



**Comments/ Questions to be answered from Council's Neighborhood Listening
SR 89A Corridor (Rodeo to the "Y")
Including a Presentation and Q&A regarding a Possible Route Transfer of SR 89A**

January 19, 2011

Mayor Adams welcomed the group, explained the purpose and format of the meeting, and introduced the council and staff. The following Council members and staff were present at the listening:

Councilor Ward
Vice Mayor Hamilton
Councilor DiNunzio
Mayor Adams
Councilor McIlroy
Councilor Rayner
Councilor Litrell – arrived later in the meeting

City Manager Tim Ernster
Assistant City Manager Alison Zelms
Communications Manager Ginger Wolstencroft

The City Manager provided a presentation regarding information about the Possible Route Transfer.

Comments Verbalized at the Meeting

This is financial suicide – premium increases will be a problem.

The light mast arms are only 2.5 feet, they do not reach the middle of the lane.

One attendant requested a show of hands of those in the audience that were opposed to the City taking SR 89A. *This wasn't a formal request and the show of hands wasn't a clear indication based on some confusion as to support or not for the route transfer.*

Biggest concern is the business community itself. She doesn't think we have really assessed what the damages will be to businesses themselves due to the impacts of the medians. She feels it is important for the City to do that assessment to find out what the damages and impacts will be to the businesses.

We have dark sky lighting on 179 and in Uptown, why aren't we willing to install that in the business corridor of West Sedona SR 89A? It creates a discontinuity within the community. The council must believe that 89A is ok until 2013, but there are numerous potholes now and the only safe way to travel on SR 89A is in a car.

The speaker hopes there will be enough median breaks so that not all traffic will get to Northview Road and then drive through the subdivision.

The speaker lives off of Posse Ground and Mission, and when you look at possible areas of no left turn there will be increased traffic through the neighborhoods that causes additional safety issues there in the neighborhoods.

Parts of the negotiated funds would be spent either way (overlay expenses, Traffic Signal - \$4.8 M of \$7.4 of Federal Funds). Therefore, a portion of the improvements will happen regardless and it doesn't seem like Sedona is really getting a lot of money when you look at it that way.

Congratulated staff on working so hard to negotiate this deal. 2 safety studies say that continuous roadway lighting won't make us safer 24 hours a day and it is the responsibility of council, first and foremost to assure the safety of its visitors and residents.

Based on the independent survey that is being done – if the results come back strongly negative to the turnback, will the Council change its mind and not take the road back.

Agrees that the status quo with the highway is a bad strategy – the center lane creates near-collisions every day and also the highway is a dark corridor. We have so many beautiful buildings that you really don't see at night and some illumination would do more benefit than the city taking no action for several years.

Regarding Medians – the concern he has is between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. – when you have an accident in the lanes, the lanes get stopped right now the emergency vehicles come down the middle.

It seems like we are chasing the money.

Has done quite a bit of research. At least 6 states have provided comments and study on what 6-inch medians do to businesses. In all cases businesses are not hurt and in some cases the business activity is enhanced.

The lights on 179, other than at the roundabouts are pedestrian lights, not roadway, they are not intended to light the roadway. Those being proposed on SR 89A are going to be visible to the residences along 89A. The job of delivery people is to deliver and they will figure it out.

SR 89A is trying to be a lot of things at the same time. Bike path, walkway, highway, a commercial corridor, has to be beautiful, safe - we are asking a lot of this piece of asphalt. It is very complicated and there isn't an easy solution.

What we just heard is we are developing a project where if we take back the highway we don't know what the total final design will be. We have questions about access to business and impact to traffic and how pedestrians will cross (impacting traffic when the crossing is triggered) we have impacts to traffic with U-turns. So we are driven to a decision, following money, with unintended consequences we will be stuck with. God help us because there will be consequences.

It is imperative that the City talks to and polls the business folks along 89A in west Sedona before any final decisions on medians are made. That hasn't been done. We are talking about people's livelihoods. I got a questionnaire in the mail - ambiguous and easy to take responses and twist them. He isn't sure we will get an accurate response but will be interested to see what the response is.

Has the City investigated a 10-story building for city hall office space - because taking over 89A is the same type of idea or undertaking to consider - not realistic.

I am worried that taxes might go up if we take over the road. Construction is a killer - 179 was very painful - the ADOT solution sounds shorter and simpler but if you do the medians she is worried about her businesses.

Not typically a participator but has a personal concern about this. In Tucson in a major thoroughfare with little lighting she almost died because the road wasn't lit properly when she was driving and she wants our roadway which is a commercial corridor to be lit properly in order to be able to travel safely on the roadway.

Is opposed to the City assuming responsibility and liability for 89A because it is short sighted. Long-term maintenance and liability will be too difficult to address. No one can predict what will happen in 20 to 30 years and what the requirements for the roadway will be in order to accommodate more people, tourists, etc in the long term. It is a state roadway and should remain a state problem. The existing roadway is too dark and he has almost hit people. The area needs more light to be able to make it more friendly.

Doesn't think that America can sustain in the long haul the heavy infrastructure that has been built and that we want to build. Some day ADOT might be turning light bulbs off. We should be looking at things that provide different more sustainable options. Concerns that regardless of ownership any improvement that is a heavy infrastructure improvement should make us wary - including commitments to ongoing cost of lighting (energy). We need to get used to some change.

This is a beautiful City and area - he loves it and he appreciates having a city staff and council that works their butts off and is willing to take the flack that they get. He feels strongly that we deserve to own our own main street and doesn't believe that

ADOT is appropriately concerned about the improvements that should be made there including daytime safety improvements.

Both the Federal and State government are trying to get through state routes that go through the center of cities and towns that is the trend and is why there have already been 7 transfers in Arizona, and ADOT could transfer it to us even if we choose to go with their option but without the funds they want to provide now.

This is a huge decision maybe the biggest in the incorporation of the City. She is not aware of any City in Arizona that has been forced to take a road back with no negotiations and no funds.

We should do this as simply as possible and he feels if we did vote as a city that people would agree to take the lights for free. He was opposed to the lights initially, but once he saw them on 179 he changed his mind. Contractors say that the lighting can be installed in a short period of time with minimal impact. He also recommends that we reduce the speed to 30 miles per hour – and leave the suicide lane for emergency vehicles. The lights would show the road and the sidewalk.

We don't know how much a loaf of bread is going to cost in 2 months so how can we know how much pavement will cost in 2 years or further?

Where did you learn that dark skies are an important tourist attraction?

Questions

Q: Is it true that if the ADOT option is chosen, construction will occur in 4 months rather than in 2 years – therefore the community plan input would not be complete before the improvements were installed?

A: If ADOT keeps the road, ADOT will proceed as quickly as possible with construction of its safety improvements and overlay project starting as early as summer 2011. The project would be then targeted for completion in spring 2012.

Q: What improvements is the City willing to make between now and 2013 to make it safe for pedestrians and cyclists?

A: If the City completes a route transfer and gains ownership of SR 89A, the timing for improvements is as follows:

- By June 30, 2011, ADOT will advertise a construction bid for a construction project to install a traffic signal at Andante.
- No later than February 1, 2013 (timing at the City's discretion and could be moved up) advertisement of a construction bid for the currently planned pavement preservation project covering the area between Brewer Road and Dry Creek Road.

- No later than June 30, 2015 (timing at the City's discretion and could be moved up) advertisement of a construction bid for one Safety Improvement job based upon City specified safety improvements within the Route Transfer limits.

Q: With the continuous median between Soldiers Pass and Mountain Shadows, will vehicles be able to make left hand turns onto the other side streets between that area?

A: No final design of medians with pedestrian barriers exists. The CivTech report does show that the areas where medians are recommended can accommodate turning movements and breaks in the medians. The specific locations for turning movements/breaks to allow left turns would be identified in a final design process, which would include public input if the route transfer moved forward.

Q: ADOT is offering \$7.4 M of Federal money – will that be offered regardless of whether the turnback occurs?

A: If the Route Transfer does not occur, ADOT will retain ownership of 89A, and will install Continuous Roadway Lighting, with dark sky compliant fixtures and in the same design style as 179, but with 35-foot high poles. ADOT will provide a pavement overlay, including bicycle lane markings and a traffic signal at Andante Road regardless of whether the transfer occurs.

Q: Do you believe as City Manager that this is a sustainable deal for Sedona if we take the road back?

A: The funds that were negotiated as part of the Route Transfer Agreement should be sufficient to provide for slightly more than the proposed minimum safety improvements from the CivTech study and up to 15 years of maintenance costs for the roadway.

Q: Has the City been presented with a plan from ADOT that we have turned down?

A: ADOT provided the City with 67 possible design/lighting type alternatives and the City Council selected a design style preference of Monterey Style lighting, high-pressure sodium, 35-foot tall, 2.5 foot mast arm, with dark sky compliant fixtures. This style is similar to those on SR 179 although, the poles on SR 89A will be taller and the wattages of bulb for 89A will be slightly lower than the roundabout lighting on SR 179 and existing lighting at intersections on SR 89A.

Q: Will the lights impact the dark skies?

A: The lighting design that was selected by the City for ADOT's installation uses dark sky compliant fixtures. As is true with any overhead pole lighting, there will be some bounce back associated with the proposed lighting. The requirements of a

dark sky compliant fixture can be found at the website for the International Dark Sky Association at: www.darksky.org

Q: Has there been any study on how Flagstaff became the first international dark sky city while they had dark sky roadway lighting installed?

A: Flagstaff is an International Dark Sky City recognized by the International Dark Sky Association. Their requirements for consideration for this award can be found on their website at: www.darksky.org

Q: What is the procedure for the independent survey? Is it a random phone survey?

A: The survey was based on a two-phased research effort conducted in January, which was comprised of a Sedona Resident Survey and a Sedona Business Survey. The Resident Survey consisted of 240 telephone interviews with Sedona heads of household. Respondent selection on this project phase was accomplished via a computer-generated random digit dial telephone sample which selects households based on residential telephone prefixes and includes all unlisted and new listed households. This methodology was selected because it ensures a randomly-selected sample of households proportionately allocated throughout the sample universe. This method also ensures that all unlisted and newly-listed telephone households are included in the sample. The business Survey consisted of 173 interviews with Sedona business owners/managers using primarily a mail survey methodology and a commercially purchased database which was screened for businesses located approximately within the study area bound by the "Y" roundabout and Red Rock High School. The mail survey was supplemented with telephone surveys in order to bring the final sample up to a minimum of 170 complete interviews. Both surveys were based on statistical research methods that provide a 95% confidence level.

Q: What are some of the non-lighting improvements that the City has recommended for the roadway?

A: The City Council commissioned a conceptual study to review the minimum alternative safety measures that could be installed with an equal or greater impact to safety. CivTech completed this study and provided a combination of recommended improvements to provide that minimum safety improvement. The minimum recommended countermeasures directly address the issue of random pedestrian and bicycle crossings of SR 89A and provide reasonable distances between motorist recognized pedestrian crossing locations. These include:

- Continuous raised medians, 6 inches in height, with anticipated median breaks at approximate ¼ mile breaks.
- A pedestrian barrier should be constructed throughout the length of the median to preclude random pedestrian crossings. Install guidance to direct pedestrians to protected crossings in conjunction with the barrier. Without the barrier the issue of

random crossings will not be resolved and regardless of other countermeasure implemented, the CRL would be needed to identify random crossing pedestrians and bicycles at nighttime.

- Adding Enhanced Pedestrian Crossings that include:
 - Highly visible and durable crosswalk markings. Advance yield markings to provide sight distance of pedestrians that may be screened from vision by a stopped vehicle in another lane.
 - Pedestrian activated warning light system (i.e. rapid flashing beacons, the HAWK pedestrian beacons or in-pavement crosswalk lighting).
 - Median refuge area for pedestrians and bicyclists. The split median concept, which requires pedestrians to turn and face oncoming traffic is recommended.
 - Pedestrian activated crossing with countdown LED pedestrian signals. Activation buttons and pedestrian signal heads should also be installed in the median refuge area to promote two separate crossing phases.
 - Overhead crosswalk lighting that meets dark sky compliant lighting requirements.
 - Creating easily identifiable crossing locations to motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists for both daytime and nighttime is crucial.
 - A speed reduction effort with extra enforcement, automated enforcement or “Your Speed Is” signing to increase compliance with posted 35 mph speed limit.
 - Advance warning signs and advance stop bar.
- The minimum recommended length of $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile to install the above-recommended countermeasures for the 2 mile section is between Andante Drive and Rodeo Road which is 1500 feet long, and between Shadow Mountain Drive and Soldier Pass Road which is 2200 feet long. Based on traffic volumes the entire two-mile section could benefit from the installation of medians; however this minimum recommendation is based on providing protection to the two of the three highest areas of pedestrian and bicycle crossing activity at other than existing signalized intersections.
- Install the warranted signal at Andante Drive. This will provide a protected pedestrian crossing in this area. The closest existing signal to the fatal pedestrian crashes crossing area is Rodeo Drive at approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile away. Andante Drive will provide a signalized crossing about 400 feet away from the area that the crashes occurred. ADOT has included installation of this signal within its initial improvement plans.
- Install marked bicycle lanes per the MUTCD. ADOT has included bike lanes within the pavement rehabilitation project.
- Traffic modeling of proposed median system to determine effects on the corridor prior to planning and design.

Q: Have the emergency responders been involved in the discussion yet and what is their opinion on how they will get to the accident to respond?

A: The Police Chief and Fire Chief presented their input on how emergency responders would or would not be impacted if medians were installed per the recommendations in the CivTech report.

Q: Why didn't the City put the issue of a route transfer to a vote of the public a long time ago?

A: Below is a brief summary of the Initiative and Referendum legislative processes that are available to electors in a city or town. Both are initiated by the electorate, and not by the City.

INITIATIVE:

The electors of a city or town may initiate a local law or ordinance by securing the signatures of fifteen percent of the qualified electors of the city or town on a petition. Once an initiative petition has been filed with the clerk of the governing body, one of the following actions may occur:

1. The governing body may enact the initiative petition as an ordinance and refer the ordinance to a referendum vote.
2. The governing body may enact the initiative petition without referring it to a referendum vote. In that case, the ordinance is subject to a referendum petition.
3. The council may decline to enact the initiative petition. In that event, the council may call a special election. If a special election is not allowed or called, the clerk is required to place the initiative measure on the ballot at the next city/town election. The deadline for submission of petitions is 120 days prior to election.

REFERENDUM:

Before an ordinance or other "legislation" enacted by a city council becomes effective, there is a thirty-day period after its passage in which a referendum petition may qualify against the ordinance. During that 30 day period a person or group intending to file a referendum against a legislative act may apply for a petition, and the clerk must supply the person with a correct copy of the legislative action taken by the council. It takes at least 10 percent of the municipal electors to propose a referendum on legislation enacted by the council. The number of qualified electors required to sign a petition is computed from the whole number of votes cast at the last city or town election where a mayor or council member was chosen. **The City Council may not voluntarily submit a measure to the people in the absence of a referendum petition except where specifically allowed by statute.**

Not every act of a city council qualifies as "legislation" subject to a Referendum. In order to qualify as "legislation" subject to Referendum, a municipal action must be a "definite, specific act or resolution. Measures that do not "enact anything" do not qualify. *Saggio v. Connelly, 147 Ariz. 240 (1985)*. Matters that have failed the "legislation" test include matters that constitute merely "conceptual approval" and "do not demonstrate a sense of absolute commitment to or final approval of" a particular action. This rejection of non-legislative acts is based upon the fact that such conceptual approval "did not establish policy, enact a law or permanent rule of government, or declare a public purpose and provide ways and means of its accomplishment." *Wennerstrom v. City of Mesa, 169 Ariz. 485 (1991)*.

Q: If the City doesn't accept ADOT's lighting plan now, then there is no plan for improvements for several years - what happens in the meantime?

A: The City would begin design of alternative improvements and include a public involvement process for input on that design.

Q: How would US Foods or CISCO who deliver their food in small semis or large trucks, how would business like the Heartline be accessed without stopping on the side of the road?

A: We are working with the best information we have at this time. CivTech was a conceptual study and before any work happens it will be necessary to do a much more detailed engineering study and traffic modeling in order to get to a point where there is enough information to move forward with a final design that takes into account all types of traffic.

Q: How many businesses are in West Sedona?

A: The City does not have an accurate count of the number of businesses in the City. This is part of the reason that the City instituted a requirement for a City business license. Once the licensing process has had time to be in effect, a better answer can be provided.

Q: How many residents are in west Sedona?

A: The population of West Sedona, including Les Springs and Rolling Hills, to the western border of town is between 7000-8000.

Q: Isn't it true the medians were recommended due to angle crashes?

A: The CivTech report shows that the alternative safety improvements recommended, including medians with a pedestrian barrier, additional enhanced crossing, bicycle lanes & speed enforcement, were chosen because of the resulting anticipated crash reduction factor for all implemented countermeasures. The study also shows that the type of crashes to be mitigated include both daytime and nighttime pedestrian, bicycle and angle crashes.

Q: The speaker has property at the end of Shelby/Finley and when it rains it floods there. Will we still have money to address drainage issues or will the road take away from those projects as well?

A: At this time there are no plans to upgrade the drainage at the drainage crossing of Shelby near Finley in the AAA Industrial Park. This drainage is a private facility crossing a private roadway. In the past the City Engineer has proposed acquiring this portion of Shelby with the aim of improving it to City standards, but the Council did not approve the project.

The Storm Drainage Master Plan did identify this private pipe as deficient (Storm Drainage Master Plan facility CP-C1A,B). The current estimated flow capacity of the existing system is 763 cfs to 1061 cfs. (cfs means cubic feet per second) The 25-yr discharge is 3805 Cfs. If the City improved the system it would need to be improved to the 25-yr discharge level at a cost of about \$2 million in my estimation. The Master Plan shows a cost of about \$1,100,000. However, these cost estimates have proved low in prior projects.

Although a cost estimate to improve this facility is provided, this facility was not included in the SD CIP plan (and related costs) that was developed because they were within private areas. Improvement of private facilities it was contemplated would need to be part of new or redevelopment plans for the private areas. In light of the current situation the City has no plans to upgrade the drainage pipes.

Comments made by provision of a written Speaker/Comment Card
(some comments below are repetitive of comments/questions also voiced during the meeting)

Excellent presentation of information by the City Manager. We have a great city and deserve to have control of our own “mainstreet.”

Do not take back the roadway!!! Let ADOT put in the lights.

89A is a highway, a commercial access road, a bicycle path a pedestrian walk, and beautiful as well. This seems a lot to ask [of one roadway].

Session worthwhile for venting, but all prior “news” reporting indicates this council has made up its mind and will go forth regardless of public opinion. We have no idea what the future design will be. Concerns about access to business, impact to traffic by pedestrian driven signals, impact to safety by U-turns at intersection breaks. It appears we are following the money and are driven to a decision with unintended consequences we will all be stuck with.

I have concerns that 240 phone contacts are representative of opinions of 8,000 people (re: phone survey). Why can't we use low-height lights like the uptown lights?

I am opposed to the City assuming responsibility and liability of 89A. It is short sighted. The long term maintenance, improvements and liability costs will be too great, especially with growth and increased tourist traffic beyond 15 years. In West Sedona the area and the highway are very DARK and need more light.

Why don't wall citizens get to vote on the take back? How are you going to get 8' of roadway to put bike lanes in?

How many businesses are there in West Sedona and how many residents live in West Sedona? Isn't it true that the medians were recommended due to the # of angle accidents? How does the City know that the lights are dark sky compliant?

Is it true that if ADOT option is chosen, construction will occur in 4 months rather than 2 years after Sedona residents and businesses have created the "new" Sedona Community Plan & given input on road design?

With continuous medians between Soldiers Pass and Mt. Shadows, can vehicles make left hand turns off the highway onto the side streets?

If independent surveys are strongly against the turnback, would City Council go with the popular opinion?

How will deliveries occur on 89A with medians? How will large motorcoaches be able to make turn arounds [u-turns] on 89A to reach their destination?

While the reported ADOT "contribution" for the maintenance would appear adequate, what does the council and City staff particularly think? Is this generous contribution "adequate?" Or are there hidden costs some are suspicious of, based on experience? What consideration has been given to LED lights as an energy savings measure? Could use solar and storage. A ten year break even is possible!

Number one, what businesses along 89A (west) have been polled or asked about construction of medians and what their impact might be on their businesses? Number 2, why in the world would a small town like Sedona take over the responsibility and expense of maintaining a 5 lane Highway.

Have there been any studies on the impact of medians on businesses?

I wish to speak in favor of streetlights. (several questions were asked but not noted on the card)

Concern about medians – pedestrian safety – ability of emergency vehicles to maneuver through traffic.

What is the procedure for the independent survey of public opinion?

I have a deep concern for the lack of lighting along west highway 89A given the number of hotel rooms in that neighborhood. The current configuration of the highway is not satisfying.

This is fiscally possible.

What is the reasoning behind the continuous median (no left turn) at Posse Ground? Have you considered the increased traffic through neighborhoods as a direct result of the medians?

89A IS IN SHAMBLES!!! What resources does the city of Sedona have now to make improvements and maintain Hwy 89A in 2026? What City plans exist NOW to improve 89A? What improvements in 89A does the city have NOW to make it safer for Bicycles and Pedestrians?

Where did you learn that quote “Dark skies are an important tourist attraction?” During the 16 years I’ve lived here I have never heard any tourists say they’ve come here to see the dark skies. How will we pay for any lawsuits once we assume liabilities for 89A? All the \$50,000 deductibles will add up with dozens of accidents plus our premiums will rise.

Wish to speak for the business input.

Why do full size school busses drive through residential neighborhoods (Northview) to pick up students (not more than 2 or 3) from their homes?

What a waste of taxpayer money! A catamaran has been parked for years on the road in front of a property and a small trailer was recently added. Are there any rules regulations, codes, in Sedona to prohibit such practices?

Has concerns about drainage at the end of Shelby/Finley. Are there plans to address that area? When would those plans be implemented?

Dark sky compliant lights are just the fixtures. Flagstaff is a Dark Sky City all it has are low pressure sodium and not continuous roadway lighting. The actual research center for Lowell is in Happy Jack – 50 miles from Flagstaff.

I am opposed to taking over the Highway. I don’t mind the dark sky compliant lighting, even though it is 35 feet high. I am opposed to restricting turns @ Posse Ground Rd and I’m sure the KFC and ACE Hardware would be hurt by their construction.. Don’t change Soldiers Pass to a roundabout. IF you must install a roundabout, do it at Posse Grounds! (Thanks for the hydrants)

What are some other non-lighting improvements that the city plans to make to the roadway – walkability, bikability, beautification, crosswalks, landscaping? West Sedona’s roadway and business corridor needs improvement visually and functionally.