Saguaro National Park Parking Lot Assessment and Design

Tucson, Arizona Client: Richard Goepfrich, Facility Manager for Saguaro National Park



Project Team: Julia Trivers, Desmin Fontaine, and Dylan Edens Northern Arizona University CENE 486C- Engineering Design November 12, 2020



## Introduction: Project Description

Project Objective: Assess the current Cam-boh Picnic Area parking lot and create a redesigned lot for the designed user





#### Figure 2: City of Tucson View

#### **Project Criteria**

- Available space for new lot
- Protection and removal of native plants
- Adequate drainage
- Permits truck-trailer parking
- ADA compliant

Existing Site: 4.5 square acres Elevation: 2,493 feet

Figure 1: Arizona State View

## Field Work/Survey Analysis



Protected Species



Goal: Travel to the site in Tucson, Arizona to take a visual, site, and vegetation survey as well as collect geotechnical samples



Figure 4: Provided 2 ft. Contour Map

The site investigation was not conducted due to travel restrictions, instead the 2-foot contour map was provided by Pima County and the vegetation map was provided by the client.

Figure 3: Provided Existing Species Location

# **Geotechnical Considerations**

Goal: Obtain/calculate geotechnical properties through classifications (AASHTO/USCS) to aid in the pavement design

- Using a boring log from a project occurring in Mesa, Arizona:
  - Assumed soil type is Sandy Clay Loam
  - USCS classification- CL, SC (Lean Clayey Sand)
  - AASHTO classification- A-6
  - Group Index- 0
- Selection of Subbase:
  - Gravel lot:
    - Crushed (Graded) Stone base- 6 inches
    - Soil-Aggregate Subbase- 4 inches
  - Asphalt pavement lot:
    - Hot Mix Asphalt with aggregate- 2 inches
    - Soil-Cement Base- 6 inches
    - Soil-Aggregate Subbase- 4 inches



Figure 5: Boring log of Union Office Complex in Mesa, Arizona

# **Subgrade Considerations**

Goal: Obtain/calculate Subgrade properties to aid in the pavement design

- Gravel Lot Drainage Coefficients-
  - Consisted of two layers
    - Crushed (graded) Stone- 0.14
    - Soil-Aggregate Subbase- 0.05
  - The drainage coefficient used in Pima County, AZ-1.25
- The Structural Number for the gravel lot was estimated to be 1.
- Asphalt Pavement Lot Drainage Coefficients-
  - Consisted of three layers
    - Hot Mix Asphalt- 0.44
    - Soil-Cement Base- 0.15
    - Soil-Aggregate Subbase- 0.05
  - The drainage coefficient used in Pima County, AZ-1.25
- The Structural Number for the asphalt Pavement lot was estimated to be 3.

 $SN = a_1D_1 + a_2D_2m_2 + a_3D_3m_3$ 

where

- a<sub>1</sub>, a<sub>2</sub>, a<sub>3</sub> = layer coefficients representative of surface, base, and subbase courses, respectively (see Section 2 3 5),
- D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>, D<sub>3</sub> = actual thicknesses (in inches) of surface, base, and subbase courses, respectively, and
- m<sub>2</sub>, m<sub>3</sub> = drainage coefficients for base and subbase layers, respectively (see Section 2 4 1)

Equation 1: Equation used to determine the Structural Number

## Hydrology and **Hydraulics Analysis**

Goal: Analyze the existing and proposed hydraulic infrastructure from required Pima County storm events

| Pre-Development Conditions            |                          |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Sub Basin Area (Acres)                | 4.5                      |  |  |  |
| Length of Longest Watercourse<br>(ft) | 1439                     |  |  |  |
| Watershed Type                        | Undeveloped<br>Foothills |  |  |  |
| Channel Slope (ft/ft)                 | 0.024                    |  |  |  |
| Basin Factor                          | 0.035                    |  |  |  |
| Vegetative Cover Density (%)          | 90                       |  |  |  |
| Vegetative Cover Type                 | Desert Brush             |  |  |  |
| Impervious Cover (%)                  | 5                        |  |  |  |
| Soil Type                             | С                        |  |  |  |
| Curve Number                          | 90                       |  |  |  |

Table 1: Pre-Development Inputs



#### Figure 6: Existing Conditions

| Post-Development Co                    | nditions  | Post-Development Co      | onditions  |           |
|--|---|--------------------------|------------|-----------|
| (gravel)                               |   | (asphalt)                |            |           |
| Vegetative Cover Density               |   | Vegetative Cover Density |            |           |
| (%)                                    | 85  | (%)                      | 85         | Pe        |
| Impervious Cover (%)                   | 10  | Impervious Cover (%)     | 10         | Disc      |
| Table 2: Post-Develo<br>(gravel) Input | Table 2: Post-DevelopmentTable 3: Post-Development(gravel) Inputs(asphalt) Inputs |                          | pment<br>s | <b>(C</b> |

| 100 Year Storm             |                 |                              |                               |  |  |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
|                            | Pre-Development | Post-Development<br>(gravel) | Post-Development<br>(asphalt) |  |  |
| Peak<br>Discharge<br>(CFS) | 26.1            | 26.2                         | 28                            |  |  |

### Utilized NRCS Cross Section Analyzer to

- Plot a cross section of the channel of interest
- △ flow due to increased impervious surfaces (pre-development vs post development i.e. gravel & asphalt)



#### Pre-Development Channel (existing)

Post-Development Channel (gravel)



#### Post-Development Channel (asphalt)



Figure 9: Post-Development Conditions (asphalt)

## Traffic and Visitation Statistics

Goal: Obtain a daily count of visitors to the Camboh Picnic Area to design a lot that will account for the increase of visitors

Visitors in Saguaro National Park in 2019

950,000

Visitors in Saguaro National Park in 2020

1,026,226



Figure 10: Typical Horse Trailer and Truck



Figure 11: Equestrian Trail in Arizona

Design Goal: 20-25 Vehicles per hour

## Parking Lot Design and Development

Goal: From the analyses completed, concluded on an overall flow size of lot and parking stalls while adhering to ADA, local, and federal standards

Overall Lot Dimension and Flow of Traffic

- Constrained to design
  around existing structures
- 169'-09" (width) x 443'-03" (length)
- Circular pattern

#### Parking stalls Dimensions

- Design vehicle Truck-trailer combination
- 45 degree angled
- 3 ADA parking stalls (8' x 18')
- 5 Passenger vehicle stalls (9' x 25'-06")
- 15 Truck-trailer vehicle stalls (18' x 55'-00")



Figure 12: Overall Parking Lot Design

### **Cover Page**

## SAGUARO NATIONAL PARK PARKING LOT ASSESSMENT AND DESIGN TUCSON, ARIZONA

#### **Cam-Boh Picnic Area Information**

Coordinates: 32.3189633°N, -111.1662121°W Elevation: 2,493 feet (760 meters) USGS Topo Map Quad: Avra Jurisdiction: National Park Service Client: Richard Goepfrich, Saguaro National Park Chief of Facility Management





**Existing Vegetation** 

Handicap Parking

Vehicle Direction of Travel

Stop Bar

(#) Keyed Notes

No Parking Zone

Wood Fence

Chain Link Fence

G

### Legend

- Project Location
- Existing Wash
- Road
- Building Structures
- Existing Footprint
- 2-ft. Contour Intervals
- Site Delineation
- Vegetation Garden

| Sheet Index                    |            |          |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Content                        | Sheet<br># | DWG<br># |  |  |  |
| Cover Page                     | 1          | G-1      |  |  |  |
| Existing Site<br>Layout        | 2          | G-2      |  |  |  |
| Proposed Site<br>Layout        | 3          | G-3      |  |  |  |
| Vegetation Map                 | 4          | L-1      |  |  |  |
| Civil Pavement<br>Marking Plan | 5          | C-1      |  |  |  |
| Pavement Marking<br>Details    | 6          | C-2      |  |  |  |
| Pavement Cross<br>Section      | 7          | C-3      |  |  |  |
| Civil Gravel<br>Marking Plan   | 8          | C-4      |  |  |  |
| Gravel Marking<br>Details      | 9          | C-5      |  |  |  |
| Gravel Cross<br>Section        | 10         | C-6      |  |  |  |
| Erosion Control                | 11         | C-7      |  |  |  |
| Signage Plan                   | 12         | S-1      |  |  |  |



### Vegetation Relocation Plan



## Site Delineation Plan



### **Gravel Detail Sheet**



## **Gravel Cross Section**



### Asphalt Detail Sheet



## Asphalt Cross Section



15.

### **Erosion Control Plan**



#### **Wash Erosion Sediment Control**

- 1. ROCK FOR EROSION PROTECTION OF ROADWAY DITCHES, WHERE REQUIRED, MUST BE OF SOUND QUARRY ROCK, PLACED TO A DEPTH OF 1' AND MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING SPECIFICATIONS: 4"-8" ROCK/40%-70% PASSING; AND 1'-2" ROCK/10%-20% PASSING. RECYCLED CONCRETE SHALL NOT BE USED FOR EROSION PROTECTION, INCLUDING TEMPORARY STABILIZATION ELSEWHERE ON THE SITE.
- 2. THE EROSION SEDIMENT CONTROL FACILITIES SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DETAILS ON THE APPROVED PLANS. LOCATIONS MAY BE MOVED TO SUITE FIELD CONDITIONS, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE ENGINEER AND THE CITY OF TUCSON INSPECTOR.
- 3. THE ESC FACILITIES ON INACTIVE SITES SHALL BE INSPECTED AND MAINTAINED A MINIMUM OF ONCE A MONTH OR WITHIN 48 HOURS FOLLOWING A STORM EVENT BY THE CONTRACTOR DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- 4. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ESC PLAN AND THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, REPLACEMENT, AND UPGRADING OF THESE ESC FACILITIES IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PERMITTEE/CONTRACTOR UNTIL ALL CONSTRUCTION IS APPROVED.
- 5. MAINTENANCE OF THE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL ITEMS MUST BE CONTINUALLY PROVIDED DURING THE DURATION OF THE LAND DISTURBANCE ACTIVITY BY THE CONTRACTOR. MAINTENANCE AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT SHALL BE NOTED IN THE SWPPP DOCUMENTATION OF NPS AND CORRECTIVE MEASURES IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF NPS.



BY DJF

60% 90%

3 2 2 4

## Signage General Notes

|    | SIGNING GENERAL NUIES  |  |          |                                | SIG             | NAGE SCHEDULE                               |                        | .u.   |
|----|--|--|----------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| 1. | ALL EQUIPMENT/MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION SHALL MEET OR<br>EXCEED THE REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE CURRENT PIMA<br>ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (PAG) STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND<br>THE STANDARD DETAILS FOR PUBIC IMPROVEMENTS, THE SPECIAL<br>PROVISIONS AND THE APPROVED PLANS. ALL SIGNING SHALL BE<br>INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PC SIGNING DESIGN MANUAL. | SIGN TYPE                                | QUANTITY | ' SIZE                         | SHEET<br>DETAIL | REFERENCE LOCATION                          | PICTOGRAM              | eign Tucson, AZ<br>Jge & Str  |
| 2. | SIGNS MAY BE MODIFIED AND LOCATIONS ADJUSTED TO FIT CONDITION<br>AT THE DISCRETION OF THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER.  |  |          |                                |                 |   | YIELD                  | King Lot D  |
| 3. | POST LENGTHS INDICATED ON SIGN SUMMARY SHEETS ARE<br>APPROXIMATE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ACTUAL POST<br>LENGTHS.  | YIELD                                    | 1        | 36" × 36"                      | 6               | MUTCD 2B.08                                 |                        | Soguaro Po  |
| l. | ALL SIGN LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL<br>VERIFY ACTUAL SIGN LOCATIONS WITH THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER PRIOR<br>TO THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SIGNS.  |  |          |                                |                 |   | V                      | 1<br>/03<br>//A<br>S.S.E  |
| i. | THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING ALL<br>WORK WITH ARIZONA 811 (1-800-782-5348) TWO BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE<br>INSTALLING ALL TRAFFIC SIGNS IN THE FIELD AND FOR MAINTAINING<br>ALL SIGNING UNTIL PROJECT IS APPROVED FOR "CONSTRUCTION<br>ACCEPTANCE" BY PIMA COUNTY.   | DO NOT                                   | 1        | 30" × 30"                      | 4               | MUTCD 2B.37                                 |                        | Information JUB NO:<br>0.021002-0365 JUP INC:<br>100/0365-0425 SCALE-N<br>00/0365-0425 DFAWN:                       |
|    | ALL SIGNS SHALL HAVE TYPE XI SHEETING OR AN EQUIVALENT. ALL<br>WARMING SIGNS HAVING YELLOW BACKGROUND SHALL USE<br>FLUORESCENT YELLOW SHEET. ALL GROUND MOUNTED SIGNS SHALL<br>HAVE AN ANTI GRAFFITI COATING APPLIED TO SIGN FACE, 3M #1160<br>FILM OR EQUIVALENT.   | LINILIX                                  |          |                                |                 |   |                        | rstems Engineering Conta<br>inter Enait dolgana edu Proce<br>e- Emait dole@mu-edu Proce<br>- Emait pht@mu-edu Proce |
|    | A 3"X2" PRESSURE SENSITIVE, UV RESISTANT LABEL INDICATING THE<br>SIGN MANUFACTURERS NAME AND DATE OF MANUFACTURE SHALL BE<br>PLACED IN THE UPPER RIGHT CORNER OF THE BACK OF ALL SIGNS<br>EXCEPT STREET NAME SIGNS AT THE TIME OF INSTALLATION. STREET<br>NAME SIGNS SHALL INCLUDE A SIGN IDENTIFICATION DECAL AS SHOWN<br>ON PIMA COUNTY SIGNING DETAIL 9-22A.      | HANDICAP<br>PARKING<br>SIGN<br>STANCHION | 4        | 12' x 18"                      | 12              | 2010 ADA STANDARDS<br>FOR ACCESSIBLE DESIGN |                        | ATE BY<br>0/06 DJF<br>1/03 DJF John Edu   |
| •  | ALL NEW SIGNS SHALL HAVE 0.080 GAUGE, RADIUS CORNER, ALUMINUM BACKING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.  | SYSTEM                                   |          |                                |                 |   |                        | SNOISW  |
|    | PRIOR TO DISTURBING ANY TRAFFIC SIGNS, A SIGN CONDITION<br>INVENTORY OF ALL EXISTING SIGNING SHALL BE CONDUCTED BY THE<br>CONTRACTOR AND PROVIDED TO THE PIMA COUNTY SIGN SHOP<br>SUPERVISOR (520) 724-2630. INVENTORY SHALL INDICATE CURRENT<br>SIGN LOCATION AND CONDITION, INCLUDING ANY EXISTING DAMAGE OF<br>DEFICIENCIES.                                      | SÁGUARO<br>NATIONAL<br>PARK<br>CAMBOH    | 1        | UTILIZE TO<br>EXISTING<br>SIGN | 8               | REFER TO EXISTING SIGN                      | REFER TO EXISTING SIGN | RE<br>NO. DESCRPTION<br>1 60% submittal<br>2 90% submittal  |
| )_ | ALL SIGNS AND POSTS BEING RE-USED ON THIS PROJECT SHALL BE<br>STOCKPILED IN A MANNER TO AVOID DAMAGE AND MAINTAIN THE<br>INTEGRITY OF THE SIGNS. SAFE STORAGE OF STOCKPILE AND ANY   | PICNIC<br>AREA SIGN                      |          | SIGN                           |                 |   |                        | 150   |

## Construction and Engineering Costs

| Item                         | Qty  | Unit | Unit Price (\$) | Total (\$) |
|------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|------------|
| Geotechnical Analysis        |      |      |                 |            |
| Land Survey                  | 1    | LS   | N/A             | N/A        |
| Complete Soil Test           | 1    | LS   | N/A             | N/A        |
| Earthwork                    |      |      |                 |            |
| Cut                          | 15   | HR   | 64              | 960        |
| Fill                         | 15   | HR   | 64              | 960        |
| Subgrade Preparation         | 1    | LS   | 500             | 500        |
| Paving/Subgrade Materials    |      |      |                 |            |
| 2" Hot Mix Flexible Pavement | 1400 | SY   | 8.5             | 11900      |
| Soil-Cement Base             | 1000 | CY   | 4.5             | 4500       |
| Striping and Signage         |      |      |                 |            |
| Striping/Signage             | 1    | LS   | 2000            | 2000       |
| Miscellaneous                |      |      |                 |            |
| Testing/Quality Control      | 1    | LS   | 1000            | 1000       |
| Inspection                   | 1    | LS   | 2000            | 2000       |
| Construction Management      | 1    | LS   | 3000            | 3000       |
| Equipment                    | 3    | HR   | 39              | 117        |
| Maintenance                  | 1    | LS   | 750             | 750        |
| Contingency                  |      |      |                 |            |
| Unforeseen Issues            | 1    | LS   | 1500            | 1500       |
|                              |      |      | TOTAL (\$)      | 29187.00   |

Table 5: Gravel Estimated Cost

Goal: Provide to the client a total cost estimation of the implementation and engineering costs associated with this project

| Itom                    | Otv  | Unit | Unit Price  | Total (\$)          |
|-------------------------|------|------|-------------|---------------------|
|                         | QIY  | Unin | <b>(</b> Φ) | 10101 ( <b>\$</b> ) |
|                         | ,    |      |             |                     |
| Lana Survey             |      | LS   | N/A         | N/A                 |
| Complete Soil Test      |      | LS   | N/A         | N/A                 |
| Earthwork               |      |      |             |                     |
| Cut                     | 20   | HR   | 64          | 1280                |
| Fill                    | 20   | HR   | 64          | 1280                |
| Subgrade Preparation    | 1    | LS   | 800         | 800                 |
| Paving/Subgrade         |      |      |             |                     |
| Materials               |      |      |             |                     |
| 2" Hot Mix Flexible     |      |      |             |                     |
| Pavement                | 8400 | SY   | 2.5         | 21000               |
| Soil-Cement Base        | 1400 | CY   | 8.5         | 11900               |
| Granular Base           | 950  | CY   | 15          | 14250               |
| Striping and Signage    |      |      |             |                     |
| Striping/Signage        | 1    | LS   | 2000        | 2000                |
| Miscellaneous           |      |      |             |                     |
| Testing/Quality Control | 1    | LS   | 1500        | 1500                |
| Inspection              | 1    | LS   | 2000        | 2000                |
| Construction            |      |      |             |                     |
| Management              | 1    | LS   | 3000        | 3000                |
| Equipment               | 10   | HR   | 39          | 390                 |
| Maintenance             | 1    | LS   | 500         | 500                 |
| Contingency             |      |      |             |                     |
| Unforeseen Issues       | 1    | LS   | 3000        | 3000                |
|                         |      |      | TOTAL (\$)  | 62900               |

Table 6: Asphalt Estimated Cost

## Impacts

Goal: Aid in the final design by conducting a feasibility tool to assess the impacts of the project on society, economy, and the environment



#### **Environmental**

- Preservation the environment
- Delineation area boundaries
- Relocation of protected species



### Social

- Decrease stress and depression
- Safe place for recreation
- Strong relationships with the community



### Economical

- Local employment
- New industries of businesses services and/or food
- New infrastructure



# **Questions?**

Acknowledgement to:

Grading Instructor: Dr. Jeffrey Heiderscheidt Technical Advisor: Nate Reisner Client: Richard Goepfrich NAU College of Engineering, Informatics, and Applied Sciences Even though the project had restrictions due to COVID-19 the below objectives were met.

Redesigned lot

Protection of native species

✓ Adequate drainage

Permits truck-trailer parking

✓ ADA compliant