MEMORANDUM

To:    Broadway Citizen Task Force
From:  City of Tucson Department of Transportation and Broadway Project Design Team
Subject:   Broadway Baseline Alignment:  Considerations regarding CTF Recommendations to Mayor and Council
Date:  March 5, 2015

At the Citizens Task Force (CTF) meeting March 19, we will be asking you to make a recommendation to Mayor and Council regarding the "Staff-Recommended 6-Lanes Including Transit Alignment" posted on the project website on February 20, 2015. That alignment is the configuration that TDOT and the project team believes best reflects the vision and goals of the project, as well as the feedback received from the CTF at the meeting of October 24, 2014. The alignment that is adopted by the Mayor and Council following the March 19 CTF meeting is not the final layout. It is rather a baseline for the engineering design and to inform the property acquisition processes.

The staff-recommended alignment generally includes an 8' sidewalk, separated from the roadway by an 8' landscape buffer, to provide an environment that encourages pedestrian activity. We believe a robust pedestrian environment contributes to the commercial viability of the corridor, is supportive to future transit, and is more conducive to making Broadway a destination where people will want to come and stay rather than simply pass through. However, narrowing the pedestrian environment may be advantageous in certain cases to avoid historic and other buildings and to provide flexibility in designing solutions for maintaining a parcel’s functionality.

The staff-recommended alignment demonstrates such an approach in the 1400 E block (between Highland to Vine) where the landscape buffer is not included on the south side of the street, leaving a condition along Miles School that is similar to what exists today. On the north side of the street the landscape buffer has been narrowed to 4-feet with a 6-foot sidewalk, and the roadway shifted southward, to reduce the impact to the north side. Doing so avoids severing several buildings and leaves parcels of greater depth.

We have attached an example of how the pedestrian environment could be narrowed for a longer reach of Broadway, to the west and east of the 1400 E. block, to get some sense of the difference to property impacts. In this example, the narrowed pedestrian area extends roughly between Fremont to Warren/Martin. The sidewalks have been narrowed to 6', and the landscape buffers to 4', though in practice it may become a 10' sidewalk. The narrowed pedestrian environment, together with shifting the roadway southward, results in approximately five buildings no longer being severed by the proposed improvements. That drawing, attached to this memorandum has been posted on the project website as of today. The project team is not certain that this configuration will be found workable when the elevations of the roadway,
driveway connections, utility relocations, goals of individual property owners, and other design factors are taken into account. As the project progresses into more advanced design, several points need to be remembered:

1) **Adopting a baseline alignment does not mean the current process is over; the DCR still needs to be written.**
   - The alignment that is adopted by the Mayor and Council following the March 19 CTF meeting is not the final layout. It is rather a baseline for the engineering design and to inform the property acquisition processes.
   - A Design Concept Report (DCR) will be prepared in the upcoming months which will include this baseline alignment. The DCR will codify the work and decisions made to date on determining the baseline alignment and provide direction for the detailed engineering in relation to drainage, landscaping, cycle track details, and many other design details. The CTF will continue to be involved in that process.
   - The Mayor and Council will ultimately approve and adopt the DCR which will guide future design decisions as construction documents are prepared.

2) **A continuum of decision-making regarding the design remains.**
   - **March 19 CTF Recommendations.** The decisions made by the CTF March 19th will serve as the starting point for preliminary engineering and design, preparation of the DCR, and acquisition of obviously impacted parcels. The CTF could choose to recommend design decision priorities, such as whether to pursue an approach that emphasizes the pedestrian realm as the staff-recommended alignment does, or provide guidance to the acceptable trade-offs to the pedestrian realm in order to preserve buildings and property as the narrowed example does.

   Appendix A provides a comparison using 3D visual stills to compare the pedestrian realm. Appendix B is a partially filled out performance measure template for your review and use. These tools could help frame CTF discussion and recommendations related to the trade-offs you would find acceptable.

   - **Road Safety Audit (RSA).** A road safety audit (RSA) will be performed in March 2015 by a team of outside specialists formed by RTA to provide suggestions on design revisions that may make the design safer for all modes of transportation. This is a process that RTA undertakes on all RTA funded projects, and has proven to be productive for projects that have received this audit. The findings of this audit will provide useful guidance for all phases of the roadway design.

   - **Relocation Plan.** The Real Estate Division will begin meeting with affected property owners to prepare a relocation plan. At this point, property owners’ desire to find a possible cure to allow them to stay on Broadway will be gathered. Owners wishing to be acquired will also be identified.
**Initial 30% Plans and Design Adjustments.** When the DCR is underway, initial design and "30% Plans" will also be prepared. Those plans (considered 30% complete) will define the overall design approach. The 30% plans will be the first formal submittal to the City. During this phase:

- The project team will be able to utilize the input received from the Real Estate Division to implement creative solutions for access, shared parking, and easements to further refine the alignment.
- With the input from property owners, the priorities expressed by the CTF’s recommendations, and direction provided by Mayor and Council, design adjustments will be made by multi-disciplinary team of City staff and the design team.
- The CTF will have the opportunity to provide input on the 30% plans.
- The CTF will be kept apprised of the progress on the design process. Should any significant changes be necessary to the proposed alignment during the design of the 30% plans, the CTF will be given the opportunity to review and comment.
- Further milestones in the design process will be 60%, 90% and 100% plans. At each of these milestones, the roadway design gets increasingly detailed until it is 100% complete, and ready for construction.

**Public Meetings.** Two CTF meetings are envisioned through the DCR/30% plan process. An Open House for presentation to the public is anticipated at the 30% plan stage. Fewer meetings are envisioned to be needed during subsequent design stages because design work takes more time.

3) **Elements that factor into the decision-making regarding narrowing or not narrowing**

- The ability to accommodate existing or relocated utilities. This applies to above as well as below ground facilities.
- Elevation differential between the roadway and adjacent property, particularly where buildings are very near the sidewalk.
- The choices made by affected property owners regarding the ability to achieve agreements on joint access and/or parking agreements, whether they wish to remain on the site, and so forth.
- Meeting ADA requirements for sidewalks, traffic signals, crossings and connections to adjacent property.
- What extent of the narrower sidewalk and landscape design is seen as being acceptable given the lesser benefit of the narrower treatment to pedestrian and other goals of the Broadway project.
4) Adoption of the baseline alignment allows property owners to get engaged, ends the uncertainty for both property owner and business owners, allows creative conversations to begin involving the right decision-makers, and design adjustments to be made accordingly.

♦ More detailed design work is now needed to evaluate where further narrowing is feasible and/or desirable.

♦ Once a general approach is adopted by the Mayor and Council, City Real Estate can begin working with property owners with plans for acquisition and determining whether acquisitions are partial or full.

♦ At locations where narrowing is found feasible, the tradeoffs can be weighed and informed decisions made.

♦ Other options may be found to avoid acquisitions during design. In a particular one mile stretch of Grant Road, the City was able to avoid six previously anticipated acquisitions. Buildings, businesses, and project cost were all saved.

♦ The CTF could express a general preference in the tradeoff of pedestrian realm versus reducing property impact to guide the design team moving forward.

♦ Adopting the staff recommended alignment allows design and acquisition activities to proceed. Those activities will provide the detail needed to determine the actual impacts to affected properties, and allow both the design team and the property owners to better plan for the future.

Attachments:
1. Attachment 1 – Narrowed Sidewalk Zone Concept in West Mile
2. Attachment 2 – Narrowed Sidewalk Zone Concept in West Mile, Includes color-coding of sidewalks, landscaping, and medians to show different depths, and to show lengths where cycle tracks could be included
3. Appendix A – Visual Simulation of Design Concepts from Fremont Ave to Warren/Martin Ave
4. Appendix B – Performance Assessments of Design Concepts from Fremont Ave to Warren/Martin Ave
Appendix A

Visual Simulation of Design Concepts from Fremont Ave. to Warren/Martin Ave.

In order to provide a better understanding of the physical differences in the redesign of Broadway between the Staff-Recommended and the Narrowed concepts, the Project Team has prepared a set of visual simulations from viewpoint of various users for both of the concepts which are included on the following sheets.

First, a plan view of the simulation model is provided for each concept with the view points for the “scenes” noted on the plans. The yellow shaded buildings are those that are “severed” by the future street right of way. The landscape that is illustrated is sized to represent approximately 8 years of growth after planting. The street trees have a height and width scaled to what could be expected from planting Desert Willows, the current recommended tree for planting within the project area.

Descriptions of View Point Scenes

Scene 1 - View from sidewalk
This is the view that a pedestrian would see while walking along the sidewalk. The main difference is how the combination of a sense of enclosure and human-scale of the presence or absence of trees and the width of the landscape buffer provides. This is the physical and visual buffering between pedestrians and vehicles. Appendix B includes a calculation of the Pedestrian Level of Service that results from the different design treatments of the landscape buffer in which the presence of trees and the increased width of the landscape buffer, as well as the 2 foot wider sidewalk results in a better Pedestrian LOS for the Staff-Recommended concept. The presence of trees also has an effect on the overall character of the street as being less expansive in the Staff-Recommended Concept; even as buildings on both sides of the street would be visible. Both concepts can use the same landscape in the median and organ pipe cacti, illustrated in the simulations, or saguaro can be used to provide some vertical relief to break up the visual width of the street.

Scene 2 - View from cycle track
This is the view that a cyclist would see from a location about parallel with the pedestrian view in Scene 1. Given that this view point is on the south side of Broadway, the cyclist gets some shade from the street trees and similar to Scene 1 the street trees frame the view while still allowing for views through to adjacent buildings.

Scene 3 - View from cycle track
This is the view that a driver of a car would see travelling in the outside lane about parallel with the cyclist and pedestrian views in Scenes 1 and 2. The characteristics of the view are similar to those in Scene 2.
Appendix A

Scene 4 - View from bus island
This is the view that a transit rider would see looking back down the street for the next bus that would arrive at the stop. This illustrates how the cycle track passes behind the bus island and shelter. There is not a significant difference in how this area would be experienced in the two concepts with the exception that the Staff-Recommended Concept provides enough space for trees to be planted in the adjacent sidewalk area. This being a south side bus stop, the trees would provide some additional shade for waiting transit riders.

Scene 5 - View from bus island crosswalk
This is the view that a pedestrian would see when approaching one of the crosswalks across the cycle bypass to the bus island. Similar to Scene 4 the view is not that different between the two concepts. But note the additional sidewalk width of the Staff-Recommended concept does allow for street trees “behind” the shelter and bypass providing shade.
11x17’s of the visual simulations should be inserted here
Appendix B

Performance Assessments of Design Concepts from Fremont Ave. to Warren/Martin Ave.

The Project Team has prepared the attached performance assessment that compares the Staff-Recommended and Narrowed Sidewalk Zone concepts from Fremont Avenue to Warren and Martin Avenues based on the set of performance objectives that was most recently used in the CTF meetings leading up to the initial identification of the 6 Lane including Transit Alignment concept. The following two-page 11x17 table presents the Project Team’s assessment and provides space for CTF members, and community stakeholders, to note their comments regarding the assessments and their own assessment of the comparison of the concepts’ performance for the objectives.

The most notable differences in performance related to building impacts and pedestrian related performance objectives.
Appendix B

*Insert 2 page performance assessment table*