

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

**“A developed country is not a place where the poor have cars. It’s where the rich use public transportation.” -- Gustavo Petro (mayor of Bogotá)**

tucson talks transit with jarrett walker- 11 july 2014 (notes- by camille kershner)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

-interesting to look at [historical transit maps] because you see some of the ways in which transit has actually gone in circles (appear, disappear, reinvention...)

-abundant access- public transit as an instrument of freedom

(working title- focus on ideas of the basic sensations of liberty and a free society)

-important about what cities do (fostering of a certain kind of liberty)

-how transit actually makes that possible

-if transit were the logical choice

-affordability

-value of travel time

-safety

-other hassles of driving

-a number of reasons to use transit emerge as things are changing

-everything is changing **out there**

-there is no status quo

(voters think every day is a choice between the status quo and some kind of change)

-the status quo IS changing very rapidly (VMT inflection point)

-overall vehicle-miles traveled (overall quantity of driving in the u.s.) since WWII has been increasing, dramatic shift in **2006**

**-fundamental threshold crossed-** role of driving, cars in the u.s. changed

(can no longer say we “need more highways because there’s more driving”)

-may be able to say locally, but no longer a matter of national policy

-growth in driving has stopped

-something about urbanization itself

(more people choosing to live in places where they don’t need to drive)

-important place to start in thinking about transit- understand all of the reasons that many people already have for **not** wanting to drive

-help get past the idea that transit has to do all the work of enticing everyone

-enormous numbers of people don’t need enticing, just need a basic usefulness

- already ready, hate driving, want alternatives

-why? affordability- we may be actually moving into a society where we aren’t all always doing better

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

than our parents did (could in many ways be a good thing- frugality makes us more aware of efficiency, ways to create a quality of life)

-technology- (extraordinary liberty) -now we have this expectation/opportunity to be in connection with things and to interact with people and work on relationships/businesses

-can do it (use devices) on transit- can't do it while driving (dead time in your day)

-statistics about distracted driving

(very dangerous- other than listening to the radio, conversating w/ front-seat passenger)

-more than just taking **eyes** off the road, taking your **mind** off the road is the danger

(personal anecdote- want to be able to go somewhere w/ a friend w/out feeling like their life is in your hands- not a "relaxing" prospect to have the capacity to kill all of one's traveling companions)

-convergence with popularity of places where **not** driving is an important part of how everything works

(slide- "the market wants transit-friendly places")

-driving is less popular

-age at first driver's license continues to rise (slowly rising- now 19)

*-research-enough urbanization- young people/adolescents living in places where they don't need cars as badly, and even when they have the option to drive, would rather be using their smartphone instead- just less interested*

-wanting continuous connection

-concerns- environment

-distracted driving

-multimodal cities (different things going on around you, and different things are close)

-diversity

-proximity

-opportunity

-serendipity

-losing the car- key to **affordability**

*-especially relating to low-income*

*(not as a class- as people on various points on the income spectrum, and hopefully moving along it)*

*-buy a car or save for college? which is better?*

-generalization about Millenials-

-have to remind people that their adult children are not "just like them" only younger

-challenge binary thinking: (utilize lit students!)

-choice rider- "make him leave the car in the driveway"

-dependent/captive rider- "has to use transit no matter no matter how bad it is"

-the structure of how we use language gives a perpetual illusion of things being divided into two groups

-ex- "tall" (not a category of "tall" people, only "taller")

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

- likewise, not a category of “low-income” people
  - people in various situations along a spectrum of incomes
- easy to use category words and to think we are talking about a group of people that are more or less like each other, in that category
- (elected officials- part of how you organize your basic sense of what a constituency is and who seems to want what)
- wrong! -whenever we’re invited to divide things into two, usually there’s actually a spectrum of possibilities between them (we don’t properly teach linguistics for engineers!
  - encountered in technical work- distinction between “choice” and “captive/dependent” riders-
  - everyone makes choices in the context of their situation
    - (choice/captive- ends of a spectrum w/ everybody in the middle)
- people are in all different situations, with different options*
  - incremental improvements can change their choice*
- already heard in this, as in other cities- implication that we need a transit system that attracts choice riders, and that there’s something else for those low-income riders*
  - heard suggestions that it’s somehow a problem if those two groups mix*
- honestly- encountered more in the Deep South, less on the West Coast, but does need to be confronted*
- fundamentally suburban idea that we can organize our lives so that we can only meet people like us
  - early suburbia was able to deliver
  - never been the proposition of urban life (cities are about encountering difference)
- what are people choosing? what are people who create economic value choosing? ask Google.
  - thought they were doing the “right” thing by building a manicured, luxurious, serene campus in the soundwalled suburbs of the Bay area (jogging trails, gymnasiums, free smoothies, surrounded by lots of nice, elite subdivisions)
  - discovery- their most creative people, creating the most value for them- all wanted to live in San Francisco, where they step over homeless people to get into the seedy jazz nightclub where they have their best ideas
- (Google needs to spend a fortune on express buses to run their geeks 35 miles between where they thought they would live and where they insist on living- so important to those people to be confronted with diversity every day, including diversity of income)
- this idea that separation and isolation is the key to any sort of economic success
  - simply not the proposition of the city, not what the market is moving toward now
- spectrum of choice/captive- changes our notions of what we’re trying to do w/ transit
  - notion of “two boxes” as categories- heard from both ends (wealthy and low-income)
  - reality of a spectrum- everybody’s situation is different
    - that difference is important to transit- **transit succeeds in the middle of this spectrum**
      - elite people might never right a bus- doesn’t matter, so few in the top 1% (can have a sustainable utopia w/ them driving their BMW) ex- Germany
  - successful transit- about the middle 80%

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

- succeeds among the people who are comfortable with that diversity
  - successful people sitting next to the guy washing dishes in their favorite restaurant (not a problem, it's part of what you expect in a big city)
  
- next generation owning fewer cars- choice or captive?
  - desire to sort people out socioeconomically- the death of transit
  - especially if designed around specific classes
  
- way we think about technologies- conversations about what rail, and different technologies, actually means, and what it means to get excited about a particular technology
  - “am I a streetcar person?” (because I get on a streetcar- assumption)  
(possibility- not interested, but it's going where I'm going)
  - may care more about speed, frequency, reliability
  
- abundant access- (map: by Convail- *would like to see attached to every real estate listing everywhere*)
  - blobs (isochrones)- how far/where you can get with transit + walking in a given amount of time (travel time- turned inside out! includes waiting time- overwhelms-frequency often matters over speed)
    - blue (:15)- errands, go to lunch, spontaneous
    - green (:30)- most people willing to commute (commuteshed)
    - pink (:45)- once or twice/week trips
  - enables people to take responsibility for the consequences of their own location choice
  - presents what transportation services do in a different way than we usually talk about them
    - usually- ridership predictions
      - development outcomes  
(still haven't yet talked about- actually *why* anyone would ride it)
      - single service outcome- speed (in vehicle-travel time)  
(only useful if it's going, and it's going where you're going, and you want to go there)
  
- new way to think about what we might be trying to do w/ transit
  - what if we were trying to grow these blobs?
    - expand the area that people can get to readily in a reasonable amount of time
      - for the most people overall
    - start asking what percentage of the city's "x" can I get to in 15 or 30 minutes?
      - no longer talking about transportation- talking about the essence of our liberty
        - how much of the city is available to me?
      - the reason you live in Tucson (not Ajo) is what's going on- options and choices
        - live in a place where there is stuff happening
          - can't get to that stuff -> may as well be in a rural village
  - freedom as an urban resident- has so much to do w/ the city being available

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

-**abundant access**- as many people as possible-

-able to reach as many destinations as possible- as quickly as possible (*transportation planning*)

**-so that they have as many real choices and opportunities as possible in their lives**

(therefore- free, as defined for an urban resident- access to your city is freedom )

-**total abundant access is multimodal** (no general disapproval for suburban/rural car dependence)

-reality- where you live overwhelmingly determines what transportation seems logical to you

-everybody believes in what they've learned from their own experience

(others' experiences- not "wrong")

-need to talk in a way that doesn't imply that everybody should be on transit

-to achieve high ridership- (design purely high ridership transit network)

-smaller in geographic area than current (Tucson) network

-current transit system goes to many places where high ridership is not a possible outcome (land-use pattern too unfriendly)

(transit can't be equitable in a "library" sense) -ridership- generated by high frequency service

-serving patterns of **density, walkability**, contiguity, linearity

-need to choose its market, focus on where it can succeed

-transit success unavoidably connected to an urban lifestyle

-choice more relevant to some neighborhoods than others

-(technology- matters around the extremes)- abundant access=

-walking (and sometimes cycling) + **a network of routes/lines designed to optimize:**

**-frequency -span -connections -speed -reliability -capacity**

(book- talks about how these variables fit together to create largest possible blobs for the most people)

-driverless rapid transit- very efficient delivery of frequency and span

**(cost of transit- otherwise driven by cost of labor)**

-rail- needs high number of passengers per driver

(if employees are on-vehicle, that cost is the dominant cost of operating transit)

-smaller buses not cheaper than larger- cost of the driver is the real determinant

(can't chop a large bus in half to make 2 smaller buses)

-carry 300 people/driver (Swiss tram) or 1,000 (Bart- SF Bay)- definitely need rail

-common associations- speed and reliability (nothing to do w/ rails vs. tires)

-in transit- **speed** and **reliability** are about:

**-how long you spend stopped**

**-what can get in your way**

-enough experience (logic)- buses and rail vehicles can all go as fast as it's safe to go in an urban setting

-speed- determined by the delay they encounter along the way

(exclusive lane- not so much delay, non-exclusive lane [mixed traffic]- more delays)

-bus/rail distinction- streetcar critique (mixed traffic)

-increased reliability if you can maneuver around obstacles that arise

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

(bus- advantage in that environment)

-**frequency**- (to some extent, **span**-duration, how long it runs)

-invisible (of the 6 factors that makes transit succeed)

-particular problem- only transit people understand

-incredibly fundamental but hard to talk about

(can't take a picture, mapable- only by intention)

-reality- need to build consensus among people who are themselves mostly motorists

-[everyone's] sense of how things work- conditioned by how they get around

-a gate that only opens once an hour (frequency- imagination exercise for non-users)

-waiting, low-frequency service

(lines on a map- don't impart clarity to understanding the network)

-without frequency, don't know if it *is* a network

-routes need to work together (first step)

-focus- not on rich/poor, any other demographic- class of "people in a hurry"

-unifying across the income spectrum

(low-income- busy with part-time jobs, evening classes, daycare)

-many little trips around the whole day- hard

-viable, frequent transit makes all the difference

-people locate along those lines in response to frequent service

-good housing policies- encourages affordable housing, senior facilities, etc. on frequent network

-don't create problems (senior mobile home park at the end of a rural road- too far, not enough)

-world-class frequency map: Washington, D.C.

(used to be color-coded according to if a Maryland or Virginia route, or stayed in D.C.)

-most important distinction? I can see that- what can it tell me that I don't know

-is it coming any time soon? is it useful?

(black lines- subway system, red lines- frequent buses)

-can see if it hooks together- opportunities to connect within it

(drew Tucson high frequency map- not asked to, but if not done for a new city, can't tell anything)

[applause] -what does this map say? -transit interested in being useful to people in a hurry

(buses on streets, bus shelters, hot, have to walk- still there, but enough people in the middle with a reason to want to try transit if we show them where transit can be useful)

-can also see connections (how easy it is to connect in that network)

(Tucson's a lot smaller than D.C.- let's start w/ celebrating what's working here!)

-with Alvernon and the N/S 16 and 3 big E/W corridors, beginnings of a high-frequency grid

-frequent routes going each way, one transfer can get almost anywhere from almost anywhere

-rudiments- success of Alvernon corridor (doesn't go downtown) 1<sup>st</sup> step to a citywide

frequent network that still **converges on downtown** but also has **strong grid element**

-**good design**- marries those 2 impulses

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

- only after drawing this map do people start asking for more frequent network  
(have to show them what they want before they ask you for it)
- problem- only showing the public maps of *where* some transit route goes
  - makes them all look equally important  
(comments like- drive further out to me, to these 4 mobile homes)
    - I'm at the UA and want to go out 22<sup>nd</sup>, what do I do? -gap @ Campbell
  - bigger deal than introducing new corridor- frequent, **incomplete** corridor  
(buses and rail- working together)
- "but I simply wouldn't ride a bus."*
  - is your dislike of buses worth shrinking the range of your freedom?*
- problem- not all judgments made on purely aesthetic terms (architects, etc. -their space imagines so)
- assumption- choice of transit determined by *that* tradeoff as most important
- ex- CEO of Alaska Airlines- future all about rail?
  - (response- your business is all about the A380? big planes, not regional jets)
  - like buses, they have an important purpose
- be prepared to **challenge assumptions**
  - "rail is permanent, buses are flexible"* (senses in which each are true and false)
    - ex- 100 years ago, lots of streetcars- most disappeared
      - mostly bus lines still running there
    - permanent market -> service was permanent, and continues to be**
      - real permanence lies in the permanence of the market**
    - concerned about a bus route? ask about productivity- high-performing, won't change
      - low-performing, more likely to
    - ultimately- streetcar is a manifestation of a particularly high-performing corridor
  - "there are bus people, and then there are rail people"*
    - very much like saying that there are "choice" and "captive" riders
  - claim- "buses don't stimulate development, but rail does"
    - large-number concept of what "stimulating development" means
- frequent network map- people making logical choices when they move, if they care about frequency
  - especially **low-income people** -not people w/out choices, they are **making choices in the context of a different set of conditions**  
(impactful choices- when we treat them as dependent, without choices,  
we fail to see the incredible opportunity) [applause]
- someone waiting in a bus shelter in a situation you think you wouldn't be willing to- 2 ways to react
  - "oh, that poor person having to use the bus"*
  - "oh, that pioneer of our future transit system"*
- [applause] -the thing about that spectrum- people who have a stronger disincentive to driving  
(income is a good reason to want to not drive) are going to try it first
  - not all down in a box stuck there, all along the spectrum

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

- attractiveness of transit will grow toward the point where it's useful to you, wherever you are (because- as more people use it, it gets better- positive feedback loop)
- more people in somewhat more fortunate situations use it -> you find it useful
- low-income people pioneered and drove that vector to the point where transit can be useful to you
- be careful (BRU) about the notion of just sticking up for yourselves, based on your needs
  - you need respect as *leaders*
  - show a useful bus system- people locate in response to it, creates the real estate market
  - buses may not stimulate high-end development, maybe more likely affordable apartments
  - an important part of the economy
- when your inner city does take off (ex- Portland) -all kinds of redevelopment on frequent bus lines
  - all kinds of development policies (now, high-end, permit lower levels of parking because on frequent bus line that lots of people will use)
- everything* that gets built on a high-frequency line is transit-oriented development (not just rail!)
  - service, mobility, access- freedom- part of the proposition of living in that place

**-successful rail projects** (emphasize needs/issues)

- makes sense for corridors with very strong endpoints**
  - feature- have to get off at the end of a rail line  
(not true of BRT corridors- bus can keep going off the end of the infrastructure)
  - [our] starter streetcar makes a lot of good sense  
(connects two really big dots- lots of people going to both ends of the line, everywhere in between)
  - east across the grid- different situation  
(markets gradually peter out- not a single, strong destination to focus on)
- succeeds in the context of a robust, frequent (bus) network**
- Portland's first light rail line- preceded by (4-years prior, in anticipation) urban high-frequency grid of buses, developed bus line that did what rail would then do, let the bus line build the market toward the rail line (need intersecting bus services to bring people to the rail stations)
- rail often grows out of successful bus lines**
  - if you want to see rail in a corridor, BRT isn't the end of the world to start [applause]

"Western cultures are prone to 'eat the wrapper and throw away the food.'"

- Alan Watts, The Wisdom of Insecurity
- the thing I want is completely concealed by symbols of the thing I want
  - I can only chose among the symbols, because I can't see the thing I want  
(many cases, the thing I want is concealed by a photograph of the thing I want)
- we are a symbol-loving culture -spend every day bombarded by symbolic representations of our desires, symbols of the thing we want, and we are sold those symbols
  - symbols of prosperity, success, sex, of whatever we want, freedom
  - ex-effective symbols of freedom- in certain circumstances, good providers of freedom
  - in other circumstances, they are not

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

-the vehicle, the technology- is the “wrap”  
-the freedom to access your city- is the “food”  
[applause]

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

jarrett walker- tucson transit talk- Q/A session

-Q- (re: isochrones) "The choices that people are making about frequency, that makes complete sense. What about price?"

-A- "Let's start with the understanding that in the larger scheme of pricing, the game is completely rigged. Transit agencies are not profitable, but then, neither is road construction and maintenance. And so anyone who is expecting transit to focus primarily on revenue outcomes is expecting somebody to act like a business when they are competing with an entirely socialist enterprise, namely, the way we build and manage roads, by and large. And so, this is pretty well-documented and well understood. And our friends in the car lobby will say, 'But we have our gas tax, we pay for all that.' No, at best you pay for what are only the most direct costs, you never pay for your indirect costs, you never pay for your contribution for air pollution or climate change or you never pay for the true market value of the hundred-square feet of expensive real estate that you take up every time that you park your car for "free." When you take transit to the mall, the price of the things you buy includes the cost of the free parking for everybody who drove. So let's not even pretend that there's any sort of fairness to that. Nevertheless, transit has to generate some revenue from its riders, and so let me raise this about fare. Because it's one of the most difficult issues when we're thinking about this income spectrum. Because what we tend to hear from our low-income riders, and our low-income advocates, is that the most important thing is the fare. Whatever you do, don't raise the fare. Well as long as we're in a world where the fare we charge affects the quality of the service that we can provide, never raising the fare is a real limitation on the ability to ever improve the service. And that tends to mean an extremely low fare transit system tends not to be able to improve in the ways that broaden its constituencies so that more and more people care about it.

And in my experience, the worst possible thing for a low-income person is to be on a transit system that only low-income people ride. Because not enough people will care about that system. And so we have to be able to raise fares. We have to be able to do that in order to grow the market. And let me tell you how the British and Australians do this. There are lots of things about them that are not to be envied, but this is one. Their idea is that transit agencies should run transit systems, and that redistributionist policies, or policies that are fundamentally about putting a layer of support under low-income people are the responsibility of the Health and Human Services department. And what that means is that the transit agency sets the fares, and the social service agencies provide fare subsidies to low-income people based on their needs. This is beautiful, because then you're no longer trying to achieve, to solve the problem of income inequality out of the transit agency's budget, which is really a lot to ask a transit agency to do, you know? They're trying to run a transit system.

And so unfortunately, we're coming out of a history where in most meetings of government agencies, when they get together, the transit agency is the most unimportant person in the room. And when you get a bunch of power figures--I've been in this room, many times--if you get a bunch of figures together around a table, representing different agencies, they will all agree that the most unimportant agency in the room should solve everyone else's problems on their budget. That's always how that works. And

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

so, the transit agency has this tiny budget, is trying to run a transit system; it is also expected to somehow meet the social justice needs of low-income people out of that budget. That is a colossal task to ask the transit agency to do. And it ultimately--and that does tend to have to be rethought, how we think about why we provide discounts to low-income people in whatever ways that we do. But if you expect the fare to be frozen forever, we're not going to be able to grow things, and we're not going to be able to grow services in the way that bring more people on them, and therefore, this is the important thing for low-income people, make more people care. And so therefore generate more support, and so transit continues to grow. That, in my experience, is the problem."

-Q- "We've been told that when discussing transit nodes, the average person will walk about a quarter of a mile. I happen to live at Alvernon and Broadway, and I'll walk much further. I'll walk to the grocery store, all around. What's the--how important is looking at that? Is that fast and true, in terms of ridership and getting to these nodes? Is there ways to expand that?"

-A- "You know, the things about these isochrones, is that they actually--when you start looking at it this way, and you imagine that what people really want is simply to be able to get to as many interesting places as possible as quickly as possible, maybe the answer to that question is, 'People will walk as far as it's logical to walk in order to do that.' In other words, you start thinking about it this way and you don't need a maximum guideline. You don't need to have--I don't think there is an answer to the question of, 'How far will people walk?' because I don't think people frame the question that way. So the first thing we observe in response to that question is, yes, lots of people are comfortable walking about a quarter-mile to transit, but if the transit is more useful, if it's rapid transit, if it's BRT or light rail or whatever, if it's fast and reliable, people walk further to it. That's just because the more useful a service is, the further it is logical to walk to it, in the context of what is still overall your fastest trip. This will happen sometimes, and a good trip planner will tell you to do this. You can tell it, "I don't walk more than two blocks," and it will take your [screen?] and shrink your blocks. But if you're willing, want a maximum range of destinations, the answer is often to walk quite a long distance to a really good service. In fact, you may actually live on an infrequent line and if you want to actually get where you're going, the answer is frequently to ignore that line and walk some distance over to the frequent line. A good trip planner will tell you that that's actually the rational thing to do. So I'm opposed to all those kinds of guidelines and rules of thumb if what they're doing is obscuring the notion that maybe people are just doing what's logical. And while lots of people have lectured me over the years about how irrational people are, and it's not like I don't know that, fundamentally we are, in the presence of good information, which is the thing we have mostly been lacking, capable of making reasonably clear decisions about what's best way to [do things?]. Oh, and in case anyone is thinking, "But, it's hot in Tucson," January, I was in Edmonton, we had the same conversation about Edmonton in January, I hear this everywhere. Human beings are incredibly resilient. They put up with, on practice, with all kinds of things that they think they would not put up with. And fundamentally, when we study walking distance across different climates, the climate matters remarkably little. Because people have adapted to wherever they are, and you live in Edmonton,

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

walking in negative twenty and a meter of snow is a normal part of life.

-Q- "Hi. Could you put the Tucson map that you created? A little while ago, we went through the process of determining a plan, and I took part as a volunteer, and in fact, looking at the corridors, the Broadway and the Speedway were something that we talked about. But what you haven't talked about is to increase that, especially those two, how do we achieve, especially in terms of City Council and major decisions? I'm a city planner [?], I know, this was the City of Tucson, but we have a tendency to keep the same type of segregated uses, as you said, suburbia, on Broadway and on Speedway, outrageously underutilized. Perfect places for a lot of residential, two, three stories, just the perfect place there are enough buses. But what we see is the same thing over and over again. But not only that, bad aesthetics. I'm a planner, right, I like nice aesthetics, but I can tell you there is a location on Broadway right now where a pad was created that the frontage, as you drive through, you're looking at an exit, emergency door. So we keep doing the same thing, so how would you address just thinking a little bit more, "Okay, these are great potentially high-transit, could hook up a lot more lines, but how do we approach changing the way we look at development along those corridors that are already serviced?"

-A- "Yeah, let me grab a couple things with that. A lot of us here probably are people that love the inner city, we love the vibe of places like Fourth on Fourth, we love the vibe of the historic city, and so on. But, and you know, for a lot of us, those big, long corridors going out to the east sort of aren't really the places we would hang out all the time. But it's very important to understand that the people who are in that income, the ranges of that income spectrum from where transit can be transformative to them are living in those landscapes. This is called the "suburbanization of poverty." And there's an enormous challenge of providing the opportunities for people to live closer in. But meanwhile, we have to think about those streets realistically. And I'm glad you framed the question in terms of aesthetics. Because my architect friends look at a street like Broadway or Speedway, and they tell you there's that thing called the "sprawl repair manual" that you use then, right? And it will tell you, "Okay, you take this strip mall and you put townhouses and an apartment tower over here, organize the retail like that." But long before you're going to do that, there's a couple of--I mean, the sprawl repair manual will also tell you that when you have large, low-density lots with big mansions on them, you should just build a row of townhouses in each backyard. So there are some things in it that are not all that practical in my opinion, in my experience.

So it is true--but let's look at the street like Speedway or out of Broadway, let's look at that classic suburban sprawl boulevard and notice what *does* work. What does work is that there is a rhythm to it. There's a major intersection every half-mile, maybe, something like that. That's also a really good rhythm for rapid transit, to stop about that often, or ideally, a little more. And existing commercial tends to be clustered around those nodes, around the big intersections, which are also the grid transfer points. You actually have a very good geography for rapid transit. The pedestrian environment is appalling. [laughter, applause, cheer] But fixing the pedestrian environment is a way easier problem than fixing the urban structure. It's frosting compared to fixing the urban structure. The urban

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

structure is very favorable. The urban structure is you've got these easily redevelopable commercial parcels on four corners, fronting right where you're going to have a station. Okay? You're not going to have to redevelop very much residential, you can do it almost all by redeveloping the commercial parcels, which are easier to redevelop because nobody lives there and commercial owners are much more willing to sell at the right price. And so that's actually a remarkably easy problem in the scheme of things.

And obviously you do need to have your zoning and land use controls brought into conformance with, and valuing, frequent transit the way we have in Portland. And so in Portland, if you're going to build a three-story building and you build it on a frequent transit line, we'll require less parking, in some cases, almost no parking, that will make the building cheaper, that will make the building more affordable. Okay? That's how that works. So and then the frequent network starts driving development. One of the ways it starts driving development is through city interventions on things like lowering the parking ratios. Okay? Some cases, eliminating them. Some cases, we have parking maximums, you can't build more parking space. And certainly, we permit something that is identified as affordable housing, that is meant to be affordable, with very low parking ratios, because we expect and want low-income, the whole point is that we're giving low-income people an opportunity to spend their money on something other than cars. Okay? That's the whole point of that. And there's a lot of--in the planning, I can introduce you to Portland city planners and you talk about the specific ways that that's done, but we've had a lot of success with that. And that's really how it begins.

But I do want you to be aware that the ugly suburban arterial can evolve. But another important thing about it is, it can eventually evolve to sort of beautiful new urbanist townhouses or retail at each one of those corners, but the most important thing is, we've got to provide a safe and humane environment for the people who are already out there, having to live out there, and needing to get to transit. And that's why this idea of--one of the things I advocate is, on those boulevards, a safe place to cross the street every quarter-mile. [applause] A safe place to cross the street every quarter-mile, which is about the ideal spacing for local bus stop service, because one of the things I'm constantly telling transit agencies is, "You know, there's nowhere to cross the street for half a mile here. But you put a bus stop here and an opposing bus stop over here, but you can't make a round trip unless you get to the stops on both sides of the street, right? You're going to leave from here and arrive back there. What is this? What is this accomplishing? If you can't cross the street safely, it's not really a bus stop. So I want to say, I drove out Speedway last night, my, it went on and on and on, [laughter] but I did finally get to the mountain for an evening hike and I have to say, I'm really impressed with how many crosswalks there are on Speedway. It really jumped out at me. And that's an interesting example, because it's not beautiful, but it's functional. And for a lot of people, functional makes all the difference. Functional and safe makes all the difference. So the aesthetics are great, I want things to be beautiful, but even more than that, I want things to be functional because I see how overwhelmingly people respond to something that is just functional itself. And those Speedway crosswalks are the best example."

-Q- "What are elements of successful strategies that you've seen throughout the nation, maybe even in

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

Portland?”

-A- “Yeah. Um, transit is being funded a lot of different ways. And one of the most interesting debates right now is level of government where funding should be. Should there be an Arizona-wide state transit source, like California has, that goes out to every county whether they want it or not? What kinds of sources should the funding come from? I think that we are working--but here’s a couple of interesting things that are happening. And let me start by giving you my simplest answer to the question that, “Who pays?” The answer to the question that, “Who pays?” is, “Who cares?” Fundamentally, the support, the financial support is going to have to come from whoever cares about it, and from whichever level of government cares about it. That’s why one of the things that’s happening in the business, in the industry, that’s very interesting now, is that the familiar giant regional transit agency that we know in a lot of big cities is starting to hit a crisis, in many different places. And the crisis it’s hitting is manifested every time you take a region-wide vote on transit and what you get back is a density map. What you get back is a map of residential density. And it’s really obvious that the core city has an absolutely urgent commitment to transit, sees transit as an existential need, and that’s completely understandable if you live in the core city. Just as it is completely understandable if you live 15 miles east of here, it doesn’t seem like that to you. It is just as completely understandable that everybody is voting based on their own experience. And based on the relevance it seems to have to them. You can’t expect anybody to do anything else.

So the interesting question that’s coming down the line is, maybe although all the transit needs to be regionally coordinated, maybe the arrangement you have now here where a lot of control lies with the City of Tucson, is actually a pretty good arrangement. And maybe also, we need more tools for voters over the small area where they really care and where they will really benefit. As this idea of the streetcar [formed?]. Voters over the area where they really care and will really benefit, being allowed to vote on something and make it really happen and tax themselves to do it. Now, one of the odd things that confuses me is that in a number of red states, conservatives who claim to want small government tend not to want to give local government the power to do things. They tend to want to keep it at the-- and that doesn’t strike me as a conservative idea at all, that doesn’t make any sense to me in the context of what I thought conservatism was. But I think that’s an important fight.

There are several crisis signs and situations happening right now. There’s an extraordinary drama playing out in Seattle, where an incredibly transit-dependent city, very much like San Francisco, surrounded by a whole lot of suburbia which cares about transit a lot less, is in the minority in its big regional county where these decisions are made, gets routinely outvoted, routinely gets underserved, routinely gets talked down to and patronized. And yet, the only reason there’s any transit in the county at all is that any time there’s a countywide measure, Seattle votes overwhelmingly “yes” and gets the whole regional map and measure over the line, and Seattle is starting to say, “You know, we’re kinda tired of this.”

And so you’re up again a lot. We need to start being able to really do what we need to do for ourselves, but use it--with the support of our voters who actually support this. So I don’t know where that’s going, but I do think this idea that it all has to be controlled up there, or even the idea that it has to be regional,

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

is becoming more and more--is, I think, inevitably going to be challenged. We are heading into an era of municipal renaissance. Pick up a wonderful book by the sociologist Benjamin Barber, called, If Mayors Ruled the World. The subtitle he wanted is, "Why They Should and How They Already Do." And he is talking about a future in which cities are so fundamental to how the global economy works, that cities have to be able to govern themselves, and have to be able to control those levers with their own voters. That's the strongest opinion about that."

-Q- We actually have two very specific examples in this city that illustrate this tension between the region and the city. Several years ago, the City of Tucson approved a widening of the Grant Road corridor, increasing the car lane capacity by 40% when traffic counts in the last 10 years have showed a decline in traffic count, somewhat corresponded to your VMT inflection point. So we're getting 20% reduced traffic counts in a corridor where we're expanding by 40%. We live in an era where, despite your "wrapper" analogy, we can't do the other modes because there's no resources left after we're excessively expanding our roadways. Right now, and I want to ask you what you would tell our local officials, because that's really where the rubber hits the road. Many of us in this room are transit activists, there's very few elected officials here today, and we've heard the best practices, we've heard these lectures for the last 10 years, but we're not getting anything done. Right now, we've got a major corridor project second only to the Grant Road one, where the regional plan was to enlarge a four-lane road to eight lanes, where there is no rationality to do such a thing. And if we do that, that will preclude investment in the kinds of modes of mobility that will make our community resilient going forward. So what are you going to leave this town with, in terms of a message to elected officials, to make a difference? Because we don't see a difference being made, and we are wasting precious resources, we're not even looking at where the oil market is going in the next 10 and 20 years, which is going to make what you've illustrated even more pronounced because we simply, as a civilization, are not going to be able to afford a car-based transportation system. So please, give me your best advice to elected officials so that you can help us, the activists, who have been trying to change the picture in this community for 20 years."

-A- "Yeah. Let me start by forgiving ourselves for why this is hard. Let's forgive ourselves for why this has been hard. This has been hard because we have been designing cities for the car for so long, that the car seems, so understandably, for most people in most of their situations in most of the places where they live, the car seems inseparable from liberty. From the sensation of liberty for themselves, not to mention opportunity. And so people--it is understandable that people feel that strong attachment and there's that expectation. I think that what I say to elected officials about this is, first of all, let's be aware that--let's push back against the professional manuals. Let's push back against--let's notice the way that the case for why, you know, Broadway has to be eight lanes, or whatever, comes out of methodologies that assume that the future is like the past. And then show them the VMT inflection chart; the future is *not* like the past. The future is not like the past. If you are planning for the past, if you are even planning for the present, you are failing to plan for the future. And that is economically ruinous. Make the conservative argument, which is that highway widening is bad for the economy.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

Because ultimately, it is preventing the emergence of the kind of city that will make valuable economic drivers want to locate here. That's really the fundamental. Make the conservative argument."

-Q- "I want to ask, so particularly on Broadway, the community's in a very involved planning process and looking at a variety of transit options and we're hopeful for, and some of the ideas that we're talking about, and my question is about, is how soon can we jump to some of those things or is it better to piecemeal it along? So bus rapid transit is an option, down the road, some rail thing if that's warranted, but there's some talk of maybe just improving bus stops and some piecemeal improvements and then "growing" into bus rapid transit. Do you see that as successful, or do you see it as better to commit that dedicated space right out the gate?"

-A- "I certainly think that if you have space that is in danger of disappearing that you might need, that it's certainly appropriate; there's a very preliminary kind of planning that is called "future-proofing," which is basically, it's done in all kinds of things. It basically means, "Make the case for hanging onto the land. Make the case for not foreclosing on the opportunity by building something else." And you certainly need to do that. Let me take that back to a somewhat higher level, which is, "What should we do next?" We have a COA, whatever that is, Comprehensive Operational Analysis, that stands for. I know what that means, but I could give you a long lecture about why I'm suspicious about all three of those words. But you have a COA, which is a bunch of well-intentioned but sort of very low-level technocratic kind of recommendations for moving some routes around, and also reducing the budget, because that was also apparently considered interesting. My understanding is that it actually shrinks this map, by the way, it actually makes some of this go away? That's not good. That's not good, because this is the "next step". This is the layer below the BRT. This is the layer that will make the BRT succeed, in the same way that our urban bus grid made our light rail line succeed in Portland. How to get it all organized; it seems to me like it's time for all of our kind of, for the City to do a transit visioning exercise. But when I say--I wish there were a better word than "visioning," because "visioning" makes people think of getting around tables with flip charts and talking about their feelings. [laughter] And it's got to be a little more than that.

So if you haven't read my book, my book begins with a simple analogy of a plumber. Say you hire a man to fix your plumbing. He goes in under your sink, he does some things, he makes some noise, he does some things. And then he beckons you over. He says, "Look, look. I could just tape all that together like that and it'd work for another couple years. Or I could rip the whole assembly out and place some new dohickey like this, and it would cost like \$700 but it would be good as new." And he's asking you what you want; here's the thing. The plumber is the transit planner, the transit consultant, like me. The customer is you, so, your City Council. Visioning for transit, that actually has an effect, has to answer the question that arises in transit planning. If you just get a bunch of people around a table and just ask them for their transit visions, and they will get together and have an earnest conversation and they will write up on the flip chart words like, "equitable," "sustainable," and "economic," and "prosperous;" [scattered laughter] try telling those words to your plumber in that situation. [laughter] You haven't answered his question and therefore, you have had no effect on reality. So that's my problem with a lot

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

of visioning, right? [applause] You have to answer the technical questions.

So one of the things that I do when I'm running these things is I say, "Okay, let's get around some tables, but instead of having you talk about your feelings, I'm going to put a map in front of you and I'm going to give you some pipe cleaners and I'm going to invite you to actually start laying out some routes, because I want you to have the experience that the transit planner has. I want you to have the experience of understanding how this tool works and what it does and what it doesn't do, right? And what trades off against what. And then people start understanding enough about what the plumber does that they can start to understand what direction they need to give him, so they can actually produce something that is what you want. And I find that that kind of process--well, I'll tell you where this leads. This leads to some very specific conversations, and if you read my book, Human Transit, I talk you through them and I talk you through why certain value questions repeatedly come up.

One of the big ones is the tradeoff between, "Is this transit system about maximum ridership, or is this about coverage?" That is, to say, a little bit of service everywhere, regardless of ridership. It is one of the basic--those two things are opposites. And so one of the basic questions--and I explain in my book technically why they are opposites. And so I've worked with a lot of city councils to get them--I'm working with the Edmonton City Council on this right now, to get them to the point where they are ready to say, "Okay, devote this percentage--"we've talked to the public about this, we've had a conversation in the media about this question. "Devote this percentage of our budget, or this percentage of our new plan, will be devoted to high ridership services. We have high standards for the ridership, for the farebox recovery, and so on. This portion of the budget is for predictably low ridership services that have nonridership purposes." Like Lifeline access, response to people's needs; generally speaking, when we're designing for ridership, we're thinking like a business, we're responding to demand, lots of people who need the service. When we're designing for coverage, we're responding to severity of needs, often among very small numbers of people. The person who stands up and tells city council how their life will be ruined if you take their bus route away, they're not defending it on ridership grounds, they're defending it on these other grounds that are also important to us. So I'm always telling transit agencies, you know, don't let your entire ridership be judged as--don't let your low ridership services be judged as failure, that's not what they're for. You know, that's not what they're trying to do.

So that's the kind of question and things that come up. Once we have that conversation, we also then--people start thinking about high frequency grids. I mean, people figure this out for themselves, I don't have to tell them. And then we start working toward a conversation where the map does start to appear and get specific. But meanwhile, we've also then gotten to a shared sense, or at least a broadly understood sense that Council can agree on, of what the point is, and what we're trying to do, and what direction is contradictory; we've tried to quantify the balance between those things so that we have a very clear statement of purpose. And my experience, you rush into a capital project without a very clear statement of purpose, and you end up with people being confused about why we're doing it and you have different definitions of success running around, and it becomes very confusing. Sorry."

-Q- "When you were talking about the "Milleniums" and them having different standards than we had

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

when we were growing up, one of the bullet points was the environment, and the New York Times came out with a revelation that the average American will have to--if we are to be equitable in how much CO<sub>2</sub> each person on the planet can emit, every person on the planet will have to reduce their carbon footprint 2/3<sup>ds</sup>, but Americans will need to reduce their carbon footprints by 9/10<sup>ths</sup>. Could you address how having a viable--what is the difference for people that care about the climate and use a transit system versus driving a Prius? What's our footprint difference?

-A- "Right. So, it's nice if you can drive a Prius, it's even nicer if you can drive these electric cars that are always being invented, that's great. You're still taking up a lot of space. And this is why high-ridership transit is not going to be made obsolete by Google's driverless taxi, or any number of other--or personal rapid transit or really, really, really cool--or Uber--anything else, because what high-ridership transit does is use space incredibly efficiently, and the definition of a city is "not much space per person." That is what a city is. The scarcity of space is what a city is. And so, I think there's no question that we're having a national conversation that reflects the sort of, "where the average American is." And the average American is way out in the suburbs, still. But the average American moves closer into the city every year. As our cities are now--as our inner cities are now growing, and in many cases, as so many of our suburbs are dying.

I don't feel quite as much despair about how you would get to a particular climate a few decades out, because I am really confident in the non-linearity of our politics. The non-linearity of our politics. That is to say, I think that we are going to have a lot of inflection points where things change rapidly. And a lot of that has to do with how generational shift manifests. Suddenly, I'm sure you can think about several issues where, just in the last decade, something that was unthinkable became routine. I can think of two of those issues, gay marriage and marijuana. The absolute, universal consensus ten years ago is exactly the opposite of what we're all pretty sure the universal consensus will be ten years from now. That's really not very much time for big things to change. And again, when you realize that people are acting out of their own experience. You think about the way those things change. You think about the way those things change as Millennials grow up and are just having conversations at the dinner table that affect their parents' opinions. The way that, you know, I think about gay marriage, in particular, as an issue that happened at the dinner table, that happened very, very much in intimate conversations among friends. And I think that the raising of this kind of consciousness is going to happen in a similar way, which is, I will not at all be surprised if attitudes change almost as fast as they did on that issue. Particularly, because the other reality is that the future is extremely non-linear, and the future contains big surprises. I think climate scientists will be less surprised by some of these things than the rest of us, but there are going to be some big shocks. And so I think transit's place is to be ready for that. I don't feel the need to take on, myself, the burden of thinking how we're going to get to that kind of footprint. Because a lot of non-linearity in our politics is going to work in our favor. That's the most I can offer."

-Q- "Well, as someone who is really rather fond of her little backyard in the 'burbs, and was really happy to take the bus when she was going to school and didn't have to be at work at 4:30 and 5:30 in the morning, I'm trying to imagine how we can have more mass transit when we have suburbs, because I

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

don't know that I'd like to live in a very dense area. I'm rather fond of having a little room between me and my neighbors, and I was trying to imagine how that would work, because I keep hearing, "We need density, you need density, that's why there's high-rises being built down near the University. It's like you have a lot of kids and you have a lot of mass transit and it drives it and it makes it go and it's a success and, 'Oh, my gosh, I don't want to live that way.'"

-A- "So here's part of the answer. Part of the answer is, transit is not going to be equally useful everywhere. It is in the nature of transit, and there's an explanation in my book about the relationship between density and transit demand; it's actually an upward curve. Double the density, you get more than double the transit demand, and in the book I talk you through about why you should not be surprised by that. So what that means is, to the extent that transit is focusing on ridership outcomes, as I often say to a Republican elected official who represents an outer suburban area, "You want us to raise our farebox recovery so we need less subsidy? Fine. The first thing we'll do is cut all the service to your ward." [laughter] Because, sure enough, he represents one of the low-ridership soundwall-subdivision areas that are impossible to get much ridership out of, because they are just too unwalkable and driving is just too easy.

And so, let me make another confession. I live on a 50'x200' lot in Portland, I have a big backyard with an enormous garden because that's really important to me. And yet, I'm standing up here pretending to be a transit advocate, how can that be? How that can be is that I've chosen this place very carefully. The transit is useful for some purposes, it's not nearly as useful as it would be if I lived in an apartment. And I do sometimes have to drive, and I would really like to pay the full costs of that. I don't want my lifestyle to be subsidized. And that's, I think, what we need to offer to our suburban friends, our people who really like the suburban experience. We're not judging you, we're not telling you that your choices are wrong, we may have to ask you to pay some more of the consequences of those choices, as we all should be responsible for the consequences of our choices. Again, this is really a very conservative idea. This is a very--you know. It's about, "Let's take responsibility of our choices, let's not expect--" you know.

And as long as we are not cross-subsidizing, as long as we are not overwhelmingly subsidizing one group of people over another, we're not passing judgment on people's lives, we're not saying what's a good place to live. I have tremendous respect for people who have chosen all different kinds of places to live. And I think that's very important to emphasize. Because one of the talking points we'll get from our Republican friends, some of our conservative friends, is that--I hear this all the time. "They're moving everyone into towers." No, Stalin moved everyone into towers. [Ceaușescu?] moved--you know, 20<sup>th</sup> century dictatorships did that. Now, people are--seem to be wanting towers, because when we build them they are really expensive, so we are responding to the free market by trying to build more of them, and that's ultimately better for you who want your suburban garden. You know why? Because I don't want everybody to want what I want. If everybody wanted what I want, what I want would be a lot more expensive. [scattered laughter] That's basic math. Right? You out in the suburbs, you should love the fact that not everybody wants that house that you're in, because if everybody wanted it, it would be a lot more expensive and you would not have been able to afford it.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

So transit--because transit so inevitably specialized and succeeds in certain neighborhoods and not others, it's really an opportunity to say, "Hey, let's be okay about being different with what we want. Let's be okay about not all wanting the same things." The fact that we don't all want the same things is why we have the chance of affording what we want. So that's part of how that plays out, you know. I really don't want to imply that there's anything wrong with choosing to live on a parcel of any size, as long as you're aware that there are some costs to that and there are some opportunity--you are going to have to drive more if you live in a lower-density area than if--in any sort of, wherever we end up. It's all okay, whatever anyone wants."

-Q- "Hi, Dr. Walker, I enjoyed seeing the Melbourne network map, that's where I'm from. However, I want to know if you've got some feelings on the operation of public transit by the city and by the state, as opposed to the operation of public transit by for-profit organizations, you know, public or private companies."

-A- "Mm-hmm. So the arrangement you have here is an arrangement that I tend to advocate, which is that you have a private company responsible for--the bus drivers and mechanics work for a private company. The private company works for you, works for the City. You know, so there's a very clear role for that private management company in handling the daily operations of the system. But they operate a system that the City tells them to operate, the City controls where the routes go, the City sets the expectations for service, the City, on behalf of the voters, is still really in control of the outcome. Now I'll tell you, and I'm not sure when you came back from Australia, but when I first moved to Australia in 2006, we--they were at the nadir of a period in which a somewhat Thatcherite, really, concept of privatization had passed through. And Margaret Thatcher's view of privatization was essentially, "Government is intrinsically incompetent, therefore, the private sector should do everything and government should stay out of the way. If it requires a subsidy, the government should write checks to the private--but by and large, we should try to have as little to do with this as possible."

And the fantasy was, that you do encounter in some British cities, but it never really emerged in Australia, is that you're going to stand at a bus stop and Joe's Blue Bus comes by and Jim's Red Bus goes by, and you have a ticket that's good on Jim's Red Bus, but that's good because you as a customer are loyal to Jim's Red Bus as opposed to Joe's Blue Bus. And partly, again, because Margaret Thatcher was a motorist and nobody explained to her this thing about transit, you know what? We'd really just like to take the bus that comes first. [chuckling] And this is the flaw of that system.

But when I got to Australia in 2006 and I was working in Sydney, which has always been the worst of the Australian cities in this way, there was practically nobody left in government who knew anything about public transport. What happens when you set a bunch of companies to pretend to be competing is that they quickly--they don't have to collude, they figure out how to stay out of each other's way and what you end up with are territories, and they stay out of each other's territories. And competition immediately disappears, and you end up with all the same problems but no accountability. And so during the five years I was in Australia, in all three of the big cities, that system has gradually been undone, and these private companies have been pushed back into, I think, their appropriate role, which

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

is the exact role that Viola is in here, which is, "No, your government is the customer, the government has to have the expertise, because it has to be able to engage with all the ways that public transport fits into all the other things that a city does." And it has to control the product, because--and it represents the customer, because customer choice between companies isn't how public transit works. We're going to get on the bus that comes first, and that doesn't mean we're fans of Joe's Blue Bus over Jim's Red Bus.

So it's been interesting watching Australia find its way back to what is basically--go through this craziness and find its way back to this sort of arrangement. But I think the arrangement is pretty good. Now there are, of course--it's still fairly revolutionary in the U.S. because we have, in a lot of other cities, the experience of what we call the "old, huge legacy transit agency" which, where the bus drivers and mechanics are public employees. And the disadvantage of that system is that first of all, an enormous amount of the government's, of the transit agency's time, goes into resolving lawsuits about accidents, which is a very nice thing to delegate to the private sector. I really like for them to handle that. The other thing, quite frankly, is that labor--it's very difficult for a public employee manager, who works for the City Council, to negotiate constructively with a labor union, when the labor union has access to your boss. And fundamentally, wherever you are on the management/labor divide, there needs to be a constructive tension there. And if there is not a constructive tension there, if it falls over one way or the other, things get really bad. So, I mean, I work for lots of legacy agencies, but I'm a big fan of the arrangement you have, I think, as long as the City has the ability to replace the operator or review the operator periodically, as long as there is constructive tension in that relationship, as long as that relationship doesn't become too cozy, which also happened in Australia a great deal--I don't know if you remember, I'll tell one more Melbourne story, which is the first time I got to Melbourne and started looking at their documents and picked up a 20-30 transit plan document and I read, "Melbourne is proud of its tradition of family-owned bus operating companies." [chuckling] Which is about as explicit as you can get that this is all basically feudalism, right? These are family--these are like crowns passed down through a family. Anyway, welcome to America. I hope you're enjoying it. Australia is a great country, by the way, there's lots of wonderful things about it and I hope you get to visit."

-Q- "Buenos tardes."

-A- "Sorry?"

-Q- "Buenos tardes."

-A- "Good evening."

-Q- "Good evening. First of all, I would like to appreciate your words that we should think about each other as equal and not low-income, high-income, middle-income. Todos equal, the same. I live in one of the last remaining barrios in downtown, and we've never had public transportation. Or maybe, I'll say, for a month or so. And from then on, we haven't had it yet. And even our children have had to walk

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MoD4c9WGoQ>

under the freeway to get to their schools. So this conversation is interesting, because then I would like to know where we're going from here. And when you say "freedom," freedom for me, I would like to think, being a native Tucsonan born and raised and have never left and I don't plan to leave, having my grandchildren here, I want to remember as freedom as what made Tucson and where we're at. And for me is, I hope you were shared the pictures, the historical pictures what Tucson was made of, the train and the horse. I always want to remind people of the horse, regardless of people saying it's not safe, because now I believe that nowadays, no where and no time is safe. So being in this uniqueness of the history that we have in Tucson, I would like to share that with you, and hoping that you recognize, admired, and noticed that we have that uniqueness and that diversity here in Tucson and how important it is to preserve that. Even though with progress and change, that we can integrate that blessing that we have, and keep what we continue having, the Chuk Son, in the regional name of Tucson in the Tohono O'odham language, es Tucsó, in the Mexican. So I just want to share that, that we have a very special place here, and as that native, I want to welcome you here in Tucson and thank you for all that you have brought us. Gracias." [applause]

-A- "Thank you, so much. And I just--and I think we are out of time at this point, but I want to say, I think that's a perfect place to end, because I really am grateful for you welcoming me here that way. Lots of people are trying to build the "ideal" city, out in blank space without any history to work with. We have these new cities around the world. You can go visit them in China and in Arabia and in many other places, and you can make them all really nice, but if there's no history, you notice that. And history is what makes a place real. And that's why, by the way, why historic preservation is such an important part about how we think about our city and [inaudible] [applause]

So let's wrap it up there, I'm just going to stay around for a few more minutes, happy to chat with you individually. I'm so grateful to you all for coming out tonight, I hope this has been useful to you, thank you so much. [applause]