

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, July 23, 2003 – 8:30 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Greg Stanton, Co-Chair, Phoenix

*Mike Hutchinson, Co-Chair, Mesa, representing the
MAG Management Committee

Grant Anderson, Goodyear, representing the
MAG Street Committee

Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing the
American Society of Landscape Architects Arizona
Chapter

Marcie Ellis, West Valley Fine Arts Council,
representing the Arts Community

Reed Kempton, Maricopa County Dept. of
Transportation, Representing the MAG Pedestrian
Working Group

Andre Licardi, Arizona Commission of the Arts
Mary O'Connor, Tempe, representing the MAG
Regional Bicycle Task Force

Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation Foundation,
representing Archaeological and Historic
Preservation Community

* Not present

OTHERS PRESENT

Dave Flynn, Chandler

Greg Westrum, Chandler

Brian Kearny, Downtown Phoenix Partnership

Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills

Steve Hancock, Glendale

Paula Moloff, Glendale

Jennifer Reichelt, Glendale

Janeen Holloman, Goodyear

Chuck Hydeman, Goodyear

Linda Snidecor, Goodyear

Tony Widowski, Goodyear

Dawn M. Coomer, MAG

Irma Hollamby Pfister, Maricopa County DOT

Andrej Wojakiewicz, Maricopa County DOT

Debbie Abele, Papago Salado Association

Burton Charron, Peoria

Louisa Garbo, Peoria

Katie Gregory, Peoria

Councilmember Vicki Hunt, Peoria

Jeff Sargent, Peoria

Gail Brinkmann, Phoenix

Ray Dovalina, Phoenix

John Siefert, Phoenix

Lynn Timmons, Phoenix

Don Keuth, Phoenix Community Alliance

Mike Valden, Phoenix resident

Dan Colton, Resident

Doug Frerichs, Salt River Project

Aaron Iverson, Scottsdale

Eric Iwersen, Tempe

Elizabeth Thomas, Tempe

1. Call to Order

Mary O'Connor, after receiving information that Co-Chair Stanton was running late and wanted the meeting to continue, called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

2. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Members of the Working Group and the audience were introduced.

3. Approval of the June 10, 2002 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Grant Anderson moved to approve the June 10, 2002 meeting minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group. Angela Dye seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Call to the Audience

No one wished to address the Working Group on general items.

5. Staff Report

Dawn Coomer, MAG staff, addressed the Working Group and provided a staff presentation as shown in **Attachment A**. No questions or comments were asked by the Working Group.

6. Review and Discussion of Round X Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Stanton addressed the Working Group to provide some instruction on the process. Applications will be heard in the order received by MAG staff as listed on the agenda for today's meeting. A summary of comments discussed by the Working Group will be faxed to applicants by tomorrow.

Scottsdale: Indian Bend Wash Multi-Use Path System Enhancement Connection

Dawn Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that homeowner association support of the project might be a concern, and that drainage issues might increase the cost of the proposal. The state committee wants to know that applicants won't come forward at a later time with a "phase two" project that funds cost increases.

Aaron Iverson addressed the Working Group, explaining the details of the project. The project is between Hayden and Jackrabbit, in the middle of a 12 mile pathway system. The idea is to eliminate crossing of Hayden, and the project also goes under Chaparral Road.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the timing for the easements. Mr. Iverson replied that there was one person in the homeowner's association who was involved, and the City was working with that individual. Ms. O'Connor suggested the application be revised to note there is a plan in place to address the easement issue.

Grant Anderson asked what was on the east side of Chaparral. Mr. Iverson replied a drainage easement was there. Doug Kupel asked if this was a last gap? If so, question 10 in the application should reflect that fact. Also, question 17 should address support from the homeowner's association.

Fountain Hills: Safe Sidewalks to School

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting there were no major comments on this application from staff or the bicycle or pedestrian committees. Randy Harrel addressed the Working Group. There are currently no sidewalks on many streets. Children walk in the streets on their way to school, and many

parents don't want their children to walk to school, which creates lots of traffic in the area. He referred to the map on the last page of the application for the location of the sidewalks. Mr. Harrel explained that sidewalks were not included in the original development of Fountain Hills because standards were not in place. Since its incorporation in 1996, the Town requires sidewalks on all streets.

Angela Dye asked if the sidewalks meet the guidance for lateral separation established in the MAG Pedestrian Plan 2000? Ms. Coomer replied that she did not know if the guidance was met. Mr. Harrel added that the intention is to have meandering sidewalks, when space allows. Ms. Dye asked how much right-of-way was available from the back of the curb? Mr. Harrel responded that the right-of-way varies from nine feet to 15 feet. Sidewalk easements will be obtained when possible. Ms. Dye noted that a detached sidewalk is preferred to a meandering sidewalk, which might take pedestrian travelers out of a direct line of travel. She asked Mr. Harrel to look at the MAG guidelines, and that a sample cross section be included in the application.

Ms. O'Connor asked if transportation enhancement (TE) funding can be used for local streets? Ms. Coomer noted that she would call ADOT staff to confirm, but that she didn't know of any restrictions for projects on local streets. The Working Group discussed this concept.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the application should limit the term "meandering" and instead use the term "detached sidewalk" to explain the concept of the sidewalk. She added that the phrase "room for curbside treatment" might be helpful in explaining the concept of the project. She asked for a rationale for the widths of the sidewalks. Five feet is alright for a local street, but it should be wider for other types of roadways, to accommodate future bus service if desired. Ms. O'Connor suggested that Mr. Harrel consult US Access Board guidelines in designing ramps, since the MAG Standard Specifications and Details do not meet the most recent ruling. Also, the FHWA Designing Trails and Sidewalks for Access manual is a good reference.

Grant Anderson noted that he liked the term "meander," and the Working Group discussed this idea. He agreed that whether TE funding could be used on local streets was an issue. Mr. Anderson added that local improvement districts can be used to fund these kinds of projects. Mr. Harrel responded that the state committee has funded other safe routes to schools projects.

Doug Kupel asked if in the cost estimate, item 12, if federal and local funding should be listed individually? Ms. Coomer noted that it was not required to list each item individually. However, if an application has ineligible items, the cost estimate should clearly identify that local funds are paying for those items. She stated that it was preferable to have the items clearly broken out by line item, but not required.

Mr. Kupel added that he shared Mr. Anderson's concern about the local streets, and said that a business community contribution would be important for the project. On a minor point, in question 10, the word "sidewalk" should not be in quotation marks.

Marcie Ellis asked if additional points would be granted on projects that incorporated public art. Ms. Ellis stated that projects that incorporate public art should be ranked higher. A meandering pathway is a nice aesthetic feature. Creating a sense of place in communities is very important. Sidewalk texture could also be used.

Co-Chair Stanton stated that the priorities of the MAG Working Group need to be reflected at the state level, and this should be discussed later in the meeting. Andre Licardi added that the rules for projects

should be followed, such as ADA, but that incorporation of aesthetic features does help projects at the state level. Some on the state committee do rank projects higher when they have art elements.

Ms. O'Connor pointed out that art is important, but that too much texture in sidewalks can have negative ADA impacts. Retaining walls can also be used as art. She asked Mr. Harrel about the three dips in the project. Will these be redone later? This could be a concern at the state committee. Mr. Harrel responded that these would be done with local funds later on, and Ms. O'Connor requested the application explain this issue more clearly.

Fountain Hills: Scenic Rest Area

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, and noted that this project was not eligible under category 4 since Shea Blvd. is not designated as a scenic highway by ADOT. Ms. Coomer suggested that the application be refined to focus on the bicyclist and pedestrian aspects of the project. Mr. Anderson asked if this would qualify as a gateway project? Ms. Coomer responded that it could be considered a gateway project under category 5, landscaping.

Mr. Harrel addressed the Working Group. He noted this is a very beautiful area with spectacular views of regional significance. Ms. O'Connor asked the priority of Fountain Hills projects, and said it would be difficult to rank this project high without more bicycle and pedestrian emphasis. Drinking fountains and restrooms should be considered for the project. Mr. Harrel noted that this is the 2nd highest priority project for Fountain Hills.

Mr. Kupel asked if there might be a conflict with bicycles and cars sharing the roadway? He suggested that a support letter from Eagle Mountain Community would be helpful. Ms. Ellis expressed support for the project, noting that it provides shade for travelers and that the artistic elements were very good.

Glendale: Bethany Home Rd. Pedestrian Improvements

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, stating that ADOT has given Glendale the grant referenced in the application. With the medians, would this project still be needed? Also, since such a large local match was provided, it would be important to justify the small amount of enhancement funding and explain how important it is to implementing the project.

Paula Moloff addressed the Working Group. Ms. Moloff noted that the medians would be enhanced with this project, which makes the funding necessary. The improvements will not be disrupted by future light rail construction, and landscaping is much of the project. Also, Ms. Moloff suggested that the storm drain portion of the budget be removed to make the local match for the project appear more realistic, at about 50 percent. The project will improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety and access along Bethany Home Road between 61st Avenue and 65th Avenue. This location is designated as the highest bicycle/pedestrian risk area in the City, and conflicts will only continue to get worse as the Sports District is constructed. Specific improvements include improving separation between the frontage road and the main lanes along Bethany, improving refuge at 61st and 65th Avenues, and improving bicycle access to frontage roads from 61st, 63rd, and 65th Avenues. If funded, the implementation of this project can be accelerated to coincide with the other ADOT grant to construct a landscaped center median.

Ms. O'Connor noted that four foot sidewalks on arterials don't work. Is there currently bus service on Bethany Home? Where do transit riders wait for the bus? Ms. Moloff responded that transit riders currently wait on the very narrow curb. This project will provide an area for them to stand. Ms. O'Connor

suggested that right of way from the median islands could be used for bike lanes or sidewalks. The application mentions a bicycle facility, but there doesn't appear to be one. A bicycle lane on the arterial would be beneficial to bicyclists. Ms. O'Connor added that the project does improve conditions for walking, but perhaps does not go far enough. She stated that the analysis map needs to be improved. What do the arrows refer to? Perhaps a cross section could be laid over the map.

Mr. Anderson asked if this project was programmed in this fiscal year or another fiscal year. Ms. Moloff responded it was in an outer year of the program, but no funding was currently identified for this project. Funding for the medians was just recently obtained through an ADOT safety grant. She added that obtaining the TE grant this year would match the timing of the other ADOT grant so both could be constructed simultaneously.

Reed Kempton said that the application states that crossing the arterial will be made easier by this project, but this factor was not apparent in the project design. The application does a poor job addressing the needs of bicyclists. Frontage roads are very dangerous for bicyclists because there is too much access and motorists are not expecting to see a fast-moving cyclist. Mr. Kempton suggested that, to improve conditions for bicyclists, the frontage road be narrowed and bicycle lanes be added to the roadway cross section.

Glendale: Old Roma Alley Pedestrian Enhancements and Landscape Beautification

Ms. Coomer stated that this project had received funding through the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program, and that a conceptual drawing would help the application. Ms. Moloff addressed the Working Group, explaining that the project converts an existing service alley in downtown Glendale into an attractive, pedestrian friendly area. There are many destination points in the downtown that would be enhanced by this project. Entry features, landscaping and public art will be included along with signage and lighting. The city match is high on this project, and includes \$100,000 in local funds for utility undergrounding.

Mr. Licardi noted that this project sets a perfect example of how public art can be integrated into projects. The project includes public art funded by the local arts commission, and does not use federal funds for art. He added that art included in projects is seen as important on the state committee.

Mr. Kupel noted that question 19 should refer to the "national" register, not the "federal" register.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the application was good, and asked about the status of the Catlin Court project. Ms. Moloff responded that Catlin Court is in final design, the undergrounding will be started soon, and that the project should be constructed in 8 to 10 months. Ms. O'Connor said that if the project was done, a photo in the application would be helpful in demonstrating the idea of the project. Ms. O'Connor added that care should be taken to make special paving treatments ADA compliant.

Ms. O'Connor asked if vehicle access is permitted. Ms. Moloff explained that only maintenance and delivery vehicle access would be permitted, and that bollards would be used to limit cars. Ms. O'Connor suggested that these points be clarified in the application.

Glendale: Historic Downtown Glendale Pedestrian Improvements

Ms. Coomer noted that conceptual drawings would be helpful in the application, and that Glendale would be asked by the Working Group to rank its projects. Jennifer Reichelt addressed the Working Group. She

explained that this project will improve pedestrian conditions along Glenn Drive in downtown Glendale, and is very close to the Roma Alley project. The sidewalk will be improved, have landscaping and lighting added, incorporate seating and public art, and would be modeled after other pedestrian improvements in the downtown.

Mr. Licardi noted that public art is a good way to limit the presence of graffiti. Ms. Ellis asked about the details of public art in the project. Ms. Reichelt noted that it is in the budget, and Ms. Moloff noted that there has been discussion on incorporating something similar to the firefighter memorial in the area.

Ms. O'Connor stated that a conceptual drawing or cross section is needed. What is the width of the sidewalk? There needs to be a continuous six foot wide clear path, exclusive of the furniture zone.

Ms. Dye asked if the city had thought about combining the Glenn Dr. and the Roma Alley project since they were close together and similar. Ms. Moloff responded negatively, since the grant size is limited to \$500,000 and these are really two stand-alone projects.

Co-Chair Stanton asked about Glendale's ranking of the project, and asked that Glendale get back to MAG staff with the ranking. Mr. Kempton noted that questions 17 and 18 are missing from the application. Mr. Anderson received confirmation that the sidewalk on the south side, near the Bead Museum, is included in the project.

Mr. Kupel pointed out that in question 16, the term "historic landscaping improvement" is not a good term to use in the application, since it is not historic.

Chandler: Chandler Blvd. Gateway at Gilbert Rd.

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, asking if there would be any issues since the city does not own all the right of way. She also asked if the median installed would have cuts to allow for mid-block crossing. Greg Westrum addressed the Working Group. The project is a gateway at the entrance to Chandler, and will match other gateways recently constructed in the city. Palm trees are included, along with signage and a monument, black concrete and bands of brick pavers. The project is located at Chandler and Gilbert.

Dave Flynn addressed the Working Group. He stated that Maricopa County and SRP own the right of way, so there should be no issues. Also, the project is 500 feet west of Gilbert Road, so a mid-block crossing would be inappropriate with the project.

Mr. Anderson asked if there were any pedestrian or bicycle elements in the project? Mr. Flynn confirmed that fact.

Peoria: 84th Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that the amount of federal funding requested needs to match in all areas of the application, that burying overhead utilities is ineligible for federal funds (but can be done with local funds), and that Peoria might be asked by the Working Group to rank their two applications submitted.

Louisa Garbo addressed the Working Group, and introduced Burton Charron and Councilmember Vicki Hunt. She explained that the project will help make the environment more friendly for bicyclists and

pedestrians. The utility poles will be buried, the median will be landscaped, and there will be collaboration with an artist in designing amenities for the project. She said the project would coincide with other downtown improvements.

Councilmember Vicki Hunt addressed the Working Group. She noted that this is an exciting project, and that there is lots of growth in the downtown area. There is a need to focus on the downtown; it is nearly 100 years old. Peoria just created a historic commission for downtown, and has worked with ASU on the design for this project. Councilmember Hunt noted that the entire Council and city staff support the project, along with several community groups.

Ms. O'Connor thanked Councilmember Hunt for her comments. Mr. Kempton stated that item 11B should be changed to note that the project is on an existing transportation corridor. On page six, there is a reference to a bike path/lane. What is envisioned for this project? Ms. Garbo noted that there is not a preferred option at this point, but that a consultant would be used for their expertise in this area. Mr. Kempton stated that a two-way path on one side of the street is very dangerous for bicyclists. He would prefer to see a wide sidewalk and bike lanes with the project.

Ms. O'Connor stated that a cross section is needed in the application. What is the width of the pedestrian facility? Perhaps a conceptual drawing from Peoria staff could be used? This would enhance the application. This application is like some others that are a bit vague on the concept, and it's difficult for the Working Group to evaluate a project that is not clearly described.

Mr. Anderson asked about an entry way to City Hall being included with the project. A gateway type of feature might improve the application as well. Ms. O'Connor noted that the US Access Board guidelines should be used in designing the median. Their Web site is www.access-board.gov.

Mr. Licardi added that the arts commission should be used as a source of funding to add an artistic element to the project. Ms. Dye noted that there was a project funded with state TE funds along Grand Avenue, which is nearing construction. This project addresses the issue Mr. Anderson raised earlier in the meeting.

Tempe: Tempe Bike Station at Downtown Tempe Intermodal Center

Eric Iwersen addressed the Working Group. He noted that this project is innovative and would be the first in the state. It is in one of the highest density areas, near Mill Avenue and ASU. The project includes long and short term parking, a possible attendant, restrooms and showers, and will incorporate education. The project is the convergence of 10 transit routes and has lots of community partners.

Mr. Kupel noted that, referring to question 18, the application does not really explain how bike theft is helped. In addition, question 19 should refer to the "national" register. Ms. Ellis stated that the project is innovative and does have an arts commission partner. The partner should be added to the application. Mr. Kempton noted that the success of other bike stations in the country should be noted. Ms. Dye suggested that the application include a description of how the project integrates into the large surrounding transit center.

Peoria: Peoria Avenue Bridge Multi-Modal Path Underpass

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that the project has a 22.5 percent match that was omitted from the project list. The application also qualifies under category 5, and the state evaluation

committee will probably want to know why the underpass funding wasn't included in the other project request.

Jeff Sargent addressed the Working Group, introducing Katie Gregory and Councilmember Vicki Hunt. Ms. Gregory showed a display board of the project. Mr. Sargent explained this is part of the West Valley Multi-modal Transportation Corridor Plan, and is part of a trail already funded from Northern to Grand. The trail will ultimately go to Lake Pleasant. There is currently no underpass at Peoria or Olive due to lack of funding. An at grade signal is planned at Peoria, but this is not desirable because of the large elderly population in the area, and the width and traffic counts on the roadway. The underpass will meet ADA, AASHTO and guidelines of the Flood Control District. The cost estimate is based on a DCR done for the trail segment. Councilmember Hunt did not address the Committee, but did express support for the project.

Mr. Kempton noted that on page 3, part B, that this is part of the Maricopa County Regional Trail System. Also, AASHTO is guidelines, not standards. Ms. Dye asked if the project was just for the underpass? Mr. Sargent responded affirmatively, noting that the trail was funded with other funding. Mr. Anderson noted that this is also part of the Sun Circle Trail. Ms. Ellis asked for a ranking from Peoria, and Ms. O'Connor noted that information could be provided to MAG staff at a later date. Ms. Ellis asked if the trail was already built, and Mr. Sargent noted that the trail is waiting for an environmental clearance. Peoria hopes to break ground on the project by the end of this year, or early next year. Ms. Ellis noted this is part of a larger regional plan, which is a positive aspect of the project.

Ms. O'Connor asked about alternative A in the appendix, and asked if this was the desired design. Mr. Sargent noted this alternative was outlined in a former DCR, but that it would only be one alternative evaluated in determining the final design. Ms. O'Connor stated that more clarity is needed in the application to provide the Working Group a better understanding of the project. The multi-use path should be wider than 10 feet, if possible, and there is a slope issue to be addressed. The application should identify minimum parameters of the design in a cross section or map.

Cave Creek: Town Core Pedestrian Pathway

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group noting that Cave Creek staff is working to correct the readability issue of the application. She added that drainage issues can increase the cost of a project, and these issues should be addressed in the application.

Ian Cordwell addressed the Working Group, introducing Councilmember Shea Stanfield and Kim Brennan from a gallery owners and merchants group. Mr. Cordwell provided a detailed overview of the project. He noted this is a big priority for their town council. Councilmember Stanfield addressed the Working Group, noting that there is a vision of a trail system through town that connects to Spur Cross. It's important to be able to define the community as walkable. Cave Creek is a destination for many visitors in the region. In the interest of time, Ms. Brennan did not address the Working Group.

Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Brennan why this project was important to the business community. Ms. Brennan noted that Cave Creek is a destination for many, and its important that the community be attractive and provide a good impression to visitors. There are also many children and elderly residents which could be helped by a better walking system in the Town.

Mr. Kupel stated that the business community support of this project is excellent. However, the Arizona Republic article in the application does not place the project in a favorable light, and should be changed. Also, a better overall map of the project is needed.

Ms. Dye stated that a cross section of the project is needed. Mr. Licardi suggested that to improve the readability of the application, just cut the shading on the background maps by about 50 percent. Mr. Anderson suggested that an art feature be added to the project, perhaps funded by one of the businesses that are supportive of the project. Ms. O'Connor noted that decomposed granite is mentioned in the application, but is not in the project budget. Also, decomposed granite is not an accessible surface and its use should be limited.

Ms. O'Connor took a moment to poll the Working Group. When do members have to leave the meeting today? The general consensus was to end the meeting by Noon. Since there were many applications left, which members of the audience would be unable to return to the next meeting on August 5th? Debbie Abele indicated that she could not attend the August meeting. A citizen with comments on the 2nd Avenue application stated he was unaware he would have to sit in the audience for this length of time, and could not return to the August meeting. Ms. O'Connor requested applicants to focus only on the highlights of their proposal in their presentations so the Working Group can review all the applications at today's meeting.

Co-Chair Stanton returned to the meeting. He stated that he would like to take those projects with citizens present to provide input on the project out of order. The Working Group voiced no objection. The next project was taken out of order.

Phoenix: 2nd Avenue, Fillmore to Roosevelt Pedestrian and Landscape Enhancements

Ms. Coomer noted that with all the Phoenix applications, department heads have the authority to sign for the City Manager. She stated that Phoenix would be asked by the Working Group to rank the five projects it had submitted.

Ray Dovalina displayed a visual of the project while Mike Bulger, area resident, addressed the Working Group. Mr. Bulger owns a home at 2nd Avenue and Roosevelt. He explained that the vision for 2nd Avenue is to create a linear park, and this has been a priority in Phoenix for over 10 years. The project will make the area more pedestrian friendly and enhance the light rail project. Part of 2nd Avenue has funding already; this grant will complete the overall vision of the project. This is the highest ranked project in Phoenix.

Brian Kearny of the Downtown Phoenix Partnership addressed the Working Group. He explained the mission and purpose of the Partnership. He noted that phase one of 2nd Avenue was funded with TE a few years ago. Connecting pedestrian elements is an important part of having a vital urban core. Phoenix has done a good job building pedestrian facilities, but not in connecting them. This project is very important in downtown Phoenix, and to commercial development.

Mr. Anderson suggested that traffic calming, such as curving the roadway or a traffic circle, be considered. John Siefert responded that SHPO and historic preservation officials want to have the historic streetscape in the area maintained. Mr. Kupel added that the design does appear to respect the historic character of the area, and is much needed because the area is an eyesore.

Ms. Dye asked why all the sidewalks were different widths. This is not logical given the vision for the area. Mr. Bulger responded that the west side of 2nd Avenue had to remain historic, according to SHPO. Ms. Dye replied that the capacity of the sidewalk is an important consideration in creating a pedestrian friendly environment. The SHPO office should be informed that the character of the area is changing, and needs to meet needs of pedestrians. Mr. Bulger said that the SHPO office had been invited to participate in the design of the project, but had not done so until the very last meeting. Unfortunately, said Mr. Bulger, he had only found out yesterday about the SHPO requirements. He said the neighborhood and the city would continue to work with SHPO to reach a compromise.

Mr. Licardi suggested that the application have a visual to show the pedestrian connections in the area. Ms. Ellis suggested a visual that shows portions of historic sidewalks, to explain the different widths to application reviewers.

Connie McDunna addressed the Working Group. She is a resident in the area, and lives about one-half block from the proposed improvements. Ms. McDunna explained that pedestrian connections are very important, and that people moving downtown expect an environment that is friendly to pedestrians. This project will also benefit the light rail project, and low income and senior residents. Ms. McDunna stated she was a member of the MAG core design group for the project.

Co-Chair Stanton thanked everyone for their comments, and moved on to the Goodyear application.

Goodyear: Bullard Wash Multi-Use Path

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, asking if the path could be 12 feet wide instead of 10 feet wide. She stated that the landscaping cost seemed low for the project, and asked if there was a need for lighting or benches. Also, the application should indicate the origins and destinations that are connected by the project. Finally, Goodyear might be asked by the Working Group for a ranking of the three projects they have submitted.

Tony Widowski addressed the Working Group. He explained that the project will connect to the future El Rio project, future employment, a regional mall and the city center. The project will also link to Estrella Park. This one-mile portion goes from Lower Buckeye to Yuma Rd. The airport will also be connected to the project. Bridges will be constructed separately – one has been funded by ADOT, another has been funded by a developer. The trail will go both in the wash, for equestrian use, and along a maintenance road owned by the Flood Control District.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the application needs a cross section with the length, width and surface of the trail identified. Ms. Dye noted that the map on page 9 is very small and hard to read. Ms. Dye suggested that another map be created to show how the project fits into the city. Ms. Ellis asked when the city center and mall will be completed, and Mr. Widowski responded that they will be built in 10 or 15 years.

Goodyear: Goodyear Provisions for Physically Challenged Pedestrians

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, asking if there would be any historic preservation issues with this project. She added that the MAG Specifications do not meet ADA for ramps, since revisions to ADA were made recently. She added that the cost estimate seemed a bit low for the project.

Chuck Hydeman addressed the Working Group. He stated that the project is along Western and Litchfield Road is historic subdivisions. Mr. Hydeman listed the numerous origins and destinations along the project.

Mr. Kupel stated that on page three of the application, the term “historic” should not be used since this is not a historic area. The term “older” should be used instead. Ms. Dye asked if this project was eligible for enhancements, since it was only for ADA access. Ms. Coomer stated that she thought the project was eligible, but would confirm with ADOT staff. Ms. O’Connor added that there is not a federal requirement to build sidewalks, but if they are built, they must meet ADA. If sidewalks are retrofitted, they must meet ADA. However, there is no federal requirement to retrofit sidewalks to make them ADA. Ms. O’Connor summarized by stating that this is a gray area subject to interpretation.

Mr. Anderson stated he was not sure if there was a federal requirement about the project. Ms. Ellis added that there should be some kind of aesthetic or artistic component to the project. Also, Luke Air Force Base should not be mentioned in the application since it is far from the project area. Ms. Ellis suggested that closer locations be used instead.

Goodyear: Southwest Goodyear Center Pedestrian Improvements

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that a written letter of support from the property owner of the needed right of way would be helpful in the application. Also, the state review committee will want to know why accommodation for pedestrians is currently missing in this area.

Janeen Holloman addressed the Working Group. Ms. Holloman displayed a board with a map of the project area. She stated that this is a low and moderate income area. The project would link many origins and destinations, and there are not many sidewalks in the area since the area developed before sidewalks were required. This project will construct the first phase of a project funded with the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program, and includes lighting and landscaping. Goodyear is working with the property owner to obtain right of way for the project.

Ms. O’Connor stated that six feet is too narrow for a sidewalk on an arterial. There should be more width if there is sufficient right of way. Also, the sidewalk should not be next to the curb. Street furniture should be outside of a six foot clear zone. Ms. Dye added that the design appears to be reversed; the landscape should be on the street side rather than the building side. Mr. Kupel suggested that more current public meetings other than those in 2001 be listed in the application. On page six, question 18, Mr. Kupel suggested that numbers of elderly and disabled be used to strengthen the application. Ms. Ellis added that this is a visible area of Goodyear, and public art should be incorporated into the project. Ms. O’Connor noted that the term “physically challenged” is outdated; instead, the term “persons with disabilities” should be used.

Glendale: New River Trail Segment C-12

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group. She stated that since there was a large local contribution for the project, that the source should be listed. For example, are there any federal funds in the project? Since there is a high local match, the application will need to make the case that the TE funding is essential to the project. Also, is there a need for lighting along the path?

Co-Chair Stanton apologized for not taking this final Glendale application sooner in the meeting. Steve Hancock addressed the Working Group. Mr. Hancock stated the project is 3.2 miles on maintenance roads owned by the Flood Control District. The project connects to trails on the Grand Canal, and is part of the West Valley Multi-modal Transportation Corridor Plan.

Mr. Kempton noted that in question 11B, the project is also part of the Maricopa County Trails Plan. Mr. Kupel noted that in question 17, page 9, that using the term “unanimous election” does not seem logical. Also, the relationship to the stadium should be shown on a map. Mr. Hancock replied that the stadium connection was mentioned since Maryland Avenue is a bicycle route and connects to the stadium and the proposed project.

Mr. Anderson noted that this segment goes from Bethany Home Road north. Is there a Glendale Avenue crossing? Mr. Hancock noted that Glendale is an at-grade crossing with a cantilevered bridge. Mr. Anderson asked how the Grand Canal would be crossed. Mr. Hancock noted that there is already an existing bridge at the Grand Canal, which is sufficient for the project. Ms. Dye suggested that a copy of the West Valley Multi-modal Transportation Corridor Plan be included with the project application, and Mr. Hancock agreed.

Wickenburg: US 60 Multi-Use Path and Wickenburg: US 60 Sidewalk

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group. There were only minor comments on this project. However, there was significant discussion by the bicycle and pedestrian committees on whether TE funds should be used for the sidewalk project. Should ADOT be providing these facilities as a matter of routine, instead of raiding TE funds to built routine accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists?

Steve McKay addressed the Working Group. The multi-use path is 1.4 miles and is phase two of a project that has already received TE funding. This will create three miles of pathway. US 60 is heavily traveled and the only access to a park and schools is from US 60. An edge line for bicyclists was constructed by ADOT in 1986, and this project can compare the effectiveness of edge lines with multi-use paths.

Mr. Kempton noted that reference to “serious” cyclists should be removed, and that question 20 could be better written. Mr. Kempton stated that this project was originally approved because at the time there was no data available that compared the safety of on and off street bicycle facilities. That data is still needed. However, multi-use paths on one side of the roadway are very unsafe for bicyclists if there is too much access to commercial areas. Mr. McKay noted that no commercial areas were in this section.

Ms. O’Connor noted that landscaping and lighting are needed with this project. How is this really an enhancement without these features?

Mr. McKay described the sidewalk project. Ms. O’Connor noted that a five foot sidewalk is minimal and is not really an enhancement. A sidewalk along a state highway should be wider and have lateral separation from the roadway. Mr. Anderson asked if there was a need for the sidewalk, and Mr. McKay noted that there was a need for the sidewalk. This sidewalk is on the edge of town, and closes a gap. Mr. Anderson stated this fact should be provided in the application.

Phoenix/Papago Salado Association: Arcadia Portal Multi-Use Trail Enhancement Project

Co-Chair Stanton asked the Working Group if this application could be taken out of order to allow citizens who arrived at 11:30 a time to speak. The Working Group agreed.

Debbie Abele addressed the Working Group. Ms. Abele stated this project is truly an enhancement. She introduced Doug Frerichs and Doug Lemmons, Tempe resident, both members of the Papago Salado Association Board. Ms. Abele stated that Phoenix, Tempe, Scottsdale, Salt River Project (SRP) and others are supportive of the project. This is a true partnership. This project will complement other features in the area such as the Arizona Falls project and a new bridge at 48th Street. This project is a critical link in the Papago Salado Trail System, that links to a larger regional trail system.

Doug Frerichs addressed the Working Group, noting that SRP is a strong supporter of this project. The project includes interpretation to educate users, and will increase safety. Doug Lemmons addressed the Working Group. He stated that this is a great project that will allow people to learn more about their community. Dan Colton, Arcadia Estates resident, addressed the Working Group, noting that the project will improve safety and provide access to area schools.

Ms. O'Connor noted this project has a much support. Is there a reason for not having a 12 foot path? Ms. Abele noted there is insufficient right of way for a 12 foot path. There are plans to purchase some additional right of way, but this option is not feasible currently. Ms. O'Connor asked if colored concrete would be used? Ms. Abele stated that was being considered, and Ms. O'Connor stated that Tempe had learned lessons from the canal path they constructed. Path texture can sometimes be prohibitive to meeting ADA access needs, and putting art elements in the middle of the path can be obstructions. Ms. Abele agreed that lessons are learned which do improve future projects.

Ms. Ellis stated that the number of partners with the project is wonderful, and that it's a project that would benefit the whole region. Mr. Kempton stated that the canal is also a part of the Sun Circle Trail, and that could be mentioned in the application.

Phoenix: Phoenix Bioscience Center at Copper Square: Pedestrian and Landscape Improvements

Co-Chair Stanton asked if this application could be taken out of order, and the Working Group agreed.

Jason Harris addressed the Working Group. He explained the concept of the Bioscience Center. The project is bordered by Phoenix Union buildings, and these will be preserved and used for some use to be determined in the future. The project is also close to historic neighborhoods. Don Kueth addressed the Working Group, voicing support for the project.

Mr. Anderson noted that a ranking of the Phoenix projects is needed. He also asked why these types of improvements weren't required of the developer as the project is constructed. Mr. Harris replied that these requirements will happen in the future. However, the intent is to have the pedestrian improvements now, and only a small portion of the site currently has a developer. There is a desire to create connectivity today.

Ms. O'Connor asked what was entailed with the enhanced crosswalks mentioned on page 18. These should be described in the application, and a cross section provided. Mr. Harris stated that the intention

of the crosswalks is to create comfort for pedestrians, but that a specific cross section is not yet available. This issue will be addressed later on as part of the overall project design. Ms. O'Connor noted that any artistic treatments in the sidewalk should be placed at the edges. Mr. Kupel noted that in question 17, a word appeared to be missing. Also, the buildings are not "old", they are "historic."

Co-Chair Stanton noted that the City of Phoenix has already devoted more than \$40 million to this project.

Maricopa County DOT: Gillespie Dam Bridge Restoration Project

Ms. Coomer noted that this project had been submitted last year, and issues with last year's application had been resolved. Irma Hollamby Pfister, addressed the Working Group and introduced Andrej Wojakiewicz, bridge engineer. Ms. Pfister explained that the roller bearings in the bridge are misaligned, and Mr. Wojakiewicz helped to explain that point from a technical perspective. Ms. Pfister showed the project location on a map, and noted that more damage would occur without immediate repair of the bridge. She added there is significant community support of the project.

Mr. Kupel stated that this is a good project that will hopefully be funded this year. He suggested that a letter of support from the historic preservation community would be helpful. Ms. Pfister stated that a letter was already in the application from Maricopa County staff, and Mr. Kupel stated that a more neutral letter would be better. Ms. O'Connor stated that a letter from the Arizona Preservation Foundation, of which Mr. Kupel is a member, would be a good idea.

Mr. Anderson asked about other sources of federal funding for this project. Mr. Wojakiewicz explained that he has had difficulty getting federal funds for the project because there is not much traffic in the area, unless a major highway is closed. Mr. Anderson suggested that more match be provided for the project to demonstrate better support.

Phoenix: Historic Streetlight Restoration Project

Ms. Coomer noted that this application was not eligible for category seven, but it might be eligible for category six, historic preservation. Barbara Sochin, historic preservation representative, addressed the Working Group. She noted that the funding category should be changed to category #6. Ms. Coomer confirmed that eligibility would be verified with ADOT. Ms. Sochin stated that these types of projects had been funded in other states.

This project will renovate streetlights in three historic districts, all listed on the National Register and the City's Register. The project includes 30 blocks of street lights; some have lead paint. This is a community inspired project. Mr. Anderson asked if Phoenix has a dark sky ordinance. Mr. Siefert stated there is a dark sky ordinance, but that there is some flexibility in the ordinance when historic fixtures are involved.

Mr. Licardi asked what happens if a fixture is too damaged to be repaired. Is it removed? Mr. Siefert noted that it's difficult to remove fixtures since the community is supportive of them. It's preferable to leave them in and repair them. Ms. Sochin added that the project will include casting of historic lights so that they could be replicated at some future point, if necessary.

Phoenix: Pedestrian School Safety Zones Project, Phase I

Mr. Siefert addressed the Working Group. He provided accident statistics for the Phoenix, noting that there are 300 pedestrian and 200 bicycle accidents each year for school age children. There are 120 high schools in Phoenix. Projects in the program will be identified by the School Safety Task Force in Phoenix. Three elements will be considered to improve safety: countdown timers, speed monitor radar units, and pedestrian refuge islands. Also included will be education to students.

Mr. Anderson asked what types of schools would be selected, and Mr. Siefert stated the emphasis would be high schools. Mr. Anderson stated that it's difficult for children to pay attention to these safety issues, and Mr. Siefert that the project would also educate motorists as well.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that there might be some issues with persons who are blind with the proposed pedestrian refuge treatment as illustrated in the application. She asked Mr. Siefert to take the concept to the Mayor's Commission to assess its potential impact on blind pedestrians.

7. Other Items Relevant to the Round XI and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

Ms. Dye noted that ADOT is limiting tree size to a mere 15 gallon, which is clearly not an enhancement. This size of tree does not provide shade and is a safety issue. Ms. Coomer said she was not aware of the new policy until she saw it in the ADOT handbook. The issue is scheduled to be discussed at the next meeting, and City of Phoenix staff is preparing a presentation. Additional discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

Co-Chair Stanton gave rankings for Phoenix projects:

1. 2nd Avenue
2. Historic lights
3. Biosphere
4. School Safety
5. Papago Salado

Ms. Ellis asked why the Papago Salado project was ranked so low. This was a good project for the region. Co-Chair Stanton stated that it was submitted to Phoenix at a late date, and projects were ranked prior to that time.

8. Future Meeting Dates

The next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held **Tuesday, August 5, 2003 at 8:30 a.m.** in the MAG Saguro Room. The purpose of this meeting will be to rank enhancement fund applications.

If necessary, a **tentative meeting** has been scheduled for **Wednesday, August 20, 2003 at 8:30 a.m.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:27 p.m.