



**Kolb/Sabino Canyon Road Connection  
Meeting Summary**  
City of Tucson Department of Transportation  
**Task Force Meeting**



Jan. 26, 2010, 6 to 7:30 p.m.

Morris K. Udall Regional Center, 7200 E. Tanque Verde Road

**ATTENDEES:**

**Task Force Members**

Grant Bennett  
Gene Brown  
John Carlson, Sr.  
Diana Dessy  
Art Hall  
Kathy Hebb  
Bob McDaniel  
Laura Newsom

**NOT IN ATTENDANCE:**

Michael Tone

**City of Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT) Staff and Consultants**

Michael Graham, TDOT, Project Manager/Public Information Officer  
Kevin Thornton, Psomas, Project Manager  
Scott Stapp, HDR, Environmental Planner  
Deborah Rainone, City of Tucson, Assistant City Clerk  
Dennis McLaughlin, City of Tucson, City Attorney's Office  
Melissa Benton, Gordley Design Group, Public Involvement  
Korinne DeJesus, Gordley Design Group, Public Involvement  
Jan Gordley, Gordley Design Group, Public Involvement

**MATERIALS PROVIDED:**

- Agenda
- Public Meeting Notices
- Task Force Member Contact List
- November Task Force Meeting Minutes

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:**

Michael Graham, TDOT, Project Manager/Public Information Officer, welcomed the Task Force members and introduced himself. A quorum was established. The project team and Task Force members introduced themselves.

- Gene Brown – Neighborhood Representative – Colonia Verde
- Grant Bennett – Business Representative – Eclectic Café
- Laura Newsom – Neighborhood Representative – Indian Ridge Estates
- Bob McDaniel – Neighborhood Representative – Dorado Country Club Estates
- Art Hall – Parks Representative – Pantano Ridge Estates

- Kathy Hebb – Neighborhood Representative – Pantano II
- Diana Dessy – Business Representative – Anthem Equity Group, Inc.
- John Carlson, Sr. – Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee

Michael reviewed the items on the agenda.

**TASK FORCE MEETING FORMAT:**

Jan Gordley, Gordley Design Group, Public Involvement Consultant, reiterated that Gordley Design Group’s role is to assist with the Task Force meetings so members can focus on project business. Korinne DeJesus will take meeting minutes. Jan, with assistance from Melissa Benton, will facilitate the meeting.

Jan reviewed the meeting guidelines and format and asked that attendees focus on the most important principle: respect for each other and all those involved. No side conversations should be held – verbal, text or telephone. If a call is necessary, please step out of the room. Let everybody have a turn when speaking. Let team members know if they are not communicating clearly.

This meeting is for Task Force members. Gordley Design Group will help facilitate the meeting. The project team and Task Force will take audience comments at the end, but Task Force members cannot engage in discussions regarding other project topics that are not on the agenda. A “parking lot” notepad will be used. This will allow the team to record future agenda items.

**OPEN MEETING LAW:**

Deborah Rainone, City of Tucson, Chief Deputy City Clerk, discussed the Arizona Open Meeting Law. The Open Meeting Law requires any public body that conducts a meeting to do so openly and only after a meeting notice has been posted a minimum of 24 hours before the meeting. Proceedings must be open to the public.

The law applies to all public officers and all public bodies. This Task Force is considered a public body because membership has been designated by Mayor and Council to make recommendations on the project.

Arizona has one of the strictest Open Meeting Laws in the nation. If a Task Force member is held in violation, a \$500 fine will be assessed. The member is liable for the fine and will be removed from the Task Force.

Deborah covered the following law components: agenda, quorum, Legal Action Report and meeting minutes.

Agenda: The agenda should include date, time and location of the meeting. The agenda must be posted with the City of Tucson. The chairperson of the Task Force will send the agenda to the City Clerk’s Office. The City Clerk will post hard copies of the agenda in four official locations and on the City’s Web site. The agenda items must be specific.

Quorum: A quorum is a majority of Task Force members. The Task Force has nine members, thus a quorum is five. If five members do not attend a meeting, the Task Force may not conduct business. If at any point there will not be a quorum for a meeting, the meeting must be canceled. If a meeting is canceled, the support staff is required to take the agenda, draw a diagonal line across it, write the word "canceled" and send it to the City Clerk to be posted. This will inform the public. If a meeting is canceled within 24 hours of the scheduled meeting, the support staff must prepare the cancellation notice and forward to the Clerk's Office. The notice must also be posted on the meeting room door. If during a meeting a Task Force member leaves and five Task Force members do not remain, the meeting must adjourn. The Task Force may not conduct an informational meeting for discussion or a meeting to distribute handouts without a quorum. To do so violates Open Meeting Law. If a Task Force member steps away, breaks the quorum but will come back, the chairperson may recess the meeting until a quorum is present.

Legal Action Report: In 2007, a law was passed that states any public body that conducts a meeting during which legal action is taken must post the information to the jurisdiction's Web site within three days after the meeting. The legal action report includes items the Task Force makes decisions on. Approval of minutes is a legal action issue, because the Task Force will vote on approval. Examples of legal actions are when the Task Force approves a report or status of an item that needs further action. The support staff may take the agenda and write general, brief statements of the legal action made on each item.

Meeting minutes: In 2007, a law was passed that required all public bodies to provide meeting minutes. This can be a recording of the meeting or written notes. These minutes are more detailed than the Legal Action Report. The minutes should include members who were present, absent, late, or left early; descriptions of the agenda items discussed; and all legal matters. The minutes must be comprehensive and detail when a motion or vote is taken and who made the motion or vote. The minutes do not have to be verbatim. After the draft minutes are approved, the Task Force must forward them to the City Clerk within two days of approval. The City Clerk posts the minutes to the City Web site and places in a public file.

Deborah reviewed the voting process. The Task Force is asked to follow Mayor and Council rules. A general rule is for a member to make a motion, followed by a second to the motion, a discussion and then the chairperson asks for a roll call or a vote. Voice votes or roll call are both acceptable. Use a roll call for clarification when a voice vote is not clear. A roll call vote should be used for budget items or election of officers.

Abstaining means to pass on a vote. During a roll call vote, if a Task Force member abstains, the Task Force will continue until the vote returns to the chairperson. Before the chairperson votes, the chairperson will ask the member who abstained to vote. If the member abstains a second time, it is considered a yes vote.

Dennis McLaughlin, City Attorney's Office, spoke to the Task Force about conducting discussions outside of Task Force meetings. A Task Force meeting is for its members to interact with each other at a designated place, time, date and agenda so the public can attend. The chairperson may have a call to the audience at the end of a meeting. The Task Force should not interact with each other outside of a scheduled meeting; however, the Task Force may interact with the general public. If Task Force members interact with each other outside of a meeting whether in person, by phone, e-mail or text, they may accidentally constitute a quorum. In doing so, the members have constituted a meeting without a meeting notice, and this violates Open Meeting Law. The Task Force is not allowed to build consensus outside of a meeting. If a Task Force member has information to relay to the rest of the team, or if any member has questions outside of a meeting, talk with the project team or support staff. The project team or support staff will then relay the message to the Task Force members.

If a Task Force member wants an item on the agenda, there are two methods. The first applies between meetings. Generally, the chairperson will set and run any meeting and may place any item on the agenda. Members may also ask the chairperson to add agenda items. If the chairperson does not want to add a requested item, a Task Force member may move to place an item on the agenda during the discussion of future agenda items. The item does not need a second to be placed on the agenda. If there is opposition to the motion, then there will be a majority vote to either place, or not place, the item on a future agenda.

A member stated, for clarification, that they are able to talk to one another about the project as long as it is only one or two members of the Task Force outside any meeting. Dennis advised the member against doing so. Task Force members may speak to the general public about the project. Members may interact outside of a meeting if they do not discuss the project. Michael Graham clarified that this Task Force does not have a chairperson. If a Task Force meeting is scheduled and there is not a quorum by the time the meeting is to begin, meeting materials may be provided to members to take home and study as long as the materials are not discussed until a quorum is established. The minutes may be turned in as the Legal Action Report as long as they are turned in within three working days of the meeting. When Task Force members are talking to the public about the project, they may give their opinion. Dennis recommended when doing so to state that as their personal opinion, and not necessarily the opinion of the Task Force.

**APPROVAL OF NOV. 19, 2009, MEETING MINUTES:**

There was a motion made to approve the draft minutes of the Nov. 19, 2009, meeting of the Task Force, a second, no discussion and a vote to approve.

**PROJECT STATUS AND UPDATE:**

Kevin Thornton, Psomas, Project Manager, reviewed what will be presented at the public meeting on Feb. 10, 2010. Two of the items that will be presented to the public

include information in an initial traffic report and a report on the structural selection for building the roadway across the landfill.

Kevin reviewed the initial traffic report. The Grant Road and Kolb Road intersection has the highest traffic congestion in the City. It also has the worst air quality in Pima County. The stretch of road between Sabino Canyon Road and Kolb Road has the second highest traffic volumes in the City or Pima County besides the interstates. About 60,000 vehicles travel through this area per day. It is projected that if this project does not move forward, about 75,000 vehicles will travel this stretch of road per day in the year 2030. If the project moves forward as planned, the projected vehicles per day will initially drop and then grow to about 60,000 vehicles in 20 years. In 2030, about 21,000 vehicles per day will be diverted to the Sabino Canyon Road extension. Kolb just south of Grant would also see a reduction of about 14,000 vehicles per day with the extension of Sabino Canyon Road.

Kevin discussed traffic congestion Levels of Service (LOS). The LOS is ranked A to F, with A having little congestion and F having very high congestion. The Kolb and Grant intersection is at LOS F. With the project, the level of service would improve to E. The current LOS on Tanque Verde Road and Sabino Canyon Road is F and, with completion of the project, would be a level F in 2030 based on projected growth and increased traffic. A Task Force member asked whether the project design is fixed or whether room exists for adjusting. Kevin answered that the project design is not concrete and change is possible. Members expressed their concern with needing a free right-turn lane from northbound Sabino Canyon to eastbound Tanque Verde Road. Kevin said he would bring the issue up to the team.

Kevin presented landfill information that will also be presented at the Feb. 10, 2010, public meeting. There are two different ways of compacting the landfill so that a road may be constructed over it. The first is surcharging, which consists of putting a load of soil on top of the landfill before the road is built. This takes a long time and does not take care of long-term settlement due to decomposition of the waste. Method two is dynamic compaction. This would compact the soil by dropping a weight on top of it. This method is quicker and more expensive than surcharging, costing about \$300,000, and also does not take care of long-term settlement. These two methods would result in high maintenance costs due to long-term settlement of the waste below the roadway. The team is also considering building a structure over the landfill. That structure is the most expensive option initially, but settlement is not an issue, and the City would not have long-term maintenance costs. The initial cost for the structure is about \$1.1 million. Kevin described how the piers for the structure would be built.

#### **INTRODUCTION TO NOISE MEASUREMENT AND MITIGATION:**

Scott Stapp, HDR, Environmental Planner, gave a presentation defining what noise is and how it is measured.

- Noise is unwanted sound.
- Sound is vibrating molecules as they move through the air.

- Sound moves in waves.
- Noise is measured in decibels.

The project team takes a reading over a period of time. Traffic noise is presented in hourly increments. This gives a noise-level average during the time period. An integrating sound-level meter is used to measure traffic noise levels. The reading is used to determine if noise levels approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) states that the level of noise at which mitigation is to be considered is approaching or exceeding 67 decibels (dBA). The Noise Abatement Criteria are not health-based. The Noise Abatement Criteria are levels at which noise causes annoyance. This level is based on being able to sit and talk to somebody in a normal voice without having to raise your voice and shout.

Scott reviewed a Common Noise Level Chart showing common noises and the measurement in decibels.

This project is federally funded and going through the local government process; therefore, the project team will use the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) standard for noise mitigation. ADOT uses a 3-dBA approach. The project team will have to consider mitigation if a reading hits 64 dBA or above or if traffic noise would increase over 15 dBA over existing levels.

A dBA reading at 50 or above usually comes from traffic. Traffic noise comes from three main sources.

- Tire/pavement interaction
- Vehicle exhaust
- Vehicle engine

A Task Force member asked if decibel readings from the project study are available to the Task Force. Scott did not have the readings with him, but offered to talk about them.

The readings are only used to check the project model. Mitigation is not based directly on the readings, because currently there is no traffic in the proposed project area. Mitigation is based on level of noise projected 20 years in the future.

How loud the noise will be is dependent on a number of critical factors:

- Traffic volume
- Distance from the source
- The number of trucks in traffic
- The grade of the road in relationship to the receptor

The project team will also run the model with existing conditions. Two criteria determine whether to consider noise mitigation:

- Does the area hit the 64-dBA levels?
- Will there be a noise increase of 15 dBA or more?

If mitigation is considered, two tests must be met. The first test would consider if mitigation is feasible. These tests would consider if a noise wall could be constructed effectively and safely. The next test would consider if mitigation is reasonable to construct. This test measures if mitigation is cost effective, how many houses would benefit from mitigation and if mitigation creates needed noise reduction. Landscaping does not provide effective reduction of noise and would not be considered for mitigation.

After the mitigation tests are complete, and if the project team comes up with recommendations to put in a wall, the impacted residents will be presented with the findings and asked if they would like to have walls.

Questions about the noise wall and sound levels were answered. There are mitigation benefits to certain types of material used to build a noise wall. The 20-year model does consider decreased noise levels from hybrid cars. Scott showed a map of unofficial noise level readings from within the project. The numbers ranged from 40 dBA to 70 dBA. The cost estimate for a noise wall is \$25 per square foot.

#### **FEBRUARY PUBLIC MEETING UPDATE:**

The next public meeting is Wednesday, Feb. 10, 2010, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. in the cafeteria at Van Horne Elementary School. Michael Graham encouraged the Task Force to attend.

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND MEETING DATES:**

No date has been established for the next meeting, but Jan Gordley reminded the members that they had established Tuesdays as the best meeting nights. The meetings are anticipated to be held at Udall and start at 6 p.m.

No agenda items were identified for future meetings. Jan would like to follow the technical team's progress as more information on environmental assessment and design information becomes available.

Requests were made on the following:

- Add discussion on noise as a future agenda item
- Add discussion on the Pantano Bridge and how it will affect the project
- Add discussion regarding the connectivity of the bike/walk path
- Project team to make available information on the cost-effectiveness criteria

#### **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE:**

A few members of the audience made comments and requests regarding noise measurements, implementing a quiet zone during the evenings, the dynamic compaction process, noise walls and the traffic report. The project team addressed the questions after the meeting.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved with no dissent.

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.**