



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



Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting
Monday, June 1, 2009
6 – 7:30 p.m.
St. Mark's United Methodist Church

CAC Members Present at Meeting:

- Robert Barr
- Kathryn Culver
- Kathy Gatto
- Steven Kresal
- Steve Sisson
- Tom Unger
- John Whitehill-Ward
- Bernie Wiegandt

CAC Members Not in Attendance:

- George Ballesteros
- Molly Frazer
- Dennis Hansen
- David Jacobs
- William Scott
- David Williams

Attending from Project Team:

- Pima County Department of Transportation (PCDOT): Rick Ellis, Julie Simon
- Pima County: Jacqui Andrade
- AECOM: Bill Schlesinger
- EcoPlan: Mike Dawson
- Sound Solutions: Bill Holliday
- Artists: Nina Borgia-Aberle, Stephen Grede
- Gordley Design Group: Barb Alley, Angie Brown

Materials Distributed:

- Agenda
- Final Traffic Report
- Noise Level Comparison Sheet
- Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Summary Table
- Art Questionnaire
- Art Themes
- Map of Potential Art Placement (key provided to CAC)

Bill welcomed everyone to the CAC meeting. He made sure everyone was aware that this was a committee meeting and the purpose of the meeting was to address the members. Once that portion of the meeting was over, he would be happy to answer questions from the public. Bill turned the meeting over to the CAC co-chairs to start the CAC introductions. Bill introduced the team, then introduced artists Stephen Grede and Nina Borgia-Aberle to present their findings from the questionnaires the CAC members and their neighbors filled out from the May 11, 2009, CAC meeting.

Nina gave an overview of tonight's presentation. She stated that she and Steve are not the artists on the project, but have been hired to put an artist plan together on this project. She pointed out the map on the wall that shows the area characteristics and opportunities for art. That information came out of the questionnaires that were passed out at the last meeting. Steve and Nina encouraged dialogue about the art with the CAC members at this meeting. Steve pointed people to a second questionnaire and handout on art themes. It was stated that the information and recommendations gathered during this phase in the project would be presented in a packet that would accompany the Call to Artists.

Nina asked the CAC members what they thought of the map on the wall and how it differed from the engineering maps. It was stated that the pictures on the map were very helpful in visualizing where art may go along the corridor. One of the comments made was the reference to the phases on the map. Nina said the phases on the map would be removed before it would be displayed at the public meeting. This project will be done in phases and there will be a different artist for each phase; however, at this point, the time frame for each of the phases has not yet been determined. Nina and Steve touched on the need for continuity between the artists and different segments along the corridor. One of the items mentioned by a CAC member was for the noise walls to have similarities throughout the entire project area. The artists said there was a question on the questionnaire regarding this, and they are looking forward to hearing the CAC member's thoughts.

A CAC member had a question about having more than one artist along the corridor since this project would take years to complete. Nina clarified by saying that what she was referring to with continuity along the five-mile corridor was in regard to sound walls only, not the rest of the art along the project area. There were additional discussions regarding art on other projects and the need for continuity.

A question was asked regarding the process of choosing the artists. Nina stated that Sally Krommes, Tucson Pima Arts Council (TPAC), was in attendance and could answer that question. Sally said the art planning happening on this project is the new way of handling art on all projects. She said once the planning was completed, a determination would be made regarding the number of artists hired for this project. One panel of seven people for each artist would be selected. Of those seven, there would be two community members. Sally stated that other community members could sit and listen in on the process; however, they would not have voting privileges.

Nina asked the CAC to take a look at the questionnaires and provide feedback to Angie Brown, Gordley Design Group, who would pass information back to Nina and Steve. Nina stated there would be copies of the questionnaire passed out at the public meeting.

Steve and Nina finished their presentation by going over an additional handout regarding art themes for the project uncovered so far. The art themes are as follows:

Nature

- The Sonoran Desert
- Vegetation
- Wildlife
- Terrain and Viewsheds
- Washes

Culture

- Prehistory
- History

Anecdotal

There was discussion regarding the differences between continuity and redundancy. There was also discussion regarding the storehouse of historical information at the OMNI resort. Nina stated that she had gotten that comment from the original questionnaire and had already acted on that suggestion.

Bill said he really does want input from the members and the public at this point. He feels it is important for input early on to incorporate into the design.

Bill went over the project schedule and update. He stated that the EA would be given to the CAC members at the June 22 CAC meeting. Once the EA was given to the CAC, their recommendation letter would need to be written and returned to the County within 30 days in order to meet the Pima County Board of Supervisors (BOS) schedule of going before the board in September. Bill said he would be available for whatever the members would need from him.

Bill talked about the level of detail and the background that he felt would be helpful for the CAC to know:

1. Why do the CAC recommendation now?
 - It is the right time during design and construction phasing. Thirty-percent plans are the perfect time for everyone to review what has been done before too much has been done and major changes have to be made. At this stage, changes can be made fairly easily.
 - Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires documentation at the 30-percent plans.

- The utilities have information at this stage, so they can move forward in their work.
 - Right-of-way and easements are done at this stage in the process.
 - 404 permitting (environmental issue).
 - Major components have been addressed and residents will be informed at this stage in the process.
2. The Stage 1 plans (30-percent plans) have gone to the County for review and Bill has received them back with comments.
 3. Major design features (components):
 - Magee Road: two lanes in each direction with a median
 - Curbs
 - Bicycle lanes
 - Storm drains
 - Retaining walls will be 7-feet tall
 - Sidewalk: south side – Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; north side – not ADA, only sidewalks where needed; walking paths in other areas
 - Noise walls
 - Striping for footprint
 - Alignment: adding to the bridge to accommodate two lanes in each direction
 - Reconstruct most major intersections: Shannon Road/Magee Road
 - Drainage

The intersection at Magee Road/La Cholla Boulevard: aware of the alignment at this point with drainage culverts and area for equestrian; however, this area will not be ADA compliant. Bill said there would be areas of environmental mitigation in- and outside of the Jug Handle at this intersection.

Bill turned the floor over to Mike Dawson, EcoPlan, to give an environmental update.

Mike said the environmental document was with the technical editors and in the process of being reduced from approximately 150 pages to around 100 pages. Mike gave an overview of the chapters in the EA:

1. Introduction
2. Purpose and need: identifying the needs and issues
3. Alternatives: bridge, frontage road, Magee Road/La Cholla Boulevard intersection
4. Impact and mitigation assessment: Mike handed out a chart on this chapter for ease of understanding this chapter

Other areas discussed in the EA are:

1. Utilities
2. Secondary and cumulative impacts
3. Public involvement
4. Documents ready for review by the general public (30-day review)
5. Appendices

Q: There are power poles at the intersection of La Cholla Boulevard and La Cañada Drive. What is planned for those poles?

A: The course of action is not known for the power poles at this time. The 30-percent plans have been sent to the utilities to review for action.

Bill said he sent out the traffic volumes by e-mail as requested by the CAC members at the last meeting. Bill said he had paper copies for those who still needed a copy. Bill also brought a graded map to show the footprint and profile of the project area.

Q: To clarify, we will be getting the EA on June 22? Then we will have 30 days to write our recommendation letter?

A: Correct. Rick Ellis, PCDOT, took a few minutes to review the responsibilities of the CAC in regard to the letter. Rick said the letter and EA would be up for public review for 30 days before going before the BOS for approval.

The CAC co-chairs asked for the notification of the June 22 meeting be mailed out as soon as possible. It was also noted that the only agenda item would be to go over the EA in detail. Bill stated that after the team goes through the EA with the CAC members, the meeting would be turned over to the members to start working on their draft letter. The team would be available to answer questions as needed.

Mike asked how the members would like to have the EA document, and the CAC members said they would like the document in a three-ring binder.

Bill let the public know that he appreciated the public's patience in waiting until the end of the CAC meeting to ask questions, and asked if they had any concerns.

Q: What part of the project is in Marana and Oro Valley?

A: There is only a small part that is in Oro Valley, and no part of this project is in Marana.

There were no more questions. Bill adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.