

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, March 16, 2004 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair	Mark Venti, Mesa
Anna Roedler, Avondale	Karen Flores, Peoria
Bill Lazenby, Coalition of Az. Bicyclists	*Briiana Leon, Phoenix
Melinda Brimhall for Michael Normand, Chandler	Amy Caruthers for Scott Hamilton, Scottsdale
Steve Hancock, Glendale	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
*Janeen Gaskin, Goodyear	Randi Alcott, Valley Metro
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park	
*Scott Lininger, Maricopa County	

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG	Kelly LaRosa, City of Peoria
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Chairman Tami Ryall, Regional Bicycle Task Force, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. .

2. Approval of the January 13, 2004 Meeting Minutes of the MAG Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Eric Iwersen moved to approve and Amy Corathers seconded the meeting minutes of the Regional Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Regional Bicycle Task Force on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes was provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Working Group requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

No one in the audience wished to address the committee.

4. Staff Report

Maureen DeCindis reported that the pedestrian conference “Trails for All People: Accessibility on Arizona’s Trails” was very successful with over 150 people attending on February 27, 2004 at the Phoenix Zoo.

Maureen DeCindis distributed a copy of the FY 2004 MAG Federal Funded Project Status Report. There is projected to be \$18,440,170 funding available in the close-out in April for projects that can be obligated by the end of the federal fiscal year (actually by August 1, 2004 in order to process). Criteria for priority status for close out funds are for transportation projects that have been designed and have approved environmental clearance; projects that are currently in the 2005 Transportation Improvement Process (TIP) that can be moved forward to this year; projects that would like to increase their federal share and projects that wish to advance the design of their project.

Maureen DeCindis discussed the process for updating the MAG Regional bicycle map. Bill Lazenby told the committee that the Wide World of Maps just printed a new bike map with updates from the bicyclists in the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists.

5. Member Agency Report

Eric Iwersen reported that City of Tempe will be sponsoring a breakfast at four different sites as part of Valley Bike Week.

Bill Lazenby reported that he and three other representatives traveled to Washington D.C. to lobby for the reauthorization of TEA-21. They met with several Arizona legislators and their transportation representatives. The Senate passed the TEA-LU and now the House will need to pass their bill and then combine the bills for the President to sign.

6. Approval to Revise the Project Description of City of Phoenix Project PHX-04-110.

The City of Phoenix has requested approval to revise the project description of project PHX-04-110 *Grand Canal at I17*, Construction of Bicycle Grade Separation Structure to *Osborn at I17*. The City of Phoenix has asked that this item be tabled to a later date.

7. Regional Bicycle Education Project

Randi Alcott, Valley Metro, provided an update on the Regional Bicycle Educational Project. The advertising and marketing proposal is not ready to be presented but efforts to promote Valley Bike Week are well under way. Promotional materials that have been distributed to over 2,300 employers and to the approximate 1,000 former riders of the Bike to Bob were passed out to members of the committee. Randi Alcott noted many of the special events scheduled for Valley Bike Week April 17-25, 2004.

- April 17-25 Bike Week Contest
- April 17 Bike Swap Meet
- April 18 Glendale Family Bike Ride
- April 19 Helmet Raffle and Capitol Bike Ride
- April 21 Bike to Work Day - Phoenix and Tempe
- April 21 College Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Celebration
- April 25 Bike to BOB Family Fun Ride

Randi Alcott explained that the Bike to Bob event has more sponsors this year and more booths including massage and a puppet theater. Valley Metro is hoping to sell 1,300 tickets this year. 30,000 posters featuring baseball player Matt Kata will be passed out at the game. The poster features the game schedule as well as the bike safety messages in hopes that people will display the poster in a prominent place.

The media campaign will feature the safety messages from the poster of wear a helmet, be visible and bike on the right. The Diamondbacks will also produce a public service announcement for television.

Karen Flores asked about the details of the Bike to BOB Family Fun Ride. Randi Alcott explained the event and invited committee members to volunteer. Volunteers receive a free ticket to the baseball game.

8. Discussion of Project Selection Process for the Regional Transportation Plan

In the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), \$132 million dollars has been set-aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs over the 20 years. The Task Force continued its discussion on major issues related to implementing the bicycle portions of the RTP.

The new Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides \$6.8 million annually for bicycle and pedestrian projects using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding. The percentage split of MAG CMAQ funding in the RTP is provided in **Table 1**. The RTP provides modal “firewalls” for each mode identified in the Plan, ensuring that bicycle and pedestrian projects will receive 17 percent of CMAQ funding coming to the region.

Because the RTP did not specifically address specific implementation of projects, the following issues need to be addressed by the Regional Bicycle Task Force (RBTF) and Pedestrian Working Group (PWG). Some issues have been resolved at a joint meeting of the committees on January 13, 2004 while others remain to be addressed. Staff has provided statements summarizing the action taken by the RBTF and PWG for resolved issues. For issues that have not yet been discussed, a staff recommendation is provided for discussion and consideration.

Table 1: Percentage Split of MAG CMAQ Funds in the RTP

	Freeways	Streets	Light Rail	Bicycle/ Pedestrian	Air Quality	Total
Percentage	19.10%	13.40%	35.90%	17.00%	14.60%	100.00%
Amount	\$7.6	\$5.4	\$14.4	\$6.8	\$5.8	\$40.0

Notes:

1. Amounts are in millions of dollars, annually, and are based on the expected receipt of \$40 million in CMAQ Obligation Authority each year. The actual dollar allocations will depend on the total amount of CMAQ funding available each year.
2. The Freeways category includes High Occupancy Vehicle lanes and Freeway Management System Projects.
3. Streets projects are further split between intersection projects (\$2.8 million, or 55/105 of the amount) and ITS projects (\$2.56 million, or 50/105 of the amount).
4. No subdivision stated between bicycle and pedestrian projects.

MODAL SPLIT FOR FUNDING ALLOCATION

The RBTF and PWG agreed that no modal split should be established for two years. The merits of each project should “stand on its own.” This concept can be revisited in the future if necessary.

There should not be a set-aside provided for education and encouragement programs. These programs should compete with all other projects.

PROJECT MATCH

The RBTF and PWG agree that the project match for bicycle/shared-use path and pedestrian projects should remain according to adopted policy by the two committees:

Federal Amount Requested	Local Match
Up to \$500,000	5.7% of the total project cost
\$500,001 to \$750,000	20% of the total project cost
Greater than \$750,000	20% or more of the total project cost – <i>it is strongly recommended that the match exceed 20%.</i>

PROJECT SELECTION AND EVALUATION

The RBTF and PWG have determined that:

- The RBTF and PWG should reevaluate the existing federal project application forms for bicycle/shared use path and pedestrian projects after reviewing and recommending projects for FY 2008 and FY 2009.
- The RBTF and PWG should provide comment on federally funded freeway and street projects. This review should be incorporated into the ranking process by the other modal committees.
- The RBTF and PWG should review the TIP forms for all modes to be sure that appropriate information, necessary to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian elements of projects, is included.
- The RBTF and PWG ex-officio members on the Transportation Review Committee should provide input on the policy sub-committee that will determine the type of bicycle and/or pedestrian facility included in regional street projects.

How should the RBTF and PWG review the bicycle and pedestrian elements of other regional transportation projects and determine that an appropriate bicycle and/or pedestrian facility is provided?

The RBTF and PWG have not decided how the review of other projects be performed. This review should be incorporated into the ranking process by the other modal committees. The review could occur at a separate meeting of the RBTF and PWG, or concurrently by having a representative of the RBTF and PWG attend the modal committee meetings.

The committees noted that review of freeway projects was very important, and questioned how review of transit projects would occur.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Should the eligibility requirements for projects be the same as those permitted under CMAQ, or more restrictive? More specifically, should the funding be used for both projects and programs?

Staff Recommendation: Eligibility requirements should be the same as those in the CMAQ regulations (both projects and programs).

Pros:

- Maximizes flexibility and choice of MAG member agencies to focus resources where needed.

Cons:

- Creates less funding for some types of projects, which might be more important to the region, by having all projects remain eligible.

What are the evaluation criteria for project selection? Do the approved projects need to regional? How is regional defined?

All projects which use CMAQ funding consider the CMAQ score as part of the evaluation process. The CMAQ score estimates emission reduction benefits using technical formulas. The Congestion Management System Score is also considered, which evaluates the impact of a constructed project upon congestion. The Congestion Management Rating System was modified by the Regional Bicycle Task Force in 1999 when the Regional Bicycle Plan was updated.

Both the RBTF and PWG have adopted supplemental information forms and ranking systems that include evaluation criteria for project selection. For bicycle and shared-use path projects, the Regional Bicycle Task Force Rating System is used. The RBTF also considers local plans and policies about bicycle accommodation. It has been the intention of the RBTF to provide federal funding to those jurisdictions who:

- Have adopted bicycle plans.
- Require the provision of bicycle lanes and/or shared-use paths as a part of developer agreements.
- Require the provision of bicycle lanes and/or shared-use paths as a part of street modification.
- Require bicycle parking in new and retrofit development.

The RBTF also requires project applications to include detailed project descriptions which identify the problems being addressed by the project; mobility and access opportunities provided; benefits to low income, minority, elderly or physically challenged populations; and impact on air quality and/or congestion.

The PWG also requires a detailed project description of all pedestrian projects. All pedestrian projects are required to adhere to the Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines and the Pedestrian Plan 2000. Applicants are requested to describe how the pedestrian project meets these guidelines and the Plan. In addition, the intra-jurisdictional composite pedestrian trip activity ranking from the Pedestrian Plan 2000

and the regional composite pedestrian trip activity ranking are used in the evaluation process. The intention of the PWG is to provide federal funding to projects that:

- Have construction drawings completed through the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program.
- Are listed as “district” or “campus” in the MAG Pedestrian Plan 2000.

Staff Recommendation: All projects/programs funded with CMAQ funding for the bicycle and pedestrian mode should be regional, which is defined as part of an adopted regional plan (MAG Pedestrian Plan 2000, MAG Regional Bicycle Plan, and the MAG Regional Off-Street System (ROSS) Plan).

Pedestrian projects should be focused in areas defined as “district” or “campus” in the MAG Pedestrian Plan 2000, or for projects with designs completed through the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program.

Pros:

- Ensures that limited funding is used where it will have the most impact.

Cons:

- May limit funding of local priority projects if these projects are not identified in the regional bicycle and pedestrian plans.

PROJECT CANCELLATION, DEFERMENT AND ACCELERATION

Because of the firewalls in the RTP, the funding for regional bicycle and pedestrian projects will stay within the mode. However, the funding will not necessarily stay within the city who cancelled or deferred the project. It is not anticipated that the project cancellation, deferment or acceleration process to be changed with the implementation of the new RTP.

Dawn Coomer reported that the next TIP will be for three years of projects rather than two years and asked how the RBTF and PWG could ensure that all federally funded projects include appropriate bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities?

The options include:

- Separate meeting of RBTF and PWG or concurrently by having a representative at the other modal review meeting.
- MAG staff review all proposals and then provide information in the ranking process.

Randi Alcott asked what would be the opportunity to add criteria to the form so that all street projects include bicycle and pedestrian facilities? Randi Alcott suggested that maybe the street projects could achieve a better ranking with bike and pedestrian facilities.

Eric Iwersen asked if MAG staff can weigh in on freeway projects especially bike/ped bridges. In the new plan, there are eight freeway projects identified. Dawn Coomer responded that design issues are not reviewed by MAG Regional Council. Tami Ryall said that it takes about 18 months for the 30% design

phase. Tami Ryall suggested that Regional Council set a policy for standard spacing of bike/ped bridges. Eric Iwersen noted that each city needs to be vigilant with each freeway project.

Karen Flores asked if there are other state Department Of Transportations that could serve as a model for integrating bicycle/pedestrian projects. Every federally funded transportation project should include bike and pedestrian facilities.

Amy Corathers suggested that those projects that have no bike and pedestrian facilities element could be reviewed by the committee. Tami Ryall confirmed that the projects for the RTP have already been submitted and asked how can the committee could influence the design of the projects.

Dawn Coomer asked the committee if all bicycle/pedestrian projects should be regional in order to receive funding. Michael Cartsonis disagreed with that concept, bike projects should be neighborhood oriented. Eric Iwersen asked for clarification on the definition of *regional*, for example, could a city apply for improvements on a canal that is in the ROSS plan which makes it regional but the portion being improved is local. Dawn Coomer responded that that would make it a regional project.

Tami Ryall suggested adding a higher score for regional projects. Dawn Coomer suggested that local projects might be locally funded. Michael Cartsonis responded that there is more impact by developing neighborhood routes.

Amy Corathers agreed that the emphasis should be on regional projects. And Randi Alcott agreed with Michael Cartsonis that if the majority of bike facilities were at the neighborhood level, it would provide greater opportunity to get more people to ride for the short trips.

Dawn Coomer suggested that for the small amount of funding available, regional proejects should be addressed in this regional forum. Eric Iwersen said that the cities should show regional significance even with local projects such as connection to the larger system or as a model for the region. Mike Cartsonis responded that the connectivity of a regional network is important but the neighborhood connection to the regional system is also very important. The two should connect. However, off-street facilities are not listed in the regional plan. Dawn Coomer reminded the committee that the Regional Off-Street System Plan (ROSS) plan identifies off-street corridors.

Eric Iwersen said that the greatest challenge is making arterial streets bicycle friendly. Projects on arterials are important because destinations are on arterials.

Dawn Coomer brought forward the project match issue. All other transportation projects will require 20% match. As part of the RTP, a 20% match is required to spread the funding around for more projects. Tami Ryall asked how the match criteria would affect small communities. Is it worth having an issue about the 5.7% versus the 20%? These are important projects for small communities and there is a challenge for small communities to raise the match. This match may preclude the development of bicycle projects in the small communities.

9. Next Meeting

The Regional Bicycle Task Force will meet on **June 15, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. in the Cholla Room.**

