



Cortaro Road/Magee Road:
Thornydale Road to Oracle Road
Community Advisory Committee Meeting



Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting
Monday, Dec. 1, 2008
6 – 7:30 p.m.
St. Mark's United Methodist Church

CAC Members Present at Meeting:

- George Ballesteros
- Robert Barr
- Kathryn Culver
- Molly Frazer
- Dennis Hansen
- Steve Sisson
- Tom Unger
- Carol Wagoner-Cook
- Bernie Wiegandt

CAC Members Not in Attendance:

- Kathy and/or Tony Gatto
- David Jacobs
- Steven Kresal
- William Scott
- Louise and/or John Whitehill-Ward
- David Williams

Attending from Project Team:

- EcoPlan: Mike Dawson
- Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT): Rick Ellis, Jacqui Andrade, Julie Simon
- AECOM: Bill Schlesinger, Jay Van Echo
- Gordley Design Group: Melissa Benton, Angie Brown

Attending from the Public:

See attached sign-in sheets

Materials Distributed:

- Agenda
- Oct. 20, 2008 Meeting Minutes
- S-Curve/Jug Handle Analysis

Bernie Wiegandt started the meeting by asking everyone to introduce themselves and whom they represent. Bill Schlesinger, Project Manager, explained that the name of

DMJM Harris has been changed to AECOM. Bill asked each of the CAC members to state his or her goals and expectations for the project.

Goals and expectations included:

- Completion of corridor to relieve traffic.
- Safe project done in timely, orderly fashion.
- Safety.
- Traffic impact to neighborhood. Expecting a traffic signal at Club Drive and Midnight Way.
- Ensure that government entities do not overlook neighborhood-friendly aspects of roadway.
- Neighborhood Association members want information and possibility of input in decisions.
- Obtain roadway in a respectful way to residents impacted.
- Continuous roadway of same nature from I-10 to Oracle Road (two lanes both ways).

Bill stated the project team's goals are the same as those of the CAC members: safety, preventing/mitigating traffic impacts, schedule and information. Their intent is for everyone to be satisfied with the process. Bill introduced the project team, as well as Nina Borgia-Aberle, artist for the project. Nina stated she was happy to be in attendance and she will be at the open house meeting with more information about the project artwork. Bill said this meeting was for the CAC; if there was time at the end of the meeting, he would take questions from the public. Bill also stated he would stay after the meeting to answer questions, if necessary.

Rick Ellis explained that a project exists west of Thornydale Road, which will be done in conjunction with this study. It is currently on hold, but will move forward when funds become available.

Q: Is that a County project?

A: No, it is a Town of Marana project in the County's jurisdiction.

Bill continued to briefly review the process of the corridor study from Thornydale Road to Oracle Road. The draft Design Concept Report (DCR) and draft environmental documents will be submitted to the State to be eligible for federal funds. In conjunction with the comments from the state and public, finalized documents – including the CAC members' recommendation – will be submitted to the Pima County Board of Supervisors (BOS). A public meeting will take place on Dec.10, 2008, at Mesa Verde Elementary School. He explained that the information being presented at the current CAC meeting would also be presented at the public meeting, plus a summary of the process. Bill addressed the intersection of La Cholla Boulevard and Magee Road. The Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) vote calls for this intersection to be combined. The team began with 15 alternatives for this project, which were narrowed down to four: S-Curve, Jug Handle, Roundabout and Flyover. Those four alternatives were presented to the CAC and the public in August, and narrowed down to two: S-Curve and Jug Handle. Bill said he would explain those two alternatives along with the process the

team went through to recommend one alternative. He explained that “recommended” is not the same as “selected”. Pima County technical staff has seen the recommendation, but it still needs to be approved by the State. Bill asked for questions on the details of the remaining alternatives.

A number of detailed questions about intersection traffic operations and functionality were posed by the CAC members. In general those questions revolved around turning movements, signal progressions, and bike and pedestrian movements. Bill and staff, with the use of the intersection display boards, described the various scenarios that motorists and bike/pedestrians would encounter. Most were satisfied with the descriptions, but suggested the intersection animation used at a previous meeting would be helpful. Bill noted the animation would be proved at the upcoming Dec.10, 2008 open house and if CAC members sought further detailed review of how the alternatives functioned, the team would be glad to follow-up with members.

Q. Who are the people that got together and made this?

A. Pima County’s Environmental Department, Traffic and Operations, Field Department and Development Services – all the major departments of Pima County – along with the AECOM design team.

Bill said the outcome of the discussion at the team evaluation meeting was the Jug Handle scored better in noise, adjoining land use/access and cost. The S-Curve scored better in vegetation and mitigation. Thus, the Jug Handle was the recommended alternative.

Q. What does the term “mitigation” mean? Is there room for a park?

A. We are aware of interest in the remnant parcels. Because we are impacting vegetation, we will be replanting. We are concerned at this stage about calling this a park or open space. We are not necessarily proposing either. It is really an issue of semantics. If we call it a park, the park district will have to take over. It will be a mitigation area with additional plants, left “as is” as much as possible. As a mitigation area for Section 404 impacts, the mitigation would have to be maintained.

Q. What is the basin called?

A. It is called a flood plain, bought for flood control purposes.

Q. Could it be expanded to have more flood control?

A. At this point, the amount of flow will not change much. The desire is to leave it as natural as possible. If the flood plain is extended, there are possible effects, such as mosquitoes.

Q. Do we need to make any statement regarding the alternative?

A. I will leave this up to the CAC. You don’t have to make any action or take a vote, but you can. Meeting minutes are for documentation of feedback. Short of hearing any strong opposition to our recommended alternative, we will continue to move forward. You can endorse it or request further discussion.

Bill said the frontage road discussion would be tabled. The team met with most of the residents that will be affected along the frontage road. It is not time to move forward on that issue.

Bill asked Mike Dawson, EcoPlan, to give an update on noise. Mike went through the steps to be carried out regarding noise analysis:

- Conditions were measured the weeks of Nov. 10 and Nov. 17 during peak hours at about 20 different locations from Oracle Road to Thornydale Road.
- The model has been built based on existing terrain and roadway geometry. The model was run and balanced based against what was measured. The model was calibrated to rely on actual field measurements.
- The design will be integrated with the model for future traffic for 2030.
- We will recommend what mitigation should be applied to best fit the situation. Around mid-January we should have the forecast numbers.

Q. Do you take what you measure and double or quadruple it for the expected future traffic?

A. The calculations are based on a logarithmic method that factors traffic volumes, speed, roadway geometry and distance to receivers.

Q. Is rubberized asphalt more expensive?

A. No, and there is no shortage.

Q. Is rubberized asphalt becoming more standard for noise mitigation?

A. Rubberized asphalt is typically three or four decibels lower than normal asphalt, but since federal highway money is involved, rubberized asphalt cannot be factored as credit into the noise analysis. National studies are being conducted to determine if rubberized asphalt is an appropriate long-term mitigation. Rubberized asphalt is standard for Pima County, and will be used on this project. An intersection alternative has to be selected before analysis is finalized.

Bill explained that the Environmental Assessment Mitigation Report (EAMR) and DCR are documents that will summarize the CAC process. Based on today's discussion, the CAC members will attend the open house and then decide if they want another meeting to discuss alternatives.

Rick Ellis asked if the CAC members would be receptive to having another meeting close to the holidays. No one was opposed.

Bill said a tentative date would be set for the CAC meeting. If the open house is sufficient information for the CAC members, the meeting would be cancelled.

Bill took the time to thank everyone for coming and said he would stay longer to answer specific questions.