

**DOWNTOWN LINKS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

Monday, January 13, 2014

Accepted and Approved by the Downtown Links CAC on January 27, 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
Daniela Diamente, Dunbar Spring 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

PROJECT TEAM PRESENT:

Sam Credio, City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)
Tom Fisher, City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT)
Michael Bertram, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Kathy Jirschele, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations
Joan Beckim, Kaneen Advertising and Public Relations
Laura Mielcarek, Wheat Scharf Associates

1. Meeting Called to Order

Quorum confirmed. Chair, Gene Caywood called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

2. Introduction of Committee Members and Staff

CAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes of November 18, 2013 as written was passed by a voice vote of 14 to 0.

4. Announcements

- None

5. Staff Reports and Presentations to DLCAC

Construction and Design Progress Report –**Sam Credio** reviewed the key project elements and milestones. He noted that the demolition of the ADOT properties is expected this year. ADOT owns the properties and will schedule the work themselves. Phase III design will be finalized in 2015.

They also plan to finalize property acquisition and relocation, demolition and any environmental clean that might be required. They will also obtain the necessary permits for construction which include railroad as well as the 404. Sam C. also updated the members on the St. Mary's construction project stating first layer of pavement and temporary striping will be placed by the end of January, 2014. Because of weather constraints, the contractor will wait until March to place the final layer of asphalt, install permanent striping and complete landscaping along the project. The RTA is planning a ribbon cutting ceremony for some time in April, 2014. Susan Gamble asked if there was going to be sidewalks on the south side of the roadway, near Main Avenue, looking east. Sam C. said there will be a sidewalk with a wall behind it. Sam C. said the 75% design plans are in the TDOT review process and they hope to have comments to HDR by the end of the month. The utility companies are also reviewing the 75% plans and as soon as that process is complete, TDOT will begin meeting with them on a regular basis. Michael Keith asked about the TEP substation and if there was any talk about them feeding downtown. Sam responded that TEP has not completed their review of the plans, but TDOT will begin conversations with them as soon as they are. Michael Keith said TEP has been provided a capacity study and they may have to come up Aviation from a substation. Sam C. said the Deck Plaza will be included in the 90% plans and also confirmed that the acquisition of the small parcel of land near 9th Avenue was complete. Tom F. said that it gives us more area for landscaping at the Deck Plaza. Sam C. said this project is really complex and the dimensionally it's pretty hard to grasp because there is an overpass, an underpass, pedestrian bridges, a lot of different grade changes. TDOT definitely sees the value in renderings to help visualize what the roadway will look like. They have plans to create renderings for; the 6th Street underpass – as if you were standing at Church looking east; the Stone Avenue pedestrian bridge – as if you were standing at Stone/6th Street intersection looking south; and the 6th Avenue underpass – as if you were standing near Miller's Surplus looking south. Sam also noted that he was able to schedule Leanne Dixon, with the Federal Rail Administration, to come to our CAC meeting in February to talk to us about what it takes to establish a quiet zone. Sam C. also announced that the Downtown Links Web site is being updated. There was discussion regarding the site. There was a question about the St. Mary's construction during the GEM show. Sam said that all barricades would be picked up by the end of January. Gail R. mentioned difficulties getting out of Barrio Anita neighborhood during peak traffic. Sam hopes that with the lane restrictions being removed, it will help, but also said that he would check on the conditions and if there was anything he could do to remedy the situation he would check into it. John Burr asked if it was an appropriate time to schedule another RTA VA subcommittee meeting. Michael Bertram said that as soon as they received the 75% plan comments and had completed their review of them, they would be able to reconvene and work through them with the subcommittee. Gene C. also commented that it is important to have the history of the Downtown Links project on the website.

CAC member's discussion regarding the renaming of Barraza Aviation Parkway to Maclavio Barraza Parkway. At the January 13, 2014 Downtown Links CAC meeting there was a presentation from some of the family members about the renaming of Barraza Aviation Parkway to Maclavio Barraza Parkway, and this time was set aside for members of the team to discuss their thoughts. **Gene Caywood** said that his feeling was that you shouldn't replace one part of history just to take on another part of history. He talked briefly about the history 'aviation' in the roadway name, and how he would hate to see that part of history lost. **Korey Kruckmeyer** felt that history aside, that there was some need for continuity among the connecting roadways. **John Burr** believes that 6th Street to St. Mary's should remain the same. The new section of roadway down to Broadway is not an expressway, not a highway, not a parkway, and has spent the last 12-years making sure that's not the case, and so he's not terribly opposed to differentiating it. **Gene Caywood** referred the team to an article in last week's paper regarding the history of Stevens Avenue and how there may be another option when determining the name of the roadway. **John Burr** said that he feels that it's believed that 'parkway' or 'expressway' suggests a *more than 30 miles per hour zone* (in people's minds). Past

discussions have been held that the roadway should be between 25-30 miles per hour. There was discussion between **Susan Marshall and Gene C.** regarding the duties of the CAC as it relates to the naming of the roadway. **Gene C.** said it is the responsibility of the committee to voice their recommendation to the Mayor and Council. **Michael Keith** brought up the issue of signage and how people who are in the downtown area, just want clear signage while driving. **Mary Ellen Wooten** asked what the technical requirements for renaming the road? **Tom Fisher** answered her, by explaining that they have put together a draft form that explains some of the following questions: What is the request? What is the history of the name, both existing and potential future name. What costs are associated? etc. Council Member Fimbres suggested that this issue be put on the February 4, 2014 Mayor and Council agenda. He discussed the process of what will happen with the name, once it goes to Mayor and Council and why the committee's influence on the decision is important. **Tom F.** also reminded the members that the section of Barraza Aviation, from Alvernon to Broadway is owned by ADOT, not the city, so we don't have a say on that portion of roadway. ADOT has their own process for determining if a roadway is renamed. There was further discussion among the team members about logical beginning and ending points on the renaming of the roadway. **Daniela Diamente made a motion to recommend** to Mayor and Council renaming what is currently being referred to as "Links Avenue" from Broadway Boulevard to the new 6th Street/Links Avenue "T" intersection (basically at 7th Avenue and 6th Street) to Barraza Avenue and for the realigned section of 6th Street from west of the 6th Street/Links Avenue intersection to Main Avenue to St. Mary's Road. **Susan Marshall seconded the motion.** There was further discussion among the group about why they decided to make this motion and why they decided to only use part of the recommendation for the name change. There was also discussion regarding the properties that may need to have an address change based on the resulting name change and what portion of 6th Street will be abandoned. Susan Marshall also reminded the members that they had recommended that a portion of the public art budget be dedicated to the Maclavio Barraza memorial. **Gene C.** invited Mary Lou Barraza, daughter of Maclavio Barraza, to address the group if she wanted. Ms. Barraza said that she felt they could live with the compromise that was made by the group, and that she understands the concept that was discussed regarding the continuity between these stretches of roadway. **The motion was passed with a voice vote of 13 in favor and one abstention.**

Historic property acquisition process and progress- **Jonathan Mabry** explained that the agenda item was incorrect and that today he would not be discussing acquisitions, but rather the inventory and historic resources affected by this project. He explained that any project with federal funding or permitting, triggers the requirement to comply with federal regulations regarding historic preservation. This project has no federal funding or permitting involved. However, early on in the project, it was decided that the city would do their due diligence, and follow the federal guidelines anyway, to show that this project was seriously taking into account the effect the project would have on the historic resources and also to keep the project eligible for federal funding in the future. The city hired a cultural resource firm to conduct an inventory of all the historic and environmental resources along the corridor or have indirect effect on the project. **Jonathan M.** showed the members a footprint of the project that included all of the parcels that are touched by construction and how historic districts play into that footprint. A very thorough inventory was performed, the findings included; 15 historic streetlamps, 7 recorded historic archeological sites, 23 historic curb inscriptions, 41 historic sidewalk stamps, 23 historic buildings and 4 historic structures. This project includes the demolition of 9 buildings that are *not* historic. Most of these do not meet the criteria because they are not old enough or they have lost their integrity because they had been changed too much. There are three buildings that are historic that will be demolished and are part of the Warehouse Historic District, and four more that are eligible for historic designation that will be demolished. There will also be some alterations to the Arroyo Chico which in several places have some late 1920 underground concrete culverts. He went over different mitigation measures and how those affect different archaeological sites and what archaeologists do to document different artifacts or features

that they come across. The Downtown Links Urban Overlay District is a new zoning overlay that is optional and currently the area is a mix of different types of zoning (residential, commercial, industrial) The UOD is another form of mitigation. **Jonathan M.** went into further detail about zoning with this project and gave examples for the team. **Richard M.** asked does the overlay only apply to anyone that wants to be redeveloped. **Jonathan M.** answered him by saying that he believed that it did. Jonathan and Richard had further conversation about the UOD and the IID. There was additional conversation regarding the UOD zoning. **Jonathan M** said he is not the zoning expert and couldn't really speak to all the rules and regulations. **Tom F.** clarified by saying that once they opt in then they then can't go back. **Gene C.** asked what the City policy is on stamping and **Tom Fisher** replied that he wasn't entirely sure what the policy was, but explained that in the past on projects, they have cut out the stamp and then reset it to where that exact location was. **Jonathan M.** said that resetting them does not meet the National Historic Guidelines. Setting **Gail R.** asked if opting-in is following federal or state Historic Preservation Foundation guidelines and **Jonathan M.** answered by telling her that the historic property must meet federal guidelines. **Gail R.** also asked how they can say in the report that there will be no visual impacts when a lot of this project is still in the design phase. **Jonathan M.** then explained that there is a range that is used to determine the height of what would be considered visual impacts and that there weren't going to be any large buildings - most structures will be at grade. He also used the 6th Avenue underpass as an example and explained that what's important is to maintain the view of the façade as it is currently experienced. **Daniela D.** wanted it noted that not everyone experiences it from the same viewpoint. There was continued conversation regarding the topic. Mary Ellen Wooten said she remembered when SHPO was here they were adamant about not creating a false sense of history by replacing historic elements back in there original location. Mary Ellen asked how far you can take it. Jonathan suggested using them as public art, or somewhere where it is clear that they have been repurposed. The team then discussed appropriate ways that streetlights can be incorporated and re-introduced. **Gene C.** suggested that this be a future meeting item. **Carlos Lozano** wondered if the documentation and the UOD is enough mitigation for the demolition of seven structures. Do the stakeholders know (or have they been made aware) about all of the creative ways to mitigate the loss of these historic resources that perhaps are not obvious to them. **Jonathan** explained that the City could do more in terms of mitigation and further explanation SHPO process. He also explained that he would like to see creative ways of mitigating others in this corridor to the arts district and not just mitigating the effects on historic resources. **Carlos L.** stated that the public may not realize the adverse effect of losing an historic building until it's gone, and then it's too late to go back and the landscape will be radically different. Jonathan said right now is the time to have that conversation with the people who are designing the project. **John Burr** asked if there is any way to encourage SHPO or City policy for some of the historic items to be salvaged (for example could some of the components be used elsewhere?) **Jonathan** replied by saying that historic items can be recycled/replaced however there are some constraints on things. Jonathan also reminded the members that the demolition contractors salvage every single thing that they can. In fact, the amount of salvageable materials in a building is factored into their bid, knowing that they can salvage every historic item and resale it for profit. Tom F. also reminded the members that they don't even own the buildings that are going to be demolished, so they can't begin talking about what they will reuse within the project. Michael Keith said that it would be helpful if the website had a map and visual photographs of the historic properties within the project area. **Daniela Diamente** clarified what buildings would be demolished and **Sam** said that it would only be the three ADOT properties. Lastly, a question was raised about the acquisition process and Jonathan answered the question with a response about how it's up to the property owner if the decide to relocate, then the appraisal may, for example, be adjusted to reflect just the value of the land.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Review subcommittee recommendations to CAC- Kylie Walzak, presented a PowerPoint and distributed hand-out information to the CAC members. Kylie reviewed the process

the Downtown Links Bicycle/Pedestrian subcommittee went through. Recent updates from Tom and Sam include that they heard back from the ADA folks that they can include a HAWK signal and cross walk 7th Avenue and 7th Street, which is currently one of the most highly used bicycle and pedestrian corridors. Mayor and council told us to move forward on the recommendation of the MUP path over the 4th Avenue bridge. Currently it does not connect on the west side – it terminates at the pocket park. The subcommittee thinks it's very important to connect at that point, 9th and Stevens. Kylie said that she will summarize the big topics that came up during the subcommittee meetings. (Presentation and materials can be seen here www.downtownlinks.info) the subcommittee questioned the levels of service and travel projects? What's the data being used? Is the project still justified? Is there enough funding to complete the project without sacrificing safety and comfort for vulnerable road users? How can we make this corridor safe for all users, minimize impacts to the neighborhoods located to the north of downtown in particular. Will this project deliver to the voters a product that will meet their expectations, or deliver a subpar product resulting in buyer's remorse? Is the 2012 Traffic Analysis performed by Kittleson accurate? **Kylie W.** provided hand-out materials to further discuss these points. Downtown Tucson Partnership did a random survey on a Friday and Saturday. **Michael Keith** said that a full 70% of people who live downtown bike or walk coming into downtown and continued by saying anything we are doing to impede the progress for this group getting into downtown or making it more unsafe, needs to be looked at very seriously. Amount of non-downtown residents who used their bike or walked is 7%. **Michael Keith** said the number one and number two requests by bicyclist is to have bike protected lanes and wider bike lanes. **Kylie** said the character of downtown is changing, is the project still justified? Kylie reviewed PAG forecasts. Additionally, Pima County is preparing for a bond election and sent out a survey. Voters from across the county vote on their priorities for Bond Projects. In every zip code that participated, pedestrian safety and comfort initiatives were a priority. A newspaper article said that there is a \$364 million RTA shortfall. **Kylie** said there is an initiative across America to separate pedestrians and bicycles from cars. They would like to add speed tables at the free right turns along the corridor. **Kylie** reviewed several other points along the corridor that create access or safety issues. **Kylie** reviewed level of service along the corridor. They also have some concern about how the resources are being distributed along the corridor. **Kylie** handed out additional information about communities across the country that are tearing out project just like Downtown Links.

There was discussion regarding **Kylie W.** presentation and whether it satisfied the purpose behind why the subcommittee was formed. A special Downtown CAC meeting will be held in two-weeks to discuss the 9 intersections/crossings that may affect bicycle/pedestrians. **Daniela Diamante** agreed with what Kylie presented and thanked her for sharing her ideas. She said that she felt that Downtown Links needs to be a multi-modal roadway for different facets of travel; and that the project as a whole, should not just be designed for passengers of cars that want to bypass downtown. There was additional conversation about downtowns across America changing. **Tom Fisher** challenged the team to really consider the purpose of this project. Discussion carried on about how the 2006 model that the Downtown Links project was based on, and some of the questions that can be applied to its accuracy today. **Richard Mayers** said the content of the presentation is not something he participated in generating. He said he does not object to the content, but that there was nothing on the screen that he had a hand in. He said all the information was discussed, but the synthesis of the content in this presentation did not happen in (inaudible word) format. **Gene Caywood** told Kylie that he wanted more clarification on the nine points and whether or not they agree with the recommendations or not. He suggested they call a special meeting in two weeks to discuss the 9 points. **John Burr** said that he is not willing to entertain the discussion of the CAC not providing a recommendation for the roadway because then what he foresees happening is the RTA going ahead and building the roadway the way that *they* see it being built. Richard M. said that he would like to come back and talk about the 9 points and probably what would emerge from that is that they are not all unsatisfactory. He added that he did not object to most of the content in the presentation and he shares in a large portion of Kylie's objection to the roadway. But we have the structural problem to

deal, and he's not sure where you go with that. **Mary Ellen Wooten** said she was surprised by the presentation but isn't averse to looking at it again and make our goal to make this more livable. **Sam Credio** requested that Gene get a recommendation from the CAC about the nine points and that they have a special meeting to further discuss this. Gene C. asked for a show of hands from the members on who would be available to meet in two weeks.

By a show of hands, Gene determined that we would have a quorum for a meeting to discuss only the 9 items the subcommittee was tasked with. Gene asked Kylie to provide a chart.

Update on Call to Artists- **Mary Ellen Wooten** spoke briefly about where she was in the Call to Artist process. Tom Fisher also announced that an additional request was received from an artist who worked on previous art work at Barrio Anita.

6. Next Steps

Items for Future Meetings

- Members would like an update on RTA Funding
- Update on UOD
- Bicycle/Pedestrian update

Confirm Future Meeting Dates

- Special meeting to discuss the nine points for bicycle/pedestrian crossing on January 27, 2014
- Next CAC meeting would be February 10, 2014

7. Call to the Audience

The following people addressed the Committee:

Karen Greene Dunbar Spring neighborhood said She works and lives downtown and was riding her bike past Borderland (on/near 4th Avenue) and she was noticing how many people went by this area. She gave the example of a Bugs Bunny cartoon that humorously depicts Bugs Bunny fighting with the construction crew doing work outside of his house about this road that doesn't allow him to just get out of his house, but, rather takes him down this long stretch of road. It reminded her of how this will likely be the case for many people who live/work throughout parts of this project. She also gave the example of some projects that have happened that have left people after the fact saying, "Oh, that's not what we wanted." She believes that the new student housing on Park seems really out of scale. She thinks about the bike and amenities and how much things are going to cost and who is going to use the downtown links as a bicyclist and pedestrian, and she thought that maybe it would make more sense to use a portion of the money to really amp-up the deck park and make it really nice. She gave the example of a job that she once took, and hated. With this idea in mind, she isn't sure how despite its greatness, if the deck park will make up for the rest of the roadway. She hopes that in 5-10 years from now everyone isn't shaking their head "who would have known that this project would have created the situations that have been created."

Les Pierce from the Arroyo Chico Neighborhood Association had two ideas to address. The State of California is currently considering different traffic measures other than level of service or possibility (being multi-modal). Transportation there will not be just about cars but rather about bikes and pedestrians. She said the report is at, The California Office of Research, and she referenced where it can be found, and its title. She also wanted to suggest that the pretty, new downtown links website be useful on dial-up.

8. Adjournment at 8:18 p.m.

