

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

Tuesday, April 21, 2009 at 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	^Joe Schmitz for Farhad Tavassoli, Goodyear
* Michael Sanders, ADOT	* Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Brian Fellows, ADOT	Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
* Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	Jim Hash, Mesa
Margaret Boone-Pixley, Avondale	Brandon Forrey, Peoria
Robert Wisener, Buckeye	Katherine Coles, Phoenix
^Brian Craig, Carefree	Shane Silsby, Phoenix
_____, Chandler	Mike Roche, Queen Creek
* Rich Rumer Coalition for Arizona Bicyclists	Peggy Rubach, RPTA
Doug Strong, El Mirage	Reed Kempton, Scottsdale
^ Steve Hancock, Glendale	* Eric Iwersen, Tempe
	Janice See, Surprise

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Jim Coffman, Coffman Studio
Keith Kesti, V3 Companies
Robert McGee, V3 Companies
Susan Conklu, Scottsdale
Lucy Ranus, Barrows St. Joseph

1. Call to Order

Tami Ryall called the meeting to order at 1: 30 p.m.

2. Approval of the February 17, 2009 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Catherine Coles moved to approve and Peggy Rubach seconded the move to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group for February 17, 2009. 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. No one wished to address the committee.

4. Complete Streets Workshop

Maureen DeCindis encouraged every member to attend the Complete Streets Workshop on May 19, 2009. Jim Coffman presented the information from the member's Complete Streets Policy survey. The survey asked what cities have policies and what the policies refer to for example on-street or off-street paths. The other section of the survey was the facility requirement for each street classification. Consistency does not seem to exist or apply across the board and there was not much information about local neighborhood streets. There are probably some level of improvements for neighborhood streets that can be recommended.

Many cities have many policy segments but not an overriding consistent approach throughout the communities. There is no standard definition of what makes a street "complete". There are landscape standards but the whole environmental impact is not addressed in each situation. Connections to other forms of transportation is not consistent either.

The purpose of this research is to identify what is currently going on in the Valley. The next step is to identify best practices that are practical to apply to this region. The contract dictates that EDAW will research ten communities as role models with follow-up phone calls to six agencies. Some examples include: Seattle, Chicago, Massachusetts, Sacramento, Charlotte, Illinois, South Carolina, Oregon, Colorado Springs, and Boulder.

Reed Kempton would like EDAW to ask in the phone interview how are cities retrofitting with these policies. Janice See asked what "retrofit" means. Traffic engineers seem to have differing opinions. Is it considered a retrofit if a city is taking down all the old asphalt and restriping the street. This seems like an good opportunity to incorporate bike lanes.

Peggy Rubach suggested research on state policies. Tami Ryall asked how MAG could impact state policy. Peggy Rubach responded that raising the issue could have impact. Jim Coffman suggested the state of Illinois. Brandon Forrey asked how a state plan would affect the cities. Shane Silby asked about other counties or metropolitan planning organization efforts.

Janice See asked about Florida. Jim Coffman replied that nothing turned up on the initial research. Shane Silsby suggested that the Florida DOT may have a policy. Denise Lacey suggested Portland area as a role model. Margaret Boone-Pixley suggested that Denver has a lot of small communities associated with it. Katherine Coles suggested that places that have similar development and political climates within those constraints would be good to compare with this region. Jim Coffman suggested Atlanta, Georgia or maybe a Texas city like Dallas, Houston or Austin.

Jim Coffman will look for jurisdictions with issues similar to this region.

5. Transportation Improvement Program Application Review

MAG staff submitted the newest draft of the Bicycle/Shared Use TIP Project Application and the Pedestrian Project Application and criteria evaluation sheet for committee members to discuss.

Brandon Forrey distributed an alternative scoring sheet based on input from a subcommittee of representatives from Peoria, El Mirage, Surprise, Goodyear, ADOT and Avondale. This is a self-ranking evaluation criteria form. Brandon Forrey explained that in the new version, recommendations sent to the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) would give a range of projects in a certain category such as Highly Qualified, Qualified and Marginally Qualified.

Tami Ryall noted that with self-scoring, people tend to manipulate their own score. Tami Ryall noted that the TRC can override any recommendations. Everyone views their own projects in the highest light. This criteria should look at how to make the scoring the most objective it can be.

Brandon Forrey talked about the qualifier statement at the top of the form which would be the initial assessment. The process would be:

- First: Does the project qualify according to accepted standards?
- Second: What is the specific allocation of points?
- Third: How are the scores ranked and forwarded to the TRC?

He further explained that the new evaluation criteria would help jurisdictions meet qualifications of the grant.

Tami Ryall suggested that each member look at each of the categories and assess if the categories and rating system benefit the larger cities or the smaller cities. The newest version seems to benefit smaller cities. It is imperative that this criteria be objective.

Reed Kempton asked if the TRC is going to utilize the congestion mitigation and air quality numbers in the final score. It is very important that these scores do not become the only scores that the TRC reviews. The CMAQ score is always going to give projects along an arterial street a higher score because the air quality score specifically looks at the number of cars.

Brandon Forrey noted that the new criteria took 10% off the safety score and added 10% to the linkage score.

The following members have volunteered to be on the new subcommittee with Brandon Forrey: Doug Strong, Margaret Boone-Pixley, Shane Silsby or Katherine Coles and Tami Ryall.

6. Review Enhancements Applications

Committee members were asked to review the Round 17 Transportation Enhancements applications to provide comments to strengthen the applications from the region.

7. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on Tuesday in the Cholla Room at 1:30 p.m., unless otherwise noted:

May 19, 2009 (Complete Streets Workshop)

June 30, 2009 (note 4th Tuesday)

July 21, 2009

August 18, 2009

September 15, 2009

October 20, 2009

November 17, 2009

December 15, 2009 (noon)