

DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY  
Monday, April 14, 2014

*Approved at the Downtown Links CAC meeting on Monday, June 9, 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  
John A. Sedwick, Fourth Avenue Merchants Association  
Kylie Walzak, Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee  
Gail Ryser, Barrio Anita Neighborhood Association  
Kristi Frank, El Presidio Neighborhood Association  
Richard Mayers, West University Neighborhood Association  
Mary Ellen Wooten, Tucson-Pima Arts Council  
Carlos Lozano, Tucson - Pima County Historical Commission  
Susan Gamble, Warehouse Arts Management Association  
Michael Keith, Downtown Tucson Partnership  
Korey Kruckmeyer, Pie Allen Neighborhood Association  
Susan Marshall, Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

VACANT, Iron Horse Neighborhood Association  
Daniela Diamente, Dunbar Spring 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  
Kathy Jirschele, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations  
Joan Beckim, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations

**1. Meeting Called to Order**

Quorum confirmed. John Burr called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. (Gene Caywood, Chair arrived shortly after call to order and resumed the regular responsibilities as Chair of the committee.)

**2. Introduction of Committee Members and Staff**

CAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves.

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

The minutes of February 10, 2014 were unanimously approved with changes. (*Changes will show correction of typo*)

**4. Announcements**

- **Joan Beckim** announced that service of the Streetcar will begin with a celebration on Friday, July 25, 2014. Friday, Saturday and Sunday, July 25 – 27 service will be free to all riders.
- **John Burr** announced that Downtown Urban Overlay will be merged with a sub group. John Burr stated that the next time the CAC meets we need to have Corky Poster give an update on the overlay districts. John Burr gave a brief explanation of some of the changes and a description of the new sub group and infill districts.

## 5. Reports and Presentations

- **Web site update** – **Sam Credio** began with brief presentation of the look for the new web site. He showed the members the gallery of photos, pointing out the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Drainage and St. Mary’s construction photos. He then showed them the CAC page which will house all the agendas, approved minutes and materials from the CAC meetings. **John Burr** asked if the old documents would still be available. **Sam C.** explained that most would still be available in the archived section, but anything older than 2002 or 2003 would go back to TDOT to be housed, but would still be available to the public. They just need to make the request for the material they want. **Tom Fisher** suggested John B. provide a list of documents he thinks should remain available on the web site. The site is expected to be live before the ribbon cutting celebration for the Phase 2 St. Mary’s construction project.
- **Construction progress update** – **Sam Credio** updated the members on the progress of the project. He explained that TDOT performed the final walk through and presented their punch list items to the contractor. The contractor has 15 days to complete the items detailed on the punch list. The final striping is scheduled for 8 p.m. on April 22 and will take three nights to complete. The artwork is partially installed. The kiosk on St. Mary’s has been installed. There is a second element that needs to be installed on “A” mountain, however, the artist’s partner passed away, so TDOT has been working with him to develop a strategy to get the artwork installed. **Kylie Walzak** asked about the bike delineators and if they were going to be installed at the same time as striping. Sam said they would be installed the week following striping. On Thursday, May 1 they will have the ribbon cutting to celebrate the completion of the St. Mary’s project. It will be held at the vacant lot on Hughes Street and St. Mary’s Road. Food provided by Barrio Anita Market, and music by the Davis School Mariachi Band. Sam invited everyone to attend and celebrate the completion of Phase 2 of the Downtown Links project. Sam then gave a brief photo ‘tour’ of the St. Mary’s construction project. **Gail Ryser** asked if *Do Not Block Intersection* signs could be installed at the intersection of St. Mary’s Road and Hughes Street. Sam said he would have the Traffic Dept. look in to it. **Richard Mayers** asked why the pedestrian refuge at the intersection of Main Avenue and 6<sup>th</sup> Street did not have a crosswalk. **Sam C.** replied that it is not striped because it is an unmarked crossing, however there will be one at Church. **Sam C.** also said that it can be evaluated later, and if it’s determined that one is needed it can be added later. **John Burr** also stated that infrastructure for a HAWK crossing had been installed during the Phase 2 construction of St. Mary’s Road.
- **Design progress update** – **Sam Credio** stated that the 75% comments had been submitted to HDR for revisions. A lot of the revisions are a result of the discussions and input from the CAC and include revisions to the bike and pedestrian facilities as requested by the group as well as TDOT. The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) coordination is in full swing with HDR ready to submit the full set of plans for the 6<sup>th</sup> Street underpass to them for review and comment. There will also be some boring work to obtain additional soil samples near the bridge. **Sam C.** reminded everyone that if they see workers and drill rigs in the area, it does not signify a start of construction. Utility coordination will be ongoing through construction. The team has had some meaningful conversations with Tucson Water, Wastewater and Century Link, and have determined that additional data is needed in order to complete the design. The majority of the information will be obtained through a pot-holing process. Some of that work has already begun and it may involve short turn lane restrictions while workers are in the area. Regarding drainage, the team has begun the permitting process with the Army Corp of Engineers. This is critical for the work that will be done in the Tucson Arroyo Wash. They are currently finalizing the Right-of-Way (ROW) easement requirements for the partial acquisitions (they already know which parcels are full acquisitions). Once they have the plans finalized, they will meet with Real Estate to go over each property. **John Burr** asked about the Corbett building. **Tom Fisher** said they had to do an Order of Immediate Possession (OIP) – he will talk more about it later in the presentation. **Tom F.** reviewed the three ADOT properties that will be impacted; 140 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street

(Orange Juice Warehouse), 530 N. Stone Avenue (owner is happy in his new location) and 510 N. Stone Avenue. The project only needs the north half of the property at 510 N. Stone Avenue. Interestingly, the north half was built in 1950's while the original building, the south half, was built in the 1930's. They need to determine what impact demolishing the north of the building will do to the rest of the structure. WAMO would like to see it preserved. TDOT arranged a field trip for WAMO, Harvest, Jonathan Mabry and ADOT to tour the building. There is a hole cut in the middle of the roof, and a hole cut in the middle of the floor, there are banana trees growing inside and there is a water harvesting tank inside. Structurally the building is a little shaky. It is a double brick structure with steel beams. ADOT said there is 500 feet of roofing that has asbestos in it and all of the metal structures, doors as well as windows, contain lead. All of these items would need to be mitigated. The city is open to preserving it, but the property is owned by ADOT. So, who pays for the mitigation? And who pays for maintaining the building? ADOT does not want to maintain it. **Tom F.** said there is ongoing conversations with the TDOT director about the worthiness of maintaining the structure. ADOT will move forward with demolition on the other two structures at 140 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 530 N. Stone Avenue. There was a question asked about whether WAMO had any use for the materials in particular from Matt Bevel and (inaudible word) **Tom F.** said an adjacent property owner was interested in the beams. **Tom F.** said one of the questions that came up when the group met, was what happens to the materials when the structures get demolished. He went on to explain that when the demolition contractor determines cost, they factor in the value of materials because they can resell them. **Tom F.** also explained that the cost of saving materials from some of the building would come out of the project budget. Also, if the city bought them, they would belong to the city and be under city control to use where they wanted. If WAMO wanted to purchase some materials they could negotiate with ADOT. **John Burr** asked if there was some way to develop a public/private partnership. **Sam C.** interjected that it was his understanding that ADOT would have to put the materials up for auction. There was additional discussion regarding WAMO and other organizations and what impact their feedback could have regarding the warehouses. **Carlos Lozano** said that for the record, the orange juice warehouse (140 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street) is not individually listed in the National Historic Registry, however, it is potentially eligible in a pending historic district. So it does have some value. He also referenced a Brownfield Study that conducted environmental studies, like soil samples. He wanted to make sure our efforts didn't duplicate the Brownfield Study. He also said he would like the opportunity to review the document if anyone was able to put their hands on it. **Tom** said that there is a lot of environmental studies going on along the corridor right now. **Tom F.** said he recently met with ADEQ (Arizona Department of Environmental Quality) and noted that there are dozens of monitoring wells along the corridor and in the downtown area because of a plum of Union Pacific diesel fuel that is migrating from downtown towards the Santa Cruz River. There are also dry cleaning fluids from the old Alders Cleaner site on 5<sup>th</sup> Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue that are also migrating northwest. **Carlos L.** asked in regards to 510 N. Stone property, what is the next step? Does ADOT provide a dollar amount of what it would cost to preserve the building? There was additional conversation about WAMO submitting a letter and further evaluation by TDOT. **Tom F.** asked if the city pays money to stabilize the building, who owns it? Who is going to buy it? What is it going to be? The city can't buy a warehouse without a purpose for it. It has to be for something. **Sam C.** said ADOT will begin the abatement process on the 140 W. 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 530 N. Stone properties, but TDOT will ask them to hold off doing anything with the 510 N. Stone property until they have determined what will be done.

**Sam C.** reviewed his expectations for the next steps for the Deck Plaza Design, Public Art, Bicycle Pedestrian design review, 90% plans, Property Acquisitions and Land Use Redevelopment

- **Deck Plaza Design** – contract modification for the Deck Plaza conceptual design has been approved and final design can begin. TDOT was able to acquire an additional parcel of property that will be added to the Deck Plaza footprint. Sam would like the subcommittee to meet again to discuss the additional parcel as well as wrap up previous discussions so that the team can move forward with final design.
- **Public Art** – Mary Ellen Wooten will give her update later in the meeting.

- **Finalize Bicycle/Pedestrian Design Review** – we will cover some of those items tonight, and reminded the members that it is a critical element that needs to get wrapped up.
- **Finalize the 90% plans by the end of summer 2014** – this is really important because several things get triggered at 90%. Partial property acquisitions and utility relocations can begin at this stage.
- **Property Acquisitions** – Real Estate has already begun the process for “full acquisition” of five properties. They are still evaluating several “partial acquisition” properties. Sam said he anticipates that this evaluation will be completed in the next couple weeks and they can begin preparing legal descriptions and right-of-way plans.
- **Land Use Redevelopment** – There are three areas, Steinfeld Warehouse area, Citizens Warehouse area and the ADOT parcels on Stone Avenue that are the areas for redevelopment. The plan is to move forward with design completion so that more elaborate conversations can begin in regards to potential redevelopment of these properties. Tom F. said that there are several interested parties, but nothing is determined at this point. John B. suggested a CAC discussion with a full vote on what should happen with the properties. Michael Keith said the information relating to the parcels that get freed up and identified needs to be made available to interested parties. John B. said he thinks that is a second step. The overlay process (inaudible audio) and then we’ll know how the parcels fit into an overall plan. There was additional conversation regarding coordination with Fire, Environmental Services and utility services.
- **Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Review** – **Sam C.** reminded the members of the list of 14 bicycle/pedestrian facilities that have been under review for the past several months. Some have already received concurrence from the group, others have been tabled waiting on either more information or on renderings. (renderings can be viewed at [www.downtownlinks.info](http://www.downtownlinks.info))
  - a) **Conversion of the westbound bus lane on Broadway under the UPRR with a cycle track connecting to Aviation bikeway (RTA VA SR04-005) – Concur**  
**John Burr** asked for clarification on how many through lanes there would be. Sam said there are two through lanes. Sam showed the requested rendering. John B. asked about N/S crosswalks. Sam said they are not planned at this time. The Snake Bridge is available for N/S connection, also because of Barraza Aviation, there are no sidewalks coming from the south. There is also a multi-use path (MUP) further south on Aviation that connects to the snake bridge that connects to the MUP. Tom F. said it could be done, but they need to figure out the need and if it’s a duplication of the Snake Bridge crossing. There was further discussion regarding a N/S/ crosswalk on the eastern leg of the Barraza/Broadway intersection. Susan Marsh asked about the size of the intersection in comparison to others around town. John B asked how long the current traffic signal cycle was. Mary Ellen Wooten asked about the location of the MUP on the north side of the road. Kylie Walzak asked about number of westbound lanes leading into downtown. Kylie thought that reducing the number of lanes into downtown and narrowing the roadway width would alleviate some of the problem. Michael K. said he agrees with John B., there should be a crosswalk even if nobody uses it. Susan M. asked if it was a simple thing to do. Sam said geometrically, it was a simple thing. Sam said they will take a look at it. Richard Mayers said that it is a less used intersection than Campbell, and it would be a shame not to provide that last piece of connectivity.
  - b) **MUP connection at the Snake Bridge and west of Stevens Avenue – Concur**  
**Gene Caywood** asked what the benefit of having two parallel paths was. **Richard M.** stated that the existing path and the new path serves two separate purposes. The existing path provides access to the park. **Mary Ellen W.** said it creates much better access. There was additional conversation regarding the two pathways. **Tom F.** said that the plans Iron Horse neighborhood has to expand the park will probably play out in the next year or so. Richard M. said that if you actually walk or ride the existing path, it would become clearer why the second path is needed. **Gene C.** asked how many agree with

Richard M. to keep it as drawn. There was a show of hands indicating **consensus to keep the paths as drawn.**

c) **MUP ramp connection to the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue pocket park – Concur**

TDOT supports the inclusion of this design element, impacts to the existing park have not been completely vetted with Mayor and Council and the City Manager's office. He also stated that there are some Century Link vaults that need to be considered and also that they would have to remove infrastructure that the city has already invested in. **Richard M.** asked if it was possible to have a curb cut at Hoff and put some type of signage up so pedestrians or bicyclist know where to get off before they run into the new little Café.

d) **MUP narrowing at MSF – Concur**

e) **MUP crossing at the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Spur – Concur**

f) **MUP north/south transition at 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Tabled**

**Sam C.** said he challenged the design team with all of the members concerns and they came up with an MUP round-a-bout. **Sam C.** instructed the members on how the round-a-bout feature would function. **John B.** asked about Corbett people. **Tom F.** said they have been paid the fair market value – so we can proceed with our improvements while the litigation continues. **Kylie W.** asked if the owners of the Corbett building were concerned about losing the parking along their building. **Tom F.** said there is plenty of access points but if needed, we could provide access from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue also. **Gene C.** thinks the round-about is a very good solution. **Kylie W.** had a question regarding the scale of the rendering. There was discussion about the rendering. **Michael Bertram** explained the process of creating the renderings. **Tom F.** reminded the group that they had a SHPO requirement not to block the old underpass. The rendering shows we have accomplished that. He also said there had been questions asked about what would happen if, in future years, they wanted to rebuild the old underpass. **Tom F.** said it could be done without affecting the new structure. **Gene C and John B** both commented on building the new structure to accommodate the potential of rebuilding the old one someday was a sound time and money investment. **Gene C.** asked the members if this item could be moved to Concur. **Michael K.** said he thought the round-a-bout provided answers to the concerns they had. **Kylie W.** asked about eastbound bicyclist or pedestrians wanting to continue eastbound. There was discussion regarding the round-a-bout dimensions and turning radiuses. **Richard M.** said he really likes what they did. **Sam C.** said they followed FHWA guidelines. The members agreed to provide an **Advisory Concurrence**, with the team agreeing to show the NE corner flattened to provide a better radius for bicyclist.

g) **MUP crossing at 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue/UPRR – Concur**

h) **MUP crossing at 6<sup>th</sup> Street/Maclavio Barraza Parkway intersection and connection to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Tabled**

Everyone agreed that the switch-back originally portrayed for this area wasn't the best idea, so they have redesigned it to have the MUP connection to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue reconfigured to eliminate the "switch-back". The also reconfigured the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue terminus to allow delivery access to the property owners delivery docks and will add a screen wall and landscaping to separate 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue from 6<sup>th</sup> Street and provide a clear distinction between the path and the sidewalk. **Gene C.** said this is much better than what they had before. **Kylie W.** asked for clarification on what bicyclist or pedestrians crossing 6<sup>th</sup> Street had to do when they reached the north side of the road. **Sam C.** said they have to use the path to get to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. **Sam C.** said maybe they could add steps for pedestrians, but it wouldn't be the ADA route. **Mike B.** said they need to determine how far the steps come into 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and make sure that it doesn't interfere with trucks accessing the loading dock. The members agreed to **CONCUR with INCLUSION OF STEPS**

i) **Stone Avenue/6<sup>th</sup> Street intersection configuration – Tabled**

**Sam C.** said that since the members had voiced concerns regarding the size of the

intersection, they escalated it to TDOT's Directors office. After review and consideration, he determined that the turn lanes need to remain as designed. He then showed the rendering for the intersection and reviewed the elements. He said they purposefully left the pump house in the drawing so that the members could see how much farther in the air the bridge would have to be in order to clear it. There was further discussion regarding the pump house. The goal is to dry-up this underpass. The pump house should not be necessary. The new storm drain facility works entirely by gravity. There was also discussion related to the design of the bridge structure itself. **Michael B.** said it was designed as a single structure and could theoretically be installed over night with minimal impact to traffic. There will be lighting on the bridge. The span is 150-feet long. **Michael B.** said the bridge is longer than it has to be, but it provides a more open view into the downtown area. **Gene C.** asked what the height from ground level to the new abutments was. **Michael B.** said it was 6 – 7 feet. **Michael K.** asked if there were other truss designs. He thinks these are ugly. **Michael B.** said there are many other designs that could be used. There was further discussion regarding the design. **Kristi Kelly** asked how tall the structure was. **Michael B.** said it is 10-feet tall at the center span. **Richard M.** said he does not like how wide the road is. **Michael B.** said the right turn lane is the only addition to this section of roadway. **Kylie W.** said she thought the rendering was supposed to show the perspective from a pedestrian point-of-view. **Sam C.** said that there is an opportunity for a 5<sup>th</sup> rendering and that if collectively, as a group, we find that there is one more area that is specifically troubling they could produce one more rendering. **John B.** asked if the pump house could be moved north by about 4 feet. The pump house sits on UPRR ROW. **Tom F.** also said they are trying to not create little pockets of unusable property. **Gene C.** suggested negotiating with UPRR. **Gail R.** said that if the underpass is only 6-feet, will it be a pallet for spray paint. **John B.** asked if we knew the cost of moving the pump house. **Richard M.** said there are a group of people who really like to look at trains. **Tom F.** said it's important to begin the conversation of what the look and feel of the corridor should be. **Kristi K.** asked what we think about looking at Cadence when we come into downtown. She said this is probably the most important part of the project. **Mary Ellen W.** said art panel will get input, and eventually we'll get to a really good complimentary art feature there. **Kylie W.** said she thought it interesting to make such a big deal about the pump house, but if we look at the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Seventh Street bridge, it is blocking the view shed of all the warehouses on Toole Avenue. **John B.** said he would like to see continuity with lighting, interaction of the bike/pedestrian facilities so that it creates more of a sense of place. We need to look at each of the elements as distinct. **Kylie W.** said the shape of the bridge looks like the shape of Matt Bevel's beams – and this could be a nice opportunity to demonstrate what we're sacrificing. **Mary Ellen W.** said these are the precise types of questions that will be asked of the artists. **TABLED**

**j) MUP crossing at 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue/UPRR – Tabled**

**Sam C.** said he knows this item will remained tabled because they still have some work to do on it. They are exploring the option of removing emergency fire access from the RR crossing and the also need to vet the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue circulation with Fire, environmental Services and possibly others. Sam said they should have something to show the CAC at a June meeting.

**k) Church Avenue eastbound channelized right turn – Tabled**

**l) Church Avenue north/south Crosswalk – Tabled**

**(These two items where discussed together)** **Sam C.** said we will talk about the channelized right turn, but he also wants to talk about the north/south crossing. The plans now show a north/south crossing at this intersection. In addition, the members can see where the new access point for the University Service Annex (USA) building is. After looking at a "T" intersection for this location, and what the additional impacts to properties in the area would be, they decided to leave the channelized right turn. They

will add the pedestrian signs with blinking LED's and pertinent striping and signing that is needed. **Richard M.** asked if this crossing had some kind of impact on the crossing at Main. **John B.** asked if we could send out the plan views along with renderings. **Michael K.** would like an arrow on the plan view that shows where the point of view is from. **John B.** still has a problem with the free right and believes it encourages high-speed traffic into downtown area. **John B.** said it is a perception of pedestrians vs. drivers. **Kylie W.** asked about information on the Road Diet plan. **Sam C.** said he doesn't have it and will have to look into it. Permanent four-way stop will remain at Franklin. **Richard M.** wanted to know how the channelized right, four-way stop and the Road Diet will all work together? **John B.** said that the team is moving in the right direction, but this item will **Remain Tabled** General concept can move forward but it is tabled until there are additional answers to the questions posed.

**m) Main Avenue Crossing – Tabled**

**Sam C.** said that there will be a median refuge at Main Avenue located 320-feet from Granada Avenue and 450-feet from Church Avenue, but they will not be installing a HAWK crossing at the Main Avenue location. **Richard M** said he would like to see striping at this location. **Sam C.** said that at crossing locations, where there are plenty of gaps in traffic flow, TDOT agrees that median refuges provide safety and offer convenience to pedestrians who need to cross. **Richard M.** agreed that since there was going to be a signalized crossing at Church Avenue, which would offer gaps in traffic, it should solve the problem. **Sam C.** said that the conduit and infrastructure for a HAWK is in place at the Main Avenue intersection. If in the future it is determined that one is needed, it can be installed. The members agreed to **Concur on this item.**

**n) Physical barrier between bike lanes and vehicle lanes. Concur**

These devices will be installed the last week in April. There will be about 50 of these installed along St. Mary's between I-10 and Church Avenue. The bases are smooth so that if you hit it, it gives you an opportunity to correct. The bases and tubing will be white with green reflectors. The striping will be two double white lines with hatching in between. There was additional discussion regarding color schemes and additional areas along the corridor where they could be used. **Gail R.** asked how bicycle lights reflect off of them. Sam will ask the manufacturer.

**Subcommittee reports**

- RTA VA – possible meeting in late May?  
Deck Park – coordination with Daniela Diamente and Wheat Design Group  
Bicycle/Pedestrian – no meeting needed  
Public Art – **Mary Ellen Wooten** said she is putting together the panel. She has sent to Neighborhood Association presidents and is not getting responses from some of them. She needs a response from Armory Park. **John B.** said he would talk to Mary Ellen about a representative.  
Barrio Anita – **Mary Ellen** asked if Gail R. could be on the panel since she was part of the subcommittee. The Ward office recommended Brad Lancaster for Dunbar Spring, but the neighborhood president is seeking another representative as well. El Presidio will be represented by Artes Nunan (sp?). Iron Horse, Nancy Robbins said she's not the president any more, but she would like to be on the panel. Mary Ellen said she has a representative from Pie Allen. Chris Ganze for West University. There was conversation about West University neighborhood not having a president. **John B.** suggested Mary Ellen send an email to the CAC members (through Kathy) with what she needs, and they can help her get in touch with the appropriate people. Mary Ellen said she is asking Tony Ford from Maker House, Susan Gamble has agreed to represent WAMO, Ceci Garcia will probably be the representative for the Warehouse District, there will be someone from the Design Team and Sam Credio. from TDOT. **Mary Ellen W.** said she would also like Susan Marsh to be on the panel since she was on the Art Subcommittee. The practice of contacting Neighborhood Presidents is a fairly standard way that they've been doing things the last several years. **Mary Ellen** will get the meetings together as soon as she gets the panel set-up. **John B.** asked how long of a process is once the panel has been established. **Mary Ellen** said it

could take a couple years. The meetings are intermittent. First they'll review the applications that have been submitted. Then the panel selects the finalists and there will be a finalist input meeting and interviews. There is a long process of getting them under contract. Once they're under contract, the panel will come back together and bring the panelist to this type of meeting where there is still broader input so the artists can hear all the different goals people have for the artwork. The artists will go into their design process and the panel will review those a couple times. **Mary Ellen** said she also likes to hold the panel meetings during the day. **Kristi K.** asked if there was anyone from the Historic Commission that would be represented on the panel. **Mary Ellen** said she has looked at the panel participants more from a location point of view, but the input certainly could be valuable for the design. **Sam C.** reminded everyone that SHPO said they do not want the bridge over 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue to look like it's old. There was additional conversation regarding design criteria of the bridge. **Carlos L.** said he could provide Mary Ellen with the name of one of the planners from the Historic Commission.

## 6. Next Steps

### **Items for Future Meetings**

- Mail copies of updated corridor map, renderings and plan view to the CAC members.
- John B. thought it would be better to get input from the Arts panel before making a decision regarding the 5<sup>th</sup> rendering.
- Presentation from Corky Poster.
- Report on status of submittal to UPRR.
- Lighting will be discussed when appropriate.

### **Confirm Future Meeting Dates**

- Next CAC meeting is June 9, 2014

## 7. Call to the Audience

The following people addressed the Committee:

**Carol Clements** – which building is 510 N. Stone? The one with the trusses. She also said she wanted to take this opportunity to compliment City of Tucson, HDR Wheat Scharf and the contractor Borderland Construction for doing such a great job on the phase 2 St. Mary's Road project. Salvaging the concrete had to be difficult, but the team pulled it off beautifully. Great job.

**Natasha Winnick**, Dunbar Spring neighborhood. Would like to push for Old Main to be striped. The neighborhood has been asking for a HAWK at this location for years, but you're not going to put a HAWK in, so I would like to see it striped. If it's not striped, you have to wait a long time before you can cross, especially if it's not striped.

**Les Pierce**, Arroyo Chico NA. Back to the crossing at Broadway and Downtown Links, trying to think ahead to the future, I'm going to assume Sun Tran will eventually think about running a bus up and down Downtown Links. People walking along Broadway might want a way to get across the street to a bus stop on the north side. IN regards to the bicycle punch sticks – the group might consider contacting the bicycle group in Seattle just to see how they went over.

**John Burr** directed the team to keep the discussions going regarding the striping at Main Avenue as a concern that needs to continue to be looked at. Also, **John B.** said he thought the audience member brought up a good point about Sun Tran and asked the team how they envision Sun Tran interacting with this particular roadway and are there any questions that the CAC ought to be considering before you go to 90% plans? **Tom F.** said there are lots of moving parts as it relates to transit. The streetcar will go into service in August. There is talk about pulling back some of the routes so there's not a duplication of service. Budget cuts are also expected. It is



a bit early to talk about transit, as it relates to Downtown Links, until it is nearer completion and there has been a more in depth conversation about Ronstadt Center and overall circulation in the downtown area. There may be opportunities presented that we don't know about yet. We don't have a fixed number of buses entering Ronstadt Center at this time. But it was a good question and we need to keep it on our radar. There was additional conversation about Sun Tran, budgets and routes.

8. **Adjournment** at 8:19 p.m.