



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

June 20, 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	Joseph Maher, Jr.		Bruce Fairchild
Michael Butterbrodt	Shirley Papuga		Farhad Moghimi
Anthony R. DiGrazia	Diane Robles		
Mary Durham-Pflibsen	Elizabeth Scott		
Colby Henley	Jamey Sumner		
Jon Howe			

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

Six (6) members of the audience filled out a speaker's card and were called upon to address the task force:

Bill Poorten:

"Hi, my name is Bill Poorten. I am a member now and have been since its inception of the CART committee. The reason that I decided to come down here today was because of a pledge that I made seven years ago when I joined the committee. I wanted to share with you how I see that pledge interfacing with this important work that you are undertaking. I do not however speak for the general CART committee these are just my views.

The publicity pamphlet that went out when the RTA was presented to the voters stated on page 18 that, "in addition to the governing board must establish a citizens oversight committee to ensure that the plan be implemented in accordance with the ballot measure and will certify that the voters desire are respected throughout the 20 year term." That has been my overarching motivation and guiding principle in serving on the CART committee to ensure that the voter's desires are respected. In fact, our pledge requires that we pledge to assure that the voters receive what the RTA plan promised them. That was in a resolution adopted by the RTA May 16th 2006 (resolution 2006/04). I mention this because as I interpret the ballot the language very clearly and un-ambiguously described what the Broadway road improvement project was. Six arterials two plus dedicated lanes, sidewalks and bicycle paths.

I question whether or not the RTA or the lead agency has the authority to modify it. Not because I think that the plan as described for this road project is necessarily the best plan, or the appropriate plan, or that the data upon which it was based is in fact accurate. It is because that is what the voters approved and I went back and I checked the voter results. The RTA plan passed overwhelmingly by a 60.05% and unless I am reading the precinct's vote tally is wrong. Every precinct that is represented by this task force along Broadway approved or overwhelmingly approved the ballot with the very clear language describing the road project. So my concern is that I honor my pledge and deliver as best as I can what the voters approved, regardless of my personal beliefs about the wisdom of any particular project including this one. If with the benefit of hindsight we now believe this project was poorly thought out, is no longer appropriate, then I think adjustments should and can be made but I question the mechanism of making those and receiving approval. I believe (its one person's opinion) one member of the CART (not speaking for the CART as a whole) that the soundest way of making those adjustments is to let the same voters who approved the package make a modification to it. So I wanted to come down and just share those thoughts with you, and I invite you to come to our CART meetings to express whatever thoughts

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.

that you have. There have been representatives of this task force there, and I imagine they will come and continue to come and talk to us. Thanks.”

JD Garcia: Mr. Garcia chose to yield his time to Mark Fink.

Margot Garcia: Mrs. Garcia chose to yield her time to Mark Fink.

Laura Tabili: Ms. Tabili chose to yield her time to Mark Fink.

Marc Fink:

“As many of you know, my name is Mark Fink, I have been to a lot of these meetings and made comments so I don’t think that I am a stranger to you all. I am on the steering committee for the Broadway Coalition so my comments represent the consensus from the Broadway Coalition (including mine but it’s the Broadway Coalition as a whole). You received our written comments in your packets I am just going to go over the highlights and I am not going to go over the whole thing, if I did you would probably just run me out of town I would hate to do that. The reason why we do that is one, we appreciate all the work that went into creating that document, and it took a lot of work. The purpose of our comments is to provide alternative interpretations of the measures and possibly suggest a process with which to evaluate all of the measures in all eyes of various scenarios or options. The Citizen’s Task Force has reached the most important phase of the process. It has worked long and hard to get to this point and what the task force accomplishes here will influence everything that occurs afterwards; therefore we feel it is vital that the task force spends whatever time is necessary to ensure that the analysis and its result truly reflect the views of the task force and of the community. If that means pushing back the public meeting we would recommend that it’s better to push back the public meeting and to do it right then to rush in something that doesn’t really work that well. So we have various comments, concerns, issues/whatever. Generally how the individual performance measures are defined & clearly understanding the assumptions used in evaluating each of the measures is the core of the analysis. The definition determines the rating. Each measure needs to be defined clearly and with all the assumptions and how it is used clearly delineated. This needs to be done both for those measures being evaluated and those that may not be in order to better determine if in fact a particular measure can be evaluated.

We would suggest that when you define a measure that you not define it by referring to other measures, several of them say we are defining this as part of 1a, 2b, 3c, and 4d that becomes very confusing particularly if you make changes to 1a, 2b, 3c, and 4d. Who knows where you have gotten to (it won’t make very much sense)? We also suggest that particularly that when you go to the public, that you do not use jargon, make sure it’s really clear because you can’t assume that the public has all the knowledge that you have and you are expecting them to make choices in a short period of time. More importantly, the definition of the various measures must be done in context of the vision and goals. I have said this several times before and I think (and others have as well) you have reached the point

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.

where you can see this. Many if not all of the measures are not context-neutral I would say that most of them are relative to the context that you are dealing with; therefore any discussion of individual measures needs to be done in relation to how the particular measure & scenario implement the applicable parts for the vision for Broadway.

This also means that land use cannot be divorced from road design. Broadway needs to be designed in a way that furthers what the function of Broadway is, and the function in a broader sense is (as the Broadway Coalition has suggested in the past) if the land use is integral to the desired context that you are trying to create. Related to this is the need to clearly spell out why a particular measure is given a particular rating. Further, it also needs to be explained why those measures not being evaluated cannot be evaluated, especially given the fact that over half of the measures are not rated in the draft assessment and many of these measures reflect important aspects of the visions and goals particularly those relating to sense of place and economic vitality. Those two may be the most important ones that you are dealing with. Not incorporating these other measures may skew the evaluation of how well a particular scenario or option influenced the visions and goals. So for example, two of the options that require the widest right of way- if you just look at what was provided to you, you would think these are great options. However, they have only 3 or 4 negatives attached to them mainly positives and a few neutral options attached to them; yet if you incorporated things related to place and sense of economic vitality you may discover even if you don't make changes to those original measures you may find that those options really do have a very, very different impact.

How we related to many years ago when the Forrest Service started doing Cost Benefit Analysis was argued, well we can't come up with Cost Benefit Analysis (we can't come up with numbers) dealing with recreation, environment, and conservation therefore the best options were- build lots of roads, and clear cut. Clearly, if you added in those other options the Cost Benefit Analysis would be very different. I would argue the same here. Further, as much of the analysis is qualitative and not quantitative many of the unevaluated measures can be assessed as how they further the vision and goals. For example, for those scenarios which will require the destruction of businesses and other uses along Broadway it seems obvious that there will be a negative impact on the various measures relating to Broadway as a destination, retention of businesses, for example and many others. Whether they are given a rating of -3 or -2 this is really pretty irrelevant as opposed to understanding do these options have negative impacts on what you are trying to achieve?

Finally, we would suggest there needs to be an evaluation of each measurement category for sense of place, economic vitality, etc. As well as a discussion of what each category demonstrates. This will be particularly important if there are measures not being evaluated in order to create a more complete picture of how each scenario being implemented affects the vision and goals. We would also argue that it is important when you go to the public; there is no way that the public is

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

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

going to be able to incorporate looking at over 50 different performance measures for a whole slew of options. In my 30 years as a land use planner, and doing public meetings, I have never been able to see any kind of public audience do that. I had a hard time -and this is what I do for a living- being able to look at them all. In terms of some of the individual measures (and we go into more detail within our report) I just wanted to touch on some. In terms of overall comments, the overall assumption is that the design speed and posted speed limit for Broadway in this portion would be 30 miles per hour. If this is widened to six lanes or eight lanes that would make this portion completely different than every other portion of Broadway as well as every other arterial in the region both in the city and the county. Further and as transportation planner told me if you have a long, straight road that generally the design speed is 10 miles per hour over the posted speed limit, it's almost infinite you are just going straight (there's no big issues).

There is no discussion of impacts from the various options onto other portions of Broadway. If that does become an issue I have talked to people who believe (including planners and transportation planners) that what happens here could have very negative impacts on sections down the road including farther down where the actual bottlenecks occur on Broadway (which is Swan and East). Having people whip through one section who are going to hit a bottleneck may actually be more detrimental than having traffic slow throughout the whole process.

We would argue generally in terms of pedestrian and bicycle access and mobility that you need to incorporate the whole issue of destinations. Access doesn't make sense if there is nothing to go to; Diane made that reference a couple meetings ago. We had this discussion when we came up with the vision for Imagine Greater Tucson. Our category related to this, we made sure there was accessibility not just mobility. Having wide sidewalks and wide bike lanes with no place to go to really does not accomplish anything and I think that that would need to be incorporated. Walk-able destinations- we would suggest that this measure evaluates how the various scenarios or options report or reduce destinations on Broadway which should be included in the assessment.

Several of the options will remove most of the buildings on the North side of Broadway. From a qualitative perspective, it's not difficult to determine how the particular option will support the creation, maintenance and destinations on Broadway. In terms of transit travel and corridor travel time, I think that these need a lot of work; but we went through both thoroughly and clear what many of these measures were actually measuring. Are they measuring just transit? Or are they measuring all modes of transportation all together? It makes a large difference. I won't go through all the details but we had a lot of comments related to that. I do want to say though that looking at mobility (whether it's transit or vehicles) one tends to ignore the whole concept of induced demand in which there have been several studies done within the last ten years (essentially again induced demand is build it and they will come). If you build a wider road more people will come, you've especially got the dog chasing its tail or vise-versa. You end up having to widen it more, and spending more money and you still haven't accomplished

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.

anything; with a possible exception of making transit less viable. If you make it easier to drive people will not take transit.

In terms of sense of place, one visual quality is not defined. I would say that that definition really needs to be defined. That is definitely not a context neutral measurement. If you are in New York City what you consider a visually pleasing place would be different than if you were somewhere else. It's not just related to having a lot of trees and plants; you may not want a whole lot of those in an urban setting because that is what you are trying to create. Broadway is a destination, this measure relates to place making and any option with a reduction in land use is negative. I would suggest with this again, that the Coalition and many others have argued, including Doug Mance from the CART has argued, the one thing that we all agree on is that Broadway should be a destination. I think that you can make very intelligent reasonable assumptions about the various options and how they relate to Broadway as a destination.

In terms of gateway to downtown I was kind of surprised to see the widest option that has the widest right-of-way was given 2 plus signs (that was supposedly the best option for providing a gateway to downtown Tucson). We would argue that what you need to do is to discuss how the option relates to what is happening downtown and what is happening downtown is not the creation of wide arterials. Downtown is becoming a real destination with restaurants, entertainment and such and you can go even when it's not downtown Saturday night through lots of people running around downtown, even in the summer, it's really quite amazing that even in the summer it's great.

Walk-able communities conducive to businesses again, those options that reduce the ability of businesses to be viable is certainly not the word for a walk-able community. Walk-able community means that there is some place to walk to. There is a whole issue of certainty which one has nothing to do with sense of place. As previous slideshows show certainty was getting it right the first time. According to the chart, the option that does the best job is the one that is the widest. The only way that is the most certain is if you decide, because you will never be able to fix that. Again, in terms of land-use mixes and economic vitality we would argue that you can make judgments on those particularly if you are trying to create a place for Broadway.

Just a couple of other points if you can indulge me, one it appears that the existing condition is an option that assumes no changes. We believe that this is a mis-interpretation of what this option should be instead the option should assume that the existing roadway and right of way remains unchanged but improvements (including light rail) as shown in Gene's option should be evaluated. Given that, we would argue that option 4a which provides a right-of-way of 67 feet throughout probably should be eliminated. There is no portion on the Broadway Corridor that is as narrow as 67 feet it really is not a realistic assumption and it really doesn't really provide anything.

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.

Finally, we would suggest when the evaluation goes to the public that you reduce the number of options to about four. As I mentioned, I have done this before and there is no way that at a public meeting people who are only given an hour to incorporate all that you have done over the past several months will be able to incorporate and make intelligent decisions on anything more than four. It will be a disaster, anyway thank you for your time.”

Gene Caywood:

“Hi I’m Gene Caywood, with Southern Arizona Transit Advocates, and as you all know at the last meeting we presented our (what we call a constrained alternative which tries to fit two lanes of transit on Broadway into the least amount of space and widen only where there is stops). We got lots of good comments on that, thank you for those. And thank you to Rocco for asking if the concept could be evaluated. What I said last time was that at this meeting we would give you a different alternative, and that is to put the two transit lanes off of Broadway. So it’s on the back table like the other one was, please take a look at it. I’ll pass these around because we did the same thing. We did a design considerations page for you to look at, which is what we used in terms of putting that together. So I won’t make a lot of comments about it except to say that it provides an alignment basically north of Broadway and an alignment south of Broadway with each one having some alternate alignments. What it doesn’t show is an alignment along 6th street which we haven’t drawn up yet and maybe we will and maybe we won’t, if we can get to that. Anyway that is for your consideration and I thank you.

I still have at least a minute left, but I do have one more thing to say. Total change of subject, at the last meeting Joe made a comment at one point, to the affect I tried to write it down Joe, that we are obligated to restore the parking. And from an ethical standpoint or a moral standpoint I agree with that. I think if you are going to take someone’s parking, even if it’s in a wrong place and they have been using it for 20 years or something or 30 or 40 or 50 years. I think we should replace it. The reality is that I think it’s very difficult to do. I said this month’s ago and I will say it again, when I worked for Mike Johnson at, Johnson Brittman Associates, and we did a design for Campbell Avenue from Elm to Glenn. We spent a lot of time and effort creating new parking for parcels that would have their parking removed. Basically at the end of the exercise it was like well you really can’t do that and I think the reason that is difficult to do is that it seems like it’s not hard on the project to buy somebody’s land in order to put a parking lot in order to let people park on it. My conclusion out of that whole exercise and other committees I have been on over the years where parking has been a crucial issue, is that the only way you are going to resolve it is to form a parking district of some kind. That’s why I was going through Arizona revised statutes looking for some other information and I thought- Hey I’m gonna look up and see if there’s a parking district. So what I found was municipal improvement districts which include parking. I will give that to staff and they can pass that on if they want. But it seems to me, what the city ought to do in terms of parking situations like this, is they ought to help the people along the right of way to form an improvement district to provide the parking. Let’s not mistake the staff, your free to contradict me; I think that’s the only way that’s

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.

going to happen. We all have ideas but it's only going to happen if you have the mechanism to make it happen. Thank you."

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

Jenn Toothaker Burdick reviewed the Public Input Report with the CTF. The report consisted of documentation of public input received from May 21, 2013 through June, 9, 2013. There were no new updates regarding presentations and outreach.

4. Update and Discussion of Future Broadway Corridor High Capacity Transit Improvements

In October 2012, Carlos de Leon (then PAG/RTA Transit Services Director) gave a presentation to the CTF regarding planning work being done by Pima Association of Governments for future implementation of High Capacity Transit (HCT). During this presentation Carlos discussed the recommendations in the 2009 HCT study, which recommended Broadway as one of two roadways for near-term implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); additionally, Carlos provided an overview of what BRT is.

Last fall, staff at PAG worked with students and professionals at the University of Arizona to perform an initial, conceptual analysis of BRT on the entire 11-mile length of the Broadway Corridor. The intent of this analysis was to develop basic information that could immediately inform the planning and design work that the project team and CTF are undertaking for the two-mile study area, and to help their continuing BRT planning efforts. The presentation Carlos provided encompassed a review of the information presented last October, as well as the results of the conceptual analysis that was undertaken and how those results and related considerations can inform the Task Force's design decisions. The discussion that followed Carlos' presentation is summarized below.

CTF Questions and Comments

- You indicated that LA was fourth in the nation for new BRT ridership. Where are the new people coming from? Existing transit ridership or people new to mass transit?
- When making the switch to BRT with local busses running; what's the effect on cost to individuals? Will bus fare likely go up to pay for new system?
- Transit-oriented land use; is there an assumption that other types of vehicular traffic will divert to other roadways (due to changes in land use)?
- Are there any examples of decrease in ridership due to right-of-way acquisition eliminating existing businesses that formerly supported ridership, and; therefore, no longer a being destination?
- Curious in terms of context of rated pictures shown, for example San Francisco. It seems that the rating system is not looking at things in the same magnitude. Were the systems rated on a smaller right-of-way? Does BRT happen in a smaller scale or larger scale? For example on six or four lane configurations, or something even wider?

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.

Summarized Project Team Responses

- My guess that the system in L.A. pulled in a lot of existing transit riders, but that there was a large increase in new riders as well; for example, 50 percent of the ridership for the light rail system in Tempe came from new transit riders.
- Any time you have an increase in cost (to ride) to the transit system a task force will be formed to ensure that the costs are equitable. The goal would be to have a seamless system with fares being the same on local route busses as well as the BRT system.
- In regard to transit oriented land use design and planning I will defer to land use modeling; however, the mode split inspired by this would depend on the type of land use. Intuitively if you had development around a stop station that allowed you to get to desired destination without the use of a car it would lower the vehicular traffic volume.
- There was an early issue with the rebirth of light rail and the projected ridership numbers. Early models were much too optimistic and the ridership numbers fell short of the projected numbers. Now the FTA requires a different, more conservative, approach to modeling and new transit systems often exceed the ridership numbers.
- This project will change the character of the entire corridor.
- The reduction of on street parking is usually a larger issue than right-of-way acquisition in terms of businesses leaving the area. There are not many examples I can think of where mass transit ridership is affected by right-of-way acquisition, most mass transit systems try and fit into the existing right-of-way.
- In regard to the magnitude of the BRT systems in America it really varies in term of the width of the roadway. Some utilize smaller roadways and some operate in larger cross sections, and some have their own dedicated right-of-way. However, there is not an example of a BRT system operating in an eight lane roadway in America, there are a few examples of this in Brazil.

5. Review Cross Sections and Performance Assessments, and Potentially Endorse a Representative set of them to move forward into review by the Stakeholder Agencies

Project team member, Phil Erickson, first, walked the Task Force through a detailed discussion of the planning and design process and how the project has built the performance measures based off of the needs and desires that have been identified by the Task Force. The project team then presented a revised analysis of the cross section concepts presented at the May 21, May 23, and May 30, 2013 CTF meetings utilizing the performance measures that were presented at these previous meetings as well. This revised analysis reflects comments and recommendations made by both the Task Force and the public and also takes into consideration the design concept that was presented to the Task Force by Gene Caywood of the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. In addition to the revised analysis of 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.RTA mobility.com.

performance measures the project team presented a new table to the Task Force that showed the individual goal items and linked them to the related performance measures. Following this presentation the Task Force broke up into small groups to analyze the revised assessment and discuss potential concerns and revisions to the performance assessments. The group exercise was guided by the following questions:

- What assessments or concepts do not make sense to you or your stakeholders?
- Are there changes that could be made to the performance measure definitions or assessments that would make more sense?
- What additional information or clarification would be helpful?

Following the group activity the Task Force reported out and presented their concerns and consideration to the project team. The goal of this process was to help the CTF come to a consensus as to what cross sections options to move forward into review by Stakeholder Agencies in preparation to be presented to the public at the September, 2013 Community-Wide meeting. The project will take the CTF input into consideration and come back to them at the July 25, 2013 meeting with further revisions to the performance assessments. The discussion that followed the group activity is summarized below.

Overview

CTF Questions and Comments

- I am concerned about going to public with nine concepts. They seem to “sit in space” and are not tied to any specific context or place on the roadway. What will these nine concepts convey? It is hard for me to think about them and I feel it is wise to think in terms of the conceptual elements. I recommend taking less than nine to the public meeting.
- Is laying out the priorities (selected concepts) on a map and allowing the public to apply the concepts to the entire roadway of any value at this point?
- Prior to next meeting, is there anyway, we as the CTF can reduce the number of concept options going to the public? I don't want to see this many at the Public Meeting.
- This discussion is confusing because different families and concepts apply differently on different parts of the roadway. The terms are confusing and make it hard for me visualize things. It would help me to understand what will constitute that one concept (recommended concept for street design) at the end. We need to define the families and concepts and what will vary.

Summarized Project Team Responses

- That is what we are trying to reach consensus on - what exactly to take into further analysis; but I feel it is important to take all of the options to the public to garner their input. As we have stated before, what we come up with in the end needs to be defensible and showing that we fully analyzed a variety options bolsters the defense for our preferred option. This is an

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.

- iterative process and will require whittling down all of the options to the one we recommend and this process is very important to the outcome.
- To a degree laying out all of the options on a map and applying them to the existing roadway would be valuable; but, because we are not looking at intersections or alignment it could be very deceiving. The spreadsheet tool we provided you with shows how each concept fits within the existing right-of-way and what the possible impacts could be, this is more valuable at this point. However, on the segment map we provided you with we did give you tools to scale and we could draw in the concepts to show how they would work.
 - There is no need to reduce the amount of concepts at this point but if there is good enough reason provided we can look into it.
 - The only alignment option that is out there is to use the south side of the roadway and take everything on the north. A more detailed analysis is forthcoming once we have more information and consensus on some of these options we are presenting to you. We need more time.
 - At the end of the day the alignment, intersection design, and the detail of the pedestrian environment and landscaping would set a preliminary right-of-way. When we say “design concept” it means the full plan of how the roadway will look - it is all of the elements that will take us to a fairly complete conceptual design. When we say “family,” what is varying is the number of lanes and what their function is, through lanes, etc. Eventually, we will even look at continuity and provide options for potentially breaking it and mixing and matching. But first, we need an alignment and an intersection design to evaluate through VISSIM technology.

Small Group Report Out

CTF Questions and Comments

- Performance measures reflect individual cross-sections; this is problematic and confusing. The performance measures will change if the cross-section changes. How do we convey that? This needs to be resolved prior to taking this to the public.
- Even though bus rapid transit is likely to be included; it is hard sell to business owners due to the wider right-of-way acquisition; unless I can justify this because the data will show an ability to maintain or increase customers - I need that data.
- 6+T(A and B) - leave in the mix. Although I am uncomfortable with larger cross sections, leave now as we need data to support and build our case.
- What will we ask the public at the public meeting? To choose a concept/cross-section? To give feedback in general? More advanced feedback? Feedback regarding the mix?
- In the concepts we have the roadway and then the elements on the sides of the roadway, outside of the right-of-way - how do we measure these independently; how do we capture that?

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

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

- We need to consider creating a new performance measure that speaks to the character of corridor and the streetscape to help define it beyond what the buildings are. Please provide something to capture that focus.
- We need to be open to all feedback from the public; it will probably surprise us what we will hear, and they may bring up things we may not have thought of.
- Assumptions need to be articulated at the public meeting, for example Economic Development (not being able to measure/evaluate it) because of not knowing what redevelopment might happen and other unknowns.
- Distilling (explaining) cross-sections: present minimum example (no landscape... bare minimum) to maximum examples that are more general (vs a specific location) as a starting point to demonstrate the cross-section concepts and how they are being developed. We can build upon this foundation. We need to simplify things.

The Task Force also provided written comments to the performance assessment charts they reviewed during the group exercise, these comments are listed below:

Transcribed Written Feedback

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Definition of terms: use cross-section not concept. Concept for final design recommendation.
- High Capacity Transit: Important to include dedicated lanes. Can flex along corridor.
- 174' does not make sense in context of sense of place, Broadway as destinations not context sensitive.
- Transit definition in notes: Clarify why transit lanes would reduce through traffic movement/efficiency.
- Cross-Section Concept Options 4+TA, 4+TB -?s
- Option 6+TB -(174'row)=Minimum

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND MOBILITY:

1g. Universal Design

- Measurement: use-ability, access, (indirect left?)

BICYCLE ACCESS AND MOBILITY:

2a. Separation of Bikes and Arterial Traffic

- Bike conflicts with vehicles accessing businesses is most important.

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.

TRANSIT ACCESS AND MOBILITY:

3c. Corridor Travel Time

- Transit only

VEHICULAR ACCESS AND MOBILITY:

- Rank all grey qualitatively for the time being.
- Options 4+TA, 4+TB- would have greater improvement on traffic than what is portrayed.

SENSE OF PLACE:

5b. Visual Quality:

- Question rating- does not seem to match
- Definition missing
- Factors expanded to include character and land use

5d. Gateway to Downtown:

- More than mobility, take in character and transition to downtown
- Ratings ignore community character aspects. Ratings based largely on traffic flow. Community character isn't coming through, especially bicyclist and pedestrian experience.

5g. Certainty:

- Comes out of Sense of Place, or if it stays, captures what we know will be there in the future. Flush out future and redevelopment definition.

ENVIRONMENTAL/PUBLIC HEALTH:

- Heat Island and Water Harvesting not very dependent but they will be.

6c. Heat Island

- Heat island neighborhood and business concern that high albedo (reflective) pavement is noisier. Need to be mindful of noise buffers if used in design. Need to clarify.
- 0 rating: 1 ft shade not equal. Need multiple feet of shade to compensate.

6d. Water Harvesting

- Re-evaluate to ensure matches
- --- rating: All landscape not equivalent. Needs to be landscape-driven/connected.

ECONOMIC VITALITY:

- Grey areas - need to capture impact. Big public concern.
- Uncertainty due to acquisition. Still need to capture short vs long term (impacts)

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.

6. Considerations for September Public Meeting #3 (please note this item took place after agenda item 7, Second Call to the Audience)

Project Manager, Jenn Toothaker, and project team member, Phil Erickson, led the CTF through a discussion of considerations for the September Public Meeting #3. Jenn reiterated to the Task Force that the task related goals would be to present the initial Draft Cross Section Concepts, performance measures, and the assessment of the concepts; as well as, to obtain public input on what cross sections, performance measures and evaluation criteria to move into the next stage of analysis. Additionally, the project team presented the process of how cross sections, performance measures, and assessments would be distilled into focused categories for presentation to the public at the September meeting. It was presented that the cross section concepts would be distilled into four, focused, functional families with variations on organization and design elements within the functional families; and, the performance measures would be compiled into combined measures. During this presentation the project team sought feedback from the CTF as how best to structure the small group activity. Listed below is a summary of the discussion that ensued following the brief presentation.

CTF Questions and Comments

- Are we going to ask the public to hit certain families? What are we exactly asking of them at the public meeting?
- Based on what our group talked about with community character, my hope is that you consider at least having a new measure that talks about those things; specifically, for example, what does it mean to have street-side character?
- Are we asking them to choose, or are we asking them to just give feedback on them in general?
- How do we define measures, independently or separately, within the right-of-way versus outside of the right-of-way?
- It seems like one of the things that hasn't always been articulated going into the public meeting, is that assumptions, from the public (that I have heard) are that widening will have a negative economic impact because it will take businesses out of the corridor.
- I would like to suggest coming up with something that is a little bit more general for the public. I think the way that this is set up (the revised performance assessment chart) because it lays everything out for us and it shows all of the families, but I think it is also one step too advanced for the public. I like what my fellow CTF member has said regarding transit and how

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.

he saw some of the options being unattractive. Can we start with less and then later show more?

Summarized Project Team Responses

- There is flexibility in the right-of-way and if you look at the performance measures we cannot evaluate economic vitality or anything outside of the right-of-way. We still feel we cannot evaluate these items at this time; however, there may be a way to do an initial evaluation. It depends on what you mean by economic vitality - preserving versus maximizing. A lot of this comes down to the potential for positive change to improve economic vitality, and what that comes down to is near term versus long term development. Without getting to a discussion of the alignment and the adjacent properties you are grabbing out of thin air for an economic vitality analysis. We will need to continually come back to this.
- The road widening will not necessarily remove all businesses from the impacted areas. It depends on the impact to the property. There may be many options for redevelopment of partial acquisitions or new development of businesses in areas where it is applicable.
- Would it be easier if we provided a diagram of the concepts that simply says landscape, instead of the particular type of landscape? We could also provide diagrams of the individual elements - kind of an a la carte design menu.

7. Second Call to the Audience (please note that this item took place before item 6, Considerations for September Public Meeting #3)

Four (4) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Gene Caywood:

“Thank you. I just want to remind you all that again we talked in the first call to audience about the off Broadway alternative that we put together and it’s on the back table. I will stay overtime as long as anyone wants to talk. I thought Carlos gave a really good presentation and I really appreciate most of it with the exception of a little bit of it. Overall, it was really good and I thought it was really informative. I wanted to make a couple comments on it. The first one is: I thought the travel time comparison resulted from extension level modeling and was fascinating in that BRT put in the right location and the right way could save 15 minutes out of basically a 45 minute trip. That’s extremely significant in terms of attracting riders to transit and so I think that’s kind of the direction in general that the corridor should aim for. How it applies specifically to the two miles you guys are studying now that’s another issue. Second thing I want to mention, was that Carlos talked under his considerations on implementation of BRT about additional

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.

planning needed to select a preferred alternative and I hope by that he was talking about the whole corridor because in my opinion you guys are doing a detailed amount of planning for this two miles. You guys ought to come up with a solution for this two miles and that ought to be the final solution because I don't think the public and you, bus, and transit people or anybody else, wants to be left out there hanging wondering what somebody else is going to decide two years or five years from now whenever they get around to finding some money and doing a study for the overall corridor. It seems to me that this study ought to be the final study for the corridor. He said that there's no project funding; project funding does not include money to implement BRT, but it can support facilities construction that works today and could be to accommodate BRT in the future. It seems to me that that statement sort of contradicts his additional planning statement because if you don't decide now what you're going to build then how's it going to accommodate transit in the future? So I think you have to decide now what you're gonna do with transit in this two miles, and then you have to build something that will accommodate it either now, if we could find the money, or in the future.

And that leads me to the money thing which he also indicated that the funding source and the commitment to operations and maintenance cost is a key consideration and he is absolutely right about that and I agree 100% and that is something that the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates have committed themselves to work on, is the improvement of financing transit over a longer term. Last thing I would like to comment on, was on his 'next steps' he mentioned the comprehensive occupational analysis which the city is going to do (and also pursuing initiating an application for federal small starts) and I just wanna say that based on our experience with the Streetcar, I think that's absolutely the wrong way to go. If you want to stretch a project out and increase your costs by 40 to 50 percent and take 10 years to do it then go apply for some federal money because that's what happened to streetcar. By the time they get started next spring or next summer, we will have been almost a few months from 10 years of working on it and it's absolutely ridiculous and unconscionable for a four mile streetcar. I mean it just is, there is no way you can get around it we don't need the federal money given all the regulations and given extra amount of costs to use their' money and to follow all their' rules. We need a local funding source, and need to decide what we are going to do... and do it."

Laura Tabili:

"I'm really sorry to prolong this meeting, but I did have some things first of all to hand out. In fact, I have four points and the first one is that, I just Xeroxed some pages from the major streets and road plan. I need to keep one for myself so I can read the points I highlighted. I made enough for the task force and just some extra

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.

so the audience could have them too. This is the major streets and road plans. You can Google it (I could send it also) but it's the Tucson one. On page 12, I've highlighted in green up here, it says, "effects on neighborhoods and historic districts shall be considered in determining the impacts of street widening, new transportation routes, reclassification of streets, such projects shall be sensitive to and compatible with the specific neighborhoods and historic districts they pass through and serve." So that's city policy and then the other one is page 20 and that one says, "landscaping of gateway roads should be required using the following guidelines: Landscaped medians shall be provided except, where the road passes through or adjacent to a historic area and the width of the roadway would intrude on the character of historic structures etc." So in other words, you don't have to have medians. Some of these streetscapes have (I think the narrowest one has three feet) that's probably not going to be a big intrusion; but, when you have a big hunk of median in the middle of the road that's two lanes wide, that's going to really enhance the width worse than the width of the roadway (since I don't consider it an enhancement). You don't have to put a median in and you can ask for a waiver. So my first point is: no median (or minimize the width of the median).

My second point is: to add some illustrative material. Mark spoke at length about the ways some of these measures of quality (and I'm so glad it's up here because obviously I can't paint mine big enough) are wrong basically. Speaking as a pedestrian, I want to talk specifically to the measurement of pedestrian quality here. According to my, and I cheated I looked at the prototypical segments so that I could distinguish the western and eastern sides of the project area and according to what I can figure out, everything from option '4c' down, has to take the built environment off the north side of the street. If it does then all these pluses must be minuses because as a pedestrian that completely obliterates my reason for walking down the street when there are no destinations. So as far as I can see from option '4c' down, at least from west of Campbell and option '4+tb' down east of Campbell, all of these pluses down here need to be made into minuses.

My fourth point is: I don't have anything to illustrate this, but one of the big problems is the congestion at Campbell intersection and actually this was pointed out on the magic bus tour by Steve Eddy who I guess has left us since. One of the major problems with the congestion at the Campbell intersection is that Safeway put their gas drive thru in such a way that, and Leslie pointed this out too Leslie Pierce, that there's a tail back into Campbell and onto Broadway at the intersection (of people waiting to get gas). And then Starbucks who's allowed to put that store there just in the last few years, the tail back of people stopping to get their morning caffeine, also tails back into Broadway. If those two stupid drive-

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.

thrus were eliminated, that would eliminate a lot of congestion at that intersection, that and a turn bay. So I'm done."

James Angel:

"I guess some of the points made by the last speaker, I was going to cover as well; looking at both the 'tb' options, both of those have ridiculous medians of landscaping. They both have two 10 foot medians on either side of the road for BRT and two 16 foot landscapes separating traffic from the 8 foot sidewalks on each side. That's 52 ft of landscaping and sidewalks, which is crazy! I looked around and I looked at some examples of where center lane transit has been implemented. I looked at Central Avenue in Phoenix and I looked at the tracks up in Salt Lake City and nowhere is the width of the roadway (and Salt Lake City where I looked at it on University is '6+t' and Central avenue they are '4+t'. Nowhere was the right-of-way anywhere close to 170 feet. I was a little encouraged because I originally looked at these and I was in dismay that how unattractive the transit options had been made by ruling out this other stuff where in some of the other options its opulent you have a 6 foot sidewalk, 8 feet of landscape and desert shade trees. So you have multiple variables that you are varying at the same time so you're including with the transit, your including these massive landscape stretches that kind of skew it and make the transit look incredibly unattractive. I mean who's going to want a 170 ft. right-of-way. No one wants that. So I think to restrict your cross-section for your 'tb' options, you were kind of discussing: well you should just put one in there, make it hideous so everyone will agree that this is horrible and dismiss it. I think that's a terrible idea. I think really, I don't know if you've done this, I asked one of your members at the last public input meeting what use cases you considered if you looked at Central, if you looked at tracks, if you looked Portland where the max is going through similar leader of an area, and it sounded like the answer is no. So I think that maybe more time should be spent analyzing where this has been done, what has the impact been on businesses like Rocco's? Ask them about that. What are some numbers? What can I tell people?

I mean I know that University in Salt Lake City (I lived there for a couple years) it isn't a very vital street. I mean it wasn't maybe 130 ft. there. I went on Google maps and just measured it and they all have 20 ft. of landscaping on the side of the street. It's like businesses are sort of part of the landscape. You don't need the trees and if you did have the trees you basically only see trees and then off in the distance businesses would be there, you wouldn't really notice them. You know what I was also thinking about, I lived in San Francisco for a few years as well (which is maybe why I am such a fan of transit). I lived right on walk, off Visidaro St. there and it kind of reminds of the character of the businesses along Visidaro, it reminds me of parts of Broadway. I think that if you push the roadway to near 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.RTA mobility.com.

businesses it would be something like that. You would walk by businesses. So I think the loss of parking would be offset by increased visibility of your business would be right there. People driving, biking, walking by would be able to see, those people along those places (I need to check this place out you know). As it is now, there's 30ft of asphalt between you and Rocco's and if you're driving you know you're just going where you're going. Anyway I guess that's pretty much it."

Ruth Beeker:

"As usual I am concerned about the public meeting and I don't really know if you are going to be ready to have it when you're going to do it. There are two things I'm really having an issue about seeing here. One, I would like to support what Colby said referring to what you're asking everybody to look at, which is cross sections. There should not be the mention of the word families or concepts if you're going to have a public meeting and expect that the people there are going to know what you're talking about. We all know what landscape is, we all know what sidewalks are, we all know what traffic lanes are, we know what bike lanes are; but I think we don't know what the width is that we have to consider if you were going to be putting these together? But to begin to talk about families and so on, only confuses the matter that you're talking about.

The second thing is, I would strongly recommend that in your planning that you do what you did the last time when we had a public meeting where each of you had the opportunity to share with what it was you had heard and what you had learned from that public meeting. I think that's enormously valuable for you and for the public who are there to hear it. I heard (I wasn't there) but people told me the best part of the whole evening was to have that closure for that meeting and I would strongly recommend that you do that whenever you decide is the appropriate time for that."

8. Next Steps/Roundtable

During the Next Steps/Roundtable Project Manager, Jenn Toothaker, asked the task force if they wanted to schedule an early meeting in August to allow the project team and task force more time to reach a consensus on the materials needed to present at the public meeting in September. Jenn stated that there is a strong possibility that the Task Force and project team may not be ready for the public meeting to be held on September 5, 2013, the currently planned date, and that the task force should be open to possibly pushing the date back. The task force nodded in agreement to this and one comment was made:

- I would like to try to make the September meeting work. I think we should schedule the August meeting with the hopes that we can cover everything

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.

that we need to at the July meeting. This way it is on everyone's calendar, and if we can't cover everything that we need to in July, well then we will still have the August meeting and then we will be ready for the public meeting in September.

Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 9:18 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.

**SOUTHERN ARIZONA TRANSIT ADVOCATES
BROADWAY CORRIDOR STUDY
DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR OFF BROADWAY ALTERNATIVES**

This drawing is SATA's attempt at showing how and where alignments could be created for High Capacity Transit (HCT) in locations other than right on Broadway. This goal was achieved for most of the two miles under study except east of Tucson Boulevard.

- An alignment along Broadway was not shown on this drawing but it was assumed that where an alternative is shown entering Broadway it would be continued in a fashion similar to that shown on the SATA Constrained Alternative.
- A goal of no buildings demolished was achieved.
- Use of existing parking lots was considered acceptable under the assumption that parking could be provided elsewhere so that use of the existing building on the property remains viable.
- Existing right-of-way was used as much as possible, but these alternatives require large amounts of additional right-of-way. Offsetting that however, is the fact that the right-of-way taken is mostly away from Broadway and thus should be less expensive than widening along Broadway.
- The Arroyo Chico alignment shown is very approximate as topo of the drainage basins and park recently constructed was not available.
- The Arroyo Chico alignment shown may require large amounts of earth work in places or costly elevated structures.
- The alignments shown were designed to accommodate any mode of HCT.
- 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.
- 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.
- The drawing used did not show parcel boundaries off Broadway. Therefore summing resultant Right-of-Way impacts by parcel count was not possible.

MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS

ARTICLE 1: OPENING, WIDENING AND CLOSING PUBLIC WAYS

PARKING

48-503. Off-street parking sites in cities; acquisition of property; exceptions to acquisition of property

A. When the public interest or convenience requires, the city or town council of such municipality may order the laying out, opening, extending, widening, straightening or closing up, in whole or in part, of any off-street parking site within the municipality, and acquire any property necessary or convenient for that purpose, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain.

B. If in connection with any lot or parcel within a proposed assessment district, adequate off-street parking facilities have been provided, such lot or parcel shall be excluded from the assessment district and shall not be assessed for such improvements if within the time and in the manner provided in section 48-507 the owner or owners file a written protest. For the purposes of this subsection in cities having a zoning code or ordinance, such off-street parking facilities shall not be deemed adequate unless the off-street parking facilities provided meet or exceed the requirements of the zoning code or ordinance for a lot or parcel of that size in that zone...

48-504. Exceptions to taking of property

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 48-503, if a natural person or persons own a business building and the land on which same is located which is not sought to be taken and operates a business therein within the proposed district, additional land owned by such person contiguous to the business building containing an area equal to or less than the area occupied by such building shall not be subject to taking by eminent domain without the consent of the owner for the purposes of section 48-503, provided the owner has operated such business on such land for at least one year prior to the adoption of the resolution of intention. The owner shall designate in writing to the council the description of the area which shall not be subject to taking within fifteen days after receiving a written request from the council. In the event the owner fails to designate such area within such fifteen days, then the council by resolution may designate the area to be taken.

48-520. Written assessment

A. The street superintendent shall make the assessment in writing, describing each lot, piece or parcel of land assessed for the improvement, designating each with a number, and shall also designate each lot, piece or parcel of land on the diagram with the same number. The diagram shall thereupon be attached to and become a part of the assessment.

B. The assessment shall show the total sum to be raised thereby, as provided in this article, and the items of the total sum, and opposite each lot, piece or parcel of land assessed the amount assessed thereon and the name of the owner thereof, if known to the street superintendent, or if unknown, the word "unknown" shall be written instead of the name.

C. An error or mistake in the designation of the owner of a lot, piece or parcel of land, or of his interest therein, shall not affect the validity of the assessment.

48-525. Notice that assessments are due; payment; delinquent assessments

A. The street superintendent shall, upon recording the assessment, give notice by publication for at least two days in a daily newspaper, published and circulated in the municipality, or by at least two successive insertions in a weekly newspaper so published and circulated.

B. The notice shall state:

1. That the assessment has been recorded in his office.
2. That all sums assessed therein are due and payable immediately.
3. The date of the first publication of notice.
4. That payment thereof shall be made to him within thirty days thereafter.
5. That all assessments not paid before the expiration of the thirty days will become delinquent, and that thereupon five per cent upon the amount of each assessment will be added thereto.

C. The street superintendent shall also notify the owners of the several lots, pieces and parcels of land affected by the assessment, as shown by the assessment rolls of the city or town, by mailing a copy of the notice to the last known address of such persons, and the affidavit of the street superintendent of the mailing shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

D. When payment for any assessment is made, the street superintendent shall mark opposite the assessment the word "paid," the date of payment, and the name of the person by or for whom the assessment is paid, and give receipt therefor.

E. On the expiration of thirty days, all assessments then unpaid shall become delinquent, and the street superintendent shall certify that fact at the foot of the assessment roll, and mark each such assessment "delinquent," and add five per cent to the amount of each assessment delinquent.

48-543. Sale of bonds; disposition of proceeds

A. Improvement bonds issued under this article may be sold to the highest cash bidder, after advertising for bids by publication at least three times in a daily newspaper published and circulated in the city or town, or if there is no daily newspaper, then once in a weekly or semiweekly newspaper so published and circulated.

POLICY 4

Provide a street network that meets the needs of the community in the southeast sector and that is sensitive to the topography and natural environment.

IMPLEMENTATION

- A. Align major streets in a manner that limits wash crossings.
- B. Approve wash crossings on a case by case basis to assure minimal impacts and proper mitigation.
- C. Align Vail Vista Road as close to the top of the ridge of the Pantano Wash bluffs to ensure sufficient width for the planned Pantano Riverpark identified in *the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails* element of the City's *General Plan* and the *Eastern Pima County Trail System Master Plan*.
- D. Condition rezonings to limit wash crossing to arterial streets.
- E. Assure continuity and coordination of City and County *MS&R Plans*.
- F. Connect Vail Vista Road with Poorman Road and Rocket Road.
- G. Align Old Vail Road east from Houghton Road to Vail Valley Ranch with the existing wastewater easement.

POLICY 5

Further the goals for scenic and gateway routes through public actions and monitoring of development regulations.

IMPLEMENTATION

- A. Development Guidelines for Public Improvements of Gateway Routes

All improvements within the public right-of-way should comply with the following guidelines:

- 1. Landscaping of gateway routes should be required using the following guidelines:
 - a. Landscaped medians shall be provided on routes of more than four through lanes, ~~except~~ where the route passes through or adjacent to a historic area and the width of the roadway would intrude on the character of historic structures, or at bridges, grade separations, or other structures where a landscaped median is not feasible.