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1. Introduction
The Regionally Significant Corridors (RSC) Study is a technical assessment of existing, planned, and proposed major transportation corridors in the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) region. The RSC Study will recommend a network of regionally significant corridors. The regional objectives of the RSC network are to:

- Improve access to employment and commercial centers to promote economic competitiveness throughout the region
- Improve access to residential areas to improve commuter travel time
- Improve mobility for cross-town travel
- Increase connections between roadways and transit and rail centers to improve mobility of people and goods
- Focus on reducing congestion and travel time on major roadways and interstates
- Continue to enhance and expand transit operations and facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Continue to enhance and expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas (riparian, drainage, cultural, hazardous materials, etc.)
- Reduce air pollution
- Decrease fuel costs and other vehicle operating costs

A focus of the RSC Study will be to functionally fill a gap between regionally significant limited access freeways and arterials. The RSC network may include State highways, State routes, major county roads, or major municipal arterials. Development of the RSC network will take into consideration planned and programmed projects such as I-11 and projects included in long-range plans and 5-year program. They may be retrofits and upgrades to existing corridors, corridor extensions, or entirely new routes.

The RSC network will serve as input to the PAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process, whereby individual routes in the RSC network could become part of the RTP and could be programmed as projects to advance relative to available funding and regional priorities. RSC-related projects would be strategically implemented according to PAG policies and procedures, with strict oversight, public involvement, and a commitment to fiscal stewardship.

A key goal of the RSC Study is to receive broad support by PAG member jurisdictions. The RSC network will be developed in the RSC Study in close consultation with a Technical Advisory Committee consisting of PAG member jurisdictions and key regional stakeholders.

1.1 Working Paper 2 Overview
Working Paper No. 2 documents input received from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and regional transportation stakeholders on the evaluation framework for developing a network of regionally significant corridors in the PAG region. The Working Paper is organized by stakeholder and TAC outreach, and jurisdictional workshops. This Working Paper concludes with the RSC evaluation framework that was developed based on the input received from these groups. This framework will serve as a foundation for developing and evaluating the RSC network.
1.2 Study Area
The RSC study area is located in eastern Pima County, including the PAG member-jurisdictions of Tucson, South Tucson, Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita, Pima County, the Tohono O’odham Nation, and the Pascua Yaqui Tribe. Since this RSC Study addresses connectivity to regional and statewide destinations, the study area includes parts of Pinal, Santa Cruz, and Cochise counties. Figure 1 on the following page illustrates the study area.
Figure 1 - RSC Study Area
2. Stakeholder Outreach

A web-based survey was developed and distributed online to various employers and organizations throughout the PAG region. This survey was non-scientific and aimed at gathering the perspectives of the employers and organizations on transportation in the region. The study team collaborated with Tucson Regional Economic Opportunities (TREO) to develop a list of stakeholders to which the survey was distributed. TREO sent out 65 emails to their member organizations with a link to the online survey. An additional 42 emails were sent out to school districts, chambers of commerce, major employers, and community organizations that are not TREO organizations.

The survey consisted of 18 questions. Questions 1 through 10 related to information about the survey respondent such as number of employees, location, type of business, and transport modes used to receive goods and services. This information was requested to obtain an understanding of how the employers and organizations throughout the region use the transportation system and what could be improved upon.

Other questions explored the use and perceptions of alternative mode transportation services such as the Modern Streetcar and a passenger rail system between Tucson and Phoenix. A copy of the full survey and responses are provided in Appendix A.

This Working Paper focuses on responses to two of the questions regarding priorities for the RSC network. (Questions 11 and 13). Responses to these questions are discussed in detail in the following sections.
2.1 Survey Results on Priorities for the RSC Network as they relate to Existing Conditions (Survey Question 11)
Survey Question 11 asked respondents to rank potential priorities for the RSC network as they relate to existing daily operations of the business or organization, or to the needs of staff. The question and response choices are shown in Figure 2, below.

11. The following are potential priorities for the RSC network. Please rank them as they relate to the EXISTING daily operations of your business or organization, or to the needs of your staff.

- Improve access to employment and commercial centers to promote economic competitiveness
- Improve access to residential areas to improve commuter travel time
- Improve mobility for cross-town travel
- Increase connections with transit, air, and rail centers to improve mobility of people and goods
- Reduce congestion and travel time on major roadways and interstates
- Enhance and expand transit operations and facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Enhance and expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas (riparian, drainage, cultural, hazardous materials, etc.)
- Reduce air pollution
- Decrease fuel costs and other vehicle operating costs

Figure 2 – Survey Question 11

The results of the online survey showed that most respondents thought that “improve mobility for cross-town travel” was the most important for existing conditions. A very close second was “improve access to employment and commercial centers.” “Increase connections with transit, air, and rail” was ranked third. It was noted by the majority of respondents that the other items on the list (e.g. reduce air pollution, minimize impacts to the environment, and reduce fuel and other vehicle costs) were not less important, but rather that they would be achieved as a result of addressing these top priorities. The survey responses are shown graphically in Figure 3.
Figure 3 - Priority Rankings for the RSC Network as They Relate to Existing Conditions
2.2 Survey Results on Priorities for the RSC Network as They Relate to Future Conditions (Survey Question 13)

Survey question 13 asked respondents to rank potential priorities for the RSC network as they relate to future operations of their business or organization. The question and response choices are shown in Figure 4, below.

13. The PAG region will continue to grow and the RSC network needs to accommodate that growth. As it relates to the future operations of your business or organization, please rank the following RSC priorities based on what you think will be needed to accommodate future conditions, when population doubles to about 2 million, in the PAG region (assuming management of water resources permit this growth).

- Improve access to employment and commercial centers to promote economic competitiveness
- Improve access to residential areas to improve commuter travel time
- Improve mobility for cross-town travel
- Increase connections with transit, air, and rail centers to improve mobility of people and goods
- Reduce congestion and travel time on major roadways and interstates
- Enhance and expand transit operations and facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Enhance and expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas (riparian, drainage, cultural, hazardous materials, etc.)
- Reduce air pollution
- Decrease fuel costs and other vehicle operating costs

Figure 4 – Survey Question 13
Interestingly, the priorities changed slightly and “improve access to employment and commercial centers” become the top priority and “improve mobility for cross-town travel” became the second priority. Increased connections between different modes remained a third priority between the existing and future conditions. These findings are summarized graphically in Figure 5.

![Figure 5 - Priority Rankings for the RSC Network as They Relate to Future Conditions](image)

In Jurisdiction Workshops (discussed in Chapter 3), agency representatives were also asked to rank the same list of priorities. Section 3.1.1 discusses agency workshop perspectives on priorities and how these were combined with the survey respondent’s priorities.
3 Jurisdiction Workshops

Jurisdiction workshops were conducted to obtain jurisdictional perspectives on a “framework” for defining a network of regionally significant corridors within the PAG region, and to provide input on RSC priorities. Workshops were offered to TAC members representing nine agencies, and eight workshops were conducted. Table 1 summarizes the jurisdictions that participated in the workshops and when they were held.

Table 1- Jurisdiction Workshop Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Workshop Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADOT Tucson District</td>
<td>October 19, 2013 (discussion only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro Valley</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima County</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahuarita</td>
<td>October 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>October 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>October 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation</td>
<td>October 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>November 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshops, with the exception of the ADOT, were organized into three exercises, Think Regionally, Think Locally, and a discussion on state highways and routes. The following are overarching comments heard at the majority of the workshops. Many of the same comments were heard in each of the workshops. The purpose of the “discussion only” session with ADOT was to be able to respond to ADOT-related questions that arose during the other jurisdiction workshops.

3.1 Think Regionally Exercise Summary

Ranking Regional Priorities

In the first part of this exercise, participants reviewed and ranked ten regional priorities discussed in Chapter 2. Their top three most important priorities were:

- Improve access to employment and commercial centers to promote economic competitiveness
- Enhance and expand transit operations and facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices
- Improve access to residential areas to improve commuter travel time

Agencies and the stakeholders had different top priorities, but both thought improving access to employment and commercial areas was important. This was the top priority for agencies and a close second priority for stakeholders. However, stakeholders felt it was more important to have cross-town mobility. This priority was ranked fourth by the agencies.

The agency representatives also felt that addressing their top three priorities would achieve the other priorities such as reduced air pollution, minimize impacts to the environment, and reduce fuel and other vehicle costs. A summary of the priority rankings for both jurisdiction representatives, and stakeholder representatives who responded to the online survey is summarized in Table 2.
Table 2 - Summary of Priority Rankings for Stakeholders and Jurisdiction Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rank (1 being most important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to employment and commercial centers to promote economic competitiveness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase connections with transit, air, and rail centers to improve mobility of people and goods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve mobility for cross-town travel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to residential areas to improve commuter travel time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce congestion and travel time on major roadways and interstates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance and expand transit operations and facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance and expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the region to provide greater mobility choices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease fuel costs and other vehicle operating costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce air pollution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas (riparian, drainage, cultural, hazardous materials, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdiction representatives were asked to think beyond the boundaries of their jurisdictions and how they connect to the region as a whole. The following are key destinations that were identified during the workshops.

- Key regional destinations were located in the greater Tucson metro area. The Tohono O’odham Nation identified destinations inside of the San Xavier District and Sells.
- Key regional employment destinations included downtown Tucson, Tucson International Airport (TIA) area, University of Arizona, and other employment centers.
- Key destinations outside of the region included points along I-10, I-19, SR-77, SR-86, and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). Named destinations included Phoenix, Nogales, Mesa Gateway.
- Future destinations will be similar but more localized within the various jurisdictions and influenced by future growth/development areas. It was mentioned that growth is occurring radially along the radial transportation corridor including I-10 and I-19. Some workshops discussed the radial transportation network as an option to the arterial grid network.

Jurisdiction representatives were asked to consider linkages to the above destinations. The following are the key linkages that were identified.

- All jurisdictions identified interstates, state highways, and major streets as key existing linkages.
- Existing linkages also included transportation hubs such as TIA, transit centers, modern streetcar, future passenger rail stations, and a tramway station to Mount Lemmon.
- Jurisdiction representatives noted a need for better connections to TIA from I-10 and I-19.
- There was general jurisdictional support for the Tucson-to-Phoenix passenger rail and the Mount Lemmon tram for tourism.
- I-10 will not provide sufficient capacity for the future. Major I-10 reconstruction, a western bypass, and I-11 were discussed as possible solutions.
- SR-77 will not provide sufficient capacity for the future. High capacity transit and new corridors were discussed as possible solutions.
- General support for regional parkways (Tangerine Road, Sahuarita Road, SR-210 extension were discussed).
- Parkways were discussed, but there is no consistent definition for parkways. MAG and MCDOT developed a design concept for parkways with indirect left-turn turn intersections.
3.2 Think Locally Exercise
Following the Think Regionally exercise, representatives were asked to focus on jurisdictions perspectives, while keeping the previous exercise discussion in mind. The following are the general key points drawn from the Think Locally discussions.

- Plans for Aerospace Defense Corridor were supported by jurisdictions and need to be integrated with other Southlands transportation linkages (Alvernon Way, Wilmot Road, Kolb Road, Nogales Highway, Sahuarita Road, Pima Mine Road, and El Toro Road were discussed).
- Parkways were identified for urbanized areas to supplement the grid system (SR-210, Alvernon Way to River Road, Kolb Road to Ina Road-Sunrise Road-Skyline Drive, Kino Parkway to TIA, and Pantano Parkway were discussed).
- Non-parkways should be considered in urbanized areas. Improving the grid system per the Tucson Major Streets and Routes Plan, increased mode choices, and increased transit and alternate mode choices were discussed.
- Road connections between I-19 to I-10 south of TIA also need to be made.
- Jurisdictions supported regional growth areas defined by PAG is the 2040 Long-Range Transportation, in addition to infill.

3.3 State Highways and Routes Exercise
In the final exercise, workshop participants were asked to discuss state highways and routes and how they benefit regional mobility. These state highways and routes are shown on Figure 6. The key issue for state highways is balancing the function of state highways with access to and from developments. It was suggested that state highway standards be different in urbanized areas. An example of an area where this balance may be needed is SR-77, which provides access to commercial areas in Tucson and Oro Valley.

Other key issues during the workshops regarding state highways and routes included the following:

- Many designated state routes might not make sense (i.e. Campbell Avenue north of Aviation Parkway and Grant Road were discussed).
- Some designated state routes should be retained, such as SR-989 west of I-10.
- Suggestions for new state routes included Park Link Drive from SR-79 to I-10 and Lambert Lane from I-10 to SR-77.
- The majority of workshop participants noted that they wanted to retain the current state routes until it can be determined what state routes will benefit the community as state highways. Additionally, it was recognized that the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) is improving state routes without regard to state highway design standards.
- There is a need for another north-south connection other than SR-77.
- There are difficulties balancing access and mobility with ADOT standards.
Figure 6 - State Highway and State Route Systems
4 Regionally Significant Corridor Evaluation Framework
Input from the jurisdiction workshops, TAC input, and the online survey findings were used to develop a framework for evaluating the Regionally Significant Corridors. The flow chart shown in Figure 7 was developed to illustrate the process, which has five sequential steps:

**Step 1 - Data and Perspectives**
The data that has been gathered to-date from Working Paper No. 1, the workshops and surveys, TAC input, and models will be combined and analyzed. Both the PAG and ADOT models will be used to show how PAG interacts with areas outside the region, for instance, what are Pinal’s plans along SR-77 and how that will impact SR-77 in the PAG region.

**Step 2 - RSC Screening**
Based on input from Step 1, a candidate RSC network(s) will be developed and screened to determine how they address the priorities, TAC perspectives, and the screening criteria developed in this Working Paper.

**Step 3 - Functional RSC Networks**
Functional RSC networks will be developed to address various emphasis areas, such as freight, congestion relief, service to employment centers, and others.

**Step 4 - Performance Assessments**
Performance assessments will be conducted to analyze performance using the PAG 2040 travel demand model. The model analysis will assume a population of 2 million persons, which is consistent with the Imagine Greater Tucson estimates.

**Step 5 - Recommendations**
Input from Steps 1 through 4 will be used to develop recommendations on an RSC system and opportunities, constraints, costs, responsibilities, and priorities.
Figure 7 – RSC Process Framework
APPENDIX A – Stakeholder Survey Summary
**Overview**

- Online survey created using Survey Monkey. Emails sent out with the link to the survey.
- TREO sent out 65 emails to their investors. KHA sent out an additional 42 emails to stakeholders not included on TREO’s list (school districts, chambers of commerce, community organizations, etc.).
- 7 surveys were completed.

**Summary of Responses**

**Question 1 - Please state the name of your business or organization.**

**Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushman &amp; Wakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Oro Valley Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Metro Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Greater Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2 - Please state the number of full-time employees**

**Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Organization</th>
<th>Full-time Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets Alliance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushman &amp; Wakefield</td>
<td>PICOR Commercial Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Oro Valley Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Metro Chamber</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Greater Tucson</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3 - Please state the number of part-time employees**

**Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Organization</th>
<th>Part-time Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets Alliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushman &amp; Wakefield</td>
<td>PICOR Commercial Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Oro Valley Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Metro Chamber</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Greater Tucson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4 - If you’re an organization serving others, state the approximate number of members.

Responses:
None

Questions 5 - Is your business or organization headquartered in the PAG region, i.e. eastern Pima County?

Responses:
Yes 71.4% (5 responses)
No 28.6% (2 responses)

Question 6 – What type of business or organization would you categorize yourself as (check all that apply)

Responses:
Question 7- Please check the location(s) of your business or organization within the PAG region.

Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Tucson</td>
<td>57.1% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Foothills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Rd./Vail</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marana</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro Valley</td>
<td>28.6% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahuarita/Green Valley</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Tucson/Ajo Rd.</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson East</td>
<td>28.6% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Midtown</td>
<td>14.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson Mountain Foothills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Responses</td>
<td>19.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 8 – How often do you receive visitors, customers, students, etc. to your business or organization?

Responses:
Question 9 - How often do you receive deliveries to your business or organization?

Responses:
Question 10 - How do your goods travel to and from the PAG region (check all that apply).

Responses:
Question 11 – The following are potential priorities for the RSC network. Please rank them as they relate to the EXISTING daily operations of your business or organization, or to the needs of your staff.

Responses:

![Priority Bar Chart]

Question 12- Please state your reason for selecting your top 3 priorities for existing conditions.

Responses:

None
Question 13 – The PAG region will continue to grow and the RSC network needs to accommodate that growth. As it relates to the future operation of your business or organization, please rank the following RSC priorities based on what you think will be needed to accommodate future conditions, when population doubles to about 2 million, in the PAG region (assuming management of water resources permit this growth).

Responses:

![Graph showing RSC priorities]

Question 14 - Please state your reasoning for selecting your top three priorities for future conditions.

Responses:

None
Question 15 - How would a passenger rail system between Tucson and Phoenix impact your business or organization?

Responses:
Positive Impact 57.1% (4 responses)
No Impact 42.9% (3 responses)

Question 16 – How would overall improved mobility and access on regional corridors impact your business or organization?

Responses:
None

Question 17- Once operational, will the Modern Streetcar impact your business or organization? (Ignore the current inconvenience of Streetcar construction).

Responses:
Yes 57.1% (4 responses)
No 14.3% (1 response)
Not Sure 28.6% (2 responses)

Question 18 - Do you support and expansion of the Modern Streetcar to other regional destinations, such as the airport, other transit centers, employment centers, medical centers, and commercial centers?

Responses:
Yes 42.9% (3 responses)
Not Sure 57.1% (4 responses)