

# 4RTLTM

## La Cholla Blvd: Magee to Overton CAC Meeting

### SUMMARY

AUG 10, 2010

TIME: 6:00 PM-8:00  
PM

LOCATION: Grace Community Church,  
9755 N. La Cholla Blvd.

TYPE OF MEETING	Community Advisory Committee Meeting
FACILITATOR	Dean Papajohn
ATTENDEES	<p><b><u>Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Members Present:</u></b>  Fred DiNoto  DeDe Betten  Bob Iannarino  John L. Reynolds  Barbara Wisot  Randy Abbey  John Lakey  Ronald Staub  Danny Goldmann</p> <p><b><u>CAC Members Not Present:</u></b>  Robert Ewens  Andrea Calabro  Brent Bartz  Thomas Tucker</p> <p><b><u>Pima County Team Members:</u></b>  Dean Papajohn, Project Manager  Rick Ellis, Division Manager, Department of Transportation  Jonathan Crowe, Pima County Dept. of Transportation  Julie Simon, Community Relations Program Coordinator</p> <p><b><u>URS Group:</u></b>  Eric Sibson, Project Manager</p> <p><b><u>Creative Design Resolution</u></b>  Steven Weitzman</p> <p><b><u>Wheat Scharf Associates</u></b>  Jennifer Patton</p> <p><b><u>Tucson Pima Arts Council (TPAC)</u></b>  Sally Krommes</p>

## 1 . Welcome/Introduction

Dean Papajohn called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Mr. Papajohn welcomed everyone then the CAC members and staffs introduced themselves.

## 2. Update of Roadway Design

Mr. Papajohn gave a summary of the project progress. He advised the committee that a recent review process was held to determine what would be the northern limit of the project, it was determined that Lambert Road would be the northern limit. County staff and the surveyor have been working on legal descriptions for the needed land acquisitions. Staff has also been coordinating with the Army Corps of Engineers for an individual 404 permit.

Mr. Papajohn followed up on a question that the CAC had inquired about in their review letter regarding the use of rubberized asphalt on the bridge deck. He indicated that concrete would be used for the bridge deck. There can be advantages and disadvantages with an asphalt overlay, but over time there can be deterioration at the joints causing additional noise and an unsmooth ride. Concrete does not usually deteriorate at the joints. Noise from a concrete bridge deck can be minimized by tinning the surface with tines with random spacing.

Mr. Eric Sibson presented an update on the changes to the design elements. The geometry has basically remained the same. There will be some changes around Metro Water's Matter Well site. A right turn lane will be added on McCarty Road, which will impact the existing hill.

Mr. Lakey inquired if these change would require the taking of additional property?

Mr. Sibson responded that there will be a need for some slope easement from the developer who has a planned development that is requiring the right turn lane.

Mr. Sibson discussed La Cholla north of Overton where the road will transition to the existing pavement. The proposed retaining walls, two fill walls, two cut walls (15 feet in height) and noise walls will remain in the same location. Drainage details are developing without many changes from Stage II, there will be some channel work north of Overton. Utilities are currently pot holing. We are working on bringing the 30% plans up to Stage 3 design (60%). The traffic report covers all the way to Tangerine.

Mr. Papajohn added that an additional traffic count Fairfields would take place in December.

Mr. Bob Iannarino inquired as to what Metro Water's position was on the well site.

Mr. Sibson responded that they would prefer moving the well, but with the established prior rights, relocating would be a project cost. Staff believes that access to the well can be maintained at its current location.

Mr. Papajohn further indicated that the challenge with the Matter Well, is that it is not only a well but it has grandfathered Type 2 water rights. Those rights are not transferable with the relocated well. Type 2 rights allow a water company to drill deeper without permitting, studies, and analysis. Metro Water would want Pima County to upgrade their existing well in a relocated spot in lieu of the Type 2 water rights. This makes relocating the well expensive.

Mr. Iannarino inquired about the visual site of the well

Mr. Papajohn responded that there would be a concrete barrier along the north bound lanes, drive way access from the south bound lanes, and a 45 foot median with landscaping to be determined that won't interfere with the well maintenance .

### **3. Landscape design update**

Mr. Papajohn introduced Jennifer Patton.

Ms. Patton talked about the landscape design. She indicated that the Saguaros near the Bluffs Subdivision south of Tortolita Bluffs Drive would remain, but those north of Tortolita Bluffs Drive would be removed. It is Pima County's policy not to salvage saguaros over 8' tall, however, the County will offer the saguaros to non-profit agencies if they are willing to relocate them. For every saguaro removed it will be replaced by new saguaro though not as tall.

Ms. Patton provided the CAC members with a handout of a preliminary noise barrier wall design at Fairfields La Cholla Hills Subdivision. She explained in detail the illustrations shown.

Mr. Fred DiNoto inquired as to whether some of the vegetation that will be removed will be replaced?

Ms. Patton responded that Pima County will not plant outside the right-of-way, but will plant native plants inside the right-of-way.

Mr. Papajohn added that when they presented the walls to Fairfield they talked about the trade offs. When walls come in some of the vegetation will come out. The goal is to preserve the vegetation as much as possible, but not to replant these areas. Smaller plants near the right-of-way should survive just fine; however, the larger trees may experience stress.

Ms. Patton discussed the noise walls handout which illustrated a preliminary design of what the sound wall might look like. The design is intended to blend with the Fairfields architecture. The wall color can match Fairfield's wall color. The stucco texture can match the Fairfield's stucco texture. Columns every 60' or so will help break up the linearity of the wall.

Ms. Barbara Wisot inquired as to why the elements discussed with the artist were not incorporated into this design?

Ms. Patton indicated that the artist's design were incorporated into the bridge design

Mr. Papajohn advised the committee that while the artist's focus was on the bridge, the staff would like CAC members to let them know what aspects from the bridge design they would like to see integrated into the walls.

Ms. Wisot stated that was not what they had discussed previously with regards to artwork.

Mr. Papajohn indicated that the artist was asked to first focus on the bridge. Once some preliminary art concepts were chosen by the CAC, these concepts could be used to enhance the wall design. The CAC should also consider if too much public art is installed in front of one subdivision, this may be considered inequitable by other subdivisions.

Ms. Patton mentioned that walls were designed to integrate with the existing walls at Fairfield. Some of the elements on bridge can be integrated into wall.

### **4. Preliminary design concept for public art**

Mr. Papajohn introduced Mr. Steven Weitzman.

Mr. Weitzman informed the CAC members that it is up to them to decide where the public art should be, whether it is at the bridge or on the noise walls. He indicated that CAC members would be making the decision on where they want to spend the money. It is up to them to tell him what they want him to do. He presented a PowerPoint presentation detailing his preliminary design concepts that gave CAC members ideas to visualization so they had a clear understanding on how to choose design, patterns, texture and color.

Mr. John Reynolds inquired as to whether any of the designs presented by Mr. Weitzman exceeded what we

have to work with in terms of dollars?

Mr. Weitzman advised the CAC that any of the individual designs did not necessarily exceed their budget; however, adding the pier treatments to a railing design would probably exceed the budget. Mr. Weitzman mentioned that the pier treatment is outside of budget, but he thought it was best to show everything he developed and the CAC can make the decision themselves what to eliminate and what to include.

Mr. Reynolds commented that he liked the water idea, even though there is not a lot of water there. It is very attractive. Some of the shapes are very geometrical, which don't seem to fit. Of the different patterns shown, cactus, needles, desert flora and desert creatures, he preferred the flora designed.

Mr. Ronald Staub indicated that he liked a three dimensional design. He also stated, that the committee would have to decide where the visual emphasis would be placed: for the pedestrians or the drivers. For example, drivers will not see sidewalk treatments. He liked the aspects that made the bridge look invisible. Especially the picture that looks like you are looking through the bridge.

Mr. Danny Goldmann indicated that he liked the flowing rail treatment and the pier treatment.

Mr. Weitzman indicated that there are variations of that concept, where height and color is being changed.

Mr. DiNoto inquired as to how the CAC can help narrow down the choices?

Mr. Weitzman replied by saying he first wanted to hear the pros and cons because that will help him understand more of what they want. Then we can use the process of elimination and he will compile another presentation showing a more finished design.

Mr. John Reynolds inquired as to the visibility of this art work. Who is more likely to be seeing this drivers or pedestrians?

Mr. Weitzman responded this is a great point. Consider that when you are driving you are about 3 ½ feet – 4 feet off the ground and the first thing you see are barriers. So you have to ask yourself “How high above the barrier do you want the design to be done and how would it look from the outside of the bridge? It is being built as a vehicular and a pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Iannarino commented that this area may become popular with walkers and cyclists and it should be looked at as a long term benefit to walkers and cyclists who don't currently in the area.

Mr. Papajohn showed the group that linear park is currently down stream of La Cholla and ends at Hardy Road. In the future the linear park may follow Hardy Road to then north to the CDO Wash upstream of La Cholla Boulevard.

Mr. Weitzman reminded the CAC members that they have a limited budget and informed them that it is up to them to decide what they want within that budget, including art for the noise walls. He asked the CAC members to identify what aspects they would like to see.

Ms. Wisot commented that she was hoping to see more architectural features integrated into the art for the bridge. Also, she liked texture shown in the bridge presentation.

Mr. Weitzman commented that everyone seemed to respond well to the flowing line. It can look like a wave, but this is not necessarily a texture.

Ms. Wisot inquired if something could be done to the wall, an imprint that looks like brick?

Mr. Weitzman provided an explanation how that could be done as well as the option of changing the color of block.

Mr. Iannarino liked the combination of concrete parapet and railing, not just all railings.

All: Agreed with that combination

Mr. Reynolds indicated that he liked the designs that were flowing, but struggled to say which one he liked better. Hard to say if he liked the one that was constant height parapet with the curving railing on it or the curving topped parapet with curving railing on top, or curving walls. There were just too many things to like.

Ms. DeDe Betten indicated that we want to see through it as much as we can, or like Barbara said, the texture so visible. I think looking through it is very unique and we do have to think ahead many years ahead, when the area is more popular with bicyclists.

Mr. Lakey indicated that he liked the view that showed both railing with parapet.

Mr. Iannarino indicated that he liked the contrasting curves – not a straight parapet.

Ms. Wisot indicated she like the different texture a little bit more.

All CAC members indicated that they preferred the variation that includes railing on top of a parapet.

Mr. Weitzman informed the CAC members that he can make the parapet taller so it can be seen through a vehicular point of view and he can create computer models to show what it will look like from a passenger or drivers point of view. Also he can show what the color railing will look like. He talked about the option of bright colors. He suggested that it not be all railing because it doesn't keep the sound down. Also he suggested stamping of the sidewalk.

CAC members indicated that they liked the one with the coyote with its shadow.

CAC members and Mr. Weitzman discussed sound walls.

Mr. Weitzman: Mentioned that they need to consider possibility of the tagging of walls.

Ms. Wisot indicated that they would like to see something on the walls.

Mr. Lakey agreed that something needs to be done about the walls, but it is not as high a priority as the bridge.

Ms. Wisot asked if someone else has to review and approve art.

Mr. Papajohn explained that the CAC is the primary group giving feedback on the art. The art will also be shown to the public at open houses for feedback. Tucson Pima Arts Council will also give feedback, but does not have any veto authority over the CAC. The art must fit into the designated budget, be maintainable and durable, and must not cause a safety hazard; otherwise DOT will not install it. The Pima County Board of Supervisors will have be able to provide feedback on the art if they so desire.

Mr. Papajohn mentioned that this is a 9-10' wall. It is a huge wall. The adjacent property owners voted for it. Once the wall design is farther along with input from the CAC we will go back to the Fairfield's and show it to them and get their input.

Mr. Iannarino thought that the wall could be used to transition to the artwork on the bridge. Mr. Iannarino also thought that the retaining walls should be considered at the same time as the bridge and noise barrier walls. He also thought a rust color would be better than a bright color.

Mr. Papajohn explained that the retaining wall will likely be soil nail walls, MSE (concrete block) walls, or poured in place concrete walls. Concrete barrier adjacent to the sidewalk could also be considered for art.

Mr. Iannarino asked about whether art could be provided in the open median.

Mr. Sibson explained that art in the open median would have to be higher than the 42" concrete barrier so it would not be at eye level with the driver.

The PowerPoint presentation will be provided to the CAC, and the CAC can think about the concepts presented tonight and provide further comments. Mr. Iannarino suggested that the CAC meet again alone to discuss the art and generate feedback for the artist. A timeframe of two weeks after receiving the PowerPoint was mentioned.

Mr. Papajohn went over the schedule and indicated that the project team would stay and answer questions if needed.