

DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DLCAC)  
DECK PARK REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, April 15, 2013

*Accepted and Approved by the Downtown Links CAC  
Deck Park Review Subcommittee on April 29, 2013*

**FROM: TDOT Project Manager Tom Fisher**

**DECK PARK SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**Chair**, Daniela Diamente, Dunbar Spring Neighborhood Association  
Kylie Walzak, Tucson-Pima Bicycle Advisory Committee  
Christopher Carroll, El Presidio Neighborhood Association  
Susan Gamble, Warehouse Arts Management Association

**PROJECT TEAM PRESENT:**

Michael Bertram, HDR Engineering, Inc.  
Kathy Jirschele, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations  
Laura Mielcarek, Wheat Scharf and Associates  
Caryl Clement, Wheat Scharf Associates  
Sam Credio, City of Tucson Department of Transportation

**DOWNTOWN LINKS CAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mary Ellen Wooten, Tucson – Pima Arts Council  
Carlos Lozano, Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission

**1. Meeting Called to Order**

Meeting called to order at 10:08 a.m. at Wheat Scharf and Associates, 442 N. 6th Avenue, Tucson, AZ  
Quorum confirmed

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

Downtown Links CAC Deck Park Review Subcommittee and Project Team Members introduced themselves.

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 11, 2013**

Motion to approve the minutes of March 11, 2013, was passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**4. Announcements**

No Announcements

**5. Staff Reports and Presentations to DLCAC**

**Sam Credio** gave a brief overview of the maintenance responsibilities of the Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT). TDOT is responsible for maintaining lighting and landscaping that is in line with typical elements of transportation projects and that TDOT cannot maintain large areas of grass or other park features. Sam also presented a concept drawing of the possible development of property located south of the railroad track. Town West owns a portion of the property. There was discussion regarding the development agreement associated with this property. Sam said that regardless of how the property is eventually developed, the City is committed to keeping the bike and pedestrian path open.

## Continued Deck Park Concept Presentation

Members of Wheat Scharf's team presented two different concepts for the Deck Park. **Laura Mielcarek** asked the members to hear both concept presentations and then the group could talk about what they liked and didn't like from each concept. She said her goal from today's meeting is to walk away a single concept that Wheat Scharf can develop further and show to the full CAC at the meeting scheduled for May 13, 2013. **Michael Bertram** reminded the members that they are in the process of finalizing the feasibility report, and the Deck Park elements selected today will be part of the final scope and design.

**Laura M.** began by giving an overview of the two concepts that would be presented. One will be a neighborhood type park and the other will be more of a civic type space. She also said that there will be constants in both concepts. There will always be shade, seating, lighting, art, gathering spaces, pedestrian and emergency vehicle access and bike lanes. There will be water harvesting. It will be low maintenance. They also plan to reuse materials from the site as well as from the demolished structures.

**Chelsea Marshall** presented the "civic" space, or neighborhood meets downtown. Highlights of the plan are:

The bike path will be located along the east side of the deck

Possible reuse of brick pavers

Seating area, with the high point in the middle

Art installations that can be used by both children and adults, or temporary art installations.

Planters that provide a greater soil depth and are located along areas that maximize load.

Trees can be about 12 feet tall

Shade structure is cantilevered over and angled toward the planting area

Area for food trucks

Trying for a type of transparency with the fencing material

**Sam C.** said there may be rail road ties available to use from the St. Mary's construction project.

**Heidi Flugstad** presented the neighborhood backyard concept and asked the question, "what elements make people want to go there every single day?" Highlights of the plan are:

The area is not big enough for a dog park.

Grassy shady areas pull people in. She is recommending turf. Heidi said buffalo grass requires half the water of regular Bermuda grass.

Playground with interactive play structures and climbing wall

Possible off leash dog area

Gathering space

Space for food trucks

Central performing area

Shade structure that also functions as a passive water harvesting feature

Terracing that is faced with Core-10 steel

Stabilized decomposed granite

Planters

Trees located off the deck or along center line piers

**Chris Carroll** asked about the edge of the park that faces 6th Street. What will it look like from the drivers' point of view? **Laura M** said they have been thinking about it, but part of it will be determined by what TDOT requires. **Michael B.** said it will most likely be some type of form line work in line with the design of the Deck Park.

**Linda Samuels, (audience member)** gave her opinion of the two concepts. She liked the materials and color pallets being used. She thought the tiered aspect help break up the "vast un-shaded platform".

**Susan G.** likes both concepts. She likes the tiered effect. Likes the re-use of materials. Likes the possibility

of transition from this space to the Town West space.

**Daniela D.** likes booth concepts also, but leans more towards the “civic” concept because there was more opportunity for shade. Daniela asked how we could incorporate more shade into the final concept. Daniela said she will talk to the neighborhood regarding the dog park.

**Laura M.** asked the subcommittee how they feel about the potential for turf and fill.

**Diana Rhoads** said turf brings in Parks and Rec, and they are already underfunded, so it could be a problem.

**Chris C.** loves grass, but it takes a lot of water and it takes a lot of maintenance. He added that he does not think the area is big enough or adequate for a dog park.

There was discussion regarding types of grass and watering needs and maintenance of them. The group also talked about pros and cons of an off leash dog run.

**Kylie W.** likes the idea of the turf bump out.

**Susan G.** said she likes the idea of a little refuge of green.

**Sam C.** asked if besides water harvesting, will there be an irrigation system installed. **Caryl C.** said both concepts would have irrigation, regardless of the turf component.

**Susan G.** said she thinks we should meet our challenges and design for the future. She thinks there is more opportunity here than she originally thought. Since the area is actually smaller than the smallest dog park, she thinks it’s a perfect opportunity to invest a bit more time energy and dollars to begin to solve problems as we move into other areas.

**Chris C.** sees a lot to like in both designs. He is worried about the turf, but agrees that a small grassy area would do an awful lot for the area; however he would hate to see it die.

**Daniela D.** said she likes the fist designs’ reuse of materials, particularly the brick.

**Laura M.** asked the members what their thoughts were on the two designs use of art.

**Chris C.** likes the old Tucson fat bricks, but cautioned that they should not be used where cars or bikes will drive over them because they break.

There was discussion on reusing materials.

**Kylie W.** likes the use of integrated art rather than a showcase because of the scheduling, permitting and programming aspects of a showcase.

**Chris C.** likes the thought of designing so there can be temporary installations of art.

Discussion on different types of art features.

**Carlos L.** likes the example of the shade structure that harvested water and thinks it’s a perfect opportunity for artists.

**Susan G.** would like the turf element presented.

**Michael B.** suggested Wheat Scharf marries the two concepts with the input received today. Include the tiered elements, reused materials, shade structures and other hardscape elements, then the next level determines materials used.

There was discussion regarding whether or not you could advance the design without knowing materials that will be used.

**Chris C.** said shade is crucial to everything.

**Daniela D.** said she is leaning more towards the neighborhood feel.

**Kylie W.** likes the U of A mall feature because it does not prescribe where you have to sit

**Michael B.** what happens if the turf can’t be used?

Discussion about alternate options for the area if there was no turf element.

**Sam C.** will discuss with TDOT and coordinate with Parks and Rec, and Gary Whitmore.

**Caryl C.** suggested the Wheat Scharf team meet with U of A Turf Management to obtain hard facts. What is the water usage, mowing requirements and maintenance? That way they’re armed with facts when they make their presentation and maybe won’t get an immediate no answer.

Discussion about the location of turf on the structure, watering on the structure and possible leaching.

**Michael B.** said o.k. for turf on the box, but he is concerned about turf on the deck.

Additional discussions regarding turf and its possible location within the Deck Park and other design elements of the Park.

**6. Next Steps**

**Items for Future Meetings**

Wheat Scharf will prepare designs to present to the subcommittee for review, prior to taking to full CAC.

**Confirm Future Meeting Dates**

Laura from Wheat Scharf Associates said she would need time to consult with her staff before she could determine when they could be ready for the next meeting. She will coordinate with Kathy Jirschele, who will then let the subcommittee know the date of the next meeting.

**7. Call to the Audience**

None

**8. Adjournment at 11:48 a.m.**