



Draft Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD CITIZENS PLANNING TASK FORCE

March 7, 2014

3 p.m.

Public Works Building, Basement Conference Room
201 N. Stone 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, , 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	Joseph Maher Jr.	Anthony R. DiGrazia
Michael Butterbrodt	Naomi McIsaac	Jon Howe
Dale Calvert	Shirley Papuga	
Mary Durham-Pflibsen	Diane Robles	
Bruce Fairchild	Jamey Sumner	
Colby Henley		

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

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

2. First Call to the Audience

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

Monica Hay-Cook

"My name is Monica Hay Cook and I have a store on Broadway called Deco. I am also the president of the Sunshine Mile. Our mantra on the Sunshine Mile is "Everything you want in one historic mile." You know we have got retail, services, restaurants, entertainment and there is a lot on the Sunshine Mile with over 400 businesses.

One thing that I was thinking about while lying in bed last night is that America is a younger country, and what I mean by that is that we don't have as much history as places like Europe. But what we do have is we have the art-deco period and the mid-century. I feel very strongly about preserving as many buildings as we can.

I agree with what was being talking about yesterday that Sunshine Mile be a destination and not just a gateway to downtown. I want to comment on what Rocco (who is not here today I guess) talked about with parking. I think you need parking with the buildings. I know that you guys talked about balance yesterday and I think that parking needs to be in that balance (with the walking and everything else that you are supposed to do, bicycles, etc.). I think there should be some front parking, you know people don't want to walk a long ways; I do, I walk five miles a day, but that doesn't mean that everybody does.

There needs to be some sidewalks along the Sunshine Mile. I have been going out and visiting some of the businesses, once or twice a week when I can get away from my business. There are so many and I don't think that we have begun to touch all of the different businesses in the area. We started having mixers and our goal was to have 48 official members and we are at 40 (I think). We are going to hit our goal early.

I was at one business this week and the owner said that when we had that rain, that his roof was leaking. He said that he didn't know whether or not to fix it because he didn't know what was going to happen with his building. You know he actually ended up fixing the roof but now the ceiling is hanging down and he said, "I don't know whether or not to fix that." So I am sure that you guys are aware of that.

In addition to that I am starting to see more people putting money toward fixing things, and I think it's a good thing. We redid our store front and the inside. Tucson tamale was going to put up an awning. Jude from Cook and Company (my husband) said, "What about doing individual letters?" He has found, that his business has grown significantly since he did that. I don't want to say how much he said, but

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.

since then I have seen several other businesses paint their store fronts. I really think that the place could shine.

I want to make sure that people think about bus pullouts and I want to mention quickly what my vision is for the Sunshine Mile, I can see retro-style lighting. I can see mid-century signage. I could see one or more of those historic neon signs that are being refurbished. Not just signs but also as public art. I thought we could do some interesting things with walking and biking. We could have markers along them with signage that says "Walk this sunshine to that sunshine" (and you have walked a mile) for example. Or we could also do a similar something with bicycles. The El Tour people are along the Sunshine Mile and I think that we could do something with that and I think it could be built in to what we do. We have done some events and we definitely could do a lot more. One of the things is that the area became the Sunshine Mile because it was a part of a contest (and you may have heard this before) and I think the winner got like \$5,000 and its goal was to bring people to come and visit Tucson (instead of going to like Wilshire Boulevard or Palm Springs). The buildings were designed with store fronts; so getting sidewalks closer to buildings so that people could walk the Sunshine Mile and look in the windows was a part of it and also they made it a place where people would want to come to. I don't think of the Sunshine Mile as a hidden gem but I think of it as a forgotten gem. I think it is something that we could really do a lot with. I want to thank everyone, you guys put in so much time. Not just here, but on your own and you guys are the best."

Ron Spark

"Thank you for the opportunity and I thank all of you for your stick-to-it-ad-ness and intelligence. I am Ron Spark I am a member of the Broadway Coalition and the Southern Arizona Transit Advocates. I live in El Encanto. I am a confirmed urbanist and I wanted to live in a viable city. I have six points that I would like to bring to your attention.

First, in regard to transit you heard Gene Caywood make a presentation a couple of times and then you heard from the Valley Transit, specifically about Central Avenue as being a very successful light rail system and this was without having to widen the right of way as it exists. So that idea would argue for four lanes plus two. If you think of Broadway right now, you have five lanes and I think it's somewhere around 68 feet but it varies and the current configuration certainly could sustain a light rail system, as well as a bus system. Light rail systems stop every third mile to quarter of a mile, while a bus stops every other block. I think that could work. I am a physician and I have to be realistic. I think that is the real situation as we currently have.

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 second is about your weave and you are designing your weave in thinking about your costs in acquisition. I think that again, you have to be realistic. There was a value judgment that a single story with fewer tenants would be less expensive than one with multiple tenants and two stories. That is a value judgment that I think that you need to weigh very heavily. Why wait when someone is a tenant in a two story (it would be more expensive obviously) when that is a value judgment and again it has to do with economic viability.

My third point has to do with trying to have you recall the District over on 6th street. If you think of the sidewalks, they have curb cuts, they have water harvesting, and they have put in trees there. This is a successful sidewalk and it was allowed by the City in its design. So what I am saying is that you don't need a great expanse with trees that have a big spread, you can use water-senses trees and have a sidewalk; that is not a justification for expanding the right of way.

The fourth is that I travel Broadway quite frequently. Often at what we call rush hour (I'm a Philadelphian, it's a joke). Quite honestly I think I can count on five fingers the amount of times that I had to wait at an intersection for two lights to get through. So that Broadway as it configures five lanes only has a peak load maybe two and a half hours a day. You all know what the projections for vehicle miles traveled are; as far as the load that Broadway can carry.

My last point has to do with the four lanes plus two lanes for transit, as an equity issue. I attribute to Margot and a few others. If you look at your chart, the average time traveled in the afternoon hours, if you reduce the time from 14-16 minutes the bus time almost equals the car time through. Ok, so what does that mean? That means that your job is to be choosing again equity. What do I mean by that? I think about a third of our citizens don't drive, can't drive. Some of them are low income and don't own cars. There are lots of children, there are more and more seniors that had to give up driving and there are people that are mobility dependant. So by choosing a right of way that would balance, have transit four plus two you are making a social judgment in your engineering. Thank you for your time."

Margot Garcia

"Well good afternoon, we meet again. How many hours ago was it? Twelve? Fourteen? Not very long. I thought it was a really good meeting last night when you finally got around some maps and gave everyone a chance to really talk to each other on concrete issues and in looking at where the alignments are. One of the interesting things that I heard Phil Erickson say was that as he was drawing the alignments he was looking at the costs mentally of where that alignment would go. Ron was just alluding to that. He said that if I avoid the big building with many tenants, which is going to be very expensive in terms of relocation, and instead

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.

take out a single building with one business I will have less expense in my relocation. That is a good thing; I hope that we all are worrying about costs.

What I want to hold up to you was that he was using a performance measure, because we have been talking about these 'abstract performance measures' for months, years it feels like. And so, here is one that he was using to make those decisions about where to put that alignment. It was not one of the ones that have been high in the public's replies to things; it's not been one that has had much discussion here.

What is the cost of relocation? What is the cost of these buildings and so forth? While I think it's one that needs to be talked about, I hope that as you are thinking about these alignments again that you're also thinking about the ones that people have brought as very high. Did we draw the alignment to avoid the historic building? Did we draw the alignment in such a way that pedestrians have equal ability to cross to work? Is it safe for the bicyclist? Did we make the corners and each intersection in such a way that each bicycle accident happens at the right hand turn? (Where the bicyclist is going straight, the car is turning and whack!) That is the most frequent kind of bicycle accident that you will find just about anywhere. So when we are designing these things are we thinking about equal level to paying attention to the cost? That is what I think it means to put some sort of references in for these performance values. So good luck with your deliberations today, I look forward to seeing what comes out of them. I am sure that I will be back to see them again in April."

Laura Tabili

Thank you for your indulgence. I just wanted to very briefly mention a couple of things that came up last night again that didn't dawn on me until after the meeting was over. Two remarks that were made. One was that if you are going to knock down nine buildings you may as well knock down the tenth. The other one was that historic buildings are nice but...

I just wanted to remind the group (and some don't need to be reminded, so for those of you I hope that you will bear with me) and it surprises me to continue to hear remarks like this. In all three public meetings hundreds of people rated preservation of the historic and significant buildings and the built environment high or highest. So the general public are constituents that want the built environment preserved. So that remark is really surprising to me this late in the process.

Once again, I just want to remind anybody who has forgotten (and I am sure most people do) that in order to have a historic district you need to have more than 50%. 51% of your buildings have to be historic contributors and so when you start talking

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.

about knocking down nine buildings and ten buildings one of those buildings is going to be your 51% and then you are not going to have a historic district. Thank you.

3. Updates and Clarifications on Street Design Concept Alternatives and Performance Measure Assessments from Project Team

The project team presented updates and clarifications to the detailed street design concepts that were requested by the Task Force and engaged with them around detailed maps and drawings.

Using the consensus-based decision-making model, which is described in the attachment to this summary, the Task Force arrived at the following decisions:

- Move forward with a hybrid of each of a 4 lane and a 6 lane street design concept for further analysis to take to the public meeting to gain feedback. (Hybrid refers to mixing approaches of minimizing impacts to properties to one side of the roadway or the other, and minimizing impacts to buildings - which may mean impacting both sides of the roadway.)
- Create design vignettes for how to address challenging areas identified by the CTF members.
- Illustrate possible infrastructure that can be built for transit in the 6-lane.
- Take the 6-lane, plus 2 dedicated transit lanes (6+2T) off the table for further analysis now.

The entire Task Force achieved consensus on these decisions, with one member opting to choose consensus rule #4, to 'stand aside' (due to the need to talk to stakeholders about the decisions):

4. I will stand aside and not block the decision. I will support it because I trust the wisdom of the group; however, I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register my views about it.

The following discussion took place during this agenda item:

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

- **Do I understand what you are saying correctly - that Mr. Cole is precluding a dedicated transit lane when the project is constructed? In other words can we recommend a dedicated lane now?**
Yes, you can recommend creating dedicated lanes at the outset; however, the conversation would need to include the discussion of ridership and whether or not the current level of ridership would justify the creation of dedicated lanes.

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.

Also we have the opportunity to set up the infrastructure now - move the necessary utilities, create curb cuts, etc. The project has the position to build enthusiasm for high capacity transit and in doing so create the environment that increase ridership on the current bus system. You can recommend to build the system incrementally - design and build the system now for rubber tires with the provision for light rail in the future when it makes more sense. If there is a potential for light rail in Tucson it is on Broadway. The reinforcement of the willingness to make it work will bode well for its future implementation.

- As a reminder, there needs to be a willingness from leadership to implement high capacity transit (HCT). Everyone is looking to light rail as the transit option for the future. People ask how Sun link will be successful; I say that it was successful when the election was won. An extension of the streetcar could work for the short term and the same tracks could be used for light rail in the future. Doing things incrementally in Tucson put things into bite size chunks that are much more easily accepted by the leadership.
- I would hate to design a roadway that isn't a transit priority roadway and the 10 years down the road realize we have the ridership and not the roadway to support it. We need to design the corridor to grow and incentivize ridership to make transit a priority.

Sun Tran recently completed their operational analysis and route 8 is already going to be enhanced.

- If we are going to have a high capacity system like light rail or bus rapid transit we need to decrease the amount of time a bus currently takes to get travel along the corridor or no one will want to ride the new transit when it is installed...I am a big fan of the indirect left turn, we could put them at Euclid, Campbell and Country Club; this could decrease the amount of stops a bus needs to make and speed up their travel time. I see making room for the light rail in the middle of the road. Also, I think we are drawing arbitrary right-of-way lines before choosing a cross section width, it seems like we are putting the cart before the horse.

We are currently at the cross section level. Hopefully we can make decisions today that can lead us to the next step where we are able to get much more detailed and refined analysis. The choices we make today are really about the cross section.

Today you will see rough drawings that accommodate light rail in a 6 lane configuration. Getting to the more detailed discussion regarding

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.

alignments are great because you are able to see the impacts the varying widths have on buildings.

- Is the public meeting going to be a workshop or more of an open house format?
Currently we envision the meeting to be a combination of presentations and an interactive open house style format, with the possibility of breakout sessions.

- I think it would be worthwhile to read the memo our fellow CTF member wrote to us due to her absence so that we can see where she is coming from (memo is attached to this report).
 - I am surprised she is leaning towards the 6 lane option as it is in conflict with what her stakeholders want. I feel that we should keep 4 lanes west of Martin to avoid impacts to buildings.
 - I agree; 4 lanes west of Martin and 6 Lanes to the East is smart for light rail and downtown, especially when Aviation connects to Downtown Links in the near future.
 - In terms of Downtown Links you can see the connections very clearly.
 - I am absolutely in favor of narrowing the right-of-way width. I do not want to knock down a whole side of the street to move traffic. Traffic is not bound up but once or twice a day.
 - Are you going to go through her memo? Because I think she is absolutely spot on. Especially in light of the sidewalk only study and the impacts to properties that would occur if the project were to solely repave the roadway. In light of the need to upgrade the sidewalks and other facilities if the roadway is reconstructed the 4 lane and the 6 lane option may not even differ greatly in terms of the amount of building impacts.

- So, for everyone's knowledge, Jamey and I have looked at the maps and have been working together to find options for transit along the corridor. We looked at the lane situation west of Martin. A 4 lane option would work in this area if the high capacity transit option was rerouted north up Campbell to connect with the streetcar at Helen and a local bus service was utilized from Martin west of Campbell into downtown. If not a 4 +2 transit lane approach could be utilized that minimizes the amount of building impacts as much as possible. This is the tradeoff from both Rincon Heights and Mile Neighborhood perspectives.

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 can narrow the individual elements in the roadway not reduce the amount of lanes.
 - I reiterate that. We can look at things such as median width and narrowing the landscaping and sidewalk widths in key areas to minimize the impacts in the narrower areas.
 - If we are going down the road to this type of decision the pain (impacts) should be shared between both the north and south side of the road. I am curious if the staff can do something to demonstrate an alignment that shares the impacts equally on both sides of the road?
- What would be helpful is to review the names of the alignments to clarify what they are.
4 Lane Minimize Impacts to Buildings: This alignment has a very high level of high risk properties associated with it because of the uncertainty regarding what the property owner and business owners will do. It minimizes the direct impacts to buildings that right-of-way acquisition would create. The 4 Lane Minimize Property Impacts has more direct impacts to buildings but less risk involved so there may be less total acquisition. The 6 lane that avoids direct building impacts has quite a bit of risk associated with it as well. My take on it is that the CTF is really concerned with high risk so you all would only assume the risk if there was a large benefit associated with it, such as not impacting a significant amount of buildings.
 - So, the 6 lane option was not looked at in great detail?
We did a cursory look at the 6 lane east of Martin, but it does not fully reflect the intersection design at Campbell and how that may affect things. The rough sketch we are providing today is a hybrid of the two 6 lane options that were previously presented - there is less impact to historic structures and less high risk acquisitions of potentially historic properties, but it has more direct impacts to non-significant structures. We can change things a bit if we move this option into further analysis.

It seems to me that an effort to look at both the 4 lane and 6 lane in a more strategic fashion would be worthwhile and more responsive to your stakeholders needs.
 - So, could you do a 4 lane hybrid in a similar fashion?
Yes we can. We could also take more challenging sections of the roadway and make multiple options that play things out a little more. This is a road - that in certain areas due to the way it was

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

originally developed - where there will be impacts no matter what. It seems like taking this hybrid approach and looking at multiple options in tough areas is the way to go and may prove more worthwhile than going through the effort of designing a road where it transitions from 4 to 6 lanes.

- This comes down to where the high capacity transit goes - if it comes off of Broadway and goes up Campbell or if it stays on Broadway for the entirety of the corridor. We need this input from the public.
 - I feel dubious about that statement. Broadway goes into downtown and has 5 major destination points along the entirety of the roadway going east. I look at Broadway as an entire network and I would be very cautious about suggesting not having the high capacity transit continue along the entire corridor into downtown. *Would it make more sense if the streetcar went south on Campbell to Broadway and that became a transfer point? We could get input on that, but then we would be getting into transit planning, which is outside of the scope of this project.*

- It would be good to show the public what would happen with the sidewalk only option. I would like this brought to the public meeting. *We have been talking about that as an internal project team discussion. We have been working on plans and sections and we do have the VISSIM analysis. Would it make more sense to do three-dimensional views of the corridor?*
 - We also need to show what exists already. When talking to the public you say 4 or 6 lanes, say that 4 lanes with a media already exists. We already have 5 lanes, if you frame it this way then 6 lanes won't seem so overwhelming. The other thing is that you should explain when we take right-of-way we are taking it to build bike lanes, landscaping and facilities other than just the roadway. I don't think the public understands the full scope of the project.
 - In regard to presenting the information three-dimensionally, this could be distracting. We need simple packets that convey the information we need to share with our stakeholders concisely.

- Are we at a decision point?

Yes I believe we are.

 - For a quick flyer, why don't we pick certain options, for example the 8 lane and the existing conditions and convey information about those. I think it is important for the public to know.

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

We need to know things like that as soon as possible so that we can have drafts for you to review at the April meeting.

- I recommend that we move the 4 and 6 lane hybrid options forward to the public meeting. We need to make clear that the 6 lane option will be built in mind with building the necessary transit infrastructure to eventually convert the road to 4 through lanes and 2 dedicated transit lanes. This will show that we have a vision.
- We need to state that with the emphasis on a vision for transit but that we are not making a decision on what the lanes are used for.
- I am comfortable with saying that we have a vision for future high capacity transit but not with saying that the two lanes are for dedicated transit lanes.

I am going to go out on a limb it seems that the 4 lane option has become a stumbling block. I would like to let you know what I am going to hear about from those that I need to answer to. I understand that the public rates the preservation of historic structures and economic vitality very highly. The challenge is that the memos that have come from the funding agencies, specifically the county, state that they will not fund anything less than 6 lanes. To get around this we can revised the project description and go back to the voters - this is of course is a lengthy process. Where do you stand on this?

- We have been told that we design whatever we want. I don't think that we can take the 4 lane off the table because we need to talk to our stakeholders. We haven't heard what you just said until now but we have been given the liberty to design thing how we feel they should be designed.

The key to this is functionality. We need to have the conversation of whether or not a 4 lane road can meet the functionality criteria that has been set in front of us. Again, stepping out on my limb, the RTA originated functionality as primarily a transportation term. What we have begun to do is determine our own functionality; thus, both options need to be looked at because the 6 lane options functions highly on some measures while the 4 lane functions highly on others. These are the conflicts we need to take into consideration when making these decisions.

- It would be good to have the RTA tell us we can't move forward with the 4 lane. We need to know this and they need to tell us as soon as possible. They need to define what functionality or they need to flat out tell us "no."

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.

- Here is where I am at: I am comfortable with moving both of the options we discussed forward because it helps define functionality. This group (the CTF) has to determine what our functionality is. I personally think that the 6 lane option is the way to go. That is the reality of where I am coming from and where my stakeholders are coming from. But, that does not mean that the 4 lane should not go forward. The fact is that right-of-way and the width of the cross section determine everything. We need to let the facts lay out.
 - Farhad came to a recent Broadway Coalition meeting where he was asked about the ballot language and where he stood. He indicated that, yes, he has a responsibility to uphold the wishes of the voters. However, he also stated that he has fiscal responsibility and that if what was voted for no longer made sense fiscally he would support a different option. He also stated that the CTF needs to define functionality and bring that design forward - then the leave it to the stakeholders to decide on things. He made me feel empowered.
 - We can study the 4 lane alternative but I don't think it will fly with the stakeholder agencies and I can vote for it. We (the CTF) need to zoom out and look at the big picture - the majority of the public data (from the last public meeting) came from people who live within one mile of the project study area. It is a disservice to the region and the City if we limit the scope of the project to just include the opinion of this group of people. Downtown is beginning to thrive and this two mile stretch is the aorta into the heart of the City. The RTA has backed off of the 6 + 2 transit lane but will not back off the 6 lane. There is a symbiotic relationship with the City and Pima County but Chuck Huckelberry has teeth and will pull the county funding. I hope that the City and the RTA see the 6 lane option as viable for the corridor...If nothing happens on this project then it is a guillotine singing over the head of everyone located along Broadway.
 - I can't take the 4 lane off of the table until the City or RTA tells us it is off the table. They need to tell us so we can let our stakeholders know.
 - If we are representing the wants of our stakeholders we can't take the 4 lane off of the table because then we would not be representing our stakeholders the way that we should be. We need to leave it on the table. Can you depict the redesigned 4 +2 transit lane option to show a 6 lane with less impact? We owe it to our

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.

stakeholders to keep the 4 lane on the table until we are told we cannot have it.

- We are looking at two issues here: 1. Our personal feelings about what works (and what doesn't) and 2. Cowing to the argument that it will not get funded or approved. I do not think that the 4 lane option works in the long haul; yet it should be looked for similar reason as why we have looked at the 6 +2 transit lane option in depth and the fact that it has such a large amount of support from the surrounding neighborhoods.
- I assumed what moved forward to the meeting is what is moving forward for more in depth analysis.
- It is our responsibility to go through this process with all of the options. Keeping the 4 lane on the table is not just to gain public feedback for clarification. If we take it off the table the public will always have the excuse that we did not analyze it and they will be able to blame that on the RTA.

The question I have for those of you who very strongly for one option or the other is if you favor the 4 lane option is there enough performance analysis done to date to advance it - or do you need more data to help you make these decisions.

- Historic homes versus transportation are a tradeoff of values. The corridor is only 1 mile away from downtown...the sense of place is very important.
Maybe the investment of the time to study the 4 lane more in depth can be deferred because as it really comes down to property impacts the difference between the 4 and 6 lane alternatives may not be as much as you originally thought.
- I feel that the 4 lane reduced risk alternative and the both the 6 lane reduce impacts and reduce risk options need more detailed analysis to help us resolve some of these issues. We may be able to pull from them all to come to the best possible solution.
- I am concerned about the building impacts and the how the loss of businesses and structure would impact the economic vitality.
- The 4 lane option does not help with any vehicle or transit measures. The 6 lane is the best compromise in terms of functionality and performance. In regard to the 8 lane being taken off the table, I do not feel good about it. Now some voices have been silenced and they no longer have an option. I think the best

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

compromise with balance between the wishes of the neighborhoods and the City as a whole is the 6 lane.

- The perspective of my stakeholders was to keep the road within the existing right-of-way. So to them the 4 lane option we have been discussing in itself is a compromise.
 - The high interest in the 4 lane is due to the building impacts the other options would incur as well as the preservation of economic vitality. The 6 lane is not a deal breaker if it is done correctly. As we get more detailed analysis we need to find more creative ways to save buildings and reduce impacts. I do not think we have even scratched the surface in terms of what we can do creatively.
The analysis will become clearer if we are just focused on 2 alternatives. The nuances become clearer with more refined and detailed study.
- We need to put together as good of a 6 lane alternative as possible to maximize our goals. We need to see how much functionality this option would have and try to incorporate as many facets of functionality in the design. We all agree that we want to minimize impacts to buildings and the loss of structures but we need to get past our feelings for the road and get down to the design work and see how we can really make this project work and how we can best minimize property impacts.
 - I think we need to look at the block where Miles School is out in light of the laws regarding school safety and how the right-of-way impacts this. These differences need to be ironed out.
 - We need to develop info sheets on the existing conditions and the 6 +2 transit, etc. and show why they didn't advance into further analysis.
 - I would like an information sheet or pamphlet on parking and access as well.
 - I would like to see a list of what has been discussed that are not currently compatible with City design standards so we can present that to the Mayor and Council. These are things that the Mayor and Council need to be aware so that they can make policy decisions based off these considerations.

At this point the CTF made the formal consensus decision to take 6 +2 transit lane off of the table.

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

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

- **One last question: does the City already have a vision for implementing the Green Streets policy along the Broadway Corridor?**

4. Review Schedule and Proposed Preparations for Public Meeting #4

The project team presented potential dates for the next large community-wide meeting, as well as the potential design and format of the meeting. Tentatively, the meeting is planned to be held during the week of May 19, 2014. The project team will email the Task Force members potential dates for the next Task Force meeting, to check their availability and to select a date. .

5. Call to the Audience

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

Laura Tabili

Laura Tabili filled out a speaker's card and was not present during her allotted time to speak and address the task force.

Gene Caywood

I have to disagree with my friend Dale a little bit, if I heard him right, he asked you not to say six lanes and not to say four plus two lanes for transit. My position is obviously that we want the lanes for transit in some form. I guess I can sort of agree with Dale, if you put it in the same sentence and say, "Alright we are going to describe this as six lanes, but it's applicable to four lanes for transit with the option in the future of dedicating two lanes to transit." Then that next sentence makes it clear that 'future' could be next month (if we find funding) or it could be forty years from now (as Mike said). We don't know, but that option clearly has to be there to the people that come to the meeting.

The other thing that I want to follow up (and I interrupted myself) I got confused last night, ran out of time and I didn't finish what I was saying about the Speedway issue. I think you should request a little minor study (not a lot of detail guys on the Speedway thing) assuming that the staff still has the information (or Mike has it in his file). I think it could answer a lot of the questions that you were talking about from a real life experience right here in Tucson, a mile away. Questions like, "How many parcels did the consultants estimate would have to be acquired and how many were acquired? What was the budget for right of way vs. what the actual budget ended up for right of way? How long did it take to resell and redevelop all of the properties?"

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.

The last thing that I want to say about Speedway is that if you want to look at those nice drawings that Phil Swaim did that show you how you could redevelop a real narrow parcel you can go down and look at Speedway carefully. Probably the one to look at most (in my opinion) is the one just East of Palo Verde on the North side. I believe that was probably the shallowest depth parcel that we left. Those depth parcels started at about 115 feet and by the time that we widened the road it was around 75 feet. It was also the last parcel to be developed (if I remember right) and this was probably because it was so shallow. You look and see what you have got, if you have got a three story building surrounded by lots of parking that takes up two thirds of the block; say for example, you want to have a continuous nature to your development and your businesses along Broadway, well you didn't get it with that. The whole swallowed redevelopment thing (which you have been wrestling with) is real tough to do and you are probably going to end up with the kind of thing that you ended up with at Speedway and Palo Verde.

Jude Cook

Hi, I am going to be brief. This was a good meeting and this was the most interesting meeting that I have sat through yet. I am glad that you guys finally got a chance to talk. I have got to remind you to remember the sense of place, the stuff that was priority last night. I am glad that you are sending both of them forward, if I was going to drop one I would drop the six...goodbye!

Camille Kershner

So just a few quick questions; I haven't been to too much of these meetings so I don't know what all has been discussed already. I am wondering what considerations you are making as far as parking in general on Broadway (because of what's happening downtown). What the improvements are, that are going on? If the transit option will be dedicated or not? High Corbett and El Con can be a hub to downtown in the future with whatever is going on now (you know with what is happening with Houghton). There are other things going on around town and it's not just this section of Broadway (the Grant Road widening).

So I would like for you to consider in the back of your mind, if people don't have to drive to get to this section of Broadway you're not going to need quite as much parking and it won't be as much of an issue. Coming from the far East side, I don't want to have to drive to downtown; I want to be able to use my transit options and not have to worry about parking. I heard some people say that their opinion has evolved throughout this process. Some of your stakeholders and constituents don't necessarily have the experience that you guys have had so I am just wondering how they are getting that sort of option to be able to have that information and to have the same sort of journey and experience.

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.

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 potential agenda topics. No comments were made or questions asked during this agenda item.

7. Adjourn

Nanci Beizer called meeting to a close at 6:50 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.