

# Meeting Notes Broadway Road Action Team April 27, 2009

<u>Members Present</u>: Ted Lehman, Ruben Valenzuela, Ted Raper, Paul Morris, Brian Farling, Steve Tseffos, Ernie Nickels, Tom and Kimberly Martin, James Richardson, William Harris, Ernest Kurschat

**Members Absent**: Dara Foias, Shari Samuelson-Wesley, Patty Tolson Gonzalez (alternate)

<u>City Staff Present</u>: Sue Taaffe, Robert Yabes, Eric Iwersen, Shelly Seyler, Jyme Sue McLaren, Glenn

Kephart

**Guests Present:** Tom Hester, Srinivas Groundla, Terry Gruver, Coral Balcazar

#### Agenda Item 1 - Introductions

The Action Team, City staff and consultants introduced themselves.

#### Agenda Item 2 — Project Status and Schedule

City staff reviewed the project status, noting the public meeting scheduled for May 18<sup>th</sup>. Staff also reviewed the project goals and issues identified in the study area, including:

- Safety
- Bike and pedestrian improvements
- Noise from cars and trucks
- Cut-through traffic
- Retain community character

## Agenda Item 3 — Public Comment Recap

Study staff provided a summary of public comment received to date from phone and e-mail, the study website, the March 18<sup>th</sup> public meeting, the Broadway Road Walk on March 14<sup>th</sup> and study area photos and comments posted on the study's Flickr site. Main issues expressed included:

- Reducing traffic noise
- Protect community character
- Address safety concerns
- Provide bike lanes
- Enhance/facilitate pedestrian usage and safety
- Retain Broadway Lane
- Improve intersections
- Reduce traffic flow
- Build a barrier wall
- Expand the project beyond the Mill & Rural boundaries

Questions and answers regarding the public comment recap were as follows:

Q: Were comments that were made early in the study incorporated into the recap?

A: Yes, comments summarized were "to date" and duplicates deleted.

#### Agenda Item 4 – Design Concepts

Staff began by reviewing the traffic analysis to date and providing a summary of both the four-lane and five-lane cross-section concepts. Comments and questions/answers included the following:

- Q: Mr. Harris: Has anyone modeled ASU peak traffic (concern regarding estimated traffic flow)? A: Yes, the MAG model used for the traffic analysis considers ASU traffic.
- To reduce traffic on Broadway, you need to limit access to and from the freeway from Broadway.
- Discussion: The group discussed the pros and cons of four-lane and five-lane configurations with comments including:
  - o Disagreement over the traffic analysis indicating that there is only 12% cut-through traffic
  - o Committee expressed concern over five lanes in a residential neighborhood; members compared the five lanes to a freeway.
  - Committee members disagree with a five-lane configuration and compared the 5-lane design to freeway running down the middle of the City.
- Q. Is the City willing to rezone the neighborhood if the intention is to run a freeway through the City?

A. No.

- Steve: A bolder vision beyond just the boundaries of this study area is needed.
- Put the traffic bottleneck outside the neighborhood.
- Some committee members expressed the opinion that bottlenecks can deter drivers from using Broadway and encourage use of other routes.
- Committee members agreed that the number of lanes should be kept to a minimum to deter traffic.
- It makes sense to narrow the road to four lanes through this area; the road should expand to more lanes as it nears the freeway.
- Mr. Harris: Concern that if traffic is slowed, pollution and cut-through traffic will be worse. (Staff
  offered to bring a MAG staff person to the next BRAT meeting to discuss how air quality is
  measured).
- Steve: Make all Tempe arterials 4-lane in order to encourage multi-modal use (Staff discussed the City's responsibility to address congestion throughout the city).
- Committee members also suggested introducing commercial opportunities to the area (e.g., coffee shop, small market).
- Steve: Need to look at what is the long-term vision for Broadway Road, from a policy (city council) level.
- Steve: Looking for project to address Broadways future, not looking for a temporary solution.

### <u>Agenda Item 5 – BRAT Broadway Road Design Concepts – Ernie Nickels/Steve Tseffos</u>

Ernie and Steve provided photos of a barrier wall along 64<sup>th</sup> Street between Oak and Thomas in Scottsdale as an example of what they'd like to see along Broadway Road.

Project staff continued to describe additional design concepts and various cross-sections, including a preliminary recommendation for a 5-lane configuration and expansion of the study area to between Loop 101 and I-10. Designs included several different options and combinations for bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway configuration. Comments and discussion included the following:

- Ernie: prefers no sidewalks and 2-way traffic on Broadway Lane.
- Raised planters were not supported.
- Several from the group do not favor a barrier wall at the property line because the amount of openings for driveways would decrease the effectiveness of the wall to decrease roadway noise.
- Several did not favor Sierra Crossing as a park-like landscaped area; believe that it would encourage transients to linger there.
- Ted: believes that the park is a good idea and creates a nice bus stop.
- Ernie: does not believe that commercial development on the south side of Broadway Road is a good idea.
- Ruben: instead of a bike lane stripe, suggested a curb separation of bikes and vehicular traffic.
- Ted: a curb separation is not a good idea for cyclists from a transportation perspective.
- Committee members would like bring character to the neighborhood through low maintenance landscaping.

#### Agenda Item 6 – Future Agenda Items

- Discussion of refined design concepts.
- Reach consensus.
- Committee members would like policy members to attend the next meeting to engage in dialogue about process.

#### Agenda Item 9 – Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on May 12 from 6 to 8 p.m. in the Don Cassano Community Room located at 200 E. Fifth Street, Tempe.