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Broadway Project has Reached a Critical Milestone

- Initial analysis of 4 alternatives complete
- Citizens Task Force (CTF) is making decisions/narrowing down alternatives
- Public Meeting #4 coming up – public will be informed and asked to provide input on decisions being made
- New RTA/City contract is contingent on ability to meet May 2016 construction deadline and policy parameters
CTF Decisions at Charrette #3

– Table the 6+2T alternative for now
– Focus on refinements to the 4-lane and 6-lane/4+2T alternatives, seeking fewer impacts to properties and acquisitions
– Create design variations (vignettes) for how to address challenging areas identified by CTF;
– Illustrate possible infrastructure that can be built for transit in the 6-lane alternative; and,
– Create surveys and/or input opportunities for public on different topics.
Key Issues Raised at Charrette #3

• Is 4-lane alternative really not an option? Why?
  – Decision will need to be supported by Mayor & Council, RTA Board, and Pima County

• Is a combo of 4-lane west of Campbell/6-lane east of Campbell on the table for consideration?
  – Future HCT not along Broadway, Euclid to Campbell?
  – Is 4-lane good enough for local service?

• What is the reality of a path from 6-lane to a 4+2T? What transit do we plan for 20+ years into future?
  – How do we address transit (from local bus all the way to light rail)?
Steps for Defining Viable Alternatives

– **4/2 TAC Workshop** – Technical input to respond to questions of viable alternatives

– **4/30 CTF Meeting** – Share TAC feedback; Review requested refined alternatives; Formulate CTF recommendations

– **5/6 Mayor & Council Meeting** – Provide recommendations from CTF and TAC; request direction
Technical Advisory Committee Workshop

• Staff representatives from a variety of departments and agencies
  
  (COT: CMO, Attorney’s, OIP, Econ. Initiatives, TDOT, ParkWise, PDSD; RTA; Pima Co. DOT)

• Data presented to CTF at Charrette #3 shared

• Obtained technical topic matter expert input

• Requested recommendations on what alternatives to eliminate and why, and what the Broadway project should focus time, efforts, and resources on moving forward
Desired Outcome of TAC Workshop

Consensus recommendation on the following question:

“As a group of technical topic experts with a role in the way this project will be designed, built, and implemented/maintained, what do you recommend the Broadway Project should focus time, money and resources on, moving forward through planning and design?”
Alternatives Performance Summary Sheets

- Overviews of Each Alternative (incl. Sidewalk Only)
- Highlights of Performances

Summary of Performance Highlights:
6-Lane Street Design Concept Alternative (118’ Right of Way)

**Description**
All alternatives include:
- Sidewalks (limited narrowing to avoid impacts, 5’ min.)
- Sidewalk areas on roadway and in median (limited narrowing to avoid impacts, 6’ min. at roadway to allow for some landscaping, 3’ min. in median without landscape)
- 7-8’ wide bike lanes with 3’ bike lanes at vehicle crossings

6-Lane Alternatives Include:
- Bus pullouts at all signals, not at midblock bus stops
- Two alignment alternatives drawn for character; additional 'hybrid' option being shown
- Minimizing building impacts - preserves as many buildings as possible
- Minimizing Property impacts - limits impacts (acquisitions and demolitions) to a single side of the roadway
- Hybrid - reduces impacts to both buildings and properties

**Results of Transportation Analysis (Transportation Specific Measures)**
Assumes a reduced growth rate of 2% from 2024 (PAC Projections 2019)

**Results of Additional Analysis (Non-Transportation Specific Measures)**

**Considerations**
- Project does not meet the RTA non-bus lane criteria, but has more miles to meet the policy "The Design of Facilities" in original Technical Committee and Citizens Advisory Committee, therefore performance is presented in comparison to the 4-27 case
Summary of TAC Recommendations by Alternative
6-Lanes (118’ Right of Way)

Staff Recommendation: Make this alternative the priority focus of project design now. Focus on how roadway could convert to a 4+2 dedicated transit lanes, as ridership and technologies warrant.

- Creates enhanced benefit to automobiles
- Creates enhanced benefit to transit
- Could accommodate future High Capacity Transit
- Remnant properties are reasonably sized
- Fundable by RTA and Pima County
Staff Recommendation: **Focus on 6-lane design that could convert to a 4+2T dedicates lanes, when ridership and technologies warrant.**

- Enhances transit, but creates congestion for automobiles
- Current and modelled transit service does not provide enough functionality to warrant reduction in auto lanes
- Congestion worse than for the 4-lane or existing
- No enhanced benefit to automobiles
- Not fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway are in cars)
  - Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County (~$7M)
6+2T (150’ Right of Way)

**Staff Recommendation:** Eliminate from consideration.

- Benefits to automobiles and transit worse than the 6-lane
- Does not serve non-transportation specific measures well (e.g., Economic Vitality, Impacts to Historic and Significant Resources, Environmental / Public Health, and others)
- Does not really allow for building a roadway that relates well to existing context (context sensitive)
- Shallow lots restrict ability to attract future infill and businesses (also context sensitive)
- Low benefits to cost ratio, given that there are higher impacts and costs, but performance does not improve on a complementary scale
- Fundable by RTA and Pima County because meets the bond and ballot language
- Construction and acquisition costs create doubt that option is cost feasible
4-Lane (96’ Right of Way)

**Staff Recommendation:** Eliminate from consideration.

- Does not accommodate future High Capacity Transit
- No enhanced benefit to automobiles
- No enhanced benefit to transit
- Not fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway are in cars)
  - Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County (~$7 M)
- Too far off from the project described in the 2 measures previously voted on (1997 Pima County Transportation Bonds; 2006 RTA Plan)
- Limits future economic vitality because it doesn’t provide enough investment and visible; it is not a catalyst for a better economic future in the area
- Time and money spent on studying this further takes away from potential of other alternatives
Sidewalk-Only (Existing Curb-to-Curb)

**Staff Recommendation:** Example of what City would face if widening not undertaken now; staff recommendation is to avoid this situation.

- Complies with 2013 joint US DOJ/DOT ruling regarding installation of ADA pathways and curb ramps when roadways are altered. If the City resurfaces the roadbed, it will trigger compliance. Such maintenance will be needed within the next 5-15 years. Roadway resurfacing would cost $5-6 M more than above costs.
- No enhanced benefit to automobiles
- No enhanced benefit to transit
- Does not accommodate ROW for future High Capacity Transit
- Not fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway are in cars)
  - *Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County* ($7 M)
Steps for Defining Viable Alternatives

- **4/2 TAC Workshop** – *Technical input to respond to questions of viable alternatives*

- **4/30 CTF Meeting** – *Share TAC feedback; Review requested refined alternatives; Formulate CTF recommendations*

- **5/6 Mayor & Council Meeting** – *Provide recommendations from CTF and TAC; request direction*

  • *Any CTF members able/willing to attend?*
CTF Discussion / Decisions

• Poll: Are any CTF members available to attend the May 6 M&C Study Session (time to be determined; most likely afternoon)?

• Does CTF support tabling the following decision until after 1st Call to the Audience and Break:
  – Formulating CTF recommendations on alternative(s) to move forward to Mayor and Council and Public Meeting #4

• Someone needs to make a motion to table this decision