

Meeting Summary
NAC/CAC (the “Committee”) Meeting
September 19, 2007

A. Attendance:

1. NAC/CAC Members and Alternates Present: Irene T. Dailey, Falcon Ridge HOA; Christine Klein, Tucson Mountain Sanctuary; Jeffery Anderson, Shadow Mountain Ranch; John Maple, Tucson Mountain Sanctuary; Candy Davis, representing businesses within one mile; Randy Newman, Star Ridge HOA; Duane Krause, Tucson Estates; and Dave R. Stone, Fire Marshall, Drexel Heights Fire District.

2. NAC/CAC Members and Alternates Absent: Dr. Buell T. Januzi, Kitt Peak National Observatory; Charles Aquilina, Jr., CAC representative; Pat Calhins, Tucson Estates; Gisela Harden, Tucson Estates No 2 HOA; John Kurath and Steve Rankin, Millstone Manor No. 2; April Snow, Shadow Mountain Ranch; Sherry Whiting and Murray Samuel, Tucson Estates No. 2; Otis Bronson, Veteran Acres; Ron Miller, Falcon Ridge; Michael Burns, Sage Creek; Kathleen Buske, Desert Mountain ; Bob Edison, Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum; Pete Mangelsdorf and Jeff Anderson, Old Tucson Studios; and Dr. Paul Smith, Kitt Peak National Observatory; James Roland, Falcon Ridge HOA; Sarah Craighead, Saguaro National Park; and Joel Taylor, Tucson Estates.

3. Audience Attendees: Kiki Navarro, District 3 BOS.

4. Project Team and Consultant Attendees: Rich Montgomery, URS; Joshua Marks, Sundt; Angela Stith, Kaneen Advertising; Keri Silvyn, Lewis and Roca; Valarie Hall, Lewis and Roca, Jim Portner, Designated Facilitator; Ben Goff, Pima County DOT; Leslie Watson, URS; and Dan Leineweber, Sundt.

B. Welcome - Introductions -Remarks :

Mr. Jim Portner brought the meeting to order at 6:08 PM, September 19, 2007, at the Multi-Purpose Room, Tucson Estates, 5900 West Western Way Circle, Tucson, Arizona.

Mr. Portner addressed the Committee and thanked them for their attendance. He said that this is the final stretch in reviewing the EAMR. He also recognized the consulting team and told the Committee the team was present specifically to answer any questions the Committee may have regarding the Draft EAMR and any other project related questions.

C. Meeting Summary Review:

No revisions, edits or questions were raised by the Committee members regarding the September 6, 2007 draft meeting summary. Mr. Portner therefore stated that the draft meeting summary for September 6, 2007, would formally constitute the final meeting summary.

D. General Project Update:

Ms. Keri Silvyn discussed the general status of the project and said that nothing has changed from her update two weeks ago at the September 6, 2007 committee meeting.

There were several questions regarding the Kinney/Ajo intersection:

1. Will the utility work begin on Ajo Road first? Ms. Silvyn said that the utility work would begin on Ajo Road first and then continue on Kinney Road.
2. Will there be any utilities located under the roads (not just under the shoulder of the roads)? Except for those utilities that must be placed under the intersection of Ajo and Kinney all remaining utilities will be located along the side of the roadway and within the right-of-way (ROW).
3. Mr. Stone, Drexel Heights Fire Marshall asked if the pre-empt signal was going to be removed from the signal during roadway construction. There will be a pre-empt signal when the new signal lights are installed at Ajo/ Kinney Roads and at the new signal at Kinney Road and the Shopping Center. When the old signal is replaced by the new signal at Ajo and Kinney Roads there may be a period of no more than one day when there will be no pre-empt signal.
4. What area of the project is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) questioning? There are drainage issues and potential USACOE issues on both the shopping center and the roadway. We are working through both right now. The final drainage plan affects the road construction and the shopping center because it identifies where culverts will need to be constructed under or beside the road to facilitate storm water drainage from the shopping center.

E. Substantive Issues:

1. Review Updated Inquiry Matrix with Responses: Angela Stith of Kaneen Advertising provided an updated copy of the "Inquiries to Date" hand-out, which is a status report of all questions and inquiries received via the project comment forms. She reported that all issues have been answered to date and reflected in the updated summary.
2. Committee Discussion/Questions of Full EAMR: Mr. Portner referred to the Draft Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Report ("EAMR") that was mailed to all Committee members on September 11, 2007. Mr. Portner opened the meeting to discussion and to questions the Committee may have regarding the report.
 - a. *Section 4.2.6 Viewshed-Visual Analysis mentions that landscaping within the medians would use native vegetation. What type of plants will be in the medians?*

Mr. Portner said that the details of what plants and where they will be placed would be addressed on the landscape plan that would be submitted as part of the roadway construction plans for review/approval by Pima County. Ms. Watson also

explained that there are very specific plants that are allowed to be used for landscaping purposes. Many of these plants are discussed in Section 2.1.3 of the EAMR. Ms. Watson continued to explain that a Native Plant Preservation Plan had to be submitted to the County planning department. This plan identified the location of each plant on the site, primarily on the shopping center site. Healthy plants will be moved to the landscape buffer areas and plants that cannot be salvaged will be replaced by the developer. The replacement of non-salvageable plants is calculated at a ratio of 2-1.

Ms. Watson also talked about keeping and replacing any trees that are along Kinney Road. Trees such as Palo Verde and Mesquite were discussed. The Arizona Native Plant list was mentioned and the Committee members were directed to Section 2.1.3 of the EAMR for specific plant examples.

b. *Where can a person obtain plants that the roadway project intends to discard? Is there a special nursery?*

The plants are identified and transported to a salvage nursery. Ms. Watson did not know what salvage nursery the plants from the Ajo/Kinney project would go.

c. *What are Key Observation Points?*

Ms. Watson explained that the Key Observation Points as represented on the maps in the EAMR are locations where visual assessments of the area were made. They are not to be confused with noise collection sites.

d. *One Committee member was aware of a property owner who was concerned that several trees that were behind her fence (between the fence and the roadway) may be removed as part of the roadway project.*

Mr. Goff said all the proposed roadwork will be done within the ROW currently held by Pima County. He thinks that these trees are most likely in the subdivision buffer areas that typically surround subdivisions and will not be affected by the proposed roadway widening.

e. *The Committee wanted to repeat from the last meeting that they believe the statement in the Executive Summary regarding winter visitors was not accurate.*

Mr. Portner stated that this is a proper item to be included in the CAC Letter to the Board of Supervisors. The Committee agreed.

f. *Section 5.1.2 **Vertical Alignment** states that the proposed vertical alignment would be designed to accommodate a 50-mph design speed. The current speed limit is 45-mph. Does this statement mean that the speed limit after the roadway project is complete will be 50-mph?*

Mr. Goff said that the roadway will be designed for speeds up to 50-mph but the posted speed limit will remain at 45-mph.

g. *Section 5.1.7 Noise Walls as a design element: One Committee member commented on an article in the Desert Times regarding noise walls. Another Committee member said that he could not count on existing walls to mitigate the increase in noise due to the realignment of Bopp Road and Sarasota Road.*

Mr. Montgomery talked about the difference between noise walls and privacy walls and that the only walls currently in place along Kinney Road are privacy walls. Privacy walls are designed to give property owners privacy from their neighbors and the public and are generally 4-6 feet high. Noise walls are designed to mitigate noise generally from roadways and can be 8-feet or higher. Mr. Montgomery stated that noise walls are not usually aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Silvyn said that the existing walls were not calculated in the projections used in the noise study, so any noise mitigation that existing walls may provide is not reflected in the study data. Mr. Montgomery added that technical studies show Rubberized Asphalt Coating substantially reduces roadway noise.

h. *Section 2.23 Kinney Road Access: Is there any place allowed on Kinney Road for bus pullouts?*

Mr. Goff said that the roads are being designed with wide shoulders on both sides of the road to allow buses to pull over and not obstruct traffic while dropping off and picking up passengers.

i. *How will Kinney Road transition from the newly developed 4 lane with median road to the existing Kinney Road north of Sarasota Road?*

Mr. Goff described how the section of improved road would meet with the section of the current road north of the shopping center. The improved road would be a four lane divided highway with extended medians with left turn slots to Sarasota. There will be a cigar median constructed past Sarasota positioned for future development.

j. *When will the South Forty property be transferred to Pima County?*

Mr. Goff said that the property would be transferred on September 23, 2007.

k. *When will the tenants be evicted and the South Forty property cleaned up?*

Mr. Goff said that some of the buildings will be used as offices for the construction company. The mobile homes and the trash behind the main buildings will be scheduled for demolition and removal. Mr. Geoff didn't know if there were tenants still in the back buildings. Mr. Stone said that he would keep an eye on the buildings and report any fire code violations.

1. *Will the buildings be tested for asbestos before demolition?*

Yes, the buildings will be tested for asbestos. If the test is positive, then a specialized company would be hired by the County to remove the asbestos from the structures and properly dispose of it.

m. Mr. Stone introduced a concern regarding Committee members that are also Government employees and are members of the Committee solely because of their employment position. Mr. Stone is the Fire Marshall for the Drexel Heights Fire District. He doesn't think he has the authority to sign a document that might be binding upon the Fire District or represent a particular opinion that might not be the opinion of the Fire District.

Ms. Silvyn said that this problem has been *discussed* without resolution. Several Committee members may have a similar issue. Ms. Silvyn didn't have an answer at this time, but the team was aware of the issue.

3. Possible Committee Review of Other Projects: There was general discussion regarding an interest of the Committee members to review other projects in the area. Ms. Silvyn explained that this Committee acting as a Citizen Advisory Committee is a requirement because Kinney Road is an Environmentally Sensitive Roadway. The Committee named the "Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC)" was a voluntary group organized by the shopping center developer, Donahue Schriber, in order to establish positive communication with the neighborhoods and businesses to be served in the area. The NAC did select a community representative to sit on the Pima County Design Review Board (DRB), to review the design of the shopping center, but there is no County requirement for organizing a NAC. The NAC would reconstitute itself after the work of the CAC to keep neighbors informed of the progress of the roadway project and the shopping center. This was done at the request of Supervisor Bronson and is required as part of the Development Agreement between the developer and Pima County. The Committee members agreed that the NAC is a good idea and that they plan to continue communicating with each other in order to improve their neighborhoods.

4. Content of CAC Letter to Board of Supervisors: Several Committee members wanted the CAC Letter to include a general thank you to the staff for the professional manner in which the shopping center and roadway projects were presented to the neighborhoods and the continued involvement with the surrounding communities. They wanted to express in the CAC Letter that they appreciated and were impressed with the dedication of the committee members, the consultants and the public.

The Committee members also said that they support the EAMR as a document however there were some areas of concern. The following bullet points were discussed as being important to the Committee and should be included in the CAC Letter to the Board of Supervisors:

- √ Request a post-construction noise study and have the results available for public review.

- √ The Committee continues to question the winter visitor/snowbird statement as used in describing the noise collection process. The general thought is that the winter visitors had departed the area weeks before the comprehensive noise study was conducted.
- √ Strongly encourage the extension of the Kinney Road improvements northward to Western Way. The continuation of the road improvements on Kinney Road would improve neighborhood and traffic safety. Committee members strongly suggested that the continuation of the road improvements on Kinney Road should be expedited.
- √ Include an emergency traffic signal as an element of the northward extension of the Kinney Road improvements. The signal would be located at the existing Drexel Heights Fire District station in order to stop traffic for fire engine entering and exiting onto Kinney Road.
- √ Encourage Pima County to integrate the various zoning overlay requirements so that the public can better interpret and implement them via community groups.

Mr. Portner said that he would put together a draft of the CAC's Letter and email it to all the Committee members for their review and final input. Mr. Portner said he would email the draft CAC Letter to the Committee members on September 21, 2007.

F. Committee Questions and Comments:

Mr. Portner asked the Committee members to review the Ajo/Kinney Improvement Project Inquires to Date. As stated by Ms. Angela Stith earlier in the meeting, all questions/inquires to date have been answered as reflected on the updated inquiry report that was passed out to each Committee member at the beginning of the meeting.

G. Future NAC Meetings:

Mr. Portner asked the Committee if they could get together on September 26, 2007 in order to review the final CAC Letter to the Board of Supervisors and make its final revisions to the letter. He also asked the Committee for its suggestions as to how the letter could best be distributed for final signatures by the Committee members. The CAC agreed to the September 26 meeting date. Mr. Duane Krause said that a final hard copy of the letter could be left at a central location, such as the Tucson Estates Office so that the Committee members could sign it at their convenience. The Committee agreed that the final draft of the letter could be sent out via email for Committee review and then the hard copy of it can be kept at the Tucson Estates Office for all Committee members to sign.

After the letter and accompanying documents are prepared and submitted to the Board of Supervisors, it was explained that copies will be available for viewing by the

public at the Mission Library, the Southwest Library, the Downtown Library, Tucson Estates Office and at the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

H. Adjournment:

Mr. Portner asked if there were any further questions or comments for discussion. Hearing none, he thanked the Committee for their time and adjourned the meeting at 7:36 PM.