

**Meeting Summary**  
**NAC/CAC (the “Committee”) Meeting**  
**September 6, 2007**

**Attendance:**

*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; Dr. Buell T. Januzi, Kit Peak National Observatory; Candy Davis, representing businesses within one mile; Charles Aquilina, Jr., CAC representative; Randy Newman, Star Ridge HOA; Pat Calhins, Tucson Estates; Gisela Harden, Tucson Estates No 2 HOA; and Duane Krause, Tucson Estates.

*NAC/CAC Members and Alternates Absent:* David Stone, Drexel Heights Fire District Fire Marshall; 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; Joel Taylor, Tucson Estates

*Audience Attendees:* Mary Ann Anderson; Alan Young; and Barbara Genter.

*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; Bill Holliday, Sound Solutions Acoustical Consulting; Bob Lutgendorf, Pima County Public Works; Leslie Watson, URS; and Dan Leineweber, Sundt.

**I. Welcome and Introductions -Remarks:**

Mr. Jim Portner brought the meeting to order at 6:02 PM, September 6, 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 acknowledged that there are representatives from the build/design team (URS and Sundt), Pima County Transportation, Lewis and Roca, and Sound Solutions Acoustical Consulting present specifically to answer any questions the Committee may have regarding the Draft EAMR Executive Summary and any other project related questions.

**II. Meeting Summary Review:**

No revisions, edits or questions were raised by the Committee members regarding the July 25, 2007 draft meeting summary. Mr. Portner therefore stated that the draft meeting summary for July 25, 2007, would formally constitute the final meeting summary.

**III. General Project Status Update:**

Ms. Keri Silvyn discussed the general status of the project and, more specifically, the 404 Permit required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“USACE”). She said that the development team is working through the drainage issues with the USACE and have

made progress. The team is hopeful construction can begin (utility relocation on Kinney Road, specifically) in the next 2-3 months.

There was one question from the Committee on timing and whether we missed a July 16, 2007 utility relocation date. It was explained that it had been determined that there was no need to move those particular utilities. Therefore, the July 16, 2007 utility relocation date was not missed.

Ms. Silvyn reported that road construction would begin on Ajo Way. Kinney Road construction will begin once the required utility relocation is complete along Kinney Road, the Board of Supervisors has approved the EAMR, and the USACE review is final. Ms. Silvyn also reminded the group that the shopping center can open when a substantial portion of the road work is complete.

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.

#### **IV. Substantive Issues:**

Mr. Portner referred to the Draft Executive Summary-Kinney Road Improvements project Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Report ("EAMR) that all Committee members received prior to this meeting. Mr. Portner opened the meeting to discussion and to any questions the Committee may have regarding the report.

*Reference to page ES-4; PROJECT ELEMENTS: Is the side walk referenced at bullet 5 be a sidewalk on both the east and west sides of Kinney Road?*

Mr. Goff said that there will be a sidewalk or paved path along the west side of Kinney Road and that the path may be a meandering path

*Reference to page ES-5; PROJECT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION: The EMAR reports that there are no direct adverse impacts occurring because of the Kinney Road Improvements Project. What are the adjoining land uses and property values referenced in bullet 3? And what is happening with the South Forty?*

The full EAMR will address property values in more detail. Mr. Goff said that Pima County will or has acquired the Tucson Mountain Trading Post/South Forty properties at the Bopp/Sheridan/Kinney Rd intersection. The property not used for the right-of-way will be graded, reseeded and most likely sold for development.

*Reference to page ES-6; PROJECT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION: **General Wildlife** What wildlife will be impacted by the roadway construction?*

Ms. Watson explained how the process of determining wildlife impact was conducted. She said that onsite observation determined that there are no endangered or threatened species or their habitat in the development area.

*Reference to page ES-8; PROJECT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION: **Access** If there are community complaints during construction who or what department should the committee members forward the complaints? Who is the Pima County project liaison?*

Mr. Goff said that part of the project planning process is to prevent obstruction of access to any street or business. The work usually begins on one side of the road, and as that is completed, the work moves to the opposite side of the road maintaining traffic movement in both directions. Traffic signs are used to help motorists and assist business to safely move along the road and access business entrances. Mr. Goff also said that the County notifies the public in advance of road construction, and that not only are neighbors notified, but property owners outside the construction area may have questions and require notification. He used the Cactus Community Church of the Nazarene on Irvington Rd as an example. The Church is not within the construction notification area, but the construction may affect people attending their services. Ms. Silvyn added that Kaneen Advertising will be working to get the roadway information out to the public.

*When will the construction on Ajo Way begin?*

Ajo Way is part of the first phase to begin in January 2008.

*When will the vegetation at the Shopping Center site be moved?*

Ms. Silvyn said that the plants will be tagged and moved according to Pima County regulations. It is currently estimated that the tagging will not begin until about four months after the road construction begins.

*Reference to page ES-9; PROJECT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION: **Noise** There was extended discussion regarding traffic noise, the traffic study prepared by Sound Solutions Acoustical Consulting and the use of rubberized asphalt.*

*There were several questions and extended discussion regarding winter visitors and the data collection process.*

Mr. Holliday explained the data collection process. He described the collection of data from eleven (11) individual locations on three (3) separate days. He stressed that the data was collected at the peak traffic hours of 6-8 AM and 4-6 PM during the month of May 2007. During this period, winter visitors had not yet left the area and all public schools were still in session. He stressed that, regardless of the particular traffic counts experienced at the time of the actual noise data collection, the noise model was subsequently adjusted (calibrated) to reflect the noise levels that would accordingly be experienced at the peak traffic volumes experienced on the roadway (these peak volumes are obtained from counts conducted by Pima County). Only after this "baseline" adjustment was the model then used to predict future, post-construction noise levels. As such, all of the noise data presented, whether existing or future, automatically assumes peak traffic levels.

*There was discussion regarding whether winter visitors were in the area when the data was collected.*

Once again, based on the model calibration described above, it wasn't essential that all possible residents in the area were present. Further, Mr. Goff discussed how Pima County conducts traffic counting all year long throughout its road system. They record the ebb and flow of traffic throughout the seasons. There has been traffic monitoring machines on Kinney Road in the past. All of the data collected throughout many years was used by County traffic engineers in promulgating the traffic-volume figures provided for the noise model.

Mr. Holliday talked about the applicable noise regulations which applied to the project, as well as the existing and future noise conditions on Kinney Road that would result from the planned roadway improvement project. Mr. Holliday explained that noise is regulated by Pima County ordinance and that Pima County has adopted the EPA guidelines for noise assessment and the determination of mitigation requirements. Any noise level over 67 dBA (decibels) triggers noise mitigation, as does any increase of 15 dBA or more above the existing condition.

Mr. Holliday used visual aids mounted on presentation boards to illustrate the location of the noise-measurement instruments and explained how a predictive noise model was then developed, calibrated, and checked for accuracy.

After further discussion Mr. Portner recommended that it might be better, in the future, to add an illustration showing projected noise levels before mitigation. One, showing current noise levels; the second showing projected noise levels without rubberized asphalt; and the third illustration showing the projected noise levels of the completed project with rubberized asphalt.

*It seems that the realignment of Sarasota and Bopp should have moved the existing noise level from the existing intersection to the new Kinney/Bopp intersection. Is that true?*

Partially, but with the note that the projected level at the new intersection is still beneath the threshold for any mitigation requirements beyond the rubberized asphalt. Furthermore, the realignment of the intersection will materially increase safety for drivers entering and exiting Kinney Road.

*The CAC then asked a variety of questions regarding specific aspects of the noise measurement process and the future noise projections, all of which were answered by the consultant team or the pertinent Pima County representatives in attendance. Of particular concern was the noise level projection along the new Bopp roadway alignment and some skepticism that the noise levels would be so low. There was extensive discussion of this matter, with consultants pointing out that without the rubberized asphalt noise levels would be higher in that area. However, the rubberized asphalt substantially reduces the noise levels.*

*Will there be a follow-up (i.e. post-construction) noise study to confirm that the noise mitigation is effective and that the “projected” noise levels are accurate? And have there been any other post-construction studies in other areas of town?*

Mr. Goff said that he was unaware of any follow up study, i.e. Pima County ordinance requirements do not stipulate post-construction evaluations.

Mr. Portner said that the idea of a follow-up study could be included in their CAC letter-of-recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

One Committee member stated that they were glad to see the use of rubberized asphalt, and that they had positive experience with that material in the past.

#### **V. Committee Questions and Comments:**

Mr. Portner asked the Committee members to review the Ajo/Kinney Improvement Project Inquires to Date. He commented that this has been and will be a consistent agenda item. He asked if any Committee member had inquiries that were not on the list.

A Committee member asked when will the open inquiries be answered? Mr. Portner said that this was a living document that is always being updated and that next Committee meeting would be the time to wrap up any open items.

**VI. Future NAC Meetings:**

Mr. Portner directed the Committee members to the Schedule of Upcoming meetings/Open House/Milestones sheet contained in their handouts. He emphasized that on September 12, 2007 the Committee would receive a full report draft EAMR for their review. Mr. Portner pointed out that the Committee members needed to be prepared to discuss the EAMR, and the potential content of the CAC letter-of-recommendation to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) at the next meeting scheduled for September 19, 2007. Mr. Portner said that a copy of the full report draft EMAR would be mailed to each Committee member. Mr. Duane Krause volunteered to have copies available at the Tucson Estates office if committee members wanted to pick up a copy.

**VII. 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 7:04 PM.