

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 16, 2010 at 1:30 p.m.  
MAG Office Building, Saguaro Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Jim Coffman, Coffman Studio, Inc.  
Mike Colety, Kimley Horn  
Hobart Wingard, Surprise  
Mara DeLuca, Maricopa County Dept. Public Health  
Susan Bookspan, Phoenix Children's Hospital  
Ximena Zamora, EDAW

1. Call to Order

Brandon Forrey called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the January 19, 2010 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Brandon Forrey suggested using the word fatality instead of "that had been killed" in the last sentence of the second paragraph under Item #4. Peggy Rubach moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for January 19, 2010. Jim Hash seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### 3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee 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 and the Pedestrian Committee 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. No one wished to address the committee.

### 4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Maureen DeCindis gave an update on the Closeout program. ADOT is unable at this time to provide an estimate of federal funding available for closeout:

- MAG has not received a obligation report from ADOT in 16 months.
- In 2009, rescissions of funding balances occurred and ADOT is currently unable to explain how these rescissions impact federal funding available to MAG.
- The current federal highway act is operating on continuing resolution that will expire at the end of February.
- The current act includes approximately \$200 million in rescissions that will impact Arizona March.

The schedule for the 2010 Closeout is *planned* as follows:

- March 1st: Project Deferral Forms and Justification Memo requirements are available.
- March 26th: Project Applications available for FFY2010 Closeout funds.
- March - April 17: Member agencies submit Project Deferral Forms and Justification Memos.
- April 16th: Noon - Due Date and Time, for signed Project Applications for FFY2010 Closeout. Late Applications will not be accepted.
- April 29th: TRC will recommend for approval the list of Deferred FFY2010 Federal funded projects.
- May: Management and Regional Council review/recommend/approve the draft list of Deferred FFY2010 Federal funded projects.
- July: Management and Regional Council review/recommend/approve the final list of Deferred FFY2010 Federal funded projects.

Typical Obligation Requirements in the Closeout Process

- The project has obtained an Environmental Clearance through ADOT.
- The project has obtained Right-of-Way Clearance.
- The project has obtained Utility Clearance.
- The project is at 100% design.
- Federal Fiscal Year 2010 effectively ends in Mid September, 2010, so agencies should submit all needed work to ADOT by August 1, 2010.

Maureen DeCindis reported that Michael Egan, the representative from AZ Society of Landscape Architects has moved to Kuwait. A new representative will be identified.

Peggy Rubach distributed an order sheet for committee members to order quantities for t-shirts and other safety items. The t-shirts will say Be Bright on the front and on the back will be a list of ideas on how to Be Bright along with the web site for further information.

## 5. ADA Ramp Detail Updates

The presentation from the Chair of the MAG Specs & Details Committee was tabled till the March meeting in which he will present an overview of the issues related to the proposed wheelchair ramp details in the MAG Specs and Details Manual.

## 6. MAG Complete Streets Plan

EDAW, Inc. presented the preliminary draft of the Complete Streets Plan for committee input.

Jim Coffman reviewed the Complete Streets Plan. The Complete Streets Plan provides prototypes, examples of best practices, and policy guidance to insure that all new and retrofitted streets in the MAG region serve as many transportation modes as practical and possible resulting in reduced capital costs due to retrofit and liabilities claims, a greater share of bicycle, transit, and pedestrian trips on our roadways and more livable communities throughout our region.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Intent of the Complete Streets Plan

Chapter 3: Reconnaissance

Chapter 4: Best Practices

Chapter 5: Goals, Objectives and Strategies

Chapter 6: Complete Streets Planning Process

Chapter 7: Sample Outcomes

- Arterial
  - 7.1 High density/intensity (suburban core)
  - 7.2 High density/intensity (urban core)
- Collector
  - 7.3 Low Density/Intensity (commercial)
  - 7.4 Low Density/Intensity (residential)
- Local
  - 7.5 Low Density/Intensity (single-use residential)
  - 7.6 Low Density/Intensity (single-use campus)
  - 7.7 Intersections

Chapter 8: New Design Guidance

Chapter 9: Applying the Guidance

Chapter 10: Performance Measures

Jim Coffman explained the modifications to the plan, after hearing comments at the last meeting. The plan must be bold and state definitive requirements to meet the Complete Streets criteria similar to meeting requirements for projects that deem to be LEED certified. One change now is to use the terms local, collector and arterial streets. The Overall Complete Streets Process still takes into consideration the Street Types, Context/Street Character, Transportation Requirements, Other Priorities, Right-of-Way Width, Design Elements. The most significant change is that there must be separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit facilities. Jim Coffman then used an example of the Camelback Corridor. There should be separate accommodation for the cars, transit, bike and pedestrians. Katherine Coles suggested that transit needs to be able to share a vehicle travel lane because otherwise no city would be able to achieve a Complete Street. Jim Coffman continued explain that on the Collector street level, there would

be separate pedestrian facilities and bike lanes with busses sharing the travel lane. However, there would need to be a bus shelter at each stop. Local street requires a separate sidewalk. Bikes and cars share the street along with a local neighborhood circulator bus. In commercial parks, bikes would share the transit and vehicle lane.

Mike Colety presented information on Performance Measures. Performance Measures are:

- Directly related to the goals and objectives.
- Based on data that is readily available.
- Can be output measures or outcome measures.
- Outcome measures represent the desired conditions.
- Output measures look at the components implemented and do not necessarily correlate to improved performance.

Peggy Rubach asked how many communities fund data collection. Maureen DeCindis responded that few communities can afford data collection.

Reed Kempton said that the Scottsdale Complete Streets policy does not have transit separate lanes. Peggy Rubach suggested having different standards for new streets versus retrofitting built environment streets.

Mike Colety presented Performance Measures Output in terms of points for each accommodation. The Complete Streets score could be used to assess the percentage complete streets in the region. Reed Kempton noted that giving points for a bus pullouts is not an advantage for buses and that an actual number of transit stops will vary on the same street. Katherine Coles said that there is a discrepancy between the Complete Streets evaluation as being flexible versus very specific points for each amenity. Mike Colety explained that these Performance Measures are an attempt to understand how to judge progress in the Complete Streets Plan.

Jim Coffman suggested that the Complete Streets Plan is to set a high enough standard to make a substantive change. What is the minimum standard? Brandon Forrey suggested that Complete Streets are context sensitive. What are the best practices from other cities? Mike Colety said that he hasn't seen any performance measures for Complete Streets in other communities Brandon Forrey agrees that standards that are not specific can be ignored. Bob Bortfeld suggested that each city individually assess each of the standards. Michael Cartsonis suggested that each mode must be addressed and allow the jurisdiction to prove it. Maureen DeCindis noted that using a Complete Streets standard A, B, C would help give a grade or weight scale. Katherine Coles suggested a gold, silver, bronze standard.

Reed Kempton said the Scottsdale policy notes urban, suburban and rural. The language suggests a general concept of accommodating all modes. Margaret Boone-Pixley suggested basic accommodation and not specific details of offsets, markings etc. Bob Bortfeld asked what the impact of Complete Streets on air quality, for example, trees would create healthy air but taking away a lane may cause more congestion and worsen air quality.

Jim Coffman noted that the previous rendition allowed decision-makers to make their own priorities. Denise Lacey reported that County funding is associated with vehicles. A rural, suburban and urban process works much better for the County. Develop a list of elements in each criteria. Brandon Forrey suggested a tool box i.e. list each of the accommodations that are acceptable as bicycle facilities.

Reed Kempton suggested that listing the accommodation type and specify meeting national standards. Flexibility needs to be incorporated based on real life issues, for example, there are equestrian trails near the Scottsdale downtown. Bob Bortfeld said that older neighborhoods have narrower streets which would make it difficult to create separate spaces. Jim Coffman noted that in the Sample Outcomes section, the streets were identified based on current right-of-way. Reed Kempton suggested considering the amount of vehicle traffic rather than older streets or newer streets. Scottsdale calls eliminating a vehicle lane as “right sizing”.

Jim Coffman said that he would take back all the suggestions and revise the Plan accordingly.

7. MAG Bicycle Map on Google

MAG staff has been working for four years to develop an interactive bike routing program on the internet. MAG staff gave an update of the progress of that project. MAG researched all possible bike routing programs from Florida, to Oregon, to New York. MAG staff submitted a prototype to *Ride the City* who developed the New York City interactive bicycle map. The *Ride the City* staff seemed unable to work with the MAG data. MAG contacted Google, Inc. again. This represents the 20<sup>th</sup> email exchange in four years. Google staff indicated that if MAG sent them a pdf of the MAG Regional Bicycle Map, they would be able to get it on their newly developing bike routing map soon. The pdf of the MAG Regional Bicycle Map was sent in early February.

8. Update from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee

On February 2, 2010, the TIP subcommittee met to identify areas in both the project application and project criteria that need refining. The MAG Congestion Mitigation program will impact the modal score. The working group will be meeting in March.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics. Peggy Rubach will give a report on the Bike Education program including information on the four spring workshops.

10. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Cholla Room at 1:30 p.m., except for those noted otherwise.

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 9, 2010 (note change)  
December 14, 2010 (noon)