

## **NOTE TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL RE: BROADWAY 30% DESIGN**

Mayor and Council,

I know you all are wrestling with the decision you must make next week with regard to the 30% design for Broadway. I realize this is a bit long, but since I was asked by the CTF to be involved in the design process, I felt it important to give you my perspective in some detail, so hope you will bear with me.

I expect and hope you have all been considering if and how the 30% design could be improved? My belief is that it can only be improved significantly by returning to the alignment the CTF recommended and Mayor and Council adopted on June 9. For unfortunately the 30% design bears little resemblance to that adopted alignment. It thus is little wonder that those who have compared the two are very upset. Let me explain by starting with a little background on my involvement.

On March 19, 2015, the CTF rebelled, claiming the staff had never presented them with the narrowest possible alignment. A week later on March 26, 2015, they asked staff to develop a narrow alternative based on a drawing I had produced, and asked that I be involved in the design process. During April last year I had 8 meetings with staff in which I provided meaningful input to aid in the development of that alternative (which some on the CTF called "threading the needle" and staff called "Starting Small"). It was approved by the CTF on May 7 and adopted by M/C on June 9.

Everyone, including me, acknowledged that the adopted alignment was not in final form and needed further work to arrive at a 30% design, and I certainly believe the CTF intended I be involved in that process. However, since Mayor and Council action, I have been basically shut out of the design modification process. Within 45 days, on July 22, Mike Johnson informed me of the staff decision to alter (one might say deviate from) the plan adopted by Mayor and Council. I protested that the alterations they were planning changed the whole intent of what the CTF and Mayor and Council adopted. At a subsequent meeting on July 30 with Mike, Shellie Ginn and Beth Abramovitz, they were firm in rejecting any ideas I put forth for keeping the alignment closer to the Starting Small drawing.

So how/why did the 30% design get so far from the adopted alignment? Along with the alignment, the Mayor and Council adopted three Technical Design Parameters:

- a. Minimize the number of buildings to be acquired and demolished,
- b. Maintain access and as much parking as possible for existing development, and
- c. Reduce construction and acquisition costs.

While the CTF had made a and b their top priority (in that order), there was nothing in the adopted Technical Design Parameters indicating priority, so one would have thought (I certainly did) that staff would make an effort to honor all three. And I expect the CTF thought their priorities (a and b) would have been taken care of first, followed by an effort to reduce construction and acquisition costs as much as possible while still preserving any buildings that could be physically missed with a narrow alignment. But alas, the staff didn't see it that way and unilaterally chose Technical Design Parameter c (the reduction of construction and acquisition costs) as being paramount. This resulted in them shifting the roadway centerline significantly to reduce the number of total takes (actually eliminate them on one side of the street) at the expense of design parameter a, minimizing

the number of buildings taken. Thus the 30% design is basically a reflection of the budget over-riding the CTF “thread the needle” approach.

Staff will argue that they had to take the approach they did to keep the project cost within budget. But they have not presented any cost estimates (that I have seen) to prove that contention. In fact they increased the cost of the project by extending it easterly through the Country Club intersection and some 700’ beyond, and westerly through the Euclid intersection, and they quadrupled the number of bus pullouts. None of these were in the Starting Small alignment adopted by Mayor and Council. How do we know but what the cost of these additions would not cover the additional cost of taking property from both sides of the street instead of one side of the street as dictated by the adopted “thread the needle” Starting Small alignment?

The right thing for staff to have done, in my opinion, if they felt strongly that the adopted alignment was not financially feasible, would have been to present two alignments with cost estimates for each – a faithful refinement of the adopted alignment, and the substantially different one now put forth as the 30% alignment – and let the Mayor and Council decide if saving additional buildings was worth the extra cost.

Now to the specifics of how the 30% design differs from the adopted alignment:

1. The centerline was shifted 5 feet up to 22 feet depending on location. No one said the adopted alignment centerline was sacrosanct, and everyone expected it to change some. My expectation was that it would shift a foot or two in many places, perhaps as much as 5’ in a few places, and that would have been within the intent and spirit of what the CTF recommended and Mayor and Council adopted. But moving it over 5’ is, in my mind, not a tweaking of the alignment, but establishing a new alignment. In fact, what the staff basically did is return to the alignment the CTF rebelled against on March 19 of last year.
2. The adopted plan had a sidewalk area (which the staff is now calling the “street side”) of about 6 to 8 feet. The 30% design increases that to 12’. An increase of that magnitude is hardly within the spirit of the adopted alignment that was supposed to be as narrow as possible.
3. In particular, the 30% design now directly impacts two blocks of buildings on the north side between Vine and Warren, that were the focus of concern leading to the CTF rebellion a year ago March and the development of a “thread the needle” plan that got CTF and Mayor and Council approval. To simply disregard that whole rebellion and subsequent agreement by insisting the north side buildings have to go because it would be too expensive to impact properties on the other side of the street, is not within the spirit or intent of the adopted plan.
4. East of Campbell there are other examples, which I won’t take time to enumerate, which while perhaps not as controversial, are also glaring deviations from the spirit and intent of the narrow Starting Small approved alignment.
5. The extension of the project east of Country Club, which was not in the adopted alignment, is unnecessary and disregards the letter and intent of the adopted alignment.
6. The extension of the project west of Euclid, which was not in the adopted alignment adds cost and disregards the intent of the adopted alignment.

7. The 30% design has a dramatic increase in the number of bus pullouts in comparison with the adopted alignment. The latter had only 4 pullouts, while the 30% design has 11 full pullouts (where the bus stops to the right of the bike lane) and 5 mini-pullouts (where the bike lane is widened about 3 feet so when the bus stops it is totally out of the auto travel lane, but occupies the bike lane while stopped). This massive increase in the number of pullouts is not in the spirit of the adopted plan

Given all these significant departures (and there are probably others I have failed to recall) from what the Mayor and Council adopted, if I were on the council I would be extremely upset, and would demand staff produce a plan that is clearly within the spirit of what was adopted.

So back to the question I started with, how can the 30% design be improved? My thoughts are to take the additional five months Councilman Kozachik has suggested and ask the staff to modify the 30% design to bring it more in line with the adopted plan. As part of that request, insist staff utilize the following design elements, with the Mayor and Council accepting liability for their use if the project engineer refuses to include some of them for that reason.

1. Maintain the existing speed limits – 35 mph Country Club to Campbell, 30 mph Campbell to Euclid, and 25 mph west of Euclid into downtown.
2. Use 10' lanes west of Campbell where the speed limit is 30 mph.
3. Use varying medians widths/types depending on situation and need to minimize adjacent impacts.
  - a. No median, just painted double yellow line (provides no refuge for pedestrians crossing – so is not intended for general use but as an option for short distances).
  - b. Jersey barrier median 2' wide (prevents pedestrians from crossing – so is not intended for general use but as an option for short distances).
  - c. Curbed median as narrow as 6' wide (allows refuge for pedestrians crossing).
  - d. Painted median 10' wide allowing left turns (allows refuge for pedestrians crossing).
  - e. Curbed median 16' wide allowing left turns only at median breaks (allows refuge for pedestrians crossing).
4. As a means of narrowing roadway width, limit left turns to every quarter mile, or more if quarter mile cross-street does not continue more than ½ mile away from Broadway. The effect of this is to eliminate the left turns at Cherry that were included in the CTF recommendation, and limit them to Country Club, Treat, Tucson Blvd., Plumer, Campbell/Kino, Highland, Park and Euclid.
5. Narrow sidewalks to 4' (ADA minimum) where necessary to avoid direct impacts on buildings and parking, while widening and meandering them between buildings to move them away from traffic wherever possible.
6. Make a command decision that future HCT (high capacity transit) will be placed in the center lanes with stops in medians. Provide street light poles of sufficient strength for use for streetcar or light rail OCS (overhead conduit system), and place them in medians where ever possible (including in narrow medians using Jersey barriers as protection) to reduce the need for span wires extending across the

entire street. Placing poles in the medians has the additional benefit of reducing the street side width needed when they are placed behind sidewalks, thus potentially reducing total right-of-way width.

Thanks for listening. Should you have questions, I would be pleased to discuss any of this with you in more detail

Gene Caywood

[caywoodgm@juno.com](mailto:caywoodgm@juno.com)

360-0268