The Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force meeting summaries provide a brief descriptive overview of the discussions, decisions and actions taken at the meetings. The summary and the audio recording of the meeting comprise the official minutes of the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force Meeting. Meeting summaries and audio recordings of the meetings are available online at the City Clerk’s web page at: http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/clerks/boards?board=100.

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

MEETING RESULTS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements
The meeting was called to order by Meeting Facilitator, Nanci Biezer. A quorum was established and the agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Biezer. An announcement was made that the evening’s meeting format was a Study Session. Items allowing basic action (approval of meeting summaries or dates) were asterisked on the public agenda to provide clear notice that action on those items alone would be taken. The Deputy City Clerk confirmed that this approach is allowed by law. No other actions would be requested by the project team.

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>Naomi McIsaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony R. DiGrazia</td>
<td>Shirley Papuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Durham-Pflibsen</td>
<td>Diane Robles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Henley</td>
<td>Jamey Sumner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Fairchild</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, $2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.
2. Approval of Documents for Posting with the City Clerk’s Office: December 5, 2013 CTF Meeting Summary and Annual Report

The Task Force approved both the December 5, 2013 Meeting Summary and the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Task Force Annual report with no requested revisions. The project team will post the approved documents to the City Clerk’s Office and distribute them to other interested parties and stakeholder agencies. All previous meeting summaries as well as up to date project information can found on the project’s website: www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway.


Jenn Toothaker, reviewed recent project presentations and project outreach, as well as the Public Input Report with the CTF. The report consisted of documentation of public input received from November 23, 2013 through January 13, 2014.Jenn also provided a brief update from the following presentations that were made since the last CTF Meeting: December 10, 2013 Tucson Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee; December 18, 2013 Commission on Disability Issues, January 15, 2014 Brainstorming Session regarding Potential 2419 E. Broadway Demolition and Possibilities for the Site Treatment, Post Demolition; and January 21, 2014 RTA CART Meeting. The conversation that took place during this agenda item is listed below:

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

- The presentation that was made to the Tucson Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee (TPBAC) went very well. I spoke for over an hour and from what I can tell the TPBAC is very excited for the potential of the Broadway Project. Here are some key take-aways:
  - The majority of the members are concerned with the length of the crossings and the installation of HAWK Lights and how they could affect bicycle travel.
  - Members would like to see 10-11 foot lanes for the automobile traffic so that the cars drive slower and; thus, making it safer for bicyclists.
  - The committee expressed their passionate support for businesses and the neighborhoods located in the project area.
  - The committee also expressed their concern regarding the amount of time lights remain yellow at intersections. They stated they...
would like enough time for bicycles to clear the intersection safely in between the light turning yellow and the light turning red.

- The presentation to the Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) also went well. I gave an overall update and made it known to them that I will serve as a conduit of communication between the Commission and our Task Force. I plan on being more active with the group as we move further into the design phase.

- The Brain Storming Session for what to do with the Panda Buffet building was interesting and many good ideas were presented. To provide some background information, the building, located at 2419 E. Broadway Boulevard, is owned by the City and is currently vacant. It has been on the market for a while and the City has actively pursued new tenants. The building was broken into in November of last year and the electrical system was completely removed - it will take at least $50,000 to repair this damage. Lately there have been several complaints of unlawful activity occurring at the site and the adjacent businesses have brought up several safety concerns. The realistic next step is for the City to board the windows and fence the property in to avoid any further damage and to mitigate the safety concerns. However, this does present an issue of liability and it would create an unfavorable visual aesthetic for the surrounding buildings and businesses. So the Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT) and City Real Estate Department have advanced the idea of having it demolished and doing some sort of site treatment to make the area look nicer. The brainstorming session was held at the Ward 6 Office to identify ideas of what could be done post-demolition. Joseph and Mary both attended the brainstorming session, would you like to present what happened?
  - A lot of neat and creative ideas were shared and I am glad that the City is looking at solutions within the framework of a limited budget to make the property attractive. At our annual neighborhood association meeting Councilman Kozachik shared information about the Panda Building. The general reaction by those that attended was that they were glad that City is looking at the situation creatively but were concerned that any decision that would be made would be temporary - this is disheartening.
  - I second that, it was a great meeting.
  
We will keep you all up to date on the progress of this decision as it moves along

- What were some of the ideas that were presented at the brainstorming session?
There were several ideas, including:

- A historic sign park
- Desert pathways
- A door and doorway art signifying the corridor as a gateway into downtown
- And other options as simple as treatment to the asphalt to color it in
  - I think it would be a waste of money to do anything just to see it torn down as part of the improvement project.

(Doug Mance, Ex-Officio CTF Member) There was actually no mention of the Broadway project at the January 21, 2014 CART Meeting. I do want to congratulate you on all you have accomplished. I admire the time and effort you all have put into this process. I am in favor of your success and as a communications channel between you and the CART Committee I want you to succeed. I define success as a plan that you come up with that is recommended by the RTA CART Committee and Board and is approved by the Mayor and Council. I have no doubt that we will arrive at that and I am here to help keep the dialogue and communication between the two committees open.

4. Review Refined Charrette Format, Goals, and Upcoming Meeting Agendas

The project team utilized this agenda item to present the CTF with a revised meeting schedule that pushes back the February Design Charrette to a later date and also adds an additional meeting to the charrette schedule. The project team explained to the Task Force that making these changes to the schedule will allow more time for:

- the planning team to present more information at the charrette,
- the CTF to digest and receive clarifications
- and the CTF to discuss, gain understanding of the benefits and drawbacks of the street design concept alternatives, and to have an in-depth discussion to reach consensus on the materials to take forward to the next public meeting.

By making this adjustment to the schedule the planning team projects that the overall planning and design phase schedule will be expedited by one to two months. The following conversation took place between the Task Force and the project team during this agenda item:

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

- I have a commitment on March 1, so I would prefer the final day of the Charrette to be on the March 7 or March 8. This would also give us some
breathing room in between the second and third day and allow us to bring information back to our stakeholders and have discussions with them, that would be my recommendation.

I can piggy back on that, a lot of you seem to not be able to make it on the first.

- I cannot make it on the March 7.
- I cannot make it on any Saturday; this is when I do the bulk of my work.

The project team does not feel that one evening meeting will give you enough time to accomplish the work you need to get done. If we cannot do it on a weekend we could have two back to back evening meetings, would this be out the question? (The CTF as a whole replied that this would not be a problem.)

We intend to ask for your approval of the meeting format and new dates at the February 6, 2014 meeting. In between now and then we will send an email polling you as a group for what dates you would be available on.

- How will the meetings be structured? Will there be one or two calls to the audience? I would like to be sure that my stakeholders have the opportunity to comment on what the design options being presented are. The first meeting of the Charrette will be a “study session” so there will only be one call to the audience opportunity at that meeting, the other two will be “action meetings” so there will be two calls to the audience opportunities at those.

- One other request I have is to schedule a break, not only is it hard for us but for everyone in the room. Does anyone have an objection to putting breaks back into our meeting agendas? (The project team agreed to put breaks back into the agenda beginning with the February 6, 2014 meeting.)

- So the design concepts you mentioned are alignments? Cross sections? Everything?

Yes, the design concepts are alignments, cross sections and looking at what it does in terms of access and parking. The issue of having alignment alternatives for the different concepts with the same number of lanes gets to how we are trying to address potential impacts to properties that we do not want to impact - they look at the different parking and access issues.

- So it’s the four lanes with no transit lane?
The ones that we received your endorsement to design in detail were the four lanes without transit and the six lane plus two transit lanes options. What we are looking at doing is having alignments of right-of-way, without all the details for the six lane and four lanes plus two transit lanes options.

5. Presentations and Discussion: Historic Significance of the Broadway Projects Area

City of Tucson, Coordinator of Tucson Bond Projects Committee, Lynne Birkinbine, and Tucson Historic Foundation President, Demion Clinco, gave a brief presentation on the Sunshine Mile Bond Proposal and what the bond project would mean for the Broadway Project Area. Additionally, Jonathan Mabry and Jennifer Levstik from the City of Tucson Historic Preservation Office gave a brief update on the historic preservation efforts the City has taken within the project corridor. No action taken.

The Task Force members were asked if they would write a letter of support for the bond project proposal, but action could not be taken at the study session meeting because the agenda item was not marked as one with potential Task Force action. The members were invited to attend the next Bond Committee meeting to share their support during Call to the Audience. More information about the upcoming meeting dates and City Bond Projects Committee is available online at: http://www.tucsonaz.gov/clerks/boards?board=117/. The following discussion took place after the presentation:

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

- When the bonds go to voters will the projects go as individual projects or go as a package?

The projects go as part of a package. This project would go as part of the historic category. There is quite a bit of information listed about on the actual ballot.

- So this project is not currently funded?

The City Bond Committee is currently looking at things and this project has been rising to the top of a lot of lists.

It would be helpful for your committee to recommend this project formally if you are interested in doing so.

- How do we formally recommend this?

This can be agenized for the next meeting. You can also come and speak to the bond committee; however, if you do so you must be sure that you are speaking as individual and not for the Task Force as a whole. More information on the projects can be found at http://www.tucsonaz.gov/bond-project-advisory-committee.

This Meeting Summary has not yet been approved by the Broadway Boulevard Citizens Planning Task Force.
• Can we write letters?
  Yes, also, we have postcards with images of the buildings that would be eligible that you can write a letter of support on the back of and these can be sent in to the County.

• You mentioned an easement with the County earlier. Can you clarify this a bit more?
  The easement I mentioned provides the County with a protection of investment. In this case it would disallow any construction on the façade of the building after the improvement had been made. The County does not want to invest in something just to turn around and have it torn down.

6. Presentations and Discussion: Local Business Support

Deanna Chevas and Erika Mitnik-White of Local First Arizona gave a presentation regarding the importance of local businesses to Tucson’s and Arizona’s economies discussing this topic in the context of how it relates to the project. Additionally, representatives from the City of Tucson Economic Initiatives Office presented to the CTF what current tools, programs and projects are available to and in support of local business, and how these items relate to the project. Finally, Jude Cook of the Sunshine Mile Business Association presented information about the mission and progress of the Business Association and announced the upcoming 1/30/14 event and other activities. A brief discussion, listed below, ensued following these presentation.

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

• The presentation by Local First really pulled together a lot of the concepts that we have been talking about, and what we value as a group.

• As a small business owner I can truly say what Local First Arizona does is better than what any Chamber of Commerce provides. It seems to be a much better fit for small local businesses.

• The Economic Initiatives Office presentation made me think of the Panda building we were discussing earlier. The building is deteriorated and needs something $30,000 worth of work - is your program something that a business owner could use to get this funding?
Our program is for gap funding and requires a minimum loan $2,000,000 that has to be matched by the applicant by some amount. For example if someone has a $5,000,000 project and has access to $3,000,000 they could apply to our program to fill in the $2,000,000 gap.

All of these incentives focus on larger investments but we are trying to be as creative as possible to help small businesses and to get people to buy in on the idea.

- So most of the people who would be able to take advantage of your programs are large scale national chains?

No, many local business owners have applied to the program - restaurant owners, boutique hotels, housing developments, etc. have shown real interest. This program doesn’t really apply to major retail developments.

- So it really is set up to help local business owners?

Yes it is.

- What is the timeline for the Broadway Volvo project?

The design charrette I mentioned earlier will be held in mid-March. We will take the input we get from the charrette and come back with new renderings sometime after that in the summer and the process will move from there.

7. Presentation and Discussion: Presentation of Initial Draft Economic Development White Paper for the Broadway Project Area

Jason Moody of Economic & Planning Systems gave a summary presentation of the of the Initial Draft Economic Development White paper that is currently being produced. The white paper presents to the Task Force the current conditions of economic development within the corridor, case studies of development and redevelopment that has occurred in other areas similar to the Broadway corridor (both in Tucson and from around the country), and assessment of the opportunities that could potentially exist within the project area following construction. Jason led the CTF in a brief discussion, summarized below, following his presentation.

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

- Thank you for emphasizing the best practices and how this all works.

- Can you please clarify something, I thought I heard you state that a goal would be to attract more major tenants and developers.

To clarify, I stated that the revitalization and redevelopment after the right-of-way acquisition and construction is likely to be incremental and attract micro-developers, not major developments.
• Can you talk a bit about the foot print that is left by big box stores?

Typically, you have a box and they like to assemble next to other boxes and create power centers. So, this really isn’t something that could occur within the corridor. Here you would have to develop vertically and perhaps also build a parking structure.

In many places people look at sites such as the Broadway Volvo site and develop with a 20 - 30 year future in their mind. They envision how infill would occur in the future. EPS’s study could show vertical type developments occurring down the road - things that might not be possible now, but that could occur down the line.

• I’m looking at this in a different way. If 90% of the current space is occupied, it would seem to me that the corridor is ideal for what is here now. Why does this need to change when it working already?

We are looking at a 25-30 year time frame. Things are going to turn over naturally but the future might hold different things and property owners may want to repurpose their buildings or change uses. We also have not analyzed the health of the existing businesses; it may be a case of a high occupancy rate with businesses that are not that healthy.

• A couple of things for me: I think it is great to hear the economic conversation unfold, but it seems disconnected for the changes we are discussing to the roadway. Do we want the users of the businesses to be pedestrians or those using automobiles? How do we figure this out and tie it all together?

My second comment is that you mentioned that the ongoing market trends are favorable to new development but the examples you gave - Office Max, Safeway, and Del Taco - are of national chains not locally owned businesses. Family dollar patrons may have a different way of getting there than patrons of other stores. The different properties have different users - how is this treated in the economic analysis? How are these users traveling to the properties? Is there an easy way to capture this data? The slide made me nervous because I want to build a road that encourages local businesses.

Those examples were used because we could quickly document them. If we pulled the data for all of the building permits that have gone in we would probably find that many local firms have located in the study area recently as well.
I have seen numerous turnovers with the small businesses located in the corridor as well. Even with this, small, local businesses are still here and still thriving.

To get back to the previous question, certain retailers have certain trade areas. For example, the Safeway I mentioned earlier will attract those in the area directly near because it is the closest supermarket to them. Most of the people who utilize the corridor are the people who live in the neighborhoods and those who commute through the area. The stores that are located here will attract those users based on their needs.

I do know that the Downtown Tucson Partnership recently surveyed people in Downtown and how they entered into the area. Perhaps we could get a hold of this data or engage in a similar survey along the project corridor.

I was feeling really good after Local First presented and saw the great things local businesses bring but then I became sensitive to what I saw in your presentation because all of the examples seemed like there are chains. Is there data that shows that establishing chains next to local shops is beneficial to them?

Actually I worked on a project where a Home Depot was moving in and the biggest supporters of the store were the already established local businesses. These businesses supplied specialty items that the Home Depot did not and were excited at the prospect of the Home Depot moving in and providing a greater amount of foot traffic and referrals. Not all examples are like this but sometimes what you have to do is distinguish between the building and the tenant. If a chain wants to move into a particular building they will do that - I’ve seen examples of Starbucks moving into historical buildings.

In terms of diversity of ownership - doesn’t the smaller size lots lock in smaller size business that tend to be local? It seems like a self-fulfilling prophecy. As long as you have the diversity of property owners you will have the diversity of businesses in the corridor. That’s seems to be a very good correlation.

We need to facilitate all modes of transportation to facilitate as much tax revenue generation in the corridor as possible. It is important to not discriminate against any mode, we need as much tax revenue as possible.

- If we can facilitate alternative modes for the neighborhood residents and those that live close we can free up the road for
those who are traveling through. We need to make it attractive, safe, and as convenient as possible.
  o And as safe as possible for all modes.

- I love the emphasis on the nodes of activity and hubs such as the Broadway Village where people can park and walk to multiple businesses.

  Broadway Village is an interesting example. It used to have parking directly in front but is functioning with it in the back. That is what we have been doing by looking at idealized parcels - what does it mean to lose parking up front, like in the example Jason showed earlier of the Bentley’s Coffee site. All of the business owners in that strip own the parking lot and take interest in the maintenance of it. We are looking for ways to somehow facilitate that on this project.

8. Call to the Audience

Three (3) members of the public filled out speakers cards and were called on to address the Task Force:

Laura Tabili

Mrs. Tabili ceded her time to another individual and did not speak.

Gene Caywood

Mr. Caywood ceded his time to another person and did not speak.

Deb Dedon

My question was, when looking at the information we received, what has happened to the recommendations that came out on the 13th of September? That huge meeting where we went through the exercises and my impression from that was that the option that was most favored was the least destructive one, and that’s not what I’m hearing up here. I’m hearing much bigger than what was taken. That’s sort of my question.

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. During the next steps, the project team presented the proposed agenda for the February 6, 2014 meeting. The following discussion occurred during this agenda item.
Broadway: Euclid to Country Club
Draft January 23, 2014 CTF Meeting Summary

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

- To confirm what charrette will look like: You provide input and information for us to consider on the first day, and the rest of the time the CTF will have a chance to converse and work together? (The project team confirmed this). Let’s ensure that we can interact with each other versus simply listening to presentations to keep the energy up. We need to cross-pollinate to be able to reach consensus. I also have concerns about stakeholder involvement - we need time to speak with stakeholders in between sessions.

- Conversation and cross pollination between the CTF members is important. We need to hear how it will impact each neighborhood and the City as a whole. Will Broadway look at ½ block in on both sides of street (like Grant) for street improvements/landscaping? (The project team responded that it is likely that improvements will be made to north-south streets in close proximity to intersections with Broadway with the goal of creating functional intersections while minimizing the extent of improvements to these crossing streets)

- So, hands-on with materials during the charrette? (the project team confirmed this)

- Needed to have presentations from the staff to build a foundation for the work and time to talk.

- I am looking forward to having the academic conversation that connects economic development to the roadway.

- I agree with Mary and Shirley - would like to hear how each of us feels and where we want to project to go.

- Excited to get started and have something to tell stakeholders. I have delayed going to Council to talk about parking until after the charrette but still plan to go to a future M&C Call to Audience if anyone would like to join me.

- We have Draft Vision and Goals in a rough format and some of our goals conflict. Will we firm this up during the charrette?

- We have had strong public input/direction from the past public meetings; yet, there are still broad alternatives. We need to connect back to public input received to refine the Vision and Goals.

- So far the Workshops (charrettes) have been a first pass with limited information to consider, there is still much more to go - this process is an evolution.

- The 22nd & Plummer Overpass is a good example of how a row of abandoned houses were converted to a park. It looks much better now - take a peek.

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

This project is funded by the City of Tucson, Pima County and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and is part of the voter-approved, $2.1 billion RTA plan that will be implemented through 2026. Details about the plan are available at www.RTAmobility.com.
I have seen this process before: Phil will have focused input to put lines on a map. I am thrilled to be getting here so have something solid to talk about.

Gene Caywood’s transit study was mentioned earlier - is something going on with that? *(The project team responded that it has been presented to TDOT administration and is part of the Public Input Report.)*

Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 8:25 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