



Draft Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE

February 27, 2014

5:30 p.m.

Transamerica Building, 1st Floor Conference Room
 177 N. Church Avenue
 Tucson, Arizona 85701

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, a brief overview of the three remaining meetings for Charrette #3 was made by the project team, 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	Colby Henley
Michael Butterbrodt	Jon Howe
Dale Calvert	Joseph Maher Jr.
Mary Durham-Pflibsen	Naomi Mclsaac
Anthony R. DiGrazia	Shirley Papuga
Bruce Fairchild	Diane Robles
	Jamey Sumner

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. First Call to the Audience

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

Gene Caywood

“Gene Caywood, Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. I wanted to go back to the last meeting as I said that I thought it was very good, I appreciated Wulf particularly and his presentation. After his presentation, two or three of us were standing around talking to him during the break and a few facts came out about the Phoenix situation that he didn’t present in his presentation and I wanted to mention those as well as reiterate some of the things that he did say.

First thing I think he said, and I forget the exact number but somewhere 15-17,000 riders a day on buses in the corridor before they built the Light Rail and after they built the Light Rail there were about 48,000 (and that keeps going up). My point that I made months ago, was that one of the reasons that you do rail regardless of its high cost is because you want to increase transit ridership and when you put in rail, you will increase transit ridership. My rule of thumb is somewhere between four and eight times what you have on the bus. They are not quite at four in Phoenix, but they are going to get there ok.

Second thing, a lot of people say “well, all you did was put in rail and you just stole the other riders from your bus routes.” Not True! In Phoenix 50% of the riders according to Wulf were new riders they never rode a bus, they don’t like to ride a bus, they are there because you put in rail. Another issue is, what happened to the other bus routes that are there? Well, the ridership on all of them is up and particularly he said on the connecting routes that feed into the stations. So if you have rail, they will ride a bus to get to the station. They might not want to ride a bus all the way to their destination, but they will ride it a shorter distance to get to their station.

So I wanted to re-emphasize all those points. Then, in terms of what he said about the Light Rail and BRT, I thought there were some good points there; that it is difficult to maintain BRT while you convert to Light Rail. That is why I think the issue of where you put the transit is critical and maybe you do want to do with something like what was proposed in the earlier Broadway Corridor study east of Columbus where we currently use the right hand lane for buses, but if you were to do Light Rail, what would happen is, it would go to the median but the median would get widened so then the right hand lane is now wide enough for buses and would become narrower and just wide enough for bikes. That was the plan in the previous study and that would work on this part of Broadway as long as (regardless of whether you had six lanes of traffic or four lanes of traffic) you had that room

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.RTAmbility.com.

later to widen the median, and that gets to the point that he made about moving utilities and making sure they are clearing the median.”

Margot Garcia

“First of all, I just want to remind you of the larger goal that is in front of you this is a major project/ a major program. The mission of our Broadway Coalition has been to educate and organize the citizens of Tucson to guide planners and the Citizen Task Force in the improvement between Broadway Boulevard between Euclid and Country Club; within (we originally said) the existing Right-of-Way, and we probably now would modify that slightly and thereby make the road as efficient as possible without causing the demolition of historic structures and displacement of viable small businesses that contribute to the culture and commerce of the community.

Widening the street would worsen air quality and increase noise in adjacent neighborhoods. It would tend to isolate the residents of adjoining neighborhoods from each other and discourage their common use of the street’s open spaces, recreational, commercial, and educational facilities. Walking and bicycling across the widened street would be more hazardous, especially for the young, the elderly and the people with special needs. The Coalition urges citizens who value Tucson’s urban core to protest the doubling of the width; we know that we are probably away from doubling of the width but still to forward this sense of place, this unique area.

When we talked about their contribution to the City, I would remind you that I had done a tax study on the property of the North side of Broadway and the two miles from Euclid to Country Club and it was contributing \$719,186.71 in property taxes and in City taxes the North side is \$176,000 and the South side it’s \$500,000 and it goes on with the amount of state tax and county tax and when you add in the state tax amount it’s up about two million dollars. So by taking out or by majorly impacting those small businesses you are contributing to the deficit of the City of Tucson (which it is now suffering from).

In addition, there was some discussion last time about the buses and what are the buses on Broadway doing. This is the latest study which has just come out which is the COA (the Comprehensive Operations Analysis) it did an onboard survey of the buses, over two million riders last year on Route 8 (which is the Broadway bus) and this was out of a total of twenty million riders; so essentially 10% of total ridership in the City of Tucson is on Broadway. When you look at what are the origin and destinations some people said “Well they are just the people on the edges.” No, this is the origins and the destinations by the size of the circle and as you can see the major place that they are going is downtown. So the places they are riding are

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.

on the section of Broadway that we are discussing here now. So transit is a big part of what is going on, I know the average over the whole area is 3-5% or a small number but when you look at the actual numbers from the onboard surveys that were done within the last two or three months, this is what you find out. It is being used heavily and one of their biggest problems is that buses have to drive past people standing on the corner waiting, because they are already full. Thank you."

Laura Tabili

"I am always sorry to prolong these meetings by even saying anything, but I think I need to remind people a number of things. I am here to really talk about preservation. To remind you that Rincon Heights Historic District (that is all the red properties) those actually are an existing historic district and it's not a potential historic district, it's an actually existing historic district. We have 19 properties in the study area and from what I can see with the designs that we were presented with the other night, two out of the three road designs are going to take out a very large portion of our historic buildings and we are going to be very unhappy.

It took us seven years to get that, at thousands of volunteer hours. I personally put in at least one hundred volunteer hours (because we have to keep track). I would urge you to preserve all historic buildings on the street to be preserved. I urge you to be cognizant of the red ones, Rincon Heights Historic District; those are already historic buildings on the register.

So I also want to remind you that all three of the stakeholder meetings were very well attended (the one in June 2012, the one in March of last year and the one in September). Very well attended and overwhelming sentiment against building impacts and taking down buildings. The last one, the one in September, historic preservation was rated number one on all the various variables that were offered.

Thirdly, I do want to reiterate the tax revenues that come off of the existing buildings. Not only \$720,000 in real estate tax but also actually if you add all those figures together for the sales tax (and I happen to have copies) if you add all the figures together they add up to \$630,538 and change. If you add those two together it is really \$1,350,53 in tax revenues every year. So let me remind you that Tucson Modernism Week, which capitalizes on those historic buildings, also brought in an estimated \$1,500,000 every year. Think about how that helps our city and I was really impressed so that was point four.

So point five is Wulf Grote's presentation, one of the things that really impressed me was how many times that he said the jurisdiction wanted this, the jurisdiction wanted that and in almost all cases the jurisdiction wanted all buildings within the built environment preserved and I seem to recall that the only time that they

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.RTAmbility.com.

didn't, that is the one part of the system that he has regrets about. It occurred to me to wonder what other best practices have been in some other municipalities. Oddly enough, this is the first time that we have had somebody from someplace else come and talk to us about how they manage to improve their transportation system and when they did it they did not destroy buildings. I really doubt that when Chicago, New York, Portland and Seattle are taking down historic buildings in order to put in ADA sidewalks. I want ADA sidewalks too, they are very important, but there has got to be a way to put them in without endangering historic buildings. That is all and thanks for your time."

Marc Fink

"There are three points that I would like to make. The first one is, (and this is a repeat of something that I read a few meetings ago, given what you are trying to do and also given the emphasis that Jennifer talked about) functionality.

I wanted to read what essentially is the second paragraph in the book, *Designing Walkable and Urban Thoroughfares*, a context sensitive approach which was jointly put out recently by the Institute of Traffic Transportation Engineers and the Congress for New Urbanism (of which Phil was a contributing author and deserves credit for this great book). In terms of functionality, (which has not been defined throughout this whole process) you guys get to define it. This is what they said, "Traditionally through thousands of years of human settlement urban streets have performed multiple functions." Mobility was one of the functions, but economic and social functions were important as well. Retail and social transactions have occurred along most urban thoroughfares throughout history. It is only in the twentieth century that streets were designed to separate the mobility function from the economic and social functions.

This report is intended to facilitate the restoration of the complex multiple functions of urban streets. It provides guidance for the design of walkable and urban thoroughfares and places that currently support the mode of walking and places where the community desires to provide a more walkable thoroughfare and a context to support them into the future. So what I would say to that, it not only deals with functionality, but it also deals with... and what I would urge you to do as you go through these exercises (you know where we stand in terms of what context we would like to see) I would urge all of you to: as you look at the performance measures, as you look at street designs and alternatives, to at least articulate to yourself and also to your fellow Task Force members with the context that you are trying to achieve.

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.

The reason why that is important- and there are two things; one, is it becomes important because that is how you can evaluate the performance measures not only the ones that the design team has decided that it feels like you should look at right now, but also in terms of the ones that aren't being looked at. Depending upon the context which you are working for, how those performance measures are measured, how they are defined, how they are rated, changes. That also applies to the ones that quite possibly aren't looked at and you can at least if not quantitatively then certainly look at qualitatively. Some of those may fall back into the picture. So I would urge you to do that.

The second point is, the third point overall, is that I would urge (because the results of your exercise are going out to the public) the Task Force to articulate to the public what they are trying to accomplish. What is the context they are designing for? What are their goals? What is the whole purpose of what they are doing? The public deserves to know that because for the public to be able to evaluate what you come up with for your alternatives and ultimate solutions, the discussion is completely different if the public agrees with your vision but may have differences with how you implement it as opposed to a basic disagreement with the vision that you are trying to create. So I would urge you to articulate it as it's extremely important. When you read context sensitive design materials, they emphasize that is one of the first things that you should do. Good luck, and have fun!"

Following the Call to the Audience a Task Force member made the following statement:

- **I just wanted to share something before we started: I went back to the public meetings that we had and want to bring that forward. We have gone to the public three times now and we have these nice, wonderful summary reports. I wanted to go back and remind us of some of the things that are in here prior to us getting into things and making decisions. This is from the very first meeting in June 2012. The first question reads: "What characteristics in the Broadway Boulevard project area should be preserved?" And there is a list in order from what was mentioned the most down to the least - so it starts businesses, historic properties, community character, neighborhoods and housing, multi modal transportation and walkability, and then roadway and parking functionality, accessibility, size, and planned improvements.**

So that was from the very first meeting - if you fast forward about eight or nine months to February 2013 and this is from page 5: "Some clear themes emerged from the comments that were received at this public

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.

meeting. The first is the desire for no widening of Broadway. The second is the desire for Broadway to be a destination, for neighborhood residents and Tucsonans. The third is an appreciation for Broadway's existing character, especially that of its architecture. The fourth is the desire for an environment that is more supportive of alternate modes on Broadway, such as walking and bicycling, and all users in general."

So they told us some consistent things there. The next meeting was just last September - six months ago or so. If you remember, we had about 18 tables who participated in the workshop. At the end of the workshop, each table was allowed to place a green dot on the performance measure categories, and cross sections alternatives they preferred. So we had 18 tables, of this 11 tables chose only 4-lane or 4+ t lane options, and there was only one table that did not choose a 4-lane option. The top three cross sections identified are also the narrowest in terms of Right-of-Way. So again, I just want to bring this to everyone's attention. I don't think that everyone will come out of this process happy and not everyone is going to get everything they want but we need to keep in mind what the public has told us. We have gone to the three times and we will be going to them again soon and I just want to make sure we are reflecting what we have been told and be responsive to them.

3. Review and Discussion: Street Design Concept Alternatives and Performance Measure Assessments - Updates and Clarifications

The project team presented updates and clarifications to the detailed street design concepts and the performance measures for 4-lane and 6-lane plus 2 dedicated transit lanes street design concept alternatives, and the 6-lane Right-of-Way alignment alternatives.

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

- It is difficult for me to look at this. One of the most important things to most of our stakeholders is maintaining the historic integrity of this corridor. How are we going to do this? None of these alternatives do this. How can we make a decision if we do not know if our decision is going to directly impact these buildings? I cannot make a decision if I do not know exactly what the answer is going to be. Most of these are going to be impacted by parking or access. From the slides, the minimum impact is going to be at least 56 properties. How can we make an informed decision? *We do know from the alignments the category of the buildings that will be directly impacted - we can be confident of these numbers. The 4-lane minimize impacts only directly impacts two buildings. It is possible through*

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.

- detailed design that this number could be reduced further. The thing about it is the risk. You will be uncertain about how many properties are going to be acquired until the City and the property owner sign an agreement. Another thing that I would remind you of is that 110 properties fall into the risk of being acquired or being directly impacted - that's almost 50% of the buildings. However, we do not even know if the other buildings will be there in 2040, the property owner may make a decision to change their property in the future or tear down the existing building and build a new one no matter what. You have to weigh what think is going to happen versus the potential benefits.*
- I have a nagging feeling that no matter what we do we will be impacting the historic integrity of the corridor.
 - For the high risk category - we need to make assumptions of the amount of properties that are going to be acquired.
The risk is because of the negotiation process. The acquisition negotiations are much different than the life of a property or a building after construction. Acquisition looks at how a property is impacted due to the project. In the future a property may be able to be reused for a different purpose.
 - Can we get data from the Grant Road Project property acquisitions - the amount of properties that were considered high risk and the number of these that were actually acquired?
We can only get the numbers for segment one of the Grant Road Project as that is the only portion where acquisitions have occurred, and the project is complete.
 - The “minimize property impacts” option gives us more confidence in knowing the amount of buildings that will be taken out. It increases the direct impacts to building but greatly minimizes the risk. We could essentially pick a side where the buildings would come out.
There are other things you can do too, such as an overlay, new design standards, parking standards and other recommendations to go along with your recommendation of an alignment. In these recommendations you can tell the City that they need to require developers, or give a better score to developers, that respond to an RFP to develop a stretch of the corridor to preserve buildings within that new development. This may lead to the discussion with the RTA that the sale of the property is being devalued but you can make these recommendations. These types of things can help increase the certainty.

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

- **Theoretically, if you shave off two feet of a property you automatically enter into negotiations - what exactly does high risk mean, is it simply the worst case scenario?**

High risk means that the building would lose a substantial enough amount of parking to the point that it would no longer function for how it is currently used. Also, buildings that exist in a strip mall where there is joint access and shared parking are deemed high risk if parking access cannot be provided within a public right of way.

- **So it is the worst case scenario because you do not have a parking plan for the corridor.**

It's not even the worst case scenario because we do not have a parking plan. There is an example on Grant and Oracle where if a set of property owners had been able to reach agreement on shared parking and access all three properties would have been functional within the zoning requirements and regulations of the City. But they were not able to reach an agreement, so three properties had to be acquired, because you could not solve any one of the properties singularly. So there had to be a joint agreement, but it was a private agreement and they were not able to reach it. What could have been no acquisitions turned out to be three. That is part of the reason why we have been designating impacts as high risk if they would trigger the need for a joint agreement - and on some of these it turns out to be 8-10 parcels in a row. There are many variables that make it difficult to predict the exact number of acquisitions.

- **It is definitely unknown if there is a shared parking agreement for the property owners to reference prior to them knowing that there parking is going away.**

I just want to clarify that even if the shared parking is there, and it is allowed now under current zoning regulations (if it is within 600 feet of the building shared parking can happen), when the acquisition conversation happens if there is an impact to just one building the City can only look at the one building that is being impacted. If that site cannot function then an acquisition can happen.

- **There are no agreements in place; there is no shared parking that I know of in this corridor so the high risk number should be higher. To me it would seem that whole street blocks get taken out. Actually, the number - 108 - was obtained from looking at the properties where either a good portion of the parking is lost or the**

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

Right-of-Way impacts their access so that it forces a shared use agreement. We have identified those and they are considered high risk.

- But if we are even attempting this suggestion (minimize building impacts), if I understand the terminology of minimize building impacts correctly or saving buildings, it seems that we taking a lot of buildings - it is the same number. So, I am a bit confused on how we get to the point where we know which buildings are going to be saved but then the properties are up for grabs because we don't have any policies in place for shared parking - we are backed into a corner. *High risk is primarily related to a high-risk for acquisition and the acquisition may or may not result in demolition of buildings.*
- First of all, unless people come forward and form a parking district, it's not going to happen. Is high risk the fact that property is impacted to the degree where the court would come in and force the sale of the property? There are a variety of things once you get into this you have to look at the property owner might do and they have their own agendas. These are the factors that make this difficult. The reality is that all you can do is look at the probability - that is why we have to consider the difference between the two options (minimize property impacts and minimize building impacts). The minimize property impacts took a lot of buildings and I took a big breath, but reduced some of the risk. The odds are that we come out in the middle.
- Phil mentioned that we are able to make addendums to our recommendations. Are addendums [additional recommendations] allowed to be specific [property specific] or are they more general? *The additional items you can recommend are broader and are general in nature. They cannot be property specific.*
- We just have to play the best game we can. We are never going to have all the right information [full ability to predict future property owner decisions] because it is a free market and we are dealing with the economic vitality of an area with a lot of individual property owners. Each one has to make their own decisions. We cannot be responsible or be held responsible for what happens - you never know, it's just how things are going to roll. It's not our decision.
- We are talking in circles - we are not going to solve this - and making the process longer by trying to perfect it. I am guessing the business owners

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.

just want us to make our recommendations. We just need to make the decision so the property owners can move on. If we keep talking in circles it is not going to happen. We do have a lot of information - the sidewalk only study shows a lot and what will happen even if we do nothing: the sidewalk only option will happen, and there will be impacts no matter what. I think we just need to make a decision and start going.

- The way I choose to look at this (as my opinion), when I look at direct impacts it means the buildings are torn down. Those buildings are gone; they are out of the picture. So to me there is a big difference between two buildings being directly impacted and 26 buildings being directly impacted. At least in the high risk scenario, the building is still there and the property owner makes the decision. And then if he decides if they are in or out, their options have not been taken away because of our decision. As part of being a Task Force member, I have seen the blossoming of the Sunshine Mile. There is a lot of pride and awareness of how special this two mile stretch of road is. My hope is that people who decide to stay in the corridor will make it work and the people who buy the remnant properties will do so too. We cannot control what the property owners do. Even if we decided to do nothing there would probably be a lot of property owners that decided to sell or to build something new that was not mid-century modern.

These are preliminary numbers - they are not final. As you move forward through the design process the numbers get more accurate. Let's not get too caught up in the numbers, they are an important guiding post, but they will become more refined as we move forward.

Also, the Right-of-Way costs drive the high project cost figures that we have presented and that is the thing that we have the most uncertainty with. If the acquisitions costs come in lower due to arrangements between property owners, there is a potential for the overall project cost to be much lower. If the Right-of-Way cost came in at 50% lower you are much closer to being able to build something within the budget.

- Am I right in assuming that there will never be enough money to build the eight lane option with the numbers that we are looking at? Because we could use that to justify recommending other things.
Acquisition costs look to be between \$50 million and \$70 million for the eight lane option. Based on where we are at now with the numbers, and again big flashing red lights putting a caveat on this that the numbers are preliminary, the 6+2T has an estimated construction cost of \$30 million dollars.

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.

- **How is property that has already been acquired being treated?**
It is not in any of these numbers.
 - **In other words you ignored all of the properties the City already owns or you included it in the cost?**
We should include the costs of what has been acquired using RTA money, which I believe, so far has been approximately \$5 million.
- **It would also be useful to see what the numbers would be if they included 100% of the impacted properties and 50% of the at-risk properties, it will give us a better guide.**
We can definitely do that. We can set up the formulas in the spreadsheet to reflect a 50% reduction in the Right-of-Way acquisition costs.

4. **CTF Large Group Activity (with Brief Breaks): Identify and Prioritize CTF Members' Questions, Issues, and Concerns in Order to Achieve Charrette Goals**

As part of their homework from the February 25, 2014 CTF meeting, the Task Force was asked to write questions, concerns, or comments regarding the detailed Street Design Concept Alternatives and the Performance Measure Assessments on post-it notes (one question, comment, or concern per post-it). The project team collected the post-its from the Task Force and organized them into categories and placed them on large sheets of butcher paper on the wall. The Task Force was given time to review the post-its and make further comments based on what they saw. Following their review of each other's comments, the Task Force discussed some of the questions and concerns they have regarding the project scope and the detailed Street Design Concept Alternative drawings. The project team provided information as appropriate, and discussed items the Task Force would like to see reviewed in more detail. The project team will take all of this into consideration and bring updates, revisions, and clarifications of the materials to the March 6, 2014 Task Force meeting.

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

- **I saw a post-it that could help streamline all of our conversations - eliminate the 6 +2T option - I feel that with the data we received Tuesday and the new information received tonight that everything is stacking up against that, economically, travel time, preservation of the buildings, etc. I wanted to ask if we were at the point where we could do that? (Two CTF members seconded this).**
This is great, because once the last CTF member returns from the bathroom we will have everyone here.

Is there anyone who is not in favor of taking the 6 + 2T off of the table? We can certainly set that option aside.

We can make the recommendation to set it aside and include your thoughts on why we should do so. We just need to be sure that you make a strong

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.

argument for doing that, and that you state that you are taking it out of your recommendations but that you have done the analysis of it and you have the data to why you are not recommending it. It could end up being that at the public workshop in May that you show what the RTA stated and that this actually what it looks like, here is the analysis that was and here is why the Task Force took it out of their recommendations. You just have to be very careful how you frame it and that you are informing the stakeholder agencies and the public why you made that decision.

- That option needs to stay so we know what's involved with it. I agree that we need to analyze it and look at it from an RTA perspective.

May I ask a clarifying question? When you talk about leaving it on the table is it for the charrette discussions today or are you talking about taking it off the table for further analysis?

- We are talking about taking it off the table because of several considerations - cost, it does not improve the travel time for any of the modes, has the maximum amount of building impacts, and as Wulf stated it diminishes the environment for high capacity transit because it takes away from the human scale.
- Some time ago it was suggested that we keep it to show that it won't work.
- We could package it to say that here is the analysis that we have done and here is what it shows and because of that we are removing it from further study.

So when you are going to the May public meeting it would be one of the decision points to clarify that it would not advance further.

- I am not arguing for it, but because it was on the ballot in 2006 that it should be a part of the discussion even though we are not leaning towards it. At least it would be there so people can make comparisons - keep it as an example.
- If we agree that it is the worst outcome and the public has continually said that it does not make sense - when do we get to take it off the table? I see the value in keeping it there to show that we did the analysis and how it fell out of the recommendations, but I want a way to rope it off and say we looked at it, it is over here, and these are the things that we are looking at.

As the project manager for this process one of the things that would be really ideal and that I would like to see these resulting discussions produce is one or two alternatives to advance into further design analysis and engineering - limiting that also limits the amount of resources we have to expend and I want to keep us on budget and on time.

- Since we are operating on the basis of consensus and we have at least two members who are not consenting to taking it off the table we cannot by our own rules take it off the table as that was the proposal.

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

- Can we do the consensus continuum for all of the members?
Can you clarify what you mean by leaving it on the table? Everyone else has clarified what they mean by taking it off the table. Does it mean more analysis, etc.?
- What I have been saying the whole time is that we are looking at two miles and it at least has to match up with what is east of Country Club and what we do here has to go east of Country Club at least to Houghton in the future. What I would like to see is a median that could be used for Light Rail. Buses could travel in the outer lanes, possibly with the bikes for a while until we could build Light Rail. Light Rail just for two miles doesn't really make sense but in the future the Light Rail could go out to Kolb, Camino Seco, and Houghton. That is what makes sense to me. This is a gateway to downtown and this is a major artery and this is something that Tucson has needed for 50 years. When I was in high school there was a proposal to have a major north, east, west, south thoroughfare that had a River Road alignment and that was shot down. Now we are all complaining about levels of pollution and how long it takes to get everywhere. The other thing I would like to see is a study undertaken on Michigan (indirect) left turn lanes - two or three of them in this two-mile stretch to improve the transit time for Light Rail and buses.

So I am hearing a six lane with enough median space or Right-of-Way to accommodate Light Rail in the future.

Can I clarify, with the way you are describing this do you mean Light Rail running down the middle of a six-lane road?

- Yes.
- Back to original topic, I agree that we do not have consensus to take it off the table. I want to see the performance assessments completed on the 6+2T. From this conversation I am pretty sure that this working group is not going to choose the 6 +2T alternative because we know what those performance assessments are going to show, but I think the assessments, at least to the initial stage, need to be completed so there is documentation that shows we looked at it. There is a significant part of the community that wants an eight lane option and we have to document why we are not recommending one. We need strong justification, backed by data, of why we took it off of the table.
- East of Country Club is actually six lanes. We have done the VISSIM and detailed assessments so I am not sure what additional analysis or information needs to be provided. We have done the most detailed work on this alignment that can be done.
- I feel that in your statement that you do not think the rest of us want Light Rail. I think we all want to see Light Rail on the future. Maybe we can start with what we have in common and move

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

forward in that direction. 6 + 2T is not the only way to get Light Rail, at least from what Wulf presented to us on Tuesday.

We will make decisions of what is and what is not moving forward to the public meeting in May after our meetings next week. There is another CTF meeting planned after the Charrette prior to the public meeting to discuss what exactly we need to leave on the table and what to move forward.

At the next meeting we will begin to identify and prioritize what is important to you and look at things holistically. The intention today is to determine what needs to be clarified so that the discussion can be informed to enable that. It seems like today we are not ready to take anything off of the table and reach a consensus on the items we would like to see move forward. I also want to reconfirm that in the consensus based decision making model that there is an option where you do not block the decision being made to the group but you want to register a strong opinion. That is the reason why there are varying levels on the continuum.

- What additional analysis would you like to see?
 - A significant amount of the assessments are greyed out so we need to get these numbers. From a conversational standpoint I am ready to move on, but what I don't want is a report that is incomplete, we need to show that we looked at things and at a minimum we cannot move forward. I am willing to give the staff the time to finish their work on the assessments.

- I want to clarify my position. I am not necessarily in favor what was voted in but we need to stay with it as a collective body until we can fully take it off the table. A lot of what was just mentioned makes a lot sense.

- I am just curious, of what we have not assessed to date, what is the projection for when these assessments will be complete and how many of the alternatives are we are going to complete these for?

From my project manager standpoint, the fewer number of the alternatives we have the better.

 - I hear from everyone that it is not a good option but we cannot seem to take it off the table.

One of the Task Force members had a great idea to move forward with what we have in common. We have two more meetings during the Charrette to discuss and prioritize what needs to move forward.

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.

Given the way this conversation has come around it gives us an idea of the effort needed to get the assessments done.

For yourselves, you should look at it from the perspective of is this information that you would even value? Or do you have enough information to feel comfortable understanding the relationship between the performance measures and the alternatives to make informed decisions. Or look at the performance assessments that have not been performed yet and determine which of those would be the most beneficial to you to make the argument that you need to make. Let's not get caught up on making the decisions quite yet.

And there is also a request of the technical team. The Task Force is making an assumption that at this point they need to have the 6+2T with enough detail and information so that they can make their case. So, how much detail is required to make that case?

The project team will also look at the measures that are greyed out and see how much time and effort are needed to accomplish things. We will also look at the suggestion of redesigning the 6+2T so that it is really just a six-lane with room for two more lanes to come and do a very quick look at how that might look as a cross section using the measures that we do have and our professional judgment.

- **Light Rail is our future. I do not see Light Rail in any of the performance measures or the drawings. In looking at things I don't know the answer to what alternative Light Rail would work best in. That is on the questions that I want answered so that I can communicate it with my stakeholders and the general public. Wulf stated that it would not work in any configuration wider than six lanes. Are we going to take his word for that, or is there data or information that shows something contrary to this? I do not even know if we are enthusiastic about transit?**
- **I am enthusiastic about transit, but I do not know in what form. I do not see a commitment to fund it.**
 - **And if you have Light Rail you do not need 6 lanes, because you are going to be taking a lot of the traffic off of the roadway.**
 - **I want to know what the stakeholders have to say about Light Rail. We might all be cheer leaders for Light Rail, but have you even had conversations with your stakeholders regarding Light Rail? That is what we need to reflect in our decisions. I think it is a great idea**

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.

and I love it but do I see the City providing funding for it or the voters even caring about? I don't, and I don't see my stakeholders caring about it either. If you have not you need to discuss it with them.

We have heard from the stakeholders to a degree by the fact that they have not even brought up transit. Also, the transit performance measures were not supported strongly at the last public meeting. Part of that is the way that we set up the workshop. We want to hear what the public directly thinks about mass transit and the viability of it along the Broadway corridor.

- In concept, I love Light Rail transit. The support has not been there in the larger scheme of things. That is why I tend to favor a six-lane option that can convert to something with two dedicated transit lanes and four through travel lanes in the future when there is broader support. I have been looking at the large 12 lane intersections and they are very prohibitive to pedestrians. I believe we could sell the six-lane option to the public in this fashion. I do not disagree with the Task Force members who are in favor of removing the eight-lane option from the analysis. However, as a CPA I have been a quasi-lawyer for 35 years. Because of this I have a concern with building the best case possible to eliminate it as an option.
 - I do not want to box ourselves in with a particular form of transit - we will need federal dollars to complete a Light Rail project. To get this funding you need to show a high interest in transit and high usage of the existing system. Whatever form of transit we want to see, we need to build it efficiently and make it friendly to users.
-
- We need to think about the future and not get boxed in by what is going on. We cannot be short sighted, City's always change and evolve. We should create a mindset about what we want and be strategic about accomplishing it.
-
- One way to tie everything in and come to a consensus is to not specify the mode of transit but specify that we want it to a transit priority corridor. The details would be more flexible this way.
 - That is a very good point. Phil mentioned that we did not hear about transit, and that transit was not ranked that highly at the public input meetings, but when discussing transit versus Light Rail - these are two very different terms. Taking the bus is something

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

that scares people, but when we have a streetcar and people become comfortable riding it they may also become more comfortable with all of the alternative modes of travel. I also feel that as a Task Force we are missing representatives from the transit and pedestrian communities. We need to talk about alternative modes and be inclusive of them. The difficulty at the last public meeting was that all of the alternative modes were grouped exclusively of each other and you had to prioritize one over the other. The alternative modes supplement and enhance each other.

It was intentional that we did not include the alternative modes together. There is a cluster of comments around pedestrian issues and comments regarding landscaping. One of the comments was why are we not looking to minimize bike lanes, sidewalks and landscaping in the cross sections we have done. But there was a strong interest in exploring whatever form of transit you want there to be. I totally agree that if you do a good transit street you bring all of these other modes with you because those are the modes that create the environment for healthy ridership. My question to you is where are you at on these other related measures (pedestrian, bicycle, and landscaping) that lend itself to creating the right environment for transit.

- I had a comment up there regarding the landscaping. My stakeholders have said that they are all for the landscaping but would like to see it narrowed down in key places such as medians or where it encroaches into buildings.
We have narrowed the sidewalk and side landscaping in some of the alternatives, the four lane ones especially but the median width is really determined by the roadway curvature and turn pockets and things such as that.
- Pedestrians are an important part of making transit and bike systems work. It is important to have robust environments and that these elements are there. It does not mean that the widths of the landscaping and sidewalks can't differ in some places. If you want to accomplish a friendly pedestrian atmosphere those services and facilities need to be there. You cannot go crazy and take a lot of buildings just to accomplish this, but that is why we have staff to think about these things and find innovative ways to include the amenities and minimize the impacts.

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

- Creating a visually appealing space (sense of place) and preserving historic resources came out as the highest ranked performance measures from the public meeting but it does not mean that the public did not want transit. I think that it was just the public saying don't take our buildings and destroy the businesses.

- I would like to see two things. I would like to see an option that includes four lanes to the west of Campbell and six lanes to the east. I would also like to see an option where, if there is a six-lane option west of Campbell that the majority of the widening is to the south because the area located to the north is a designated historic district (Rincon Heights).
 - We need to look at widening to both sides. Miles School is a barrier to the south base on the area plan and the work that was accomplished by the City. There is significant congestion along the corridor that needs to be mitigated. I haven't decided what the design should look like but I agree that it shouldn't be the eight-lane option. I am open for dialogue regarding how the two sides of the roadway should be impacted. We need to ensure that we are creative regarding the ultimate design we choose. We have finally opened up dialogue in our neighborhood. Miles can certainly be affected by the project, many thought it couldn't, but why should Miles be spared when all of the other neighborhoods are affected (this is my personal opinion)? It is important to have this dialogue between the north and the south side.

- We have been putting words in the public's mouths for months saying that they haven't talked about transit. In reality, it did fall all the way down on their list of priorities at the workshop and others have expressed that their stakeholders really do not even care about transit. To show an example there was a massive amount of traffic congestion going to the public meeting in September. There is a meeting tonight at Broadway Village regarding parking because there is not enough parking there. My stakeholders live in that neighborhood and they just put in a beautiful walkway connecting Broadway Village to the neighborhood, but they don't walk there, they drive. People are going to drive no matter what. I want to believe that Tucson wants transit but to convince ourselves and the public of this we have to hear that from the broader public.
 - What then does the Task Force do? Are we a sponge or do we have the responsibility to provoke the discussion and provide leadership on some of these issues that are not coming forward?

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

- We have a route that shows the highest ridership in the City. The PAG High Capacity Transit Study already shows Light Rail transit running through Broadway. The public has shown they support transit they just have not said it in this forum.
 - It is important that we show leadership. Some of us have very well defined constituents, some of us don't. My constituency is the whole city because I represent the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee. Some of them want an eight-lane option, some of them want better pedestrian and bicycle facilities and some want enhanced transit. There is point where we need to provide more leadership. I think there a lot of considerations; we have been exposed to a lot more information and have more at our disposal than the general public does. We are the ones that have to balance the information and the opinions that are out there and make the decisions.
 - My goal of this body is to consider ourselves as leaders and provide that leadership for all of the stakeholders.
- Is there data out there for Light Rail systems that have been unsuccessful? It seems like every City I have ever been to that the systems are an incredible success.

There is information out there for systems that have failed; off of the top of my head Buffalo has been the poster child for a system that has not been successful; but recently ridership there has begun to improve. San Jose also has serious problems but a lot of that has to do with how they structured their network. There is also information out there for systems that did not start out well, but ended up being successful. The right land use pattern makes a significant difference; there were a lot of sweet spots along the Light Rail system in Phoenix that enabled its success. Mesa, for example, had a road that allowed them to reduce the Right-of-Way and the speed. A lot of places have roads that would be conducive to Light Rail, but it is very complicated to get the transit system there.

The funding mechanism is equally important. From Wulf's presentation you can see that the individual jurisdictions made the decision to implement sales tax measure to provide for a portion capital cost. This helped leverage the federal funding that allowed them to complete the project. This is a key conversation that needs to happen, and needs to be provoked in the community.

Also the reason why the designs are the way they are is because when talking to the stakeholder agencies and asking them if we should include

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.

high capacity transit in the modeling they have stated that at this point should include local bus service.

- Can we include high capacity transit, specifically Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail, in our models?

The short answer is we can, from a technical standpoint, but it will take a significant effort. It is very difficult to project ridership because you have to look at the entire transit network.

- It seems eschewed because we transit travel and other transit performance measures but we are assuming that we will have the same transit service that we have now in 36 years.

The dedicated lanes on the outside in the model provides foreshadowing and gives us transit travel times for the corridor because they are in their own dedicated lanes.

There are some things in the model that are not included because they have to do with the operations side of things. These could improve things. Only looking at two miles you won't see that large of an effect, but you would if you looked at the entire transit network.

To add one more thing, that is why we looked at the "what-if" scenarios. How many people do we need to get out of their vehicles and onto to transit to get the four-lane to perform as well for transit as the six-lane does? This came out to be about 800-900 cars. This is the type of increase you need to have. But even if we were to have that type of increase, would it be enough of an increase to compensate for the capital cost of bus rapid transit or even Light Rail?

- These are the types of questions we need to think about that are not in our scope. The concept there is that you need to create enough Right-of-Way to be able to accommodate things in the future. The reality of what we can deliver is a good pedestrian environment, adequate bike facilities and enough Right-of-Way that preserves the opportunity for transit in the future if the City makes the decision to implement it - that's the sweet spot and this is what I am going to advocate for.
- Is there enough of an imbalance of east versus west traffic during peak hours to warrant making the road two lanes on one side on three lanes on the other.
52 percent of the traffic goes in one direction and 48 percent goes in the other, so there is not a major difference.

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.

5. Call to the Audience

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

Gene Caywood

"Thank you that was a great discussion and I agree with most of what everybody said. You guys are right that the support for this doesn't appear to be there right now for a Light Rail system. I think it has the build and I think it will build in a couple of ways, well at least one way, I think that once the streetcar has started, I think the experience has been in other communities that once you do a rail transit system that all of a sudden everybody wants it everywhere. They all become supporters.

The second thing, is that if you go back to the 2003 election with which we lost that Southern Arizona Transit Advocates under their old name -Tucsonans for Sensible Transportation put on the ballot - that passed in the central city areas strongly. Steve Farley did a precinct by precinct analysis of some of the central city areas like along the west University neighborhood, which I think was over 70%. There was real strong support in a lot of the areas if you go from like Alvernon to Silverbell and from Grant (or even north of Grant, Fort Lowell) to south Tucson it passed. Ok, so it was the outlying areas that said no. I think the support is there and the people that want to protect the central city, I think it will grow.

The question about where Light Rail has not worked (Phil I think you should get them some information) I think Buffalo is the classic example. The bottom fell out of Buffalo at the same time that they were building the system and that is really why it doesn't work. The major employer at the end of the line downtown left and folded up (and I don't know how many people that they employed, 10-20 thousand), a huge employer all of a sudden left town and that's why it didn't work the way it's supposed to. San Jose, I am not so familiar with but you live over that way and you can tell us.

I thought Jamie's comment was right, don't be shortsighted; lets plan for the future. I thought Colby had a good point. Transit riders (sort of in a sense) voted for transit by their ridership on route eight which is the heaviest used route. The other thing that I want to say in regard to that and the reason Broadway was selected for the first Broadway corridor study to look at Light Rail and the potential for Light Rail was because even back then it was the heaviest route and it's the logical starting place for Light Rail. I may have said this several months ago, but I will say

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.

it again; it's the only corridor in the valley where you can line up two major hospitals St. Mary's and St. Joseph's. I always take the corridor west of downtown and don't stop it there and the University of Arizona if you deviate a little off of Broadway, Williams Corporate Center, two regional malls. You cannot line up that kind of major activity centers in this valley. Pick any other corridor, try to do it. You cannot do it. That's why it will work because like Phil said that's why Phoenix works, because they lined up everything on the line, ASU, Skyharbor, downtown, Central Avenue. It will work in Tucson for the same reason; we have got all the right activity centers along the right corridor. It will work."

Laura Tabili

Mrs. Tabili ceded her time and did not speak.

Les Pierce

"Howdy. Shirley has asked for some comments about transit and Gene has provided some and let me provide one or two more. Recently I found on Jarrett Walker's website, humantransit.org, that there was a survey done in Portland, and if you have heard of Portland you have heard that they are bonkers for transit. The survey was recently conducted and said that of the people surveyed the majority wanted an increased frequency on the bus service and less than half showed enthusiasm for streetcar. Not saying that that is exactly relevant to this discussion on Light Rail but it's something to keep in mind that maybe shiny and possible in the future.

Maybe putting more money into increasing what we already have and what works well might be better. As the team said Sun Tran operators run the heaviest routes using the Sun Tran system and this is verified by their fair box return. I believe they have the lowest subsidy among all the Sun Tran routes: 24 percent vs. close to 40 percent for some of the express routes. The express route on Broadway was something the city was running. Sun Tran was running before the RTA came in and added their express route so as Gene has pointed out it's a productive route.

To echo what Jamey had said building for the future, I would say build for what you want, if you build for lots of lanes and for cars only, then that's what you are going to get. I am from back East and I know route 17 from New Jersey and I don't want that in my backyard."

6. 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

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.

potential agenda topics. The discussion listed below occurred during this agenda item.

CTF Questions and Comments

- Thanks to Mary for writing the letter on behalf of the CTF for the Sunshine Mile Grant. In Portland you ride the Light Rail for longer distances. I rode it from the airport to the northwest part of town and there were very few stops and then you get to the streetcar and there is almost a stop every block to get around the northwest area. It's fabulous and it's the same streetcar that we will have here. Wulf's Phoenix presentation was very similar the Light Rail was planned to go to major destinations and they found a way to implement it. If you look at the presentation in reverse, from an opposite view point of what they had to do accomplish things, not the results would help us from a planning perspective. There is a lot of good information there and I love that they mentioned an overlay. I think that it is very important to have the planning component and an overlay that increases density along the transit corridor so that it is successful.
- When will we get the latest traffic projections for Broadway? It seems to me that would be very important to help us make sounds decisions. (The project team responded that the 2045 projection are in process now and will take approximately 12-18 months to complete).

7. Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 8:40 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.RTAmobility.com.

The following summary of Performance Measure information provides justification for the removal of the 6+2T alternative from further evaluation and consideration by the Citizens Task Force. In general, the 6+2T alternative does not provide substantial (or any in most cases) benefit over at least one of the other 4 or 6 lane alternatives. In many cases, the 6+2T alternative has significant disadvantages, primarily related to its excess impacts to historic buildings, leaving the smallest remnant parcels and reduced economic potential, and highest construction costs. These impacts of the 6+2T alternative would be counter to the values consistently given the highest ratings by the public at the 3 public meetings.

Summaries from Performance Measure Workbook (2/25/2014)

1. Pedestrian Access and Mobility
 - All alternatives are generally beneficial. The only negative ratings are for 6+2T for 1e Pedestrian Crossings due to the excess width.
2. Bike Access and Mobility
 - All alternatives are generally beneficial. The 6+2T alternative has negative scores for 2e Bike Network Connections and 2g Bike Crossings, both due to excess width. The 4-lane alt west of Martin also had a negative rating for 2g Bike Crossings because the proposed crossing at Santa Rita would not be signalized in this alternative.
3. Transit Access & Mobility
 - Most alternatives generally improve transit access and mobility compared to the existing condition (4 lane transit travel time does not), but the 6+2T alternative does not provide any greater benefit than the 6 lane alternative.
4. Vehicular Access & Mobility
 - The 6+2T alternative does not provide any substantial benefit for auto travel over the 6 lane alternative.
 - The 6+2T alternative intersections perform similar to or worse than the 6 lane alternative due to having to transition to narrower roads and both ends of the project.
5. Person Access & Mobility
 - The average person travel time is longer for the 6+2T than for the 6-lane alternative
6. Sense of Place
 - The 6+2T alternative would have the highest number of direct historic building impacts, and the highest number of overall historic building impacts even if you assume 75% of the high risk acquisitions are demolished.
7. Environment & Public Health
 - The 6+2T alternative doesn't provide any substantial additional air quality benefits beyond the 6-lane alternative
 - The 6+2T alternative has the lowest heat island scores of all alternatives

8. Economic Vitality

- The 6+2T alternative would remove just over 1/3 of existing buildings and over 20% of remnant parcels would be 70' deep or less = lowest range of scores of all alternatives.

9. Project Cost

- HDR Memo (2/27/14) shows 6+2T alternative has highest estimated construction cost
- Acquisition cost 6+2T would be higher than at least one 4-lane alternative

10. Certainty

- All alternatives are beneficial and relatively similar in the rating, with the 6+2T alternative having a slightly higher score.