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 Beizer. A quorum was established, handouts were distributed to the Task Force with supplemental information, and the agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Beizer.

Citizen Task Force Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Belman</td>
<td>Jon Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Butterbrodt</td>
<td>Joseph Maher Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Calvert</td>
<td>Diane Robles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R. DiGrazia</td>
<td>Jamey Sumner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Durham-Pflibsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Fairchild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Henley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi McIsaac*</td>
<td>Shirley Papuga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Naomi McIsaac officially resigned from the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) on 7/28/14, which resulted in losing her representation on the CTF for Alternate Modes. Her colleague on the BAC, Anne Padias, a representative on the BAC for Ward 5, attended the meeting in her stead and in anticipation of being appointed her replacement.
2. Approval of July 17, 2014 CTF Meeting Summary
The project team asked the Task Force to approve the July 17, 2014 CTF meeting summary. The Task Force tabled the approval of the meeting summary until the next meeting (August 26, 2014) to allow for further time to review.

3. Public Input Report, and Reports on Project Presentations and Outreach
The project team presented the Task Force with a matrix of the most recent public input received, from July 8, 2014 through July 28, 2014, and the latest project presentations that have been made. Listed below are the informational materials that were forwarded and/or requested by CTF members.

**Informational Items forwarded by CTF Members**
- July 24, 2014 - Recommendations for CTF Consideration from Joseph Maher (Items 5. and 7.)
- August 15 Arizona Planning Association Workshop: ‘Future of Transportation Planning for All Modes’ from Colby Henley

**Project Team Memos responding to CTF Requests**
- 8/4/14 Memo, Follow-up to Questions Asked at July 17 CTF Meeting (Item 7.)
- 8/4/14 Memo, Viable Transit Options for Broadway (Item 5.)

**Presentations & Outreach**
- 7/24/14 and 7/31/14 Broadway Business & Property Owner Meetings (to be reported in Item 6.)

4. First Call to the Audience
Eight members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

**Gene Caywood**
“Sixty thousand riders, Wow! Was that some great weekend, I hope you all had a chance to ride the streetcar maybe when there weren’t so many people on it and note the smooth, quiet ride. That’s one of the reasons you do rail transit it’s just a totally different feel than a bus. With the reception that the streetcar has received I think it’s on target to do real well, it’s on target to meet its ridership projections because the students aren’t even back yet and when they come back then they will be able to exceed those. I think with the reception it has received it’s just a matter of time before other things happen and the streetcar gets extended. Everybody is now a believer because they experienced it and people are talking about extensions...
which I find very exciting and of course Broadway is one of those extensions and it has been on the books for a long time and it will continue to be until we find a way to fund it and to make it happen.

So I urge you to consider the three key things that I have been saying off and on (maybe not necessarily all at the same time) but decide on an alignment that can accommodate to streetcar and maybe light rail in the future. Move the utilities out of the way because that was one of the major expenses with the Modern Streetcar and one of the major reasons for delay. So if you do anything to the road at all, get the utilities out of the way now. And number three is put the streetlight poles in a position where they can double to be used and make them strong enough so they are in a location in which they could be used in order to support the overhead wire for the streetcar. Those are three key things that you can do whether we can fund the streetcar now or not. So please remember that, thank you.”

**Marcus Jones**

“Good evening, my name is Marcus Jones and I am representing Tucson Unified School District. I run the Architecture and Engineering Department, apologies to the committee as a whole that I haven’t been able to attend more meetings but it conflicts with our Bond Committee and that program is over now and so I have more time. I want to compliment and thank the committee for the time that you have given to it and the staff for the help that they have done. We had a real positive meeting this week for the owners meeting. It was a real positive event the main points that I want to make with everybody- student safety; please don’t let that part of the project down. You have got some real good solutions in 2B that address that. Another critical item for us is that they have developed a option for a left turn for westbound traffic off of Broadway that allows our busses to go in and drop legally on the right side of the campus so that we can get our kids. If that’s not there it’s a problem for us in that we have to detour busses but it’s a problem for the neighborhoods because those busses will have to come up through the neighborhood. So I think those are the key points. Also to the homeowners and to the property owners across the street, I think the architects made some strong points to the groups last week about getting together and helping solve some of your own problems because the City can’t tell you how to fix those. That was one thing that really impressed me and with that, again thank you for all of your effort and if there’s anything that I can do let me know.”

**Laura Tabili**

Laura Tabili waived her time to Robert Cook.
Robert Cook

“Thank you. Well a lot has happened in the last six months. We have seen the RTA loosen up a little bit and not insist on the six plus two ballot language which was the six lane expansions and two dedicated (that was the ballot language) that option is no longer on the table because it was unreasonable and so now that we are taking unreasonable things off of the table it’s time to think about what the best solution is and so the best solution is the criteria that should be guiding us. The City of Tucson has integrated a planning office, office for integrated planning. It’s interesting we are doing the second major corridor project in the RTA and we are not doing a high capacity transit study to do the alignment while we are doing this corridor study. It’s really out of sync that we haven’t really considered the alignment of the high capacity transit and we are spending two hundred million dollars or whatever this thing is going to cost so I would vote for one, the minimum of ninety six feet or less at the pitch points.

I have got some major links for everyone to look at these are links to important stories that have come out in the last couple months, look at those. There’s also two documents that I am passing around from the neighborhood associations surrounding the Broadway Corridor who were also looking at the Broadway Corridor Project back in 2005; it’s very instructive because you will find that the neighborhoods really opposed dramatic widening of Broadway so please take a look at what the neighborhoods actually said ten years ago, when you are thinking about making big decisions about Broadway. The other thing is that everything is pointing toward alternative modes, I am really happy to announce that the streetcar project is going to be exceeding expectations.”

Mark Crum

“Good evening. I represent only myself. I do pay taxes in support of the City of Tucson and the RTA. I like my car and I like it a lot, it takes me from where I am and it delivers me to where I want to be twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. On the other hand, from ages 8-24 besides walking, I rode the bus because those were the only two forms of transportation I could afford. My legs and busses took me to school, libraries, church, grocery and drug stores, movies, parties, etc. They allowed me access to the essentials as well as providing me with a fuller life. My point is this; I am appreciative of all forms of transportation which still includes walking. It’s not a matter of either or, it’s not a matter of cutting one short for the other. I hope you feel the same way as I do.

There was one thing however, that concerns me very much and that’s the issue in the long run. In my heart of hearts I feel that if this task force and the Mayor and Council and the RTA Board do not make a commitment, call it upon us to public transit that could be a comprised lesson in the future. The promise that transit need to be strong and unequivocal, now whether or not the plan means two transit
lanes the entire length of the project, twenty-four seven and on and on, I don’t know. But, it is important to emphasize that the RTA special legislation of May 16, 2006 provided for the adoption of twenty-five roadway improvement elements. Only one element, call it a project, provided or mentioned public transit, project number seventeen, Broadway Boulevard.”

Bob Kaye

“Thank you again for the opportunity to speak this evening. I am here to speak on behalf of transit, I support wholeheartedly Gene’s comments about design standards for the future project, for us to make possible transit. My point this evening is to ask you to consider Broadway Widening Project as an opportunity to land bank for future transit. This is more than just a once in a year or generation opportunity this may be the last chance that we get to set the land aside so that we can create a great transit system east and west on Broadway. I urge you to consider that as you consider the alignments. By land banking we can make it possible to have transit in the future. Thanks very much.”

Marcos Esparza

“My name is Marcos Esparza, I grew up in Tucson for the first eighteen years of my life and started commuting my bike for the last couple of years of that. I am currently attending college in Boston, Massachusetts. While living in Boston my colleagues and I have quickly learned that it’s incredibly easy to get around given the incredible rail system and the accommodations for bike use. This experience will definitely come into play given that I am entering into my last year of college and figuring out what I am going to do next and where I will be going. I and others my age have come to realize that the hassle of owning and maintaining a car are not worth it when you can just go to a city where that is not necessary. For this reason, I urge you not to expand Broadway to six lanes as it will be my generation that will be using the roadway the most in the coming years and if the road must be expanded to six lanes I ask that you leave dedicated lanes for rapid transit to accommodate for those of us in the future will not be using cars. Thank you for your time.”

Julia Liatti

“So my name is Julia Liatti and I want to thank you for your time as well and trying to be attentive to all the different points of view and needs that we are trying to take into account here. I just graduated from the University of Arizona, I am twenty-two years old and I was born and raised here in Tucson. To follow up with what Marcos was saying I want you to give the perspective people, my generation, who are going to be impacted by the possible widening that is going on, on Broadway. I ask that you maybe not consider widening Broadway or if you have to please consider rapid transit, utilities, and bike and ped friendly accommodations
to be put in place now while there is still time. You guys have seen all of these statistics and the statistics show trends that we are moving toward more and more people choosing alternative transit and my perspective is someone from this generation and the reason for that is because there are a lot of us who are really well educated and who have a lot of creative, ambitious educated potential behind us but we don’t have a lot of money because of the downturn in the economy so we are more and more looking for forms of transit that serve where we are in life right now and potentially, theoretically where we are going to be in the future still since we can’t predict how the economy is going to go. It’s now more important to us to choose lifestyles that are sustainable that aren’t going to cost us a lot of money, putting off decisions like buying houses and cars in favor of going more local and trying to urge more alternative transportation to suit our needs, for a variety of reasons too, not just money but for the environment, for social well-being, for our fitness. I can tell you commuting from here to Grant and Swan, there and back, that’s some calories burned right there. It also makes me feel self-empowered so it’s definitely worth it.

But, the other thing that I want to add in is that a lot of us are making decisions about where we want to live based off of what opportunities there are for us to continue this kind of lifestyle of where we want to go. Me personally, I have friends that chose where they went to grad school not only based off of what kind of stipend they were getting but because of what transportation options there were and I wanted to encourage you if you want to bring that creative, collaborative potential that we as this generation have. You should build a city that is going to enable us to come live here, when we figure out the where we are going, when we’ve got the mobility in life to choose that. So thank you.”

5. CTF Discussion on Transit
Discussion held, action taken. In a response to CTF requests made at the July 17, 2014 meeting time was set aside to for the CTF to discuss:

- Highlights from the book provided to the Task Force by the Broadway Coalition, “Walkable City: How Downtown Can Save America One Step at a Time.”
- Transit option for Broadway and what can implemented within the project scope.

At the conclusion of this discussion the CTF made a consensus decision to form a Transit Subcommittee in preparation for the August 26 and 28, 2014 design meetings. CTF members Mary Durham-Pflibsen, Colby Henley, Shirley Papuga, and Joseph Maher volunteered as members of the subcommittee. [The first transit subcommittee meeting will be held on August 25, 2014.] Listed below is a synopsis of the conversation that took place during this agenda item.
CTF Highlights from July 11, 2014 Jarret Walker Presentation:

- People are willing to walk farther for good services, destinations
- People are ready to stop driving
- The community needs a place where things are happening
- Move as many people as possible to reach as many destinations as possible - not just in cars
- Rail can grow from bus routes
- We need to promote walking and create walkable areas
- I think we can achieve these goals by starting with a 4+2T and going from there
- I found the graph demonstrating vehicle use decline since 2005 very interesting
- We need to look at planning - not from past or today but for the future
- The most important thing to grow transit is a presence of a destination within walking distance
- We need to balance accommodating pedestrian space and destinations
- Positive examples: RTA building downtown planters next to sidewalk, and UMC shade structures provide options for narrowing for landscaping but also provide the positive benefits that landscaping provides, such as shade and aesthetics.
- Let’s not confuse landscaping and shade - there will be no pedestrians or a pedestrian environment without shade

CTF Takeaways from “Walkable City: How Downtown Can Save America One Step at a Time:”

- A wider street is harder for pedestrians and bikes to cross; we need to plan the functionality of the roadway carefully
- For the typical pedestrian, a mundane store front is more interesting than landscaping. How much landscaping do we really need?
- Need “something to walk to” - where can spending least amount of money make a difference; the private realm already exists for the public realm
- There seems to be a strong alignment between the book and Jarrett Walker presentation
- There seemed to be a very linear process to create walkability:

The Ten Steps of Walkability (from Jeff Speck’s “Walkable City”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Put cars in their place</th>
<th>2. Mix the uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Get parking right</td>
<td>4. Let transit work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Protect the pedestrian</td>
<td>6. Welcome bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shape the spaces</td>
<td>8. Plant trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Options for Broadway:

- What are the widths needed for different type of rail systems?
  (Project team response) - Light Rail - 13’ - Street Car, 11-12’ and can travel in the vehicle lane where buses currently are.
- We really need to consider light rail to connect to the east (all the way to Houghton) and have the capacity to serve more people.
- Wouldn’t light rail only have a total of 3 stops for all of Broadway, is that really what we want?
  (Project team response) - The frequency of stops for a light rail system can vary. Typically they are space approximately one mile from each other; however, in more dense areas they can spaced every ½ mile or so. Streetcars typically have stops more close to each other, roughly ¼ mile apart.
- Light Tail is in the distant future, how do we know it will be funded? I was told we can’t compare Broadway to Central Ave in Phoenix. I Was just there - there was Light Rail, two lanes of travel, and bike lanes and was not congested
- Can we get update from PAG on funding for the transit study?
- We need to remember that as the CTF we are only responsible for two mile of Broadway. That is what our scope is. We can make recommendations for overall policy or what transit should be for the entire roadway but our charge for this project is the study area only.

6. CTF Report/Discussion: Broadway Business & Property Owner Meetings
Time was given to the CTF members representing business interests to report out to the full committee regarding the recent business and property owner meetings held on July 24, 2014 and July 31, 2014. Key takeways and concerns from the business and property owner community were shared as well as results from the business and property owner survey distributed at the meetings that were compiled by the project team. Listed below are key highlights:

Meeting Purpose and Statistics:
- 2 Zone Meetings
  - 7/24 (East Zone), 6-8pm; 7/31 (West Zone), 8:30-10:30am
  - @ Child & Family Resources
- Invested businesses and property owners on Broadway invited
  - 145 unique property owners (for 328 properties)
  - 228 businesses with addresses on Broadway
  - Emails to recognizable emails from Broadway project listserv
• CTF business reps, Sunshine Mile leadership assisted project team and staff with planning of materials and meeting format

Attendance Results:
• 53 properties were represented:
  – 16% of 328 properties in the project area on Broadway
  – 30% of 145 unique property owners attended
  – 16% of 228 business addresses
• For the 48 properties, reps included:
  – 4 with only business owners / tenants reps (2% of bus.)
  – 13 with property owners only (9% of prop. owners)
  – 31 with property owners & business owners / tenants (21% prop. owners; 14% of bus.)

Main Issues and Takeaways
• Parking, Access & Collaboration
  • Parking at front door vs. changing realities.
  • Parking to be going from bad to worse.
  • Lack of easy access will affect business.
  • The need to take initiative and cooperate with neighbors became more apparent.
  • Have common interest in sharing parking, access, alleyways. Door has been opened to further negotiations.
• Make a Decision
  • Hurry up, make a decision on widening, design, plan so businesses can move on.
  • Everyone wants a decision regardless of what it is and they want it to be made sooner than later.
  • Further delays exacerbate problems of maintenance, vacancy, and vandalism that are at odds with all performance measures our CTF is eager to achieve.
• Businesses are Engaged -Their Perspective
  • Attendance demonstrates front lines can be engaged, make decisions about their futures. Not just turmoil here, but opportunity for many.
  • Majority West of Campbell not opposed to being acquired, rebuilding, and/or relocating. East of Campbell more concerned with staying and making it work.
  • Assembly of God Church is not opposed to relocating if any or part of the property is acquired.
  • Stark differences in talking points between most vocal neighborhood representatives and many business owners in attendance.
  • Receptive to ombudsman, handouts, Real Estate information...
• Build it Right -Build for Future
  • “Build it right the first time”- constant refrain. In stark contrast to neighborhoods, businesses are willing to part with properties to gain the best roadway and transit corridor possible.
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• If street has to be 6 lanes, make it compatible with future transit (streetcar, etc.).
• Most West business owners want roadway widened so it will accommodate the flow of traffic and future street car access.
• More are more open to the widening - great change from 1st meeting 2 years ago when there seemed to be nothing but dissent.

7. CTF Discussions and Recommendations: Block-by-Block Analysis of Map Variations

The CTF and project team members met around detailed maps of the alignment variations allowing for a block-by-block detailed review for the west end and east of the project study area. The CTF utilized street design concept rating sheets to assess each alignment variation’s performance through a variety measures. Following the work around the map the CTF engaged the project team in a discussion related to their concerns with the variations and provided recommendations to the project team for further refinement and analysis:

**Segment/Map #1:**

• Miles School:
  - 0 impact
  - Left turn lane
• Prefer Segment’s Variation 3, plus part of Variation 2B with tweaking
• High voltage wires are better high than underground; it does not look that bad, check the north end of Mountain Avenue (all buried in this stretch of Broadway)
• Bikes - in places where shorter segments do pylons (Ann suggests there are also newer options).
• Keep reminding cars there are bicycles
• Promenade approach to area
• 6’ minimum sidewalks

**Segment/Map #2: Olsen-Tucson**

• The 2200 block needs further attention and refinement
• We need to look at parallel parking
• Don’t want to take the gas station
• Not comfortable going South
• There needs to some off-set for properties
• Concerned about losing historical contributors on North
• Variations #1 and #4 - off table
• **Work on variations 2 and 3 - Olsen - Tucson Segment**
Segment/Map #3: Tucson-Norton

- Variation #2 is better: it does not impact the south as much and impacts the north less
- Majority CTF: Variation #1 makes more sense
- 13 parking spaces is that a problem? There needs to be parking in back.
  Chance building will be acquired?

Summary of group discussion:

- East side- there is clear direction for refinements
- West side- Colby/Jamie - collaborating to address issues, will solicit neighborhood input and report back to the group during the next meeting
- The block between Cherry & Warren still needs a lot work and refinement
- We absolutely need to avoid historic properties at every possible opportunity
- This was a Robust conversation there was a nice blending of viewpoints
- Revisit performance measures - matrix during the design charrette (August 26 and 28, 2014). Can performance measures be narrowed to most important?
- Include discussion of performance measures during the next design charrette (August 26 and 28, 2014)

8. Second Call to the Audience

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

Laura Tabili

Laura Tabili waived her time to speak.

Gene Caywood

“I just had a couple of comments on your transit discussion earlier in the meeting. The first one is, thanks for appointing a transit sub-committee. I think it’s a good way to go about it and I think it can be very productive. The second is: In all cases, I know you’re doing it with the lane widths and the sidewalks and landscaping. You’re taking the widths as being something that can be played with a little bit and narrowed where necessary. I think you still need to do that with the transit stuff that was presented by the staff. And I say that (let me do this logic if I can quickly) with light rail and the thirteen feet versus the streetcar with eleven to twelve feet: You know, if you were to build the streetcar first, for example, at eleven feet (let’s just pick it), and then light rail came along later, light rail would work with it. They’re not going to rebuild it - they can’t, they shouldn’t, they won’t if I’m still
alive - rebuild the darn road for two feet. Okay? They’re going to make it work! So put in the narrowest width you think is going to work and then make it work. And the last thing I wanted to say in that regard was, there’s a bunch of cities around who, when you look at their light rail system, they run kind of slow in kind of a mixed traffic, or close to mixed traffic, situation when they’re close to or in downtown. San Diego- two miles. Portland and Sacramento - close to two miles if not over two miles. The Blue Line in Los Angeles, probably right about two miles. There’s no problem in my mind with running light rail in a slower situation- more like a streetcar- in a travel lane if you have to when you’re close to the downtown area.”

Dick Basye

Dick Basye waived his time to speak.

Robert Cook

“Thank you. I’m going to continue where I left off. I passed out this sheet. I’m just going to run through it briefly. We’ve known this for some time. The nation studies are out. Jared Walker, in his July 11th presentation suggested that the VMT reflection point was 2005. That means, for the United States the VMT is going down for the first time in history. We thought it was going to go on forever. This is the basic logic of why we have to shift to all modes and stop widening roads- period. He came and addressed us and answered my question about- “What do we do in a city where we’re continuing to widen major corridors and we don’t have enough money to invest in this kind of transit?” This is the tradeoff we’re going to make if we continue widening without actually investing. Farhad said that we may have high-capacity transit in our community by 2040. We cannot wait until 2040. Jared said this pattern of widening without investing in transit will lead to economic ruin. That is the basic logic here. Are we going to do the easy thing which is to take a short term decision to benefit the road designers and the road builders? At the March charrette, the guy at my table from Oro Valley, who was he employed by? Granite Construction. Go to this video: Corridor Transformation starts with it. You will see what we did 10 years ago and why we have a streetcar today because there was an integrated vision. Look at the REAL performance measures. We’ve had a billion dollars investment in that corridor. You’re NOT going to get a billion dollars investment in widening Broadway. Omaha study- transit costs less than market.”

David Kubista

“I understand and appreciate your attention to detail and trying to work out the little stuff. The only thing that I don’t understand - two things: Talking about light
rail, streetcars, whatever. I’m looking at this thing that was put out for the opening of streetcar. It’s got the plans for where we want to go on things. None of these maps even show any proposal or idea to go down Broadway. Not at all. There is one thing here from Advocacy Group and it completely bypasses this whole system. Where is this plan? Where is this goal? Where is this vision? Second question: I can understand on the east side how six lanes kind of goes into six lanes of Broadway. On the west end you got three lanes of basically high speed traffic that go into a two lanes underpass and a parking garage. I don’t understand how this fits together? Is there some basic design, concept as to what’s going on? Can someone tell me where I need to look?”

9. 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. Closing comments were made by the Task Force including:

• At the May 6 M&C Study Session, during Jenn and Daryl’s presentation, I thought Daryl indicated that in pinch points a 6-lane roadway could be fit within 96 feet of right-of-way. My stakeholders saw this and liked this. I would request a drawing for 96 foot variation. [Clarification was requested regarding whether the 96-feet should include the roadbed only (curb-to-curb)] or also the sidewalks and landscape areas. Response was roadbed plus sidewalks and landscape areas.]
• It is important to document the 96 foot option and why we can or cannot do it and why are we deviating from it.
• Wish I could join transit subcommittee but I will be in Alaska - not talking about transit tomorrow, but the potential room to put it in in the future.
• If we want light rail in future we must preserve the right-of-way.
• I want to clarify the Transit Subcommittee’s purpose - to get information to present during the design charrette; not make decisions.
• Business owners are the ones who are directly impacted, they don’t want road as narrow as possible. There is stark contrast between what businesses and neighborhoods want.
• We need to landbank to make room for future high capacity transit.

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

The presentations given at this meeting can be reviewed by visiting the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force web page at:
http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/broadway/broadway-citizens-task-force
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New Tucson Study: Alt modes up, driving down

According to a new Arizona study, titled "Bikes, Trains and Less Driving," there was a 24.6 percent increase in public transportation trips and a 31 percent increase in per-person passenger miles traveled on public transportation in Tucson between 2005 and 2010.


Corridor transformation starts with an involved community

The following is a link to the video Tucsonans for Sensible Transportation (now Southern Arizona Transit Advocates) produced in 2003 to educate and promote the citizens multimodal plan for Tucson. It is a visionary video that still rings strongly true today. In fact its central arguments are even more compelling now given the significant changes in our economy, infrastructure, environment, and demographic preferences.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VhnoMI01zk4&list=UUHbG2UGL9WJ79eoheQWBK7Q

World transportation expert says Tucson’s pattern of unnecessary widening of roads will lead to economic ruin

http://cal.a.arizona.edu/community-outreach-partnership-center-copc-0.

New Omaha Study: transit costs less than parking

http://verdisgroup.com/2014/02/transit-programs-cost-less-than-parking-reduce-parking-demand-omaha-study-finds/

High capacity transit is planned for Tucson including Broadway Blvd Euclid to El Con Mall


Vision of linking area educational institutions with transit

http://www.streetcarfriends.org/maps/
To: Regional Transportation Authority Board  
RTA Citizens Advisory Committee  
RTA Technical/Management Committee

The Sam Hughes Neighborhood Association (SHNA) Board is writing directly to you to voice our growing concerns with the proposed RTA Plan and the proposed ½ cent sales tax. Although we have individually attended many meetings and completed many surveys, we wish to express the view from an area centrally located in Tucson adjacent to the University of Arizona and directly impacted by a number of high cost major projects identified in the plan. Additionally as residents of the City of Tucson and the region, we have issues about the overall plan and its financing, particularly as it affects the city’s budget and street maintenance.

One project that directly borders on the SHNA would widen Broadway to 8 lanes from Euclid to Country Club. The City of Tucson has talked about this project for years and perhaps at one time it seemed to be the thing to do. However, many circumstances have changed. What had some appeal twenty years ago doesn’t hold up the same way now. We would question the necessity of carrying out this old conventional plan. Recent upgrades of Broadway that included repairing, striping, lighting and bus pull-outs show how improvements can make a difference. There is still more work to be done to make Broadway safer and to revitalize the business environment. Why can’t Rio Nuevo funds generated from this area be used to help create a more vital business scene, instead of the blight resulting from the city’s confusing acquisition efforts. Widening Broadway to 8 lanes is not the approach that area businesses and residents want.

Spending several hundred million dollars to pour more traffic into Downtown from a widened Broadway along with increased traffic from a new Barraza/Aviation East Parkway seems at cross purposes with the idea of keeping traffic out of the Downtown area. Why have more traffic converge at Downtown only to have to divert it around Downtown on a very expensive Barraza/Aviation West? Even this bypass has potential difficulties of creating choke points at 6th Street and Stone Avenue for both westbound and eastbound traffic. If any of these three projects is built, it might be appropriate to construct the Barraza/Aviation West segment first to see if the bypass can do the job.

The Broadway project illustrates many of the questionable aspects of conventional major street widenings designed primarily (e.g., N. 1st Ave and Grant) to carry more cars at faster speeds through the urban core without full consideration for business and residential surroundings. The RTA “Key Corridors” report suggests only benefits and features for these types of projects as if these widenings were not taking place in built-up
urban areas without consequences. It is as if these long established areas are simply to be passed through.

We agree that improved intersection safety and traffic flow are desirable along with many other urban streetscape features, but major widening creating mega-streets and massive pedestrian-hostile intersections (e.g., Speedway/Campbell, Broadway/Kolb) are not the way to do it. We need new pedestrian-friendly intersection designs. We have not seen information that convincingly demonstrates just what gains there will be from these projects that will cost several hundred million dollars. How much travel time will be saved, and for whom, and why is that the most important consideration? What about safety?

University of Arizona representatives on the RTA committees have strongly favored both Grant Road and Barraza Aviation East to bring more cars into the UA area. At the present time this is one of the most congested parts of Tucson with high automobile and pedestrian accident rates. At the same time other UA officials are saying the UA will not be providing more parking spaces. Where will these cars go? This is totally self-serving, contradictory and irresponsible on the part of the UA. The proposed streetcar project with a fixed route would have minimal effect on mitigating the chief causes of congestion in this area resulting from commuters to the University and pass-through traffic. Many cars would still be driven into the UA area as their primary trip. More flexible alternatives (e.g., utilizing busses) are needed to address this situation.

We support sensible improvements to urban streets along the lines of the recommendations in the “5/6th St (Corridor) Livability Study” that treat the street as part of the urban environment. Urban streets need to be viewed as more than just a device with a high price tag for moving more traffic at a faster pace through established areas. In fact, we are curious why the 5/6th St. Corridor is not included in this plan. Was it because a citizens committee largely chosen by the neighborhoods themselves did not recommend widening the street as the traffic consultants and city staff favored?

Stated another way, if these major city projects were significantly altered or removed from the plan and the funding significantly reduced or eliminated, why should city residents pay a ½ cent sales tax for the remaining road projects that seem to further peripheral development under some vague concept of regionality. Many of these roads would bring more congestion to the city – an area that already has 70% of the region’s congestion according to a City of Tucson report. Why have roads such as River Road and Skyline/Ina not been studied and compared for east-west mobility instead of just picking Grant as the convenient “corridor of choice”? Is this another example of trying to complete an old plan or is this possibly the path of least resistance compared to a foothills route that could accomplish the same cross-region mobility? We cannot maintain the roads we have, yet we would get wider roads with heavier usage under this proposed plan. Is this a “benefit”? 
We understand that there may be approximately $8-10 billion in anticipated revenues available to this region according to the recently approved Pima Association of Governments’ “2030 Regional Transportation Plan” that will be available for this region, even if the RTA were to go out of existence tomorrow. The RTA sales tax money estimated around 2 billion dollars over 20 years would only amount to approximately 20% of the total transportation money for the region over the next 20 years. Yet the RTA plan is being presented in isolation from the RTP plan and being described as if without the 2 billion dollars from the ½ cent sales tax all major transportation projects would come to a halt. This is just not the case. City residents should ask if they would be better off paying ¼ cent sales tax for actual regional roads along with supporting realistic regional transportation impact fees. City residents faced with increasing city government budgets may want to reserve their sales tax options to pay for public safety needs and street maintenance before they commit to a limited purpose ½ cent sales tax for 20 years.

In summary, while there are some good features in the proposed RTA plan for the urban area, such as improved bus service, too much of the plan is simply more of the same conventional road building. The plan does too little for the urban area to warrant the imposition of a full ½ cent sales tax – over 70% will come from the City of Tucson. Rather than being the catch-up plan for existing residents that proponents claim, new roads outside the core will accelerate development at the city’s edge and beyond. New development made possible by these new roads will further strain government budgets if we continue to finance infrastructure in the present manner. We need new, equitable fiscal plans as well as transportation plans.

Perhaps enough changes can be made to the proposed plan in time for the May 2006 election to merit support. At this point we see no compelling reasons to support either the draft plan or a full ½ cent sales tax.

Sam Hughes Neighborhood Association

JOHN S. O’DOWD
President
TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Midtown Road Widening Working Group

DATE: November 7, 2005

RE: Regional Transportation Authority Plan

In consideration of the following:

• The City of Tucson is a member jurisdiction of the Regional Transportation Authority.
• The Regional Transportation Authority Board has requested member jurisdictions to review the Regional Transportation Plan prior to its final approval by the RTA Board.
• The widening of City roadways (including Grant Rd., Broadway Blvd., 1st Ave., and 22nd St.) would have serious adverse impacts on City of Tucson businesses and neighborhoods.
• Businesses and neighborhoods that would be directly impacted by these projects were not represented on the RTA Citizen’s Advisory Committee.
• City of Tucson business owners and residents have expressed concerns about the adverse impacts of these road widening projects and these concerns have not been adequately addressed within the RTA process.
• An alternatives analysis for Grant Rd. has concluded that intersection improvements would provide 70% of the traffic flow benefit of widening at significantly reduced fiscal and social costs.
• An economic impact study to determine whether the traffic flow benefit of widening Grant Rd. would outweigh the added fiscal and social costs was not conducted.
• No alternatives analyses have been conducted for Broadway Blvd., 1st Ave., and 22nd St.

The Midtown Road Widening Working Group, consisting of business owners and neighborhood representatives, therefore urges the Mayor and Council to take the following action:

• Request that the Regional Transportation Authority Board move the planned transportation and sales tax election from May 2006 to November 2006.
• Convene separate community-led forums, over the next few months, for each road widening project (Grant Rd., Broadway Blvd., 1st Ave., and 22nd St.). These forums should involve all interested and affected parties (to include both businesses and neighborhoods). The purpose of these forums should be to identify a vision and guiding principles for each corridor (Grant Rd., Broadway, 1st Ave., and 22nd St.), including whether widening the roadway is an appropriate solution.
• Conduct all necessary alternatives analyses and economic impact studies for each of these road widening projects (Grant Rd., Broadway Blvd., 1st Ave. and 22nd St.) and make the results available to each community-led forum.
• Each community-led forum should provide a report to the Regional Transportation Authority’s Citizen Advisory Committee for consideration in developing its final Regional Transportation Plan.