



KINO PARKWAY – 22ND STREET INTERSECTION & WIDENING TO TUCSON BOULEVARD



Kino Parkway – 22nd Street Intersection Improvements Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #22 Meeting Summary

The 22nd meeting of the CAC was held on Thursday, April 2, 2009, from 6:00 - 8:25 p.m. at the Acosta Job Corps Center Conference Room, 901 South Campbell Avenue. In attendance were CAC members Ivo Ortiz, Dirck Schou, Elaine Ward, Claire Fellows, Bill Seitz, Les Pierce, Jamey Sumner, Brett Dumont and George Kalil. Absent were members Sandra Zepeda, Wright Thomas and Sylvia Campoy. Project staff present included Janice Cuaron, Edie Griffith-Metty, Alejandro Angel, Jay Van Echo, Claudia Perchinelli, Dave Dobler, Priscilla Fernandez, Nanette Pageau and Freda Johnson. Also in attendance was Abe Marques, Ward V City Council office.

1. Welcome and introductions; confirm quorum

Chairman Ivo Ortiz called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and turned the meeting over to moderator Freda Johnson. Freda announced that a quorum was present and invited all present to introduce themselves and state their affiliations.

2. Review ground rules for meetings/meeting summary/agenda item order

Freda reviewed the ground rules and acknowledged the summary of the previous meeting.

3. First call to the audience

Freda invited members of the audience to address the CAC, but no one spoke at this time.

4. Project schedule

Edie Griffith-Metty of AECOM presented the project schedule. She said that regular meetings of the CAC would end in late May. During the design phase of the project, the CAC would convene two or three times, and on June 10, 2009 there would be a public open house about the project. Brett DuMont asked about the status of the signal at 19th Street/Park Avenue. Edie said this would be addressed later in the meeting as noted on agenda item #5. Elaine Ward asked when there would be discussion about the structure over the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks. Edie said this would happen during the design phase of the project. She said that a consultant yet to be chosen would complete the bridge design work beyond 15%. The CAC would be involved during that phase and Brett suggested that the City keep AECOM.

5. Project updates on Kino Parkway/22nd Street intersection and widening to Tucson Boulevard:

- Park Avenue Signal Subcommittee meeting – final outcome

Edie reminded the CAC that the Subcommittee was comprised of representatives of the Millville, Santa Rita Park and Armory Park neighborhoods. She said that all supported a full signal at 19th Street/Park Avenue. She added that an island is needed on the north side. Brett DuMont said that the signal at 19th Street is good for all the neighborhoods. He asked about the situation regarding Praxair (located at the northwest corner of Park Avenue and 19th Street), because he is concerned since that business generates retail traffic. Staff responded that Jose Ortiz, City of Tucson Traffic Engineering, would discuss the situation with Praxair on April 6.

Brett mentioned that perhaps a frontage road on the west side of Park Avenue could be constructed to access Praxair. Claire Fellows observed that an existing Park Avenue frontage road from 17th to 18th Street is one-way (northbound). She asked to read a statement, which follows: ‘Recently, I have heard rumors that the projected placement of a signal on Park at 19th has added impetus to the proposed expansion of industrial uses onto residential property along Fremont Avenue. Last year when I suggested placing a signal on Park, the purpose was to address access issues and mitigate current traffic in the NW quadrant not to facilitate an increase in industrial traffic on a residential street. The irony is not lost on me. I doubt that when the subcommittee endorsed the signal placement it could have foreseen consequences like these.’

6. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendations:

- Traffic modeling for two lanes vs. three lanes on Kino Parkway**
- 21st Street ramp connection**
- Bicycle and pedestrian circulation for Kino Parkway (28th Street to Murphy’s Overpass) and 22nd Street (Fremont Avenue to Tucson Boulevard)**

Alejandro Angel of Psomas began with the topic of two vs. three lanes on the Kino Parkway Bridge. The key issue is that having three northbound lanes would not allow northbound ramp traffic to adequately merge onto Kino Parkway because of the proximity to Murphy’s Overpass. He said that the TAC had asked if four lanes on the bridge would provide enough capacity. Subsequent investigation showed that there is less traffic on the bridge because traffic to or from 22nd Street would not use the bridge, as the off ramp is before the bridge, and the on ramp is after the bridge. Alejandro said that traffic projections show that 25% of Kino Parkway traffic will exit onto 22nd Street (before crossing the bridge).

Furthermore, the signals on Kino at Silverlake and at Aviation limit the capacity of the intersections. Because there are no signals on the bridge, four lanes on the bridge could serve more traffic than six lanes at the intersections. Les Pierce asked about bike lanes going south on Kino Parkway, and the team said this would be addressed later in the meeting. Claire Fellows asked if there is only one exit lane southbound on Kino Parkway. Response was made that this is true, but that as traffic approached the 22nd Street intersection there would be additional left and right turn lanes, for a total of 3 lanes approaching the intersection from the ramp. Elaine Ward asked if the traffic model took

into account new development planning for Kino Parkway and 36th Street. Staff said yes, new development was factored in.

Alejandro said that the TAC concluded that if there were three lanes in each direction on Kino Parkway, then two lanes in each direction on the bridge would suffice. Janice Cuaron reported that the TAC approved the four-lane bridge. Edie added that the cost impact of this recommendation would create a savings of approximately \$2 million. Alejandro said that adding another lane in the future could be done fairly easy, if needed. The cost would be minimal compared to widening all the intersections on the Kino Parkway corridor. Ivo wondered about what the impact would be on the art component. Edie said that there might or might not be an impact on the art. Les said that bike lanes are an issue regardless of the number of lanes on the bridge. Alejandro pointed out that there is an eight-foot shoulder on the bridge to avoid having stalled vehicles blocking travel lanes. Jamey Sumner said that one never knows what will happen in the future. He said he understands the rationale for two lanes in each direction on the bridge. He asked that language be added to the effect that if capacity is needed in the future look to add lanes on to Murphy's Overpass.

Claire asked if a light rail or modern streetcar is envisioned going south on Campbell and if the narrower bridge would preclude this. Alejandro said that rail or streetcar modes could be accommodated on the bridge based on lane configuration as a modern streetcar typically operates in existing traffic lanes. Claudia Perchinelli clarified that the bridge is not designed to accommodate modern streetcar structural loading. Alejandro said that traffic projections show that 25% of Kino Parkway traffic will exit onto 22nd Street (before crossing the bridge).

By general agreement, the CAC indicated that there was no objection to the TAC recommendation, but with the addition of wording that allows the bridge to be widened in the future if extra capacity becomes necessary.

Edie presented background information about the 21st Street connection to the Kino Parkway off ramp. She said that traffic, safety and visibility issues have been explored. With regard to visibility, 380 feet would be required and 450 feet is provided. The connection will allow traffic from 21st St to access the ramp, but right turns from the ramp onto 21st Street would be prohibited because of the proximity to Curtis Avenue. She said that a curb would be added as a barrier to avoid traffic from turning right onto 21st Street. Edie said that the TAC recommends this configuration. By general agreement, the CAC approved the TAC recommendation. Comment was made about the great work staff had done to address concerns in this area. Claire asked about examining 23rd Street to Cherrybell and staff agreed the 23rd Street connection is a good idea and that they are looking into it.

Edie summarized issues associated with bicycle and pedestrian circulation. She said that an at-grade crossing is recommended for the single point urban interchange (SPUI) with crosswalks through the medians both ways. She said that an example is at McDowell and 51st Street in Phoenix as well as at Indian School and State Route 51. She said that medians could be extended slightly to provide a refuge area for pedestrians. Bicyclists

could use the bridge instead of the pedestrian crosswalks if they so desired although the at-grade crosswalks can serve both bikes and pedestrians. The TAC suggested that there be perpendicular crossings for bikes and an illustration of this 'hook' concept was shown to the CAC. Les asked if there might be a signal on the Kino Parkway ramps to avoid conflicts with bikes. Staff said that signals on the off-ramps are not recommended because drivers don't expect to stop when they exit the Parkway. Certain locations do use ramp meters to regulate traffic entering the highway.

Bill Seitz said he is concerned about the proposed ramp merging to the bridge and that there should be more radiuses for the turn. Jay Van Echo said that it is a stop condition for bikes. Alejandro said that the radius could be shifted. Les said that she likes the options for different kinds of cyclists and she supports Bill's request to adjust the radius. Bill commented that there is a loss of stability at low speeds on a bike. He said that many drivers are aggressive towards cyclists. Jamey asked if a tunnel might be provided. Jay said that it would be a very large structure. Bill noted that the south end of Kino Parkway is shown in the exhibit and asked if the north side would be treated the same. The answer was yes. He asked that a better approach be found for cyclists coming from the north. Dave Dobler of Structural Grace reported that the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, Tom Thivener, is planning for alternative routes around this intersection and the Kino Parkway over Aviation-Highway intersection for cyclists. Jay said that options would be worked on to improve circulation.

Janice said that the TAC made no recommendation about bike and pedestrian circulation except to continue investigating the best possible solutions for access and safety.

There was some discussion about providing separate overpasses in some areas such as the UPRR. Elaine Ward said that UPRR built a pedestrian overpass. Jay commented that it was not ADA accessible and was built only for use by union workers at the railroad. Dave Dobler presented an alternative concept that was also presented to the TAC at the March 24th TAC meeting. This concept is fundamentally a suspended steel structure with a concrete deck in the center of the twin vehicular bridge decks. The center structure connects to grade at east and west ends of the bridge underneath the bridge and has the potential to activate otherwise unused areas. The structure would vary in height above the ground as it passes between the bridge decks and could be as high as 35 feet in the air (same height as the vehicle bridge) and the suspended structure would be about two blocks long as compared to the vehicle structure which is about 5 blocks long. Ivo supported the creative approach presented where connections were made on the east side of the UPRR Bridge to Aviation Parkway pedestrian/bikeway.

George Kalil asked if the new structure could be an attractive nuisance to skateboarders. Bill said he is concerned about people in wheelchairs/other adaptive equipment dealing with a switchback ramp. He said that his wife rides a hand-cycle that requires a 20-foot radius for turning. Elaine wondered if one could cut over on the ramp to go down. Dave said that the ramp is eight feet from the ground at the point Elaine was wondering about, and that stairs could short-cut the ramp length although the ramp lengths could not be reduced as they were at ADA minimums. He added that it's important to make the journey as short as possible between the west and east connection points. Jamey said that

the possibilities of this center structure are exciting and that achieving connectivity to Aviation Parkway means there will be another way to get downtown without using cars. Les and Bill concurred with Jamey's remarks.

The CAC enthusiastically endorsed (by a round of applause) the idea of a center pedestrian/bikeway. Dave stated that a Safety by Design review by TPD was scheduled and evaluation of accessibility issues would be pursued in preparation for the Charette.

7. Describe April design charette/work session – Structural Grace

Dave Dobler presented an overview of the April 30 design charette and provided handouts to the CAC. He reviewed the proposed format and agenda and distributed a homework assignment. He asked for the homework to be returned no later than April 17. He said that questions could be addressed to him between now and the deadline and gave out the Structural Grace office telephone number.

8. Discuss future meeting dates and agenda items

By general agreement, the next regular CAC meeting was scheduled for May 28 at the Patrick K. Hardesty Center. Jamey asked that the topic of lighting be put on a future agenda to talk about safety and aesthetics.

9. Call to the Audience

Freda invited audience members to address the CAC after informing everyone that the City Attorney's office had clarified that the CAC Chair may respond to a speaker if the topic is germane to the agenda, and that the Chair may request staff to follow up on an issue.

Stephen McDonald from Earl Sheib asked what the status was on the project's bids for property and relocation procedures. Chair Ivo Ortiz asked staff to explore this issue. Janice said there would be an update on the next agenda.

10. Adjournment

Ivo declared the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.