

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP AND THE
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, July 19, 2005 - 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair, Regional Bicycle Task Force and Acting Chair of the Pedestrian Working Group	*Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Bruce Meyers, ADOA Gen. Services	Peggy Rubach, Maricopa County
Michael Sanders, ADOT	Mitch Foy, Mesa
Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	Karen Flores, Peoria
^Anna Roedler, Avondale	Katherine Coles, Phoenix
Melinda Brimhall for Michael Normand, Chandler	Gail Brinkmann for Briana Leon, Phoenix
Amy MacAulay for Bill Lazenby, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	Randi Alcott, RPTA
Steve Hancock, Glendale	*Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale
Farhad Tavassoli, Goodyear	*Reed Kempton, Scottsdale
	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
	*Randy Overmeyer for Lee Lambert, Surprise
	Mark Smith, El Mirage

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Phil Garthright, The Heith Companies
Laura Paty, HDR Engineering, Inc.

1. Call to Order

Acting Chair Eric Iwersen called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the May 17, 2005 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Catherine Coles moved to approve and Karen Flores seconded the move to approve the meeting minutes of the Regional Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group for May 17, 2005. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group 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 Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items were given an opportunity at the time the item was heard.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Maureen DeCindis gave an update on the MAG Regional Bikeway Master Plan. The consultant, Sprinkle Consulting, Inc., was approved by the MAG Regional Council on June 29, 2005. Staff is currently working on the contract.

The Pedestrian Design Assistance projects are moving forward. The city of Scottsdale has chosen to work with A Dye Design, the city of Mesa with e group and the city of Phoenix with HDR Engineering. Avondale and El Mirage are still making their decisions.

The Arizona State Committee on Trails (ASCOT) is sponsoring their conference entitled *Volunteers: Helping Hands on the Land* on October 6-7, 2005 at the Lake Pleasant Outdoor Center. There is a reception/party on Thursday evening offering an opportunity for volunteers, potential volunteers, and land managers to learn how to get involved and exchange ideas. There will be music, dinner, stargazing, activities and door prizes. On Friday, the conference features workshops focusing on managing, motivating and retaining volunteers. Maureen DeCindis passed out the ASCOT conference registration packet.

Peggy Rubach asked if the Transportation Enhancement Review Committee (TERC) meeting was on the same date as the ASCOT Conference. Michael Sanders reported that yes the meeting runs concurrently, October 5-7, 2005.

Catherine Coles gave an update on the underbridge at 24th Street and Camelback. The utilities are currently being relocated and full construction will begin in January. The city will honor the moratorium on construction in November and December because of shopping. The project should be finished in December 2006.

Mike Sanders reported being at the national bike/ped meetings in July. He gave an update on the re-authorization on the fair share for safety funding that would use the same percentage of safety funds for bike/ped safety programs as the bike/ped fatalities. In Arizona, bike/ped fatalities were at 15% versus 3% of funds being allocated to bike/ped education programs. Another stipulation may have State Departments Of Transportation hire full time coordinators for Safe Routes to School programs. Randi Alcott asked if there was a pilot program for additional funding to promote safe walking and bicycling to school programs. Mike Sanders responded that he thinks that is included as well.

Tami Ryall reported that the City Council will adopt the Gilbert bike plan on July 19, 2005.

5. Review the Transportation Improvement Project (T.I.P) Process.

Committee members were asked to discuss a Transportation Improvement Project (T.I.P) Process and schedule.

The first issue discussed was the Reading Score. Tami Ryall asked if the committee wants the reading score to continue. Peggy Rubach suggested that the reading score be dropped. Dawn Coomer had submitted written comments “that indicated that the initial score should be determined based on both the application and the applicant's presentation. Sometimes when reviewing the applications certain facts are not clear and clarification of these items affects the ranking. We need to be able to change the ranking based on these other things that come to light after the presentations, and sometimes it's tough to move projects in the ranking once that initial ranking is already determined.”

The second issue discussed was the Score Sheets. Tami Ryall asked the committee if they prefer the electronic mathematical calculation or the dot method. Dawn Coomer wrote “that the 'dot' process creates group think and that some projects will rank higher than they would have otherwise because voters don't want to 'throw away their votes.' Sometimes a straight vote reveals that some projects have a tie, and that would need to be discussed by the committee. Anonymous voting also allows committee members to vote with conscious objectivity.” Tami Ryall noted that the mathematical process may not discern the top projects. Mitch Foy expressed concern for regional distribution. Tami Ryall noted that the dot system is the fastest and easiest. Karen Flores suggested that more dots be given out with only two dots per project allowed. Eric Iwersen suggested that the dot process makes projects top heavy and many projects would not be ranked. Catherine Coles suggested that the dots should be done twice so that the second process will flush out the top projects. Mitch Foy would like to see regional equity continue and discussion of the projects would allow that to happen. Bruce Meyers suggested color dots be representative of first, second, third priority. Then the points would have to be averaged out. Eric Iwersen would like to keep it simple with three dots, then discuss and then rank. Tami Ryall suggested doing individual dots (each person would put dots on a separate piece of paper thus insuring anonymity), the dots would be added up, discussion would ensue and then if necessary the committee members would apply dots again with one color and one value for the final ranking.

Randi Alcott asked if the bike and ped applications will be ranked together. Tami Ryall responded that the funding is for both bike and ped projects. Applications should be judged on merit not on modal allocation.

Peggy Rubach suggested that the Shared-Use Design Assistance program be put on the agenda for future discussion. She also suggested discussing combining this with the Pedestrian Design Assistance program. Peggy Rubach inquired whether there may be more safety funding available. Staff was directed to research this information.

The third issue discussed was whether the committee should allow PowerPoint presentations. Dawn Coomer wrote “that cities should be allowed to use PowerPoint for their presentations if they wish (it should not be required). They could also bring along a display board or other items that might help present their ideas. Of course, it is simpler just to refer to the photos in the application, but I'm not sure that all the applications have color photos, so the use of PowerPoint or a display board might help

explain the project a bit better. I really like the idea of presentations of the different projects by cities because some absorb information by reading, and others by hearing. However, another idea might be to get rid of the presentations all together and have the written applications stand on their own, but I don't really care for that idea." Tami Ryall expressed concern about the effort needed for the PowerPoint presentation especially after the time needed to fill out the application. This may put undue pressure on the smaller cities.

Eric Iwersen concurred that PowerPoint sets the stage to make the process more complicated. It levels the playing field when the jurisdictions represent the merits of the project. Mark Smith agreed that hype may become more important than the content of the project. Committee members may vote on the project based on how well the presentation was. Amy MacAulay pointed out that PowerPoint presentations take a lot of time.

Randi Alcott noted that PowerPoint presentations are more visual and that the technology is very common. Slides could be maps and photos with one slide depicting the main points of the project. Michael Eagan suggested that the cities provide boards.

Steve Hancock suggested three slides per jurisdiction and the slides must be sent ahead of time to MAG staff. Bruce Meyers agreed that slide template should be sent out ahead of time so that all members are on equal footing. Peggy Rubach suggest that the slides be submitted at the same time as the application.

Mitch Foy suggested that the whole application should be in electronic format.

Eric Iwersen made a motion to allow PowerPoint presentations with a cap of six slides per project. Presenters would have 3-5 minutes and then questions and answers. Peggy Rubach seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Eric Iwersen made a motion that the committee use the dot method for voting and one vote per jurisdiction ranking bike and pedestrian projects within one ranking system. The motion was seconded by Randi Alcott. The motion passed unanimously.

Peggy Rubach suggested that bike/ped projects should be prepared ahead of time in case more money comes through reauthorization. Tami Ryall asked MAG staff to request a presentation from Eric Anderson on potential increase in funding. Mitch Foy asked if it would be beneficial for bike/ped projects to request design and right of way acquisition funding in one year and construction funding in the next year. Tami Ryall responded that it would be better to pull forward the design component through the close out process.

Randi Alcott suggested having a longer first TIP ranking meeting. The meeting would start at 1:30 p.m. but end at 4:30 p.m. if necessary. Maureen DeCindis reminded the committee that the first meeting is scheduled on October 18, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. and the second meeting if necessary is scheduled for October 25th at 12:30 p.m.

6. Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines Workshops

The updated *MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines* are intended to provide a source of information and design assistance to support walking. To that end, MAG has \$5,000 to sponsor five workshops around the Valley to train city staff (planners, engineers, project managers, zoning, parks, economic development, etc.) and any others. MAG is seeking five cities to host a workshop. The following cities will work together to conduct a workshop:

- Phoenix/Valley Metro/Maricopa County
- Mesa/Gilbert/Chandler
- Avondale/Goodyear/Litchfield Park
- Glendale/Peoria /Surprise/El Mirage
- Tempe/Scottsdale

Amy MacAulay suggested that the consultant hired be experienced in teaching material in interesting manner. Amy MacAulay offered to help write the request for proposal.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be August 16, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. in the Cholla Room.