

**DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

Monday, August 11, 2014

Accepted and Approved by the Downtown Links CAC Members on November 17, 2014

FROM: TDOT Project Manager Tom Fisher

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair, Eugene W. Caywood, Old Pueblo Trolley
Vice Chair, John Burr, Armory Park Neighborhood Association
Debbie Chandler, Fourth Avenue Merchants Association
Daniela Diamente, Dunbar Spring Neighborhood Association
Kristi Frank, El Presidio Neighborhood Association
Susan Gamble, Warehouse Arts Management Association
Richard Mayers, West University Neighborhood Association
Kylie Walzak, Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee
Carlos Lozano, Tucson - Pima County Historical Commission
Susan Marshall, Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee
Mary Ellen Wooten, Tucson-Pima Arts Council
Korey Kruckmeyer, Pie Allen Neighborhood Association

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

VACANT, Iron Horse Neighborhood Association
Michael Keith, Downtown Tucson Partnership
Gail Ryser, Barrio Anita Neighborhood Association

PROJECT TEAM PRESENT:

Sam Credio, City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)
Tom Fisher, City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)
Brent Kirkman, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Michael Bertram, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Laura Mielcarek, Wheat Design Group
Kathy Jirschele, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations
Lindsey Normoyle, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations
Joan Beckim, Kaneen Advertising & Public Relation

1. Meeting Called to Order

Quorum confirmed. Gene Caywood, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

2. Introduction of Committee Members and Staff

CAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of July 14, 2014, were unanimously approved with correction to the spelling of Jarrett Walkers name.

4. Announcements

- **Tom Fisher** announced that Mayor and Council approved the 2-year Term of Service Extension to August 2016, for the Downtown Links CAC members. Tom F. also said the City of Tucson had completed repainting the 6th Avenue underpass and also that they (TDOT) had received a call from El Presidio neighborhood regarding some graffiti abatement needed on a wall along 6th Street west of Stone. **Sam Credio** interjected that the abatement will be taken care of as soon as possible.

5. Reports and Presentations

Project Updates

- **General Design update** – **Sam Credio** updated the members on the status of phase 3 design. He said that the design team was working on submittal for the 90% design. **John Burr** asked if there were any updates related to the crosswalk at Broadway/Aviation Parkway. **Sam C.** said they planned to have a roadway safety assessment completed for the intersection. **Michael Bertram**, said they plan to have the 90% plans delivered to TDOT on September 12, 2014. The Right-of-Way and easement plans have already been submitted. **Michael B** also noted that they are already working on their response to Union Pacific Railroad's (UPRR) comments and that they will re-submit to UPRR concurrently with the 90% submittal to TDOT. The 90% plans will include the structural design for the 6th Street underpass, shoe-fly track plans, construction sequencing regarding the box culvert construction of the Arroyo Chico where it goes under the tracks, as it coincides with the construction of the underpass itself. **Michael B** also said that at 75%, they had over-the-shoulder review meetings with Pima County Wastewater and the City of Tucson Water Department. Comments from those meetings have been responded to and will also be submitted concurrently with the 90% plans to TDOT. They are also working with private utility franchises like Tucson Electric Power, CenturyLink and others along the corridor. Utility are most interested in when the right-of-way will be available for them to begin relocation. **John B.** asked when the CAC members would be able to see the 90% plans. Michael B. said that TDOT has to review and approve it first. He also said that at that point the RTA VA review subcommittee needs to meet again. **Gene Caywood** asked how long it would take TDOT to review the 90% design plans. **Sam C.** said it would take them about six weeks to review it internally.
- **ADOT warehouse update** – **Sam Credio** said that the historic documentation on 510 N. Stone and 15 E. 6th Street has been completed by SHPPPO. **Sam C.** also said that abatement on some of the properties began this week and are expected to take approximately 2 weeks to complete. During the site visit, bricks, the metal cistern, and some metal beams and trusses were identified as possible salvage opportunities. **Sam C.** said they have to work with the demolition contractor and have set up a meeting to discuss the possible salvage materials. **Sam C.** provided the members with the name and contact information of the demolition contractor and said if they had an interest in any of the salvageable materials they should contact him and they could negotiate directly with the contractor. **Susan Gamble** mentioned that in light of Gene's first paragraph, she wanted to go on record stating that they had not received a full engineering report of the Schwam building. There was additional conversation regarding the engineering report. **Tom Fisher** said that a copy of the letter WAMO sent to TDOT was sent to all the members. The letter requested that TDOT save the building, conduct a structural assessment and provide an Engineers report. Tom said that since TDOT does not won the building, they would need to get permission from the owners, (ADOT) to perform the inspection. And then, after spending ten-of-thousands of dollars on the assessment, there was no guaranty that the owner wouldn't demolish it anyway. **Tom F.** also said that local developers where aware of the building, but no-one came forward to purchase or invest in it. Tom

also said that using transportation dollars on the building would not be approved by ADOT or the RTA. Tom said TDOT tried to sum up all this information in its response to WAMO's letter. **Susan Gamble** said she understood Tom summation and also the response letter TDOT wrote. She just wanted to make sure it was on record that they (CAC) had requested an engineer's report of the property, and one was not performed. **Tom F** then asked if anyone had any thoughts about the salvageable material. He also said that they were working on identifying quantities to provide the contractor. **Daniela Diamente** commented on how she'd really like to see the design team incorporate salvaged materials into the deck park. **Carlos Lozano** said that by salvaging materials they would actually be saving money because they'd be reusing materials that they would otherwise have to buy. **John B.** asked about the firing techniques used in making the bricks that are going to be salvaged. **Sam C.** also said that the 90% plans will include a utility indemnification so some of the utilities may begin working along the corridor to relocate infrastructure where needed. **Michael B** briefly explained that the indemnification letter tells the utility companies to begin their redesign efforts based on the 90% plans. It is a very big milestone for them as well as the project. In regards to property acquisition, Sam C. said that Tierra Right of Way had been working with affected property owners. He also said that the 90% design plans had been able to identify the partial acquisitions.

- **7th Street/7th Avenue field visit** – **Gene Caywood** provided the members with a prepared handout detailing his observations regarding the **building** and **challenges and options** noted during the site visit. (A copy of the handout is included and made a part of these meeting minutes and can be viewed here: www.downtownlinks.info) **Gene C.** spent time detailing the condition of the building, the location of the multi-use path (MUP) and then reviewed the challenges and options as he saw them. **Kylie Walzak** wanted clarification on the location of where the sidewalk would be (with the recommendation that reverted back from a bicycle/pedestrian path to a sidewalk). Additionally, she wanted to know if bikes, pedestrians and semi-trucks would all be traveling within the same area. **Gene C.** provided clarification and showed her on the map where semi-trucks would be traveling. There was discussion regarding the location of the HAWK at 7th Avenue, and whether it would remain in the plans. Gene C. said the HAWK would remain as designed, however, **Sam C.** said that in order for bicyclist to share the sidewalk with pedestrians, it needs to be at least 10 feet wide, which it won't be at this point. **Kylie W.** still felt as though the design was complex and needed to be reviewed further. **Carlos Lozano** suggested that they use more roadway space by narrowing the width of the median. Michael B reminded the members that there is a turn lane into Benjamin Supply and also, because of the HAWK crossing, the median must be wide enough to provide refuge for crossers. **Susan G.** said she thought Gene had provided a very reasonable step-by-step approach and would also like to see an engineering report so it could be determined if it was feasible to save the building. **John B.** wanted to know what the elevation of the existing sidewalk was vs. where the new sidewalk would be built near the most easterly building of Benjamin Supply. **Sam C** said there is about a 7-foot elevation difference between the corner of the building and the existing 7th Street. **John B.** said that he thought it would be possible to put in a new angled wall where they wanted the new bicycle/pedestrian path to be which would allow the building to remain intact. He also felt that the owners input needs to be taken into consideration. Do they want the building saved? John B said may a portion of the building could be saved. He also stated that he was having a hard time with a retaining wall constructed half way up the side of the building. Susan G. said that even if an engineering report is provided, as Gene's first paragraph states, the building owner, for whatever reason, could still decide to have the building demolished. **Tom F.** said that Tierra Right-of-Way will coordinate with the property owners in order to obtain an engineer's structural analysis of the building. **Sam C.** said there are different options, the city does what is most fiscally responsible. **Tom F** reminded everyone that the city must work with the property owner and see what he wants. **John B.** asked if they had developed any parking options for the lot next to Benjamin Supply. **Sam C.** said that they had not

developed parking options yet, but that Mr. Berman, the owner of Benjamin Supply has looked at the site plan and they are thinking about a master plan for the future. **John B.** added that it would be nice for the CAC members to be able to see that plan when it's available. **Gene Caywood**, chair, opened the floor to Mr. Berman, the owner of Benjamin Supply and allowed him time to speak and address the CAC members. **Mark Berman** said "when this process started about eight or nine years ago, we looked at ways of saving both buildings and you know, I wish there was. I have done more to keep our building as historic as possible. I never thought the retaining wall was seven feet, I thought it was five. But, a five foot retaining wall on your sidewalk, makes the building unusable. We have thought about the possibility of taking it back somewhat so we could have truck access and save part of the building... I can't see how it can go down fast enough for us to have a right turn at Aviation, maybe it can, but if it's seven feet at the corner, fifty feet away it can't be zero. I'm happy to look at any way to save as much of that building as possible." **Michael B.** added that their site plan works with the owners plan in terms of the operational characteristics necessary for the delivery of vehicles. **Susan Gamble motioned to have staff look at the various suggested options presented by Gene Caywood in his handout, with the understanding that the City will check all options. Mr. Burman (owner) will be included in discussions as appropriate. Susan Marshall seconded the motion. Kylie W.** said she want to add to the discussion how to sign that crossing. Do we ban bikes from using it? **Michael B.** said that there are bike lanes along Barraza Aviation that cyclist can use. **There was further discussion about possible routes for cyclist to use. Susan Marshal** clarified the words of the motion she seconded. **Korey Kruckmeyer** asked if this further investigation was being conducted without concurrence from owners of Benjamin Supply. **Sam C.** said that owners are included in any conversation. **Korey K.** asked again if they were exclusively involved in this part of the review. **Sam C.** said they would certainly be included in any talk about this process. **Susan G.** suggested the words of the motion be amended slightly to make it clearer. **(The above noted motion is the final motion) Gene C. called for a vote on the motion. The vote passed unanimously with one abstention. Richard Mayers** asked if this would go back to the bicycle/pedestrian committee. **Gene C.** said that since it's an issue that the entire CAC cares deeply about it makes more sense to include it in the full CAC discussion. **John B.** asked a question about a drainage facility that passes beneath the building and what might happen if you took a corner of the building off, he wanted to be sure the structural analysis would cover something like the example that he gave.

- **Subcommittee Reports**

- **Public Art Review – Mary Ellen Wooten** said that she, Sam Credio and Tom Fisher had a preliminary meeting with Simon Donovan and also that they were in the process of moving through approvals. She anticipates that the selected artist will be under contract for about a month before they can really start working. She also said that the interviews for the interactive sculpture for the Deck Plaza was scheduled for September 4, 2014. She said that the artists are just getting a feel for the large variety of structures and surfaces available for art application and so there is no design approach yet. The next step is be to bring the artists back to the selection panel for input. **Kristi Frank** asked about the design and art application of the bridge at 6th Avenue. **Mary W.** said it was very complex, but they are looking at it. **Michael B.** added that they would be working with the selected artist on form liner and hand rail design.
- **Deck Plaza Review – Daniela Diamente** briefly updated the committee on the Dunbar Spring neighborhood comments and concerns; the neighborhood is questioning the twenty-four foot wide fire lane requirement from Ash Street to 9th Avenue; no bollards at Ash Street raise safety concerns especially as it relates to the interaction between cars, bicyclist and pedestrians; the heat island affect; graffiti and safety in the area. Daniela also reminded the team that native plants and shrubs should be the only acceptable planting material used, and said that the Dunbar Spring neighborhood has spent a lot of time over the years making sure the

neighborhood stayed true to this idea. Daniela thought that using the Watershed Management Group might be beneficial to the project. Daniela also said that she wanted to spend more time talking about concerns regarding the roadway width. Sam Credio thought that topic should be addressed at a subcommittee meeting. **John B.** asked a question about the code for one-way fire access and its dimension; Sam clarified for John that the code for one-way fire access is twenty-feet. **Daniela D.** suggested the subcommittee meet one more time, but wanted to clarify that they could still request changes after the 90% plan submittal. **John B.** asked about utilities and Mike B. told him they were pretty sound in terms of where the utilities gear is and where they will need to go. **John B.** also wanted to know about as-built utilities and how that would work. **Mike B.** answered and said that when they begin projects they map them on the surface and underground, they are then mapped onto electronic files. He noted that there are always issues that aren't shown, they have to determine whose line it is, whether or not it's active/abandoned and then adjust in the field accurately. **Sam C.** said that if there were any issues they could 'pothole', which is essentially where they'd drill a hole in the ground and determine if there are any utilities in the area.

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Review** – **Kylie Walzak** said the Tucson-Pima County Bicycle Advisory Committee was meeting on Wednesday (August 13, 2014) and that she would debrief their comments to the full committee at the next meeting. **Tom F.** informed the CAC members about a recent fatality.
- **RTA VA Review** – **John Burr** noted that the subcommittee would not meet until after the 90% plan submittal.

6. Next Steps

Items for Future Meetings

Sam C. suggested a full CAC meeting in October and said that until then there really wouldn't be any updates to report. **John Burr** wanted to know if some of the items from the submittal could be summarized and agenized for the next meeting. He also requested that if any information comes back about the 7th Ave. and 7th Street building they'd like to do another onsite meeting so that they are up to date for the full CAC meeting in October. **Gene C.** suggested they have a map on the Main Avenue crossing or it be agenized for the next meeting. **Richard M.** said that it's not clear to cars that they need to yield pedestrians at the Main Ave crossing, they often just proceed without stopping. There was additional conversation regarding this crossing.

discussion continued about this area. **Gene C.** thought it would be a good idea to have an onsite meeting at the Main Ave. crossing and whoever is interested is welcome to show up. Gene also asked that additional information related to Mr. Burns property located on 6th Street/7th Avenue be presented at the next CAC meeting. **John B.** asked the project team to try to prepare meeting materials in advance of the meetings; he felt that having advanced materials before the start of each meeting would be helpful on some of the stuff that is more complex.

Confirm Future Meeting Dates

The team believed a CAC meeting in September would not be necessary and discussed the option of making the next full CAC meeting on Monday, October 13, 2014; however, since October 13th is recognized as Columbus Day, and is a national holiday, the team told CAC members they would let them know at a later date when the next CAC meeting would be held.

7. Call to the Audience

Mark Berman

What I would like to propose is, I'd like to find out the elevation changes that are going to be needed for the road vs. grade and the sidewalk and I'd be happy to have one of our contractors put up something so people can come and see how tall the road is and where it would be at various points because it's taller than I thought and I don't really have an understanding. I don't see how this HAWK is going to work and get back down to grade level.

Laura Mielcarek

I'd like to let the committee know that there is a tremendous amount of salvaging of materials going on in this project, not including the buildings. We are salvaging the sidewalks and using that for scupper armor, seating on terraces and paving material on the deck plaza. We are salvaging the curbs and using those for weirs and water harvesting. We are salvaging boulders, ocotillo, saguaro and barrel cactus. Whatever concrete we don't use we are crushing and mixing it with screen rock for the inner material, the hardscape material and the planting areas. We are also salvaging rock mulch and using it as rock check downs near Broadway. I just wanted to let everyone know that despite the fact that I don't know what's going to happen with the buildings, and salvaging/the reuse of materials in the buildings. We are salvaging a lot of material on this project and it is already included in the 90% plans.

8. Adjournment at 7:01 p.m.