



## 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Corridor

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1

February 17, 2009

The first meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) took place at 10:00 am in the fourth floor conference room of the Public Works Building at 201 N. Stone Avenue. **TAC members in attendance:** Janice Cuaron, TDOT Project Manager, Don Freeman, PAG/RTA, Jonathon Mabry, City of Tucson Historic Preservation Officer, Walker Smith, City of South Tucson, Diahn Swartz, City of Tucson Traffic Engineering, Tom Thivener, TDOT Bike and Pedestrian Coordinator, Peg Weber, City of Tucson Parks and Recreation, Alex Arevalo, ADOT, Ron Lee, ADOT and Pat Terry, ADOT. **Team and staff in attendance:** Jay Van Echo, AECOM Project Manager, Priscilla Fernandez, Community Outreach, Justin Smith, AECOM, and Freda Johnson, Rillito Consulting Group.

---

#### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Project Overview

Jay Van Echo/AECOM welcomed everyone and introductions were made. He summarized the agenda topics as distributed to the TAC members by e-mail on January 30, 2009. He said that this kick-off meeting was an orientation to review what has happened to date and to clarify the role of the TAC in the process. He reviewed the contents of a meeting packet which included a list of TAC representatives, a list of Citizen Oversight Committee (COC) members, the agenda, the RTA pamphlet entitled 'Our Mobility' July 2008, a list of project opportunities and constraints as identified by the project team December 12, 2008, copies of the first two pages of the project website [www.22ndstreet.info](http://www.22ndstreet.info), a memo from the City Clerk's Office documenting the role and membership of the COC, and a June 2008 report entitled 22nd Street Corridor, I-10 to Kino Parkway, Phase 2 Public Involvement Plan and Summary of Phase 1 Public Outreach.

Jay provided the TAC with a brief history of the project noting that the project will consist of a 6-lane roadway with a raised median and a grade separation at the UPRR tracks. The project is part of and funded by the voter approved RTA. Jay noted that Phase I of the project has been completed and he provided the TAC with a brief history of the tasks completed to date. The TAC was informed of the formation and status of the Citizen's Oversight Committee (COC). Members of the TAC were encouraged to be involved in future COC and public outreach meetings.

Walker Smith asked if there would be sketches of alternative geometrics for the "over vs. under" options at the Nogales rail crossing. He said he would like to know more about height and distance options. Jay responded that AECOM was currently conducting an

“Under vs. Over” analysis and the team would be providing 3-D modeling in a ‘sketch-up’ format for the TAC to discuss. Jay added that no commitment had been made to the public regarding the separation and that a design charrette was to be completed as part of Phase II of the project.

## **2. Existing Conditions, Traffic and Drainage**

The issue of drainage challenges was raised regarding the ‘underpass’ option for the grade separation at the Nogales tracks near Santa Rita Park. Jay said that there is a drainage engineer on the team and preliminary analysis indicated that gravity drainage would be possible if 22<sup>nd</sup> St did go under the tracks.

Diahn Swartz asked if there was a possibility that the tracks could be modified to minimize impacts at the crossing. Jay said that there is a 1% prevailing grade of the tracks in the area and that the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and any modifications would be challenging and would require significant coordination with the UPRR and project delays. Jay also noted that if 22<sup>nd</sup> St were to go under the tracks, the bridge would become property of the railroad and they would likely require two tracks plus a service road. Currently, there is only one track; Jay added that there is an option for a ‘through girder’ structure that can also be examined. Peg Weber asked if the UPRR would require more land. Jay said no; the UPRR has right-of-way (ROW) of about 100 feet.

Don Freeman asked if some intersections might be closed in the project area. He observed that there are many alleys and cross streets. Jay said that there have been many comments along these lines from the Phase 1 outreach and the recent project open house. Peg Weber said that if 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue were to be closed in the vicinity of Santa Rita Park, the vacated street could be added to the Park. Diahn Swartz asked about the train activity on the Nogales spur. Walker said that there are currently about two to four trains per day, but if the Ford plant in Hermosillo, Mexico reopens, there could be up to 40 trains per day.

A question arose about a possible change at the intersection at 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue/22<sup>nd</sup> St. Jay responded by saying that the Santa Cruz Church is to be avoided as well as Borton Magnet School. These are givens as reported to the public. Jay acknowledged that some neighbors are very concerned about the homes on the south side of 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. Another question arose about issues on the north side of the street and the effect on the residences of a structure that would go over the Nogales spur. Jay said that going over the tracks would mean a transition from Tyndall Avenue to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which would be more of an issue than going under, transitioning from Euclid Avenue to 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. An ADOT representative said that there are many trucks going to and from the Commercial Drivers License (CDL) facility in the area as well as a number of businesses in the area.

## **3. Expectations, Issues and Concerns**

Walker Smith asked what the recommended posted speeds would be. Jay said that the design speed is 45 mph, but the posted speed will likely be 40 mph. Currently, the street is posted at 35 mph west of Kino Pkwy. Jay added that the TAC and the City of Tucson

should provide guidance on the desired design and posted speed through the corridor. There will be more discussions here regarding the City's direction for design speeds on urban arterial roadways.

Jay took a moment to describe the project at Kino Parkway and 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. Regarding this related project and a proposed future connection between 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and Aviation Parkway, Jay said that a preliminary traffic study had been done a couple of years ago that showed fewer people going to the freeway (I-10) from Aviation Parkway by way of 22<sup>nd</sup> Street than one would anticipate. Likewise, it was acknowledged that one premise of the Downtown Links project suggests that some traffic may be encouraged to use 22<sup>nd</sup> Street rather than going through downtown. The TAC advised that traffic for this project must be evaluated regionally, not just project by project.

An ADOT representative made the observation that there is less impact to the community by shifting the road to the north side of the street.

Diahn asked about how the horizontal and vertical cross-sections compare to what has been done on the Grant Road Corridor. Jay said that there are differences between the two projects and that at the next COC meeting guiding principles would be discussed.

Peg Weber reminded the group that Santa Rosa Park is just north of the Drachman School playground. Jonathon Mabry asked about the status of the inventory of historic properties. Janice Cuaron said that BobVint has completed this, and Jonathon will review Bob's findings. Jay noted that Technical Memorandum #1 would be submitted to the City for their review within the week. Diahn asked about how the Kino Parkway/22<sup>nd</sup> Street project will transition to the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Corridor to the west, specifically about the width of bike lanes. Jay said that 6-foot bike lanes are specified to the east but there may be a transition to 5-foot lanes to the west. Janice commented that people in the neighborhoods would be looking for consistency between the projects.

Walker observed that there is an abundance of vacant land to the east and asked about how the City of Tucson Planning staff will be involved. Jay said a land-use study is underway and recommendations will be made to the City about potential future uses. Walker felt there could be a mix of business and residential uses. Peg said that planners should look at use of concrete and how children might use those spaces for skateboarding as an example. Jay said that COC input on these types of amenities is important.

Don Freeman asked if there would be new streetlights. The response was yes. Don continued by saying that there should be a pedestrian-scale mindset in this project. And that attention should be paid to median widths at crossings for pedestrians as well as the aesthetics of lighting. He said that ambience and pedestrian-perspective in this project is important for everyone.

In response to a question from Diahn, Jay said that intersections would have dual left-turn lanes and some right-hand pockets all based on final traffic analysis. He added that there

is a traffic component in the existing conditions report and additionally there will be a traffic report completed for the project. Tom Thivener inquired about pedestrian opportunities and referred to the ‘woonerf’ concept he discussed with people on the bus trip. Jay clarified that the concept co-mingles traffic at lower speeds and is a concept from the Netherlands. The ideas and concepts would be introduced to the COC as they relate to the COC developed opportunities and constraints.

#### **4. Project Schedule and Objectives**

Jay reported that initially this project was on a very aggressive schedule, but now it is being modified to allow the COC to fully explore the opportunities and constraints of different cross-sections. In response to a question from Walker, Jay said that the ‘Michigan left-turns’ being used in the Grant Road Project would not be possible on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Corridor. An initial investigation of Michigan left-turn suitability for 22<sup>nd</sup> Street shows that the benefits are offset by the right-of-way requirements required to implement them, especially at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection where the Santa Cruz Church is located. Additionally the remainder of 22<sup>nd</sup> Street to the east, that is already completed to its full build 6-lane facility, uses standard intersection left turn geometrics.

Don Freeman asked if there is a provision for the Modern Streetcar along 22<sup>nd</sup> Street or other more significant transit. Response was made that Broadway Boulevard is considered the ‘transit corridor.’ However, there had been some planning completed for a possible future 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue street car alignment. Walker said that 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is of importance to South Tucson. Jay said that bus pullouts were planned at certain intersections and he would also check with Sun Tran regarding their 25-year plan for location of all future improvements. Jay also mentioned that Sun Tran staff were members of the project TAC and hopefully will attend future meetings.

Janice asked those present to raise any issues or concerns. ADOT representatives spoke about property issues and the challenges of maintaining access to their properties with a grade separation at the UPRR tracks. Walker asked that there be mitigation of any cutting-off to South Tucson and indicated that South Tucson was very concerned about being cut-off from adjacent areas. Peg said that a new Santa Rita Park master plan should be done with consideration of public spaces, little nodes, spaces for bikes and skateboard activities, and access from the south as well as the north. Diahn expressed concern about the design speed, preferring 35 mph over the stated 45 mph. Don asked that the team think beyond this immediate project to future needs. He also noted that the team should strategically consider what right-of-way it plans to acquire, for example avoid two partial acquisitions when you can take a full acquisition on one side. Jonathon said he would review the historic properties report. Pat Terry of ADOT said that there should be discussions about ROW, and impacts on the CDL facility.

#### **5. Future Meeting Dates**

Discussion turned to the TAC meeting schedule. It was agreed that the TAC would meet approximately every other month. Janice encouraged TAC members who own property

in the corridor to attend the April COC meeting when topics of real estate and right-of-way would be addressed. By general agreement, future meetings for the TAC would take place on the second Tuesday of the month.

**6. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.