Call to the Audience Guidelines

• 2 Call to the Audience opportunities
• Must fill out participant card
• Participants called in the order cards are received
• 3 minutes allowed per participant
• CTF Facilitator will call on speakers and manage time
• CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
• CTF cannot take action on matters raised
• CTF members can ask project team to review an item

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order/Agenda Review/Announcements
2. 1st Call to the Audience 15 min
3. Draft "Non-Transportation" Performance Measures including Related Qualitative Assessment of Example Cross Section Concepts 65 min
4. Discussion of Updated Initial Cross Section Concepts 35 min
5. Discussion of Updated Transportation Performance Measures 35 min
6. 2nd Call to the Audience 10 min
7. Next Steps/CTF Roundtable 15 min
8. Adjourn

Draft “Non-Transportation” Performance Measures Including Related Qualitative Assessment of Example Sections

Phil Erickson
Community Design + Architecture

Mike Johnson
HDR Engineering

Call to the Audience

15 Minutes
Please limit comments to 3 minutes

• Called forward in order received
• CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
• CTF cannot take action on matters raised
• CTF members can ask project team to review an item

CTF Charrette Approach

• **Charrette** – an intensive and focused series of meetings and working sessions to advance major work items for Broadway Boulevard

• This week’s charrette is mainly a planning charrette not a heavily design-oriented charrette
• We do not plan to use small group or interactive working sessions
• We will focus on facilitated discussions and decision-making with the full CTF as a group
CTF Charrette Approach

- Tuesday night focused on discussion and refinement of
  - Draft Transportation Performance Measures
  - Draft Example Cross Section Concepts

- Wednesday and Thursday the Planning Team
  - Made revisions to the Performance Measures and Example Cross Section Concepts
  - Prepared initial assessments based on the Performance Measures

• Tonight is focused on discussion and refinement of
  - Draft Non-Transportation Performance Measures
  - Updated Transportation Performance Measures
  - Initial assessments of updated Example Cross Section Concepts

Thursday, May 30th CTF Meeting will finalize a set of work products for Stakeholder Agency review and comment:
- Draft Transportation and Non-Transportation Performance Measures
- Example Cross Section Concepts
- Initial assessment of Cross Section Concepts

Broadway’s Planning & Design Phase

Overview Performance Measures

- Tonight we will discuss potential Non-Transportation Measures organized by topic areas
  - Sense of Place
  - Environment/Public Health
  - Economic Vitality
  - Project Cost

- Later discussion of updated Transportation Measures

Assessment of Example Cross Section Concepts

- At this level of design development most assessment will be qualitative
- Impacts related to alignment cannot be fully evaluated as alignment is not included in design concepts at this point. But future width allows for some qualitative comparisons.
- We plan on assessment report out being similar to the following—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Section Concept</th>
<th>Perf Measure 1</th>
<th>Perf Measure 2</th>
<th>Perf Measure 3</th>
<th>Cost Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- ★★★ Best Performance
- ★★★★ Worst Performance
- $$$ Highest Cost
- $ Lowest Cost
Refined Schedule

- Assessment of Street Section Concepts not until May 30th Meeting
- June 20th CTF to include
  - Informational Presentation — BRT Update
  - Review and Endorse potential cross sections and assessments for Stakeholder Agency review
- July 25th CTF to include
  - Informational Presentations
    - Universal Design and ADA
    - Corridor Economic Development & TOD
  - Update on Stakeholder Agency review
  - Discussion of September Public Meeting format

CTF Discussion

- Initial discussion will occur for each of the 4 topic areas covering 2 performance measures
  (we will “bank” any additional time to return to this or other items if there is time)
- Followed by overall discussion of potential additional measures, refinements, etc.

Sense of Place

5a. Historic Resources
5b. Visual Quality
5c. Broadway as a Destination
5d. Gateway to Downtown
5e. Conduciveness to Downtown
5f. Walkable Community
5g. Certainty

Sense of Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a. Historic Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The number of historic structures lost due to direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The number of historic structures with limited usefulness as a result of loss of parking, setback, site access, and other conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5b. Visual Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability of the roadway design to enhance visual quality using a mix of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Qualitative assessment (project team and input from CTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design of median and streetside landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number and location of placemaking features (including public art, wayfinding, lighting, furniture, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Width of roadside areas for streetscape elements and landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Evaluate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate at current level of design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design does not currently include details for streetscape design, but lower cost cross section concepts may allow more budget to be spent on visual quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5c. Broadway as a Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote development and civic spaces that would be attractive to users from surrounding neighborhoods, the city, and the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide visual quality, access, and other features that make Broadway appealing to development and customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Qualitative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Factors related to 5b Visual Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinate facade improvement, parking management, and other programs and improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land use regulations supporting development sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Evaluate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low for current level of design and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sense of Place

**5d. Gateway to Downtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual quality, ease of mobility, and similar features that improve connection to downtown</td>
<td>To be determined through discussions with CTF</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low to Moderate at current level of design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5e. Conduciveness to Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The type and size of businesses that would be drawn to the corridor under various development approaches</td>
<td>Site access and parking location; Building size and design accommodated; Other TBD</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low at this level of design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sense of Place

**5f. Walkable Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well the improvements and land use plan place businesses within walking distance for a viable number of residences</td>
<td>See measures under &quot;1. Pedestrian Access and Mobility&quot;</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5g. Certainty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relates to comments received, &quot;Do it right this time so it doesn’t have to be done again.&quot;</td>
<td>Capacity projections; Ridership projections (bus transit; BRT); Flexibility to meet changing transportation needs</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Environment/Public Health

**6a. Greenhouse Gases**

**6b. Other Tailpipe Emissions**

**6c. Heat Island**

**6d. Water Harvesting**

**6e. Walkability/Bikability**

**6f. Land Use Mix**

**6g. Affordability**
### Environment/Public Health

#### 6b. Other Tailpipe Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and reduction of other important tailpipe emissions, such as particulates</td>
<td>Quantitative evaluation</td>
<td>Proportion alternative modes of transportation • Level of congestion • Quality of vehicle fleet, fuel, etc.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not at current level of design • Some factors ultimately not effected by this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6c. Heat Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine comparative heat island effect of various alternatives</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative evaluation</td>
<td>Reduce roadway and sidewalk pavement contribution to heat gain through a combination of shade, solar reflectivity (high albedo) of materials, and area of pavement • Increase landscaped area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate at current level of design (amount of landscaped area &amp; number of trees) • High with more detailed design and selection of building materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6d. Water Harvesting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain rainfall onsite to benefit project landscaping</td>
<td>TDOT Active Practice Guideline “Green Streets” [draft]</td>
<td>Width and depth of median and streetside areas • Amount of reduction in runoff on paved areas • Types of materials used (pervious pavement)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate at current level of design • High as design is developed further</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6e. Walkability/Bikeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design elements that will encourage biking and walking over driving</td>
<td>See 1. Pedestrian and 2. Bicycle Access and Mobility performance measures</td>
<td>Number of bike and pedestrian facilities and features • Continuity of treatments • Comfort and security features</td>
<td>High to Moderate depending on performance measure</td>
<td>High to not viable at current level of design depending on performance measure • High to Low depending on performance measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6f. Land Use Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to accommodate mixed use development within walking and biking distance of the Broadway corridor, and to support transit ridership</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
<td>Support of mixed use by current/future zoning • Determine if, and what type of policy and procedural changes are needed • Count and size of parcels conducive to accommodate desired land use mix</td>
<td>Low to indirect</td>
<td>Not at current level of design • Moderate as design is developed in more detail (i.e.; alignment) and policy issues are discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6g. Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Ability to Effect</th>
<th>Ability to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined housing and transportation costs for users of the Broadway corridor</td>
<td>Qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>Relates to other measures: • 1, 2, &amp; 3 – Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Access &amp; Mobility • 5f Walkable Community • 6b Other Tailpipe Emissions • 7g Job impacts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not at current level of design and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Vitality

7a.-7b. Change in Economic Potential
7c.-7d. Change in Business Revenue
7e.-7f. Change in Sales Tax Revenue
7g.-7h. Change in Property Tax Revenue
7i. Business Impacts
7j. Job Impacts
### Economic Vitality

**7j. Job Impacts**

| Description | • Potential change in number of jobs |
| Measurement | • Estimate of current and potential future employment in project area (may be challenging to track given business relocations and/or job creation under various alternatives) |
| Factors | • To be determined |
| Ability to Effect | • To be determined |
| Ability to Evaluate | • Not at current level of design and planning (see 7a-7b Change in Economic Potential) |

### Project Cost

#### 8a. Construction Cost

| Description | • Cost of construction |
| Measurement | • Approximate quantity takeoffs of major cost items (pavement, curb) |
| Factors | • Width of roadway cross-section |
| Ability to Effect | • High (ROW acquisition is also a significant cost) |
| Ability to Evaluate | • Moderate at current level of design (estimates made based on cross sections) |

#### 8b. Acquisition Cost

| Description | • Cost to acquire needed ROW, including the cost of the property, relocation, and other qualified costs |
| Measurement | • Quantitative and qualitative evaluation |
| Factors | • Number and size of property acquisitions |
| Ability to Effect | • High |
| Ability to Evaluate | • Low at current level of design and planning (estimates made based on cross sections) |

#### 8c. Income for Reuse of City-owned Property

| Description | • Income from sale or lease of remnant City-owned properties not needed for the project |
| Measurement | • Qualitative and quantitative analysis by economic and other planning team members to estimate use potential of existing and remnant land |
| Factors | • See 7a-7b Change in Economic Potential |
| Ability to Effect | • To be determined |
| Ability to Evaluate | • Not at current level of design and planning |

### Discussion of Updated Initial Cross Section Examples

**Phil Erickson**  
Community Design + Architecture

**Mike Johnson**  
HDR Engineering
Initial Cross Section Concepts

- Exploring range of potential design solutions based on community input to date
- Five “families” of concepts based on number and function of travel lanes
- Range of types and widths of roadway, roadside, and landscape element “cards”
- To be used in initial evaluations and next round of public and stakeholder agency review and comment

Initial Cross Section Concepts

- Agenda for this item:
  - Overview of section cards
  - CTF discussion of section cards
  - Overview of initial concepts
  - CTF discussion of other options, issues, etc.

Cross Section Cards

- Roadway lanes
- Sidewalk and associated landscaping
- Medians
- Local access lane, sidewalk, and landscaping

Roadway Lanes

No changes

Sidewalks & Associated Landscaping

New Card

New Card

New Card

Sidewalks & Associated Landscaping

New Card

New Card

New Card
Medians

Medians
Local Access Lane

“Families” of Cross Sections

- Dimension range for Cross Section Families
  - Four lane
    - 92 to 130 feet
    - 67 to 134 feet
  - Four lane plus transit lanes
    - 116 to 154 feet
    - 89 to 156 feet
  - Six lane
    - 114 to 152 feet
    - 89 to 152 feet
  - Six lane plus transit lanes
    - 138 to 172 feet
    - 109 to 174 feet

Option A: 97’ Right-of-Way

Option A1: 67’ Right-of-Way
Option A2: 96’ Right-of-Way

Option B: 119’ Right-of-Way
Four Lane
Potential R.O.W. Range – 67 to 134 feet

Option B: 112’ Right-of-Way

Four Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 116 to 154 feet

Option A: 121’ Right-of-Way

Four Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 89 to 156 feet

Option A: 118’ Right-of-Way

Four Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 116 to 154 feet

Option B: 150’ Right-of-Way

Four Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 89 to 156 feet

Option B: 152’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane
Potential R.O.W. Range – 114 to 152 feet

Option A: 125’ Right-of-Way
Six Lane
Potential R.O.W. Range – 89 to 152 feet

Option A: 128’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane
Potential R.O.W. Range – 89 to 152 feet

Option B: 152’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 138 to 172 feet

Option A: 143’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 109 to 174 feet

Option A: 143’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 138 to 172 feet

Option B: 172’ Right-of-Way

Six Lane plus Transit Lanes
Potential R.O.W. Range – 109 to 174 feet

Option B: 174’ Right-of-Way
Cross Section Studies
West of Campbell Concepts

CTF Discussion

- Are there additional “Families” of design approaches to add?
- Are there additional cross section options we should illustrate?
- Are there cross section options we should eliminate?
- Other issues to discuss?

Discussion of Updated Transportation Performance Measures

Changes made to measures within:
1. Pedestrian Access and Mobility
2. Bicycle Access and Mobility
4. Vehicular Access and Mobility

Pedestrian Access and Mobility

1a. Functionality of Streetside for Pedestrian Activity
1b. Separation from Vehicular Traffic
1c. Pedestrian-Oriented Facilities or Improvements
1d. Walkable Network/Neighborhood Connections
1e. Pedestrian Crossings
1f. Vehicle/Pedestrian Conflicts at Driveways
1g. Universal Design
1h. Walkable Destinations
1i. Ease of Choice
### Pedestrian Access and Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1f. Vehicle/Pedestrian Conflicts at Driveways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Evaluate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle Access and Mobility

**2a. Separation of Bikes and Arterial Traffic**

**2b. Bike Conflicts with Crossing Vehicles** (combined into 2b)

**2d. Pavement Condition**

**2e. Bike Facility Improvements**

**2f. Bike Network Connections**

**2g. Corridor Travel Time**

**2h. Bike Crossings**

---

**2b. Bike Conflicts with Crossing Vehicles** (note this includes the 2e perf. measure)

**Description** | Vehicles cross bike lanes for a variety of reasons, the design and frequency of these crossings can affect bicyclist safety and comfort |
| **Measurement** | Frequency and type of traffic crossing bike lanes, Length of uninterrupted bike lane, Design details of crossing area |
| **Factors** | Reducing number and length of crossing points, Design details of crossing area |
| **Ability to Effect** | High |
| **Ability to Evaluate** | Moderate at current level of design (location of transit stops and use of local access lanes), Design does not include current details of site access or intersections |

### Pedestrian Access and Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1h. Ease of Transition to Walking™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to Evaluate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle Access and Mobility

**2a. Separation of Bikes and Arterial Traffic**

**Description** | Greater separation is a factor related to bicyclist safety and comfort, and therefore likely bicycle use of Broadway |
| **Measurement** | Relationship of proposed separation compared to ITS Walkable Thoroughfares Manual recommendation of 6 feet |
| **Factors** | Bike lane is a legal bike lane (as opposed to a “striped shoulder”), Combination of bike lane and buffer (painted line or other) width, Buffer other than painted line, Location of transit stops (street side or median) |
| **Ability to Effect** | High |
| **Ability to Evaluate** | High for cross section and location of transit stops, Low for intersections (crossings of bike lane for right turns) |

### Bicycle Access and Mobility

**2d. Pavement Condition**

**Description** | Smooth pavement is a priority for bicyclist comfort |
| **Measurement** | Input from TDOT and Bicycle Advisory Committee, Best practice guidance, possibly including elements of NACTO Bike Guide |
| **Factors** | Concrete with proper joint design versus asphalt, Gutter design, Landscaping palette |
| **Ability to Effect** | High |
| **Ability to Evaluate** | Low to none, Pavement type not dependent on cross section design, except for potential for lower cost cross section concepts to allow for more budget to be spent on bike lane pavement |
**Bicycle Access and Mobility**

**2e. Bike Facility Improvements**

**Description**
- Extent of bike racks, shade, drinking fountains, green pavement (bike boxes, etc.) and other features to serve bicyclists needs

**Measurement**
- % shade, number/frequency of design features
- Qualitative evaluation

**Factors**
- Increase in number of features
- Continuity of bike treatments through project area

**Ability to Effect**
- Minimal at the cross section and alignment level, beyond provision of enough area in streetside to allow for facilities. Evaluation of space is generally covered by measures 1a and 1b.

**Ability to Evaluate**
- Moderate at this level of design
- Design does not currently include this level of design, but lower cost cross section concepts may allow more budget to be spent on bike facilities.

---

**Vehicular Access and Mobility**

**4f. Persons per Vehicle or Person Trips**

**Description**
- Multi-modal measures allowing evaluations on a per person basis

**Measurement**
- Convert vehicle, transit, and bicycle trips to person trips for the corridor
- Use traffic model and VISSIM to assess different modal performance for:
  - Corridor travel time
  - Average delay
  - Travel time reliability
  - Other measures as appropriate

**Factors**
- Number of traffic lanes
- Signal design/timing
- Intersection design
- Access management
- Transit service design
- #2B-Bike Conflicts with Crossing Vehicles
- Dedicated transit lanes, transit priority treatments at intersections, level boarding, off-vehicle ticketing, and other measures

**Ability to Effect**
- High

**Ability to Evaluate**
- Not viable at current level of design
- Requires alignment and intersection design

---

**Next Steps/Roundtable**

**Jenn Toothaker**

Next CTF Meeting: Thursday, 5/30/2013
5:30-8:30 p.m., Child & Family Resources

- Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- Call to the Audience
- Public Input Report & Reports on Presentations & Outreach
- Review potential cross sections and performance assessments, and endorse a representative set of them to move forward into review by the Stakeholder Agencies
- Initial discussion of September Public Meeting #3
- Call to the Audience (2nd)
- Next Steps/CTF Roundtable

---

**Vehicular Access and Mobility**

**4a. Movement of Through Traffic**

**4b. Intersection Delay – Overall Intersection Performance**

**4c. Intersection Delay – Worst Movement**

**4d. Accident Potential**

**4e. Lane Continuity**

**4f. Persons per Vehicle or Person Trips**

**4g. Access Management to Adjacent Uses**

---

**Call to the Audience**

10 Minutes

Please limit comments to 3 minutes

- Called forward in order received
- CTF members cannot discuss matters raised
- CTF cannot take action on matters raised
- CTF members can ask project team to review an item

---

**Thank You for Coming – Please Stay in Touch!**

Broadway: Euclid to Country Club
Web: [www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway](http://www.tucsonaz.gov/broadway)
Email: [broadway@tucsonaz.gov](mailto:broadway@tucsonaz.gov)
Info Line: 520.622.0815

RTA Plan
[www.rtamobility.com](http://www.rtamobility.com)