

DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – MONTHLY MEETING

ACTION REPORT AND SUMMARY

Monday, September 11, 2006

FROM: TDOT Project Manager Shellie Ginn

Vice Chair Don Durband called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. at the Joel D. Valdez Main Library.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Vice-Chair** Don Durband (Tucson Downtown Alliance)
- John Burr (Armory Park Neighborhood Association)
- Charles Davis (Barrio Anita Neighborhood Association)
- Joseph Maher, Jr. (Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee)
- Natasha Winnik (Dunbar-Spring Neighborhood Association)
- John Sedwick (Fourth Avenue Merchants Association)
- Kory Kruckmeyer (Pie Allen Neighborhood Association)
- Mindy Bernstein (West University Neighborhood Association)
- Christopher Carroll (El Presidio Neighborhood Association)
- Mary Ellen Wooten (Tucson-Pima Arts Council)
- Jonathan Levy (Iron Horse Neighborhood Association)
- Gerald Juliani (Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission)
- David Bachman-Williams (Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee)
- David Aguirre (Warehouse Arts Management Organization)

PROJECT TEAM PRESENT:

- Andrew Singelakis, TDOT
- Shellie Ginn, TDOT
- Melissa Antol, TDOT
- Michael Graham, TDOT
- Mike Barton, HDR Engineering, Inc.
- Corky Poster, Poster Frost
- Joan Beckim, Kaneen Advertising & Public Relations

AGENDA ITEM/COMMITTEE ACTION	STAFF ACTION
1. Moment of silence in memory of September 11, 2001.	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>
2. Introductions	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes It was MOVED to accept the August 14, 2006 meeting minutes with no changes. SECONDED . Motion PASSED .	<u>APPROVED MINUTES TO BE POSTED TO WEBSITE</u>
4. No Announcements	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>
6. (Item out of Agenda order) Neighborhood Outreach Process Update Andrew Singelakis described the past five land use neighborhood meetings as having been successful. Attendees were able to determine and articulate what their needs were.	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>

Andrew introduced Corky Poster who described his role in the DT Links process. Corky said that the project team will be scheduling more meetings in October or November, returning to the different districts with more detail and a summary and objective for the whole area, as well as the individual districts, and some urban design concepts in response to what they heard at various neighborhood and stakeholder meetings. He stated that the average meeting turnout was from 30-40 to 60-70. He explained how the area was divided into into five separate districts, Iron Horse Neighborhood, 4th Avenue commercial district, 6th Ave. to Stone Ave., Stone Ave. to Main Ave., and Main Ave. to the I-10 frontage road. The goal is to establish a companion process that meets the needs of each district located on both side of the proposed roadway. The end product will be an urban design map or plan showing land uses, proposed building masses, open space connectivity, etc.

There was much discussion regarding the issues categorized as:

- Issues of Character – what will the character of that district be at the conclusion of both the roadway improvements and urban design improvements
- Issues of Connectivity – what will it connect to and how does it connect to bus routes, pedestrian transportation, bicycle transportation, etc.
- Parking – some districts had more parking issues than others
- Land Use – what are positive and negative proposed land uses for those areas and individual proposals for what neighbors and stakeholders would like to see happen in their areas
- Safety – kids getting to school safely, attractive nuisances
- Amenities – what types of urban furniture would they like to see, nice places to live, parks, public art
- Environment – noise, drainage, pollution, water harvesting
- Stewardship – if we’re successful, how is it taken care of and who takes care of it
- Process – how do we make sure voices get heard, how do decisions get made
- Specific proposals for the districts will be tied to the project’s goals and objectives.

8. (Out of Agenda order). Call to the Audience

An audience member said that many disabled residents like himself use the 4th Ave. underpass and commented on how the City is suggesting to run a shuttle to pick up pedestrians, including high school students, and transport them to the other side of the railroad tracks. However, the train traffic at that time is atrocious so he wonders how they can provide safe passage during construction and hopes they will come up with a safe alternative for them to cross.

Susan Gamble, owner/lessee of properties on 6th Street and 6th Avenue, urged the CAC to make a broad selection of alignments. She would like to see a 5th Ave. alignment, a 6th Ave. alignment, and a 7th Ave. alignment with a 6th Street disconnect so they can see how each of those will

NO ACTION
REQUIRED

<p>develop with the urban landscape design and overall affect on the community in that area.</p> <p>Daniela Diamente’s comments stressed the preservation of the historic warehouse district.</p> <p>Michael Toney commented on the 4th Avenue Underpass. He believes that it would be fair to construct sidewalks on both the east and west sides, both 15’ wide.</p> <p>Scott Cummings commented on the fact that he was not aware until now of the possibility of an outlet on 5th Avenue and he hopes that the committee would not go with that plan. He believes that because of possible future development between 4th Ave. and 6th Ave., they really need 5th Avenue as another outlet for those businesses.</p>	
<p>5. Proposed Concepts Alignments – Selection of 3 Concepts</p> <p>Andrew Singelakis stated that the Downtown Links Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has made recommendations on three alignments. They are Concept 1A which is the 6th Street disconnect, Concept 3A which was 7th Avenue, and Concept 6B which is 6th Avenue. There were many comments during the land use/ neighborhood meetings regarding a 5th Avenue connection, so that concept has been included even though the TAC did not make that recommendation. The final concepts will be presented to the Río Nuevo Mayor and Council Subcommittee and the Transportation Subcommittee for their review.</p> <p>Mike Barton presented the four alignments that are up for recommendation. He stated that there is still a lot to consider including: lane widths, bike and ped access, sidewalks, landscaping, on-street and public parking, traffic patterns, access to existing and future developments, how many properties the City needs to purchase, pavement treatments, retail and neighborhood connectivity, etc. Mike displayed and discussed each plan in further detail.</p> <p>Shellie Ginn was asked about her inquiry to the City Attorney’s office regarding the question of two lanes versus four lanes, and whether or not four lanes is required by the ballot. Shellie said that she has not yet received an answer to that question from the CA’s office. John Burr said that he understood from the CA’s office that if it is anything other than a four-lane road, it would have to go back to Mayor and Council for them to decide. Andrew Singelakis said that regardless of the legal opinion rendered, the CAC and staff would need to be directed by the Mayor and Council to evaluate anything other than four-lane alternatives. TDOT does not know what the ramifications of that would be and how the RTA would respond and there are a lot of complicated issues that would go into deciding how that would play out. Mike Barton said that the RTA language proposed four lanes because there has been 15 to 20 years of planning before this that indicated that four lanes was what was needed.</p>	<p><u>NO ACTION</u> <u>REQUIRED</u></p>

<p>After discussion, it was MOVED by John Burr that the committee, in the future, should consider the four proposals: 3-A, and any combination thereof; 6-B and any combination thereof; 1-A with future modifications; and 9-A perhaps modified, as the general plans that the committee should move forward with. SECONDED by David Bachman-Williams with an amendment to drop Concept 1-A. After discussion, Don Durband called for a vote on the amendment to remove Concept 1-A from the motion. The question failed 7-5. The original motion was again placed on the table and PASSED.</p>	
<p>7. 4th Avenue Underpass Update Andrew Singelakis said that at the most recent Río Nuevo Subcommittee meeting, the subcommittee approved a cross section for the 4th Avenue Underpass with 10-foot sidewalks on the west side of the underpass and twenty-foot sidewalks on the east side of the underpass, with Toole Avenue remaining open. That item will be before Mayor and Council at their next study session.</p>	<p><u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u></p>
<p>8. Call to the Audience Chris Stebe said that another project, the straightening of Drachman between Oracle and Stone, may impact this project since the City may want to start limiting traffic onto Stone by moving traffic down to Main from Speedway and 6th Street.</p> <p>Scott Cummings commented about John Burr’s speculation of people who may or may not want to build there. He has been in the area for some time and they have been precluded to do anything because of the underground arroyo. He also feels that directing traffic onto 5th Avenue would be a nightmare.</p> <p>Matt Williams from West University neighborhood, supports Natasha Winnick’s suggestion about putting a curve in the road at the railroad tracks at 6th St. because it would alleviate conflict with the historical buildings in the area. He also thinks it would help the businesses in the area.</p> <p>An audience member asked: Regarding the 4th Avenue Underpass, what is the width of the traffic lanes, and what is the rationale for having the sidewalks of unequal width?</p> <p>Another audience member asked: Why is there a difference in the width of the sidewalks in the east and west side? Don Durband said that there was originally a proposal to not have a sidewalk on one side and a very wide sidewalk on the other side. This is a compromise in terms of having a wide sidewalk on one side, but you still have access on both sides.</p> <p>Bruce Beenken commented that he does not believe the community is being adequately represented by the Citizens Advisory Committee. He does not think this committee will get the community support for a bypass downtown. Historic structures should be prioritized. He is</p>	<p><u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u></p>

disappointed in the community of Pima County and thinks they are too focused on special interests.

Lauren Rabb, owner of The Gallery at 6th and 6th in the Old Firestone Building commented that the Central Tucson Gallery Association supports and emphasizes the fact that you can walk from gallery up 6th Street to 4th Avenue to the galleries there. She asked the committee to remember that the project needs to be extremely pedestrian friendly.

Michael Toney commented on the RTA and the concept options.

Daniela Diamente asked that information about levels of grade and how that would affect the Warehouse District be included for the public's information.

ADJOURNMENT at 7:15 p.m.