MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 20, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

* Brandon Forrey, Peoria, Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, Vice-Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Michael Sanders, ADOT
Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter
Margaret Boone-Pixley, Avondale
Robert Wisener, Buckeye
D.J. Stapley, Carefree
* Rich Rumer Coalition for Arizona Bicyclists
Jorge Gastelum for Doug Strong, El Mirage
* Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Steve Hancock, Glendale
Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Jim Hash, Mesa
Katherine Coles, Phoenix
Peggy Rubach, RPTA
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Alfonso Rodriguez, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Lisa Padilla for Queen Creek
Hobart Wingard for Surprise
Mara DeLuca, Maricopa County Public Health
Paul Ward, Olsson Associates
Aaron Jenson, city of Phoenix

1. Call to Order

Reed Kempton called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the September 15, 2009 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Peggy Rubach enumerated the following changes to the minutes:

- Item 3: Call to the Audience. Add "for marketing and advertising expenses" before bicycle safety education. Change "will" to "may". Add and " TE" after CMAQ and "marketing expenses" after education.
- Item 5: Complete Streets Update. In the last paragraph change "there" to "many".
- Item 7: Health Impact Assessment. Delete "getting this into the national standards" and insert "working with other organizations like the ITE School Citing Committee who is currently producing technical guidelines with the goal of creating national guideline standards".

.

Peggy Rubach moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group for September 15, 2009. Catherine Coles seconded the motion. 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. Tony Bowman of RPTA wished to address the committee. Tony Bowman explained that there is a review of the CMAQ budget to determine if the funds can be used for bicycle safety education. If it is deemed that these funds cannot be used, Valley Metro will not be able to support the program any longer. Eric Iwersen asked for clarification if the funds were being reallocated. Tony Bowman explained that this decision is being decided by the MAG Executive Committee. Peggy Rubach explained that through the competitive CMAQ process, ADOT has approved spending CMAQ funds for safety education.

4. Staff Update

Maureen DeCindis explained a few changes that have an impact on the committee. The Regional Bicycle Task Force and the MAG Pedestrian Working Group have been combined to form the new MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee. Each jurisdiction will have one voting member. Brandon Forrey was appointed as Chair and Reed Kempton as Vice Chair.

The Transportation Enhancements Review Committee (TERC) met on October 7-9, 2009 and recommended four of the eight MAG projects for funding to the Arizona State Transportation Board. The four projects were:

- Wickenburg Pedestrian Bridge
- Scottsdale Canal Shared-Use Path
- Valley Metro Bike and Pedestrian Safety Education Program
- Peoria Multi-modal Path North Avenue to Olive Ave

Since the committees have been combined, there will be only one representative on the Transportation Review Committee. The chair request a volunteer. Peggy Rubach volunteered to be the representative.

5. Transportation Improvement Program Application Process Overview

MAG staff present the new process for evaluation of the projects submitted for the Transportation Improvement Program FY2014. There is $8,737,000 available for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects in FY 2014. In September, each committee member will receive a copy of each application with an Evaluation Criteria sheet. The Evaluation Sheet needs to be filled out for each application.

At this meeting, each jurisdiction will have three minutes to present an overview of their project and then there will be time for question and answers on project information contained in the application. If the

sponsor is not able to answer questions at the first meeting, they will have an opportunity to clarify information at the second meeting in November. The date for the revised application information must be submitted to MAG staff by **Friday October 30, 2009 at noon.** Members will have an opportunity to edit their scores based on information from the presentation. At the end of the October meeting, MAG staff needs to collect all the evaluation sheets.

The expected emission reductions and cost-effectiveness for all proposed CMAQ funded projects are evaluated by MAG staff and need to be considered by the modal committees. MAG staff will compile the bicycle and pedestrian scores, and the CMAQ scores. These will be transmitted to committee members prior to the second meeting**.**

At the November meeting, any clarified project information is presented and then the project ranking can move forward. The Bike and Pedestrian Committee will review and produce a ranked order list of projects and evaluation summary that will be forwarded to the Transportation Review Committee. A reminder, technical committees cannot change the project scope, schedule, budget or requested amount of funds during the evaluation process.

The presentations will be in alphabetical order except that the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation has requested to present first as they have another obligation. The presentations are:

Bicycle/Multi-Use Path Projects

- *Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation: Fort McDowell Road: SR-87 to Mohave Road Roadway Shoulder Bike Lane*
  Alfonso Rodriguez proposed a bike path shoulder to be added to Fort McDowell Road that will benefit the community, Fountain Hills, and Scottsdale. There are a lot of amateur and professional bicyclists in this rural area. In the past few years, there have been at least four accidents. The project length is three miles and in the future, there will be more mileage added. This will be done in partnership with Maricopa County. Michael Sanders clarified that this would not be a bike path but paved shoulders and marked as bike lanes and then asked what the one foot wide buffer zone was. Alfonso Rodriguez explained that a 12-inch stripe would be painted between vehicle lanes and the bike lane. It is an obvious painted symbol. There will be a crash barrier for a short distance along this route that goes around a corner with a drop off of a slope. Paul Ward addressed the issue that this section needs further design and analysis.

- *Avondale: Central Avenue Bicycle Facility Project (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Sue McDermott, Avondale City Engineer, explained that this provides a mile of bike lanes that don't currently exist. The road will be narrowed to two lanes in each direction and include bump outs and the corner. This will also be a traffic calming project. There are two schools in the area. Catherine Coles asked if improving the existing safety issue is to deter ice cream trucks. Margaret Boone Pixley explained that a bulb out would move the ice cream truck to a better position and this would create a shorter crossing for the school children. Peggy Rubach asked about the two feet and the 13 feet of buffer zone and the map does not indicate which ones exist where on the map. Sue McDermott explained that there will be public meetings to help identify these zones. Reed Kempton asked if this was all parallel parking. Peggy Rubach said that the density does not match the aerial photo.

- *Chandler: Galveston Street Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge*
  No representative from Chandler was present. Michael Cartsonis noted that ADOT should be building. Peggy Rubach noted that this project has received 2012 funding and asked if on Part C, is Chandler allowed to use prior matching dollars now for their 2014 request? This bridge is located ½ mile from Chandler Blvd.

- *El Mirage: Rancho El Mirage Multi-use Path (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Jorge Gastelum explained that this multi- use path will include lighting and landscaping. Steve Hancock noted that 8x8 box culvert on the railroad tracks that does not meet AASHTO standards. ADOT will not accept this unless it meets standards. Reed Kempton noted there are number of issues that would be raised by the railroads. El Mirage does not think that this will be an issue.

- *Gilbert: Bike Crossing Improvement & Safety Project, Phase III (#2 priority project for the city)*
  No representative from Gilbert was present. Reed Kempton noted that the concept of counting cars for one hour and multiplying that number by 24 hours is not acceptable practice. Each of the five designs should be pre-determined because this will greatly affect the cost of the project.

- *Glendale: New River Multi-use Pathway Amenities (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Steve Hancock explained that Glendale is committed to the design of the project and this project requests landscaping under the underpasses at this time. Catherine Coles asked how this completes the West Valley Rivers Corridor. This plan, Steve Hancock explained, would link trails with Peoria and also this connects with the Grand Canal project. This entire system will be one huge loop. D.J. Stapley asked about the existing water in the place where the pathway would go. Would the pathway be elevated? Steve Hancock responded that the path would be elevated about three feet. Peggy Rubach asked if this cost covers anything more than landscaping. Steve Hancock noted that this is a 2.1 mile stretch and the path would be installed first with amenities at a later phase.

- *Glendale: New River & Grand Canal Pathways Hub Connector (#2 priority project for the city)*
  Steve Hancock explained that basically this path is tied into New River going south. There is an existing Grand Canal pathway going east and west near the Stadium. This will bridge the drainage channel and tie the three linkages together. Margaret Boone Pixley asked how this will improve ADA. Steve Hancock responded that this will provide underpass rather than a bridge providing a grade separated access not an at-grade access.

.

- *Glendale: Maryland Avenue Bicycle Spot Improvement at the Russian Cemetery (#3 priority project for the city)*
  Steve Hancock explained that Maryland Avenue runs the entire distance east and west through Glendale and into Phoenix. This is multi-jurisdictional. At 75th Ave, it stops short because of the cemetary. This will be widened and will have to buy some private property and make changes with the traffic signal. Peggy Rubach noted that Glendale has received Enhancement funds for Maryland Ave. Steve noted that that funding was for two other gaps on Maryland Ave.

- *Litchfield Park: Pathway Along West Side of Old Litchfield Road*
  Michael Cartsonis explained that this was an alignment that was relocated to the west to bypass

the village. There is a narrow old arterial roadway with 8' bike path on the east side with no improvement on the west side. The project on the west side would connect to the north village and to schools. Reed Kempton asked about the costs that seem very low and there could be $40,000 more needed for the things that were not itemized, such as sub-grade and colored concrete which usually cost more than regular concrete. Catherine Coles asked about convenience improvements the box for shade is checked on the application, but the application specifies palm trees which don't provide shade unless they are very close together and low to the ground. Steve Hancock noted that this is called a multi-use path but it is only on one side of the street and this doesn't meet AASHTO standards plus there are too many intersecting streets. Reed Kempton noted that it might meet standards as there is a path on the other side of the street.

- *Maricopa County: New River Road Shoulder Widening*
  Denise Lacey explained that this is a shoulder widening project. It is only a portion of the road and this is part of a continuing project improvement. Robert Wisener asked if there were destination and schools. Peggy Rubach noted that bike lanes would make it safer for bicyclists. There are large vehicles and sports vehicles traveling at fast speeds. Peggy Rubach noted that there is no current bike-ped education program as indicated in the application because MCDOT decided not to participate. Margaret Boone-Pixley asked about demographics. Denise Lacey noted that there are seniors living in that area.

- *Phoenix: Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School & 16th Street (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Aaron Jenson, Landscape Architect with Phoenix explained that this project would provide a connection from the Grand Canal over 16th street. There is a very small sidewalk that is difficult to negotiate. The current sidewalk is not up to ADA standards and this is a very high pedestrian traffic area with bus stops. There will be a two phase crosswalk and this will make it easier to cross. There are schools and parks in close proximity to this canal. This project would create a seamless connection from 7th Street to Thomas Road. Peggy Rubach noted that there is a 20 percent contingency fee in the budget. Most projects request 10 percent contingency fees. D.J. Stapley asked if there will be any barriers. Aaron Jenson responded that this is a SRP service road and there won't be any barriers. Peggy Rubach noted that in a recent public survey, canal crossings were the highest priority by the general public. Margaret Boone-Pixley asked if there was any preliminary engineering done according to AASHTO standards as this could be a steep grade bridge. Aaron Jenson responded that there is a similar prefab bridge at another canal location and that it is relatively flat.

- *Phoenix: Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Thomas Road (#2 priority project for the city)*
  Aaron Jenson explained that this project is crossing one major intersection. The property is vacant on southeast corner for development.

- *Scottsdale: Arizona Canal Shared-Use Path North of Camelback (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Reed Kempton explained this project is a 300 foot-long segment that a developer first agreed to build but then rescinded on that agreement. There are water, sewer and electric lines that require a major utility reconstruction. This project is located right in the heart of the downtown Scottsdale. D.J. Stapley commented that there are no schools within the project areas. Reed Kempton noted there are schools within 2 miles.

- *Scottsdale: Arizona Canal Shared-Use Path 64th Street - Goldwater Blvd. (#2 priority project for the city)*
  Reed Kempton explained that this is essentially the same enhancement project that just got funded.

- *Tempe: El Paso Gas Easement Multi-Use Path - Rural Road to Kiwanis Park*
  Eric Iwersen reported that this project is a high priority with the city of Tempe and links to pathways, bike lanes, three schools, and has extended links to local neighborhood parks. This project is a multi-use path extension of the existing El Paso Gas Easement path from Rural Road west into Kiwanis Park. It would connect a path system from Price Road to Kiwanis Park. There is a traffic signal at Rural Road. There are bike lanes and paths linking to this.

- *Youngtown: Bike Path Project*
  No representative from Youngtown was present. There was a question about the accuracy of the housing density and how much of the facility would be bike lanes and how much would be bike paths.

Pedestrian Projects

- *Avondale: Western Avenue Pedestrian Project. (#2 priority project for the city)*
  This is a similar project to the Central Avenue Bike Project and connects to it. This is first phase of the Old Town Revitalization program. This project connects to schools and it will provide sidewalks and directional kiosks including community centers and libraries. Michael Sanders asked to clarify that this is sidewalk project with landscaping and lighting but there will be bike lanes added. D.J. Stapley asked if Goodyear has added bike lanes which would connect to this project. Joe Schmitz asked if there was going to be bulb outs or on-street parking. The response is that there will be curb extensions (bulb-outs) that will create on-street parking as well as a buffer for pedestrians from the traveled way.

- *El Mirage: Varney Road Sidewalk (#1 priority project for the city)*
  Jorge Gastelum explained that currently there is no sidewalk in this area. Students are using the dirt pathway. Peggy Rubach noted that there is a proposed eight foot sidewalk on the south side but the north side sidewalk is currently five feet wide. Catherine Coles asked if there were large lot residences. Jorge Gastelum confirmed this. Michael Cartsonis asked if there are any restrictions on development. Jorge Gastelum responded that no new development is expected. Michael Sanders said that the bike map shows that Varney Road is signed as bike route. Jorge Gastelum noted that it is not signed as such. Peggy Rubach asked about the cross section with two 11-foot lanes and 70 feet of right-of-way. There is a curb on north side and no curb on the south side. Could bike lanes be added? Jorge Gastelum responded that this is only a pedestrian project. Reed Kempton suggest that if a curb and gutter are added that the project should expand the buffer zone from four feet to ten feet to be easier in the future to add bike lanes.

- *Gilbert: Gilbert Heritage District Pedestrian Pathway Development (#1 priority project for the city)*
  No representative from Gilbert was present.

6. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Cholla Room at 1:30 p.m., except for December meeting that begins at noon.

October 20, 2009
November 17, 2009
December 15, 2009 (noon)
January 19, 2010
February 16, 2010
March 16, 2010
April 20, 2010
May 18, 2010
June 15, 2010
July 20, 2010
August 17, 2010
September 21, 2010
October 19, 2010
November 16, 2010
December 14, 2010 at noon

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics. Catherine Coles suggested the committee review the TIP application and criteria again after using it in this process.