

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

BACKGROUND:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Interstate 11 (I-11) Corridor between Nogales and Wickenburg, Arizona. The Tier 1 EIS will assess the potential social, economic and natural environmental impacts of a No Build Alternative and a reasonable range of Build Corridor Alternatives for a proposed transportation facility within the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study area. The Notice of Intent to prepare the I-11 Tier 1 EIS was issued in May 2016. Since then, FHWA and ADOT have conducted public and agency scoping meetings, outreach to tribes and stakeholders, and completed an alternatives development and screening process.

FHWA and ADOT have invited the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) to facilitate meetings with interested stakeholders regarding the I-11 Tier 1 EIS Corridor Study in Pima County, to augment the ongoing public input effort. The objective of these stakeholder group meetings is to provide a method for additional productive Pima County community conversations to inform the Interstate 11 Corridor Environmental Impact study with more specifics regarding individual community concerns and preferences to enable technical analysis and planning.

This is the last of three meetings for the B Study Group, which includes stakeholders located in the urban I-10 Tucson geographical area.

AGENDA ITEMS & HIGHLIGHTS

TOPIC	DETAILS
WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS	The US Institute's 3 rd party neutral facilitator, Joy Keller-Weidman, welcomed everyone. Introduced herself, as Senior Program Manager, Transportation Sector; and the Senior Program Associate, Mitch Chrismer, who will be co-facilitating and notetaking.

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING OVERVIEW	Reviewed the Meeting#3 Outcomes & Agenda Items <u>OUTCOMES:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understand the values, interests and characteristics most important to the stakeholders• Identify potential impacts/benefits of proposed corridors based on local knowledge within the stakeholder group<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Identify ways to mitigate/promote those

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore creative alternatives/options moving forward that address concerns • Inform decision-makers re: what is most important to stakeholder groups <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AGENDA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting overview (Meeting outcomes, agenda & meeting agreements) (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (20 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Complete chart#2: last column: identify options related to the interests (HOMEWORK) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (50 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Focus discussion of options related to key themes (<i>i.e. Viewsheds, Wildlife Connectivity, Community cohesion, etc.</i>); and stakeholders provide pros and cons of each (small groups) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (60 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If option B were selected, what would you want it to look like? ○ What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option B was selected? (design features?) <input type="checkbox"/> BREAK (10 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders' Input (30 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the most important aspects for the decision makers to consider going forward? <input type="checkbox"/> Future Public Involvement (5 minutes) <input type="checkbox"/> Closing Comments and Meeting feedback (15 minutes)
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Facilitator asked for everyone to share their name & stakeholder group</p> <p>Stakeholders present represented the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection ◆ Menlo Park Neighborhood Association ◆ Erickson Terrascope

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tucson Audubon Society ◆ Friends of Ironwood Forest ◆ CAPLA ◆ Statistical Research, Inc. ◆ Sonoran Institute ◆ Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation <p>In addition, members present from FHWA and ADOT staff included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Aryan Lirange, FHWA ◆ Jay Van Echo, ADOT ◆ Dayna Wasley, AECOM ◆ Carlos Lopez, ADOT ◆ Laura Douglas, ADOT
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
MEETING AGREEMENTS	<p>The facilitator referred to the items below and asked for consensus on these meeting agreements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prepared to participate, collaborate, and share pertinent information. 2. Engage in a respectful, thoughtful deliberation. 3. One person speaks at a time: Listen carefully when not speaking. 4. Be open to all perspectives. 5. Keep in mind the large picture (regional interests as they relate to larger needs and priorities), as well as your individual/stakeholder group viewpoint. 6. Turn off or mute all electronic devices, so there are no distractions. 7. No recording devices will be allowed during the meeting. 8. Show up on time 9. Stick to agreed-upon speaking limits

TOPIC	DETAILS
-------	---------

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	Complete chart#2- last column: Identify options related to the interests (HOMEWORK)- see below
---------------------	--

CHART #2: STAKEHOLDERS' KEY INTERESTS/ KEY ALTERNATIVES-OPTIONS

letter	Key Interests	Key Alternatives – Options – Mitigation Opportunities / Solutions (Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate)
A	Want to look at what's affected geographically – intangible heritage of landscape	<p>Look at viewshed, from and to historic districts / neighborhoods / river / mountains / places of tribal interest.</p> <p>Consider Tucson's origins and cultural practices of all time periods and cultures. Review criteria used in Santa Cruz River Heritage Area document, Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan document, and Pima County Multi-Species Conservation Plan.</p>
B	Incorporate alternative means of transportation / modes / technology into design package	Increase efforts to expand transit, rail, and other forms of transit options between Tucson and Phoenix.
C	<p>Embrace sustainability within realms of Economic, Environmental, Social, Climate Change mitigation</p> <p>I.e. – should not be encouraging more people to drive personal vehicles.</p>	Refer to NACTO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) for interfaces with urban streets, and collaborate with PAG and local DOTs to reduce freeway usage from intown trips.
D	Protect tangible heritage (cultural resources, i.e. archaeological / architectural resources). Avoid destruction of tangible heritage (i.e. avoid demolition and destruction). Consider known and unknown resources.	Refer to City of Tucson website, reports on archeologically sensitive zones, consult with SHPO & City and County Preservation Office, Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation – get more info on protection of tangible heritage, identify historic districts, location of individual historic properties/resources, information on previously evaluated properties and their significance, issues like vibration, drainage, character-defining features of historic districts.

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

		Look at complete surveys before completing a comprehensive assessment. Minimum 264 historical properties would potentially be affected (that are currently surveyed and listed) within the 2000ft potential corridor of impacts (study area) (with center line of I-10). Also need consider social justice impacts to affected neighborhoods.
E	<p>Avoid disruption to river corridors (Santa Cruz and tributaries), habitat, and migratory corridors, wildlife.</p> <p>Footprint, noise, dust, lights- all impact wildlife, both nocturnal and diurnal.</p>	<p>Avoid disruption before, during and after construction. Avoid any new building as the first step. See studies on light, noise and dust and incorporate suggested mitigation into any plans. This could include tunnel construction, wildlife bridges, sound barriers and many other suggestions. Reference existing studies, regional plans and documentation on Sonoran Desert and Santa Cruz conservation. All of this should be completed on the front end of any I -11 planning.</p>
F	<p>Impact of I-10 has already created a separation, some residents still bitter about separation of different barrios from downtown. Disrupts life / character of city. Walkability, bike-ability, connectivity becomes affected, neighborhoods get more isolated.</p> <p>Encroachment into neighborhoods important to consider – neighborhoods can become more separated from city</p>	
G	Evaluate new non-highway options to reduce congestion and assess the cumulative impacts	<p>Consider range of activities / programs / technologies / other proposed highways that cumulatively could address congestion issues (at least in near term)</p> <p>Look at management / design of existing highways (I-10 & I-19) – i.e. ramp metering, etc.</p> <p>Programmatic efforts to reduce congestion – pricing, tolls, bus/shuttle systems, rapid rail system between</p>

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

		<p>Tucson/Phoenix.</p> <p>Set of technologies that improve traffic flow – intelligent transportation systems (ITS).</p> <p>Enhancements to existing rail system to accommodate increased freight.</p> <p>Proposed new highways within our region that could relieve congestion along corridor, consider extension of Aviation corridor through downtown (I-210).</p> <p>Goal: relieve/address congestion in near term, put off construction / funding of [bypass] or other major enhancements to I-10 (i.e. tunneling, triple decking, etc.) Revisit in 10-15 years, maybe new technologies will be available then that could further reduce congestion. Look at more near-term traffic modeling rather than 2040 projections. What could local plans better reflect? What more information is needed to better inform near-term planning/modeling? Are all possibilities being considered in current models?</p>
H	Consider economic harm to (small) businesses located along future widened corridor during planning, construction, and after, particularly along I-10 frontage roads	
I	Option B doesn't address the needs for projected population growth, congestion, national security considerations, trade flows, etc.	
J	For all interests – need information on full APE (Area of Potential Effect) to make informed comments.	

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS'	Focus discussion of options related to identified key themes (<i>i.e.</i>

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

<p>Create key crossings</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>River restoration, focusing on linear park -increase effort to improve existing linear park along Santa Cruz, other parks downtown</p> <p>OPTION #3</p> <p>Protect and enhance viewsheds from San Xavier del Bac and sacred lands</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>I-19 is located along a transportation easement.</p>	<p>Maintain natural migration patterns</p> <p>Giant park, create healthy communities, beneficial to small businesses (cafes, etc.)</p>	<p>Cost, initial funding, use-ability of a park located next to freeway</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY COHESION</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Put freeway underground from Grant to I-19 to protect historic neighborhoods</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Focus investment on intraregional transit – dedicated travel lanes, bus rapid transit, rail on arterial roads</p>	<p>Viewsheds, community connectivity, protect historic properties, increase property values, attract businesses</p> <p>Lower traffic on I-10, increase community access</p>	<p>Cost, hydrology</p> <p>Construction time, funding costs</p>
<p><u>ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION AND TECHNOLOGY</u></p>		

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

<p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Technology changes – ramp meters, tolls, HOV lanes, dedicated through travel lanes, congestion pricing</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Change work schedules- potentially reduce traffic by 12% 	<p>Helping remove vehicles (push off to other transportation options)</p>	<p>Increase cost of using I-10, increase traffic on surface streets, impacts on lower income families</p>
---	---	---

GROUP 2: KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS:</u> OPTION #1</p> <p>Put corridor underground in selected areas</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Minimize lighting impacts</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>Tunneling under historic properties risks damaging properties (vibration etc.)</p>	<p>Preserve historic neighborhoods, no need for decorated walls</p> <p>Maintain dark skies for people and wildlife</p>	<p>Cost, disruption to traffic, hydrology, archaeological concerns, safety concerns</p> <p>Safety</p>
<p><u>WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY</u> OPTION #1</p>		

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

<p>Close off some of arterials crossing under the corridor</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tunneling comes up a lot, great way to mitigate historic sites, comes down to \$\$\$. Tier 2 will look at it as an option. Tunneling can be done from an engineering standpoint, and public has to pay for it. Decision to put underground would be a local decision. 	<p>Provide safe alternative transportation routes, reconnect neighborhoods, enhance safety</p>	<p>Potential traffic disruption</p>
---	--	-------------------------------------

GROUP 3: KEY CONSIDERATIONS RE: CORRIDOR DESIGN OPTIONS	PROs	CONs
<p><u>VIEWSHEDS + WILDLIFE CONNECTIVITY + COMMUNITY COHESION:</u></p> <p>OPTION #1</p> <p>Capped highway with a tunnel (trains /trucks in tunnel, cars enter/exit the cap). Parks / business on top of tunnel. Train goes to Phoenix.</p> <p>OPTION#2</p> <p>Suspended highway (raised road bed). Under area is pedestrians, bikes, businesses, etc. Suspended area for traffic. No walls</p>	<p>Improve cohesion, economic, reduce air / sound pollution, better views, open space, less light pollution</p> <p>Reduce pollution (noise light etc.). No walls</p>	<p>Construction disruption, safety, lower traffic flexibility</p> <p>Potential engineering first, cost</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
-------	---------

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	<p>If option B were selected, what would you want it to look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Corridor should be hidden (and permeable -allowing people and animals to cross through) as much as possible. Park deck idea (below grade with a deck, on same level as streets are currently) – where traffic goes under – between downtown and west side, a park deck with open space / development on top of it, would make downtown a bigger area. That “deck” could become quite valuable in terms of how it enhances the city. Would grant Tucson a good reputation if this were achieved. Reconnects the grid. Grant ability to go through to other side, see other side.◆ If has to be above ground, then get rid of “wall” / impermeability – options could include a suspended highway and closure of some of the arterial streets to create greater connectivity. For example, certain places under I-10 would be just for bikes (i.e. dangerous undercrossing like Speedway).◆ Either go above grade, with permeability and visual “invisibility”, or go below grade with deck park. Either go up, or go down, either with bridges or tunnels.◆ <u>Co-location: I-11 would be combined with I-10/I-19. Not adding a new freeway alongside existing.</u>◆ Need make enhancements where congestion will be most likely to occur. Expansions don't have to occur along entire way from Nogales – Phoenix. Break down into specific areas to see what traffic needs will be.◆ Ground level continuum important – for wildlife, bicyclists, etc.◆ Bridges / tunnels in key locations – need include options for wildlife connectivity. Need improve access for wildlife.◆ Option B would not look like what it looks like today. I-10 currently a blight.◆ Pull city back together through tunneling etc.
---------------------	---

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

	<p>Note: hard to discuss these options b/c only in Tier 1, will know more about potential specific impacts when enter Tier 2 process.</p> <p>Note: ADOT is criticized when come too late with information, purpose of this exercise is to look at all potential options and let these conversations inform the next stage.</p> <p>Q: How can we be become a consulting party in Sec. 106 process? A: FHWA sent THPF an invite on April 11th. FHWA asks that THPF let them know if this invite was not received.</p>
--	--

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT	<p><i>What are opportunities and/or mitigation options for decision makers to consider if Option B was selected? (design features?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Stakeholders should be involved early, and at every step of the way until the end. Continue to check in and listen to stakeholders. <p>A: Who are the decision-makers? Q: ADOT -Transportation Board funded the Tier 1 EIS Study. Team will make recommendations to FHWA AZ Division Administrator Karla Petty. Will look at trade-offs, pros and cons of different options, then make decision based on all the information collected, including impacts, cost and benefits.</p>

TOPIC	DETAILS
STAKEHOLDERS' DISCUSSION	<p>What are the most important aspects for the decision makers to consider going forward?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Group wants ground-level re-connectivity, and full consideration of: Viewsheds, wildlife corridors, historic properties, walkability– (include all group Post-it information gathered earlier.) No walls – at grade. Eliminate all other walls. Ground level pedestrian / wildlife / non-motorized connectivity is desired. ◆ Project should improve quality of life of this city.

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Project should reflect vision of Tucson community as represented by Stakeholder Group B, and Stakeholder Group B should be involved throughout the project life. ◆ Project should reflect the community's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. ◆ We embrace innovation to consider future transportation needs of our region. ◆ Identify and respect historic properties / resources. ◆ Empower stakeholders to be decision makers. ◆ Project should address future areas of congestion – need be identified more specifically. <p>Note: public hearings will be next time for public input. Public comments accepted any time until ROD is signed (late 2019).</p> <p>Q: When is the cut-off date for documents to be considered for draft EIS?</p> <p>A: Just to be in the DEIS and considered in the decision, would be early August. For the input to be seen by the Cooperating Agencies during their review, then needs to be by early May.</p>
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
<p>FUTURE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES DISCUSSION</p>	<p>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:</p> <p>Q: When can stakeholders make comments on document?</p> <p>A: Once the DEIS is released, the public and other stakeholders have 45 days to review and document and provide any comments. During that 45 days, ADOT and FHWA will hold public hearings throughout the study area and the project website will contain additional avenues to comment. The current schedule is for all of this to occur before the end of the year.</p> <p>Q: Who takes the lead on cultural impacts?</p> <p>A: Linda Davis, ADOT Major Projects Historic Preservation Specialist</p> <p>Comment: Could have started this process by looking at current existing</p>

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center
1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

design of the road and critiquing the current layout.

Note: Could have started with potential effects of specific impacts, would have made more progress if started there. Could have moved into discussions earlier – Meeting #3 more effective than previous meetings.

ADOT/FHWA could have taken ASR document, condensed it down for meeting participants, then guided conversation on specific points. A lot to dig through for these meetings. Could have stated where impact corridor would be, would have accelerated these meetings. For future, attempt to provide greater focus / specific maps for stakeholders.

A: FHWA/ADOT was challenged to share requested maps, because they could not create anything special for these groups.

Comment: Would have been beneficial to have better maps.

Q: Were these stakeholder meetings value added?

A: FHWA/ADOT learned a lot, i.e. that double decking I-10 isn't really a palatable solution. Also understand that it is important to choose options that will promote a far greater unified Tucson metro area.

Q: Why didn't we have greater than 50% participation from the original stakeholder groups in this process – was it possibly a reflection on design / process of these meetings?

A: Nine out of original seventeen interest groups participated. Two of the stakeholder representatives had business and personal issues arise that prevented them from participating. It was a considerable time commitment to participate.

DISCUSSION:

- ◆ We worry about artificial separation between options – issues being discussed are all-encompassing, not limited to option B vs. Option C/D.
- ◆ Discussing getting B and C/D groups together to hold a separate meeting, keep going and look at these issues together. Additional maps will be added to Dropbox before next C/D meeting, then stakeholders will discuss getting the two groups together.

I-11 Corridor Stakeholders Engagement Meeting

Group B – April 24, 2018

Ellie Towne Flowing Wells Community Center

1660 West Ruthrauff Road

Tucson, AZ 85705

1 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tenor of 1st meeting was very different from 3rd meeting. Stakeholders with business interests may have been more interested in this type of conversation vs. Meeting #1. ◆ Support idea of this corridor, so long as impacts are mitigated (compared to C/D option) ◆ Need to address congestion, facilitate freight, expand economic opportunities. ◆ Could have started by talking about what is wrong with current I-10/ I-19 set up. That would have given the group a good focal point on which to start conversation.
--	---

TOPIC	DETAILS
CLOSING COMMENTS	<p>Closing comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ ADOT – this process has been very helpful. Recognize value public brings to projects like this. Good to hear from community re: “what did we miss?” Want science/technology to look at impacts, embrace impacts. Helps ADOT know if did deep enough dive into alternatives. Thanks for everyone’s hard work and input. ◆ FHWA – Genesis of these meetings was derived from the ASR public outreach process. Helped gather more substantive information/concerns than gathered previously from comments. Will be thinking about how everything discussed gets incorporated into a Tier 1 Draft EIS document. Appreciate everyone’s time and the ideas that came up. Look forward to Nov. Dec. when the next public review opportunity come around. ◆ Participants thanked federal and state agency representatives for the time and effort required for all the meetings ◆ Participants thanked the US Institute for time, energy and resources to conduct these meetings.