

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

Tuesday, June 30, 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, Goodyear |
| * Michael Sanders, ADOT
Brian Fellows, ADOT | * Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Jim Hash, Mesa
Brandon Forrey, Peoria
Katherine Coles, Phoenix
Shane Silsby, Phoenix
Vacant, Queen Creek
Peggy Rubach, RPTA
Reed Kempton, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Janice See, Surprise |
| * Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter
Margaret Boone-Pixley, Avondale | |
| * Robert Wisener, Buckeye
Vacant, Carefree
Vacant, Chandler | |
| * Rich Rumer Coalition for Arizona Bicyclists | |
| * Doug Strong, El Mirage | |
| ^ Steve Hancock, Glendale | |

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Susan Conklu, Scottsdale
Susan Bookspan, Phoenix Children's Hospital
Trent Thatcher, Horrocks Engineers

1. Call to Order

Jim Hash called the meeting to order at 1: 30 p.m.

2. Approval of the April 21, 2009 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Denise Lacey moved to approve and Katherine Coles seconded the move to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group for April 21, 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. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Staff and committee members were invited to provide an update of pedestrian and bicycle-related activity in their agencies.

Peggy Rubach reported on a Valley Metro and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) project. All 23 schools within the regional Safe Routes to School have received their materials. Valley Metro is still working with Children's Hospital and St. Joseph's. The program will be completed through Valley Metro. There will be a meeting for the technical advisory subcommittees for the developing the curriculum, incentives and tracking measures for the Enhancements project. These will take July and August to complete. Partner cities will receive an invoice for \$247 to cover legal fees and give away items, etc.

Brian Fellows noted the start of the fourth cycle of the Safe Routes to School program which is operating under continuing resolution with \$2.5 Million available. The grants will be on-line in September. Brian Fellows encouraged cities to apply for infrastructure grants. He noted that those grants are more complicated and need a longer timeframe to complete. Brian Fellows is available for consult.

Janice See noted that Surprise is developing a bike and pedestrian plan for the city. This is their first effort.

5. Complete Streets Program Update

EDAW was expected to present the information from the Complete Streets Workshops and progress on the plan. This item was moved to the July meeting.

6. Transportation Improvement Program Application Review

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

Brandon Forrey explained that the subcommittee wanted to establish an objective approach to the new criteria for the TIP application. Within the criteria, there are general guidelines for each person to rate each question.

Section I: Project Description

Reed Kempton asked "What is a convenience improvement?" Brandon Forrey noted that page two, #19 lists the types of factors to be considered. Items such as water fountains, way-finding signage, bike racks, rest areas are considered as convenience improvements.

Maureen DeCindis explained that Section I has standardized questions for all projects not just for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Peggy Rubach asked if there were more points for a certain kind of project over another. Katherine Coles responded that each project is judged on its own merits. There was discussion to change the width of the wide outside lane to five feet from four feet. Margaret Boone Pixley asked if the committee should encourage four feet with no curb/gutter even though it is in the AASHTO guidelines. Shane Silsby suggested adding the word “minimum”.

Reed Kempton suggested adding speed limit and number of travel lanes to the discussion of the “traffic on the segment”. Denise Lacey asked if the application should ask for a roadway classification such as arterial, collector and residential street. Reed Kempton replied that the speed and number of lanes would provide that information.

Reed Kempton asked the purpose of asking the question if the city owns the right-of-way. Peggy Rubach suggested that this was a federal requirement. Right-of-way cannot be counted for reimbursement if it was purchased before the grant was approved.

Section 2: Proposed Improvements

#16 Referencing Guidelines. Reed Kempton suggested using the words “cite the specific references”. Discussion followed as to how to state this requirement. Members suggested to state it in a way that is clear but not onerous. Reed Kempton noted that historically projects had been submitted that did not meet guidelines. Shane Silby suggested adding the choice of guidelines in bullet list format.

Change the bike lane width from greater than 5 foot to 6-7 feet.

Katherine Coles suggested adding the category “other” under #18 Identify the Types of Safety Improvements. Add “identify and briefly describe”. Strike the “overpass and underpass” and change to grade-separated crossing.

The Convenience Improvements question will be stated the same and asking for a brief description. Way- finding signage will be added as an option.

Linkage: Asks for project connectivity. This will give the projects more emphasis. Brandon Forrey compared the questions to the Evaluation Criteria. Shane Silsby suggested taking the word “Regional” out of the title. Reed Kempton asked if a two mile project that both Tempe and Scottsdale are working together to connect is the same as a 20 mile long facility in one city that touches the border of another city. Maureen DeCindis responded that both projects are considered regional.

In terms of the linking to sites, Brandon Forrey cited the Evaluation Criteria that describes the linkages more clearly. It was decided that the application questions would be restated to be more definitive.

Brandon Forrey noted the grouping of transit facilities with commercial location so as not to discriminate against those cities without transit. Peggy Rubach suggested adding multi-modal (bus, rail, stop, station) to the question.

Brandon Forrey reviewed the Evaluation Criteria. The committee supported making the language the same in both documents.

Constructability was discussed. Is this the same as cost estimates and cost effectiveness? Margaret Boone Pixley noted that the importance of this category was to make sure that the cities costs were accurate enough so the committee could feel confident that the project will be constructed. Margaret Boone Pixley would like to review the exact costs. Joe Schmitz noted that if this was a threshold requirement, then what is this committee evaluating. Katherine Coles noted the original purpose was to insure that the jurisdictions by going through the cost estimate process will be better prepared to actually construct the project.

Katherine Coles suggested changing the question to ask “how are you going to fund the project”. Peggy Rubach noted that this may be a very difficult question to address given the state of the economy.

Reed Kempton asked why use the number of dwelling units for population. Katherine Coles noted that this data is easier to access. Brian Fellows asked about empty dwelling units. Margaret Boone Pixley noted that facilities are being built to last and therefore will be in existence when the dwelling units are filled in better economic times. Shane Silsby noted that housing units are more uniform.

Brandon Forrey asked members to review the Regional Importance criteria. Katherine Coles noted that this was the criteria that would allow for subjectivity or the “icing” points.

Brandon Forrey asked the committee to review the Pedestrian application and criteria and to send comments to MAG staff within the next week. MAG staff will send out a revised application and criteria sheet electronically to allow members the maximum review time.

7. Next Meetings

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

July 21, 2009
~~August 18, 2009~~ cancelled
September 15, 2009
October 20, 2009
November 17, 2009
December 15, 2009 (noon)