



Draft Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE

February 25, 2014

5:30 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

MEETING RESULTS

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements

The meeting was called to order by Meeting Facilitator, Nanci Biezer. A quorum was established, brief announcements were made by the project team and handouts were distributed to the Task Force with supplemental information, and the agenda for the meeting was reviewed by Nanci Biezer.

Citizen Task Force Members

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

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

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

2. Approval of January 23, 2014 and February 6, 2014 CTF Meeting Summaries

The project team asked the Task Force for their approval of the January 23, 2014 and February 6, 2014 CTF Meeting Summaries. The Task Force approved the January 23, 2014 summary with no requested revisions and tabled the approval of the February 6, 2014 meeting summary until the March 6, 2014 meeting to allow more time for review. All previous meeting summaries, as well as up-to-date project information can found on the project's website:

www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway.

3. Public Input Report and Reports on Project Presentations & Outreach

The project team reviewed the latest Public Input Report (updated from 2/7/2014 through 2/21/2014) with the Task Force. Additionally, a Task Force member brought to the attention of the group a meeting that between the Planning Commission and the Broadmoor Neighborhood association regarding the expansion of parking at the Broadway Village retail plaza to be held on Thursday, February 27, 2014. Because the meeting will be held on the same day as a Task Force meeting it was requested that a project team member attend the meeting and debrief the Task Force on the discussion that occurs. Project manager, Jenn Toothaker, stated that project team member, Phil Swaim as well as a member of the City of Tucson's Office of Integrated Planning will be attending the meeting and will be able to brief the Task Force at the March 6, 2014 CTF meeting.

4. Presentations and Discussion: Phoenix Light Rail Implementation (Wulf Grote, Phoenix Valley Metro, Planning & Development Director)

Wulf Grote, Planning and Development Director for Phoenix Valley Metro presented the history and key implementation focal points of the Phoenix Light Rail system. Wulf also discussed the similarities and differences between the implementation of the Light Rail system and the Broadway roadway improvement project. His presentation can be found online along with the other CTF meeting materials.

The following discussion occurred during this agenda item:

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

- **The discussion regarding sidewalks - there isn't a requirement for a [landscape] buffer between the sidewalk and bike lane?**
We wanted a buffer and tried to plan to create one, but we also wanted to minimize impacts in as many areas as we could.
- **What are the widths for the cross section templates you are presenting?**
The cross sections are roughly 96 feet wide - something like that. We did have to take some frontage areas and also had to acquire land for areas near station platforms and left turns.

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.

- **There seems to be a difference in the widths of the travel lanes you are presenting. Some seem to be 11 feet and others are 10 feet, can you clarify?**

We narrowed the lanes to 10 feet in some of the downtown areas because the traffic is slower in those areas (20-25 MPH), but those are the only areas we did this.

What are the considerations for narrower lanes?

Giving enough room for all forms of transportation - the safety and comfort factor. I would not recommend building lanes narrower than 11 feet wide; however, the area in question is in downtown. Traffic is much slower in this area - people want to look at businesses, etc.

- **How frequently spaced are the station platforms?**

The stations are spread a 1/2 mile apart inside the core areas of the alignment, and are spaced 1 mile apart outside of the core areas. Some areas are spaced at 1/4 mile apart near the higher activity centers; it actually varies quite a bit throughout the 20 miles.

Do any of these areas have single track alignments?

I don't recommend that. The only area that is single track are the areas that have one-way couplets, otherwise it would really constrain operations.

- **How much of the 20-mile alignment has an overlay?**

I am not sure. It is mostly in Phoenix. The local jurisdictions make these policy decisions. It took several years of planning to implement the overlay prior to construction. There are new state laws have that been adopted that make the implementation of overlays more challenging.

- **Were the Park and Ride facilities included as part of the project cost?**

Yes, these facilities are included as part of the overall cost of the Light Rail project. The costs were planned into the system. Most of the Park and Rides were built on the outer edges of the system. When we initially built the Park and Ride facilities we were concerned with the demand for parking but we have found that we actually haven't needed as much as we originally thought?

- **In response to your last slide stating whether you want to a roadway designed for transit or want one designed to be a highway - did you ever discuss functionality in your planning process? We are stuck counting cars**

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.

on our project - we are overly concerned with what the capacity of the roadway should be.

Not really, the only place we thought of capacity was Camelback. We did look at traffic analyses for the entire transit corridor - businesses were concerned with losing traffic.

- **You mentioned Camelback isn't transit friendly, why is this?**
Camelback is the widest road in the transit network - it is very wide and not very conducive to pedestrians. It is not very walkable. When looking at making things transit friendly, you also have to ensure that is pedestrian friendly as well to support the transit.
- **In terms of destinations along Camelback, what exists there?**
There are not many businesses. There is a Target, a Park and Ride and some apartments. There are not many major development sites.
- **Light Rail transit is a potential ultimate build out for our transit system...I'm curious in the discussion regarding transit versus auto oriented - Light Rail is a bigger animal than other things. Are there things we can do at a smaller scale to encourage transit before we get to the point of pursuing Light Rail?**
The streetcar is going to be very good at encouraging Transit Oriented design but is not very good at creating a large network because it loses the speed advantage of having dedicated Right-of-Way, etc. In terms of bus rapid transit versus Light Rail - private investment comes with the sense of permanency that rail provides. Developers are more willing to come in if they know the system isn't going to move. If you do put the buses in their own dedicated guideway, it can attract development. Cleveland is an example of this, but you will get more development with rail transit.
- **Regarding the concern that Camelback is not necessarily the best - would you do a different route if you could do it again? I'm curious because Camelback is a big cross town route.**
We looked at a lot of different streets and different routes and Camelback was the best option. If we did it over, I would probably not have added the extra lane. I think four lanes [plus the space for Light Rail] would have worked.

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.

- **You mentioned the importance to connections routes (bike) - how much do you make use of other multi-use paths?**

The City of Phoenix has made it a priority to create more connectivity between bikes and the Light Rail. Our project scope does not include this in it, but we have recommended to the jurisdictions to build up the capacity of their bike networks to provide connectivity.

- **We are struggling with the question of bike lanes - whether or not we should leave them or lose them.**

In some cases bike lanes are on the Light Rail route but we also have parallel routes. We had a difficult decision in Mesa regarding this. It is a Right-of-Way issue and has much to do with the values of the community.

- **In terms of (relocating) utilities - what are the best conditions for Light Rail?**

We went through this in Tempe. The problem with building on one side of the road is that you lose access to the private properties so we built most of the track in the center of the road - so we needed to relocate the utilities from the middle of the road to the side of the road.

- **So where are the utilities on Broadway?**

The project engineers will know this best; however, they will be clearly marked in the final construction drawings.

The utilities on Broadway are all over the place, a lot of them are right in the middle of the roadway.

- **You stated that some of the remnant parcels on Camelback became parking - what were the setbacks on these parcels?**

The setbacks for the Park and Ride lots were 60-65 feet wide. These properties were not that big to begin with. Additionally, the ability to redevelop the parcel has a lot to do with what you can do with the adjacent properties and how you can assemble them to make larger parcels. We acquired a lot of Right-of-Way for the Light Rail project, over \$100 million worth. Any resale of the land must go back into the transit system per FTA requirements.

The tension Wulf mentioned regarding the Park and Ride lots happened on Camelback because there was a belief that there would need to be a lot of parking. Some sites would have been easily redeveloped but because there was an attitude that Park and Rides were necessary, they trumped redevelopment of the remnant parcels.

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.RTAamobility.com.

- **In terms of utility relocations - what do you do with cross utilities?**
With cross utilities, you need keep them where they are but there is a need to make them deeper. There is a minimum amount of clearance needed under the trackway.

5. Presentation and Q & A: Street Design Concept Alternative

Discussion held, no action taken. The project team presented the detailed street design concepts that the Task Force agreed to advance into further study. The concept drawings showed detailed roadway alignments for two 4-lane alternatives, one that focuses on minimizing directing building impacts and one that focuses on minimizing property impacts; and a 6-lanes plus 2 transit lanes (8 lanes total) alternative that focuses on minimizing property impacts. The drawings included Right-of-Way locations, the number of lanes, the geometric orientation of the roadway alignment, landscaped areas, a color-coded index of historic and significant buildings, and City-owned properties. The two 4-lane alternatives also showed the right-of-way alignment of two 6-lane alternatives. The project team also presented prototypical design diagrams developed to show design options for possible development and redevelopment opportunities on varying sized parcels and lots. At the conclusion of the presentation, the Task Force was presented with the opportunity to look at the maps as a group and ask questions of the project team. Listed below is a summary of the Q & A that took place:

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

- **I'm just curious - the parking in the concept you just mentioned would then fall into the public Right-of-Way?**
That is one of the things we would have to work out - what type of parking district might there be. Also, this may come up on some of the other alternatives as well; the buildings that are to the north in this area are City owned so that presents itself an opportunity to repurpose them as public parking as well. That is part of what would need to be worked out - is there a parking district here? Will the property owners manage the parking lots themselves? What is the negotiation about how the parking works and what needs to happen in terms of parking requirements so that these uses can rely on public parking?
- **So, you are not planning on incorporating any bus pullouts?**
For the four-lane alternatives, all signalized intersections would have bus pullouts, but the six-lane alternatives would not include them. The analysis that has been done shows that you will not get the backup that necessitates the pull-outs.

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

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

- I noticed from the development form in the development diagrams that many of them have both alleyway and street access. I know that in my neighborhood, a developer was just restricted from having alley access. What is the city's formal position on allowing alleyway access to properties? Will alley access indeed be allowed?

This comes back to the topic we have been discussing at some of other meetings - are there things where the community might consider utilizing an overlay? There are varieties of things you could look at with an overlay and one of those is alley access. Another thing that is important is the dumpster issue you mentioned - different uses require a dumpster but there are some instances where you could negotiate with the refuse people to not have a dumpster for refuse, there are a lot areas in town where this is already occurring. This is important, because if you notice from the diagrams if you do not have an alley the access needed for the dumpster makes a huge impact on the property.

- I was surprised to see alley access on the diagram because we have been told that alley access was kind of a non-starter.

At this point we included it because we wanted to put it out there to see what people thought. It is not in our scope of work to look at developing an overlay, even if there was going to be one. This would have to come from the City from the standpoint of doing it from an economic development perspective.

- My hesitation is that I do not think we should be making decisions based on something that might not be allowed. I would like assurance from the City that we are making decisions that conform to their existing policies.

Absolutely, and something we can do as we move forward is to figure what is more appropriate. As we get closer to making a decision that will really inform the discussion. And Phil is right; there is no budget within this project to do an overlay. But we do have staff members that know how do that.

Also, the reason that we are putting it out there is for you all to think about it. You could recommend an overlay and the particular details of it to the Mayor and Council as part of your design recommendations and the final Design Concept Report. That is what you all need to think about. Even though it is not a charge of the project, I am sure the issue will keep coming up and you may want to have an opinion on that. This is just another tool to help enhance your understanding of the issues.

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

I can really see this coming forward with the Design Concept Report as recommendations for the Mayor and Council to consider as they make a decision on the alignment.

The question of alley access is a good question - when we initially started discussions with Development Services they stated that alley ways did not meet their standards. This is because many of the traditional alleyways are not wide enough, but as we got into the design work we discovered that a lot of businesses along Broadway do have alley access right now so Development Services realized that this is a possibility. They are learning how to utilize this in the downtown in the more urban environment. There is tremendous potential with this option to be able to get service and provide local access. So the possibilities are there.

Environmental services may have new technologies as well. Trash compactor technologies are being utilized in more restricted area so that is a possibility to recommend as well.

6. Presentation and Q & A: Performance Measure Assessment - Review of VISSIM Modeling and Other Performance Assessments

The project team presented an update of the status of the performance measure assessment of the design concept alternatives that have been advanced for further study. The Task Force was given a workbook that detailed each performance measure and the methodology behind the development of the performance measure and the assessment of the design concept alternatives. Following this, the project team presented an update of the VISSIM modeling which is being utilized to assess and compare the transportation performance of the design concept alternatives. The project team members and the CTF engaged in a brief discussion, summarized below, during this agenda item.

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

- **What intersections were used in your VISSIM analysis?**
We looked at all of the signalized intersections for the study area - just west of Euclid to just east of Country Club. All of the models were built to include exclusive left turn lanes, and at some intersections dual left turn lanes based on the demand, as well as exclusive right turn lanes.
- **I'm curious, the east bound lane in the both the four-lane and the four + two transit lane alternatives are the outliers, why is this?**
This is because the model takes into account the p.m. peak traffic, if you modeled the a.m. peak traffic it would be the opposite.

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.

- In the model the four-lane alternative looked really congested, but the four + two lane alternative did not look as congested, is it literally just taking the buses out of the travel lane the reason why it is less congested?

Every model we run is different so we are not necessarily comparing the same days. [Each model is run 10 times, and each time it runs, it will be somewhat different.] Looking at the clip we did just now does not give you the big picture. What gives you the big picture is looking at the average one-hour travel time [compiled from all 10 runs]. That is because what we have done is tracked every auto and every bus that moves through here, so that is what you need to look at.

- Does the model we are looking at utilize the low growth numbers? Does it take into account the induced demand from using Broadway instead of the other roadway due to its improvements?

It does take into the low growth projections - the 22% growth from today. Also, the traffic projections are based off the regional model. The 2040 model assumes six lanes so the model shows all of the traffic that will come onto Broadway.

- What period of time does the numbers you are using come from, is it high season or low season?

The period of time we modeled was in spring which is generally the higher season. Traffic volumes generally drop 5 - 8 percent in the summer in Pima County.

- I have an observation: I am very surprised in the disparity between the automobile and transit travel time; it's almost double the time to take a bus in the same two mile stretch. If want to encourage transit ridership we need to equalize the times and incentivize riding transit. When it's double the travel time, it makes riding transit a tough sell.

- Quick question, there is going to be another new six lane roadway a mile to the south. I assume those numbers are factored into the model as well?

Yes it does. The regional model included the widening of 22nd Street, as well as the widening of Broadway. It also includes the Barraza Aviation Parkway extensions, as well as all of the other projects included in the RTA Plan.

- What is the average two-mile travel time for the Light Rail in Phoenix
I am not sure, but the Light Rail in Phoenix does have a dedicated Right-of-Way with its own travel lane and it has signal prioritization. One of the

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

reasons why the Light Rail is so successful is because of its travel time - besides stopping at transit stop platforms it does not stop at all. It has the signal priority and just zooms right through the light.

- **Can we recommend signal prioritization for transit as part of our design recommendations?**

Absolutely, but it will only work if you have a dedicated transit lane; otherwise the transit vehicle will be stopped behind the other vehicles.

I did have a chance to learn more about this recently. The City's signal system is not the most advanced and does not have the ability to add transit priority to the system. They would have to upgrade both the hardware in the field and the software in the command center.

- **If there was budget capacity to do so within our project could we upgrade the signals in just our two mile area, or would this have to be done system wide?**

On Broadway, you would want it system-wide because there are a lot of transit riders that do not come from the project area - they come from further out east. To get a lot of ridership, you would have to extend the benefits of the signal technology throughout the entire transit network.

If we were able to start securing the hardware in this two mile section to get ready for the upgrade, that is a possibility.

You also have to remember that with signal priority you have to stop everyone - just the transit vehicle gets to go through the light. So you will see an increase in the travel time for the other modes. It may equalize the travel time for autos and transit.

Again, this gets back to what Wulf talked about - the decision to make the corridor a transit priority corridor, because it will not only affect the traffic on Broadway it will also affect the north/south traffic at all of the signalized intersections. There is also the issue of where the traffic that is affected by the signal priority will go because the regional model does not account for the corridor being a transit priority corridor.

7. Call to the Audience

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

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

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

Gene Caywood

First, I want to say to Jenn and everybody, thanks for having my long-time friend Wulf Grote here. I thought he did an excellent job and I almost never believe 100% of everything that somebody says in a presentation, but I did agree with 100% of what Wulf said. I would also like to say that he and his former boss, Dick Thomas, are the first people in the Phoenix staff that felt that rail transit would work in a city like Phoenix. He is largely responsible for the fact that they have Light Rail today.

What I really came to say tonight was about the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. As you know, we have been asking the City to do a transit study and Mary brought that up last week and Jenn gave a good answer, which was that they are looking into it. We are a little concerned I guess that you guys are going into the whole selection of alternatives without a little bit more transit guidance. So what we did is we came up with a little questionnaire that I would like to hand out in a minute.

Let me read just this one paragraph: it says that since the Task Force is at the point of making decisions about alignments, what kind of responsibility (in our opinion at least) can be expected to do so without some degree of specificity regarding the location of future transit for which they are expected to provide space. The Southern Arizona Transit Advocates suggests this question to be the feelings of the stakeholders, given the knowledge and information that they have to date. So we have listed some questions which we believe at this time can be answered at this time, based not so much on a comprehensive knowledge of transit design or requirements, but based on the prospective of business and a residential interest along or adjacent to Broadway. Thus, the questions asked are not technical in nature but are designed to have listed the preferences of the Task Force members. Which preferences can later become starting assumptions when the transit study is conducted?

So I would like to hand these out to you and you don't have to turn them back to me, but you know we would like your opinion. We want to ultimately comment on the alternatives and maybe produce some alternatives to the alternatives and if you would answer these questions and give them back to me it would really be appreciated. I have coded them on the bottom T= Task Force and there is one for each of you. I have some here for staff and the staff can keep them for reference, if the staff wants to answer them for too, that would be fun! I would like to know what the staff thinks. We will tally them differently, and I have the pile in the back for the audience.

Laura Tabili

Mrs. Tabili ceded her time and did not speak.

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

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

Robert Hadel

I live in the Miles neighborhood on 13th street just off of Broadway. Primarily I am a pedestrian, and I bike and use transit as well. I think Tucson has long been considering this being kind of an urban corridor and I think that widening, it kind of takes away what would be considered a more urban feel.

Also, right now we have a barrier to our neighborhood which is Kino. We have another potentially 6 lane barrier on the North side as well which makes it that much more less connected, less accessible. I think rather than taking an area that is becoming more urban and just adding more lanes, that doesn't incentivize using transit. It's not just about taking cars off the road; instead you have to make it more enticing. People don't ride transit in these bigger cities just because it's the best way to go, it's because it is easier than driving cars through congestion in these big cities. I think it's just incentivizing automobile use and making transit less of an option by widening. It's also making other modes less of an option. I guess that is all that I have to say, thank you.

Margot Garcia

We were just hearing again about whether it's a 33% increase or a 22% in the number of cars. The things that we just heard again along with the projections, just makes me scratch my head; and I understand that we have to use the PAG numbers. But I just wanted to put out something that I got together from March 3-5, 2014 (it's even a head of time for 2014) from SPOKES, the National Bike Summit. It says that 2013 was another year of falling per capita driving in the U.S. It's absolutely stagnant the total number of vehicle miles traveled in the U.S., for a mean of about 2% lower than its 2007 peak. The number of miles driven in 2013 was lower than that of a 12 month period of that ending in February of 2005. A nearly 9 year period of stagnation of the total vehicles traveled in the U.S. (which is unprecedented in U.S. history). The average number of vehicle miles traveled per capita was 7% below its 2004 peak and was the lowest since 1996 of roughly 17 years span of stagnation and per capita vehicle miles traveled.

In looking forward, continued stagnation and per capita vehicle miles traveled, both would have major implications for public policy and traffic volumes would be insufficient to justify highway expansion projects, in all but the fastest of growing areas. We know we are not one of those anymore; though we were for a while. Congestion in most areas would grow only slowly and could largely be addressed through measures to improve the efficiency of the current transportation system, included by expanding access to public transportation and through the use of information technology and possibly pricing rather than through costly capacity conditions. Revenue from fuel taxes would continue to decline as increases in driving, failed to make up for improvements in fuel economy and for the impacts of inflation and places where gasoline taxes are not indexed, increasing highway user fees, such as gas taxes, tolls, and VMI fees (to recover that lost revenue would likely further depressed vehicle travel by increasing the cost of driving).

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.

So I think we even have to look at the lower 22%, with some real critical thinking and saying we had stagnation for the last 17 years and the amount of national vehicle miles traveled, so why do we think that we are going to be any different? Again, just to point out for those looking at the size of some of these intersections, there was also an article about when you get four lanes plus two lanes plus two turn lanes, you know then you are up to eight lanes on one side! Then four lanes on the other side, that's twelve lanes that we are looking at in total through an intersection!

You know that is going to take a long time to cross, it's expensive, more expensive than and analogous to, but a smaller version of, a downtown street. They talked about the speed and we heard about Mesa going down to one lane with only 25 miles an hour through the downtown section. We know that when there are more lanes that people go faster and we become a transportation sewer; as opposed to a place-making. It reduces the economic value of the street, fast cars aren't going to stop and even if they did complete streets, that shows more economic strengths than really broad, wide streets and there is a picture of a street in Salt Lake City. So again, I just know that there is an awful lot of stuff to think about. I have been studying the maps as well, but I think we just really need critical thinking when I see some of those pictures about the increase in traffic. I frankly don't believe it's going to happen.

8. Next Steps/Roundtable

The roundtable presents an opportunity for the Task Force to provide feedback on any aspect of the meeting or the project in general. During the next steps, the project team reconfirmed the dates for the design charrette and listed the potential agenda topics. The discussion listed below occurred during this agenda item.

CTF Questions and Comments

- I would like to see existing examples of successful properties that have a 60 foot lot depth. (The project team acknowledged this request and stated that they would work on providing these examples soon.)
- I encourage everyone to go to Phoenix and ride the Light Rail. It is a totally different transit experience.

9. Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 9:05 p.m.

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

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

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

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

BROADWAY TRANSIT

QUESTIONS NEEDING TO BE ANSWERED BY BROADWAY CORRIDOR STUDY CITIZEN TASK FORCE

February 25, 2014

The Southern Arizona Transit Advocates (SATA) has for some time been asking for an expanded transit study as part of the ongoing Broadway Corridor Study (BCS) in order to provide answers to basic questions so that adequate provisions can be made for future High Capacity Transit (HCT) along Broadway in the alternatives being developed. This request has been supported by some members of the BCS Citizen Task Force (CTF), and the City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT) is exploring the matter.

Since the CTF is at the point of making decisions about alignments, but cannot reasonably be expected to do so without some degree of specificity regarding the location of future transit for which they are expected to provide space, the SATA suggests this questionnaire to determine the feelings of the CTF stakeholders given the knowledge and information they have to date. Below are questions we believe can be answered at this time based not so much on a comprehensive knowledge of transit design or requirements, but based on the perspective of the business and residential interests along or adjacent to Broadway. Thus the questions asked are not technical in nature, but are designed to elicit the preferences of the CTF members, which preferences can later become starting assumptions when a study is conducted.

QUESTIONS TO ELICIT PREFERENCES OF BCS CTF REGARDING BROADWAY TRANSIT

1. Should HCT be placed directly on Broadway (within the existing or widened right-of-way) or off Broadway?
 - a. If directly on Broadway,
 - i. Should it be primarily in a median (either painted or raised with curbs) and/or potentially partly in the left hand auto travel lane, or
 - ii. Should it be primarily in the right hand auto travel lane?
 - b. If off Broadway,
 - i. Should it be south of Broadway generally following Arroyo Chico?
 - ii. Should it be north of Broadway utilizing 9th or 10th Street, or?
 - iii. Should it be north of Broadway utilizing 6th Street.

2. Assuming the recommendation of the PAG High Capacity Transit Plan for both BRT and streetcar along Broadway, and assuming BRT operates from the eastside along Broadway straight into downtown as does local Sun Tran service, should the streetcar also go to downtown, or should it instead turn north to the UA which is a larger activity center and has no direct transit service from the Sunshine Mile?
 - a. If the conclusion is that the streetcar should turn north to the UA, which street should it use?
 - i. Campbell, in which case it serves only half the Sunshine Mile but all of the UA campus including the sports complex?
 - ii. Cherry, in which case it serves about 62% of the Sunshine Mile and all the more intensively used part of the UA campus including the sports complex?
 - iii. Highland, in which case it serves about 75% of the Sunshine Mile and about half the UA campus yet still is within walking distance of the sports complex?
 - iv. Park, in which case it serves about 88% of the Sunshine Mile, and comes within a couple of blocks of the Lost Barrio, but serves only the west side of the UA campus and misses the sports complex completely?