

January 15, 2008

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #6
Meeting Summary**

A meeting of the TAC was held from 10:00 am -12:20 pm on January 15, 2008 at the Public Works building fourth floor conference room. In attendance were members Bea Paulus, Carl Latimer, Connie Yazzie, Deputy Chief Pat Quinn, Don Freeman, David Duffy, George Caria, Jim Meskan, Jose Carballeira, Rob Soler, Sandy Elder, Tom Thivener, and Vince Catalano. Project staff present included Janice Cuaron and consultant team staff Claudia Perchinelli, Darlene Danehy, Darlene Showalter, Dave Dobler, Edie Griffith-Metty, Jay Van Echo, and Nanette Pageau.

1. Welcome and Introductions;

Janice Cuaron, project manager welcomed everyone and invited them to introduce themselves and tell of their affiliation. She explained that this meeting would be focusing on the Kino-22nd Street intersection portion of the project and at the conclusion of the meeting we would like to have the TAC complete the matrix similar to what was done for the widening alternatives.

2. Overview of Alternatives

Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM provided an overview of the three Kino-22nd Street intersection alternatives. In all alternatives, Kino Parkway is bridged over 22nd Street.

-The first alternative is called a “tight diamond” and is similar to the interchanges you see along the Interstate. It would have two signalized intersections where the ramps connect to 22nd Street.

-Alternative number two is called a “SPUI”, a single point urban interchange, would be similar to the one in use at the I-19/Valencia Road Interchange. All roads and ramps come to a center point that is signalized.

-Alternative number three is called a “partial cloverleaf” with the cloverleaf portion occurring on the south side of the interchange. This alternative would also have two signalized intersections at Highland on the west and Cherry on the east.

3. Darlene Danehy/PSOMAS, presented the traffic simulation to the TAC as it relates to each of the alternatives. The traffic model uses the year 2030 traffic projections. The TAC members began to make comments and ask questions regarding each of the alternatives. Those comments are as follows:

Alternative 1 (Tight Diamond):

-Tucson Fire commented that we might be underestimating how many u-turns will be made by motorists coming out of Cherrybell.

-Vince Catalano/TDOT Traffic observed stacking through the interchange like on I-10 with most of the back-up occurring at the Cherry intersection.

-Vince Catalano/TDOT asked if a “Florida T” could be used with this alternative relative to the access issues at Cherry. It was determined that would not work with this alternative.

-Don Freeman/PAG wants to make sure that traffic simulation is optimizing the signal timing. Darlene indicated it was.

-Vince Catalano/TDOT commented that 22nd Street runs at a 90 second cycle currently. He also observed that bicycles would have to cross traffic to exit on the ramp with this alternative.

-Don Freeman/PAG observed that the two buildings on the north side of 22nd Street at Cherry would most likely be removed with the widening of 22nd Street. Does that open up a possibility for realigning the two short “L” shaped roadways on the north side and south side of 22nd Street to improve the Cherry connection?

-Vince Catalano/TDOT commented that it might be difficult for pedestrians to move from north to south across this interchange – discussed where a HAWK crossing might assist in that movement.

-Rob Soler/U.S. Post Office commented that most pedestrians come from the bus route at Cherrybell and 22nd Street. The bus stops at the southwest corner and northeast corner might need to be relocated. Concerns discussed about pedestrians needing to cross traffic to access the bus stops.

-Bea Paulus/Sun Tran reported that the #2 bus serves the post office from the south, then on Cherry, then turns left onto 22nd Street.

-Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM indicated that there is a land use component to this study effort and that the planners have identified the east side of this interchange, both north and south of 22nd Street, as possible employment center. The west side of the interchange, both north and south, is identified as mixed use.

Sandy Elder/Tucson Water commented that this alternative, the tight diamond, was the least effective for their Plant 1 relocation.

-Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM next reviewed the elements of the matrix as it related to Alternative 1. She commented on the environmental issues that would be looked at with this and all alternatives - noise and visual impacts. She observed that residential is not at all close to this intersection. Edie also commented that business access to Kino is of concern, primarily eastbound 22nd Street wanting to make a u-turn. Overall this alternative is easy to construct, however, it is more costly due to a longer bridge over 22nd Street and the need for two signals.

Alternative 2 (SPUI):

Darlene Danehy/PSOMAS reviewed the traffic simulation for this alternative and indicated that because only one signal is needed at the interchange, that allows for a partial signal at Cherry. This alternative has some weaving issues at the northbound Kino ramps and is also more difficult for pedestrians to access because of the large intersection. In addition, this alternative has a 4th phase which has been added, a through phase on the ramp to allow local circulation to/from the ramp turnoffs which eliminates some of the efficiency of the SPUI.

-Tucson Water prefers this alternative because it provides the most property on the east side of Kino Parkway, south of 22nd Street, for the Plant 1 buildings. All the operations could be located on one side rather than split between east and west sides of Kino.

-The Fire Department commented that the more traffic you can get away from the intersection, the better it will be from an emergency access standpoint.

-The Post Office wanted to confirm that the Silverlake signal would stay in this alternative.

-It was observed that the bicyclists will have to cross traffic to exit the ramps just as in Alternative 1.

Bea Paulus/Sun Tran asked about the possibility of improving Silverlake east of Cherrybell. Jay Van Echo/DMJM responded that the team will need to look at other street improvements in the area in general during this process.

Tom Thivener/Alternative Modes indicated that the Bicycle Advisory Committee has expressed concern about being able to get through the large SPUI intersection.

Eddie Griffith-Metty/DMJM reviewed the elements of the matrix as it relates to Alternative 2. Land Use: this alternative would be better for Tucson Water, land use opportunities would be very similar to Alternative 1, and this alternative allows for more redevelopment in the area because the interchange is more closely configured. Regarding environmental issues, this alternative is very similar to Alternative 1 although it might be more visually impacting due to the density of the interchange. Some cost savings will be realized due to fewer traffic signals. Circulations in the area of the interchange will be very similar to Alternative 1.

-Janice Cuaron/TDOT asked about drainage. Eddie indicated that Alternatives 1 and 2 are very similar. Darlene Showalter/McGann & Associates indicated that she believes water harvesting will be more difficult with the SPUI.

-Don Freeman/PAG asked if the team can quantify the total delay of the system by alternative. Darlene Danehy/PSOMAS responded that the tight diamond (Alternative 1) has more delay, the SPUI (Alternative 2) is significantly better, and Alternative 3 is even better.

-Dave Dobler/Structural Grace asked if reversing the SPUI onto 22nd Street would change anything. Actually, more impacts would occur to land uses on both Kino and 22nd Street. Additionally, more impact to Cherry.

Alternative 3 (Partial Cloverleaf):

Darlene Danehy/PSOMAS reviewed the traffic simulation for this alternative and indicated that two signals would be required at Highland and Cherry, located 1,100 feet apart. Access to the post office would be via a slip ramp under the Kino northbound off-ramp. This new access would require some education of customers. It was added that these loop ramps are somewhat “out of style” in the transportation industry and that they are more difficult for large trucks to maneuver.

-Vince Catalano/TDOT commented that curving roadways are causing more accidents all over the City.

-Don Freeman’s/PAG idea about relocating the Cherry intersection to the east might work well on this alternative. Additionally, it would open up the loops more making them easier to maneuver.

-Carl Latimer/Kalil commented that this alternative is best for Kalil because of available access points. It allows truck traffic out of neighborhood and really improved business access on the north quadrants.

-Vince indicated that the ramp at Kino and Ajo Way is working very well – it is near the Pima County Juvenile Courts and the gas station.

-Vince Catalano/TDOT commented that this alternative would handle pedestrians on a multi-use path and would probably be easier for Sun Tran because the intersections are more standard.

-Jay Van Echo/DMJM indicated that this alternative has potential to connect 21st under the overpass.

-Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM reviewed the elements of the matrix as it relates to Alternative 3. Land Use: This alternative opens up the area within the cloverleaf, but limits access. No real differences for other land use issues. The environmental is very similar although this alternative is closer to neighborhoods. Potentially opens up more right-of-way for pocket parks and provides some good gateway opportunities. Not as ideal for Tucson Water’s Plant 1 relocation. The post office access would merge into an off-ramp to 22nd Street.

-Don Freeman/PAG commented that if Cherry is realigned to the east, then the connection under the 22nd Street overpass would not be needed.

-Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM, continuing with the matrix elements, indicated that constructability of this alternative is not as easy as other alternatives. Also, this is the most costly of all three alternatives due to more earthwork, pavement, and two traffic signals.

4. Edie Griffith-Metty/DMJM handed out the matrix form and asked the TAC to prioritize the six elements and then identify their first priority in the sub-categories. The TAC completed this exercise and turned in the matrices.

5. Discussion continued as to what the design team would be reviewing prior to the next TAC meeting. In Alternative 1, the team will eliminate the Cherry connection and look for other options. In Alternative 2, the team will review the potential for a three-phase intersection, and in Alternative 3, the designers will look at expanding the eastern-most cloverleaf to connect with Warren.

-Don Freeman/PAG requested that the team look at moving Cherry intersection with all three alternatives.

The TAC meeting previously scheduled for Tuesday, January 29th will be cancelled and the TAC will meet again on February 19th, from 10 a.m. – Noon.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm.