

MEMORANDUM

- TO: CITY COUNCIL
- FROM: Jessica Matson, Legislative & Information Services Director/City Clerk
- SUBJECT: Supplemental Information Agenda Item 11.a – Discussion and Consideration of a Project Status Update and Direction Regarding the Brisco-Halcyon Interchange Modification Project
- DATE: March 28, 2023

Attached is additional correspondence received before 4 PM for the above referenced item.

cc: City Manager Assistant City Manager/Public Works Director Community Development Director City Attorney City Clerk City Website (or public review binder) Mayor and City Council,

I echo the sentiment shared by Claudine Lingo in her email below.

The projected costs for the Brisco-Halcyon Interchange has most likely doubled since a decision was made to move forward. The City budget is being impacted by inflation, storm damages, and the tax increase proposal voted down by the public.

Please be fiscally responsible. Only after the City has dealt with all of the infrastructure needs should any other projects be considered.

Thank you,

Bob Perez

Provided below are comments regarding the subject agenda items.

<u>11.a Discussion and Consideration of a Project Status Update and Direction</u> <u>Regarding the Brisco-Halcyon Interchange Modification Project</u>

As several of you know, I have provided input regarding the Brisco project to the City on numerous occasions in the past regarding why I am very much opposed to Alternative 4C. Briefly, my opposition was based on the following:

1. Most respondents to the survey conducted several years ago, overwhelmingly indicated residents were opposed to Alternative 4C for various reasons.

2. The cost of the project was growing by leaps and bounds and the City General Fund could

not absorb the increasing costs. The General Fund money would be better spent to fix the roads and sidewalks.

3. The impact of the significant traffic resulting from the roundabout will have on local residents, especially Grace Lane residents is unconscionable. None of the Grace Lane residents were informed (via disclosures, as required by law, when they bought their houses) about the Brisco project and that the street was going to be a "connector road" resulting in a lot more traffic than what would be expected on a residential street.

4. The traffic study conducted by the contractor before Grace Lane was even in existence (and wasn't reflected on the various driving direction apps) indicated there would be no impact on traffic by having a roundabout that would push traffic up a "residential street" instead of to the shopping area between Camino Mercado and Rancho Parkway. The organization that conducted that study was not local and apparently did not understand the traffic pattern and was not qualified to predict what the traffic patterns in the area would become. It is unfortunate that City staff at that time did not reject that traffic study. The director of AG Community Development either failed to review the traffic study objectively, was not familiar with the area (James Way, Mesquite, and Rodeo) or had some reason that was not disclosed to residents about why the City accepted the flawed traffic study.

5. The danger of locating a roundabout in such close vicinity to a school is concerning. When a youth sports event is held at St. Patricks, cars are parked up and down the street, visibility is limited, and it is not unusual for pedestrians to be in the street.

6. The speed that drivers travel on Grace Lane (on a hill with several curves with limited visibility) to get from James Way to Patrick's School and Branch Street, and from Branch Street to Grace Bible Church and James Way is not controlled. After seeing some scary near misses as a result of significant speeding up and down Grace Lane, I am still very much opposed to Alternative 4C and do not support pursuing the roundabout. When the Brisco on/off-ramps were closed several years ago, the congestion at the Brisco, Branch and El Camino interchange was significantly alleviated.

12.b Consideration of a Resolution Rescinding the Declaration of a Stage 1 Water Shortage

I think it is very short sighted to rescind the water usage limitations. While we may be temporarily out of drought as a result of all of the rain we've had the last few months, it is unlikely that this weather pattern will continue next winter and the winter after that.

As you know, it is very difficult to get residents to conserve water; so we'll likely be right back to a water shortage within a couple of years. Therefore, I have a suggestion, rather than rescind the declaration, revise it to be a temporary suspension of the declaration and give the City the authority to reinstitute the declaration when needed by simply notifying residents so water usage restrictions can be re-implemented without delay when the Lopez Lake water level gets to 35% of capacity or less (or whatever level would provide water to residents for at least 2 or 3 years).

Sincerely, Claudine Lingo AG District 1 Constituent