

Comments on 2012 Traffic Engineering Study posted on Broadway Project website

Thank you, Mayor & Council for entertaining my comments this evening

I would like to speak to you this evening specifically about the Traffic Engineering Study recently posted on the Broadway Project website.

This study contains traffic counts and projections and discusses the anticipated results of tearing down the north side of the street to provide more traffic lanes.

Ironically, the logo for the project depicts a bus bearing down on a bicyclist with nary a car in sight.

This in itself is deceptive, as the report admits the expenditure of \$74 million and destruction of \$43.7 million worth of property

will only marginally improve bus times and improve conditions for bicyclists not at all:

Curiously, no pedestrians are depicted: one could surmise the pedestrian has expired while standing on the center median trying to cross the street.

Because the main deficiency in this Traffic Study is its continuing advocacy for adding traffic lanes for such minimal benefit, and in some cases active harm to users of the street.

#### TRAFFIC CONGESTION

1. p.1: reports traffic volumes ranging between 36,00 and 41,000 vehicles per day. This in itself is deceptive, since volumes of 41,000 were found only east of Country Club, that is, outside the study area.
2. The report admits, also on p.1, that due to the bottleneck at Country Club created by Broadway Village on the south and the Chase Bank on the north, the Country Club intersection is expected to fail within 7-10 years from the completion of this \$74 million project.

Quote: At Country Club Road, dual left turn lanes and right-turn lanes are required to serve projected future turning demand, however due to constrained right-of-way, it is likely that only single left-turn lanes can be provided. As such, it is expected that this intersection will become congested during the evening peak traffic period based on 7-10 years of projected traffic growth.

What about other users of the street?

## PEDESTRIANS

3. The report admits the “improved” roadway will be worse for pedestrians, by forcing them to wait through 2 changes of lights to get across the street: existing pedestrian crossing at Cherry and Plumer will be redesigned as “2-stage crossings” pp. 2, 23, 29.

As a pedestrian, I am continually amazed that Tucson traffic engineers think it is just awful for a motorist comfortably seated in a climate-controlled vehicle

to have to wait through 2 changes of lights to get across an intersection

–but as for a pedestrian--an elderly person, a child, a disabled person in a wheelchair-- it’s just fine for them to get halfway across the street in one change of lights,

and then have to to hang around on a sunbaked median while traffic whizzes all around them belching exhaust, waiting for another change of lights to get across the same intersection.

I call that a double standard at best!

## BUS RIDERS

What about bus riders? Page 2 of the report projects a 12%-15% improvement in bus delays and A 6% improvement in bus travel times over this 2-mile stretch. After the expenditure of \$74 million!

## BICYCLISTS

Then there are bicyclists: p. of the report finally gets around to bicyclists on p.27, and this is what it says:

The results, provided in Exhibit 19, indicate that a 6-lane roadway with 5-ft or 6-ft bike lanes will provide good level of service for transit users and pedestrians, however bicyclists will experience poor level of service (LOS E). The primary factors affecting bicycle level of service are high traffic volumes and high density of driveways and side streets. Wider multi-use lanes may improve bicycle level of service simply based on a more lateral clearance between a cyclist and adjacent traffic, however the effects of conflicting transit vehicles and right-turn traffic using the same lane could very well make it a worse condition for cyclists.

That’s what the expenditure of \$74 million is expected to do for bicyclists.

## CONGESTION?

Let’s get back to cars, shall we? If I’m reading the tabel on p.6 correctly, 7% of Broadway traffic occurs during morning rush hour, 7:30-8:30 am, and 8% during evening rush hour, 4:30-5:30

p.m. This just confirms the observation of anyone familiar with the street that “rush hour” on Broadway is not all that congested.

Further, delay times in this 4-5 minute drive amount to a whopping 27 seconds during eastbound morning rush hour to 80 seconds in westbound evening rush hour—perhaps due to pedestrians crossing. [section 3.2.4 on HAWK signals & traffic flow missing from report]

But, the framers of the report might object, that’s because you are not considering the 30%-50% rise in traffic in the next 30 years (p.14). And I repeat: if traffic has not risen on this stretch of Broadway since 1984, 28 years ago, why should it rise in the next 28 years?

Never mind that the cross-streets such as Euclid, Highland and Campbell will not feed enough traffic to produce these volumes (p.14) or that accidents, another justification for widening, are actually higher on the “improved” cross-streets.(p.10)