason the city purchased the Greyhound bus and people moved the Greyhound bus station out of there, was because 4th Avenue was supposed to extend to Broadway (which then meant people could access directly off of Broadway and they could make a left turn and go out of downtown on Broadway, which is not there in the re-design because of this developer and that is why that intersection is such a nightmare - Fourth Avenue on Congress and Toole). So don’t blame us…we had it designed right! Blame the former city manager, blame the city council for having no guts to stand up to a developer who came in at the last minute (again after it was not only designed, but bid out) and totally changed the whole project. So it can happen. Now does it happen frequently…no. I have been involved in corridor studies in this community for 30 years and that’s the first one that I know of where that ever happened. Most of the projects go smoothly, the recommendations that the CAC [Citizens Advisory Committee] comes up with are adopted and you go through the process and the darn thing gets built.
Now sometimes projects don’t get built, like Mike and I worked on Campbell Avenue from Elm to Glenn and the part from Elm to Grant finally got built but not the part north of there, even though we had CAC agreement and we worked out everything with all the businesses along there at the time. Now, some people would say that’s good it never got built, others would say it’s bad, but the point is that is another one where it didn’t quite end up the way that the planning effort happened. Thank you.”

**Margot Garcia:** Ms. Garcia addressed the task force with the following comments:

“I have some handouts here. I just wanted to bring to your attention a brand new book that has just come out called “Yesterday Transit Oriented Design” - by Reid Ewing and Keith Bartholomew, professors at the University of Utah, now formally were here in Tucson... at least Reid Ewing was. This is just the cover. Maybe Jenn will be generous enough to buy a copy that you can borrow? It has lots of really good pictures I just gave you one short section, which is about working with roads and the size of roads, and pedestrian access and so forth. So I just wanted to show you that these things are going on and things are constantly being updated, new thinking. There are pictures and experiences from a wide variety of communities.

The other thing that I would like to just mention is; what is the role of a task force? You have just been having this discussion about what is going to happen here at the end. And as some of you know, I am a former elected official. I served on the city council and I have also been on a lot of task forces, so I have seen it on both sides. I can tell you that elected officials take it very, very seriously that they are the decision makers. They expect to make the decisions, and they will make the decisions, but the reason that you have a Citizens Task Force is that you have the opportunity to have these lengthy discussions. No city council could spend the amount of time that you are spending in thinking through and talking through these kinds of issues that you have before you. So what the decision makers do is value that kind of thinking and talking through and working through these issues guided by staff with the information and the education that you get.

I think that you have to remember, that ultimately, you are advisors and I know that’s tough when you put your heart and your soul into it (as I have) and into many things within this community and then to know at the end that it can be rejected. We hope that that won’t be the case and I think that you have been getting excellent advice about how, if you keep the people informed in bringing them along with you, that you cannot surprise them at the end, because it’s usually the surprises where you get that clash.

I would encourage you to do independent thinking, to work at it the best you can and to give the best advice that you can, regardless of what those decision makers way out there are going to do. Talk to them (those of you who have a rapport with your council). It’s unbelievable that you have a council member that comes to how many of these meetings! Listen there are not many task forces that have that kind
of interaction and input. So you know what he’s thinking and he has a chance to hear and to track because he often has people in the meeting that stay the whole time to hear about what is happening here. It is a tough thing to do to thread this needle, but you know it’s better than any other way that we have ever been able to think of. Democracy is messy but it’s better than anything else, so thank you for your time and effort and I hope that you will keep reading, looking and thinking about some of this new information that is coming forward.

I have talked before about vehicle miles traveled in 2004. It fell again this year and it looks like the eighth year in a row that total vehicle miles traveled in the country have continued to decline and so I am glad to hear there is some discussion of reviewing and rethinking about the projections of how much traffic we are going to have. Thank you.”

Dale Prescott: Dale had the following to say to the task force:

“Hi. I am a business owner as well as the building owner at 2259 E. Broadway. I am going to use an analogy and what we have heard before about breakfast with ham and eggs. People on the South side are the eggs and people on the North side are the ham and we are fully committed to this thing and we are going to be completely impacted by it. I am concerned; I think Broadway has run right to the heart of the matter of what is going to happen with the recommendation? Is this just a bunch of noise or is there really going to be somebody listening and acting upon it? I don’t think that I am a cynic but I am a skeptic about when government gets involved.

Obviously your dedication and effort is not only admirable, but most appreciated. I would like to know what has been decided and what is flexible? There was a foldout of the Broadway corridor and apparently there were some lines drawn that said ok this is where the curbs are going to be and this is the expansion that is anticipated. Why isn’t that readily available and where is the 5 foot diagram of that? Does everybody have to go online and for some it’s not even online yet, except for the task force? That doesn’t make sense to me. I would like to know because the values are being driven down by this, I mean if the economy has made an impact of course.

Spoken about earlier was this building across the street, what used to be The Rose Petal. The guy was renting it out to some businesses that are less than ideal perhaps right now, because of the values of our properties along Broadway. I would like to know just what kind of persuasion you will have with the decision makers. With the people that have investment in this it just seems to me that those that aren’t really invested are the people on the north side, who would like to know what is going on. The word has been used before at the meeting in February, Blight. I think that that is a word that cannot be overlooked. The north side of Broadway values are falling because of vacant buildings. Those that are coming want good-looking businesses within a community that we’d all be proud of. So I
would like to know where this really is going. Is anything really happening with what you are doing here?”

Eliza Dray: Eliza made addressed the Task Force with the below listed statements:

“I have a couple of points that I want to ask questions but I know that I won’t get an answer but I will ask them anyway. My family and I purchased 2801 E. Broadway which is directly across the street next to Zemam’s in the fall of this past year knowing full well it might be torn down, but we had actually looked at it for two years. It was owned by the Brewster Center and it sat on the corner literally decaying, sorry I get kind of worked up about this because I went to the U of A over a decade ago now and there was a pink Pepto-Bismol-colored building on the corner of Broadway and Cherry and it has a shake shingle roof and it was sad! And it bothered me! I was in architecture school and I just kept thinking why does the city look like this, and who owns it? What is the problem? So I eventually called the city after looking up that the city did own it, oh that’s even worse!

So I found out through the real estate office that that building would sit and fester indefinitely until it was torn down. So here you have a city that looks at old buildings as disposable and is more than happy to tear them down. They don’t invest in them and they don’t encourage any investment and that is so contrary to me when you think about all the destination cities of the world that people are willing to spend money to visit. You don’t go to Rome and drive down a huge corridor and they say “Well the coliseum used to be there but it didn’t really make sense with pedestrian traffic so we took it down.” That doesn’t make any sense to me!

The value of the center of Tucson is deeply rooted in the architecture that is available here and other cities who financially benefit from that and use that model, they don’t operate the way that we do. So what I have personally done, I have owned a business in Tucson for five years. My husband and I own a house on Elm Street (just across from the Arizona Inn) we are totally invested in it. It was a house that was a little dilapidated, and even though we had a three month old baby we bought it and we put every cent into fixing it up and we will do that with everything that we can get our hands on. The building that we bought across the street very well might be torn down in three years and Emanuel that owns Zemam’s next to us said, “Why are you putting money into that?” I said I would rather they tear down the best looking thing on the street and leave a good looking pile of rubble and set the example and let people think that this is how the people of Tucson want their city to look.

If everything looked like that pink Pepto-Bismol-colored building on the corner of Cherry no one would want to live here and no one would come here. The fact that the city owns that property sets a horrible example for people who want to stay here after they graduate from the U of A, whose husband works at the U of A. I
mean we are so invested in this and we feel like we are alone in it and that is very frustrating. So my three questions, as quickly as possible are:

1. You had said that it was very hard to get in touch with property owners, and that you go through the county assessor’s office, but there are a finite amount of structures within this corridor and they were outlined within the MainStreet presentation and I don’t know why there isn’t just a list that says these are the structures, these are the addresses and these are the people that we know that own the properties & then go through and systematically come up with who do we not know who’s a property owner and why do we not know where they are? Because I as a private citizen find people all the time because I do design work and the guy that owns Feesey’s (Rose Petal…whatever) the people who live behind him found the owner. I mean I only know about this meeting because I have a client on 10th Street who forwarded me an email that they got forwarded to them from Kozachik.

2. So I think the second thing that you need to look at is not just the data of what comments are being made but for instance the gentleman that was really furious earlier, he owns a very valuable piece of property. I don’t know why he didn’t know, but I would be interested to learn what he knew about this meeting and I have other clients in Sam Hughes that did not know about the meeting. So when people come to the meeting I would also ask them, not just, “Oh great you are here, “what’s your comment?” How did you get here? Because obviously there is very inconsistent information as to why there are 25 people here and there were 145 people at the other meeting. I was unable to go to the other meeting but had to send members of my family and they probably didn’t comment.

3. The other problem I see is with the wonderful presentation by MainStreet was very valid but I feel like it did not identify the elephant in the room, which is oh we are going to help all these businesses. It’s like well yeah you are going to help the ones except for all the ones that are going to get torn down, and those people will languish indefinitely because they don’t know what’s going on and they are just going to rent to hairdressers/tattoo artists and really the ironic thing is, since 2006 the value, or yet since 1987, I have a lot of clients who purchased in Sam Hughes during that time period and you could buy a house in Sam Hughes for about 30% of what it is now worth so the value of the adjacent area has gone up tremendously but the commercial property continues to decline because of this situation. Ok I am done. Thank you”

10. Next Steps /CTF Roundtable

At each Task Force meeting time is set aside for to discuss next steps and allow each CTF member to discuss and give feedback about any aspect of the project or process to the project team. There was one comment made during the CTF roundtable:
We are putting off electing a new CTF member because we have members who are absent tonight! Is everyone held accountable for the same standards regarding attendance? I feel that we have an issue with members being absent too much.

11. Adjourn
Jenn Toothaker Burdick called the meeting to a close at 9:10 PM

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
March 15, 2013

To: Broadway Corridor Citizens’ Task Force

We, the undersigned members of Broadway Coalition, want to commend you members of the Broadway Citizens’ Task Force for your dedication, the many long hours you are devoting for the benefit of our entire community. Having attended many of your meetings, we perceive that you have made great strides in listening to each other and to the community, and in understanding the issues involved. We are pleased with your recognition, as stated by all of you at the February 28th open meeting, that the assumptions and conditions upon which the original plan was based have changed over the last 25 years, and we’re very encouraged that the Mayor and Council have lent their support in giving you the leeway to consider all options in making the Broadway project results to be of maximum benefit to our community.

We would like to bring to your attention a situation that is within your purview and which is in danger of causing an important and historical part of our city to cease to be a vital thriving destination. Without some timely action on your part, that section of Broadway is likely to become a part of urban blight. This situation is caused by the lack of a decision on the extent of the demolition which will occur in connection with the roadway improvement.

If you imagine yourselves in their place, you can understand that business owners face survival difficulties due to delay of a decision. There is no reason to upgrade or improve a store if it is going to be demolished a year from now; one is not even likely to invest in an advertising campaign under these circumstances. Furthermore, the City has already acquired some properties, which stand empty, some made to look disreputable by graffiti and lack of maintenance; these may cause some customers to avoid the area altogether.

These businesses need to know whether they will still be standing, whether to invest at this location, on a timescale much shorter than two years. Thus, there is some urgency to making a decision about the maximum extent of road widening considerably sooner than the two years projected to finalize your recommendations. The knowledge that there can be a future in the Broadway Corridor for them is essential.

We recommend that you consider setting a maximum extent of the roadway as soon as possible, then work to design that roadway within those bounds in such a way that this important part of our city remains thriving and livable while improving the transport of people. Also, as you know, several historic neighborhoods border the Broadway Corridor, and they too will be affected; that too needs to be considered.

Our recommendations are also informed by the fact that actual traffic counts do not support the premise for the much wider roadway, nor do current transportation trends – see attached chart.
Our specific recommendations are that:

- You set the maximum road width as close as possible to the current width, given other parameters.
- You consider the timing of the decision at least as important as the specific width. A long delay of that decision will surely lead to results which nobody wants. Your recommendation to the Mayor and Council, the lead agency’s decision-making body, should stress the importance of a timely decision.
- Broadway continue to be a destination, as it has been, and not just a through-fare or freeway.
- You give careful consideration to the preservation of all historic and architecturally significant buildings in the corridor, as well as giving the business owners a timely basis for planning their business futures.

We also suggest that you consider what the City needs to do for the businesses in the corridor so that the project actually improves the livability of our city. Broadway, from Euclid to Country Club, is a destination, a great part of our great city. Your recommendation to the Mayor and Council on maintenance and beautification will be important to the results for all of our community.

We appreciate your efforts on behalf of our community: Thank You!

Trusting in Tucson’s future,

Jose D. Garcia  
President, El Encanto Homeowners Association  
Members, Broadway Coalition

Laura Tabili  
Member, Broadway Coalition

Margot W. Garcia  
Member, Broadway Coalition

Les Pierce  
President, Arroyo Chico Neighborhood Association  
Members, Broadway Coalition

Mary Terry Schiltz  
President, Broadmoor Neighborhood Association  
Members, Broadway Coalition

Katya Peterson  
Member, Broadway Coalition

Jessica Shuman  
Owner, Kismet on Broadway  
Member, Broadway Coalition

Ron Spark  
Member, Broadway Coalition
1984 to 2010 (26 years) = increase of 2,500 ADT

Traffic Model Projection 2010 to 2040 (30 years) = increase of 16,000 ADT (???)

Doesn't reflect recent research on new transportation trends

1. AZDOT Study – Compact, Mixed-use Development Leads to Less Traffic (May 2012)

2. Has the US Reached Peak Car (Scientific American, July 2012)

3. Public Transportation Ridership Use Surged in First Quarter 2012 (American Public Transportation Association, June 2012)

4. The Future Isn't What It Used To Be; Changing Trends and Their Implications for Transport Planning (Abstract, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, July 2012)

5. Transportation and the New Generation; Why Young People are Driving Less and What it Means for Transportation Policy (Executive Summary, Frontier Group/US PIRG Education Fund, April 2012)

---

1 Campbell to Tucson; 1987 Parsons Brinckerhoff & 2012 Kittelson & Assoc (Summary Analysis)
workers within one-half mile of rail transit stations, transit commute shares average 19 percent. This figure is particularly impressive when compared with the regionwide average of 5 percent.

Of course, transit service quality depends on more than just geographic coverage. According to the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual (Kittelson & Associates 2003), service frequency, hours of service, load factors, on-time performance, and travel time relative to the automobile are also important, and the manual contains quantitative standards for each of these measures.

Two- to Four-Lane Streets (with Rare Exceptions)

As blocks have gotten longer and grids have given way to discontinuous, curvilinear street networks, the few remaining through-streets have had to be widened to carry the same volume of traffic. In suburban areas, a standard arterial cross section is now six lanes, with additional turn lanes at intersections. It is hard to find a six-lane arterial that is easy to cross, pleasant to walk along, or comfortable to wait next to when using transit.

The conventional theory of roadway design has been that wider, straighter, flatter, and more open thoroughfares are better from the standpoint of traffic safety. High-speed designs are presumed to be more forgiving of driver error and thus to lead to reduced incidence of crashes and injuries. As stated in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, often referred to as the “Green Book,” “Every effort should be made to use as high a design speed as practical to attain a desired degree of safety” (AASHTO 2004b, pp. 66–67). Another standard of the transportation engineering field, the Transportation Research Board’s Highway Capacity Manual (TRB 2000), bases roadway level-of-service determinations on speed along arterials and delay at intersections. Streets and intersections are widened in an unending effort to earn passing grades, without regard to the effects on development patterns or walkability (Ewing 1992, 1993).

Beginning with Jane Jacobs’s (1961) The Death and Life of Great American Cities and extending to the new urbanism, smart growth, and similar design and planning movements, urban planners have argued for narrower, shorter, more enclosed, and more interconnected streets. The new urbanists seem to have gotten it right, not only from the standpoint of walkability but also from the perspective of traffic safety. It has long been understood that vehicle operating speeds decline as individual lanes and street sections are narrowed (see figure 3–11). The most recent research also shows that, in addition to slower speeds, drivers behave less aggressively on narrow streets, run fewer traffic signals, and are involved in fewer crashes with pedestrians, bicyclists, and other vehicles (Dumbaugh and Rae 2009).

![Figure 3-11](image)

**Figure 3-11**

Average Lane Width versus 85th Percentile Speed

On multilane streets, where passing is possible, high-speed drivers set the prevailing speed. On two-lane streets, prudent drivers set the pace and others must follow. One might expect, then, that reducing multilane roads to two lanes would result in slower and, perhaps, safer roadways. In fact, before-and-after studies of road diet projects (see sidebar) confirm this hypothesis, finding that traffic crashes decrease by as much as 34 percent as lanes are eliminated (Stout et al. 2006). Narrowing streets is also shown as an effective countermeasure to the most common pedestrian crashes (D. Burden and Langerway 1999; Zegeer et al. 2002, p. 53).

The lower vehicle operating speeds and shorter crossing distances of narrow streets make them more comfortable for pedestrians. This increased level of comfort is
confirmed by visual preference survey data (for example, Ewing et al. 2006), where the addition of travel lanes beyond the basic two is associated with lower preference scores. Hedonic price literature shows that residential real estate markets also favor narrow, slow-speed streets. Preferences for narrower streets are also demonstrated by how people vote with their feet, literally. One study by Untermann (1990) reports higher pedestrian volumes on narrow streets than on wide streets. Another study, from Orlando, Florida, shows how narrowing a roadway can increase pedestrian volumes (by 23 percent) and cycling rates (by 30 to 144 percent) (Rosales 2006). Narrower, low-volume streets are also associated with higher degrees of sociability among neighbors (Appleyard 1981). More elderly users, more bicyclists, more people out walking, pets, and more pedestrians crossing back and forth all attest to a level of pedestrian comfort with traffic on the narrower streets.

Although two-lane streets are preferable, there are ways to make wider streets function like two-lane streets. By dividing four-lane streets, they become almost as easy to cross as two-lane streets. Raised medians or islands offer pedestrians protection halfway across and allow them to focus on one direction of traffic at a time. They thereby greatly reduce crossing delays at uncontrolled locations and reduce pedestrian crash rates—in some cases by as much as half—compared with undivided roadways or roadways with center two-way left-turn lanes (Bowman and Vecellio 1994). Raised medians are particularly important in suburbs, where long blocks encourage midblock crossings (S. Smith et al. 1987, pp. 61–62).

Another way to divide four-lane streets is to provide one-way pairs or couples of two or three lanes in each direction. Rather than separating opposing traffic through the use of a raised median, the one-way pair separates opposing traffic with an entire active block face, complete with cross streets, between the pairs. Each street in the pair can be limited to two or three lanes and still carry heavy traffic volumes because of the

Road Diets

The term road diet refers to a type of road reconfiguration where four-lane roads are restriped to have two travel lanes (one in each direction), plus a center turn lane. Particularly in dense urban environments where right-of-way is limited, the technique can provide additional road space that might not otherwise be available for bike lanes, wider sidewalks, on-street parking, and pedestrian islands. Narrowing the amount of road space dedicated to travel lanes improves safety by reducing average vehicle travel speeds and shortening the distance pedestrians must traverse when crossing the street. It also reduces rear-end and side-swipe vehicle crashes because left-turning vehicles that formerly had to wait in travel lanes before turning can now use the center turn lane (Huang, Stewart, and Zegeer 2002). Where the reconfiguration results in the elimination of on-street parking, pedestrian safety and comfort are enhanced by having a row of cars between the travel lane and the sidewalk. The city of Reno, California (2012), has used a number of road diet configurations and maintains a comprehensive website on the technique.
efficiency of one-way streets (Ewing 2000b). A prominent example is downtown Portland, Oregon, where all the streets are paired, each one containing two or three lanes of one-way traffic. New urbanist Peter Calthorpe has been a proponent of one-way pairs and includes them in his town center designs.

Six-lane roads are best avoided in pedestrian areas. Where unavoidable, they are most comfortable for pedestrians when bordering buildings provide a sense of enclosure, when sidewalks are appropriately buffered from traffic by street trees or curbside parking, and when wide, raised, planted medians break up their paved expanse. Substantial trees in the median and on either side of the street have the power to visually divide street space in half, for a sense of visual enclosure and human scale.

An exception to this guideline is the multilane boulevard (A. Jacobs, Macdonald, and Rofe 2002). These boulevards are composed of four or more heavily trafficked through-lanes divided from local roads. The local roads, also known as frontage roads or service roads, run parallel to the through-lanes and are normally composed of one moving lane and one or two parking lanes. These roads allow vehicles access to the highway and to other local streets. Tree-covered medians separate the busier through-streets from the calmer local roads. In addition to trees, these medians also often include transit stops, bike paths, and benches.
Number of Street Lanes

Although streets that are wider than two to four lanes pose considerable challenges for pedestrians, it is the rare community today that is able to do away entirely with the demand for such streets. The following provisions demonstrate two attempts to address this issue. Albuquerque’s form-based code specifies the boulevard as the widest permissible street type, and the code provides a number of restrictions and controls to make those streets somewhat safer and more welcoming for pedestrians. By providing for one-way slip roads separated from the primary three or four lanes, the boulevard ensures that pedestrians walking along the right-of-way experience slower traffic and are buffered from the rapidly moving bulk of vehicular traffic. Additionally, the landscaped medians that separate the slip roads from traffic provide some protection for pedestrians who are crossing, ensuring that they need not make their way across so broad and inhospitable an expanse of roadway.

Oregon’s administrative rule 660-012-0045(7) instructs local governments to establish standards to minimize excessive width requirements for streets, in order to reduce design speed and provide for the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists. The rule also balances emergency-vehicle requirements, a common source of concern for jurisdictions considering narrower streets. The rule is worded generally and could apply to both the width and number of lanes.

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
Form-Based Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABQ</th>
<th>BV-115</th>
<th>BV-125</th>
<th>BV-135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfare Type</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Width</td>
<td>115 feet</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
<td>135 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Realm</td>
<td>15 feet, each side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway Type</td>
<td>8 feet Sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planter Type</td>
<td>5 feet Continuous planter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Type</td>
<td>Trees at 25' o.c. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge zone</td>
<td>2 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Realm</td>
<td>85 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Width</td>
<td>18 feet - 33 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Lanes</td>
<td>2 lanes w/ one turning lane &amp; two one-way slip roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lanes</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Type</td>
<td>Curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OREGON STATE
Administrative Rule

Local governments shall establish standards for local streets and accessways that minimize pavement width and total right-of-way consistent with the operational needs of the facility. The intent of this requirement is that local governments consider and reduce excessive standards for local streets and accessways in order to reduce the cost of construction, provide for more efficient use of urban land, provide for emergency vehicle access while discouraging inappropriate traffic volumes and speeds, and which accommodate convenient pedestrian and bicycle circulation.


Local street (Lake Oswego, Oregon). | Dan Burden

In 1862, Maj. David Fergusson of the Union Army commissioned a survey of the little sun-baked adobe town of Tucson.

The town had about 600, mostly Spanish-speaking townspeople, and the street names on the map reflected this. Today's Congress Street was called Calle de la Alegria, and Pennington Street was Calle del Arroyo, just to name two. There was no name for what was then a poorly defined dirt path and what is now Broadway.

When the town map was updated by George Hand around 1880, the road was called Camp Street after the Union military's Camp Lowell, which the street led to. Camp likely got that name in 1872 as a result of the S.W. Foreman Survey, when downtown street names were changed from Spanish to English. Many were renamed for prominent Tucsonans killed by Apaches.

In the late 1890s, Fred Ronstadt, who owned a blacksmith and wagon shop on the corner of Scott Avenue and Camp Street that was described as "a neat adobe structure with high-peaked roof and wide, sliding doors," was visited by a traveling hardware salesman from New York City. After their business was done, they chatted about life in the small, hot and dusty town of Tucson.

The salesman is said to have told Ronstadt, "What you need here is some of the spirit and liveliness of the big city. Some of the bustle and hustle - like our Broadway back in New York."

Several months later, the traveling salesman called on Ronstadt again, the story goes. He opened his sample case and took out a street sign "borrowed" from the city of New York. The two stepped outside the shop on the Camp Street side, and the salesman fastened the Broadway sign to the adobe wall of the store.

"There you have it. Tucson's in the big time now - there's your Broadway," the New Yorker is said to have boasted. Soon people started calling Camp Street Ronstadt's Broadway, probably as a joke - but by 1909, Broadway began replacing Camp Street on Tucson maps.

Editor's note
Each week the Star tells the stories behind Tucson street names. If you have streets to suggest or stories to share, contact writer David Leighton at streetsmarts@azstarnet.com