

South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team Meeting

July 24, 2008, 5:30–8:30 p.m.

Location: South Mountain Community College, 7050 S. 24th Street, Phoenix (Student Union Hall)

Agenda Topic	Discussion Lead(s)	Expected Outcome(s)	Action Item(s)	Time
Check-in and dinner				5:30 p.m.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and introductions • SMCAT role and responsibilities • Upcoming SMCAT meeting topics • SMCAT questions and comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Keller • All 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions of all new participants (if any) • Knowledge of proposed upcoming meeting topics • Ask questions/clarification on issues, articles, press information since last meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	6:00 p.m.
Economic Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADOT/HDR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of SMF economic impacts issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADOT/HDR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of SMF utilities issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	
Break				
Prime and unique farmland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADOT/HDR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of SMF prime and unique farmland issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	
Visitor comment session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Keller 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/comments documented and addressed or added to future parking lot issues memorandum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	
Adjourn				



**South Mountain Corridor Study
Citizens Advisory Team
Meeting Summary**

Date: June 26, 2008
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Location: South Mountain Community College

SMCAT Members Attending:

Camilo Acosta, Arlington HOA
Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee
Sandy Bahr, Sierra Club
Chad Blostone, The Foothills HOA
Al Brown, Arizona Public Health Association
John Cochran, Calabrea HOA
Derrick Denis, Foothills Reserve HOA
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee
Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council
Wes Lines, Laveen Village Planning Committee
Cathy Lopez, Foothills Reserve HOA
Linda Lujan, South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce
Laura Rivers, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce
John Rodriguez, Lakewood HOA
Jack Sellers, East Valley Partnership
Timothy Stone, Bougainvillea HOA
Terry Tatterfield, Kyrene Elementary School District
Woody Thomas, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Carnell Thurman, City of Avondale

SMCAT Members Absent:

Gila River Indian Community–District 4
Tamala Daniels, South Mountain Village Planning Committee
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
Diane Krecker, Mountain Park Ranch HOA
Dave Olney, Valley Forward
Nathaniel Percharo, Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association
Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development
Dave Williams, Arizona Trucking Association

Staff and Consultants

Michael Bruder, ADOT
Fred Garcia, ADOT
Mark Hollowell, ADOT
Larry Langer, ADOT
Jim Lemon, ADOT
Velvet Mathew, ADOT
Barney Remington, ADOT
Floyd Roehrich, ADOT
Timothy Tait, ADOT
Bill Vachon, FHWA
Arianna Valle, FHWA

Michael Book, HDR
Amy Edwards, HDR
Janet Gonzalez, HDR
Pat Higgins, HDR
Heather Honsberger, HDR
Ben Spargo, HDR
Jack Allen, Jacobs NCI
Fred Erickson, KCA
Tom Keller, KCA
Dean Howard, PDG
Andy Jacobs, PDG

Citizens:

Al Brown
Chester Erwin
James Garnand
Jim Jochim
Linda Jochim
Steve Johnson
Tim Lank

Doug Murphy
Robbie Sherwood
Woody Thomas
Michael Walsh
Irene Wesley
Daniel Wishnatsky

Meeting Agenda	Speaker
Welcome and introductions	Tom Keller, KCA
SMCAT role and responsibilities	Tom Keller, KCA
Upcoming SMCAT meeting topics	Tom Keller, KCA
Team member questions and comments	All
Environmental justice	Pat Higgins, HDR
Social conditions	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Pat Higgins, HDR
Noise	Fred Garcia, ADOT
Visitor comment session	Public Tom Keller, KCA

Meeting began at 6:00 p.m.

Tom Keller: Good evening everyone. Can we begin?

No response

Tom Keller: Welcome to the June 26 meeting of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team meeting. Sitting at the table are the SMCAT members. The members of the public are sitting in the chairs in the back at the room. The representatives from ADOT and the study team are seated along the wall.

We officially have a quorum tonight. There are a few people who are here on behalf of several of the SMCAT members, who could not be in attendance tonight. First, we have Linda Lujan sitting in for Lisa Bray with the South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce. Next, we have John Cochran here for Brian Smith with Calabrea HOA. Finally, we have Laura Rivers attending in place of Carola Tamarkin with Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce. We appreciate your attendance.

Janet Gonzalez and Andy Jacobs are manning the sign-in table. They have blue question/comment cards, which the public can use to submit their inquiries. Feel free to take some of these cards and write your questions and comments on them. At the end of the meeting tonight, the public will be given the opportunity to either read their question or submit and I will read it. If you have multiple questions, please write one per blue card.

It is important to note that the SMCAT is a voluntary advisory team, not a decision-making body, and it will not be responsible for decisions made by the State of Arizona or the Federal Highway Administration. The SMCAT meets regularly to review project

status and provide input on issues that are relevant to the project—the single purpose of the SMCAT is to provide a build or no-build recommendation for the proposed freeway. As we go through this process, each of these meetings will have predetermined topics where the appropriate experts will be available.

SMCAT members are expected to treat each other with mutual courtesy, respect and dignity. It is important that individual SMCAT members abide by accepted standards of behavior. Unacceptable or disruptive behavior will not be tolerated and will be grounds for exclusion from further participation in these meetings.

As you know, we have changed the format of the SMCAT meetings. We have agreed that there will be an unlimited amount of time for the SMCAT members to ask questions. Because of this, there is the possibility that we may not get to all the scheduled topics on the agenda. This new format went fairly well in the last meeting so I anticipate that it will go equally well at this meeting.

Here is tonight's agenda. You have copies in front of you. There was a last minute change. Because of the schedules of the experts associated with each of these topics, the order of topics tonight will be noise, followed by environmental justice and social conditions. Does anyone have any issues with this?

No response

Tom Keller: Do any of the SMCAT members have questions about any of the information that you have seen recently in the media or with any of the information that has been sent to you?

No response

Tom Keller: Okay, let's move on. The study team has session feedback forms that will be distributed at the break to the SMCAT members. Please make sure you fill out the form on both sides. At the end of the meeting, please see that these sheets are returned to one of the study team members.

Fred Erickson: Tonight, Andy Jacobs will be taking a few pictures. These pictures will be published in study newsletters or on the ADOT Web site.

Tom Keller: At this point I would like to introduce Ben Spargo. Is everybody ready?

No response

Ben Spargo: I want everyone to note the overall SMCAT meeting schedule. We have juggled a few of the topics because of the availability of the presenters. The revised schedule is on slide number 9. In August, the SMCAT should be prepared to have the initial discussions concerning membership and ground rules for the air quality panel. In

October, we will readdress the air quality panel discussion and finalize the information. The revised schedule will be updated on the study Web site. When comparing the revised schedule with the previous one, it is only the order of topics that has changed. As we get further along in the schedule, the remaining meeting topics (that do not have assigned dates) have not changed.

Tonight's topics for discussion are: noise, environmental justice and social conditions. These are the various federal, state and local agencies that the study team has worked with on these issues.

With that, I am going to turn the presentation over to Fred Garcia with ADOT's Environmental Planning Group, who will be discussing the noise impacts for the corridor.

Fred Garcia: I am Fred Garcia. I am here to give you some basic information about noise and information on how noise relates to the proposed South Mountain Freeway.

First, I would like to present a few basic ideas so when we go over the slides they will make better sense to you. The current noise regulations have been in place since the 1970s.

There have been several studies that show that the average person becomes bothered when noise levels approach 67 decibels. Noise is perceived differently by everyone in any typical crowd. When talking about noise we are talking about averages. We record these noise samples with noise meters.

Noise affects people much differently from one person to the next. A young person getting ready for school may have music playing loudly as he or she prepares to go to school. Another person in the same home may hear this music and be annoyed and ask him or her to turn the volume down. Noise is subjective.

The federal government designated their noise level standard being 67 decibels. This level of noise can be experienced when two people stand outside at a distance of three feet. Typically at this distance, these people would be able to hear each other quite easily while using a normal tone of voice. Once a person has to raise their voice in order to be heard by this other person, the sound level has reached at least 67 decibels.

The first slide runs through some of the common definitions related to noise. A decibel is a logarithmic unit indicating the amount of sound energy. The approximate threshold of hearing is 0 decibels, while the approximate threshold of pain to the human ear is 140 decibels. A receiver site is a location at which noise levels are modeled and analyzed. Receiver sites of interest are usually residences, schools, parks or other noise-sensitive land uses. There are other types of locations that fit this category, but there are too many to list on this slide. A monitor site is a location at which noise levels are measured. In some cases, a monitor site is also used as a receiver site. We monitor at locations where there is going to be significant human activity. We concentrate on that area that will be

used for significant lengths of time. The noise readings are taken near the proposed freeway right-of-way.

Noise is defined as unwanted or excessive sound that can come from many sources. There are certain things that you cannot eliminate, such as noise from an airplane or train. If you live near a major roadway then you are going to hear it. This is especially true if large trucks and motorcycles are using the roadway.

Traffic noise is caused by the vehicle's engine, air flow from a fast-moving vehicle, and the sound created from the interaction between the vehicle's tires and the roadway pavement. This interaction creates the constant hum, which is what we try to mitigate.

The average person can hear a difference in three decibels of sound. When we mitigate, we try to lessen the noise levels by five decibels or greater. This is not a wise investment for ADOT if the mitigation will create less than this difference.

So why do we study noise? The construction and operation of this proposed freeway would introduce a major noise source into an area where such noise may not have existed in the past. As we all know, the area is growing. People who have been living in the suburbs get used to the noise levels that have surrounded them. As the land develops around them and more sounds are introduced, these residents tend to be more disturbed by the extra noise. For those people who have been living in the inner city where there are higher levels of noise, the residents tend to be used to higher noise levels and don't seem as affected by traffic noise. I have investigated noise issues in cases where homeowner's residences were relatively equidistant from Interstate 17. One owner was going to sell their home because they couldn't stand the traffic noise. The other homeowner had no problem with the traffic noise. It is a different perception, which sometimes can be an emotional issue.

We used a traffic noise model to evaluate the noise levels using the information that was gathered at the noise receivers and monitors in the Study Area. There are various elements that may affect the noise levels in a particular area. For example, if there is a body of water nearby, this can affect noise levels.

When we talk about noise mitigation, there are some locations where it is just not feasible to build noise walls. The costs in some of these locations are just too high and if it is not feasible, sometimes mitigation in some areas is not justifiable.

ADOT has a pretty good idea about the peak times for freeway noise. However, I like to talk with the residents to find out more about their ideas about the noisiest times on a nearby freeway. I have found that different freeways have different times when they are noisiest. If there is a difficulty in determining the peak noise time of a particular freeway, sometimes 24-hour noise monitoring is performed.

