

October 16, 2007

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #4
Meeting Summary**

A meeting of the TAC was held from 10:00 am -12:20 pm on October 16, 2007 at the Public Works building fourth floor conference room. In attendance were members Andrew Singelakis, Bea Paulus, Bill Ball, Carl Latimer, Chris Kaselemis, Don Freeman, J.T. Fey, Jose Carballeira, Rob Soler, Sandy Elder, Tom Thivener and Vince Catalano. Project staff present included Andy McGovern and Janice Cuaron and consultant team staff Alejandro Angel, Angela Stith, Claudia Perchinelli, Darlene Showalter, Dave Dobler, Edie Griffith-Metty , Freda Johnson and Jay Van Echo.

1. Welcome and Introductions;

Janice Cuaron, project manager welcomed everyone and invited them to introduce themselves and tell of their affiliation. She explained that this meeting would be focusing on the 22nd Street widening portion of the project and a similar process and matrix would be used in the future for the intersection. Janice also noted that any of the three alternatives presented today would be able to work with either of the three intersection alternatives.

2. Overview of Alternatives

Edie provided an overview of the three 22nd St. Widening from Kino to Tucson Blvd. alternatives. The first alternative is a middle alignment where widening along 22nd St. would occur on the north and south sides of the street. During construction two lanes of the current road would be used during construction to allow one lane of traffic in each direction. This alternative is estimated to take the longest time and be most costly because traffic will have to be on the original bridge alongside new bridge construction.

Alternative number two shows widening on the south portion of 22nd St. Traffic flow would be maintained on the existing bridge while construction of the new bridge occurs. Of the three alternatives this one impacts the railroad most.

Alternative number three shows widening on the north portion of 22nd St. Traffic flow would be maintained on the existing bridge while construction of the new bridge occurs. This alternative has the least impact to the railroad property.

Jay noted that all alternatives require some right of way (ROW) property acquisitions. The amount of ROW acquisitions will be determined by a land use study. He also said that all property owners along the project were invited to attend a private meeting to discuss the project and possible ROW issues. Attendance was very good but not everyone attended so follow-up contact will be made to those not yet spoken to.

3. Overview of Matrix Feedback

Angela explained how both the CAC and TAC were sent a blank copy of the alignment criteria matrix and asked to prioritize the seven criteria and then select the most important sub-criteria for each. Angela handed out a document summarizing the TAC and CAC's submissions. Priority was summarized using a point system with first priority receiving 7 points and seventh priority one point. The points for each criteria were totaled and then divided by the number of submissions. The criteria with the most points was considered the highest priority for that committee. The sub-criteria received one point for each chosen and totaled with the highest point receiving top selection under those criteria. The document showed that there was minimal difference between the two committees preferences.

4. Traffic Operations After Construction

Edie from DMJM Harris presented the matrix in order of the TAC's formulated priority. Alejandro went through each alternative's traffic operations after construction is completed. He noted that alternative two allowed continued connection of Campbell and 22nd St. to keep traffic from the Cherry intersection. He also said that alternatives one and two have slip ramps to access Plumer and stay at grade level so easy accessibility for bicycles and pedestrians. Alternative 3 would have a steeper grade up to the bridge.

Vince asked if signals were planned for Tucson Blvd. and Cherry Avenue. Andy said yes for Tucson Blvd. and Cherry would depend on the Kino/22nd St. intersection alternative chosen. Alejandro said that the ideal situation would be no signal at Cherry because it is only 500' from the Kino intersection.

Vince stated he favored alternative two because it provided bicycle and pedestrian access to cross 22nd St. under the bridge ramps. He asked if this access could be designed into the other alternatives. Jay responded that it could be accommodated with alternative three but may be more difficult for alternative one.

The group then discussed each of the sub-criteria; Way-finding, Continuity of Travel, Expedited Construction Schedule/Phasing, Maximizing Number of Travel Lanes Open, Business Access and Neighborhood Access.

Alejandro explained that way-finding was the same for all alternatives.

Vince suggested making Wilson Avenue and Fairland Stravenue cul-de-sacs and Jay said that the Parkway Terrace Neighborhood Association had also communicated that request. Andy added that neighborhoods have communicated concerns with high speeds on Fairlane Stra. and that it will be used as a cut through. He also showed that alternative two prohibits neighborhood access on Plumer out to 22nd St. Bea noted her concern with getting a 40' bus access from the Cherrybell Post Office to 22nd St. Andy agreed it would be difficult but said the team would take another look at the design and work out a way.

5. Land Use

Edie explained that the three alternatives do not impact land use but help in developing a draft framework. The area east of Barraza would probably become a neighborhood

buffer, the central area of the project would stay commercial and the west area would be mixed use.

Someone asked if the available land use space would be the same for each alternative. Jay answered that it would be close except alternatives two and three will have more open space because alternative one only requires partial acquisitions.

Janice asked if it is better to have more or less acquisitions. Andy responded that there is no difference other than cost. Someone else said they felt that sometimes teardowns stimulate urban renewal and are therefore positive and that alternate two would provide the best opportunity for expansion of the Post Office.

6. Environmental

Andy explained that all three alternatives add ten-foot sidewalks and 5-foot bike lanes. Tom was concerned that five-foot bike lanes are tight when on an overpass structure.

Bea noted that Sun Tran currently has stops at Cherry and Tucson Blvd. The route doesn't go over the 22nd St. Bridge because of the weight restrictions. She asked if alternative designs would have bus pullouts. Vince said they are required.

7. Cost

Edie explained the cost differences between the three alternatives. Alternatives one and two are close on constructability.

8. Union Pacific Railroad

Claudia presented that alternative two impacts the existing UPRR facilities the most and will require longer spans over the railroad tracks. Alternative 3 will impact the UPRR facility the least and will have the shortest spans over the rail road tracks.

9. Traffic Operations During Construction

Claudia explained the phasing of bridge construction for each alternative. Alejandro noted that alternatives two and three allow more of the roadway open during construction, which is important with the 45 thousand vehicular traffic each day. During construction the maximum capacity will be ten to twelve thousand if only one lane per direction remains open.

After each criteria discussion, Andy surveyed the TAC and filled out the matrix, shading the appropriate bubbles with the magnitude consensus from the TAC.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm.

