

May 7, 2012

TO: Members of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

FROM: Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, Chair of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, May 15, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Offices, Ironwood Room, Second Floor
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members may attend the meeting either in **person, by video conference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending by videoconference must notify the MAG site five days before the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call are requested to call (602) 744-5840 and the meeting I.D. is 2453.

If you are attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting and parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the parking garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Maureen DeCindis at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen DeCindis at (602) 452-5073, or send email to mdecindis@azmag.gov.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the April 17, 2012 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the 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 will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard. Please fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for Action Items.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

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

5. MAG *Bicycles Count* Project

Bicycle Count Station Selection Process and Preliminary Results - the consultant has performed a preliminary selection of bicycle count stations for the MAG Bicycles Count project and will describe the selection process as well as the preliminary results of this process. The

2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the April 17, 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting.

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

project team will look to the Bicycle Pedestrian Committee members for input on refining count station locations.

6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2015, 2016, 2017 Applications

MAG staff will distribute the revised TIP application which incorporated the Congestion Mitigation (CMP) questions. There are two applications: one for facility projects and one for education projects. Discussion will address the issue of whether there should be a set-aside of funding for regional or sub-regional education projects. See Attachment #1.

7. MAG Bike Map

MAG staff will give a status update on the printing of the 2012 MAG Regional Bikeways Map.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics.

9. Next Meetings

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

June 19, 2012

July 17, 2012

August 21, 2012

September 18, 2012

October 16, 2012

November 20, 2012

December 18, 2012 (noon)

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

9. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	^ Steve Hancock, Glendale
Margaret Boone, Avondale, Vice-Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
Michael Sanders, ADOT	Paul Ward for Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Tiffany Halperin, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	^ Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Robert Wisener, Buckeye	Jim Hash, Mesa
* D.J. Stapley, Carefree	Brandon Forrey, Peoria
Chris Mosely for Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	^ Katherine Coles, Phoenix
^ Jason Crampton, Chandler	Dawn Coomer, RPTA
^ Mark Smith, El Mirage	* Karen Savage, Surprise
Ken Maruyama, Gilbert	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
	Mark Hannah, Youngtown

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Peter Schelstraete, Tempe Transp. Commission	Anissa Jonovich, RPTA
Vince Lopez, Maricopa County Public Health	Teri Kennedy, MAG
Grant Anderson, Youngtown	Monique de los Rios-Urban, MAG

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of the February 21, 2012 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Paul Ward moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for February 21, 2012. Mark Hannah 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..

Peter Schelstraete from the Tempe Transportation Commission said that Tempe is in the process of re-writing their bike ordinance. Bike theft is very challenging in that city and the solution may involve a more regional approach such as requiring bikes to be registered on a national database. Has MAG addressed this issue? Reed Kempton responded that the MAG committee has not addressed this issue in the past but is willing to put it as an agenda item for future discussion.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Maureen DeCindis distributed the schedule for the Design Assistance program for 2013 for members to review and discuss at the next meeting.

Denise Lacey announced that Maricopa County will be submitting an application for Design Assistance for the intersection of McDowell and Bush Highway. Recently there was a fatality in that area.

Reed Kempton announced that tomorrow is Bike to Work day in the Valley and encouraged each member to participate. Scottsdale held their *Bike to the Arts* events. Not as many children came this year but the event was successful. Reed Kempton will lead a bike ride to the *Great Bike Chase 2012*.

Jim Hash announced that on April 14, 2012, Mesa held the *Great Arizona Bicycle Festival* in downtown Mesa. Over 4,500 people attended and the *El Tour de Mesa* attracted 1,300 people.

Brandon Forrey said that the Peoria Pioneer Days and Family Bike Ride was successful with 55 riders who were nearly blown away due to weather.

Dawn Coomer introduced Anissa Jonovich as the new Valley Metro staff person managing Safe Routes to School. She came from the County Safe Routes School program.

5. Request for Approval for Project Scope Change

The Town of Youngtown requests MAG approval of a change of scope of the Youngtown FFY2014 Bike Path Project. Mark Hannah explained that in 2009, Youngtown applied for a grant to develop a shared use path around the perimeter of Youngtown. At that time, there was a push for channelization along the Agua Fria but now will not be built as planned. The Town would now like to begin the project at the southwest corner of 115th Ave and Olive Ave. and go north along the subdivision developing a half dozen points to provide access into the subdivision. At Peoria Avenue, the path would veer east

to 111th Avenue and then north one block to the bus stop of Route 106. Currently, residents in the north part of town have easy access to this route. However, the subdivision south of Peoria Avenue has no access to the bus stop.

Also, at Olive Avenue the pathway follows the town right-of-way to connect up with Maricopa County. The town of Youngtown has also contacted city of Peoria for a bike lane connection to the Country Meadow grade school to provide a safe route to school. This project would provide a six-foot wide asphalt path with storm drain provisions and restriping a bike lane on the road along Peoria Avenue. The total construction cost would be \$290,000.

Reed Kempton said that six foot is not an acceptable width and asked what the original scope length was. Grant Anderson replied that the original plan was for three miles and the new scope is for two miles. The original cost was \$296,000. The conversion of the storm drain easements into pipes will cost \$25,000 each. Brandon Forrey also noted that six foot wide path is not standard practice and that the absolute minimum is eight- foot but it would be better at 10 -12 feet. Grant Anderson said that eight foot is the most desirable from a cost stand point. There are some areas along Peoria Avenue and along the subdivision with bike lanes and a sidewalk. Therefore, the Town could include eight- foot path in other areas. Brandon Forrey noted that any projects south of Olive Avenue are being promoted by Peoria. Grant Anderson said that improvements in Peoria would benefit the project.

Paul Ward noted that there is \$296,000 in federal funding and a cost of \$85,000 which is needed for preliminary engineering costs. Mark Hannah replied that the Town has budgeted for this in local funds, however, they will also be looking at other fund sources.

Robert Wisener made a motion to recommend change in scope to make the path eight-feet wide. Brandon Forrey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Congestion Mitigation (CMP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Teri Kennedy, MAG TIP Manager gave a presentation on how the Congestion Mitigation Program elements will be incorporated into the Transportation Improvement Program bicycle and pedestrian facilities application for 2015. An updated application and criteria rating sheet will be distributed.

Teri Kennedy introduced herself.

Transportation Reauthorization

- Currently MAG is operating under a Continuing Resolution until June, 2012.
- President has a proposed budget that includes six-year \$476 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal.
- House and Senate bill versions proposed.
- Funding is a major impediment.
- No clear transportation bill to date (amendments are being discussed now).
- Highway trust fund expected to last to ≈ November 2012.

Current Expectations:

- Until a new transportation authorization is passed; funding is uncertain.
- Programming must be planned for and assumptions made.
- Plan for current year funding levels and project out for future years.
- Have a ranking and evaluative measure in place to respond to changes in funding.
- Collect and rank projects.

CMAQ Program:

- Was created under the ISTEA in 1991, continued under TEA-21, and reauthorized in SAFETEA-LU.
- Arizona Division of FHWA approves the STIP (and the MAG TIP is included).
- FHWA AZ and ADOT are responsible for oversight of federal funds.
- The CMAQ Programming process at MAG was reviewed in 2011 by FHWA AZ.

FHWA CMAQ Programming Process Review:

- The purpose of the CMAQ review was to take an in depth look at how MAG programs Federal CMAQ funds through its modal committees and determine if the funds are being used effectively.
- To determine if air quality played a role in project selection within the modal committees. The review also considered the MAG project deferral process and ADOT involvement in the CMAQ program.

Observations and Recommendations from the Review:

- Observation #2: The Congestion Management Process (CMP) was recently completed by MAG and will be implemented for the next round of project selection for the Intelligent Transportation Systems and Bicycle and Pedestrian modal committees. MAG has developed a sketch tool that was utilized to prioritize arterial projects this past year.
- Recommendation: the CMP is a requirement of 23 CFR, we recommend that MAG take appropriate steps to implement the CMP in project selection for the ITS and Bike/Ped modal committees.

Historic and Next Steps:

- Monique de los Rios-Urban presented the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Study to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee on September, 2010 and provided updates in 2011.
- Baseline Congestion Management Process Report with the CMP tool was published October 22, 2010 and is ready for a working group to guide implementation.
- At Transportation Review Committee on March 29, 2012 MAG requested volunteers to form the CMP Working Group consisting of up to nine TRC members.
- The group will meet beginning in April 2012 and after the initial meeting will meet four times a year.

Aspects of the CMP tool:

- It was developed with the assistance of representatives from each modal area.
- It has two major components: Quantitative data and Qualitative criteria that is evaluated.
- Much of the qualitative criteria included in the CMP Tool was taken from historic evaluation criteria from the modal committee process.

- The CMP Tool is a scoring tool that assists in documenting the ranking process.
- The CMP tool assists with making programmatic decisions as funding increases or decreases.
- The CMP tool is adaptable to current conditions.

Tasks of the CMP Working Group:

- Develop suggested Policies and Procedures for utilizing and implementing the CMP tool.
- Review and refine the Qualitative Data questions for the CMP tool that is applicable to each modal area.
- Determine Data Collection needs and propose methods to address gaps in data collection that strengthens the quantitative evaluation.
- Annually: Evaluate the CMP tool and make recommendations for updates to the CMP tool to address any changing conditions such as economic outlook, new federal requirements, major changes to Regional Transportation Plan, etc.

Programming for 2015, 2016 and 2017:

- Have a FHWA approved evaluation process in place that documents choices based on current conditions.
- Evaluate the projects and produce a rank order to meet changing funding levels.
- Change program financing to include Design, ROW, and Construction.
- Change CMAQ federal program finance ratios from 70/30 to 94.3/5.7.
- Remove the \$1 million/project ceiling.

CMP Sketch Tool:

- The MAG Congestion Management Process is designed to be an integral part of the planning & programming process. It is intended to complement, not replace the project evaluation processes in the MAG modal committees.
- The CMP tool provides input to the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), using quantitative & qualitative methods to assist MAG committees in considering the merits of proposed projects under consideration for competitive funding.
- The CMP tool makes use of existing performance measurement systems that monitor and report on the status of the transportation network.
- The evaluative elements for each of the modes takes previous process' and expands to include additional criteria

CMP Sketch Tool Outcomes:

- Assist in generating an evaluation and ranking of projects for programming during each application cycle.
- Identify and document process in meeting the Regional Transportation Plan goals.
- Meet FHWA requirements.
- Have a tested and accepted practice for evaluating projects if funding is increased or decreased in the adopted TIP.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Tasks:

- Begin in May 2012.
- Review the CMP Tool and criteria to identify required modifications.

- Quantitative Data
 - Define years of data to be used for evaluation of proposed Bike/Ped projects.
 - Identify available data sources (MAG/local agency).
- Qualitative Data
 - Review each area and assign points.
- Mobility and Throughput for People and Freight
 - Level of Service.
 - Per Capita Miles Traveled.
- Update to the application to capture data

Future Agenda Items:

- Pre-application review with timeline.
- Application submittal.
- Project evaluation with the CMP.
- Project evaluation by Air Quality.
- Project evaluation and recommendations by Bike/Ped Committee.
- Project ranking by the TRC.
- Committee approval process.
- Programming of projects in the TIP.

Maureen DeCindis explained that a small working group of the Committee spent months adding CMP measures to the current application. She distributed a copy of the application and a copy of the scoring sheet for future discussion.

Reed Kempton noted that readiness of cities to implement a project and their ability for continuing maintenance are not possible for this committee to ascertain. Brandon Forrey noted that there is a backlog of projects. He suggested that asking right-of-way ownership questions on the application could potentially determine if the project could derail.

Reed Kempton said projects are added to CIP (Capital Improvement Program) when federal funds are procured. When cities submit an application it is implied that cities are prepared to implement the project. Ken Maruyama noted that some jurisdictions are self certified which makes it easier to implement projects. Brandon Forrey said that there are new FHWA guidance for ADOT to make ADOT more timely. Teri Kennedy explained that once a project is in place, a letter from the local jurisdiction comes from the manager indicating readiness and schedule to build. Maintenance over the life of the project is specified. Only the local agency can specify this.

Dawn Coomer asked about bike lockers, bike education and bike maps which are CMAQ eligible, but don't fit into the evaluation structure. Teri Kennedy noted bike lockers are in the CMP sketch tool. She suggested using a different funding source for bike education. Dawn Coomer said that education and materials should be included. Monique del los Rios-Urban said they had discussed this and that there are many project types that didn't fit into quantitative evaluation aspects so it was included under the qualitative assessment. Paul Ward noted that CMP was developed because it was mandated. However, we must pay attention to guidelines, even though CMAQ may be eliminated. The major problem with bike and ped and ITS projects in the past was the 30% match the locals needed to pay for scoping,

design and right-of-way. This could equal up to 50% of project cost. Education projects are almost impossible to rank in competition with facility projects. There was a time when money was set aside for educational projects.

Teri Kennedy said that the final evaluation tool needed to be developed before August. Reed Kempton offered to submit a bicycle level-of-service formula.

7. MAG Bike Map

MAG staff explained that the final deadline for submission of newly built facilities is due before May 11, 2012.

8. MAG Bicycle Count

A working group met with the consultant in March and developed a proposed criteria matrix to help define the best locations to count bicyclists. The matrix was distributed for consideration and a presentation from the consultant will be given at the May meeting.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics. Two topics were suggested:

- Bicycle registration
- Bike level-of-service information.

10. Next Meetings

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

- May 15, 2012
- June 19, 2012
- July 17, 2012
- August 21, 2012
- September 18, 2012
- October 16, 2012
- November 20, 2012
- December 18, 2012 (noon)

PART B - BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN REGIONAL/SUB-REGIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT

This part of the form identifies the current characteristics and proposed improvements for each project.

The purpose of Part B is to provide sufficient information to evaluate the cost estimate for the project and to provide assurance that the project will be capable of meeting the ADOT administered federal design review and clearance process. This process requires environmental, ROW and utilities clearances and a bid ready design prior to FHWA approval to encumber federal funding for construction.

Section 1 - General Project Description	
1. Please describe the work to be performed on the project. What are the objectives of the project?	Briefly describe:
2. Is this a one-time opportunity?	Briefly describe:
3. Guidelines used to develop project: (Check all that apply)	
MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>
AASHTO Guide for Bicycle Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
MAG Complete Streets Guide	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	Please specify:
4. How is this project benefit the regional transportation system?	Briefly describe:
5. Describe how this project impacts multiple jurisdictions. How will each jurisdiction benefit?	Briefly describe:
Section 2 - Detailed Project Description	
For each message, describe the approach:	
6. Please describe how this project will address:	
Bicycle Safety	
Pedestrian Safety	
Persons with disabilities	
Lower socio-economic communities	
Seniors	
7. Describe how this project may impact schools.	
Identify Schools (elementary, middle, and high schools, colleges, and universities) this project may benefit:	
8. Describe the demographics of the target audience.	
9. Describe the specific message for each target audience. What is the call to action?	
10. Describe how the message will be communicated to each target audience.	
11. Will the program include events and maps?	
12. What are the materials/items to be developed?	
13. If this is a way-finding/educational project, describe the type of signs and message.	
14. How will this program promote biking and walking to transit (the last mile)?	
15. What are the measures of success?	
Submit a Project Schedule	
Submit samples (if possible)	

BICYCLE and SHARED-USE FACILITY PROJECT APPLICATION
CMAQ Funding Available for Federal Fiscal Year 2015, 2016 and 2017

General Instructions:

This Excel form is to be used to request federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding available through the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) for Bicycle Projects to be included in the FY2014-FY 2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. Funding is available for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015, 2016 and 2017.

This application form includes: Part A - Contact and Project Description, Part B - Segment Description and Proposed Improvements, Part C - Total Project Budget and Schedule, Part D - Checklist and Signature Page, and Transmittal Instructions and Schedule. Each part is a separate tab of this excel file. Please complete Parts A - D. Alternative application forms are available upon request.

Deadlines and Transmittal Instructions:

Two copies of a printed, complete and signed application must be received in the MAG offices by noon/12:00 p.m. Friday, September 19, 2008. And the application is to be submitted electronically. Detailed transmittal instructions are located in a separate tab in this excel sheet. Late applications will not be accepted.

If member agencies need additional information or have questions, they should contact Teri Kennedy, Stephen Tate or Dean Giles at (602) 254-6300 or contact them by e-mail at the following addresses:

<mailto:state@azmag.gov>

<mailto:tkennedy@azmag.gov>

<mailto:dgiles@azmag.gov>

All information is required, unless noted by the word - Optional.

PART A - CONTACT AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Contact Information

Agency Name

Contact Name

Phone

E-Mail

Mailing Address

Project Description

Please provide the Project Title.

Please provide a general description of the project

Please attach a map with streets labeled showing the location(s) of the bicycle/shared-use facility.

Please attach map with transmittal

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
WITH CMP QUESTIONS (APRIL 2012)

This part of the form identifies the current characteristics and proposed improvements for each project.

The purpose of Part B is to provide sufficient information to evaluate the cost estimate for the project and to provide assurance that the project will be capable of meeting the ADOT administered federal design review and clearance process. This process requires environmental, ROW and utilities clearances and a bid ready design prior to FHWA approval to encumber federal funding for construction.

Section 1 - Project Description

1. What is the type of bicycle project? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle lane (4' min. w/o curb/gutter) | <input type="checkbox"/> Paved shoulders (5' min.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle lane (5' min. with curb/gutter) | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shared-use path (10' min.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge (overpass) | <input type="checkbox"/> Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tunnel (underpass) | Other <input type="text"/> |

1a. What is the type of pedestrian project? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalk (5' min.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wide sidewalk (8' min.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized midblock crossing/HAWK |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Detached sidewalk (4' min. buffer) | <input type="checkbox"/> Mid-block crossing w/ pedestrian refuge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge (overpass) | Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tunnel (underpass) | |

2. Please describe the facility on which the improvement will be located

Facility Name, Starting Limit and Ending Limit

Type of Facility

Collector Road

Residential Road

Unpaved Road/Path

Length (in Miles)
 Posted Speed Limit (MPH)
 Through Lanes

3. Please provide a map, aerial map, graphics and photos that clearly show the segment alignment and features that connect to other bicycle facilities and that cross into or about the alignment such as: washes, canals, railroad crossings, and other crossing features that may affect the project.

4. Please provide a simple diagram of the current typical cross section, including widths, of the segment that shows the right of way limits, sidewalks and shoulders (if any), and the lanes of travel.

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

5. Please provide an estimated traffic volume (ADT) below.

ADT Estimate	Name of road the traffic count was taken from	Date Counted
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Description of Methodology used for the ADT Estimate

6. Federal law requires that all federally funded projects comply with a federal environmental clearance. For projects that have a minimum ground disturbance, environmental surveys are required and an environmental document will need to be prepared, which typically requires 12 months to complete. Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.

Describe any known cultural, historical and biological resources, hazardous materials or other environmental issues that could affect work on the segment.

7. Current ROW: (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agency owns all ROW Needed | <input type="checkbox"/> Agency owns easement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ROW to be acquired | <input type="checkbox"/> Agency has right-of-use (i.e. canal) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Owners will donate ROW | <input type="checkbox"/> Condemnation may be required |

8. Please describe any right of way issues associated with the project.

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

9. Current Utilities in or abutting the alignment: (Check all that apply)

- No Utility in or abutting the alignment
- Pipelines, Sewer and Water
- Canals & Drainage
- Private Structures
- Power Lines & Cables
- Other

10. Please describe any utility conflicts that will need to be addressed.

Section 2 - Proposed Improvements

11. Please describe the work to be performed on the project:

12. Is this a one-time opportunity?

13. Guidelines used to develop project: (Check all that apply)

- MAG Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines
- MAG Complete Streets Guide
- AASHTO Guide for Bicycle Facilities
- Other

14. Why is this project an enhancement to the local and/or regional transportation system?

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

15. Please describe the current surface condition of the proposed project

15a. Safety improvements to be included for bike facilities: (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wide bike lanes (6'-7') | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass) | <input type="checkbox"/> Path lighting |

Buffer Zone, Width

Other

15b. Safety improvements to be included for pedestrian facilities: (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wide sidewalk (8' min.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Signalized crossing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade-separated crossing (overpass or underpass) | <input type="checkbox"/> Path lighting |

Buffer Zone, Width

Shade
Other

16a. Convenience improvements to be included for bike facilities: (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water fountains | <input type="checkbox"/> Trash receptacles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Way-finding signs | <input type="checkbox"/> Seating/rest area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bike racks/lockers | <input type="checkbox"/> Shade |

Other

16b. Convenience improvements to be included for pedestrian facilities: (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water fountains | <input type="checkbox"/> Seating/rest area |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Way-finding signs | <input type="checkbox"/> Shade |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trash receptacles | |

Other

17. How does this project improve upon an existing safety issue?

18. How does the project improve ADA facilities for persons with disabilities?

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

19. Connectivity: (Check all that apply)

Project fills a gap in the system

Project is on the regional facility

Regional Facility Name

Multi Jurisdiccional Project

List of Participating Jurisdictions

Project connects to other local facilities

Links to Transit.

Describe: route number/number of bus stops/park & ride.

20. Total length of facility connected by this project (in miles)

21. Activity centers (parks, libraries, senior centers, recreational centers, etc.) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

Between 1/4 and 1/2 miles List:

Between 1/2 and 1 mile List:

21. Commercial destinations (malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.) and transit services (bus/rail routes, stops, and stations) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

Between 1/4 and 1/2 miles List:

Between 1/2 and 1 mile List:

22. Schools (public elementary, middle, and high schools, colleges, and universities) this project will benefit:

Within 1/4 mile List:

Between 1/4 and 1/2 miles List:

Between 1/2 and 1 mile List:

23. What are the demographics of the area served:

+15 Units 15 - 5 Units < 5 Units Housing Density (Number of dwelling units per acre) within 1/2 mile

The project is in a block group where the average household income is less than \$26,000/year? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2010)

The project is in an area that serves adults over the age of 60 years? (Use blockgroup data from the Census 2010)

24. Jurisdiction has the following policies for improved bicycle/shared use facilities:

With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on arterial streets are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

With new development and capital improvement projects, bike lanes on collector streets are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

PART B-PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & SHARED-USE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

With pavement restoration or regular pavement maintenance on arterial streets, bike lanes are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

With new development or during development retrofits, shared-use paths are:

Required Recommended Not Addressed

Bicycle program implemented, including bike education, safety events, and bike maps

Required Recommended Not Addressed

Complete Streets Policy

Required Recommended Not Addressed

35. The project is: (Check one)

- Identified in General Plan, council adopted policy, or Capital Improvements Program
- Consistent with general policy/practices, but not formally identified
- Not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices

List:

Explain:

34. Describe how this project will be publicized to the general public.

35. How will you determine customer satisfaction/evaluation?

PART C - TOTAL PROJECT SCHEDULE AND BUDGET INCLUDING ALL SEGMENTS

Please provide a cost and programming estimate for the total project (e.g. the cost to complete all planned segment improvements). The design for the project should

Cost Estimate for the Project Including ALL Segments	Cost	(Optional) Additional Notes			
1. ADOT Fee	\$ 10,000.00	Required ADOT review fee. May increase/decrease depending on project characteristics.			
2. Design	\$ -				
3. Right of way	\$ -				
4. Utilities	\$ -				
5. Construction	\$ -				
Maintenance					
6. Contingency	\$ -				
7. Total	\$ 10,000.00				
8. (Optional) Please attach a detailed cost estimate if available.					
Agency Programming					
9. Please describe the programming of the project in the agency's own CIP/TIP.					
Requested MAG Programming	Year (Choose One)	Local Funding Source	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Total Cost
10. Design			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Right of way and Utilities			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Construction			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Federal Function Classification (link)					