

4RTLTM

La Cholla Blvd: Magee to Tangerine CAC Meeting

SUMMARY TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2009 TIME: 6:00 PM–7:30 PM LOCATION: Grace Community Church, 9755 N. La Cholla Blvd.

TYPE OF MEETING	Community Advisory Committee Meeting
FACILITATOR	Dean Papajohn
ATTENDEES	<p><u>Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Members Present:</u> Barbara Wisot Bob Iannarino Brent Bartz Danny Goldmann DeDe Betten Fred DiNoto John L. Reynolds John Lakey Robert Ewens Ronald J. Staub, PE</p> <p><u>CAC Members Not Present:</u> Andrea Calabro Loren B. Christenfeld Randall Abbey Thomas Tucker</p> <p><u>Interested Parties/Community Members:</u> Ed & Ellen Stephenson Kathryn & William</p> <p><u>Pima County Team Members:</u> Dean Papajohn, Project Manager Eric Sibson, Project Manager Rick Ellis, Engineering Design Division Head Jackie Andrade, Supervisor Ann Day’s Office, District 1 Julie Simon, Community Relations Program Coordinator</p> <p><u>Oro Valley:</u> Jose Rodriguez, Engineering Division Manager</p> <p><u>URS Group:</u> J.P. Charpentier, Environmental Planner</p> <p><u>Sound Solutions:</u> Bill Holliday, Acoustical Engineer</p>
DISCUSSION	La Cholla Blvd: Magee Road to Tangerine Road Project

Agenda

1. Welcome (Dean Papajohn)
2. Review of Open House (Dean Papajohn)
3. Presentation of Noise Analysis (Bill Holliday)
4. Schedule (Dean Papajohn)
5. Questions/Discussion (All)

1. Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Dean Papajohn. Mr. Papajohn extended a thank you to Grace Community Church for allowing the County to utilize their facility. Mr. Papajohn also indicated to the committee that they would be updated about the Open House that was held at this same location on December 1, 2009. He further indicated that several individuals attended the open house and provided feedback on the project.

Mr. Papajohn introduced all the project team members and extended a welcome to all the community members that were present.

2. Review of Open House

Mr. Dean Papajohn provided the CAC with an overview of the Open House held Tuesday, December 1, 2009. He indicated that he was pleased with the attendance. Approximately 50 individuals attended the open house. This open house allowed the project team to discuss the project with community members and explain the preliminary plans for this project. The following feedback was received at the open house:

- **Positives:** All weather access over the CDO wash, which includes the construction of a new bridge. Individuals were anxious to know when construction was going to begin. Individuals were pleased with the expansion to 4 lanes allowing for an increase in capacity, implementation of turn lanes, and improved access, paved shoulders for bicycles, improvement to site distances (especially when traveling over the hills and dips along La Cholla), landscaping, medians, and recreational paths. Several individuals commented on that they liked how the new multiuse path would tie into the linear park that was recently built and the Magee Intersection Project, as well as how the multiuse path would increase the safety of pedestrians along La Cholla.
- **Concerns:** The increase of traffic, noise levels, and accessibility to Lucero. Individuals expressed their concerns regarding a median opening or access to Lucero. Attendees were advised that the traffic engineer was looking into providing access onto Lucero. An additional access point that brought up some concern was at Fairfield La Cholla Hills. Mr. Fred DiNoto, a representative for Fairfield La Cholla Hills, mentioned that several individuals from that area expressed their desire to have a traffic signal installed at that location. Mr. DiNoto was advised that the County's Traffic Engineers have conducted a study of this area and that the current traffic volumes do not warrant the installation of a traffic signal. The major concern of residents in this area is not necessarily traffic volumes but the wait time that may be experienced by individuals trying to access La Cholla. The County's Traffic Engineer will look into this matter and try to determine what kind of wait times might be experienced by motorists.

Mr. Papajohn asked those CAC members that attended the open house if there was any feedback they wanted to share with the other CAC members.

Mr. Bob Iannarino provided the following feedback. He indicated that it would be beneficial to provide citizens with some dialogue by responding to the feedback received at that meeting. He indicated that representative from the Bluffs subdivision were concerned with the increase of noise. He further expressed his concerns about attendance at the CAC meetings by CAC members. As CAC members, we are liaisons in the community; lack of attendance could jeopardize that communication. Staff was asked to send out a reminder message two days before the CAC meetings in the future. Mr. Iannarino further expressed his support to move forth with the project.

Mr. Ronald Staub provided the following feedback: Individuals had concerns with noise mitigation, drainage, and access. The access to Lucero was a major concern.

Mr. Fred DiNoto provided the following feedback: He felt that there was good representation from the community. Individuals were concerned with noise and signal lights. He also feels that attendance is not adequate.

Robert Ewens indicated that he was concerned with the fact that he did not receive notice about the open house.

Mr. Papajohn indicated that if the attendance at future CAC meetings continues to dwindle, staff will evaluate the situation. He extended his appreciation to all CAC members for their participation. All CAC members serve on a voluntary basis and currently we have a strong committee, but in the future if we find that CAC members may not be able to continue with the group we will look at the possibility of replacing that individual as necessary.

Mr. Papajohn indicated that at the open house there were several inquiries about the noise study and noise mitigation. Tonight staff will be presenting Part II of the Noise Analysis. Mr. Papajohn introduced Mr. Bill Holliday. Mr. Holliday previously presented the noise process for the noise analysis. Tonight he will share the results of that process. It is the staff's intention to conduct further dialogue with the community, especially to La Cholla Hills, and other HOAs regarding these findings.

3. Presentation of Noise Analysis

Mr. Bill Holliday addressed the committee about the noise study process: (a copy of this noise analysis will be made available on the project website at a later date). A copy of the Draft Noise Analysis Report was provided to each member of the CAC. The noise model used was approved by the Federal Highway Administration. It is used to predict current and future noise and utilizes the following criteria for mitigation to be considered:

- A reduction of at least 5dBA must be achieved at noise sensitive receivers.
- The barrier must benefit two or more adjacent receivers.
- Using a cost of \$25/sf, the cost of the barrier will not exceed \$35,000 per benefitted receiver.
- A majority of the property owners must approve the mitigation.
- Mitigation is only for the first floor of multi-story residences.
- Barriers must be less than 10 feet tall.
- No mitigation will be provided for undeveloped properties unless building permits have been issued prior to the final EAMR.

This phase of the study only includes La Cholla Boulevard from Magee Road to Lambert Lane. It does not include those areas that fall within Oro Valley's phase of the project; no receivers within Oro Valley were identified. It was noted that Tacolote De Oro is not in Oro Valley. The noise report recommends consideration of two walls in front of Fairfield Hills. Twenty five predictions locations were used in the study. Traffic volumes from the Traffic Study were used in the noise analysis. In general, the barrier height is effective in blocking noise if it blocks the line of site. To be considered effective a barrier must provide a 5dBA reduction. The second row of houses does not get this level of reduction even if a wall were constructed. Properties impacted by a noise barrier get to vote on whether a wall is desirable. Over 50% of the vote is needed to approve a wall. Individuals can not veto a wall near them since breaks in the wall reduce the wall's effectiveness. Page 7 of the report shows a reduction in future traffic volumes on Overton Road. This might be due to vehicles using the improved La Cholla with a bridge rather than Overton without a bridge. Undeveloped properties are not considered eligible for mitigation. If there are any recommendations for noise barrier walls, these should be included in the EAMR. Board Approval of the EAMR is anticipated in the summer of 2010. Weather conditions are used as input in the noise model. The model is conservative in that it uses noise levels at the high range not the low or average. Rubberized asphalt provides noise mitigation for all properties along the project as well as for the drivers.

Figures 5 and 6 are similar to figures 3 to 4, but include an overlay of the proposed future alignment. Figure 5 shows the two barrier locations at Fairfield. The prediction results for the 22 locations that are in Pima County are on page 19. Three receiver locations were modeled where the walls are to be considered. The bridge was modeled with and without rubberized asphalt and no change in the results was noted. Traffic signal locations are input into the model. No new signalized intersections are planned. Table 6 shows proposed height and length of potential noise barrier walls. Table 5 shows three areas in Oro Valley

that exceed ADOT decibel requirements. However, barriers aren't feasible because they are isolated receivers and driveways place breaks in the walls that hinder mitigation.

On a hill vehicles may accelerate and decelerate thus creating additional noise. The model does not take into account potential turn lanes for future subdivisions. The report makes recommendations on how to mitigate construction noise. The appendices include references and some acoustic terminology.

Mr. Papajohn inquired as to whether the committee had any questions regarding the results of the study.

Mr. John Reynolds asked if the results made sense. Were you surprised by the results or did you see what you expected to see?

Mr. Holliday responded. Yes, more or less. La Cholla Hills was so elevated. With the model we only look at the first floor receivers, we only consider the first story.

Mr. Iannarino inquired: What about the Bluffs? They have the closest proximity to the road way.

Mr. Holliday responded: Parts of the Bluffs already have barriers. Measurements are taken in the patio areas in the back yards which are behind the barriers. With the existing mitigation, the results didn't exceed the threshold levels.

Mr. Robert Ewens inquired: Did you measure the Bluffs behind the walls of the homeowners? The walls are 6 ft tall? You didn't measure at the top of the wall, but behind the wall?

Mr. Holliday responded: Yes, all the measurements were made 5 ft off the ground behind the wall.

Mr. Ewens inquired: What was the noise level in front of the wall?

Mr. Holliday responded: Similar to other stretches of La Cholla. We did do some prediction locations at undeveloped parcels or in other sections that didn't have any barriers. There weren't a lot of properties with walls already.

Mr. Iannarino inquired: One section of the Bluffs is at the corner of La Cholla and Overton; it is closest to the intersection. Will they have noise problems?

Mr. Holliday responded: There are two story homes there. Mitigation is for the first story only. Noise levels don't require mitigation. At the Bluffs and at Country Club Apartments there are no barriers at the entry points and no chance of there being barriers because of the entrance. However, the rubberized asphalt mitigates noise even with an increase in traffic volumes in the future.

Mr. Reynolds inquired: Looking farther north in the area south of Lambert, you got predicted locations up against houses. You took measurement at the street, correct?

Mr. Holliday responded: Some of them are just predictions. Where there are circles, they are just predictions.

Mr. Reynolds inquired: You took the measurements at the street level for those, correct?

Mr. Holliday responded: They were taken the same distance from the road. If the residence is 300 feet from the road, then the prediction locations were taken at that distance. They are not closer to the road than the rest.

Mr. Iannarino inquired: Are these the only types of mitigation?

Mr. Holliday responded: Mitigation that blocks the line of site is the best. Vegetation won't do.

Mr. Ronald Staub inquired: Is the best mitigation a block wall?

Mr. Papajohn responded: Other mitigation may not be feasible. Shifting the road to one side only pushes

the noise closer to someone else. Lowering the road can cause drainage problems. Rubberized asphalt is the most common noise mitigation. The possible wall at Fairfield may cause a loss in the existing vegetation that currently serves as a nice buffer.

Mr. Eric Sibson addressed the committee: Other issues impacting types of mitigation include utilities close to the right-of-way as well as the mature vegetation.

Mr. Papajohn added: We will meet with Fairfield and allow the affected property owners to vote whether they want a wall or not. There are approximately two dozen properties. The vote is taken one time before the constructions starts. Before the meeting, the approximate wall location can be marked in the field. The wall will likely be a concrete block wall of one solid color.

Mr. Iannarino inquired: Did you model the proposed service road in front of the Bluffs?

Mr. Holliday responded: Yes.

4. Schedule

Dean Papajohn reviewed the schedule shown on the agenda. Mr. Papajohn asked if there were any comments or questions. Mr. Iannarino wanted to know when the CAC will have access to the EAMR. The CAC is already seeing the information that will go into the EAMR, including the noise report, traffic study, and preliminary roadway plans. Barbara Wisot asked about the Equestrian Survey. Ten to twelve responses were received so far. We phoned a number of the respondents to get more detailed information. Mr. Iannarino asked if there were any surprises with utilities. DOT has been in contact with all the utilities for several months. Metro has a well site that will need to be relocated.

The next meeting is anticipated to be in February.