

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
1				Y	The DCR is very extensive and quotes heavily from the meeting materials that were presented to the Task Force. The tone is generally upbeat and positive about the amount of work done by staff. In general it is a good documentation of the process as designed and carried out. However, one has to read between the lines to see the differences between what the Broadway Boulevard Citizen Task Force (CTF) said in their discussions on lane width, to what staff told the Technical Management Committee of the Regional Transportation Agency (RTA), to what the RTA Board passed as part of its authorization to release more money to the City to continue the road design process. Another caution applies to the trajectory of the CTF’s discussion and consensus that morphed into the CTF report to the Mayor and Council and technical document that was adopted by the City Council on June 9, 2015 as the base alignment.	No response or changes to DCR needed.
2	Context Sensitive Design	document vision		Y	We are delighted, but surprised to find reference to Phil Erickson’s book on context sensitive design, since he never quoted from it by name in the meetings, but the Broadway Coalition (Marc Fink) did quote from it on several occasions when Mr. Fink spoke at “Call to the Audience.” Context Sensitive Design was suppose to be the heart of the project, but that perspective got lost, even though the public kept trying to bring it back into the discussion. This is a mid-century modern historic commercial corridor that has a sense of place and most of the businesses are small and locally owned (exceptions: Safeway, Starbucks, Carl's Junior, Brake Masters and Weinerschnitzel). The small businesses needed to be the focus for the vision and driving force of the design. We don’t find that in the report.	<p>The Walkable Urban Thoroughfare manual was cited as a design guidance source and discussed at several CTF meetings during the alternatives design and evaluation process. Specifically noted in 4 meetings' PowerPoint Presentations during May to August 2013. The manual is also cited and discussed in the Charrette #3 evaluation workbook.</p> <p>No changes to DCR needed in response to this comment.</p> <p>Context sensitive design does not require that existing context be fully preserved, but it is taken into consideration and the public's value of that existing context is important to the process, and did shape the decision making and final CTF recommendation for the Broadway Improvement Project.</p>
3	Broadway Redevelopment				We find it surprising that the work done by EPS on Redevelopment of Broadway Boulevard, report dated January 2014 appears in the report only in a short summary on page 4-17. This important study on development along the corridor and what kind of redevelopment can be expected on the small remnant lots should be threaded throughout the document, and it is not.	No response or changes to DCR needed.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
4	Project Need	context sensitivity	1		We find some curious language in 1.1 Project Need. It states that improvement is needed to improve mobility for all modes, and it states that “the context-sensitive design approach has been employed to achieve a street design that better complements the character of development along the corridor – both that which exists today, as well as the community’s vision for the future.” There is no statement about where they are getting the vision for the future. From Plan Tucson, which calls for historic preservation and mixed use in midtown? From Imagine Tucson, which calls for dense urban development respecting history in midtown? Or from the CTF, which never adopted a vision statement ?	Regarding the Vision Statement and Goals: added clarifying text and footnote to page 4.1. Also, Plan Tucson was under development during the project. Ultimately, the majority of the public participating in the Broadway project determined that reducing impacts to existing buildings was the context goal for the project and the CTF recommendations reflect this.
5	Project Need	Traffic Counts	1		In addition, the document does not contain the traffic counts over the last 20 years which show decreasing car traffic on Broadway, mirroring national trends, including the significant drop in driver’s licenses for young drivers. While the need to accommodate more cars is simply in error, there is a need to more adequately provide for improved transit such as BRT (bus rapid transit), as well as for bicycles, pedestrians, and people in wheelchairs.	No response or changes to DCR needed.
6	Vision		1		Page 1.2 Table 1.1 Major Planning and design work items and schedule. We suspect the third bullet under 5 should say consolidated alignment variations developed and evaluated.	Typo will be corrected.
7	Context Sensitive Design		2		1. The definition of Context Sensitive Design (CSD) does not adequately incorporate the non-transportation aspects of the concept. As described on the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) website, “The transformation to context-sensitive design requires nothing less than the transformation of the highway development process -- a new philosophy, culture and organizational structure It is based in the realization, by transportation engineers, planners and others that transportation projects could have serious impacts on the surrounding communities and natural features and that a new way of designing such projects was needed in order to insure that community values were maintained.” “Transportation corridors, whether a main street or a scenic road, and transit facilities whether a simple bus stop or a major train station, are natural focal points for communities. To view them as catalysts for strengthening community life necessitates a shift away from the way transportation has traditionally been conceived.” In addition, the list of meeting topics (pages 2.3-5) shows that not one meeting had an agenda item to discuss what CSD is and what it requires. The Broadway Coalition developed a position paper on what CSD is; this is not (and never was) referenced.	Context Sensitive Solutions was presented as the approach that would be used for the project at the June 20, 2012 CTF meeting - the first meeting of the CTF through agenda item #4 "Overview of Context Sensitive Solutions Planning". There are 7 slides in the PowerPoint presentation for that meeting and a selection of these slides were presented at Public Meeting #2 on February 28, 2013 and again at Public Meeting #3 on September 29, 2013. The issue of how the community defines and values the context along Broadway is also discussed as part of the project goals for the project. The project team has reviewed the DCR's discussion of Context Sensitive Solutions and has not identified the need to make modifications in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
8	Context Sensitive Design		2		2. The report claims that the book, <u>Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach</u> , was a reference throughout the process. This is patently untrue, at least publicly. The book was only referenced twice; both times by a member of the Broadway Coalition at two different “Calls to the Audience,” in which the speaker asked why the book (co-written by one of the consultants) was <u>not</u> being used in the process.	This statement is untrue, see response to comment 2, above. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
9	Context Sensitive Design	Project Performance Measures	2		3. In any event, the project planning process did not use the process outlined in either the referenced book or on the CSS website. The process requires a bottom-up decision making process that first identifies the context to be developed/maintained and then requires that the context (including goals and vision) be used in the evaluation of alternatives. This also did not occur. A) A desired context was never finally approved, only a draft document of goals and visions. In fact, 1½ years into the process, the program manager stated, when it was suggested that the process would be more efficient if a common context was developed, that she preferred to have this occur “organically” through future discussions (something that was never done). In addition, at the August 2013 CTF meeting, staff stated explicitly that they would not use the draft goals and vision to evaluate the alternatives because it would be “too complex.” Instead, staff used a set of over 55 (the number vacillated) performance measures and never referred to the draft goals and vision (much less an agreed upon context). Furthermore, despite several promises that all of the performance measures would be used, only half were evaluated and most of the sense of place measures were not used. Many citizens found these measures too complex to be used in any meaningful way.	The goal statements that were developed through the Broadway project process were illustrative of the broad range of values that were expressed by the public and CTF throughout the process. The linkage between the performance measures and the goals was discussed several times with the CTF. As discussed throughout the responses to comments similar to this one the CTF's recommendations to Mayor and Council ultimately reflected the public input received through the process. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
10			2		4. The report states that the purpose of the second meeting was to finalize the goals and vision (page 2.6). This was never done .	This statement is not correct, the description of the second public meeting in the DCR states "The meeting was intended to assist the Citizens Task Force (CTF) and project technical team in finalizing the draft Vision and Goals..." The public input from the meeting did inform the goals. Ultimately, the goals were not finalized, but instead were used to inform the process. This is reflected in the Conceptual Baseline Alignment and Technical Design Parameters that were adopted by Mayor and Council. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
11			2		5. Page 2.7 discusses the public meeting held Sept. 26, 2013 .	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
12	Meeting Attendance	Project Notification	2		2.7 a) The report states that 78% of attendees lived within one mile of Broadway (a change from what was reported following the meeting from 70%). While this may be true, the intent of the statement is to imply that only neighborhood people opposed the project. However, only those people living within one mile of the project were notified; therefore, 25% of the attendees came despite not being notified.	Text describe how the public meeting notices were distributed has been added to section 2.2.3.3 as a clarification. Changes of text regarding Public Meeting #3 are not necessary in response to this comment.
13	Performance Measures	Meeting Results	2		2.7 b) The report downplays the results of the meeting. 1) Despite the fact that the top three performance measures were not transportation related, the report states that these are “open to interpretation.” This is a bizarre statement given that staff provided the performance measures to be rated (see chapter 4). If the measures are unclear, then why was the public asked to rate them?	The statement of "open to interpretation" relates to the Economic Potential and Visual Quality performance measures. These are open to interpretation by the stakeholders as expressed in discussions of what the goals related to these measure mean - some felt existing businesses need to be preserved to be successful in terms of Economic Potential, while others felt attracting new businesses is necessary for success. Similarly for some performing well for Visual Quality means preserving what exists and for others it means changing what exists. Success in terms of these performance measures depends upon the interpretation of what they mean, which varied widely amongst participants. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
14	Narrow right of Way	ROW	2		2.7 c) The report states that though the overwhelming majority of the attendees supported a narrower right-of-way (ROW), discussions at the tables of why they made these selections was not always based on width. Exactly! As the report states, the overwhelming majority of attendees supported values such as historic preservation, business vitality, walkability, etc.; these are all values that require a narrower ROW.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
15	Narrow right of Way	ROW	2		2.7 d) The report says that the attendees’ choices for narrower ROWs were done despite their poorer performance for bicycle and pedestrian environments. However, there are two issues here: 1) when reading the comments from the public, it is clear that the public defined walkability as the ability to walk to destinations; and 2) the definitions used by staff were very formulistic; i.e., sidewalk widths, curb heights, etc., nothing related to place. It also ignores the fact that narrower ROW’s are generally safer for both pedestrians and bikes (slower traffic, less time needed to cross the street) and for cars (lower speeds).	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
16	?	ROW	2		<p>2.7 e) The report claims that, though unstated, staff believes that the prevalent belief was for no change. This is presumptuous on the part of staff (similar to assuming that attendees did not really care about narrow widths). If it is unstated then it is inappropriate to make this assumption. Further, it ignores the fact that most people <i>want</i> Broadway to be improved; the issue is <i>how</i> improved is defined.</p>	<p>The commenters' assumptions regarding an "unstated" staff belief has no basis. The result of the process, not involving any assumptions, is that the CTF recommendations and the Mayor and Council's adopted Conceptual Baseline Alignment and Technical Design Parameters seek to minimize impacts to existing buildings.</p> <p>It is unclear what the commenters' mean by "narrow widths" - if right of way width, it is clear that the adopted Conceptual Baseline Alignment and Technical Design Parameters seeks to keep the right of way width narrow.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
17			2		<p>2.7 f) In general, the opinions expressed at this public meeting conformed with those expressed at the previous two meetings.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
18	Design Tradeoffs		2		<p>2.7 g) Page 2.8, the report discusses possible tradeoffs. However, the report does not acknowledge that the attendees identified the tradeoffs they desired; i.e. more importance on the non-transportation measures than transportation measures. This was never incorporated into the process, and in fact, the staff continually emphasized transportation measures to the detriment of the other measures and goals. This was made very clear at the end of the process (March 19) when the project manager stated when asked why she did not present the CTF's recommendations to the RTA and PAG, that she "had a road project to get through."</p>	<p>The DCR describes the process that occurred and the resulting project design.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
19	Narrow right of Way		2		<p>2.7 6) Meeting 4, though intended to provide input on various alternatives, did not provide a narrow ROW alternative (e.g. 96-feet), even though this was preferred by many people and was stated to be viable by staff at the May 6, 2014 Mayor and Council study session.</p>	<p>The DCR describes the process that occurred and the resulting project design.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
20	Public input		2		<p>2.7 7) Why is there no discussion of the results of the last public meeting?</p>	<p>Page 2.9, there is discussion regarding the input received from this meeting.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
21	Roadway Functionality	RTA	2		<p>2.7 8) Table 2.1 lists various decision guidelines from various public agencies. These include the RTA Board stating that there should be no reduction in functionality. What the report does <i>not</i> state is that Jim DeGrood, at the August 2012 CTF meeting, refused to define what functionality meant and that the CTF needed to come up with a definition. This was never done; later in the process staff defined it in purely transportation terms, despite the fact that CSD criteria always defined it in terms of both transportation and non-transportation terms. And, this is reiterated in <u>Walkable Urban Thoroughfares</u>, in the book’s second paragraph which states that the purpose of the book is to recombine the transportation and community/placemaking values of urban corridors.</p>	<p>The DCR describes the process that occurred and the resulting project design.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
22	Existing conditions report	historic preservation	3		<p>3.1.1 Existing Land Use and Urban Form “Isolated “ single-family houses is a curious statement. According to the 2012 Existing Conditions Report 25 residences front on the Broadway corridor out of the 247 properties. There is a row of craftsman bungalows and period revival buildings, some of which have been repurposed for commercial uses. The only purpose-built commercial buildings between Mountain and Campbell are in the 1500 block. There is also no mention that along this corridor is the highest concentration of Midcentury Modernist buildings in the city. Nor is there mention that several blocks are part of a historic district registered on the National Registry of Historic Places.</p>	<p>Discussion of the buildings built as single family homes on page 3.1 has been revised.</p> <p>The term "Midcentury Modernist" will be added to the discussion of the Eastern Segment on page 3.11</p> <p>There is a discussion of the Rincon Heights Historic District on page 3.11 of the DCR, the text will be revised to state that it is on the National Registry of Historic Places.</p>
23	historic preservation		3		<p>There is also no mention in the text of residential neighborhoods next to Broadway, that are also nationally registered historic neighborhoods: Pie Allen, Rincon Heights, Sam Hughes, El Encanto and Colonia Solana.</p>	<p>Text describing these adjacent historic neighborhoods has been added to page3 3.10 and 3.11</p>
24	commercial businesses	historic preservation	3		<p>Page 3.2 Commercial uses: there are 212 businesses and other establishments fronting onto the Broadway Corridor according to the 2012 Existing Uses document. The “vacant and under utilized” land mentioned is owned by the State of Arizona and is the result of previous road widening and the construction of the Aviation – Barraza Road. The note about how small some of the buildings are – some as narrow as 20 feet - is reflective of the wisdom of our forefathers and foremothers who purposefully built them as incubator spaces for small businesses. For example, Solot Plaza continues to perform that function half a century later. This intentionality should be made clear in the document.</p>	<p>Text on page 3.2 has been revised to mention the 212 establishments in 2012.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
25	Existing conditions	commercial businesses	3		Page 3.3 We take exception to the characterization of no medical offices; there are dentists, an orthodontist foundation, a podiatrist, and an optometrist. There are real estate offices and property managers in a number of buildings. According to Existing Uses document, there are 3,214 employees working on Broadway.	Text on page 3.3 has been revised to be clearer that some of these uses do exist within the project area.
26	existing conditions	Education uses	3		Page 3.4 Missing from the list of education uses is Miles School which is directly on Broadway and a strong, historic presence on the street. It has a program for special needs kids.	A discussion of Miles School has been added to this page. It is already mapped and is one of the two photos on this page.
27	open space		3		Page 3.5 Open space is limited, and most of it is along the Arroyo Chico and in Cherry Field. However, the area is very close to the large, essentially 1 square mile regional park, Randolph/Reid with Hi Corbett Field and amphitheater. Some undeveloped space is awaiting this road program (by the Casitas) and the vacant land down by Euclid is the bare remnant parcel from an earlier road widening.	Text has been updated regarding open space, see response to similar comment by Camille Kershner.
28	sidewalks	existing conditions	3		Page 3.6 "Few areas have sidewalks" is a generalization that does not hold up for the entire project length. For instance, west of Campbell to Euclid has almost continuous sidewalks, but many are interrupted by light poles that render the remaining width too narrow for ADA. The 9th and 10th Street RHNA storm water management infrastructure is referred to in the future tense, but in fact this project was completed years ago.	The text states "Few areas have sidewalks with trees along them..." Text has been revised to add that "Portions of the street that do include sidewalks also have utilities within the sidewalks that render the remaining width to be narrower than desired for ADA." Note that ADA does allow a narrow sidewalk with for a short length for utilities.
29			3		Page 3.7 Office development between Fremont and Santa Rita" is described approvingly, although current plans call for its demolition.	Text is describing existing, not future, conditions. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
30	arroyo chico		3		Page 3.10 The subareas: Arroyo Chico Industrial Area We would suggest just calling it the Arroyo Chico Area. While part of the neighborhood is industrial, it is also residential and so we would not focus on the industrial part, unless you want to focus the other neighborhoods on their commercial sections. It also seems to us these commentaries should be referenced to their neighborhood plans (can be accessed through the city website) and also to the 2012 existing uses plan. This material is not new.	"Industrial" has been deleted here and clarified on page 3.5 No other changes to DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
31	historic preservation	landmark	3		<p>3.1.4 Historic Resources We hope that the update, promised in the first paragraph, will include the buildings that with the passage of time, have become eligible for listing, that the city landmark status granted to Broadway Village will be noted, as well as the registry of the Rincon Heights Historic District.</p>	<p>The text on page 3.10 speaks to a minor update that was completed in 2013. No other update is forthcoming.</p> <p>No changes to DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
32	historic preservation	landmark	3		<p>Page 3.12 The listing of individually listable buildings omits 1601 E. Broadway. Please correct this omission. We think the report would be improved by including the provision from the National Historic Preservation Act regarding anticipatory demolition 16 U.S.C. 470h-2(k).</p>	<p>The historic evaluation work done as part of the planning effort for the project, and updates that were made to it during the project planning have not identified this building to be individually historic.</p> <p>No changes necessary in response to this comment.</p>
33	traffic projections		3		<p>Page 3.13 3.2.2.1 Vehicular We are glad to see the authors point out that the PAG 2045 population and therefore traffic projections will be substantially lower than the 2040 projections. In looking at Table 3.1 the 22% reduction of 2040 vehicle projections is a pretty good approximation of the 2045 population and vehicle traffic numbers. But looking more carefully at the numbers, we see less traffic projected from the 2045 figures will travel west from Campbell than are projected using the 22% reduction of the 2040 figures. The Design Team should be using the more recent figures since they take into account recent land use changes. Also we point out that traffic west of Campbell has never actually reached 40,000 vpd. "Traffic flow during morning and evening peak periods is often congested due to several factors...." We would maintain that Broadway is never or very rarely congested. We have driven during "rush hour" during the Gem and Mineral Show and while the UA is in session. Driving at a reasonable speed many of us have proceeded along the roadway without ever stopping for a light or at most once. Exactly what is the operational definition of "congestion" employed by Tucson DOT traffic engineers?</p>	<p>While the 2045 projections were not available for the alternatives evaluation, the Design Team was pleased that the reduced growth estimates were in line with those generated by the PAG travel forecasting model. Although the 2045 numbers are higher east of Campbell and lower west of Campbell, the Design Team did not feel that re-modeling and re-evaluating the alternatives would change the recommended 6-lane section between Martina and Euclid which was based on several considerations, including sufficient capacity to serve vehicular traffic and the need to provide lanes that could be dedicated to future high capacity transit service.</p> <p>Text and a footnote have been added to section 3.2.2.1 to address the definition of congestion on an urban arterial.</p>
34	street car		3		<p>3.2.2.2 Transit No mention is made of the current PAG study of implementation of the HCT study and the possibility of the modern streetcar or LRT on Broadway shown in the 2045 PAG Plan. This needs to be added.</p>	<p>Added text to clarify status of the HCT study.</p> <p>Text has been added regarding LRT being mentioned for Broadway, streetcar is already mentioned.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
35	bicycle traffic		3		<p>3.2.2.3 Bicycle “The low bicycle volume...” This statement is quite correct. There is a “poor environment” due to “the close proximity of high-speed traffic in the adjacent through lane and the high number of driveways and side streets.” Many bicyclists will avoid such situations. Fortunately we have to the north the 3rd Street/University bike route, which serves most of the east/west traffic as well as one on 9th Street. However, bicyclists who do most of their travel by bicycle do take Broadway into the downtown. This has become a problem since the streetcar was installed. There was much poor design, creating significant hazards on what were previously reasonably comfortable bike routes. The problem persists as one comes up from the underpass. Continuing along Toole or getting into a position to make a left is very hazardous. Thus, people detour around increasing their travel time. This is raised not to beat a dead horse, but to express concerns that in its continued pursuit of “improved progression and traffic flow” the city engineers will continue to disregard the inconvenience created for bicyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
36			3		<p>3.2.2.4 Pedestrians. The description of the pedestrian environment is generally accurate and presents the picture of how important improvements for pedestrians are. The issue becomes how grand those improvements should be and the tradeoff with protecting historic resources.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
37	signal timing	pedestrian accommodation	3		<p>Page 3.14 3.2.2.5 Intersections and Crossing Broadway We note that the timing of the five signalized intersections is coordinated during morning and evening peak periods to improve traffic flow along Broadway. The result is that pedestrians are kept at bay. Therefore, the car is given preference over pedestrians. This is supposed to be a multimodal transportation corridor. Let’s see some equity.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
38	bicycle crashes	bicycle safety	3		<p>3.2.2.5 Transportation safety along Broadway. There is no mention of bicycle crashes or deaths, or of pedestrian accidents. That would be a valuable addition to this section. Induced demand will not only create a less safe roadway for everyone, but render this project meaningless in the near future.</p>	<p>The Planning Team used the best available crash data for Broadway which does not break out bicycle and pedestrian crash data specifically. Still the planned improvements can be expected to provide higher safety (e.g.; reduced crash potential) compared to the existing condition.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
39	flood plain		3		Page 3.15 3.3.1.1 Flood Plain There is mentioned a large detention basin created by the US Army Corps of Engineers and PCFCD on Tucson Arroyo. Do you really mean detention basin or is it a retention basin?	This is a detention basin. Detention basins store in incoming flow, releasing it at a lower rate over time into the same watercourse. Retention basins retain the water indefinitely, disposing by recharge or evaporation, and apply to much smaller flows. No change to the DCR is needed in response to this comment.
40	potential environmental effects	environmental impacts	3		3.4 Environmental What is the possibility of coming across old septic tanks from the time when all houses had those instead of being connected to the sewer? Is this not the place to comment on air pollution that exists in this part of the city? We would also expect to see comments and a map of the arroyos crossing this corridor – Arroyo Chico and High School Wash or what is being referred to as Tucson Wash. These are underground, but still parts of the drainage system for the community. The issue of noise pollution is not mentioned, nor is the heat island effect. All these effects need to be acknowledged even if they are determined by project designers to be at acceptable levels.	Text has been added to explain that a Phase 1 environmental site assessment will be prepared for all property acquisitions. No other changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment, as it is not the purpose of this section of the report to describe all environmental conditions in the study area, but instead it is to focus on potential environmental impacts from the project itself.
41	transit	CTF Vision Statement	4		Page 4.1 4.1.1 CTF Vision Statement. This is a list of the CTF’s priorities, which the Design Team ignores. There is lip service paid to transit, but no transit study was done during this process, so there was no way to take the interest in transit and fold it into the design. The vision statement also says “support of the unique character of the historic and unique character of the places along Broadway.” But it has been a continual struggle to get the Design Team to honor this part of the vision. In fairness, they have talked at length about the historic assets, but somehow, they get impacted and slated for loss. Overall it was a good vision statement, but it was never “officially” adopted by the CTF. Additionally, there is no reference in this document as to how the vision statement guided design and decision-making.	See response to comment #4. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
42	historic preservation	CTF Goals	4		4.1.2.1 Goals “Sacred Places” – wouldn’t these include functioning longstanding businesses and historic streetscapes? We support the important goal to “protect adjacent neighborhoods” and we think more emphasis should be on 4.1.2.2 Buildings and Site Development which says they need to recognize the importance of historic buildings and sites and significant buildings and sites. How did these goals guide design and decision-making?	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
43	historic preservation	narrow ROW	4		4.1.2.4 Right-of-Way Impacts carries the important goal to “Minimize physical impacts to buildings and properties.”	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
44	case studies	best practices	4		4.1.2.6 Planning and Design Process. We think it is critical to “Learn from best practices (in Tucson and other places)” and would like to see more evidence this is happening in reports and presentations from the Design Team. What other city did it the way you are proposing? Where else in Tucson can we see an example of this action? Which cities did something different and what was it?	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
45	EPA sustainable performance		4		Page 4.3 We are disappointed that the Design Team so readily rejected the EPA sustainable performance standards as more appropriate to regional planning. We are glad they felt the EPA guidelines inspired their approach to developing performance measures, but ultimately there were too many performance measures, so no one even used them.	The EPA defines in the guide how the 12 measures discussed would be appropriately applied. The EPA itself only identified a few measures that were appropriate for the level of project planning being undertaken. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
46	functionality	alternative modes	4		Page 4.3 Functionality – Functionality is not supposed to be diminished for any mode. New bicycle lanes and sidewalks will improve those functionalities, more lanes will improve car functionality, and it is probably only transit that suffers. However, functionality includes both transportation and non-transportation aspects. RTA staff member, Jim DeGroot at the August 2012 CTF meeting told the CTF they needed to define functionality. It was never explicitly done. One can infer a definition from the performance measures. However, RTA continues to talk about functionality in vehicle and maybe multimodal terms, ignoring the non-transportation aspects.	See page 4.3 - RTA information is clear that their concerns regarding functionality are related to all transportation modes, not non-transportation aspects. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
47	community character		4		4.2.1.2 Sense of place or community character is difficult to define, and therefore it was fudged. The Design Team needed to be creative or to do the research to find how other groups defined it and operationalize the definition in order to use it to evaluate the alternatives.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
48	performance measures		4		Page 4.4-4.8 The consultants developed a large spreadsheet as a way to communicate the performance measures. However, it mostly confused people because they did not understand what the measures were, or how to use them to evaluate alignments	Charrette #3's Workbook includes a detailed discussion of how the alternatives examined at that Charrette were assessed in regards to 32 performance measures. This is referenced on page 4.20 of the DCR; a footnote will be added with a weblink to that report. Pages 4.20 to 4.30 of the DCR summarize the definition and assessment methods for a number of these performance measures. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
49	Economic Vitality		4		<p>Page 4.9 4.2.1.4 Economic vitality; As the text says there were different interpretations of what this meant and the CTF and Design Team never worked the differences through. So there was no attempt to establish benchmarks about how the project would be evaluated.</p> <p>Despite evidence to the contrary (i.e. Wulf Grote’s discussion of widening Camelback Road and the EPS Report) staff persisted in claiming that shallow lot development was viable (even as shallow as 60-foot lots and 40-foot buildings). Despite repeated promises, staff never produced examples of districts on arterials where such development occurs.</p>	<p>The issue of shallow lot depth was discussed and researched several times during the planning phase of the project. There was no direct research on this issue found through several searches of resources. Ultimately, the decision points regarding the Baseline Alignment were focused on other issues that have resulted in efforts to narrow the street right of way to the extent feasible. This does generally provide the benefit of maximizing the depth of remnant parcels. Efforts are being made as the design moves forward to maximize remnant lot depth to the extent feasible.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
50	historic preservation		4		<p>4.2.2.2 Impacts to historic buildings and methods of avoidance. As the text points out, there was strong agreement among stakeholders and CTF members that avoiding direct impacts to historic or significant buildings was a priority performance measure of the project. However, the performance standard did not develop a numerical standard. Therefore this performance criterion was weak, despite knowing that there was strong public and CTF agreement to protect these structures.</p> <p>In short, whenever the Design Team did not want to take a CTF priority seriously, they simply dismissed it as impossible to measure.</p>	<p>The performance measures were established to compare the alternatives, few of the performance measures had a "numerical standard" or threshold.</p> <p>No change to the DCR needed in response to this comment.</p>
51	transit	dedicated transit lanes	4		<p>4.2.2.4 Transit This text is like the economist, on the one hand and on the other..... It omits pointing out that dedicated transit lanes were voted on by the CTF and the Mayor and Council in summer and fall of 2014. Again, the report simply says “some did not believe that dedicated transit would make sense in the longer range future, and others felt that the near term improvements should include dedicated transit” from day 1. No effort was made to talk this through and come to a conclusion, or at least a compromise. Using a trained, experienced, professional mediator might have helped the CTF come to a consensus on this issue.</p>	<p>The design resulting from the DCR can accommodate future infrastructure for transit stops, such as dedicated lanes, stations/stops, etc. The condition of the pedestrian environment was discussed with the CTF; the resulting conditions in the design reflect their recommendation to Mayor and Council, which was adopted by M&C.</p> <p>Other sections of the DCR discuss signal provisions for potential future transit improvements and the provision of space within the right of way for future transit.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
52	Economic Vitality	performance criteria	4		<p>Page 4.10 4.2.2.5 Positive change in economic potential. Again we get the text pointing out that virtually all the stakeholders agreed that economic vitality was of primary importance. The question how the project improvements can affect economic vitality was a source of much discussion. The CTF did not discuss these performance criteria in a way that they could come to some consensus and thus make it a viable performance criterion.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
53	performance criteria		4		<p>While it is valuable to have documentation of Public Meeting #3 which was focused on performance criteria, what is missing in this documentation is the feeling that in the facilitator training, there was an effort to skew the process. Many groups did not have adequate time to finish their process because a consultant talked too long. Participants reported feeling manipulated. Despite this, as shown on page 4.11, in Table 4.2, the public’s constant theme of the highest priority was given to historic and significant buildings, second was to economic potential, and third to visual quality. It seems very disingenuous to have the Design Team write up, put forward, the performance criteria, and then complain in the text, that they don’t know what these mean. If they really didn’t know what they meant, then they should have written them with definitions and explanations in such a way that everyone was clear on what they were talking about.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
54	design alternatives	10-foot lanes	4		<p>Page 4.12. Table 4.3 contains a series of cross section illustrations. While they are very hard to read when reduced to this size, what is interesting is that on them a number of lanes are 10 feet wide despite the fact that Mike Johnson of HDR has adamantly refused to consider 10-foot lanes in the design. This was either bait and switch in getting people to like the total right-of-way widths gotten with this lane reduction, or a problem of miscommunication between consultants. Once again, the citizen is left scratching his/her head about what is going on.</p>	<p>The cross sections that are referred to were prepared prior to alignment studies and therefore the issues of curvature of lanes had not been assessed. It is the curvature of the lanes and the "off-tracking" of trucks and buses that led to TDOT's determination that 11 foot lanes are needed on Broadway,</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in responses to this comment.</p>
55	design alternatives		4		<p>Page 4.13 As in the meeting themselves, the text here is an effort to explain away the fact that three most popular cross widths were the narrowest. People picked the 4-lane, not because they necessarily wanted four lanes (there are five lanes now), but because they wanted the narrowest road possible to support their top priorities of historic and significant building preservation and economic vitality, meaning leave the current businesses alone!</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
56	Context Sensitive	design alternatives	4		<p>4.3.3. Summary of Exercise 3: discussion of tradeoffs. Once again the text touts a context sensitive approach to design as encouraging balancing of various transportation goals with non-transportation goals. Too bad the clear language found here was not used in the meetings.</p>	<p>The issues of balancing and tradeoffs amongst goals was discussed in the presentation at Public Meeting #3, and was covered in the facilitator training materials.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
57	design alternatives	performance criteria	4		<p>Page 4.14 4.4 Initial Concept Screening</p> <p>As described in the text, a number of alignment alternatives were presented to the CTF for discussion and after working through them, the CTF could see that to meet their top performance criteria, they needed to go with the narrowest roadway, or the 4-lane version. Not described here is the effort from the county to put pressure on the CTF by announcing that the county would pull their bond funds of \$25 million if a 4-lane roadway was put forward. The RTA liaison also expressed strong disapproval of the alternative and said that such a design was unacceptable.</p>	<p>The issue of county and RTA not being willing to fund a 4-lane alternative are discussed in Section 4.4.4 and 4.4.5, and in more detail in Section 5.1.2</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
58	design alternatives	10-foot lanes	4		<p>Page 4.15</p> <p>Figure 4.7 Note that a number of the lanes in this figure are 10 feet wide despite the protestations of HDR engineers that they won't stamp any road that has 10-foot lanes. What is going on?</p>	<p>See response to comment 54.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
59			4		<p>Page 4.17 4.4.2.1 Broadway Boulevard Corridor Revitalization White Paper (EPS)</p> <p>We are delighted to see the recitation of their key findings. We are dismayed that most of their findings have not been acted upon. They warn about the problems for redevelopment with narrow depth of remnant parcels and proximity to low-density residential areas. They encourage the City to create development incentives to expedite investment in the area.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
60	sidewalks	design alternatives	4		<p>4.4.2.2 Parking and Access Study (HDR) (February 2014)</p> <p>A study was presented that seemed to show that just putting in sidewalks would cost 17-21 million dollars and would take out as many businesses as the alternatives being studied. What was not elucidated were the underlying assumptions of 12-foot wide sidewalk areas and closed access to businesses. Gene Caywood, a retired highway designer from the private sector, found that ADA conforming sidewalks could be built for the entire length of the project for \$3-4 million dollars because the city already owns most of the right-of-way. HDR also looked at the loss of parking and its effect on functionality. Again, the assumptions are extreme and very generalized so that the level of refinement found in the other alternatives is not duplicated.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
61	traffic analysis		4		<p>Page 4.18 and 4.19 4.4.2.4 Additional Traffic Analysis</p> <p>Extensive traffic analysis using the VISSM traffic modeling tool showed that adding lanes delays autos due to longer pedestrian crossing times. The 6-lane proved "optimal" for both auto and bus operations" but not other stakeholder and CTF priorities.</p> <p>Not having bus pullouts improves transit speeds. We think this statement needs to be highlighted in the analysis of alternatives.</p>	<p>The performance analysis Section 4.4.3.1 Summary of evaluations, includes a discussion of the Transit Corridor Travel Time performance measure on page 4.23 it states "The bus pullouts result in additional delay for buses as they wait for a gap in traffic to merge back into the travel lane."</p> <p>A reference to this discussion has been added on page 4.18</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
62	performance criteria		4		Page 4.20 The consultant and staff developed the scoring of the performance criteria for each alternative; therefore we are dubious of it being reflective of the CTF and stakeholders opinions.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
63	performance criteria		4		Section 4.4.3.1 Summary of evaluations. Interestingly, we have gotten from some 50 performance measures to just 32 performance measures and we are never told how this happened. Who made this decision? When? And by what process of elimination?	A description of the transition from 53 to 32 performance measures has been added to Section 4.4.3.
64	performance criteria	pedestrian accommodation	4		Pedestrian Access and Mobility. We are not told why 16-foot sidewalks get the highest rating. In the desert climate, sidewalks are a heat sink and for people walking on them, they can feel the heat on their feet and legs. Narrower sidewalks are better. Again we are told that 8-foot wide sidewalks are “standard”. Whose standard? Not AASHTO – see Table 8.1 Pedestrian crossings have the highest ranking when the roadway is narrowest. We agree with that.	Text has been revised to clarify that text is stating the combined width of the sidewalk and buffer (new text (8 foot sidewalk and 8 foot buffer); as is stated in the Charrette #3 Workbook that the DCR text is a summary of. Text has been revised to explain that the 8 foot "standard" width is referring to the 8 foot width that was being used in the majority of the section alternatives at that point and what is also being used as the standard for Grant Road improvements. Additional text from the Charrette #3 Workbook has been added regarding the key factors that influence the assessment (which is derived from the guidance in the ITE Walkable Thoroughfares Manual), and an additional reference to the Charrette #3 Workbook has been added.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
65	performance criteria		4		Table 4.6 Summary Performance Evaluation of Street Alignment Alternatives. Why are over half of the pedestrian and bicycle evaluations blank? – also sense of place environment and public health, project cost? This seems strange. There is language about it, but a reluctance to put in marks. This omission needs to be corrected by including the evaluations in the tables.	<p>The table in the DCR is an in process table that was produced just prior to Charrette #3, the 4+2T and 6 Lane assessments were done just prior to the Charrette and were not included in the Workbook materials provided prior to the Charrette.</p> <p>Table 4.6 has been replaced with the post-Charrette version of the table that reflects design refinements that occurred during the charrette; text describing Table 4.6 has been updated.</p>
66	design alternatives	transit	4		<p>Page 4.23 Table 4.7 Transit Services Travel Time in PM Peak Hour How can the authors explain that any change in the road alignment makes the westbound bus take longer from Euclid to Martin, granted the change is very small?</p>	It is likely not directly related to alignment, and rather related to the number of times buses stop in the modeling, traffic volume in the west bound direction, and signal timing.
67	commute time	design alternatives	4		<p>Page 4.24 Graph 4.2 Vehicular and Transit Travel Time in PM Peak Hour as well as Table 4.9 Vehicular Travel Time in PM Peak Hour show only marginal improvement in travel times for \$74 million dollars. From Euclid to Country Club (east bound) on 6-lanes, the saving is one tenth of a minute for \$74 million. The 8 lane is actually longer by 1.1 minute. Going westbound by car, from Country Club to Euclid, a driver can save 1 minute on the 6-lane or 8-lane roadway (non-peak direction). How is this going to help the commuter from the east side get to work faster in the downtown?</p>	<p>PM eastbound travel time through the project area would increase 65.4% with the 4-Lane alternative while travel time would reduce by -1.4% for the 6-Lane alternative. Travel time for the 4-Lane is more than twice that of the 6-Lane, a relatively significant difference.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
68	congestion	pedestrian safety	4		<p>Page 4.25 People who live in the area say they rarely to never see congestion at the Euclid and Broadway intersection going east where the cars are transitioning from 6 lanes to 4 lanes. However they have seen cars blast through the HAWK in that area.</p>	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
69	historic preservation		4		<p>Page 4.26 Sense of Place 6a Historic Resource Although the number of historic buildings affected by various alignments varies, all of them except the 4-lane alignment were expected to destroy 16-17 buildings from RHHD, e.g. “Current District Contributors.” As the report states elsewhere, there are only 17 contributors facing Broadway. This is the pinch point that all the earlier comments about narrowing lanes, sidewalks, streetscapes etc. were aimed at. Here is the place to reiterate the goals of the CTF and public that are supposedly driving the decisions on roadway alignment. All that discussion should at least be referenced here, and preferably restated.</p>	<p>This section of the DCR is documenting the assessment of the alternatives, not which goals are more important.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
70	historic preservation		4		Page 4.27 Table 4.11 Historic Resource Potential Impacts. We think showing the level of risk of acquisition is a refinement that is very helpful.	This information was provided to the CTF and the public at the Charrette. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
71	design alternatives	green infrastructure	4		Page 4.28 Table 4.13 Water Harvesting and Green Streets Stormwater Management Assessment. We are disappointed that the 6-lane is not evaluated here. We think that needs to be added.	See response to comment 65. Table 4.13 has been updated to include the 4+2T and 6 Lane alternatives
72	Economic Vitality		4		Economic Vitality Any widening will diminish current economic vitality since it impacts parking and access to current businesses. There has also been no planning of any kind to stabilize the businesses. We think it would be appropriate to mention that while land use planning is not part of the contract for this roadway development, the city is fully aware of the potential for loss of sales tax from business disruptions and will be working on this issue. The issue of remnant parcels is also critical. The 4-lane as mentioned would have 90% of the remnant properties have a depth of at least 90 feet. If the remnant parcels are to be redeveloped, they need to be at least 80 deep. We are glad to see that the text states, “likely having fewer parcels over 90 feet deep, which causes the long-term economic potential to be lower.”	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
73	historic preservation		4		Page 4.29 Table 4.14 Change in Economic Potential Assessment shows the cost difference between the “minimize building impact” and “minimize property impacts” alternatives is about \$1 million – a negligible difference in a \$74 million dollar project. The prose accompanying the table does not make that clear.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
74	design alternatives		4		Page 4.30 4.4.4. Technical Advisory Committee Review of Alternative Design Concepts We are delighted to read an account, finally, of what this committee did. They felt the priority focus should be the 6-lane alternative and the 8-lane should be removed from consideration. They also recommended taking land from both north and south, which greatly upset the landowners on the south side of the street.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
75	design alternatives	economic vitality	4		<p>Page 4.31 We strongly contest the statement that the 4-lane alternative (98 feet ROW) limits future economic vitality because it doesn't provide enough investment and visible (? Did they mean visibility?); it is not a catalyst for a better economic future in the area. Once again, the consultant has fallen into the trap that new and bigger is better. New studies coming out every day suggest that smaller stores with a richer experience of mixed uses (retail, services, and food) are the antidotes to the growing on-line shopping decisions. The Green Lab study in Tucson (see presentation by Jonathan Mabry, Historic Preservation Officer at the Arizona Chapter of the American Planning Association Meeting in November 2015) found the most desirable places for small businesses are small scale, historic buildings. The statement in the report should be removed.</p> <p>We contest the statement that the sidewalk-only concept has no enhanced benefit for transit. We find that when people have a better walking experience, it is easier for them to get to the bus. We have witnessed people in wheelchairs moving in the bicycle lane because light poles block their use of the "sidewalk" area.</p> <p>We are glad the authors reported the negative reactions of some of the CTF members to the TAC recommendations to eliminate the 4-lane alternative.</p>	<p>This information on page 4.31 is the TAC's recommendations as presented to the CTF at the April 30,2014 meeting.</p> <p>The following will be added to the DCR after "visible" [sic-visibility]</p> <p>No other changes to the DCR are needed in response to these comments.</p>
76			5		<p>There is some confusion in the numbering of the Figures. The first figure on page 1.1 is Figure 5.3, then Figure 5.4. On page 5.2 we find Figure 5.3A, then Figure 5.3 B on page 5.3. Page 5.4 has Figure 5.2A and page 5.5 has Figure 5.2B. On Page 5.6 the order is reestablished and we Find Figures 5.5 and 5.6.</p>	<p>The numbering of the figures follows when they appear within the narrative text, not the order in which they appear in the layout of the document.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
77	design alternatives		5		<p>On Page 5.1 are two small roadway cross sections with lane widths and other parts of the roadway labeled with numerical widths that are extremely hard to read, even with increasing the size on the computer as high as possible, and using a magnifying glass. What we found most interesting was that some of the lanes were 10 feet wide. This was amazing given the categorical rejection of 10-foot lanes by the HDR consulting engineer project manager. Also, the width of the streetscape was often omitted, so that we did not know if they were using 10, 12, 14, or 16 feet of width. We appreciate the effort to show the steps taken and the thinking that went into the analysis, but it is very frustrating to not be able to read the numbers and put it together in a comparative fashion. This typifies the vagueness and unnecessary complexity of many materials furnished to the CF and public throughout the three year process.</p>	<p>The dimensions of the lanes are not the primary purpose of including these images, the purpose is to be illustrative of potential intersection treatments that were explored during the planning and conceptual design of the project.</p> <p>Two through lanes and two turn lanes are shown at 10' widths in these drawings. Turn lanes may be 10' wide per the design criteria included in the DCR. The through lanes would be 11' wide per the design criteria in the DCR which resulted from analysis that occurred during the design process after the illustrations in Figures 5.3 and 5.4 were prepared.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
78	design alternatives		5		<p>Page 5.6 5.1.2.5 “Do Nothing Alternative” is not Viable HDR Engineering did a study of the cost of only providing sidewalks which ended up costing an estimated \$17-\$24 million. The assumptions built into this alternative included a 12-foot sidewalk area. It turns out that the city is under a court agreement to improve its sidewalks to comply with ADA requirements. Therefore, just repaving Broadway would require the ADA-compliant sidewalks (only 3 feet wide, though 5 feet is nice) and ramps at street corners. This information would be appropriate to add to this section. It is true that RTA would not pay for this road improvement, and Pima County would not add their bond funds either, though all we have regarding this is a letter from the county manager. The Board of Supervisors has not voted on the proposal for a 4-lane roadway or the repaving plus normal sidewalks proposal. This section should use the term the “county manager” not Pima County made the statement. The City has agreed to spend \$3 million on the project anyway.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
79	design alternatives		5		<p>Page 5.7 Table 5.1 Performance Summary of Design Alternatives. While we understand this table has been presented before, the notion of rating historic preservation as “potentially good to moderate functionality” is difficult to understand. How does functionality relate to historic preservation? Evaluating the risk to historic preservation from each of the different proposals makes some sense and is a useful exercise in developing the design. The same concern is raised for using functionality as criterion for public health, water harvesting and green streets. We would suggest writing "improves opportunity," instead. For operation and maintenance, functionality is also a strange word or criterion choice.</p>	<p>The purpose of including this table is to document the public input process and planning and design process. This is the table that was presented to the public at the June 2014 Open House. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
80	design alternatives	historic preservation	5		<p>Page 5.8 Community Character and Economic Performance. The consultants got the concept of community character partially correct. It is certainly a function of maintaining as many existing buildings as possible, but also keeping them together. In other words, an historic building here and another one there is not the same as an historic streetscape of a block or two blocks of mid-century modern buildings. However, this section is also missing any discussion of loss of property tax and sales tax over the next five, ten, even 15 years while the property is vacant, if existing buildings are destroyed. We are glad to see Figures 5.8 and 5.9 Estimates of the number of buildings directly impacted and probable acquisitions, rather than the vague responses that came later in this report.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
81	design alternatives		5		<p>Page 5.9 Figures 5.10 and 5.11 provided important information about how much time would be saved by these improvements to Broadway. The difference between 8-lanes and 6-lanes was minimal and that was important information. We are glad the figures are in this report.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
82	Public input	assessment	5		5.2.1 Begins a Summary of the Survey Responses from the some 246 people who attended the fourth public hearing on June 12, 2014. Graphs 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 have no units on the x-axis making them difficult to understand. Overall though we see that among “topic area prioritization” and “performance measure prioritization,” historic building preservation was number 1.	These graphs are either showing % of total respondents or average score with standard deviation. Graphs 5.2, 5.3 and 5.5 have had subtitles changed to read (average and standard deviation of scoring by all respondents)
83	design alternatives	performance criteria	5		Page 5.12 Table 5.2 Performance Assessment Key Considerations It is impossible to understand how the rankings were developed. There is no explanation in the text. What is the significance of the grey versus blue, versus white lines around a topic/issue? How does transportation getting 64 responses giving it 50% rate a #1 ranking and bicycles with 72 responses getting 57% also rank a #1? Is there some sort of weighting going on? This table either needs to be scrapped or explained. In its current form it is meaningless.	There is a more detailed description of this table in the Planning Update and Community Input Report that was prepared for the June 2014 Public Meeting. The text in the DCR has been replaced with the more detailed description.
84	design alternatives		5		Graph 5.6 Alignment Preferences, (all responses) is also a problem. When using a pie chart, the assumption is that the total is 100%. Adding up the percents listed for people preferring one alternative to the other gives a total of 122%. The text states that some people marked more than one alignment. How was that handled? If all those ratings were given equal weight, then some people got two votes while others that followed the rules got only one. This graph needs to be redone to equal 100% or scrapped. If assume all preferences mentioned got a vote, there are 173 responses. Recalculating the percentages using the 173 one can make the statement that 53% selected alternatives wider than just 4-lanes or if remove the “no response,” then 65% prefer wider than 4-lanes. Let’s get the statistics right!	The graph labeling has been revised to remove the % that are reported (this is the % of all respondents that selected that alternative), also, Table 10 from the Planning Update and Community Input report has been added to clarify the diversity of responses received at the public meeting.
85	design alternatives	building impacts	5		Page 5.13 At the end of the section on summary of public comments, the report accurately reflects that “many stakeholders remained concerned about minimizing impacts to buildings and properties.” We think the word should be most. We are glad that the authors of this report recognized that.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
86		building impacts	5		5.3 July 2014 Business and Property Owners Meetings The statement is written that “Property and business owners generally showed more willingness to part with properties....” The reader wonders more willingness than? Who is the comparative group or expectation?	Edited as follows: "...showed more willingness to part with properties or move businesses, <u>than the majority of the general stakeholder comment received through public outreach,</u> if that would result in a better street for traffic and transit."
87	design alternatives	transit	5		Page 5.14 5.4.2 Options for Accommodating Transit Transit was a big discussion. How to accommodate it and where should it go and what kind of high capacity transit. A subcommittee met to discuss this topic in great detail. The diagrams of cross-widths do a good job of showing the different ways of accommodating center-running transit of different types. Note there are still 10-foot lanes in the drawings.	See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations; comment 54 and 77. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
88	design alternatives	transit	5		5.4.2.1 “Ultimate” Transit Concept was developed to show how wide the roadway would need to be to accommodate everything some people wanted. To some extent it was a bit absurd. The problem with this approach is that light rail (LRT) which can share infrastructure with modern streetcars, was installed in Phoenix in existing rights-of-way without all the fancy stuff and it is working very well. Another problem with this section is that it does not discuss the several presentations made by Gene Caywood on behalf of Southern Arizona Transit Association. He proposed a transit system on Broadway that used the current right-of-way and had a map showing how to do it. The SATA proposal is mentioned once early in this document, but should also be mentioned in this section here and analyzed.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
89	design alternatives	transit	5		5.4.2.5 Revised Transit concepts Cross-sections were drawn showing a bus on the outside lane of the 96-foot and 118-foot rights-of-way. This helped the CTF and public understand the complexity of including transit in the design alignment without a transit study that CTF members and the public repeatedly called for, and that would analyze what kind of transit and how it should be routed.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
90	design alternatives		5		5.4.3 118’ and 96’ Right of Way Comparison We commend the honesty in this document that admits that calling one of the options an 118-foot option is misleading because only 9% of the entire length is actually 118 feet wide, and the 96-foot option has only 6% of its length 96 feet wide. The rest of the length – 94% - is wider than 96 feet.	Basis of this comment is analysis of earlier alternatives and the design of the elements for pedestrians, cyclists, etc. that are a part of the 96 ft. design. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
91	Design assessments		5		Tradeoffs. Value judgments are made that discount the narrower version as lesser in landscape, sidewalks, cyclist and environmental performance, though admitting that it would have less impact on buildings. There is no justification or discussion of the basis for the judgments.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
92	design alternatives	transit	5		<p>5.4.4 Citizen Task Force Recommendations for Design Guidance</p> <p>This section details the conclusions that the CTF reached in their deliberations on a number of issues. This documentation will help in later discussions as roadway designs come forward. The project engineer should have these points on a paper over her desk to remind her of them frequently.</p> <p>“Give priority to local transit in the short-term which will have more frequent stops, with a goal of expanding or include express transit (limited stops) to support the commuters coming from the east in the longer-term. An environment that has great bike lanes and walkable and ADA compliant sidewalks contributes to supporting the economic vitality of the corridor that everybody is interested in preserving and enhancing in the future, as well as supporting transit use.”</p> <p>But the transit subcommittee actually said to replace buses with a streetcar that makes equally frequent stops as the buses west of Country Club. The point was to not need double land width for both buses and streetcar.</p> <p>“Broadway is a business boulevard and commerce should thrive here.”</p> <p>“The roadway width will flex throughout the project area as is reasonable.”</p> <p>“As design of the 6-lane including transit alignment progresses, make it narrow where possible to achieve all of the following to the extent possible-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Avoid impacting historic buildings or parking ·Ensure adequate space to support all modes safely ·Preserve enough “dirt” for future mass transit.” <p>However, the subcommittee did not mean that enough “dirt” referred to wide medians that could become streetcar or LRT rails in the middle.</p> <p>We commend the authors of this report for putting this material in.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
93	Refined Alignment	design alternatives	6		<p>6.1.1 Initial Refined Alignment</p> <p>The agenda for the December 10, 2015 RTA meeting shows no reference to Broadway Boulevard Improvement Project. We think the authors mean the December 11, 2014 RTA meeting where Broadway Project was discussed as item #7 on the agenda. There was an update and request for IGA Amendment #4 whereby more money was released to further the design and Right of Way Acquisition Planning for the project.</p> <p>This section also conveniently omits the fact that the dedicated transit lanes approved by both CTF and Mayor and Council were removed from the agreement at the Technical Management Committee meeting and therefore the RTA Board did not see that aspect of the design. RTA also added in more bus pullouts, thereby diminishing the functionality for transit.</p>	<p>Commenter is referring to an earlier draft of the DCR, the final public review draft included the revision to the Dec. 11th date.</p> <p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
94			6		<p>6.1.1.1 RTA Board Meeting is correct here.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
95	design alternatives	building impacts	6		6.1.1.2 Staff-recommended 6-lane including Transit The last paragraph in this section references the work done on Grant to avoid taking more buildings by on-site tweaking for the design. In fairness, the situation on Links should also be noted where on-site tweaking has resulted in additional buildings being destroyed that had been promised to be retained.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
96	transit	recommended alignment	6		6.1.1.3 CTF Review and Comment on the Staff-Recommended Alignment concept. This section fails to mention that the CTF was infuriated that their dedicated transit lanes had been stripped out without their acquiescence or knowledge. This was even written up in the Tucson Weekly by Tim Vanderpool on March 23, 2015. The fact that the CTF reached consensus on a motion stating that the “CTF recommends dedicated transit lanes when funding is available or Mayor and Council support it, consistent with the Task Force’s priority performance measures,” somehow is lost in the rest of the document. This ongoing concern and dedication to improving transit performance in this project has been lost and needs to be added in.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
97		building impacts	6		6.1.2 Start Small Design Concept “The Start Small approach affected 13 fewer buildings...” Fewer than what? The earlier staff designs were never very clear on how many structures were threatened or which ones those were.. We contest the statement that the Start Small was not a vibrant environment for business. Research repeatedly shows that slower traffic is beneficial to business because drivers see what they are driving past and is especially beneficial for bicyclists who stop and shop at stores they see. Maybe it is not beneficial to big developers who want to tear down historic buildings, assemble lots, and recreate a suburban environment in an urban midtown area. Remove this offense statement.	The text in Section 6.1.2 has been clarified in reagrds to 13 fewer potential property acquisitions. The bulleted comments, including "Not a verbiage environment for business" are quotes from the CTF discussions during this meeting. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
98	baseline alignment		6		6.3 Mayor and Council Adoption of baseline Alignment Concept, June 9, 2015 In the overall Design Guidance, priority 1, reducing construction and acquisition costs appears. In the earlier CTF meetings this document reports at great length, this is not noted nor part of their discussions. How did this element get added into the report and who did it?	This was a requirement of Mayor and Council. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
99	baseline alignment	lane widths	6		The lane width definitions were not discussed at length either. This is a staff insertion. Also, the CTF kept getting told that 10 feet wide lanes were not permitted by AASHTO guidelines (see Table 8.1), which is false, so their discussion of 11 feet was seen as pushing the envelope, rather than as a choice of a preferred width.	See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
100		building impacts	6		Page 6.7 4. Directly impacted buildings. “Because the street element widths are already minimal...” This is not true. All lanes could be 10 feet, not 11 feet as mentioned in the technical design element adopted on June 9.	See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
101		building impacts	6		<p>Page 6.7 “Acquisition does not always mean demolition.” We are waiting for some examples of this statement. So far we have watched the deterioration of the Tudor House, All State Insurance building, and the Panda Restaurant to the point it had to be torn down. The other two aforementioned buildings were in such bad repair they could not be rented out. Show us a building that the city owns along a right of way that they have held and then resold.</p>	<p>Added the following footnote text describing examples: For example, two buildings have been leased by the City of Tucson to new users after the buildings were acquired by the City: 2227 E. Broadway, current user is Soccer Planet, and 2229 E. Broadway, current user Spork Press.</p>
102	parking	building impacts	6		<p>p. 6.7 b. “Economic factors of acquisition negotiations, which incorporates individual comparisons of costs to cure vs. total acquisition for properties as well as block-by-block comparisons along both sides of the street” are factors, we are told, in determining what will be acquired and what will be demolished. We wonder who will be making the comparisons of cost vs. cure? Someone in the department of real estate? A planner? A TDOT person? Or a consultant? Why is the government making this determination instead of letting someone in the private real/estate development market make the decision? Someone who has a vision of what could be done? How the property could be used? We were told by building code officials that the building code that was built is what a building goes by in meeting code - known as legally nonconforming. This pressure to bring everything up to a modern code is misplaced. We have been told by the City of a few efforts to help businesses negotiate the upcoming parking issues when they lose parking and access as a result of the road widening. From the businesses perspective, the City is causing their problem, they should help resolve it. We think the City has to be much more proactive in helping small businesses stay in this location. While we acknowledge that state statutes preclude directly providing parking and access measures to benefit private property, we are interested in how access to certain buildings is decided. We are told there must be 300 feet between accesses, but notice on the south side, two driveways right next to each other being maintained. There seem to be incredible opportunities in this design feature to reward your friends and punish your enemies. We encourage the City to be flexible and transparent in their use of this important power of design.</p>	<p>Added the following footnote text to page 6.7: (the cost to cure and the cost of acquisition comparisons are completed by a third-party appraiser)</p>
103	alignment	building impacts	7		<p>7.1 Alignment and Street Width Refinements. “The street will be designed to minimize acquisition of right-of-way and impacts to property.” The policy was to avoid impacts to buildings, not property. We are watching carefully to see that this is what is done.</p>	<p>No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>
104		10-foot lanes	7		<p>7.1 “The new street will consist of six 11-foot mixed flow travel lanes” We protest this description and urge the Design Team to make it four 10-foot lanes and the two outside lanes be 11 feet which is supported by AASHTO Guidelines and a plethora of best practice publications. The 11-foot lanes are an expansion over the currently existing 10-foot lanes which have functioned just fine for decades. We urge that there be no left turn lane at Cherry. That will help with the width and protect the row of historic houses at the front of Rincon Heights Historic District.</p>	<p>See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations; comment 54 and 77. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.</p>

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
105		building impacts	7		7.1.1 Minimize Property Acquisition Costs through Design. We think this is very important, both for keeping costs down and for protecting historic buildings.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
106		building impacts	7		7.1.1 Minimize Property Acquisition Costs through Design. We support the statement “The streetside width determined here is for the purpose of establishing the street alignment. It can, where right-of-way allows, be widened to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities, provide for water harvesting, and so forth. It can also be narrowed to avoid directly impacting a particular building or potential full acquisition due to loss of access or parking.” The reason that is so important is because when the demolitions are done, and the street construction is done, the small remnant parcels will remain as dead space, weeds, and a source of dust. With the amount of midtown road construction (Broadway, Grant, 22 nd Street) the number of commercial properties to absorbed by the market is very large and will in all likelihood take 10 years or more. The vacant lots will be a drag on the surrounding businesses and a loss of tax income to the community. Avoid this problem by avoiding total acquisitions and demolitions.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
107	sidewalks	lane width	7		7.1.2.2 It is bothersome to see that the streetside width is proposed as 12 feet and that is considered the minimal width with 6-foot sidewalks. In the previous paragraph, the report talked about variations. We trust that custom designs are allowed, even though it is not specifically mentioned in this paragraph. Narrowing sidewalks in small stretches along the roadway to achieve other benefits that enhance the sense of place, makes walking in the area more enjoyable and likely. We point out that ADA requires only sidewalks be 3 feet with opportunities every 100 feet for a wider sidewalk where two wheelchairs could pass each other. AASHTO Guidelines allow for sidewalks at 4-6 feet as shown in Table 8.1	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
108		building impacts	7		7.1.2.6 Deviation from the Nominal Streetside Width; We are glad once more to see the statement “It should be noted that the streetside width can be narrower at specific locations to 10 feet or even 8 feet where doing so would avoid particular property impact. These areas will be limited to the extent feasible.” We want to point out the critical idea is to <i>avoid building impact</i> . We are counting on the design team to follow through with this understanding. We point out that the CTF discussed in their meetings that buildings should not be demolished to amass land for landscaping. This fact should be noted.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
109	street width		7		7.1.2.6 Deviation from the Nominal Streetside Width; The report states “that these changes would involve widening or narrowing the street while maintaining the alignment that is being established as this time and a general shift in the alignment.....unless very compelling reasons for doing so emerge.” This seems a strange statement in light of the previous pages talking about flexibility in width of streetscape, avoiding building and property impacts, and the Mayor and Council statement that the baseline alignment is a starting point, not a hard and fast line. This statement needs to be removed or reworked.	Widening to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities, landscaping/green infrastructure, etc. are specifically included in the Technical Design Parameters that were recommended by the CTF and approved by the Mayor and Council. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
110			7		7.2.1.1 Enhancements to North-South Signalized Intersection Approaches We support the decision not to add a second north-south left turn lanes at Euclid and Country Club. This contradicts the statement found on page 9.1	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
111			7		7.2.1.2 Channelized Right Turn Lanes We support the decision not to provide channelized right turn lanes at Broadway and Campbell. We agree it is confusing for pedestrians and dangerous for bicyclists.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
112			7		7.2.3 Transit-oriented Features. We support equipping traffic signals on Broadway with signal controllers and communication equipment required to provide transit signal priority capability.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
113	pedestrian		7		7.2.2.1 Traffic Operations Technology The “possibility of integrating the HAWKS into coordinated operation with the traffic signals to improve... traffic flow will be determined in final design,” will most likely result in longer pedestrian waits to cross the street. Therefore such an action may improve functionality for the car, it will definitely reduce functionality for the pedestrian and bicyclist. We want to know more about this possible decision. We point out that when people have to wait too long, either at a single or two-stage crossing, they simply jaywalk. Two-stage crossings are not pedestrian friendly, but instead make the pedestrian feel like a second-class user of the road.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
114	access management		7		7.3.1 City of Tucson Access Management Guidelines We note that the guidelines state access every 300 feet for NEW CONSTRUCTION. The text goes on to say that entrances and exits are limited to “two per 300 feet of frontage”, or two per standard block. The accident <i>potential</i> is for rear-end collisions. What is the actual data for accidents. Also information about severity of accidents at faster speeds needs to be included in this report.	The access management guidelines are guidelines that allow flexibility to avoid eliminating access to a parcel that would render it unusable. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
115	access management	driveways	7		7.3.2.1 Driveway Consolidation and Relocation. We recognize that this is a sensitive point for businesses. Which one of them in a strip along a block will get the access to their building? And, how will they cooperate with others to give access over their property? We think this is a topic that the City of Tucson Planning people need to facilitate and help the citizens. Without this help, the folks will go away. (Same comments for 7.3.2.5 below)	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
116	median openings		7		7.3.2.2. Median Openings. We request that there be no left turn bay or opening in the median at Cherry Street. Cherry only goes a few blocks in each direction from Broadway. The narrower road width can protect the historic houses in this block. These houses are important to the Rincon Heights Historic District.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
117	median openings	pedestrian traffic	7		7.3.2.2. Median Openings. In general, the medians are not pedestrian friendly since they impede people pushing strollers, individuals in wheelchairs, and those pulling grocery carts from crossing the street except at signalized intersections. Where there are residential streets that do not have a left turn option, medians should have a cut-through wide enough for a wheelchair and a painted cross walk.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
118	access manage		7		7.3.2.5 Recommended Access Management Practices We are reassured that access management restrictions do not apply to existing conditions unless “safe or functional.” We are hoping that the Design Team is taking this admonition seriously and we will be watching carefully.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
119	property impacts		7		7.4 Property Impact Mitigation. We applaud the City for designating an ombudsman for property and business owners and another one for neighborhoods and stakeholders. We think this kind of access to the City staff who play an important role in the roadway design is critical in building trust with the City. While it seems that the 30% construction plans are late to start negotiating shared parking etc. we recognize the City has been warning property owners and businesses for two years that this was coming.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
120	street width	10-foot lanes	8		Table 8.1 Street Element Widths would be an eye opener if we had not been researching street widths for the past year. Despite what engineers told the CTF regarding AASHTO (that it only allowed 12 foot lane widths), this table accurately notes what we learned from reading the appropriate chapters in AASHTO that lane (travel, right turn, left turn) widths can be from 10 to 12 foot wide. In fact in the little drawings in chapter 4, many of the lane widths are shown as 10 feet. This table also shows that AASHTO has bike lane widths at 5 feet, a number we have been arguing for. AASHTO also allows for 4-foot medians (mid block) and for left turns, as does Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), with the county and city arguing for much wider medians. This is the difference between an urban roadway and a suburban roadway.	The planning and design did not state that AASHTO only allows 12 foot lanes. See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
121	travel speed	10-foot lanes	8		p 8.1 We are glad to see listed in black and white that the posted speeds will be 30 mph between Euclid and Campbell which makes the 10 foot lanes perfectly safe as has been found in many traffic engineering research papers.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
122	street width		8		8.1.3.1 The statement that Mountain Avenue is too narrow for any vehicle except cars is surprising, since Ha:San’s school buses use it every day and on Jan 23, 2015 a large van truck was observed driving down it.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
123		10-foot lanes	8		8.1.3.2 Lane widths. We protest the 11 feet for the travel lane. We believe it should be 10 feet, which is now seen as the safest lane width because cars slow down. Since we seem to be designing for buses in the outside lane, that can be 11 feet to handle the bus width.	See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.



Appendix A - Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
124	building impacts	10-foot lanes	8		8.1 The traffic engineers have argued that they need extra lane width due to the curving road. This road curves so subtly that a driver will probably not notice the curves. There are lots of other urban roads with gentle curves to avoid important buildings and a driver would probably say the road is straight. We think this argument is way overblown.	See earlier responses regarding 10 ft. lanes in illustrations. No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
125			8		8.1.3.4 Horizontal and Vertical Alignments. Horizontal alignments are adjusted as needed to meet technical and cost constraints – cost constraints being acquisition costs. This is at variance with the CTF recommendations as stated on page 5.18, which were changed by the staff and reflected in the Mayor and Council adopted guidelines of June 9, 2015.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
126	bicycle traffic		8		Page 8.2 8.1.3.5 Bicycle criteria. Bicyclists all over the city handle lane widths of varying size. Where it is necessary to save buildings, especially historic buildings, then narrowing the bike lane to 5 feet is fine. Bike boxes and other pavement markings will help.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
127	building impacts	sidewalks	8		8.1.3.6 Pedestrian Criteria. We are delighted to see the statement that in some cases, a sidewalk may be strategically narrowed if an acquisition or demolition can be avoided.” Also we are glad to see that the separation distance from the street “can be less to avoid direct impacts to buildings.” We agree that the buffer can be wider where right-of-way allows. We look forward to seeing how the Design Team responds to this guideline.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
128	drainage		8		8.1 Drainage, pavement, street and intersection lighting design criteria were never really discussed in the CTF meetings. It is interesting to see it show up here as a “to be determined.” Drainage especially is an issue because there has been interest expressed in green streets (no mention of it here) – both by the CTF members, and as adopted policy by the City, PAG, and RTA. However it is discussed on page 8.5.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
129	streetscape	public art	8		8.1 Streetscape, landscape and public art are given lip service with no criteria or design elements mentioned.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
130	building impacts		8		Page 8.3-.4. We applaud the language that states “Planning and design phases of the project, various alignment studies [that]explored ways to minimize impacts to adjacent properties and buildings” and hope that inspiration is carried through in the actual design. There are caveats that the interest in shaded walkways, narrow streetscape to save buildings will result in negotiation with the TDOT landscape architect to meet his/her requirements and the CTF vision.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.

Appendix A – Table A2 Broadway Coalition Review Comments and Response Notes

Id #	Subject	Other Subject	Chapter	Throughout?	Comment	Proposed Action and response
131	streetscape	public art	8		8.5. Streetscape to Enhance Corridor Character. We are glad that there is a recognition that “banners or public art can highlight the Sunshine Mile business district identity or historic neighborhoods.”	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
132			9		This chapter is primarily an apology for all the work not done. There is no opinion of cost estimate (though information is presented on page 4.29, Table 4.16.), no opinions about property acquisition costs, (though information is presented on page 4.3, Table 4.17). It is acknowledged that there are other projects in the area that will need to be coordinated with this project. At least the chapter mentions the contacts for ombudsman and monthly newsletter (none recently). There is mention of development of a cycle track along Broadway out of downtown. This is the first this has been mentioned and it is not clear how it will be integrated with the bicycle lanes developed on this roadway design.	No changes to the DCR are needed in response to this comment.
133			9		9.3.1 Construction Project Limits There is mention of double left turn lanes on Broadway Boulevard in both directions for Euclid. This seems unnecessary, especially since Euclid going north narrows down as it goes past Tucson High School and along the edge of the University. Sections 7.2.1.1 and 7.3.1.1 says there will be no second left hand turn at Euclid or at Country Club. What will it be?	Text has been revised to clarify that double left turns on Broadway Boulevard at Euclid are part of the project, and are not part of the project at Country Club Road.
134			9		This document is the combined effort of (in alphabetical order) Mark Finc, J.D. Garcia, Margot Garcia, Mark Homan, Camille Kershner, Robin Steinberg, and Laura Tabili.	Not a comment
135			9		The Broadway Coalition is a collaboration of businesses, neighborhoods, and Tucson residents who care about their community of Tucson. The Mission of the Broadway Coalition is to educate and organize citizens in Tucson to guide planners and implementers of the Pima County Regional Transportation Plan Project 17 (The Broadway Corridor) to improve Broadway Boulevard between Euclid and Country Club within the existing right-of-way and thereby make the roadways 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. Unnecessarily widening the street would worsen air quality and increase noise in adjoining neighborhoods. It would tend to isolate the residents of adjoining neighborhoods from each other and discourage the common use of their streets, open spaces, recreational, commercial and educational facilities. Walking and bicycling across the widened street would be more hazardous especially for the young, elderly, and people with special needs. The Coalition urges citizens who value Tucson’s urban core to help us create a street that maintains a sense of place and is as narrow as possible.	Not a comment