22nd Street Corridor

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2 Minutes

June 9, 2009

COT 6th Floor Conference Room

The second 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, Don Freeman, Jonathon Mabry, Walker Smith, Peg Weber, Bea Paulus, Mick Jensen, Gary Gonzalez, Ron Lee, and Pat Terry.
Team and staff in attendance: Jay Van Echo, Priscilla Fernandez, Justin Smith, and Freda Johnson.

1. Sign-in

2. Welcome and introductions

Jay Van Echo of AECOM welcomed everyone to the meeting and each person in attendance introduced themselves. Jay reviewed the materials provided to everyone during the meeting including, meeting minutes from previous Citizen Oversight Committee (COC) meetings, Opportunities and Limitations maps and boards, and typical sections.

3. Project Update

i. General Update

Jay provided the group with a general update on the project. He noted that the design team was approximately 6 months through a 12-month planning process with the COC. Currently the project team has identified a target date of October 2009 for a Mayor and Council approved alignment and cross section.

Jay provided an overview of the makeup in membership and overall dynamics of the project's COC. He walked the COC through recent activities and meeting agenda topics with the COC. The most recent meeting included the identification of opportunities and limitations. Walker Smith added that he was at the last meeting and noted that the team's use of transparency cross sections was a success with the COC and the public. Jay added that the project team felt like progress was being made with the COC.

ii. Technical Memorandums

Justin Smith of AECOM introduced the technical memorandums (TM) that were going to be prepared as part of the planning process for the corridor. He added that each technical memorandum stands alone, but at the end of the project, AECOM intended to roll the documents together into one master planning document. The technical memorandums are as follows (detailed description provided in TAC member's meeting packets):

1. *Data Collections/Existing Conditions* – This TM summarizes existing conditions along the corridor including land use, zoning, circulation, and pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Includes a historic property assessment. The document was completed in April 2009. Jonathon Mabry of the City of Tucson noted that AECOM needed to provide a general reference map identifying historic properties in relation to the new alignment. He also noted that the project team needed to make a presentation to the Historic Commission.

   AECOM indicated that they would prepare the map and begin coordination to arrange a presentation to the commission.

2. *Traffic Analysis* – An initial submittal would be made analyzing existing conditions, level of service (LOS), and making recommendations. A final report to evaluate the selected corridor alternative would be prepared. Initial submittal will occur this summer.

3. *Drainage Analysis* – This TM documents existing drainage infrastructure and available information, while evaluating existing flood plain and drainage basins. Justin noted that AECOM understands that drainage is going to be a challenge on this project and is working to prepare a scope for the development of storm water management alternatives along the corridor. This scope will also include coordination and planning for the 22nd Street/Kino Parkway overpass. The initial submittal of TM#3 occurred in March 2009.

4. *Land Use Analysis* – This TM will evaluate existing and future land uses in order to help refine the corridor alternatives, with the goal of preventing the creation of uneconomic parcels and identify possible strategies to promote economic development along the corridor.

5. *Opportunities and Constraints* – This TM is a summary of previous meetings and the public outreach process. The TM consists of corridor maps that identify key features along the corridor. These maps were then used to develop the team's preliminary corridor alternatives. This TM is complete.

6. *Corridor Alternative Alignments & Evaluation* – Upon completion of the planning process with the TAC, COC and public, AECOM will document the

process, alternatives developed, evaluation process and refinements in an Alternative Alignments and Evaluation report.

7. *Santa Rita Park Master Plan* – The project team recognizes that this project will result in impacts to Santa Rita Park. AECOM/EDAW will be working with Park's and Recreation and the COC to develop a preliminary master plan for the Park to help mitigate impacts from the new roadway. A TAC member asked if the project includes funding to rebuild the Santa Rita Park. Jay noted that the TM would consist of a master plan that will mitigate impacts. To the extent that amenities are being impacted, the project will be required to mitigate impacts to those improvements.

8. *Final Corridor Preferred Alignment Drawings (15% Drawings*) – This TM will be prepared following approval by Mayor and Council and the completion of the planning process.

9. *Public Art Summary* – This TM will provide a summary of the public art planning process and shall recommend themes for public art along the 22nd Street Corridor as well as locations for public art to be implemented. A TAC member asked if the COC would be taken through the same process as the Kino/22nd Street Overpass CAC. Jay noted that following Mayor and Council approval, the same process would occur on this project.

10. *Technical Memorandum #10 – Type, Size, and Location UPRR Nogales Track/22nd Street Structures Report* - This TM consists of a report summarizing bridge alternatives for the UPRR Nogales Track crossing. The report will evaluate two concept level bridges showing type, size, and location for the proposed crossing.

iii. Grade Separation Analysis – Environmental Update

Justin noted that at the February 2009 TAC meeting, the group talked in-depth about the under/overpass at the UPRR Nogales tracks. He added that, at this time, the project team has not engaged the COC in an in-depth discussion about the grade separation; however, the COC is extremely aware of the challenges that this grade separation creates. Justin added that July's COC meeting would dedicate time to discuss the grade separation.

Justin added that AECOM has done some preliminary cost estimates for the grade separation. AECOM is currently showing a savings with an overpass, however does not have all the information necessary to complete the estimate. The project team has engaged City of Tucson's Environmental group to perform a Phase I investigation of the parcels potential impacted by the grade separation. The intent of the Phase I investigation is to flush out any fatal flaws with a proposed underpass.

iv. Citizen's Oversight Committee Update

Item Discussed above.

v. Opportunities and Limitations Summary

Justin explained that the opportunities and limitations maps were included in the TAC member's packet. He noted that the maps identified land use and a photo documentation log along the corridor. He added that these maps were used in the preparation of the alignments. Don Freeman of the RTA added that the project team should consider preparing a map that identifies the ease to which a parcel can be impacted. He noted that some parcels, such as vacant properties, would be easy to impact. However, parcels with possibly historic homes would mean a more difficult process. He suggested it may help the COC member visualize impacts easier. Janice added that she liked the idea. Jonathan followed up on the idea that the map should also indicate historic structures and potentially historic structures.

vi. Overview of Typical Sections

Jay provided the COC with an overview of the typical sections that the project team had brought forth to the COC in the May 2009 meeting. He noted that copies were included in the TAC member's packets. The typical sections included:

1. Minimum Typical Section – 20-ft. median, 11-ft. travel lanes, 7-ft. bike lane, and 8-ft. pedestrian area. Jay added that this is not the section we are recommending for the corridor. It creates access issues for parcels with existing driveways out to 22nd Street because drivers can not back out onto 22nd Street. Jay said that alley improvements would be needed. Bea Paulus suggested that some parcels could have circular driveways or hammerheads that would allow them to continue their access.

2. City of Tucson Major Streets & Routes (MS&R) Section – 20-ft. median, 12-ft. travel lanes, 5-ft. bike lane, and 9-ft. pedestrian area. When frontage roads are implemented, a 20-ft. lane to meet fire code requirements would be used.

   Jay added that this is the section that an engineer would utilize without any guidance from the City or the public. This section is current policy with the City; however, it is not being used on other RTA projects.

3. Grant Road Section - Jay added that this is the section that Mayor and Council directed the project team to look at for the corridor. This section includes a 20-ft. median, 11-ft. travel lanes, 7-ft. bike lanes,

and 20-ft. pedestrian area. When frontage roads are added, a 17-ft. lane with a 16-ft. pedestrian area is utilized. Jay added that this section really focuses on the pedestrian experience with the goal of improving the neighborhood along with the roadway.

Bea asked about the use of trees in the median on the frontage road section. Jay added that trees would be included, but sight distance triangles would be used to ensure adequate sight distance. Bea also asked a question about how the bus stops would interface with the frontage roads. Justin noted that, currently, no formal bus pullouts are in the areas of the frontage roads. Pullouts are located at the far side of major intersections, and that frontage roads would pick up after the bus pullout.

Walker asked about the use of indirect lefts on Grant Road. Jay said that Michigan lefts are not being used on this corridor. They create a situation where the corridor has signals every ¼ mile to accommodate the left turns.

4. Corridor Design Concepts to be Presented to the COC

i. Overview of 22nd Street Corridor Design Concepts

Jay and Justin rolled out four alternatives for the TAC to look at. The alternatives were as follows:

1. 22nd Street shifted north (holding the south ROW line) with a Minimum Section
2. 22nd Street shifted north (holding the south ROW line) with a COT MS&R Section
3. 22nd Street shifted north (holding the south ROW line) with a Grant Road Section
4. 22nd Street with a “Through the Park” alignment and a Grant Road Section

ii. Issues and Concerns

Bea added that the alignments proposed a bus pullout on the far side of 10th Avenue/22nd Street intersection. She noted that currently there are no bus routes west of 10th Avenue.

Walker added that he was concerned with the use of large sections. The sections created a buffer and a separation between the north and south side of 22nd Street. He was concerned about creating that separation. Jay noted that larger medians provided refuge for pedestrians as they crossed 22nd Street.

The team discussed the benefits of going through the Park. Jay discussed constructability benefits such as traffic sequencing and cost savings for the grade separation, because there would not need to be a temporary Mechanically

Stabilized Earth (MSE) wall built. The team also discussed the benefits of drainage. By bringing the Park to the south side of 22nd Street, the engineers could utilize park area for detention to minimize storm infrastructure costs.

Jay also introduced the concepts of districts to the TAC team. He noted that the corridor could be broken down in to 3 distinct districts. From the Interstate-10 to 6th Ave. this area represents the Neighborhood Commercial District, where commercial and residential intermix. From 6th Avenue to Park Avenue, this area represents the Park District. An area dominated by open space and residential uses. From Park Ave. to Kino Parkway, this area represents the Commerce – Mixed Use District.

Jay noted that different cross sections could be used in each District. The corridor did not need to be consistent in terms of cross section and the road should match the character of the neighborhood.

5. Open Discussion

Jay added that after meeting with the COC, the project team would be looking for a recommendation from the TAC on the cross section and alignment. Ultimately, the team was seeking an endorsement from the COC and TAC on the final corridor concept.

Walker asked when would be the appropriate time for the next meeting. Janice noted after the July COC meeting, in early August, the TAC should meet.

Don advised the project team to be careful of what we decide to show the COC. He specifically mentioned that he had concerns about he cost of the “Through the Park” option. He advised we carefully evaluate the costs to ensure we aren’t showing the COC/public something that can’t afford to be built. Walker agreed that estimates would be needed. He also added that the team needed to identify cost savings related to traffic control. Janice also added that the drainage costs would offset the park mitigation costs.

Jay added that costs are a concern of the COC, and funding would be a significant concern. He added that 22nd Street had funding from the RTA in the amount of $104M, $3M other, and $10M from Pima County Bonds. Jay added that in the original RTA budget Kino/22nd Street Overpass was not included.

6. Future Scheduling/Meeting Dates

Next meeting will be held in early August.