

# DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – MONTHLY MEETING

## ACTION REPORT AND SUMMARY

Monday, June 9, 2008

FROM: TDOT Project Manager Shellie Ginn

Chair Gene Caywood called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. at the Joel D. Valdez Main Library.

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Chair** Gene Caywood (Old Pueblo Trolley)  
**Vice-Chair** Don Durband (Downtown Tucson Partnership)  
John Burr (Armory Park Neighborhood Association)  
David Bachman-Williams (Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee)  
Daniela Diamente (Dunbar-Spring Neighborhood Association)  
Mary Ellen Wooten (Tucson-Pima Arts Council)  
Jonathan Levy (Iron Horse Neighborhood Association)  
Charles Davis (Barrio Anita Neighborhood Association)  
Korey Kruckmeyer (Pie Allen Neighborhood Association)  
John Sedwick (Fourth Avenue Merchants Association)  
Joseph Maher, Jr. (Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee)  
Susan Gamble (Warehouse Arts Management Organization)  
Mindy Bernstein (West University Neighborhood Association)

### PROJECT TEAM PRESENT:

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

### AGENDA ITEM/COMMITTEE ACTION

### STAFF ACTION

AGENDA ITEM/COMMITTEE ACTION	STAFF ACTION
<b>1. <u>Meeting Called to Order</u></b>	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>
<b>2. <u>Introduction of Committee Members and Staff</u></b>	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>
<b>3. <u>Approval of Meeting Minutes</u></b> Minutes of the May 12, 2008 meeting were approved with corrections.	<u>MINUTES APPROVED WITH CORRECTIONS AND POSTED TO WEBSITE</u>
<b>4. <u>Call to the Audience</u></b> Jeff DiGregorio, resident of Iron Horse NA: Impressed with and supports alignment 3.d. The neighborhood will use this roadway to their benefit with the connectivity of the bicycle route and the	<u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u>

conversion of a railroad frontage into a tree-lined 30-mile per hour road with sidewalks. The opportunity for public art and the pedestrian promenade and deck is very cool. Use time and energy to develop these qualities further.

de Vie: Speaking as a cyclist she expressed that whatever alternative is chosen, that BICAS be able to survive and thrive. As a visionary, she would like all money to go to bike paths and getting everyone a bicycle to use when they can. She wanted to plant the seed of bicycles and BICAS on everyone's mind when they make their decision.

James Rourk, Taxpayer: The City should not be proud of the money being spent on this roadway. He represents his family who are south side residents and business owners, and this project does not benefit the south side in any way. The real City sustainable tax income is down so this project should be limited in scope and this pathway is not reasonable. The alternatives are citizen proposals and should be taken seriously.

Chuck Bressi, Armory Park business owner/resident of Iron Horse: Urged CAC to vote for 3.d. It's a good alignment and this project is very difficult as is any project of this scope. There are elements that people like and elements that people don't like. The City did a good job of mitigating disadvantages as much as possible and unfortunately the disadvantages are focused in one neighborhood. The CAC needs to vote tonight so they can move on beyond this to take as much time as possible and work hard to mitigate disadvantages to Dunbar Spring. The deck shows the bike, pedestrian and vehicle connectivity to downtown, and this is our opportunity to participate in this process as much as possible.

Glenn Lyons, Downtown Tucson Partnership and resident of Armory Park: This road connects the Aviation and Broadway traffic headed to I-10 along the north edge of the railway. Very important link because we are saddled with a one-way system to accommodate through traffic. This project will give us the ability to go back to two-way traffic downtown. He supports 3.d because it is the best solution available.

Brad Lancaster: Appreciated the City extending the public process. Also thanked the City for providing more 3D images to give everyone a better visual sense of the options. He would appreciate if the pros and cons would be more even. Doesn't show how many buildings will be lost and how many will be retained. Favorite option is number 4 because it shows the least amount of new construction and the taking away of pedestrian access to and from, but it doesn't really address the railroad underpass. Option 1 is good too and he would like to see more information on that. He understands the push

<p>to move forward but he wanted to make a point of building on a solid foundation rather than using band aids on decisions that are made. He would like solid cost comparisons between the overpass and 3.d for comparison.</p>	
<p><b>5. <u>Announcements</u></b>          Andrew Singelakis introduced Nancy Peterson, Deputy Director of the City of Tucson Environmental Services Department (ESD). ESD is responsible for conducting environmental investigations on properties the City might use, sell or buy, and make sure that they're safe from any environmental issues. Ms. Peterson handed out a report entitled "Preliminary Soil Sample Results" in reference to the property at Sixth Street and Ninth Avenue, the site of the Dunbar Spring community garden. The City's Real Estate Department asked ESD to investigate after an unauthorized excavation of the property and the observation of discolored soil. After taking samples from the property, and based on soil remediation levels established by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, preliminary lab results indicate levels of lead, arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene may exceed regulatory levels. Final soil sample results are pending. Based on these preliminary findings, the property has been temporarily fenced off and signs have been posted. If tests confirm the regulatory exceedences, steps to prevent potential exposure will be taken as ESD conducts a more thorough investigation. She asked that people please stay away from the site until the final test results are complete.</p>	<p><u>NO ACTION REQUIRED</u></p>
<p><b>6. <u>Alignment options review and discussion</u></b>          Mike Barton from HDR reported that based on the last CAC meeting, they were asked to review several alignment options presented at that meeting. Options presented were from Williams and Dame, Terrence McMahon, the Sine Wave options, and the Curved 6<sup>th</sup> Street Option (3.d). More graphics were developed for this meeting to give everyone a better sense of what the roadway would look like near certain areas. When this process started, the CAC's goals were to look at a north side alignment with a modest 4-lane facility with enhanced multi-modal features, drainage improvements, and noise mitigation, minimize historic impacts, provide circulation to downtown, not just through downtown, and keeping within context of the potential development of the downtown area.</p> <p><b>Option 1: Raised Overpass (submitted by Williams and Dame)</b>          This plan proceeds north from Barraza-Aviation, over the Fourth Avenue underpass, over Sixth Avenue and makes the connection at Seventh Avenue. It calls for an overpass on 6<sup>th</sup> Street and takes 6<sup>th</sup> Street from Seventh Avenue over Stone Avenue over the railroad tracks, over the Citizens and Steinfeld buildings, and then proceeds down to try to match up with Church Avenue. Because it goes over Stone, there cannot be a connection at Stone which helps in regard to</p>	

moving traffic, however, there would not be some of the connections and linkages the CAC is looking for. There is also a ramp that goes up and over 6<sup>th</sup> Street that will go 20 feet over Stone Avenue and a ramp that goes over which is another 20 feet to get up and over 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Clearance required for the railroad is 23.5 feet, similar to the 22<sup>nd</sup> Street overpass so this is similar in scale and size to that overpass. This option was also reviewed by an independent engineering firm who submitted a profile. At Seventh Avenue, there would be a grade of 7 percent to get up and over Stone Avenue. With a 7 percent incline, ADA requires 5 percent so it would not accommodate ADA accessible sidewalks as it starts to go up. The top of the profile over the tracks is around 32 feet. Taking a look at some of the issues, one of them would be going over the top of the Citizens Warehouse which would be the controlling structure for the grades because you need 23.5 feet to get over the railroad, but Citizens is about 25 feet. Stone Avenue could be lowered but you would be changing the historic approach to Stone Avenue which the Committee has been trying to avoid. A different drainage option would also be called for because you could not go down 6<sup>th</sup> Street because piers for the structure would have to be placed there. The 5<sup>th</sup> Street alignment could be utilized but there are cost issues associated with that. From a traffic perspective, there is no connection to Stone Avenue. If the northbound movement from Stone is taken away, that forces traffic to use Granada or the frontage roads. Building a structure of this size would create visual impacts and depending on how it's built, there will most likely be higher costs. Also because of the grade issues there would not be ADA pedestrian access adjacent to the roadway.

Michael Barton addressed the following comments from the CAC:

- Noise impacts would be a challenge and they would have to find ways to mitigate that, and it would be a noise issue for a much larger area.
- Regarding ADA issues and the requirement of sidewalks, typically for through routes they would like to provide pedestrian access in case someone breaks down. Even if they did accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access underneath, they would still look for opportunities to provide access adjacent to the roadway because bicycle and pedestrian connectivity have been very important in everything that they've tried to do.
- There was a comment that it's good to point out that everything can happen underneath but everything listed is still negative. Would like to see some of the good things that can come out of all of these other options. A local engineering firm reviewed these plans which came from Williams and Dame in Portland and they weren't trying to show something like the 22<sup>nd</sup> St. Overpass. These drawings depicted projects in Portland or Paris and other cities that utilize that space underneath for bikes and pedestrians,

shade structures, skate parks. Williams and Dame apparently had a modification of this that didn't have the different flyovers but HDR has not seen that plan. Andrew Singelakis pointed out that TDOT does not support the overpass alternatives due to incompatibility with the historic districts.

- It would be assumed that a lot of the piers for this structure would be built in the existing 6th Street alignment so that means that 6<sup>th</sup> Street would have to be closed during construction.
- It is possible that to go over the Citizens building, it would cantilever out and the piers would be built beside the warehouse building or they would have to get some sort of easement. To build over it, the Citizens building would most likely have to be vacated until the bridges were put into place and depending on the type of bridge that was selected this could take weeks or months.
- If 6<sup>th</sup> Street has to be closed, that could pose a significant impact to businesses.
- We assume drainage would follow adjacent to the roadway. It would not be able to go down Sixth Street and would have to go somewhere else – perhaps the 5<sup>th</sup> Street alignment which is another major arterial that would have to be closed.

During the presentation on the options, a constituent approached a CAC member and a conversation followed. Andrew Singelakis interrupted them to say that the discussion between the constituent and the CAC member at the table during the presentation was inappropriate. Another CAC member objected to Andrew's comment and a discussion on this issue followed. Because a CAC member had previously expressed concerns over consultations taking place at the table at meetings, Shellie Ginn had asked the City Clerk's Office for an opinion and they agreed that these conversations were inappropriate. After more discussion, a motion followed:

**A Motion was made to allow constituent consultations with CAC members during CAC meetings, and that these communications occur away from the meeting table.  
Seconded and passed.**

MOTION MADE,  
SECONDED AND PASSED

Michael Barton addressed the following comments from the CAC:

- There is the potential that there would be columns erected next to these buildings to support this roadway. In order to go over the Citizens building, there would probably be long spans which would need several significantly-sized columns to support that.
- Without getting into the nitty gritty, it's tough to come up with an estimation of the total cost of this option. The long spans and flyover ramps could run the costs up about \$30 million plus which is that much more over the cost of 3.d.

**Option 2: South of the Tracks (submitted by Williams and Dame)**

Many think this plan looks like the DLUCS alignment previously designed. This plan works but there are issues such as an intersection that must be moved, grade issues along Sixth and Toole Avenues that made some of the warehouses somewhat unusable or limited their access which was a big issue that came out of the Warehouse Arts District Master Plan. This led them to start looking at a north side alignment. Since moving away from this alignment, there has been planning for new developments such as the Historic Depot, the Greyhound site, an art walk plan, the joint City-County Courts complex and the graveyard found at that site, and new roadway setbacks because of the Oklahoma City bombing, when you reach the top of Fourth Avenue you have to start diving down in between the railroad right-of-way and the maintenance and storage facility for the modern streetcar project. This also does not address safety concerns at the 6th and 9th Street railroad crossing because it does not separate vehicular and railroad traffic, and drainage is not specifically addressed in this option.

Michael Barton addressed the following comments from the CAC:

- The geometry for this plan simply does not work no matter how you look at it.
- This committee formerly voted to reject this plan for all those various reasons and that vote still stands.

**Option 3: Splitting the Difference (Williams and Dame)**

This option takes westbound traffic on a one-way facility, connecting it to northbound Sixth Avenue with the commensurate eastbound traffic utilizing Toole Avenue. and coming back down under the Broadway TI and exiting out. It is inconsistent with the following:

- the goal to do away with one-way streets downtown and does not provide a good linkage into downtown
- because of the construction underway at Fourth Avenue, a leg of this project would not be allowed as the road is constructed today
- these one-way options are not consistent with the RTA by providing a two-lane roadway, not a four-lane roadway
- drainage issues are not specifically addressed
- does not address the railroad safety issue with the crossing at 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Street

Michael Barton addressed comments from the CAC:

- A lot of congestion seen today is because of railroad interference and does not allow coordination of signals so the 6<sup>th</sup> street railroad crossing must be addressed. The RTA calls for the grade separation at 6<sup>th</sup> Street so you cannot propose an option that does not address this issue.

- An option similar to this one with the one-way option was voted down by the committee previously.

**Option 4: Utilizing the Existing (Williams and Dame)**

This option takes Downtown Links adjacent to the railroad and instead of proceeding on to Seventh Avenue, curves it on to Sixth Avenue. It takes a four-lane facility up with two lanes northbound and two lanes southbound. There is 55 feet on north Sixth Avenue with two lanes coming through on an underpass, two lanes adding on, and two lanes coming out without enough room for all the lanes. Some of these lanes would have to be shared with Sixth Avenue but it removes any parking on Sixth Avenue and may possibly impact additional buildings along Sixth. It also takes northbound Downtown Links traffic and directs it straight up north and this could make traffic difficult to handle. Large vehicles will not have enough room to turn at 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Sixth Avenue so they would have to go north to Speedway or the intersection will have to be widened. Again the safety issues at 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Ninth Avenue are not addressed and there is no specific drainage alignment addressed with this option.

Michael Barton addressed comments from the CAC:

- This option does not address the 6th Street railroad crossing even if you could work out the problem at 6<sup>th</sup> and Sixth which would be difficult to do without tearing down buildings. Also, today there are 50-60 trains that go through downtown and in a few years there will be 100-120 trains per day. There is an initiative being proposed for the ballot in November that would provide train service from here to Phoenix and would also provide commuter rail in the Tucson area so there must be a grade-separated crossing there.

**Option 5: Sine Wave Option #1 (submitted by Paul Schwam)**

This option is a variation of the City's Curved alignment. It dives south curving around trying to avoid historic buildings such as Bevel but it does impact Tannos, which is a contributing structure, and there is potential impact on part of the Citizens building. As depicted the horizontal curvature is less than the minimum radius that we are looking at for appropriate design speed. The criteria is 550 feet for curves but some curves on this design are only 300. The 550 feet is for a normally crowned roadway without trying to incorporate super elevation which is where you bank a turn. It also would not be possible to install ADA accessible crosswalks because of the curvature and one side of the roadway being lower than the other. Because of the issues it creates at intersections, super elevation is typically not used when designing urban, collector-type roadways. There was also an attempt to make the drainage option fit which does not work as depicted because it does not allow enough room for the required size of concrete boxes to meet equivalent capacity.

Michael Barton addressed comments from the CAC:

- There would be a roller coaster effect at the Stone Avenue intersection. The problems created with an intersection is that you have to go up, level off, go down, level off for ADA and then get back up to grade which is why super elevation is not typically used.
- Without super elevation, the speed for this option would probably be around 20-25 MPH.
- By dropping the design speed you could eliminate the super elevation, but typically facilities of this nature are not designed for those lower design speeds because it is a collector-type roadway. People would still drive the high speed which would not make it safe.

**Option 6: Sine Wave Option #2 (submitted by Paul Schwam)**

This option is very similar to Sine Wave #1 but now there are now impacts further north to the Schwam and Tannos buildings, but does avoid Originate, Bevel and tattoo shop buildings. There are similar issues related to the intersections, design speed and elevations.

**Option 7: Sine Wave Option #3 (engineered version)**

It too has the same issues because it gets close to the Citizens Warehouse but they try to do a super elevation through the curves. The same types of elevation issues apply and also pushes these problems closer to Stone Avenue. It also shows a potential drainage alignment showing one of the 6<sup>th</sup> Street alignment drainage options (Alternative A) that ties in near Granada and Main which is significantly more expensive. Other drainage options could work but they all have cost considerations associated with them. Another issue that the group came across during previous review was regarding construction near the Steinfeld building. There was a 50 foot envelope that we wanted to stay out of because building there would cause problems with the stability of the building or we would have more cost considerations with any of these drainage options.

Michael Barton addressed comments from the CAC:

- This option was submitted by an independent engineering firm to see if they could make some of this geometry work.
- The west curve could be straightened out but we have been attempting to stay as perpendicular to the railroad was practical to get under it which shortens the structures cost and structures depth.
- The curve on the east side of this option can be straightened out but not without encroaching on buildings. Some of the curve could be flattened out, but because of the other curves you still need room to transition. It was pointed out that the current occupant of the effected building has said that he is willing for his building to be taken if it will save the others in order to

accomplish this. In January the CAC looked at the Curved Alignment 3C which was similar but took out several buildings. It was suggested by the CAC to avoid impacting all historic structures within the district which led to 3.d.

- This option shows the drainage underneath the roadway as does the Curved alignment to limit construction. The only reason it would not be in the roadway is because of grade issues. Straightening out the east end of the roadway, if that building was not there, is similar to the 3C option discussed in January but it still takes out several buildings.
- To construct the Sine Wave Option, 6<sup>th</sup> Street would be closed for some time, perhaps six months, because of major construction. The intent is to minimize disruption to 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Sine Wave would also impact Stone Avenue. The Option #1 flyover option would also include time to construct retaining walls and it would be difficult to estimate how long 6<sup>th</sup> Street would be closed.
- Some sections of River Road, before it was straightened out, might have been a similar driving experience to the Sine Wave option.

**Option 8: 6<sup>th</sup> Street Study (submitted by Terrence McMahon)**

Some of the major issues of this option were that because it gets closer to the Stone Avenue underpass and changes the depth of Stone and Sixth Avenues by 10 or 15 feet, the geometry does not work. There would have been major retaining walls and a shoofly work to the south. They did look at that shoofly track but couldn't make it work from the Stone Avenue underpass and get enough clearance. It has to start south of the underpass to get clearance. This would have also closed down Stone Avenue and Sixth Street. The drainage options looked at could not stay under 6<sup>th</sup> Street which would have raised the cost by \$3.4 million more. Railroad clearance and access to some of the existing parcels were also issues.

Michael Barton addressed comments from the CAC:

- Responding to a member's question, other CAC members said that the original ADOT freeway and parkway alignment hugged the tracks past 6<sup>th</sup> Street and over or under the tracks north to connect to St. Mary's. There was a one block encroachment on the adjacent neighborhood and it also takes out the Citizens Warehouse.
- A comment was made that certain alignments require the closing of 6<sup>th</sup> Street and the alignment that this committee approved over a year and a half ago actually did that too. They didn't know whose issue that was, but it is not the CAC's issue.
- A member inquired that if the Citizens Warehouse were taken out of the picture, would that resolve all the issues that make the alignment as approved impossible. The response was that no particular option resolves all the issues on this alignment.

- If you take out Citizens you still have grade issues at the Stone Avenue underpass. There was an alignment discussed that took care of that and the roadway geometry worked, but there were trade offs with there still being a depressed Stone Avenue underpass, depressed 6<sup>th</sup> Street, and the closure issues.
- A CAC member said that all the options have their pros and cons and that the pros are not brought out as the cons are because they are being encouraged to approve only certain alignments which is disingenuous. Roadways do not produce money as the businesses there so the CAC should start recognizing the pros and cons of both.
- A CAC member said that he wasn't asking about closing down 6<sup>th</sup> like it's a hidden agenda. He is just asking so he can get as much information as possible to try and make a decent judgment.
- A CAC member said that at the time last year when the 6<sup>th</sup> Street alignment was approved they were focused on the Citizens and Steinfeld warehouses. He is satisfied that all seven alignments as being unacceptable alternatives. Each one brings some serious disadvantages but there are also positives. Some of the deal breakers are not addressing the grade separation at the railroad tracks at Ninth and 6<sup>th</sup> which would be a violation of the RTA and the very objectives of this roadway; not in support of any alignment that takes the roadway back south of the tracks which is where they started and the Arts District Historic Master Plan which recognized the roadway on Toole would create a bad situation for the arts district; not in support of any alignment that creates new one-way streets in downtown or prevents any current one-way streets from converting to two-way; there are some attractive features of an overpass as they've done in Portland but a lot of things that have been done underneath is because have been out of necessity because they have a dense urban city as others have done using those spaces because they don't have other room to grow but that is not the case in Tucson; not in support of any alignment that does not address access to northbound Stone. The purpose of this roadway is to create simultaneous options for commuters trying to get to the area but also creating a linkage to improve accessibility to the Warehouse District, to the neighborhoods, to northbound traffic, to traffic that wants to get to I-10 and if those options are eliminating those are deal breakers. He will not vote for any of the alternatives unless something different to encourage alignment and supports the 3.d alignment. He also opposes the closure of 6<sup>th</sup> Street for construction.
- Another CAC member agreed with the previous comments and will support 3.d.
- At the last meeting a member asked had asked for a matrix of the pros and cons, and any alignment that allows 6<sup>th</sup> Street to remain open is a huge plus.

- A member agreed with some of the previous comments and saw problems with almost all of the other alternatives and said it comes down to if they want a grade separated underpass at the railroad and 6<sup>th</sup>. If not then they can just let Aviation dump out on Seventh and leave everything else as it is. He does not like the overpass idea and thinks it would be more intrusive to Dunbar Springs than the tunnel through it. He also favors the 3.d alignment as the best alternative given the fact that they agreed that they do not a grade separated intersection.
- A CAC member said that it sounds like the other options are being ruled out and wants to remind everyone that her neighborhood has not seen officially seen the other options so she would like time to have the neighborhoods look at these because they have not had the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons so it's one thing to say that Dunbar Spring wouldn't like that but she doesn't know what they think. The deal breaker for the neighborhood was 3.d because it took down contributing buildings and organizations. What are deal breakers for some are not necessarily deal breakers for the neighborhoods.
- Another member favors 3.d and he doesn't see any of the other options saving the amount of money and time that 3.d does. It offers the best options for all types of transportation and he is delighted to see the additions that have been made. The 100+ foot deck is a great improvement that will probably do a lot of positive things for the neighborhood. He would like to see more pedestrian improvements and connectivity and would like to see how this will connect to Sixth Avenue. He realizes that some of the buildings are still privately held, but most of the buildings that are going to be taken out are publicly held, they are rented and not owned. They have been slated for this demolition for 20 years and everyone else has known that and if there is a plan that can save \$10 million for other improvements and create larger chunks of land that can be given back to the neighborhood and the Warehouse District, in those savings he would be pleased to appropriate some of those savings for rebuilding Mat Bevel, BICAS, and he thinks they should focus on that. They're at a point where they're going under the railroad, they're meeting RTA and they have looked at all the engineering studies and he doesn't see how it is helpful for the neighborhood to continue to debate if there aren't any other viable options for everyone. He is ready to vote for 3.d.

**A Motion was made for the CAC to vote for 3.d for recommendation to Mayor and Council tonight including the deck and public amenities that have been developed and further amenities that can be developed for the benefit of Dunbar Spring and all the neighborhoods that are interactive because this Committee's best use will be to develop that interconnectivity. Seconded.**

MOTION MADE AND  
SECONDED

Discussion followed with the following comments from CAC members:

- One of the reasons why they talked about delaying the vote until August would be to take a look at the alternatives and she feels a duty to go back to her neighborhood association and discuss the alternatives. She would like to know if there are any extrapolations that they could take a look at that would offer a feasible alternative to 3.d. She does not support a vote tonight and would like to look at some extrapolations and has a duty to speak to her neighborhood association before she can vote.
- One member said that he did not get the alternatives and he had to track them down and got them a few days ago. This is all moving too fast and he feels that they should be in a position to vote at the next meeting. He wants to be in a position to say that he went to his neighborhood, he was informed of the perceived problems with them, and he discussed them with his neighborhood prior to a vote. For that reason alone he is opposing of forcing it to an up or down vote this evening.
- One of the plans that they talked about that was pushing the roadway up a block, going around the TEP building and going into the neighborhood, that goes into Dunbar Spring and they were looking into doing a railroad park greenway. We cannot make that decision for them here and that alternative brings in another alignment so there are some suggestions that were made at the table that potentially changed the alignment and she would like to explore those and have Dunbar Spring weight in on those.
- One member was curious about the drainage. He thought that the whole idea of the drainage was that this would naturally by gravity drain all the underpasses for the new underpass and he sees that the drainage is shown above the grade of the bottom of the road. Michael Barton said they will be draining the other underpasses but because the drainage is higher than the roadway, they would have to drain this one with a pump system but the others will drain naturally. The member asked if the pump fails then they have a flooded underpass. Michael said the pump technology is better now and they're looking at retaining some of the water to use for water harvesting but they haven't gotten to that level of design yet.
- Another design issue asked about was the cross section of the road shows a considerable narrowing and some cross sections showed a bicycle path. From the point of view of the bicycle community there are bicyclists that don't mind going alongside the cars in an underpass, but some don't like to do that. He thought that a separated bicycle facility made more sense. He also liked the trees in the underpass so it's not just not a concrete canyon. He would rather see a narrower, pleasant underpass then a wider one that is just a concrete canyon.

- A CAC member asked if there is a vote tonight and it passes, would the concerns that members have still be on the table for tweaking, specifically this cross section. The member who made the motion said that he intended to recommend the alignment, not the design feature which he thinks should be elaborated on. He included the deck and the presentation drawings that were made tonight because he thought they were desirable elements. His motion was for the alignment, not the design of the roadway.
- On discussion on whether or not to pass the motion, a member said that she would like to see the design features presented and she would like to understand the deck features and also the vote at the last meeting was to slow down the process to fully understand and comprehend. She would also like to take this back to her constituents and have a full discussion with them regarding this and this would give them July and August per the last vote and she would like to see what the alternatives are so that she can fully discuss the 3.d alignment with them as well.
- In response to a CAC member's question, if the task is to make a recommendation and the alignment is recommended, the committee will continue to meet and there will be many opportunities for public input.
- A CAC member said that a vote right now would be premature because not only have they not seen 3.d and its features, they would like to go back to their neighborhoods, and they have not heard the call from the audience to see why or why they do not like certain things and is fully unsupportive of a vote.

A motion was made as follows:

**A Motion was made to table the vote for the alignment tonight to allow more time for public comment and time for CAC members to meet with their respective neighborhood associations if they wish to do so and resume this conversation at July's CAC meeting.**

**Seconded.**

The member who made the original motion stated that he had no problem finishing with Michael Barton's presentation and if the vote does not happen tonight or there is a vote to table it, he will continue to push for it.

**The motion to table was voted on and passed.**

**Option 9: Curved Sixth Street Option (3.d Alignment)**

Michael Barton showed the group where the new Fourth Avenue design was coming in, the MLK development, the Depot Plaza development, the Greyhound facility at Sixth and Toole, the modern streetcar and storage facility, and showed conceptually what

MOTION MADE,  
SECONDED AND PASSED

Downtown Links would look like as a modest four-lane roadway and how it all fits together. One of the other issues is how it interacts with Davis School. Currently there is a five-lane section with a rough edge on both sides, and the concept showed new access with a median, bike lanes and a better edge against the school and Wildcat Storage. There has been discussion of a PELICAN crossing signal or two-stage HAWK crossing connecting to a greenway in that area. At 5<sup>th</sup> and Ninth looking into downtown that would create a deck in between 9<sup>th</sup> and the railroad right-of-way. Citizens and Steinfeld would still be in place and there is a connection across 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue which could potentially be a park.

Shellie Ginn said that because many of the CAC members need more time to review the options with their respective neighborhoods, she suggested that an open house be held next Monday, June 16, to give everyone another opportunity to review all of the proposed alignment options. She also suggested that the members come back for another CAC meeting on Monday, June 23. A July CAC meeting may not be a good idea since it can be difficult to obtain a quorum. The following Motion was made:

**A Motion was made to accept the proposed schedule to have a meeting for public comment on Monday, June 16 and a CAC meeting on Monday, June 23. Seconded and passed.**

MOTION MADE,  
SECONDED AND PASSED

**7. Call to the Audience**

Terrence McMahon: Suggested that a consultant come in to discuss the state highway geometry on Sixth Street. The existing drainage channel should stay on Sixth because the flow of water will be increased. What will happen to neighborhood below, especially the Tucson Electric substation which is in the flood plain. He and his wife have property there and some are in the flood plain and some are not. Is the drainage channel going from 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue all the way down, or will it protect only 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue but what about Barrio Anita. Many more properties who are not in the flood plain now are going to be. If this plan is chosen, the City will suffer the consequences.

Brad Lancaster: Again he encouraged the CAC to look at net gains and losses in the quality of life for Tucson as a whole and also for those working and living downtown. The only things he sees that are gained are the crossing by Davis Street and enhancements to the Ninth Avenue crossing. We will lose many of the east-west crossings due to the increased traffic and many affordable live-work space that currently act as unofficial community centers for these downtown neighborhoods. These work because they are low cost-low rent which means you don't have to spend your money and time making rent and makes more time to create which makes this area of town more vibrant. If we lose these buildings, he would like to see in the

NO ACTION REQUIRED

budget the replacement costs of these spaces for their current use. Can the need for drainage space be downsized by infiltrating more water upslope throughout the water shed starting at the top and working down to the bottom? Look more at the Sine Wave alternatives. If we construct at a lower design speed it will get everyone to drive slower. If it costs more to deepen the road, he would like to see the City spend more money and time now to enhance it so it will be better in the long run for more.

Chuck Bressi: The longer we delay the road the less time we have to spend on the design elements which are more important than spending time on alternatives that just won't work.

Audience Member: Lives in Dunbar Spring and they have put up with Stone Avenue construction which affected traffic, businesses, bikes and made Stone Avenue the Gateway to Downtown smoothing it out and trying to bring back business. Option 1 shows a 45-foot tall overpass that would block off view of downtown and view of "A" Mountain and everything that is traditional to Tucson. This should be completely thought out.

Audience Member: Possibly a 20 to 25 MPH speed limit is reasonable. There are other places in town where there is a major drop in speed. This could be a City revenue source from speeders. It seems that the CAC is pushing and pushing and not everyone is getting a fair shake at what they want to say. Talking about banks and curves, let's see what it takes. On Country Club during summer rains you have a foot and a half of water on one side of the road because of the pitch. Our roads are designed to beat our drainage system. That's not that much water and he has a 6" hump in his street and it works. Those designs can work and don't have to be that big of a problem. Make it a 25 MPH speed limit, make it smaller.

James Rourk: Regarding the Environmental Impact Study, digging near the railroad tracks can cause a problem if there is lead, and arsenic and benzyne. There should be conversations and thought should go into the danger to the residents of the neighborhood and not just consider financial interest and gain.

Audience Member: The fact that the City says they will put back extra money to rebuild lost properties would never happen in this City. They promise a lot but deliver very little. Promises should be put in writing because that's the only way that will happen.

**8. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

NO ACTION REQUIRED