

FINAL MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

October 9, 2014

Maricopa Association of Governments; Ironwood Room;
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

ADOT: Nicole Patrick	*Paradise Valley: Jeremy Knapp
Avondale: Kristen Sexton	Peoria: Stuart Kent as Proxy
#Buckeye: Sean Banda for Andrea Marquez	Phoenix: Maria Hyatt, Vice Chair
Chandler: Jason Crampton for RJ Zeder	*Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
El Mirage: Jose Macias	Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann, Chair
#Gilbert: Kristin Myers	Surprise: Martin Lucero
Glendale: Debbie Albert	#Tempe: Robert Yabes
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Tolleson: Chris Hagen
#Maricopa: Kazi Haque for David Maestas	Valley Metro: Wulf Grote
Maricopa County DOT: Suparna Dasgupta	Youngtown: Grant Anderson
Mesa: Jodi Sorrell	

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Jeff Martin, Chandler/Mesa
Marc Pearsall, MAG	Ken Kessler, Phoenix
Margaret Boone, MAG	Ratna Korepella, Scottsdale
Alice Chen, MAG	David Kohlbeck, Surprise
DeDe Gaisthea, MAG	Abhi Dayal, Valley Metro
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Jorge Luna, Valley Metro
Julie Walker, MAG	Deron Lozano, URS
	Jennifer Pyne, URS

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Chair Madeline Clemann. She welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that four members were joining the meeting by teleconference: Kristin Myers of Gilbert, Sean Banda of Buckeye, Kazi Haque of Maricopa and Robert Yabes of Tempe. Chair Clemann asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft September 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Chair Clemann inquired if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft September 11, 2014 Minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion on the Draft September 11, 2014 Minutes. Mr. Grant Anderson of Youngtown moved to approve the motion, Mr. Martin Lucero of Surprise seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Chair Clemann then proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Clemann stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Chair Clemann invited Eileen Yazzie of MAG to brief the Committee with the Transit Program Manager's Report.

Ms. Yazzie noted that she had a brief update with three items. She began by stating that there was a TOD Project Planning Grant under the purview of a MAP-21 NOFA. She said that via the Valley Metro TOD Working Group, they discovered that the NOFA was one of the most specific and limited grants relating to HCT Projects in some time. The grant stipulated that the project must be in the New Starts/Small Starts Program and must be in planning development phase/or NEPA. Any projects in engineering or ROW acquisition would not be considered. In the MAG Region, the Tempe Streetcar was an early candidate considered for this NOFA. She then stated that the South Central Light Rail Project had been presented to the Regional Council, Valley Metro Board, State Transportation Board and Maricopa County Board of Supervisors for a Major Amendment to the RTP, in the August-September-October time-frame. She noted that Air Quality Conformity would be run during the spring, then the South Central Project would be brought back through the MAG Committee process.

She also thanked the members for their efforts with the TOD Working Group and the Service Standards and Performance Measures Working Groups at Valley Metro, as they had both been huge efforts over the past year. Ms. Yazzie completed her report.

Chair Clemann thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report and asked if there were further questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Hearing none, she moved onto the next item on the agenda.

5. Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (STSP) Update

Chair Clemann then invited Ms. Margaret Boone of MAG to present a report on the Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (STSP). Chair Clemann noted that the item was on the agenda for action and possible approval.

Ms. Boone began by referring to the presentation and the recent efforts of the STSP Working Group on tasks 5 and 6. She noted the objectives were to identify regional practices that could be part of the STSP Implementation Plan. She briefly referred to the 2008-2012 crash data, then explained some of the major action areas within the STSP, specifically: impaired driving, speeding and aggressive driving, incidents related to Intersections, bicyclists, pedestrians, persons with disabilities and young roadway users. She noted the support action areas of: improve data collection, quality, availability, integration, and analysis for sound decision making, and summarized the strategies for the STSP, which included: identifying new practices or standards that integrate safety into planning and design; addressing safety and multi-modal connectivity in planning and design; establishing complete streets policies that integrating safety analysis and design throughout the planning process. She then explained the consensus on practices within the STSP Implementation Plan.

Ms. Boone continued and explained that at the first meeting, attendees we were introduced to the STSP process and what had been done to that point by the Safety Committee and the Stakeholders Group. There was a review of crash data specific to bicycle and pedestrian incidences, development of Action Areas that focused on the types of crashes that were prevalent and then strategies that recommended to address the Action Areas. She said that based on the discussion at the first meeting, a list of proposed practices was generated and sent to members of the working group and an assignment to comment on each practice based on our agencies needs, resources, etc was completed. She then stated that the second meeting included a small group break-out session that was facilitated to score the list of practices. This list was included within today's presentation and would be provided to the other technical committees; Streets, Transit and Transportation Safety. It was anticipated that recommended practices will be then be promoted within the Implementation Plan.

Ms. Boone then reviewed the potential practices by working group. She advised that the practices had opportunities and constraints, and the practices were ranked based on the following factors and scored subjectively: cost effectiveness, need and ease of implementation. She elaborated and explained the criteria definitions: Cost Effectiveness: was the proposed practice expected to be effective in reducing the fatal/severe injury pedestrian and/or bicycle crashes relative to the expected cost of implementation?; Need: Does the proposed practice address a fatal/serious pedestrian and/or bicycle problem used to establish an Action Area and related Strategy? Does MAG or the MAG member agencies already implement or utilize this practice or will this represent a new or modified practice?; and Ease of Implementation: can the proposed practice be easily implemented within the MAG Planning Area or will it require new ordinances, council resolutions or funding that may not exist? Followed by Is the proposed practice practical?

She then added that 'Recommended Practice' as advised by the Working Group was #3. This selection would entail a one-year implementation time-frame and would encourage submittal of TIP projects that included a variety of safety elements, for improving safer access for all modes, by including safety as an explicit project evaluation criteria for all TIP projects.

Ms. Boone then briefly reviewed some of the other scenarios that were brought forward in the STSP report. She noted that Option #5 recommended developing a short-range action program oriented to 1) high transit activity stops and 2) new routes that would enhance transit stop safety with focus on amenities, safe access and connections. She followed by adding that the intent of this program would be to employ the checklist from the MAG Designing Accessible Communities and tie to Valley Metro Service Standards. She noted that Option #7, the recommendation was to develop an update of regional bus stop design and location guidelines to promote a greater emphasis on safety and consistent practices by local jurisdictions in cooperation with bus operators.

She then summarized the next steps of the STSP process by addressing the performance monitoring, implementation plan and MAG Adoption of the Final STSP: Task 8 – a means of monitoring established performance measures and reporting of safety performance of identified practices and programs will be addressed and aligned with MAP-21 regulations for performance measurement and meeting targets; Task 9 - programs and practices that have been introduced through a series of technical memoranda as well as the Working Group activity will be promoted to the Implementation Plan; and Task 10 - The final plan would be developed and will go through the MAG approval process with final approval expected in April 2015. Ms. Boone stated that Transit Committee action was requested: to recommend approval of a practice to encourage submission of TIP projects that include safety elements, for improving safer access for all modes, by including safety as an explicit project evaluation criteria for all TIP projects.

Ms. Yazzie noted that there was an extensive review of Scenario #3 and that three Committees had approved the selection, and that the item was on the agenda for action specifically related to Scenario #3. She added a brief overview of all eight scenarios, but focused on and reiterated that they were looking for consensus on the attainability and applicability of Scenario #3 (because it's elements would be included within the TIP) as well as on Scenarios #5 and #7 (transit related). She also mentioned that it had already been approved by the Streets, Bike-Ped and Transportation Safety Committees. Ms. Boone clarified that the other scenarios not approved by the committee (1-2, 4-8) would be options in the future for implementation within the UPWP. Discussion followed. She completed her presentation. Chair Clemann thanked Ms. Boone for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the agenda item.

Mr. Grote of Valley Metro offered a comment and noted that he participated in the STSP meetings. He appreciated the work done by the group in providing a greater emphasis on safety on a local level and the FTA supports it. He added that the only thing challenging for Valley Metro was related to crash data, automobile accident and pedestrian data, because unless a transit vehicle was involved, the data may not be reflecting an accident that involves a bus or light rail rider, passenger or bicyclist. He advocated for a way for the data to be more specific in its reporting. He then commented on the phases of the STSP, and in particular phase 3 and inquired on the guidelines pertaining to capital and transit infrastructure and his agency's eagerness to participate. Ms. Boone replied that Valley Metro had requested two RSA's at light rail stations to assist in narrowing the accident data from a more transit specific angle.

Mr. Anderson of Youngtown noted that regarding the recommendation, he said that there were a number of TIP projects that may not apply. He also stated that in the past there the processes have similar to this that have gone awry when the evaluation criteria gets changed mid-stream, and subsequently cause the scoring of the projects to be affected in a negative way. He said he was a little

hesitant to move forward. Ms. Yazzie and Ms. Boone replied that MAG staff and the Safety Committee would be coming up with the criteria for the TIP projects, with the input from the Committee for vetting before it was adopted. Chair Clemann offered commentary on the risks of a project doesn't rank very high even though its important for the region. Discussion followed regarding the elements of safety within the project rankings and how some transit projects don't particularly address safety criteria as pertaining to roadway, etc.

Mr. Grote of Valley Metro and Ms. Albert of Glendale noted that ITS and safety implementation for transit had previously been tried to little success and instead offered that perhaps the safety criteria should be more geared towards the needs of the communities as opposed to the criteria being set up in advance as a 'crash-related' one-size-fits-all format. Mr. Martin Lucero added that he had concerns over the presumption that guiding principles for safety aren't necessarily exclusive for safe operational environments for transit, and offered an example of experiences of the new UTA Sugarhouse Streetcar. Brief discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie referred the members to the notes and offered that they may alleviate some of the concerns that the members had over the motion and if it needs a modification. Ms. Boone asked Chair Clemann if it was possible to return at either the November or December meeting so that there could be additional input and collaboration with the STSP team prior to returning with a recommended motion. Chair Clemann replied in the affirmative and invited her to return.

Chair Clemann again thanked the presenters for their report and asked if there were further questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Hearing none, she moved onto the next item on the agenda.

6. Southeast Valley Transit System Study

Chair Clemann then invited Mr. Marc Pearsall of MAG and Mr. Jorge Luna of Valley Metro to present an update on the Southeast Valley Transit System Study (SEVTSS).

Mr. Pearsall began by referring to the presentation and the topics to be addressed by the SEVTSS team, which included: study purpose, study team, community outreach, transit optimization task, travel patterns and markets and next steps. He noted that this was the third of three sub-regional studies and that this was a joint-study co-managed with Valley Metro and MAG staff.

He summarized that the study's purpose consisted of a variety of areas: 1.) Identify efficiencies and service gaps for existing and future transit services; 2.) optimize existing services; 3.) identify current unmet needs; 4.) address changing study area conditions; 5.) develop recommendations for addressing short-, mid-, and long-term transit needs; and 6.) Investigate funding strategies and partnership opportunities. He then referred to the study area map, which included a vast area from Tempe east to Apache Junction, south to Florence, west to the City of Maricopa and then north to Ahwatukee in Phoenix. The map featured three zones of service, the Transit Optimization/Core Zone, Transit Emerging / Aspiring Zone and Regional Transit Connection Zone.

Mr. Pearsall advised that the SEVTSS study team consisted of MAG and Valley Metro, the co-managing agencies of the study, with the URS and TDM consulting teams at the helm for writing the report and data collection. Valley Metro's staff was managing public involvement over the 18-

month period and as of October 2014, and at present the study was approximately 60% complete. Valley Metro's efforts for community outreach for the study were expansive as per the goals and objectives. The primary point was to develop a public understanding of the study, which was challenge due to the size of the study area. The study had encouraged public comments by providing various opportunities to participate, and obtaining input from a variety of stakeholders, notable those in the far Southeast Valley. The study had also informed and involved media outlets to maximize stakeholder participation. This data collected from the public would assist the study team with identifying short-, mid-, and long-term transit needs for the Southeast Valley. One-On-One meetings with agency staff and committees had also been frequent since the spring of 2014.

He noted that in regards to media coverage, there had been a broad public profile for the study in the following outlets: AZ Republic, Apache Junction/ Gold Canyon Independent, Queen Creek Santan Independent, La Voz, Prensa Hispana, arizona.newszip.com; Valley Metro: Commute Solutions Newsletter, FaceBook, and Twitter, as well as staff had attended 23 events/ presentations and solicited 1,170 self selected survey responses. He then discussed responses by community. A majority were from underserved/unserved areas of the Valley Survey Results Summary, with the largest response from periphery communities. He said that more than 70% of responders did not work and live in same community, while personal vehicles were the primary mode of transportation. A majority of responders stated that they do not use transit, and felt that current options did not meet their needs, but about half of the responders added that they would support a fare or tax increase to fund transit improvements, with a majority requesting expanded service areas and hours.

Mr. Jorge Luna Luna of Valley Metro then began to explain the Transit Optimization Analysis (TOA) component of the study. He said that the TOA was a data-driven process that evaluated current transit successes and challenges, agency resource efficiencies, and potential service improvements, and ridership growth opportunities. He explained that the evaluation reviewed existing conditions and established guiding principles and a framework for making draft recommendations. With stakeholder involvement, the TOA also reviewed the Southeast Valley Service Structure for transit as well as the grid network with an emphasis on strong connectivity to LRT. The analysis also looked at service types such as local bus, LINK, neighborhood circulators, express bus, Rapid, light rail, and Dial-a-Ride.

He noted that the fares were the same for local, LINK, and light rail service; whereas circulators were free. Ridership and performance indicated a commute (work/school) focused on transit demand, and that market conditions, rather than transit network design, were having the greatest impact on service performance, with performance strongly tied to population and employment densities. He stated that each service entailed different elements: local bus featured: ¼ mile stop spacing, frequency and alignment typically based on local jurisdiction funding, whereas limited stop buses featured: 1 mile stop spacing, extended LRT service, and faster travel times. The circulators focused on neighborhood / ASU based trips, and were fare-free, with stops at both designated and flag stops. Express buses featured: AM inbound to Downtown Phoenix, PM travel outbound to suburban areas, with passenger pickups occurring at Park and Rides or along local route segments. He said light rail featured: 12 minute frequencies, stop spacing less than 1 mile and typically ½ mile, with Park and Rides located at four of ten LRT stations in the SE Valley, and was used as a tool to stimulate dense development. Dial-a-Ride featured: service for seniors citizens (age 65+) and disabled.

Mr. Luna explained the current ridership observations from the study. Average daily boardings for all services in the SE Valley were currently 81,000 weekday boardings, with 43,000 on Saturday (53% of weekday), and 27,000 on Sunday (33% of weekday). The ridership was concentrated to the top four routes (Routes 61,45,72,30), which account for 33% of total boardings. Other key corridors were Arizona Ave (ALNK,112) and Main St (MLNK,40), corridors that account for 15% of weekday boardings. He added that those six corridors carry 50% of all SE Valley bus ridership.

He then discussed performance by geographic area, which displayed a significant difference in performance in service by geographic area, and also noted the highlights of transit's performance where local land use and development patterns had favored transit oriented development or density. The Transit System Design concluded that a grid network design was appropriate for the Southeast Valley, as the grid represented the optimal balance of effectiveness and efficiency for the prevailing road network and development patterns. The effectiveness was maximized when customers could use the network spontaneously (requires 15 minute frequencies or better), and that major corridors (fast, 10-min or better service) should be emphasized within the grid and targeted for linear TOD.

He added that hub-based network elements were inefficient and ineffective and should be oriented to the periphery where service is infrequent, and since that periphery was always expanding, infrastructure investment levels should recognize this lack of permanence. He noted that the Southeast Valley Transit Plan would present a phased approach that responds to development intensification and expansion while recognizing minimum density thresholds for frequent transit.

Mr. Luna then explained the Corridor Design observations. He said that overall the corridor design was sound, but that deviations should be reconsidered based on value added impact to network, with a rich grid network structure demand oriented to corridors, not the other way around. He said that considerations for last mile service and/or new pedestrian environment enhancements were important. He briefly showed trips production comparison maps (origin and destination) for 2012 and 2035. He also discussed travel districts, such as intra-district travel, where the top five intra-district trip generators included North Tempe, West Mesa, Central Mesa, North Chandler, and North Gilbert.

He then showcased inter-district travel and summarized key observations and noted that by 2035 the study area would become more attraction-oriented overall, and the northern portion of the study area had districts with high inter- and intra-district travel patterns. Intra-district trips would increase with the most in districts on the periphery, and that the vast Mesa Gateway district would grow the most as a producer and attractor. The GRIC had different travel patterns than its neighboring districts, and he noted that trip interaction between the City of Maricopa and Florence, Eloy, Coolidge, and Casa Grande as well as San Tan Valley would increase in the future.

Mr. Luna concluded by noting next steps, which featured continuing stakeholder briefings, completing the Transit Optimization Assessment, and incorporate stakeholder feedback into the analysis. The needs assessment for short-and longer term recommendations would also be completed. He added that SEV Study updates and briefings to agencies and the public were available upon request. Chair Clemann thanked Mr. Luna and Mr. Pearsall for their report and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the agenda item.

Ms. Nicole Patrick of ADOT inquired if the SEV project had been involving and coordinating with areas in the Southeast Valley in need of rural transit, such as City of Maricopa, GRIC, Coolidge and the Sun Corridor communities. Marc and Jorge replied that all the aforementioned were members of the Project Management Team that had been involved and participating since the beginning and were advised monthly on the status of the study.

Chair Clemann again thanked the presenters for their report and asked if there were further questions or comments regarding the agenda item. Hearing none, she moved onto the next item on the agenda.

7. MAG Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Call for Planning Projects for FY2016

Chair Clemann and Ms. Yazzie advised the Transit Committee members that MAG was soliciting a call for planning projects for the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY2016. They noted that at the next meeting, Transit Committee members were requested to be prepared to share ideas that the committee as a whole will discuss for consideration and inclusion in the next UPWP.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Clemann asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Mr. Crampton of Chandler requested a discussion on Regional Fleet expansion needs and opportunities. He said that Chandler was looking into expanding their local service with the required 15% local match, which opened efforts to garner 85% from the FTA. He wanted to know how the regional fleet was being funded and what potential options there were for acquiring new bus vehicles. Mr. Grote noted that the issue, as well as the bus vehicle purchases through Phoenix or Valley Metro, could also be discussed at the Valley Metro's Service Planning Working Group. Ms. Clemann added that perhaps VM staff with knowledge of the TLCP could be invited to offer their input. Ms. Yazzie replied that she would bring the item forward at a future meeting. Hearing no further comments, Chair Clemann proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

9. Next Meeting Date

Chair Clemann thanked those present and announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, November 13, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Ironwood Room. She noted however that the Committee may prefer to consolidate both meetings into one since the holiday season can be busy, and advised that MAG staff would subsequently inform the committee members on whether there would be a November or December meeting. There being no further business, Chair Clemann adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.