

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

**April 18, 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 Citizens Task Force (CTF) facilitator Nanci Beizer. A quorum was established and the meeting agenda was reviewed.

**Citizen Task Force Members**

<b>Present</b>		<b>Absent</b>
Bob Belman	Jon Howe	Farhad Moghimi
Michael Butterbrodt	Joseph Maher*	
Anthony R. DiGrazia	Shirley Papuga	
Mary Durham-Pflibsen	Elizabeth Scott	
Bruce Fairchild	Diane Robles	
Colby Henley	Jamey Sumner	

*\*Joseph Maher was recently appointed to the Task Force, replacing Steven Eddy as the Planning Commission representative.*

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).*

## 2. First Call to the Audience

Four (4) members of the audience filled out a speaker's card and were called upon to address the task force:

JD Garcia: Mr. Garcia provided the following comments to the CTF: "Good evening my name is JD Garcia and I live at 3100 E. Calle Cortal in the El Encanto. My house is part of the study area for your task force. I am a member of the Broadway Coalition and we wanted to discuss with you the issue of functionality for your deliberations. I have placed a copy of our paper on your desk.

First, I wanted to say what a golden opportunity you have for making Tucson one of the lead cities in new understandings of taking a major road project and adapting it to fit what actually makes a city livable. Your public input meetings thus far have produced overwhelming evidence that the public favors enhancing the destination aspects of the section of Broadway you are considering while increasing the efficiency of transportation in all modes of travel. This, as opposed to, creating just another quasi-freeway with its potential for urban blight. These ideas fit very well with the context-sensitive solutions approach which your Broadway Boulevard design team has found, enabling the Sunshine Mile to remain a part of the life of the Tucson community, a place for locals and others to meet and interact while maintaining its current arterial status is what I heard was wanted by the public. This is a part of the definition of functionality. What is the specific part of roadway that you are charged with for approval?

Broadway is already classified as an arterial street according to the standards discussed on page two of the pamphlet that I left with you. The standard definition of level of service (page three); however, does not serve all modes of transport equally well. It does not include all modes of transport for a street that is also a destination. I have become more aware of this question of level of service since my son was in an accident which put him in a wheelchair. I believe that a 30 second wait for someone in an air-conditioned car may be the trade-off so that my son does not have to spend one and a half or two minutes wheeling across the extra street when necessary for the person in the car to save 15 seconds by having more lanes available. This is one of the many reasons for the City Council as the Lead Agency has asked you to use the factors in the EPA guide to sustainable transportation listed on page four of the pamphlet. These guides include public transport, walking, biking, and all modes of moving people through the roadway. Again, we thank you for your time and efforts spent on this project. Please make Tucson a city to be proud of."

*(A copy of this pamphlet is attached to this meeting summary.)*

Gene Caywood: Mr. Caywood provided the following comments to the CTF: "Good evening, Gene Caywood representing Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. I just want to let you know that I did attend the CART meeting a couple weeks ago and at that meeting I took the opportunity to pass out to the committee our statement that we gave you back in October defining functionality and I made the point to them that I thought that this was the key element that needs to be considered for the whole study. Because you have other people that have a different idea of functionality unless we come to some agreement between the

study which is you folks and the members of the CART, I think you are going to get down to the end of the study and members of the CART are going to say that wasn't my idea of functionality. So I said that I don't care who defines it, but somebody needs to define it and either it be this group or the CART, or the RTA folks staff-wise need to get on it (that was the message that I conveyed).

About a week or so later a representative from our group also met with the City Manager and the Mayor. Albert Elias is the new Deputy City Manager for Transportation. In that meeting we went to discuss our view of the Broadway Corridor Study and so again I find it, in essence, the same thing, and said the same thing to them; the key issue here is functionality. We are going to get to the end of the study and unless we have a clear definition that is agreed to by all sides, the thing is going to fall apart on us at that point. So I urge you, Mr. DeGroot and whoever else is involved here to get going on this and to get us a clear definition. Thank you.”  
*(A copy of this definition is attached to this meeting summary for ease of reference)*

Bob Cook: Mr. Cook provided the following comments to the CTF: “My name is Bob Cook. I am a current member of the CART. I was an original member appointed in 2006. Before that in the 90's I was the Tucson Metropolitan Chair. In 2003, I was the treasurer of a citizen's based ballot measure on multi-modal transportation opportunities for the City of Tucson. In the development of the RTA plan I video-taped the entire thing with very active calls to the audience. And after the plan passed, I wrote three firm de facto ballot arguments; so I was very much a supporter of the plan and was subsequently appointed to the CART committee. I take this role very seriously and am thankful that I was re-appointed.

I interpret our mission in CART, its citizen's accountability. We are not here to rubberstamp or to promote the RTA. We are here to evaluate it and to make sure that the RTA does its job. In most cases, I have been very complimentary of both the past executive director and Jim DeGroot; you couldn't find a better senior manager in any jurisdiction in this region. This has been a very good staff to work with, but I have raised some questions in the last three years and unfortunately the CART has not been a place where citizens are actually discussing any of these issues. So I wrote a letter to the CART. It shows you what some of the CART members are thinking, but not all of them.” Mr. Cook read his letter aloud and provided it as a handout to the Task Force.

*(A copy of this letter and related graphics are attached to this meeting summary.)*

Dale Prescott: Mr. Prescott provided the following comments to the CTF: “Hi, thank you. I spoke at the last second call last month regarding the blight that seems to appear along Broadway. I continue to be concerned about it, I met with a couple of your members, but I am not sure who is here from the City? May I ask you to raise your hand up? Ok...thank you. I own the building at 2259 E. Broadway. I operate my business from there and I have done so for more than 25 years now. My office manager called the city today (and I can give you the number if you need it) to report graffiti on the building next to us, the bridal shop, and also a couple buildings to the East of our building. Since I didn't make the call, I have asked her write down what happened. I will keep it within the three minutes for sure. And so when I use the word “I” I am speaking of my office manager.

"I called 792-2489. Pressed 1 for refutable reporting. Left a message that there is tagging on buildings at 2245 and 2257 East Broadway and had to leave a message. The return call stated that since the tagging is on private property, the City will not repaint. I said that, I thought that all tagging was to be reported. She (the person calling her back) said that they are only interested in the monitor to identify the group. They have to be caught in the act of tagging to prosecute."

So it seems like, once again the blight factor comes in to play. I know at one time they (the city) was taking care of private tagging along Broadway but at this time, unless this person was miss-informed the City has come to a position where they are not going to be spending money for inexpensive paint to correct or to wipe out this tagging. And only in my opinion does this encourage additional tagging. This is a tug-of war between certain gangs or you know whoever is doing this. They want to leave their moniker.

At what point as an owner of that building, and the city if they are going to take it over; do we halt the depression of these values along Broadway. Obviously, it is in the cities interest to keep them low (or lower than they are now). And that seems to be the direction that they are going. And I would like to see at least the tagging end. Thank you."

### **3. Approval of February 7, 2013 Meeting Summary:**

Nanci Biezer asked the Task Force to approve the meeting summary from the March 21, 2013 CTF meeting. The Task Force approved the meeting summary with minor changes that were requested via email prior to the meeting.

### **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, and a presentation to the RTA CART Committee.

Requests for new presentations can be made via email between meetings and announced at the following CTF meeting (email: [broadway@tucsonaz.gov](mailto:broadway@tucsonaz.gov) or Jenn [Jennifer.burdick@tucsonaz.gov](mailto:Jennifer.burdick@tucsonaz.gov) or Nanci [nbeizer@dakotacom.net](mailto:nbeizer@dakotacom.net)).

- **Public Input Report:**

Jenn Toothaker discussed, briefly, the most current Public Input Report that the Task Force received as part of their pre-reading materials. The report covered input from March 9, 2013 through April 8, 2013. Eleven (11) new items were received from the public during this time including two reports which totaled over 60 pages. The two reports received will be reviewed by the project technical team and a response will be

shared with the Task Force in a future report. The next Public Input report will be distributed prior to the May 21, 2013 CTF meeting.

- **Stakeholder Outreach:**

The following discussion took place regarding stakeholder outreach that the CTF has undertaken since the last Task Force Meeting:

Summary of CTF Questions and Comments

- Somehow or another my stakeholders have received information that the design of the street is pretty much set in stone; it's going to be that way and they didn't understand why we are meeting. Then I explained to them what was actually happening and why we are meeting.
- Another stakeholder explained to me how their friends businesses' were failing downtown due to construction. I told them about the services MainStreet offers, but this still concerns me.
- I spoke to people who don't believe that this project is actually going to happen. They think that it's eight years away, when in reality it's set to happen in four years. There is a lot of mis-information out there.
- Resources are being made available other than just what we are doing here. The Business Assistance Program from the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce will be talking to members of the Sunshine Mile soon.
- I have input that I would like to share from a past committee: We came up with a whole series of definitions for what multi-modal means. When looking at this project we do need a roadway that will accommodate multi-modal options. In my mind sometimes keeping to these strict definitions won't always work within a modern world; however, I would be happy to share with you what we discussed and how it relates to functionality.
- I was involved with that discussion as a member of CTAC and it had to do with the criteria's that defined what those road projects were: one, what's a multi-modal corridor, what a parkway corridor is, and what an arterial street is. It laid out the definitions and classifications of what these streets are. I have a copy somewhere that I would be happy to bring to the committee.  
*(A copy of the draft Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee's definitions, dated March, 2000, is attached for ease of reference.)*

Summarized Responses:

- In regard to the business issue, perhaps this is something we should bring to MainStreet's attention to follow up.

- **RTA Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation (CART) Committee – Doug Mance and Jim DeGrood:**

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 also offered advice from the point of view of someone who had been a member of several Task Forces.

He gave the example of a stakeholder wanting to know “when are we going to know something?” Doug explained that this type of question is a key indicator to what the Task Force has coming its way and that at this point in the project the CTF should feel equipped to now make some decisions.

After sharing this advice with the Task Force Mr. Mance explained that at the last CART meeting three terms were discussed that will apply to the project:

1. Elemental
2. Substantial (which may come into play this would be a reason to come back to mayor and council)
3. Functionality (the gorilla in the room right now)

Furthermore, Doug explained that he would like to act as a communication conduit between the Task Force and the CART committee. Doug concluded by stating that the ultimate definition of what functionality is will come from the RTA board as they have the fiduciary responsibility; however, he believes that the CART committee should, and will, have input on the definition. He provided a handout to the Task Force, highlighting what he feels reflects common beliefs about the Broadway project that both the Task Force and CART members hold. His hope and goal is to continue to grow this list as the project progresses (see handout attached to this summary):

- Broadway should be a destination
- Broadway is a major gateway to our vibrant downtown
- Broadway transportation should be multi-modal
- The status quo on Broadway is unacceptable
- The Broadway project has been promised to the voters of Pima County

Following Doug’s report, Jim DeGrood, RTA Director of Transportation Services, presented information that addressed at the April 4, 2013 CART meeting regarding legal concerns that were raised by a CART committee member. The following questions were addressed:

1. Does the City as the lead agency have the authority to modify the project from what was described in the ballot?
2. If the City as the lead agency has the authority, is the RTA still obligated to contribute to the road or improve funds to the project?
3. If the City lacks this authority, yet chooses to act as if it does have it, is the RTA obligated to take action to require the City to appear to what the RTA believes to be the voter-approved mandate?

Mr. Degrood provided the following as a response to the three questions: “To be brief, the City owns the roadway, and the RTA has the plan and funds for the project. Once the two sides agree to the final design decision the RTA will move forward with the funds. If there is a dispute, it will most likely be resolved prior to agreeing upon the project scope and signing the agreement. In response to the third question I feel that we are assuming that the city lacks the authority to modify the project, and that *is not* the case. However, the project must meet the criteria of functionality.”

Mr. DeGrood concluded by stating that the RTA is completely committed to engaging in the committee process, and that the issue of functionality still needs further discussion; in fact, the CART committee is still struggling with this issue. Following the presentation of this information a brief discussion ensued. Listed below is a summary:

#### Summary of CTF Questions and Comments

- The substantial change part, I always thought that it was just an addition to the project; can it be a minus as well?
- I am more design oriented and I like specifics. Can you give me an example of your definition of functionality? What are we talking about?
- Didn't the Valencia/Kolb intersection project have the county back off as the lead agency?
- So what I heard so far is that the RTA is committed to listening to the CTF and CART committee but need to implement the project within the scope of the project; furthermore, the scope of the project can't be modified to diminish functionality. Element, Substantial, and Functionality have not yet been defined and these proposals that we come up with should be tested against the model...what model?
- The language is completely obfuscating and opaque.
- I would encourage us to design the road based off what we think and what we hear from our stakeholders.
- Comments from my stakeholders were that the traffic projections that have been utilized to date have never been met.
- I heard someone say that pedestrian crossings can disrupt the flow of traffic (example given of pedestrian crossing on Broadway). So what! If it saves a life that is all that I really care about.

#### Summarized Responses

- The question regarding the substantial term is a question that is still on the table and we are working on that.
- To answer that, functionality needs to be translated into units per mile and how we move people throughout the city. The CART committee will be looking at this in the next coming months.
- This project and its functionality has not been defined yet.

- We appreciate your commitment to this project. I wish we did have a real definition of what functionality is. I think that what we are going to have to do is to look at the proposals that come forward and to test them to help get us to that definition of functionality.
- Yes they are, currently the county is being sued by a property owner.
- The “model” refers to the ballot language that describes functionality and the project.
- I would argue that we could look at proposals that you come up with and compare them; like for example, do they match traffic projections?
- I would encourage you to look to your project team to evaluate those ideas.
- Soon, we will delve deeper into the technical discussion including traffic projections, cross section design and other considerations. Phil will be talking to you all about the project schedule in the next agenda item.

#### 5. Discussion of Revised Planning and Design Project Schedule

Phil Erickson led the CTF through a discussion of options to “tighten” the project schedule with the ultimate goal of expediting the decision on a cross section width. Phil presented the following three options (as well as the amount of time each option could shave off of the project schedule):

1. Allow for more two CTF meetings per month as some points
2. Use a “Charrette Approach” for some pairs of CTF meetings
3. Additional efficiencies in time needed for design and technical work

Phil discussed each option in depth and graphically showed how each would affect the project schedule. In addition to this, the project team continued the discussion of prioritizing the topics scheduled to be presented to them and whether or not they the presentations should be made at future CTF meetings, or if the information that would be presented could be made available to the CTF through other means. It is was explained to the Task Force that even if the information was not presented at a CTF meeting that the project team could provide materials that would substitute for a presentation; thus, allowing the project team expedite the schedule to allow for more technical work to be accomplished.

At the conclusion of Phil’s presentation the Task Force was asked to make four (4) decisions:

1. The use of more frequent meetings
2. The use of charrettes
3. The decision of what presentations to have and when to have them
4. The schedule for potential charrette meetings

The Task force came to a consensus decision to **1. Meet more frequently, 2. To use charrette style meetings, 3. To have the top three prioritized presentations at the next study session meeting with the promise to provide materials related to the presentation prior to the**

**meeting, and 4. To schedule the first charrette style meetings for Tuesday May 21, 2013 and Thursday, May 23, 2013.**

Listed below is a summary of the discussion that took place during this agenda item:

Summary of CTF Questions and Comments

- So what if Mayor and Council does not accept our recommendation?
- The study session seems packed with three presentations; will there be enough time to cover everything?
- Would there be a morning and an evening meeting?
- There needs to be an effort to keep the presenters to 20 minutes or less to allow time for discussion. We need to be provided with the presentation slides and pre-reading materials related to the presentation prior to the meeting.
- If there are gaps in the schedule in down the road can we come back and request some of these other presentations to be made?
- Will there be an opportunity in the future to hear a presentation on modernism week?
- I feel like we should get through these (top three) topics and then see how much time we have left for the remaining topics.

Summarized Responses

- If the Mayor and council were not in agreement with the approach we are taking they would let us know before hand during the agency review process. If they did say that they would not endorse the recommendation during this process we would have time to come back to you all and work toward something they would endorse.
- There will be more time during the meeting scheduled to have the presentations, as it is a “study session” meeting and not an “action” meeting.
- The charrettes will be at the normally scheduled meeting time and location, 5:30 p.m. at the Child and Family Resources building.
- For the Modernism Week information we would most likely request a white paper or other materials instead of a presentation. A presentation could be held if the CTF wanted to allow additional time at the study session meeting or schedule another meeting down the road.
- If there are gaps in the schedule down the road we could provide time for additional presentations and bring in presenters currently in the “parking lot” list of presentations.

## 6. Review/Endorse Report from Public Meeting #2 (February 28, 2013 Progress Report and Community Input Meeting)

Project Manager, Jenn Toothaker, reviewed the Community Progress Report and Community Input Event Report with the Task Force. The report provides an overview on the public meeting held on February 28, 2013 and includes documentation of the input received, a matrix analyzing the relationship between comments received and the Draft Vision and Goals Statements, and images of the display boards presented at the event. A component of the report contains an analysis of the input received; this analysis is pertinent to the further refinement of the Draft Vision and Goals Statements.

After Jenn gave this brief overview she asked the CTF if they would like any changes made to the report, and if the CTF would endorse posting the report to the project website for public review. The CTF endorsed the report without and recommended changes and agreed to have it posted online for public review without any objections.

## 7. Finalize Draft Vision and Goals

Phil Erickson led the Task Force in an exercise to help refine and finalize the draft vision and goals statements. Phil and the CTF reviewed the analysis and recommendations that were made based off of the public input received and the CTF's "takeaways" at the Community Input and Progress Report Event (Public Meeting #2). The Draft Vision and Goals, recorded public input, and CTF takeaways can be found in the Appendix of the February 28, 2013 Community Input and Progress Report Event Summary at [http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2\\_28\\_2013\\_Community\\_Wide\\_Event\\_ReportFull\\_DRAFT\\_FINAL.pdf](http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/files/projects/broadway/2_28_2013_Community_Wide_Event_ReportFull_DRAFT_FINAL.pdf).

The project team recommended a minor change to the Vision Statement, two potential goal modifications and four (4) potential new goals. Please note that the Vision and Goals Statements will still remain in **DRAFT** form after they are finalized. These statements are meant to be an iterative process and help guide the Task Force's decision making process throughout the planning and design phase. These potential modifications were discussed in detail. Listed below is a summary of this discussion:

### CTF Questions and Comments

#### ***Vision Statement***

- I like both potential modifications to the Vision Statement.
- These comments about it being a destination are more about the land use rather than the mobility and function of the roadway so I would lean more toward the second one.
- I like emphasizing that the speed should be mentioned. I also agree that it should be about the mobility and function of the roadway. Also it should state to make the improvements "attractive,"
- I think that mobility is the way to get to these destinations and so I think that they go hand-in-hand.

- I suggest a rewording: “Balance the boulevards function as a major street serving city-wide mobility as an attractive destination and to support making Broadway a stronger retail-service and civic destination.”
- Add multi-modal mobility ( I know this is already addressed in the statement but want to emphasize it).
- Leave “design” in the statement. We need to have the terms function and design in the vision statement.

***Potential Goal Modification # 1***

- Clarifies the purpose
- “Best examples” bothers me because that implies that something has got to go. This puts fear into people hearts so that they wonder if “what if that is my building that has got to go?” Can we simply say “protect?” Who decides what the best example is? That seems subjective.
- We need to be clear and not misleading as there maybe buildings that need to go. Can we really protect them all? I have a problem with that.

***Potential Goal Modification # 2***

- What does “places” mean? Gathering places? We should use existing and future streetscapes and destinations not the word “places.”
- So it’s the streetscape and the places people go?
- I don’t like the word places either. Maybe we should say destinations.

***Potential New Goal # 1***

- Can we add “cultural” to the statement..
- Are we improving the economic vitality (or is this covered elsewhere by another goals statement)?
- This statement is recommending the UA as an important place to Broadway

***Potential New Goal # 2***

- Is this statement mixing design with method?
- Design Broadway to accommodate through traffic.
- Do we need to make a new goal statement for every comment that is made?
- I think we need to acknowledge that this is not just about the stretch from Euclid to Country Club, but it’s really about how the entire roadway will ultimately work.
- I don’t like the word widen, I like the word design better.
- We have goals on width of Broadway and we have goals on vehicular traffic through mobility so we kind of have those, and I think it’s good to capture that statement.
- Why not just use: “increase capacity,” because when you use increase capacity you are looking at all modes.

- I think also in this statement we have that we are going to engage all stakeholders, and certainly the people that commute through are our stakeholders.
- Specifically, we need to address vehicular traffic, and not link it with the issue of widening the road; this represents another perspective – improving vehicular mobility.

***Potential New Goal # 3***

- Omit this; this is just another way of saying what is in the goal statements.
- This is unrealistic. Something has to happen on Broadway.
- We are starting to judge the goals whereas we just look back at what people said and base our goals off of this.

***Potential New Goal # 4***

- I like this goal.
- Me too, it looks good.
- Does this include future right-of-way (ROW) needs? Does this statement mean that there will be no future ROW takings?
- So when you go to revise these statements will you highlight the changes you have made so when you recirculate for our review I know what was changed?

*Summarized Responses*

***Vision Statement***

- How about “Balance the boulevards’ function as a major street serving city-wide mobility with its function as a stronger and attractive retail service and civic destination.”

***Potential Goal Modification # 1***

- We already have a goal that states “protect all.” There are a range of goals on this topic.

***Potential Goal Modification # 2***

- This modification obviously needs some work and word-smithing. I’ll rewrite what we have based on what we have discusses and recirculate it to you.

***Potential New Goal # 1***

- Vitality is covered in other goals.
- We will add cultural to the statement

***Potential New Goal # 2***

- Essentially, that is what this goal is attempting to do – add a third option of through mobility.

***Potential New Goal # 3***

- If you think this goal is unrealistic there are many other goals statements that are unrealistic as well.
- I think we are getting feedback that this is cutting it too close.
- I will omit this as potential new goal then.

***Potential New Goal # 4***

- We will rewrite these modifications and include them as part of your pre-reading prior to the next Task Force Meeting. We will highlight the changes so that they are clear to you.

**8. Nominations for New CTF Chair and Possible Election/Selection of Election Date (please note that this agenda took place after item 9, Second Call to the Audience, which took place at 8:05 PM)**

At the March 21, 2013 CTF meeting the members in attendance decided to wait until the April meeting to make nominations for the chair and to decide when to hold the CTF Chair election. Currently, Vice Chair Mary Durham-Pflibsen is the acting Chairperson. Nominations for the position were requested via email prior to the meeting. Jenn Toothaker explained to the CTF that if they desired to, an election could be held at this meeting, but a vacancy does not necessitate an election to be held at this point.

During the meeting Mary Durham-Pflibsen and Bruce Fairchild were nominated for the position. Bruce declined the nomination but stated that if Mary were willing to be the permanent Chair he would assume the role of Vice Chair. A motion was then made to make Mary the Chair and Bruce the Vice Chair. The Task Force reached a consensus agreement to vote in Mary as Chair and Bruce as Vice Chair.

**9. Second Call to the Audience**

*(Please note that this agenda item took place before item 8, Nominations for New CTF Chair and Possible Election/Selection of Election Date)*

Six (6) members of the audience filled out a speaker's card and were called upon to address the Citizens Task Force.

Gene Caywood: Mr. Caywood provided the following comments to the CTF: "I want to thank Joe for bringing up the work that CTAC (Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee) did on different types of arterials and I think it's really good, Joe and Jamie, if you guys can get that to the committee. I brought that up a little bit Joe, in the presentation that I made on behalf of the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. I gave a whole lot of information in ten minutes and I am sure that it passed by everybody, but I made a minor point in there and I think that I even said that Broadway was transit arterial regardless of what it happens to be called. It has a focus on transit already, it's the heaviest bus route, it's the planned route for BRT (Bus Rapid Transit), etc. So Broadway really is a transit arterial but still it would be helpful to get that information out.

*(A copy of these definitions are attached to this meeting summary for ease of reference.)*

The other thing I wanted to say though, was that Joe said that he didn't know what happened to it and I will tell everybody what happened to it; well what happened to that recommendation from CTAC is that it went to the Department of Transportation (because that is who CTAC advises) but the Department of Transportation doesn't manage the major streets and routes plan, the Planning Department does. So the Planning Department and the Department of Transportation got together and they said here is something that we would like to have considered (a change to the major streets and routes plan). Then everybody said that it needs a lot of other revisions and they ended up hiring a consultant to work through the revisions and the consultant was (I think) very favorable to the CTAC recommendation but there were a whole lot of other things so this became a multi-month process that went on and on until we finally had a design-charrette kind of thing to go over all these potential changes with a bunch of the city staff and the Deputy Director of Transportation at the time (who I won't name) was in that meeting when he saw this concept of having more than one type of arterial he essentially lost his cool a little bit and that ended it right there. So that is what happened. It was a great idea it still should be done in my way of thinking at some point, but that is where it died."

Bob Cook: Mr. Cook provided the following comments to the CTF: "This will be a little kinder and gentler. Thank you for having me and for allowing me to speak tonight. I just want to echo something that Doug Mance said (my colleague on the CART) and that is that nobody wants to have a new election on any of these projects. We just can't waste the time and resources to re-do this; but as I said earlier, I believe that there is a way to address the ballot language which can interpret functionality as mobility equivalence so you are really planning on mobility. One of the key goals, I think that you ought to have here is that you ought to be thinking about optimal modal mixes. So you are really going to have to come up with some estimates of the possible modal mixes in each of the scenarios if you look at multiple design options.

Don't rely on your technical team to give you the projections on these things - this is part of the creative process. If they give you traffic counts or projections you have to ask them what the assumptions in their models are because that is what's going to give you the information that you need. If you look at all the past PAG projections and the City of Tucson, Department of Transportation they are all wrong. They are all badly wrong. We are going to invest a lot of money in this corridor and we don't want it based upon really bad projections. Ok, I really am going to urge and to continue to urge the RTA to loosen up a little bit.

My problem with them is that they are interpreting their plan, our money, their plan a little bit too rigidly. I think that we need to loosen up the assumptions and the mentality of the people that put this plan together in 2006. They lived in a completely different world. The RTA has yet to actually acknowledge that we do live in a different world and let me just go through some of the different things, population. The 2010 US Census said that Pima County Population was less than 1 million. PAG said that we had broken through 1 million in 2006, and that we were going to reach 1.5 million at the end of the RTA planning period. It's all nonsense! It's not happening and that is just one area that needs to be re-jiggered in terms of what this plan means. The other is transportation costs, fuel costs. You know in 2006, we

were just coming out of four decades of \$20/barrel for oil. Talk about context-sensitive. We need to be context-sensitive about the long term and even though the long term I saw that up there, I have yet to see any description of what are the long term prospects, what is the context that we are planning in? I really like the report that you had on the interests and the priorities and I think that economic development, TOD. One of the things about TOD is mixed use which is not destination, its place.”

Steve Kozachik: Mr. Kozachik provided the following comments to the CTF: “First of all with respect to your observations and Bob’s, none of the traffic data on which the original design was based have borne out. You are on the right track. The first step to designing with alternate modes in mind with changes in lifestyle and the absence of all of that, I would say you are going in the right direction. Secondly, I would remind you that the Mayor and Council empowered this board to define functionality in the framework of EPA Guide to Sustainable [Transportation Performance Measures] and so that burden has been shifted to you but by the agency in this project. And finally, regarding Colby’s point about the definition of “significant change.” It is specifically defined in statute as a 10% change in a cost of an *element* of the RTA plan, not a project. So it is intuitive that if you come up with a scope within this project that reduces the cost of this project that existed on the ballot by 15-20%, you do not have to take that back to the voters. This is a project, not the whole context of the roadway element, and that is a fundamental distinction that wasn’t made earlier by Mr. Mance. Thanks.”

Les Pierce: Ms. Pierce provided the following comments to the CTF: “Good evening I am Les Pierce from the Arroyo Chico neighborhood association. I am also a member of the Broadway Coalition. I just want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and also for the time and effort that CTF members have invested into this project. I would like to specifically thank the task force and the project team for the February 28<sup>th</sup> open house. I was an attendee there and it was informative to me as an attendee to hang out at the information stations and to hear what other people were saying and how many of these other people at these stations were overwhelmingly in support of keeping Broadway as a destination and not built out as a freeway.

The presenters tonight, there were a handful of comments about what I heard which is generally overwhelmingly in support of keeping Broadway as a place with improvements for increasing pedestrian and bicycle circulations to support the local businesses. It was also gratifying to hear at the end, the task force member’s takeaway, summarizing partially that they had also heard a lot of this as well. They had also overheard the support for Broadway as a destination and possible pedestrian improvements and generally I guess turning Broadway into a freeway and that it wasn’t just me.”

Marc Fink: Mr. Fink provided the following comments to the CTF: “I am also with the Broadway Coalition; I live in Sam Hughes and as many of you know I am a recently retired (semi-retired) planner I did this for 30 years and I still remember a little bit of what I did, and bob can testify to that, as I had to convince him to do certain things which he even did once in a while. One, I will re-iterate what Steve and Bob said about traffic projections. I am really

glad that you are all skeptical about what you are hearing. I just want to re-iterate that you have been informed by various people and various studies that show that these kinds of projections don't work anymore people are driving less and there are studies by ADOT -which is not your most radical planning organization- around talking about the impacts of Smart Growth and how it reduces congestion.

There have been numerous studies over the last ten years, the whole issue of "induced demand", the whole issue about "simply build it"... and they will come and you end up in this vicious cycle of always widening roads and spending money – and not accomplishing anything.

I also want to support Colby in relation to requesting to the CTF, that you guys come up with what you believe is the right thing to do. I have been involved with countless committees dealing with planning issues, many of which drove them absolutely batty trying to figure out what the decision makers wanted. Don't worry about that. That is not your job. Your job is to make a recommendation. If the decision makers want to do something different, that's what they get paid more or less the big bucks for. That's what they want you to do. Your job is not to provide or govern. You come up with what you think is right and we will go from there.

Third, and I am sorry there are so many issues that came up today (I was only going to talk about one). The whole issue of functionality. I was really glad to see and I think that you guys did a great job on your first modification. You have gone a long way to defining functionality. You have said it, mobility and place - that's the function of Broadway. It re-iterates a lot of what the Broadway Coalition has provided you with in the pamphlet that they gave you, and it re-enforces what historically has been the function of streets. The function of streets historically has not been just moving people through. Historically, the function of streets is where the community conducts its public business. Stores, public places and everything else are included – also people driving through, but that's only one aspect of it. So I would encourage you to keep going on the idea of what you just proved today, of what it is. The only suggestion that I might make is, instead of using the term mobility, I would use the term accessibility. That's because mobility means that you can move around easily; accessibility talks about actually getting to where you want to be, but that is a minor thing and I think that you have gone a long way and I think that that is great.

I would say that if you look at context sensitive design, that I have been looking and gone back to their website recently, <http://contextsensitivesolutions.org/>. It's a transportation-oriented group and when they talk about the various things what really struck me was that they said context sensitive design should do all of these things, *including* transportation. So, even transportation engineers are seeing that context sensitive design, transportation, and moving people is just one aspect of it.

Lastly, I just want to say that throughout this whole process beginning in June staff has repeatedly said everything is on the table – so bear that in mind. If that's really the case, you do what you think is right. Staff said everything is on the table. Today I started hearing things that, well, everything may *not* be on the table. Well, I trust staff and if they say it's on the table...do it. I have more things that I would say, but I don't have time. Thank you. “

Jessica Shuman: Ms. Shuman provided the following comments to the CTF: “Hi, there. I am speaking right now, not just as a member of the Broadway Coalition, but as a small business owner along Broadway who is in a state of limbo. Also, as a regular and long-time commuter. I have been using Broadway for more than 25 years, multiple times a day, so first I want to thank the task force for your willingness to meet more frequently. Thank you so much, I am so grateful. I also just wondered if the input summary report of the community meeting was available online?”

Also Phil, I was really taken aback by your comment stating that there is significant traffic even during off peak commute hours: that is not something that I see and actually during peak commute hours, I only feel that I am backed up in traffic in my car when pedestrians are crossing at poorly designed intersections, at places where there’s bus stops but no pullouts, at places where there is weird zoning allowances like Starbucks drive-through where people are getting their morning coffee and it’s backing up onto Broadway, and especially where Broadway bottlenecks downtown. As far as I know, that’s really not up for re-design.

So those are things that I hope that you will keep in mind and consider when designing the roadway. I am not speaking as a member of the Broadway Coalition, because, I don’t know where my colleagues stand on this, but one of the ways to accomplish a lot of the goals that I think that we all have in common – about not just maintaining Broadway as a destination but enriching it and increasing economic investment and linking it to the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods and such – is actually to slow traffic down.

There is a man who owns a business called Caps and More and he will be coming to one of the next meetings to speak to you about his experience. He was my neighbor in Solot Plaza. I don’t know if you recall seeing his sign? He rented from the owners of the auction, Urkshaw. He had an opportunity to buy a place just south of Cooks Co. Signmakers on Tucson Boulevard and he has told members of the Sunshine Mile that his business has improved significantly. Significantly, without any additional advertising or anything, simply because he is on Tucson Boulevard now where vehicles are moving more slowly. So, I just want to add that as food for thought and again thank you so much.

I am probably going to drop a letter to all of you in the coming days or weeks in regard to some of the language in the potential new and revised goals that made me uncomfortable. So, Jenn will get that to you when I send it in. 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. Jenn Toothaker confirmed with the Task Force that the next meetings will be held on Tuesday, May 21, 2013 and Thursday, May 23, 2013 from 5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. at the Child and Family Resources building located at 2800 E. Broadway.

Jenn also explained that the Project Team will be submitting an annual report to the City Clerk’s Office (the report was distributed to the CTF prior to the start of the meeting) and

requested that the CTF review the report and offer any suggestions or edits prior to the next Task Force meeting. Jenn then addressed the issue of attendance requirements with the CTF as this was an issue that was brought up at the previous Task Force meeting. It was explained that CTF members cannot miss more than 4 meetings in a row or over 40 percent of the meetings in a calendar year. After Jenn made these clarifications the CTF made the following comments:

- Are we going to know our schedule for the summer soon?
- I hear this over and over again about a freeway. That is an extreme classification and when I hear that being applied to Broadway that makes no sense to me because Broadway is more of a transit arterial (example given of I-10 and I-19).
- It's wide to have three traffic lanes on each side (the example was used with part of Speedway way east). Both sides are not going to be connected it won't be a destination. Some of these streets are wider than Aviation Highway.
- A freeway is a controlled access road where an arterial street is not (its curb cuts).
- I want to encourage everyone to walk into the businesses because you really get the livelihood of how many people's lives and businesses are at stake. This has changed my opinion of what I see and how I feel when I visit these small businesses.
- I would like to thank the audience for responding to my questions about functionality.
- The newly widened sections of I-10 are 8 lanes wide.
- I am extremely optimistic and positive that we will get there.
- I appreciate Jamey's comment and Diane's comment their dialogue is important. I appreciate that it was not sarcastic, but honest and true.
- I had a stakeholder ask me to find for him the original ballot language. It took some digging but I found it for him. It talked about how the roadway projects would be designed with the Citizen's Task Force. What we have been hearing from people is true, and the voters themselves have given us some real power here.

*(By way of email, a link to this document has been provided for the information of the Task Force. <http://www.rtamobility.com/images/stories/pdfs/RTABoard/2006/RTABoard-2006-05-31-SummaryOfVotesCast.pdf> The document is titled: Pima County Official Canvass Regional Transportation Authority Special Election, dated May 20, 2006.*

*The reference is to the section "Questions Text," which starts on page of the 24-26 of the PDF document, and is attached to this meeting summary for ease of reference.)*

## 11. Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called the meeting to a close at 8:38 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>