



Draft Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE

August 22, 2013

5:30 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

MEETING RESULTS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements

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

Citizen Task Force Members

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

*Please note that Dale Calvert and Naomi Mclsaac replaced Farhad Moghimi and Elizabeth Scott respectively.

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:

Margot Garcia:

Good evening. I want to take 10 seconds and please invite all of you to transportation 101 you are here because you are interested in transportation and this is a Karin Uhlich award pre-office sponsor as a result of comments made at a neighborhood symposium last spring. Transportation 101- How does transportation work? It is being put on by a combination of Jim Degrood (RTA) and Jenn. They will be some of the speakers and these are people who have been working on this, so I hope that you will come I think it's an opportunity to begin a broader discussion to the community. So my comments tonight:

As you move into the 3rd public meeting, I am very concerned about one aspect of that meeting. What are you going to tell the public? What are the task force vision and goals for the project? How can you present performance criteria and be evaluating cross sections when you don't have a finalized idea of what you are trying to achieve?

I went back through the meeting summaries to try and resolve this issue and I found that at the April 18th meeting a statement was made that this was going to be a finalized draft of the vision and goals statement and they remain draft so the task force could alter them making it an iterate process. That baffles me, because that means that each of you members have a vision in your head of what you are working toward, but it has not been agreed to by the whole group. I came upon the revised June 10, 2013 version (which as far as I can tell is the latest version). The vision statement is consistent. Then on the next page, the material is organized by goal topic, potential goal topic, goal statement and related performance measures. The potential goal statement column may have 2 or 3 suggested goal statements which differ in tone and emphasis and in some cases can be contradictory. For example, on page 4 "protect adjacent neighborhoods," the choices for goal statements are:

-protect all contributing structures for existing of potential NRHP historic destinations

- protect best examples of contributing structures to existing potential NRHP historic designations

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.

- or to the extent feasible if needed transportation and other improvements along Broadway protect the best examples contributing to structures to existing and potential NRHR historic district designations while maintaining the viability of the historic district

So, if a member of the public asks you, "what is your goal for protecting adjacent neighborhoods?" Are you going to tell them: you will protect all contributing structures, the best examples of contributing structures, or whatever is left over after the street design? This is not the only area where there are three contradictory messages; look at page 7 on vehicular traffic through mobility. Is the goal to improve vehicular mobility through any means other than widening the roadway? Or is it to improve vehicular mobility while minimizing widening the roadway? Or is it to increase the capacity of Broadway to accommodate future growth and through traffic and commute traffic? And my own parenthesis- even as PAG consultants and that other consultant did on the growth, they keep getting revised down. Sorry, but I think you have a real problem keeping the trust of the public when you don't have a consistent set of goal statements. When do you intend to finalize it?

JD Garcia:

Good evening, my name is JD Garcia, and I am a member of the Broadway Coalition and I represent the El Encanto neighborhood. I have a letter here from Chuck Huckleberry, the Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Authority. The letter is dated May 3, 2012. The subject of the letter is: "Broadway Corridor Improvements Regional Transportation Authority Project #17." The letter goes on to say, this letter is to provide you with information. Please feel free to distribute this correspondence as necessary. The last page reads the Broadway Boulevard project appears to have taken on a life of its own. Council member Kozachik's press release, quoted from my report, and I stand by those statements (my comment on page 18). It makes little sense to force the original scope of transportation improvements where they are clearly outdated or unnecessary. Reducing the size and scope of transportation improvements not only saves money, but is more responsive to community needs and desires. Simply means, that if the travel forecast originally prepared for an RTA project is substantially overstated, and indicates that fewer capacity improvements are necessary to meet the goal of functionality to the project as envisioned in the plan, then it would be reasonable and logical to build only what is actually necessary as demonstrated by an acceptable scientific method of engineering analysis. Such an analysis is up to the lead agency (which is the City of Tucson) subject to verification by the RTA; therefore, I do not understand why project objections have been directed to the RTA. These objections should be directed to the City. In fact, given all 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.RTAmobility.com.

controversy associated with the Broadway project it would be my recommendation as chair of the RTA technical management committee that (except for present planning process) the Broadway project should be placed on hold until the city decides through their deliberation and their directing body on how to proceed with 6 lanes vs. 8 lanes. The city's decision should then be submitted to a standing CART subcommittee and the Citizen's Task Force for further review and recommendation on the RTA's approval process. Only the City of Tucson can determine the size and scope of the project and justify any downsizing to the RTA. So I will leave a copy of this letter with Jenn.

Laura Tabili:

First of all, I want to draw people's attention if they don't know that Rocco's Pizza made the Arizona Daily Star final for best pizza. That is the happy part. I have to say that I looked at the website to see the new cross-widths and I was puzzled. The first thing is that, the new revised cross-widths still don't show where the properties are currently. I thought that I heard task force members ask for that last time; and specifically, I thought that I heard task force members ask for that to definitely be on those cross-widths and at the public meeting. I think that tonight is the night when the task force has to make sure that those are going to start re-appearing on the cross-widths. They were on the prototype cross-widths, and then disappeared again. I really don't think that the public can have a clear idea of what the impact is going to be at those different cross-widths, if the properties are not shown. It looks like a tabula rasa, so I was kind of puzzled by that; but, I'm sure the task force can sort that out (but it would have to happen tonight because there are no more meetings before the public meeting).

The second thing that puzzled me is that some of the cross-widths actually got wider and they seem to have gotten wider because really the bike lanes were added (which is a good thing, right)? You want safe bike lanes so that more people will bicycle. It was represented in the report and you guys correct me, but the task force asked for this stuff to be added and yet I don't think that I heard any of the task force say make these cross-widths wider. I think that is something that really puzzles me.

I just want to say that the third thing (and Jonathan Mabry is here so he can speak to this better than I can) but you can't have a historic district when you have eliminated most of the historic buildings. You have to have at least 51% of your buildings historic in order to have a historic district. The map (or the sheet) that shows which properties will be affected, it shows that almost all the cross-widths are going to take down a huge number of historic buildings (all except the SATA one

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.

(which got cut off here). So again, if a huge number of historic buildings go, then there won't be a historic district. Thank you.

Rob McLane:

I live a block south of Broadway and two blocks west of Kino and I have two young children. We have lots of young children (more and more families) moving into the neighborhood and I feel like Kino is a good example of how a large road with high speed limits creates a barrier. I am going to feel very nervous about my children as they get older exploring independence in whatever ways that they do crossing Kino. Even with the cross walk there, no one pays attention to it. And with the light, half of the time, they go through it. If Broadway gets any bigger it's going to be the same thing, and we are going to be hemmed in by two large roads unless there is very specific and intentional action taken to make Broadway crossable (lights/pedestrians). I mean maybe children shouldn't be crossing roads by themselves; but at some point they do, and your children can't stay tethered to you all their life, so it worries me to think about another Kino right there.

I also feel like it's transportation in the wrong direction and there is more space for cars instead of more space for other forms of transport. It sounds like maybe there is an addition to cars making space for bikes, but most things you see (and I am not an expert but when I look at what's going on around); you build a road, then you make it wider and then it continues to fill up with cars. Nothing changes as far as safety goes, or less cars, or less congestion. It just fills up with cars again. I think we need to focus on how to make transport better and not just widen roads.
Thanks.

Marc Fink:

Most of you know me, my name is Marc Fink. For the two new people who are residents of Sam Hughes I live three blocks from here and it's great to have meetings here when I can walk. I am a member of the Broadway Coalition and I am also a professional land use planner. I was a professional land use planner for over 30 years, and I have recently retired, but I am still doing it and this is what I have done for a living. There are two things that I want to talk about.

One, at the last meeting it was stated by the design team that actually the projections being used for the analysis have declined by 20-30%. If I heard right, statements also made are that projections may also even be lowered again. So that brings up the question of what are you even designing the road for? What are you doing and how wide should the road be? To look at performance measures without answering that question is really beside the point and it makes no sense to build a road that you don't need any more, than it makes to build sewer lines that are too

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.

big, or water lines that are too big or whatever. I think that is a discussion that you need to have and I think that you need to have it before you have a public meeting.

The second thing that I want to talk about again, it relates back to the goals and vision of the draft goals and vision. Yes it is true that some of the goals are somewhat contradictory. There are a whole lot of goals (I would say about 80-90% of them) that are actually really are contradictory. A lot of them deal with the stake that you want to maintain the existing context of Broadway, in terms of how it feels as a destination (and also in terms of it being a place of local independent businesses). Those are the goals that when you read them, that you see. Last meeting, you heard "well, we can develop parcels and sometimes they can be viable and you can do them on properties not buildings (and you can do them on properties that are 65 feet deep." Well, I would suggest that if your goal is to maintain and enhance the existing context of Broadway then destroying buildings and looking at remnant parcels by definition contradicts that goal. Any of those options probably that are 104 feet of right of way or wider will destroy businesses. It would be kind of neurotic that you find out that Rocco's has made the semi-finals for the pizza tasting and if you widen the road too wide then you will wipe out his business. What does it say about a community that does that? Even if you look at this idea of 65 feet, I would argue what are you even really creating because to create 65 foot parcels just means that the building will be less because even if you have shared parking you still need to have room for stores, for trashcans, for loading/unloading and all these sorts of things. You are looking to build buildings probably 50-55 feet. What kind of businesses are you going to have with a 150 foot right of way? Just to give you a little perspective (and this is the last thing that I wanted to say) if you look at some of the buildings on 4th Avenue the buildings are anywhere from 100 and 120 feet deep and then there is probably about 30 feet of space behind them. On Broadway- some of these buildings that you might think are small; for example Feezy's is 77 feet (I measured it today) (and these are buildings not parcels). No such thing on Broadway, our business is just a converted house, which is 70 feet deep. So what are you really going to do with these parcels? Thank you.

Bob Cook:

I just wanted to report on the last CART committee that happened in the end of July. The agenda called for a discussion in the Broadway Corridor Project (and I was the person to speak); I try to put a positive spin on what we are doing here. I talked about my reporting to the RTA, with the RTA plan being a transformative plan (probably the most transformative) and how this project itself has transformative elements. I tried to point out that compared to some of the other corridor projects; this particular corridor project has seen a major outreach between the Coalition

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.

and the task force. I think that this idea speaks to the fact that we are considering (in this RTA project) a much deeper and more significant range of criteria, and the value of criteria (not just one criteria or two criteria). With that significance, I just want to applaud your efforts to take this step and venture into a new dimension of smart planning. So thank you.

One of the things I didn't focus on in my talk (and by the way I think that when we went around the room in the CART committee, I was in the minority). Most of the CART committee members at this point, have said that they thought that the most important thing was to abide by the voters instruction of their will. The issue is, what the voters wanted was really a firm devoting on the ballot language on the plan. I think that what we need to acknowledge is that the voters (when they went in to vote) spent a year considering the community discussion about problems and solutions. What the voters are really saying when they make a decision, is that they are talking about the intent of the ballot. I think we have to go into the intent of the ballot to really get at what it means to abide by the voters' wishes. As we have reviewed before there are many assumptions that went into this plan that no longer are really viable and that the problems and solutions as defined in 2006 are very different than the problems and solutions that we would find today. In fact, some of the CART committee actually spoke to that and said that if the vote was taken today that we would see a very different result.

We are very appreciative of the impact of the RTA plan as it has been implemented. There is no problem with the integrity of the plan or even with the execution the RTA has been extraordinary with its ability to really burdock every project and make sure that projects are done according to the voters' wishes. When we have these corridor projects which contain assumptions which are no longer sensible... I just want to end by saying one thing because this is where I am going in the next three months and that is if we end up with a proposal to expand Broadway to eight lanes, this will not only be another tragic project but a tragic ending to a hopeful project. It will literally be insane economically, and I am going to make all of the arguments if you guys don't to show that.

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

A draft summary for the July 25, 2013 CTF meeting was distributed to the Task Force as a late delivery at the meeting. Facilitator, Nanci Beizer, asked the CTF for their approval of the summary to submit into public record. The Task Force asked for more time to review the meeting summary and the approval was tabled until the October 21, 21013 meeting. All previous meeting summaries, as well as up to date project information can found on the project's website:

www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway.

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.

4. 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 June 10, 2013 through August 12, 2013. Doug Mance, of the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Citizens Accountability for Regional Transportation (CART) committee, and Jim Degrood, of the RTA, were present at the meeting to answer any questions or concerns that may have arisen from the July, 31, 1023 CART meeting's discussion of the Broadway improvement project. Jenn also announced new replacements for members who recently resigned, Farhad Moghimi and Beth Scott. Dale Calvert was appointed as the new Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) representative and Naomi McIsaac replaced Beth Scott as the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee appointee. The CTF did not have any comments or questions during this agenda item.

5. Review of Revisions to Materials Presented at July 25, 2013 Meeting

New materials were provided to the Task Force based on the revisions that were discussed at the July 25, 2013 CTF meeting. Project team member, Phil Erickson led the Task Force through a conversation that discussed the methodology being used to assess the different lane configuration and street cross section alternatives, and street cross section elements; reviewed the changes made to the materials based on the conversation at the July 25, 2013 meeting; and further discussed potential approaches to present the information to the public. At the conclusion of this conversation the Task Force endorsed the methodology the project team has been using and endorsed moving forward with the materials to present to the stakeholder agencies and general public at the September 26, 2013 Planning Update and Community Workshop Event. This discussion is summarized below.

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

- I see that the 6 lane option could convert to 4 lane + 2. But the issue is that we do not have funding for BRT. If we don't have money for BRT, how does that work?

How BRT might be implemented needs further discussion. Internally, we have been discussing this with City and RTA staff. Some views are, don't build the facilities for BRT until we have the money. Another view is to include enough ROW that there is the option to use for dedicated in the future. While another is to do a Rapid Bus approach in the dedicated lanes sooner than BRT could be implemented. With that, you would need pedestrian islands, signalization enhancements; regular buses using the lanes would experience enhanced service. BRT would need bus stations built to the right height, and those could come when BRT comes in the future.

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.

- **Cycle tracks - at what point do we talk about driveways?**

Cycle tracks are used when you don't have frequent access to adjacent properties. This project will be looking at access management and reducing the number of right turns across the bike lane. It isn't clear now if you could build cycle tracks the full length of the project area. If you remember, we looked at ways that a local access lane for parking could be created, and that could create a long stretch you could use the tracks within. A lot of cycle tracks around the nation switch between cycle tracks and buffered bike lanes depending on specific conditions along the street. There are ways we could deal with the design of that.

- **Are we going to be able to get a presentation about light rail in Phoenix? Didn't they construct the light rail without a lot of acquisition? Are we making progress on getting information on that?**

Yes, we are planning to present on Phoenix light rail. We'll get the more information to you. A lot relies on how the network in Phoenix works, and the fact that the crossing routes carry a lot of the traffic.

6. Preparation for Community-Wide Meeting on September 26, 2013 (Public Meeting #3)

The project team presented the following aspects of Public Meeting #3 with the Task Force:

- Agenda and roles of the CTF, project team and others
- The communications plan to promote the meeting and get the invitations out
- The pertinent content that will be presented (specifically the performance measures, lane configuration alternatives, and the initial assessment tools)
- Overview of planned small group activities and the public's input opportunities.

At the conclusion of the presentation for this agenda item the task force broke up into two small groups and took part in a dry run of the activities that were proposed for the public meeting. Listed below is a summary of the discussion that took place following the group activities, organized by table.

Table 1

CTF Questions and Comments

- The top 3 measures for our table were: Vehicular access, bike access, and economic vitality.
- It was clear that bus pullouts and intersections will impact the design a lot, and we still have to do that. That will come in the next segment when the alternatives are studied.

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.

Table 2

CTF Questions and Comments

- We chose 4b and 6+Tb - which supported the transit and pedestrian categories best.
 - Point of tensions:
 - Economic vitality vs. sense of place
 - Short-term vs. long-term economic vitality
- 6+Tb made people feel more comfortable, but wasn't a perfect solution.
- We asked ourselves, what if we chose another option - the 6 lanes? Could we do better with dedicated transit on one side of Campbell, then on the other?
- What didn't come across was that the width of the roadway could be modified and played with.
- We continued to remind ourselves, what is our goal at this phase? One thing I would suggest is to use a checklist at the table that the group checks off as they move through the exercise.
- Another question that came up is what are the City requirements, i.e. codes and zoning requirements? (Related to parking, development requirements and reuse potential, whether private property can be used for sidewalks.)

Suggested Revisions and Refinements to the Group Exercises

- Have communal check boxes for groups to track progress together
- Move to higher level of performance measure ranking (9)
- On the map, the blue and yellow lines are confusing - please add a key that clearly defines what these are.
- How do we communicate the nuances of the project, which are important, to the public? They might not understand?
- It is a struggle to clearly communicate the economic Vitality ranking, this needs refinement.

General Discussion

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

- **Who are you going to use for facilitators?**
The facilitators will be planners from within TDOT, COT, RTA, consultant team, and volunteers from groups like American Institute of Architects (AIA). In addition to facilitators, we are looking for recorders. Once we have the volunteers lined up, we will conduct, at least, two trainings prior to the public meeting.
- **Concerned about how people will understand the concept of the three alternatives. Need to give them a sense that there is flexibility in the manner in which the cross sections can be used along the entire length. There is a way to do that. Additionally, we are asking them for ways in which they would revise them.**

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

Also, the DCR will not be completely linear.

Our next steps - the design of the alignment - will show this. We can move the right-of-way around as the road goes along.

- I want to ask the Task Force to overrule the engineer's scorings: some of the performance measures do not make sense like transit travel time - virtually no benefit between dedicated transit lanes and mixed flow lanes. (It doesn't make sense, there should be a noticeable difference) As well as economic vitality - with the number of empty lots that there are now, how are these going to be filled? I don't see how the area could be viable in the future if widening the road leads to even more empty lots.

The 4 lanes have less negatives, so they are better. But even when the transit is performing good, it is only up to two ++. I guess we can look at making the mixed flow lanes as neutral, and broadening the range which might make more of a noticeable difference. It could simply be the way we are communicating the change.

The existing condition is neutral, and so those that don't impact the properties much get more of a neutral ranking. Perhaps we can show this as a plus as they take away uncertainty.

- Wouldn't that area of Broadway become a prime market? It seems like people would look at this area differently than 22nd or Speedway.
That is what the economic consultant is looking at.
- The facilitators at each group, will they get to do training?
Yes, the facilitators will be trained. We are finalizing a handbook that will guide the facilitators through each exercise and offer advice for difficult situations that may arise. Additionally, we will offer at least two training sessions prior to the community wide meeting.
- The process that occurred in our group. I think Josh did a good job ALLOWING us to have the discussion about what we didn't agree on with the measures or assessments. We needed to get some of that out. The facilitators shouldn't be too concerned about moving it along. I felt anxious about what I was seeing and the discussion was good. I think if we move the public along, they may feel that they weren't heard.
- The most important part of the exercise is the process. We won't need every checkbox marked off.

I think what I saw happen at our table was that understanding the background and knowledge of the rankings helped move through these obstacles at the table.

People are going to question one element or another

We should be able to get people past that at the meeting to get through the exercise

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

Part of the issue at the table was a disagreement over the evaluation itself. The other part of the issue was that the selection of the measures directed the decision to select options that the group was not comfortable with.

Circling the performance measures creates a starting point for the discussion. There are going to be inherent conflicts between the measures. The result is that once you see what is working well and what isn't, you see how the alternatives line up. The group has the ability to decide if they stick with only the best performing, or if they want to look at those that are performing within the mid-range. An important component for the report out will be what the tensions were. So, in Table 2's case, if the 6+TB ranked well, but "we didn't choose it because $_(x)_$." In that group, compromising the width could be something that the group would be OK with.

We had to remind ourselves that we aren't picking or designing the roadway, we are just discussing these options. We are just identifying the areas of input for further study.

Sometimes it will make sense for a group to pick something because it is performing well, but it has these other problems with it. The groups can encourage the project team to test more, or design better.

We could maybe articulate better what the conflicts are, and that we will be refining them further as we move forward.

- **Will there be further community-wide meetings after this?**
Yes, we have two more community-wide meetings planned after this.
- **What about people who might have comments to share, but don't stay for the meeting?**
We can look into an online option to allow for comments.
We will also have comments cards and easel pads stationed throughout the room to allow the public ample opportunities to provide comments.
- **Advertising. How will this event be advertised? I am thinking of the commuter type people. How are we reaching out to them?**
We have issued save the date cards already to our email distribution list and will send out invitations to all addresses within a ½ mile of the study area. We will send the invitation out as an eBlast as well and will encourage CTF members and our stakeholder agency partners to distribute the invitations as well.
MainStreet Business Assistance program will walk the corridor and provide the invitation to all of the area business as well.
- **Do we have access to the information that went to the 2005 meetings for RTA? Seems to be important to invite them to this event. Is there a way to tap into that?**
We will look into to getting access to the 2005 RTA mailing list as well.

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

- In regard to the business open house, from my experience on Grant Rd, this workshop idea would be an appropriate adjustment to the approach used on Grant Road. Many people just wanted specific business information - I like this idea.
- Can I take it upon myself to distribute the postcards for these events?
It is the project team's hope that the business representatives could find out from the local businesses what information they would like presented. MainStreet can help distribute the invitation out to the more 600 businesses in the corridor, and encourage getting the business owners/managers and employees to the workshop. Addresses of the business have been provided to the project team for the mailing.
In regard to the business open house: experience on the Grant Road project showed that businesses are worried about having discussions in a more public setting.
 - *These kind of break out sessions are more private and could be very helpful.*
 - *It will be more about general questions.*
 - *It is tough to get the businesses to come out. As a percentage, they are lower attendance.*
 - *The invitations can be printed out as posters, and can be left as stacks in the businesses.*

At the conclusion of the agenda item the Task Force provided input regarding the public meeting (see discussion above) and endorsed the following:

- Moving forward with the community-wide meeting scheduled for September 26, 2013 at Sabbar Shine Hall and confirmed the start time of 6 p.m.
- The outlined meeting agenda, project team and CTF roles, communications plan to promote the meeting to the wider community, invitations, room layout, displays and visuals, stations, content materials, and the activities and input opportunities.

The following small discussion occurred during this decision point:

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

- **Section 8A definition for future Economic Vitality.** I am struggling with wording - 95% retained or redeveloped; this is like rolling dice, it can be odds or even and the two terms mean quite different things - will this be going to the public?
- **Is distilling the 16 performance measures into just nine that are overarching doable?**
I would recommend that we keep the fine detail in the evaluation matrix but have them choose things at the higher level.
We will take a second look at the transit travel time and economic vitality measures and ensure that the differences are evident.

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

7. Second Call to the Audience

Five (5) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Gene Caywood:

Good evening, Gene Caywood, with the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. I just wanted to comment on one thing tonight and that is the comments that Phil made to Shirley's question about funding for transit and the lanes, and so forth. I thought that it was interesting to hear that people in TDOT are having discussions about how to approach that. I guess that I would land very strongly with point number two. Point one was, that some people are saying don't build the transit lanes until you have the funding for the whole corridor and the other option is to basically do what was done many years ago, east of Columbus, and that is to put lanes in that can have some function now (even though the function may not ultimately be what you envisioned).

Again, I have said this before and I have said this at the last meeting, I urge you all to build something now while we have the money to do it in terms of the two miles, and I stick with that. I think that what we are going to do within the two miles, we need to decide now, and we need to do it and we need to build it. If it means just putting in lanes that are just used by a regular bus for a while, pull outs (or whatever they are/stations) and whatever we can get out of this amount of money we ought to put it in now. There is a couple of reasons for that; one, is that it functions for now and the second reason is that it lessens the amount of money that you have to have later when you do the rest of the corridor (ex: you already did this two miles). So I think it's very important if you all have an influence on the decision makers down there at PAG and TDOT that you tell them to go with alternative number two that Phil described.

Laura Tabili:

Laura yielded her time to another member of the public.

Bob Cook:

I am Bob Cook with both the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates, and I am also with the Citizen's Oversight Committee for Regional Transportation. There are a couple of other thoughts that I wanted to share. One has to do with a little bit of the history of the development of the RTA plan and it has to do with the concern that we adhere to the voters' wishes with respect to the funding of this plan, because in

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.

the past there have been many cases where the jurisdictions have had bond elections and the voters approved these bond elections and the projects weren't built. This is very different than a bond election; this is a sales tax election. There has been no record in this region of citizen's uprising because our sales taxes were misused for transportation projects, it's been mainly when the jurisdictions have incurred debt and that is what a bond election is, because you get the taxpayers to say lets borrow money to build _(x)_. The problem is that the jurisdictions by state law and constitution are prohibited from going over certain debt limits, so if a project goes over cost (a bond project goes over cost) it doesn't get built because you can't raise more bond money past that limit. This is not this situation, so don't buy into that argument that by a different interpretation of the ballot language with which we are actually going to incur the wrath of the voters. It is just not going to happen, because this is not a debt-based plan it's a sales tax (current and accumulative revenue) although the RTA has actually issued bonds to accelerate the project and that was done for political reasons to actually get more projects going and hire more people in order to get the economy going.

Another point that I wanted to raise, is just keep on doing what you are doing, because I think what is happening here (because you are really scrutinizing the estimates of the impacts of various design decisions) and some of these are arbitrary and some have just come off the top of people's heads or are some simulation modeling. I don't know how much simulation modeling is actually being done, but the ultimate criteria for the decision makers (and that is the RTA board-they have the ultimate authority by statute to make the decision on what projects (like this project) get funded or not). If you have got a smart design (and that is what we are really going for you know); what is the smartest design? What is going to have the greatest impact? And we do know that transportation features have major impacts not only in transportation but economic criteria. So you look at our River Park Loop and where we have installed bicycle transportation infrastructure and look at the economic development that that's generating. If you look at a good case of a constrained design, like downtown re-development, look at the economic vitality that we are finally creating in Tucson because of 4th Avenue and Downtown. So keep doing what you are doing.

Marc Fink:

I just wanted to comment on a few things that Phil brought up that seemed a little strange. One was, if you notice when his discussion of long-term economic vitality he said what we are looking at is redevelopment. I don't know when the task force ever said that the goal for long term economic vitality is redevelopment. If you look

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.

at the goals, there is nothing in there that talks about that. It is all the existing context; which then relates to even a broader issue of sense of place. What are you trying to accomplish? What are you trying to create? If you are trying to create a sense of place and you are trying to enhance the existing sense of place, then talking about redevelopment is not the way to go. You are changing the context of what you are trying to achieve and that becomes real important in talking about creating a vibrant area with 40 foot deep buildings. Take Feezies (that used to be the rose pedal), cut it in half, and that is 40 feet. That is going to be on 150 to 160 foot right of way. What kind of district are you trying to create?

I am also involved with Arizona Local First, I sit on the steering committee (the Tucson branch of Local First) and I can assure you and this has also been reinforced by planning seminars and other planning related things that I have attended. You are not going to create an environment for local independent businesses if you have 40 foot deep buildings on 150 foot right of way. The only way that you are going to have any kind of businesses would have to be if you were to reorient them (instead of having them deep) having them wide. Take 4th Avenue for instance triple the right of way of 4th Avenue, orient the businesses the other way (so they are now the long way) and you eliminate 50-75% of the businesses and you will not have a 4th Avenue. It will disappear because you won't have the synergy of all the businesses that are there.

The last point is that you can't evaluate the options based on the goals because there are too many goals. I would say that you absolutely have to evaluate the options based on the goals because that is telling you what you are trying to achieve. What are you trying to do? If you don't look at the goals how do you know what is good and what is not good. Again, you can distill all of those goals down into just a few goals that represent everything just like you are trying to do with performance measures. And in fact you have already starting doing it; you were looking at pedestrian access, mobility and economic vitality and sense of place. You could just take a look at a couple of things of each of those, to get an idea of does this option help create that, or not create that? You don't need to go into all these little things.

Jessica Shuman:

Of all the things that I thought I would advocate for in life, I never imagined it would be parking. Although, if there are no buildings or businesses that is a moot point anyway. Of all the proposed right of ways, only the 98 foot one, preserves 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.

plaza in which my business is in and leaves little or no parking, one to two spaces for my business which would require backing up or pulling out directly onto the boulevard. My small, locally owned business is in Solot Plaza. Included among the offer of goods and services are a tamale shop, a veterinarian, a vintage boutique, a Chinese herb shop, a dance studio, a pet groomer, two non-profit organizations, a metaphysics shop, a salon, law offices, a notary, and an art gallery (and that is not including Bruce's Lock Shop). It doesn't get much more diverse than that.

This is a historic plaza, it is a part of our community's heritage, and is the densest concentration of businesses on the North side. When you settle on a 98 foot right of way or 118 foot right of way, you might feel at ease to see what appears to be open land that can be used for shared parking. You might even feel comfortable taking out Bruce's Lock Shop, which would create some shared side parking. What you are not considering are that each business is unique and it adds to the character and sense of place around Broadway. What you are not considering is that we each have unique needs and that we have a unique current use of the land. In Solot Plaza because of our limited parking given the density of businesses the vast majority of owners and employees already all park behind our businesses (that's to leave room for our customers and clients in the front).

Even if customers could be directed to the land behind businesses, it would require diverting traffic through the neighborhood. It would require costly remodels of businesses to offer layouts to accommodate customer entry from a different direction. For example, we have storage spaces or offices or kitchens and such. Shared side parking in such a long plaza would actually eliminate many of the businesses and limit the diversity that makes Broadway so unique and so appealing to all of the surrounding neighborhoods which is why we chose to have our businesses there in the first place (so one example that I can give you right now, would be the veterinarian's office). If you took out Bruce's Lock Shop to create shared side parking that would require hundreds of feet of a walk to the veterinarian's office, that veterinarian's office building no longer has value and that veterinarian cannot stay there. That is a loss to all of the surrounding neighborhoods there. You cannot expect someone to carry cats in carriers in 90 degree weather for hundreds of feet. So if we want Broadway to be enriched and to have a diversity of goods and services, parking absolutely needs to be an immediate consideration and an integral part of your discussion and decision making. It cannot be an afterthought. Thank you.

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

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

8. Next Steps/Roundtable

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

- Congrats to Rocco.
- Thanks, and to Nanci!
- Thank our new TF members
- We normally have a copy of the slides (can we get electronically?). Thanks to the TF members - I have gotten so anxious. Since this process started, my mindset is changing, and I know there is a diversity of opinions. I think it makes us a strong task force. I appreciate the level of maturity to be able to discuss what we have differences over.
- Thank you for welcoming me. It is clear to me how much you are all invested. It's exciting to be involved.
- There is a lot that is still unknown. I want to know what our options are, and what the city can do, how ParkWise works, etc. I think we need that information soon.

Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 9 p.m.

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

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

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

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



COUNTY ADMINISTRATORS OFFICE

PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER
130 W. CONGRESS, TUCSON, AZ 85701-1317
(520) 724-8661 FAX (520) 724-8171

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

May 3, 2012

Gary Hayes, Executive Director
Regional Transportation Authority
177 N. Church Avenue, Suite 405
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Re: Broadway Corridor Improvements – Regional Transportation Authority Project 17

Dear Mr. Hayes:

As you know, this project has been the subject of some community concern. In fact, Tucson City Councilmember Steve Kozachik issued a press release citing a component of an overall report I provided the Board of Supervisors regarding pavement repair and maintenance as a justification to substantially and/or significantly modify this project. In addition, at the last RTA Board of Directors meeting, Tucson's Mayor issued a request for information that stated:

*"Mr. Huckelberry has made a suggestion in a recent report how the RTA funds could be utilized for street repair and maintenance by local Governments and Jurisdictions and we would request that a further report by the RTA as to that suggestion and other suggestions the RTA Board may have with regard how RTA funds could be used by local Jurisdictions **and** the exact parameters for modifications of any plans going forward. We know that modifications have been made in the past and I think it would be helpful to all Jurisdictions to know exactly what the parameters are."*

This letter is to provide you with this information. Please feel free to distribute this correspondence as necessary.

Mr. Gary Hayes
Re: **Broadway Corridor Improvements – RTA Project 17**
May 3, 2012
Page 2

For the purpose of clarification, the suggestion I made was to ask the State Legislature for increased authority to levy an additional incremental sales tax and dedicate such for street repair and maintenance. Item 8 on Page 19 of my April 10, 2012 report to the Board of Supervisors, *Need for Increased Investment in Transportation*, states:

“8. Add specific highway maintenance authority to the RTA legislation. . .It is certainly possible to ask the Legislature to add authority to the RTA legislation allowing a sales tax election for the purpose of making roadway repairs and conducting maintenance activities. Specifically, it would be appropriate to ask for authority from the Legislature to enact up to a one quarter-cent sales tax for the purpose of providing highway maintenance and repair of existing streets.”

Other than this suggestion, I indicated I believe asking the voters to alter the existing adopted RTA Plan was a mistake. In Item 7 on Page 18 of my April 10 report, I stated:

“7. Reprogram RTA revenues. . .In the past, we have treated most voter decisions as sacrosanct; and, once made, cannot be reversed. While it is not impossible to reprogram RTA funds for road maintenance with voter approval, it begins a path I would not recommend.”

I further stated in Item 7:

“This reprogramming would break the RTA pledge as identified in Resolution 2006-01, signed by every jurisdiction, which states:

‘WHEREAS, This Board now expands its pledge to include:

The promise that the minimum allocation for each project as voted by the public will be honored and will not be changed.’”

I do not believe there are any modifications that can be made to the Plan, other than those identified within the statute and previously reported to the RTA Board of Directors by legal counsel. I also believe there have been no modifications to the adopted plan to date.

The only matter that someone might construe as a “modification” in a specific program area is the fact that a number of projects have been under budget, with surplus funds being allocated back to complete projects on the approved list for the program category. These excess funds not allocated to and for the specific use of the jurisdiction. Councilmember Kozachik may be operating on the mistaken belief that any savings on the Broadway project, by reducing its scope, could be used by the City to maintain City streets. Such is an incorrect assumption.

Mr. Gary Hayes
Re: **Broadway Corridor Improvements – RTA Project 17**
May 3, 2012
Page 3

The Broadway Boulevard project appears to have taken on a life of its own. Councilmember Kozachik's press release quoted from my report, and I stand by those statements. My comment on Page 18,

"It makes little sense to force the original scope of transportation improvements where they are clearly outdated or unnecessary. Reducing the size and scope of transportation improvements not only saves money; it is more responsive to community needs and desires,"

simply means that if the travel forecast originally prepared for an RTA project is substantially overstated and indicates fewer capacity improvements are necessary to accomplish the primary goal of functionality of the project as envisioned in the plan, then it would be reasonable and logical to build only what is actually necessary as demonstrated by an acceptable scientific method or engineering analysis.

Such an analysis is up to the lead agency, which is the City of Tucson, subject to verification by the RTA. Therefore, I do not understand why project objections have been directed to the RTA; these objections should be directed to the City. In fact, given all the controversy associated with the Broadway project, it would be my recommendation, as Chair of the RTA Technical Management Committee, that except for the present planning process, the Broadway project be placed on hold until the City decides, through their deliberations and direction from their governing body, how to proceed; i.e., six lanes versus eight lanes. The City's decision should then be submitted to a standing CART Subcommittee, the Citizens' Corridor Planning Subcommittee, for further review and a recommendation in accordance with the RTA's approval process.

Only the City of Tucson can determine the size and scope of the project and justify any downsizing to the RTA. I would also like to caution, as I did at the RTA Board of Directors April 26, 2012 meeting, that doing nothing, or maintaining the status quo, is not an option. It is either eight lanes or six lanes – not the existing four lanes.

Sincerely,



C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/mjk

c: Richard Miranda, City Manager, City of Tucson
James DeGrood, Transportation Director, Pima Association of Governments