



Draft Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE

May 30, 2013

5:30 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

MEETING RESULTS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements

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

Citizen Task Force Members

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

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.

2. First Call to the Audience

Two (2) members of the audience filled out a speaker's card and were called upon to address the task force:

Gene Caywood:

"Ok, Gene Caywood, Southern Arizona Transit advocate. As promised at the last meeting we have completed our constrained alternative artwork. Which basically fits the transit lanes into the five-lane cross section by using one median lane for transit, and then an additional one of the travel lanes adjacent to it (for the other lane of transit). The only place widening occurs is every quarter-mile where you will want to put a stop and where you'll want to go around left turn lanes. Left turns are close between those quarter mile locations. Basically, it limits dramatically the amount of right-of-way needed. I counted the parcels that were impacted there's thirteen of them.

I said last time we didn't think there were any buildings that would have to be impacted, but it turns out there's one partial building demolition which happens to be the building I'm in, which Old Pueblo Trolley leases from the City of Tucson, but it is a city owned building. I also put a big red "S" on the building so you can see which ones are significant on the map that was developed by the staff and there are thirteen of those significant parcels that have some additional right-of-way taken from them, but it doesn't directly impact the buildings.

I did a list of all the design features, which you can look at there's enough for the task force and maybe for the staff over here. You can read more about it and the drawings are on the table right back there, and please if we have a break, I don't know are we having a break? During the break look at it, or at the end of the meeting I will be here as late as anybody wants to stay to take a look at it. Thank you very much."

Ron Spark:

"Hi I'm Ron Spark, I'm the past president of the El Encanto Estates, and a member of the Broadway Coalition Steering Committee and I sit within our neighborhood council. I'm going to talk about two items, cross width and parking considerations. What's at stake here? Broadway corridor is really Tucson's Main Street if you think about it. After downtown, it's in a robust, developmental phase; this street won't have intense developmental capability of sustaining a lot capital in full. So that's what at stake and what you do here will tip the gallons on that.

I would like to talk about cross width. To think in terms of Broadway as a single width, the entire length is utterly simplistic, and it's not really, as it sets in place. Broadway today has variable widths and historically has been that way. Think of all the successful biological systems, plants and animals, they have from top to bottom

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.

varied width, and they're very functional and I think you can think of Broadway in the same way as a living organism. This maximizes both efficiency and functionality just like plants and animals. There's also a beauty in the variation. I think we all forget that just been seeing things that has some variation, it's very good that way. I think also, the benefit if you can vary the way and keep the configuration largely as it is, it'll minimize destruction, it'll enhance livability, and promote cost effective design. So I urge you to study and look at the Broadway cross section within a segmental way.

Parking, this is an essential feature of land use development, whether you call it context sensitive design or complete street design. I think you need to have a holistic approach unto this. It's not just part of streetscape; it is an inherent part of the entire wide Broadway Corridor. Think of 4th Avenue, there's parking on the street and off the street in the surrounding neighborhoods and what people do is they park and then they are able to stroll and take advantage of 4th Avenue. I think we can do the same thing with Broadway if we have good parking design.

So now, I see in your drawings you have parking parallel and diagonal. I'm talking about a bigger picture. So what are we, what am I talking about? First and most important, think about parking lots. Most urbanists now look at parking lots as being capable of being recycled, being brought back into the life of the city. They can be used for other things, repurposed, for living and pop-ups situations. So that's critical for how they are placed, how you design where parking is, is very important. Second, consider aggregating the parking, maybe modal parking, frontal, side and in the back, that has tremendous advantage. That's again a design land use feature. So how do you do this? I think it's very important to go back to the stakeholders, the businesses, residential stakeholders, and have them work with you and talk about parking. Talk about parking and try to get their ideas, but please don't just do frontal parking and leave. I think that would be defeat livability. You have an opportunity to design an efficient and attractive streetscape, with strategically designed cross widths and attractive parking, and that will enhance the Broadway Corridor. Thank you for your time."

3. Public Input Report, and Reports on Project Presentations and Outreach

Jenn Toothaker reviewed the Public Input Report with the CTF. The report consisted of documentation of public input received from May 9, 2013 through May, 20, 2013. Following the review of the Public Input Review Doug Mance briefly presented highlights from the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation (CART) Committee meeting that occurred on May 22, 2013.

Mr. Mance stated that the CTF is doing a great job of going through the actions and the Broadway Task Force will become a model for transportation planning. This process should be replicated in future and the CART appreciates what the CTF is doing. Mr. Mance also stated that the Task Force members are unsung heroes. Mr.

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

Mance then went on to reiterate that his role is to provide transparent communication between the CTF, the CART and the RTA.

Additionally, Mr. Mance explained that the RTA is now 1/3 of the way through its 20 year life and that they really have accomplished things. Examples of these accomplishments include the many bus pullouts, HAWK crossings, intersection improvements, expanded bikeways and the nearly complete Modern Streetcar. Mr. Mance further added that out of the 599 projects on the RTA plan, 506 and have been completed -on time and on budget- and currently there are 73 projects in design and 20 in construction. Finally, Mr. Mance shared that the CTF is engaged in a multi-year process and that they have a big role in the project, and that he will ensure that their dedication and hard work is appreciated wherever he goes. A brief discussion ensued after Mr. Mance's presentation and is summarized below.

CTF Questions and Comments

- What is your take on RTA's lawyer's comments regarding the flexibility that the RTA has to modify projects? Is the presentation he gave to the CART a part of the public record?
- Can we expect an executive summary in layman's language or should we continue with the cross-sections and not worry about it.

Summarized Responses

- The RTA will decide based upon the legal advice from their counsel. In terms of functionality we did not go backwards, but moved a little forward on the definition. The Board has the fiduciary responsibility for all of the RTA projects and is charged with defining what is elemental, substantial, and what functionality means.
- Yes, the presentation will be part of public record.
- Continue with your work on the cross sections.

4. Review Potential Cross Sections and Performance and Endorse a Representative Set of them to Move Forward into Review by the Stakeholder Agencies

The project team presented an initial analysis of the cross section concepts presented at the May 21 and May 23, 2013 CTF meetings utilizing the performance measures that were presented at these previous two meetings, as well. The initial goal of this first analysis was to present assessments of the cross sections so that the project team and CTF could consider which options to move forward into review by Stakeholder Agencies in preparation to be presented to the public at the September, 2013 Community-Wide meeting. An additional goal of this conversation was to prepare the CTF to possibly "finalize" the Cross-Section Options and Performance Measures at the June 20, 2013 meeting. The Project Team and the

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

Task Force took part in a lengthy discussion regarding these assessments (summarized below).

CTF Questions and Comments

- To put things in perspective, is the existing width of the roadway shown anywhere?
- Thank you for the table (Block by Block Widths of Existing Streets, Right Of Way, and Building Separation); this is a lot of work as Broadway is a variable roadway and it is important to look at things in this context.
- Option 4 +T (B) 152' - Are you suggesting that you have to have dedicated transit lanes running in the center?
- Is the assumption that the sidewalk is building to building? Should I read between the lines that East and West of Campbell will be different?
- If you go with option 6 +T (B) 179', how does this meet Country Club with bus/BRT? Bus lanes on the outside makes more sense to meet at Country Club. In the future, could it be possible for the outside bus lane to shift to the middle once you are west of Country Club?
- If you extend the right-of-way, is there space for new buildings or will it remain an empty spot on street?
- Caution: design parks (in remnant parcels) that will draw people. I see parks that are not used. Consider use to make the most of design decisions and costs. Could businesses that had to be demolished be relocated to a remnant parcel?
- Is there a reason the prototypical examples do not include bus pull outs?
- For option 6(A)-138': Setback requirements will have to be addressed property owners?
- Are these the only options we will work with or can we vary them segment by segment and make changes (transit, landscaping)? If the right-of-way is up to building face and the expansion of the road affects access it may require acquisition - how is this determined? Does acquisition happen after our recommendations about design concepts? If yes can the CTF provide recommendations for negotiations with property owners? I fear the CTF will come up with a design concept; then, what is implemented will not be what we recommended. What is your experience? How often are CTF recommendations considered? In response to the previous statement we really need to make sure we can defend our recommendation. If you can convince yourself, you can convince others. It is like sitting on a jury.
- My stakeholders don't want encroachment to the front of their buildings, they will say "buy me".
- When initially asked to be on the CTF, I wanted the road widened. Now, I have changed my mind. All of the pink (on block by block grid) concerns me (pink indicates that the property would be affected by the particular design consideration).

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

- After all this time, our recommendation could change due to negotiations with property owners. This concerns me.
- There are issues with parking in front of storefronts with sporadic sidewalks: if we change the local access to address these conditions, will this be a partial acquisition? If some parking remained in the local realm, we could look for ways to address the lack of parking. When we look at the lighter pink options in the grid - partial acquisition may be the solution for design.
- If comparing (performance measures evaluation), what is the baseline we are using? Wouldn't it all be neutral?
- The two tables seem to contradict each other.
- For the modified cross-sections - will we do a plus or minus evaluation at a later time?
- If we are concerned about these assessments or the assumptions behind them, is this the time to address them?
- I have the following concerns:
 - (1) Pink side of chart concerns me greatly (personal opinion). Page 2 of the cross-section concepts: movement of through traffic-4 + T (A &B), what is the underlying assumption? Is there no benefit to through traffic? If we can get people onto BRT, we will reduce friction on travel lanes but the 4 + T option stays the same, whereas the vehicular travel time for the 6 +T get two plus signs (progressively better); could you please clarify the assumptions underlying the decisions made for these ratings.
 - (2) For the "Gateway to Downtown" performance measure - help me understand what goes into this rating. There is only a 4' difference in width between the 4 + T option and 6 option, why does the 4 lane option receive such a lower rating?
 - (3) For the "Water Harvesting" performance measure: I would like to understand why the two options that are nearly the same width get different evaluation scores.
 - (4) Please clarify the certainty rating (5G).
- I am having a difficult time reviewing this evaluation objectively. The CTF spent time coming up with the performance measures; but have had no say in this evaluation. We should have been part of the evaluation. Why wasn't this a blank document and we could use the CTF meeting to complete it in an activity?
- What is missing -and this makes it hard to evaluate- is the rationale behind the assumptions. Do we need to come up with definitions prior to doing this exercise?
- The Factors and Performance Measures (we provided feedback on during Charrettes) should drive the evaluation. We should go back to these, and take them a bit more seriously and use them.

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

Summarized Project Team Responses

- We have given you a chart that we will explain in further detail that shows the existing width of the roadway, block by block for the corridor, and how each of the cross section concepts fit into that width.
- Center running transit lanes are the most feasible option for dedicated transit.
- The (bus) system in the corridor would be a part of a larger transit network. There could possibly be a scenario where the system weaves from center running to the side. For example, in Eugene, Oregon the BRT system starts in the center and transfers to dedicated side lanes, and in some parts is in mixed flow traffic.
- The transit lanes already change along Broadway - from dedicated lanes east of Country Club to mixed flow west of Country Club.
- The project team is tasked with looking at what the possible uses for the remnant land could be. This will be looked at during the next phase with the discussion of the alignment. We will also have to look at what the existing zoning allows, as well as what could be changed.
- With the map we have provided you, you can see where the setback depths vary and where the remnant parcels would be.
- An existing example of this is the senior housing center we visited on our tour of the corridor. The building would still remain if the right-of-way in this area was acquired. In some areas it will be easy to see where the redevelopment would occur, in others -especially west of Campbell- it is more difficult to envision.
- We did not include bus pullouts in the concepts or the assessments because we were trying to reduce the amount of variables.
- To address the question regarding the setback requirements we would have to look at the Tucson Zoning Codes as well as the relationship to the existing conditions. The southside of the street is more consistent in regard to the setbacks due to the 1987 plan.
- In general the approach to designing a roadway, due to engineering standards, is to have continuity throughout. For example, lane widths, lane transfers, sidewalk widths, etc.
- You have to create a DCR with your recommendations with the idea that there may be more right-of-way acquisitions than you think will occur so that it is flexible.
- Your charge is to come up with the best possible approach and make recommendations you are comfortable with that you provide reasoning for and defend easily. We will take this work to the Stakeholder Agencies to get their feedback and buy in so the (final) recommendation will have the support and accompanying reasoning it needs.

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.

- In regard to right-of-way acquisitions, land use planning, and real estate's process: Everything will be done on a parcel and site by site basis; all they can do is look at each specific property and go from there.
- It is not in the scope of this project to design an overlay; however; through this process we can provide recommendations for land use policy and provide direction through our recommendations.
- We cannot look at specific properties with parking issues, but we can look at what the prototypical would be. The City cannot influence legal negotiations; however, they can talk about approaches and recommendations on how to resolve issues.
- There will be more certainty and we will know a lot more about the right-of-way needs and the associated impacts once we have a proposed alignment. Once this occurs we can provide outreach to the specific properties that will be impacted, at this point the property owner will be able to influence negotiations.
- There is also the issue of what the property owner will want to do. Some may not want to preserve their existing property and may want to re-purpose the parcel with a new building.
- In terms of shared parking and access there are strategies we can talk about and how to implement them. This is something we will continue to think about and keep on our radar.
- Additionally, we are connecting with internal staff and resident experts to see what option would work best to resolve the parking and access issues.
- We need to look at what the current policy is to see how "district parking" could be implemented.
- The baseline we measured against, and the methodology we used to evaluate things, is on the 'Notes' page [page 3] of the performance assessment spreadsheets.
- The two spreadsheets we distributed talk about two separate things; one demonstrates what the potential impacts to properties could be, and the other relates the cross section concepts to the performance measures.
- Once we narrow down the alternatives, we will do a comprehensive evaluation, including the use of VISSIM modeling and analysis.
- Yes, we can address your concerns now... it all comes down to the fact that these assessments are qualitative and I can definitely understand why there would be issues with them. There is a range and what we need to do is come to a consensus about what we are comfortable with presenting. The process is dynamic and we can work through things and provide more options.
- The task force needs to talk about the different assumptions. We need to think about what the traffic growth will be, how much of a shift to transit there will be, the issue of induced demand; all of these things play into how the vehicular travel time performance is measured. We also need to be clear about what the assumptions are and articulate the methodology behind what

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.

- we change. We will make adjustments this way and we can certainly have a discussion about these changes. For example, if we assume that the traffic growth would be lower it would completely change the way a lot of these are evaluated.
- The Gateway to Downtown measure is roughly a combination between transit and vehicular access. If you made the changes you are proposing to the vehicular access measure, then this would change as well.
 - Let me explain the “Water Harvesting” measure because I do not think it is clear: what we did is looked at the base section and looked at what the width of landscape is and what the width of pavement is for each cross section. Pavement includes asphalt and hardscape medians and sidewalks. The measure evaluates the ratio between landscaping and pavement: the cross sections that have more landscape, score higher.
 - The “Certainty” measure is about the relationship of the cross section concepts to the notion of doing the project right, so it doesn’t have to be redone in the future. Specifically how does the specific concept relate to capacity projections? How does it relate to the implementation of High Capacity Transit in the future? Is it flexible to meet future considerations? What factored into this was the functionality of the pedestrian environment, bicycle facility improvements, and the accommodation of future transit as well as the movement of through traffic. Looking at the movement of through traffic and possibly changing the considerations for this will impact the way this performance measure evaluates the cross section concepts.
 - I would like to reiterate that these materials are in a draft format and they are available online. It is our intention to listen to the Task Force and the public and take in the comments that are made, and then bring back a revised version for review at our June 20, 2013 meeting.
 - I understand how you feel about the assessments, but the idea is that you are involved. We are starting now, then at the June meeting we are hoping we can decide on something that we can take to the stakeholder agencies. And then we will have another meeting where we bring that back to you. Additionally, we will be taking your continued input as you review these while we are meeting with the stakeholder agencies. Then you will have additional input from the public after the September Community-Wide Meeting. The process is iterative and will take us through September and really through the end of the year until we get to narrowing to the fewer alternatives.
 - The challenge with the assessments and doing them as a group exercise is knowing all of the manuals and the best practices that are out there; and we have that on our team. It took a lot of professional expertise to be able to go through these and provide quality assessments.
 - Additionally, we would like the opportunity for you to go through these and talk about the assessments. And this is for you to do between now and the next meeting, and then we can come back and discuss things as group - especially the concerns you have.

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

- I realize this is a lot of stuff, and a lot to review. And I get your concern about wanting to this as a group; but, that would have taken on the order three or four meetings just get through it as a group exercise.

5. Initial Discussion of September Public Meeting #3

Project Manager Jenn Toothaker Burdick led the CTF through a brief, initial, discussion of the September Public Meeting #3. Jenn presented that the task related goals would be to provide an overview of the vision statement and the initial Draft Cross Section Concepts and the initial assessments of these concepts as well. The public would have the opportunity to review this information and provide feedback to help refine the analysis and further narrow the concepts. Jenn also explained that it would be a natural fit to have small group activities where the public would have the opportunity to review the concepts and assessments and give the project team an indication as to what the most important performance measures are, and what their greatest concerns are in relation to the cross sections, as well as what cross sections would be best to move forward for further evaluation. Additionally, the project team sought initial feedback from the CTF as how best to structure the small group activity. Phil Erickson and Jenn engaged in a brief discussion, summarized as follows.:

CTF Questions and Comments

- By September, the concepts will be so far along and developed that I am not sure the “build your own cross section” exercise is going to be helpful. Is there any we can just focus on the concepts at this point.
- I have a similar concern. My reasoning is that we shouldn’t expect them to start from scratch.
- Maybe a hybrid or some combination of approaches that allow the public to see how the cross sections fit within the corridor.

Summarized Project Team Responses

- We envisioned having the concepts, as well the elements, to allow the public to work with the map. We will provide acetate strips that are to scale that allow the public to place them on the large corridor maps and see exactly how the concepts fit within the existing right of way. We will continue to think about and refine this activity in the coming months.

6. Second Call to the Audience

Six (6) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Gene Caywood:

“Thank you. Some of you got here a little bit late and didn’t get my handout. Basically, what I said before you all got here is we have our design alternative and it’s on the back table right back there and I’ll be there afterwards as long as you all want to stay and look at it. What I wanted to say in addition was that I talked to Jennifer this afternoon by email about getting copies of it but that’s the only copy

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

right now so she is going to work out some way to have that copied so you all can have it , maybe it can be online or whatever.

The third thing that I wanted to say was that you know, it's a concept, and it shows a lot of neat, I think neat, ideas, but it's by no means finished and there's lots of issues; when I look at it I say "Oh crap, why did I do it that way?" It needs changing, and it needs tweaking, and it needs a lot of stuff so it couldn't go forward. You know Phil was joking with me before the meeting, "well you just designed everything, we can all just go home," and no that's not the case. You know it still needs a lot of help, even you all were to decide to adopt a real constrained alternative, which is what we tried to do there, it still needs a lot of work and there are lots of other things that you all need to do. The other thing is that, you know, as I mentioned earlier, to make this work we put one transit lane in a travel lane, and the other in the median. You know ideally it would be, if you could figure a way to do it, two dedicated transit lanes is really more ideal and that's what we would really like to support and see. What we did was to try to accommodate a lot of the things we were hearing from you and from the public was to show that when push came to shove you really had to be as constrained as you could and you really didn't want to take any right-of-way except for when you absolutely had to, then this could be made to work and I think this demonstrates that. But I think the discussion tonight and the prototype things Phil just presented were very creative in terms of how you could get more right-of-way but still preserve buildings and still solve other problems like their access and parking. So I think that's important to continue the discussion and to let this thing evolve into something that is really going to work for most cases.

The other thing I wanted to talk a little about, is cross section, because I sort of heard somebody bring that up and we didn't do a cross section and there's a couple of reasons why. One is it's the existing cross section, so if you want to see it, it's the 60 ft. of right-of-way next to the west of Campbell, and 64 ft. to the east. Except for where we had to widen it to do the left turn lanes to get transit stops, and there we used the minimalist approach. See you've all got your little cards of what would be the minimal lane widths and everything. You can add it up and you can make the cross section if you really want to, because that's the way we did it, but even where we did the widening there is no consistency in cross section. In each case, what I basically did was decide, ok where is the most right-of-way, ok that's what I'm going to work with. Then I'm going to put the transit stops in such a way and then I'm going to try to weave everything around so you can weave around the left turn lanes. So every single intersection where there is a transit stop is designed differently. There is no standard or typical cross section, ok? That's the way I think that the whole corridor should be designed frankly. Now it's not to say this whole cross section exercise you're going through isn't really good, because it is. It makes you think about it, it makes you understand the pieces that you need to put together, and they say I'm out of time so my last comment is just to say that this, what we presented here, is the "keep it in Broadway at a minimalist approach idea." The other option is to move transit totally off Broadway and we're working on that for your next meeting."

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.

Henry Schneiker:

"My name is Henry Schneiker. I own a couple of buildings on the East side of Tucson Boulevard. I used to own another building on the West side of Tucson Boulevard. I will speak for my tenants. I realize that the right of way is approximately 100 feet in front of my current buildings, and that would remove 50% of the parking area. Not only that, but you would be backing out onto the right of way, which is not a happy thing.

I like preserving things that ought to be preserved, but you know the reality is a lot of things just shouldn't be preserved. I would be one for removing those buildings that are in that full strip (built back in the 50's) and moving them back to the back side of the property and then maybe removing a couple of those buildings permanently so that you have parking on the sides of the buildings, in addition to in front of the buildings. One of the lots, down on the West side of Tucson Boulevard (there happens to be a bridal shop there) you will notice that there is an empty lot (right next to that building) where people are parking along the side of that building. This is a great example.

Yeah you don't have to have all the buildings (and my tenants would like to stay in that location) but I think that during construction you could temporarily move them to someplace else; rebuild, and move most of the tenants right back where they were (or pretty close to where they were) so that they don't have to go anywhere. Then you could add additional parking, like say take out a building every eight buildings or so and have parking next to the sides of the building. You could move the building back if you needed to.

If you really have a great example (like say one or two) historic buildings that you really feel have got to be saved; well ok fine, save them. You know the definition of historic is typically over 50 years old; well you know if I go spray paint on National Forest Service, it's graffiti until its 50 years old; and then it's historic and then it's illegal to remove. Ok... and I personally don't agree with their definition. 50 years doesn't make it any more aesthetic, but you know that is the way that some people look at these things. If you take a broader look at it, you have got the money to tear down the buildings; I don't see why you can't spend part of the money building back once you are done. Thanks."

Mark Homan:

"Hello I am Mark Homan. I am a member of the Broadway Coalition and for the past 37 years I have lived in Rincon Heights. First, I want to thank the members of the Citizen's Task Force for the hours and hours of service you have given to our community. I come to many of these meetings, you come to them all. I see the volumes of information that you have to read, consider and question. That's when a contribution should be recognized not only with words of thanks but most importantly, your work and recommendations you make need to be honored by

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.

those in other decision making roles so what you do here really matters. Again thank you.

As a member of the Broadway Coalition, I have been active in meeting with neighbors, business owners, elected officials, members of the project team and many others and I find that from time to time I need to make some corrections about the coalition's perspectives. I'm not sure if any of you have any misunderstandings, but I thought it might be helpful to you, to speak about a few of the things that we believe are important. I think that you might hold some similar views.

We hear a lot about negative impacts: eliminating local, tax generating, family-owned businesses, losing what might have been an unrecognized jewel of mid-modern architecture, spending your tax dollars and mine in a way that is wasteful and will continue to incur more costs and on and on and on. Well, of course we want to prevent negative impacts from a project unmindful of the historic, economic, and other assets that it could cause. Those are not the only impacts of a project.

There are certainly a host of positive impacts that a creative project can produce. We can build on what we have rather than destroy it to create a remarkable place. We can make the area more beautiful with good road design and other features to enhance streets. We can let business investment, excited by the prospect of being part of a vibrant district, give a needed facelift to buildings, spur economic activity, and develop an array of attractive retail and other enterprises and again on and on.

There's tremendous potential for beneficial results if we do things well. We can brand our city as innovative, even exciting or we can forward a reputation for plotting ordinariness. My guess is that most of us would prefer the innovative, exciting brand. So while you will continue to look at and ultimately recommend how this project will move forward, I hope you consider that the basic criteria that your neighbors and customers in the Broadway coalition have offered. These reflect many of your values. I have them here and I will give them to Jen. I know they're on the back table; I want to make sure everyone had them. I'm just going to touch on them:

- To advance the notion of place, which is quite different from the notion of corridor, including the 40 residents in the area, range of services' amenities and establishing a unique identity etc.
- Preserving the structures that exist along Broadway and provide safe, easy access to them.
- Enhance the business climate and viability.
- Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation and give particular attention put to test the pedestrian and bicycle activity safety.
- Be visually appealing.
- Aid the movement of people using a variety of forms of vehicular traffic.

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.

- Contribute to environmental sustainability and be a fiscally sound, affordable approach.

Again thank you for your service to our community. It is this citizen involvement, in its many forms, that make Tucson a special place. What happens here will be our legacy for generations to come. Thank you."

Eliza Drag:

"Hi. Just two things- One, I just wanted to touch on the parking in a way that... (How should I put this)? We own the building at 2801 and when I went to the City to get a permit to renovate the building and tear out the front porch that was falling down, I discussed with zoning the parking issue which is currently around the building. I was informed that when the building was zoned commercial it was not zoned in a compliant way; meaning that the City allowed it to be zoned as a commercial structure knowing well that it would never meet commercial parking requirements.

I think that that is something that I wasn't necessarily aware of; having dealt predominantly with residential. I came into this process very much like this is going to be a bad thing; I am going to lose my building. Now, I am kind of looking at it like I want to keep my building but if there is a way (and I think Phil said that you can't necessarily get into the gray area where the City has to deal with the legal aspect-is that making any sense?) I think Phil knows what I am talking about. My point is I don't know if you can identify slots of the roadway that particularly suffer from non-compliance already in the parking in the roadway. Because there are certain areas where I said, well my neighbors have 5 parking spots; but well they are all illegal.

I wonder if the City can help you identify areas that are already beyond your control because if they are already not in compliance, then you are going to stress out about well I am going to lose my building because you are taking my parking. I don't have any parking; I don't legitimately have any legal parking. Please don't anybody turn me in! I have to encourage my customers to park in the street, which I guess is kind of legal but it doesn't really satisfy any of my... I can't legally even park on my own property. Anyway, I don't even know if that is possible, but I would maybe encourage somebody to look into that because if there are areas (specific areas) that you can identify and legally not get in trouble I think that might help.

The other thing was, as far as what is historic and whether or not that is relevant? Tucson is very diverse and my advice would be that you don't have to feel like this is a homogenous process and that we have to make it look any particular one way; Tucson is just not that way. Where there are areas where you would end up with tremendous cuts into properties where you would end up with someone with like a 10 foot set-back to the sidewalk. I wonder if, just based off of the Campbell corridor-where I personally live, it is a different area because it has no commercial commerce of any kind from you know Speedway to Grant, The roadway is business-free. Which I don't know if it's a bad thing and no body's collecting taxes on it?

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.

Where you do have areas where it's interspersed between residential and commercial I wonder how a wall is going to interplay with that? If you are going to have large pieces of property where you have got the big wall, like Campbell? Where there will be landscaping? Or no wall? -and how that will evolve over time."

Marc Fink:

"Originally, I wasn't going to speak tonight, but there were various things that came up that I just couldn't resist commenting on based on my experience. Thirty years as a land use planner, I felt that I would chip in my two cents worth, because I think that it becomes important.

One, in terms of the charts the evaluation criteria and such, I think that there are some things that you probably need to pay attention to that become really important. One is, their definitions there, you need to look at the definitions and really look at: is this my definition? Because if it's not... different words mean different things to different people. I spent 30 years of asking: what is the definition of high or low density? You get anything from 1 house per acre to 20 houses per acre. It completely changes the whole definition and you will have conversations where people are talking past each other. So you need to be really clear that the definition is the definition that you think should be applied to.

The one example is "gateway to downtown;" the County has gateway overlay zoning districts in various locations. The County and how they look at a "gateway" is different than what is looked at here. This is just one example so that it becomes real important. Related to that which I think is not listed here is the rationale behind the ratings. When I look at some of the ratings, some of the ratings to me seem counter intuitive. I guess I have a different definition or I am coming from a different place. That becomes real important so I would agree with Diane that you can't just accept it, with all respect to Phil I know how hard it is and he is coming from his perspective and I would probably would have done the same thing just as a place to start the discussion, but you need to really look at that and you need to know why a rating was given a certain rating. You may have completely different criteria than the rating. It may have showed as a negative and you think it's a positive or vise-versa so that becomes real important.

Second, I know Gene said that his alternative is not complete but I think it's a viable alternative for evaluation. He chose using the existing roadway, and I would define roadway making sure that when I say roadway I am talking about curb to curb. The right-of-way is what the City owns which goes beyond curb to curb and it's important to keep those definitions in mind. Otherwise, everybody will get really confused. The idea that he can present an alternative that is done essentially within the existing roadway and within the existing right of way becomes an interesting alternative to look at.

It also might be worth looking at what Phoenix did with its light rail. Now I realize that in Tucson as soon as somebody mentions Phoenix in a positive light everybody

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

else stops listening because of course nothing gets out of Phoenix, and to a large degree that is probably true; however, they have created a really viable and successful light rail system that runs through the center of town including up and down Central Avenue (which is one of their major North-South corridors). They didn't widen Central Avenue I don't think to any extent. It's very narrow and very successful through their downtown and then North of their downtown. So there are ways of looking at this, and this also becomes important with the ratings and the whole idea of induced demand. Induced demand really is a phenomenon that exists and the more that you keep widening the road, you haven't solved any problems. So that becomes that.

I would also re-iterate, in support of Diane's statement, even though she said it somewhat snarky, I think she was right on when she said: "why build a park because there will be nobody there?" If you don't have destinations people aren't going to come; you are just going to be building something that may look nice but there won't be people there and there may be the law of unintended consequences because there may be people there but it may not be the people that you want there. It can become very unsafe, so what have you really created? Again, if you are creating a place you are creating a place where people would want to come to. Finally, one of my roles is, I am also on the steering committee for the Tucson chapter for Local First Arizona, so I would also encourage you to look at the impacts not only to the business in general but also what are the impacts to local business. Also, I look on the chart and see that there are a lot of areas that are grayed out because Phil felt that you really couldn't evaluate it. My feeling is that looking at some of them, you probably can. This is qualitative analysis you are not being asked is it an 8 or a 3 or a 16 or something. Generally speaking, I think a lot of those categories you can probably come to a conclusion. If one of your alternatives is to go wipe out all of the businesses on the North side then I think that you can logically say that there is a negative impact to commercial activity. That is not to whether it's two minus signs, three minus signs or one minus sign. I think to say that you can't evaluate it, I would disagree but I guess Phil and I can have a long discussion interestingly. So that is it. Thank you."

Dale Prescott:

"I have owned the building at 2259 E. Broadway for almost three years now. I own a building on Broadway on the North side and across from me as far as I can think of its commercial on both sides of Broadway and even where, like for example across the street from here, residential property has eventually become a commercial setting. So I just want to say that maybe there was some way, maybe I'm not imagining enough, it seems like the parking has been neglected on one side of Broadway. I can't understand from these wonderful drawings, why you can't have parking on both sides? It just seems maybe I am missing something, but maybe you are too. I want to compliment Marc on his comments, I want to endorse him. I think he's insightful eloquent and certainly represents, I think, my opinion, what we're looking at in way of changing the current setting that we have on Broadway. I would like to add that it seems like human nature, unless you can understand the

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.

value of a change, it's going to be resistant. So I think I want to encourage everybody for all the great time we have put into this, don't overlook the idea that if you can't convince me that what you are doing is going to make my life better, by either purchasing the building or at least letting me stay there and enhancing the environment, then you are going to fall short. Change has got to be seen as a positive. And I am not sure if that is happening. Thank you."

7. Next Steps/Roundtable

During the next steps and roundtable, Jenn Toothaker confirmed the next meeting date and agenda with the Task Force. During this agenda item the Task Force made requests to the project team.

- If buildings are acquired, are there City funds to build new structures in their footprint?
- If it is on the record, I would like map that show the non-compliant parking structures and lots along the corridor.
- I would like the project team to take an initial shot at evaluating the non-transportation performance measures, such as economic vitality (related to Marc Fink's call to the audience comment).
- If possible, I would like to request a diagram with Gene Caywood's map in the same format as the cross section concepts to review by the June meeting.
- On Broadway most parking is non-compliant. How will we solve this? I am hopeful that becomes one of our tasks. Six foot local access lanes with parking for everybody that is compliant with existing building and their use.
- Our meetings are so full; we need to stick to the time allotted for presentations and the Q & A so the second presenter is not cut short.
- We should cut it down to only one presentation next meeting (BRT) and delay the Downtown Links project presentation to July meeting, and have other presentation topics until after the Public Workshop.
- The Project Team is doing a great job. The materials are helpful, thanks for putting them together for us.
- In future Call to Audience I would like to request that the presenters face everyone so that I can see them and read their lips.

Adjourn

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

The presentations given at this meeting can be reviewed by visiting the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force web page at:

<http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/broadway/broadway-citizens-task-force>

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, \$2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.



BROADWAY COALITION

Design Criteria for the Improvement of Broadway

- Advance the notion of place (quite different from the notion of corridor), including affording residents in the area a range of services and amenities, establish a unique identity, etc.;
- Preserve the structures that exist along Broadway and provide safe, easy access to them;
- Enhance the business climate/viability;
- Promote use of alternative modes of transportation and give particular attention to pedestrian and bicycle activity and safety;
- Be visually appealing;
- Aid the movement of a people using a variety of forms of vehicular traffic;
- Contribute to environmental sustainability, and
- Be a fiscally sound, affordable approach.

BROADWAY CORRIDOR: CROSSWIDTH AND AREA PARKING CONSIDERATIONS
RON SPARK, M.D.,
BROADWAY COALITION MEMBER

What's at stake?

Broadway Corridor: "Tucson's Main Street"

After Downtown, it surely will be the next area of intense development and capital investment

Cross-sectional width

Single width the entire length (?): utterly simplistic and not responsive to current sense of place.

All successful biological systems, plants and animals, vary in their segmental width.

This maximizes both efficiency and functionality.

Think of the varying breadth of the segments of the human body. Also, think of the inherent beauty in this variation. Broadway now has such variation.

The great value in varying the segments of Broadway means minimized destruction of current functionality and livability while enabling cost-effective design enhancements.

We urge you to study and consider a design that largely retains the current segmental widths as they are.

Parking

An essential element to Land Use and Development; Context Sensitive Design; Complete Streets Design.

Take a holistic approach. It's not just as a part of streetscape. It's an inherent functional part of the wider Broadway Business Corridor.

Think of 4th Avenue, where patrons park both on street and off the main street, to be able to stroll and enjoy that District

So, don't limit design choices to just parallel versus diagonal parking.

Look at two planning considerations for efficient use of parking space

First, many urbanists see parking lots now as an opportunity to be repurposed for additional and asynchronous uses. Parking lot design placement becomes critical.

Second, consider plans to aggregate parking into frontal nodal or side lots and behind business.

So, how to approach the parking discussions? Two steps.

First, initiate more focused group discussion among stakeholders, both business and adjacent residents. How would altered locations or an aggregated configuration effect them?

Second, use and value their input product in your area design.

Bottom line: Don't just design frontal roadway parking and leave.

This is a one-time opportunity to design an efficient and attractive streetscape with strategic cross widths and attractive parking while enhancing Broadway Corridor livability.

Thank you.

**SOUTHERN ARIZONA TRANSIT ADVOCATES
BROADWAY CORRIDOR STUDY
DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR CONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE**

This drawing is SATA's attempt at creating an alternative for Broadway that stays within the 5 lane cross section of the existing roadway as much as possible while still providing two lanes and stops for High Capacity Transit (HCT). Below are the design considerations/constraints used, or which resulted during design.

- A goal of no buildings demolished. It was reached with the exception of part of one building already in City ownership.
- Minimum right-of-way "takes". It is to be noted that right-of-way takes are shown on the drawing only when on private property, not when impacting City or ADOT owned property.
- Existing right-of-way used as much as possible, especially where additional right-of-way has been acquired over the years with development and is vacant other than landscaping.
- Transit stops have been placed as near as possible to where Sun Tran buses currently stop.
- The roadway has been widened only at transit stops.
- To conserve space, transit typically has been placed in the median as much as possible, and in the left travel lane for some distance on the far side of an intersection.
- While not specifying a particular mode of HCT, the design was done to accommodate the streetcar since it stops more frequently than BRT or LRT.
- The curves used in design match the minimum radius used on Broadway through the U.P.R.R. underpass. Design speed was not calculated, but speed limits were presumed to match those currently in place in the underpass.
- Providing transit lanes requires closing median left turns except at ¼ mile spacing as would be the case with a 6 or 8 lane divided roadway with raised medians.
- Sidewalks and crosswalks, and pedestrian connections to transit stops were not shown but adequate space was provided for them.
- Driveways were not shown on the drawing.
- Transit connections have been shown west of Euclid Ave. into downtown and east of Country Club to El Con.
- Wide medians were provided at both ends of the project which will improve the "first impression" of the project and which provide space for a gateway feature. The drawing shows something spanning one or more transit "lanes".
- Medians are not defined as to raised (or curbed) vs. painted, but are shown as curbed in order to more clearly define where left turns would be prohibited and where cross streets would be closed.
- Resultant Right-of-Way needs:
 - 17 parcels impacted
 - 1 partial building demolition
 - 13 impacted parcels contain a significant building – one shown on the Broadway Corridor Study "Summary of National Register Status" map