MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490
E-mail: mag@azmag.gov ▲ Web site: www.azmag.gov

December 1, 2011

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, December 13, 2011 at noon
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 placed 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 November 15, 2011 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

   2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the November 15, 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting.

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.

   3. For information.

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.

   4. For information and discussion.

5. MAG Unified Planning Work Program

   MAG staff will present the two projects submitted for the 2013 MAG Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP): printing of the MAG regional bikeways map and the Design Assistance Program.

   5. For information and discussion.

6. Implementation and Adherence to Regional Bikeway Master Plan 2007 (RBMP)

   Great time and expense went into the creation of RBMP 2007. Projects submitted to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for recommendation should make every effort to implement and adhere to RBMP 2007. There are several methods that can address this compliance, including: giving priority to projects that adhere to RBMP 2007; applications could ask whether projects adhere to RBMP, and any scoring mechanism could assign extra weight to implementation/compliance with the RBMP.

6. For information and discussion.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

   Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics.

7. For information and discussion.

8. 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.

   January 17, 2012
   February 21, 2012
   March 20, 2012
   April 17, 2012
   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)

8. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, November 15, 2011 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
Margaret Boone-Pixley, Avondale, Vice-Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
* Michael Sanders, ADOT
Tiffany Halperin, ASLA, Arizona Chapter
* Robert Wisener, Buckeye
D.J. Stapley, Carefree
Chris Mosely for Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists
Jason Crampton,Chandler
* Douglas Strong, El Mirage
Ken Maruyama for Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Steve Hancock, Glendale
Joe Schmitz, Goodyear
Paul Ward for Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
* Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Jim Hash, Mesa
Brandon Forrey, Peoria,
Katherine Coles, Phoenix
Dawn Coomer, RPTA
Karen Savage, Surprise
* Eric Iwersen, Tempe

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Vincent Lopez, Maricopa County Health Dept.
Madhuri Uddarato, Atkins

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of the October 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Reed Kempton had one change to the October meeting minutes. On page 3, change the wording of "Reed Kempton further commented that people *seem to think* that Sharrows indicate that those are the only streets that bikes should ride on" to *concern that people might start thinking* that Sharrows indicate that those are the only streets that bikes should ride on.

Margaret Boone-Pixley moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for October 18, 2011. Karen Savage seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes was provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Bicycle and the Pedestrian Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items were given an opportunity at the time the item was heard. No one addressed the committee.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Maureen DeCindis reminded the committee members that the Enhancements Workshop for Round 19 was going to be held on Wednesday, November 16, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. in the Saguaro Room.

Maureen DeCindis announced that for the 2012 Unified Planning Work Program, there are two potential multi-modal projects. One project is a consultant study entitled *Canal Connectivity and Economic Development Opportunities Study*. A consultant would develop a Canal Connectivity and Economic Development Study. This study would identify cost-effective crossing solutions such as mid-block crossings, medians, and HAWK signals for the each of the arterial streets intersecting with the canal path system. The consultant would build on the work already developed with the Canalscape project that focused on creating vital hubs of urban activity where the canals meet major streets to identify economic development opportunities in the system. The study would also show the transit and light rail connectivity and consider how a bike share program could work. The study would provide recommendations for how to move forward.

Tiffany Halperin commented that the economic development should look at how the community can help make any project successful. The Canalscape project has identified only a few potential spots for example the Arcadia District. Katherine Coles suggested looking at infrastructure and land use along the canals. What would the local community really want? Tiffany Halperin added that the study should look at zoning as well. Paul Ward suggested that the use of canals in general is good alternate mode transportation use. One aspect should show how other cities for example Mesa has been very successful in developing their Consolidated Canal path. There should be information on how to take advantage of the canal opportunities.

Paul Ward asked if the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program was going to be included in the UPWP. Maureen DeCindis responded that at this point, it was being considered to be put on hold till the next UPWP. Discussion ensued. Katherine Coles said that there is so little funding available for the cities, that the program should be continued but maybe at a reduced amount of $150,000. Maureen DeCindis will follow up with a phone call to Federal Highways to determine the new rules for on-call consultants list.

Maureen DeCindis explained that the other project could be a *Sidewalk Inventory Connectivity Map.* A consultant developed map identifying sidewalks on arterial and collector streets. The map would be color coded based on the type of sidewalk. For example, the eight foot sidewalk would be a certain color and a four foot sidewalk another color. When finished, this map would identify gaps in the sidewalk network and types of sidewalks. On transit routes the condition of the sidewalk would be assessed especially for persons of need at transit stops. This could be used by local jurisdictions to prioritize areas of concern especially in terms of ADA compliance. The data would be in GIS format and could be combined with layers of information such as major destinations and schools to create the core of a Livability Map. This project would apply the *Pedestrian Policies and Design Guidelines.* The map would be electronic and interactive on the MAG website.

Inventory attributes could, depending on the feasibility, include:

- corridor width
- materials, colors and textures
- sidewalk condition
- edge treatment
- slopes
- linkages and resting spots
- buffers and barriers
- curb cuts
- lighting levels and placement
- users and levels of use
- dedicated signage size, color and contrast
- visible & accessible bus stops
- bus stop links to sidewalks
- ADA access to/at stops
- bike lanes as pedestrian buffers

Tiffany Halperin suggested a station area plan such as rapid bus transit or light rail transit station and to focus on sidewalks within ½ mile of that site. Maureen DeCindis responded that is what the Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study will be doing.

Katherine Coles said this project sounds like a sidewalk version of the regional bike map. What would be very useful to would be cost-effective retrofits for things like moving light poles. A detailed study raises the expectation that all sidewalks will be made to the ideal. This study should only be on a concept level.

Paul Ward suggested doing the study on illustrative corridors with the format in GIS and put on the MAG website. Create a template for local jurisdictions to populate their own data. Tiffany Halperin said that Valley Forward would like have an interactive map. Reed Kempton noted that $150,000 would not be enough money to do a region wide study. Scottsdale used a pedestrian design grant just to study their downtown.

Brandon Forrey thanked the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists for their support of a road diet at a Peoria public meeting. The public did not want slower lanes.

5. Bike Count Project

Reed Kempton reported that MAG received four consultant proposals in response to the Request for Proposals for the MAG Bike Count project: e group, Lee Engineering, Alta Planning & Design and Fehrs & Peers. The consultant review group met on November 9th to review the proposals. There was over a hundred point scoring difference so it was determined that interviews were not necessary. The consultant review recommends Fehr & Peers for approval. Maureen DeCindis added that the project manager, Sherry Ryan has a phD in Transportation Science, a masters in Civil Engineering and BA in Romance Languages. She has worked on bike count projects in San Diego and San Francisco and a technology report with Active Living Research. In January, the project manager will come meet with the committee to get input before writing the scope of work.

Jim Hash made the motion for the Bike and Ped committee to recommend Fehr & Peers for approval for the Bike Count Project. Margaret Boone-Pixley seconded the motion. Passed unanimously.

6. MAG Safety Presentation

Bike crashes/injuries in the MAG region, for the period 2008-2010, are on an upward trend contrary to the trend for all crashes/injuries that is on a downward trend. Sarath Joshua gave a presentation on this observation and other findings from the draft final report on *Effectiveness of Non Engineering Road Safety Countermeasures*.

Sarath Joshua said that currently the study is looking at the Crash Trends. This study is looking at non engineering solutions to reduce crashes. Most funding is earmarked for engineering solutions. Crash trends indicate more injuries and fatalities. The police only report crashes that cost more than $1,000 in damage or have an injury or fatality. Between the ages of 10-24, there are more injuries and people over the age of 65 have more fatalities. Very often police officers check the unknown box in the crash location category. Most crashes occur crossing the road.

Proven counter measures included reduced speed, targeted enforcement, public information and education, speed monitors, and establishing a pedestrian safety zone. Bicyclist crashes have increased compared to all crashes. All crashes have decreased except the bike crashes and bike injuries are increasing. The only explanation seems to be that there are more bikes on the road. The usage of bikes on transit had an increase of 59% and coupled with the downturn in the economy has encouraged more people riding for shorter trips. Brandon Forrey suggested that there may be more riders that are inexperienced. Proven countermeasures also include more helmet usage. Other counter measures include helmet laws, bike rodeos, and speed enforcement. Rear-end is the predominant crash type.

Intersection related injuries and fatalities by age tend to occur the most with people between ages 15 to 19 years. Paul Ward asked if it was a check mark for the age on the form that the police use. Sarath Joshua responded that the police officers enter the exact age. One of the best ways to get more accurate information is to train the police officers to fill out the forms more completely.

Sarath Joshua said they will be finalizing the report this week. A report on bike education safety was distributed. Maureen DeCindis will distribute this report electronically to members as well.

Reed Kempton asked Sarath Joshua what was the top most effective measure? Sarath Joshua said that MAG is assessing what they could do. Driver education and safety education to bicyclists seems to be the most effective. MAG is pursuing funding for these programs.

Katherine Coles asked about the reporting being inconclusive and suggested that the sample could be skewed. Sarath Joshua agreed that there is a lot of information missing in the reports. GPS coordinates should be included. Reed Kempton suggested that the original reports may have detailed diagrams. Sarath Joshua reported that there are 80,000 crashes a year. MAG has to rely on ADOT crash codes. Bike on bike crashes are not reported even if there is a fatality.

Margaret Boone Pixley suggested that individual agencies can look at more detailed reports. Reed Kempton suggested the consultant could take a sampling of the "unknown" reports and see if there is additional data there.

7. Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study

The purpose of the study is to develop strategies to make transit more accessible for pedestrians and bicyclists. The American Public Transit Association (APTA) defines transit access as "the segment of an individual trip that occurs between an origin or destination point and the transit system." The goals of the study are: 1) to identify the challenges that are faced by transit users in the region when accessing transit; 2) recommend improvements, polices, and guidelines that are applicable in the MAG region; and 3) provide a cost analysis and a framework for funding options and prioritization.

Alice Chen explained that the project will start in the middle of November and last one year. Transit Accessibility is defined as a segment of an individual trip that occurs between origin and destination point and the transit system.

Alice Chen asked for a representative from the Bike and Ped Committee be a liaison to the Technical Working Group.

The Access and Comfort Inventory would assess utilization of transit stops. A few images were included to illustrate the criteria. One element of the study is to identify the level of baseline amenities that are cost-effective. Every bus stop will be included in a category. There will be design prototypes and feasible improvements that can be afforded.

The Technical Working Group will include representatives from land use and zoning, bicycle, pedestrian, safety, elderly and persons with disabilities and streets and roadways. There will be five technical working group meetings. Katherine Coles volunteered to be the representative from the Bike and Ped Committee to the Technical Working Group.

Reed Kempton asked if this study would focus on current transit routes. Alice Chen said that the study will focus on current routes.

Sarath Joshua said that there are a high level of pedestrian crashes in mid-block locations without crossings. There was a finding showing the possibility between high speed wide roads and transit stops.

There should be transit stops near crossings. Is there a communication with traffic engineers? There should be a foundation for a safe crossing. Safe accessibility is essential if transit is going to be expanded. Dawn Coomer said that there is an assumption that people will always cross at signalized intersections. Reed Kempton said that data proved that more crashes occurred at intersections. Brandon Forrey said that mid-block may mean uncontrolled. If bus stops were once a mile it would be easier to put them at intersections than having the stops every 1/4 mile.

8. Implementation of the Federal Fund Programming Guidelines

The Federal Fund Programming Guidelines are on the Regional Council agenda for approval on October 26, 2011. The Programming Guidelines outline a different process, schedule, and information exchange than what was done before. In order to implement the Programming Guidelines, a transition period is needed acknowledging some requirements will not be completed. Please refer to Attachment One for a memorandum and overall transition schedule that outlines applicable guidelines for projects programmed for obligation in Federal Fiscal Years 2012, 2013, and 2014. Eileen Yazzie has new title Transportation Project Planning Manager. The Guidelines are on the MAG website.

On July 8, 2009, the Management Committee formed the Federal Fund Working Group. The Working Group met on October 22, 2009, and July 20, 2011. The Management Committee tasked the Working Group with addressing four issues: project deferrals, project development and small and/or inexperienced member agencies, project costs, and local financial commitment. There was a peer review of other MPO's policies that looked at Portland area – METRO, Salt Lake City region, Dallas/Ft. Worth – NCTCOG, Atlanta, Georgia, Denver, Colorado and the Seattle region.

Lessons learned and applied:

- Sponsors must submit CDOT Form 463 and checklist four months before the beginning of the year in which the project is programmed.
- A one-year deferral is allowed.
- If there is a second delay, the sponsor must appear before the MAG committees, including Regional Council.
- If sponsor does not appear, project is deleted.
- A subsequent delay or a breach of the conditions of the second delay, the project is deleted.
- The action can be appealed to the Regional Council.

New Policy elements:

- Commitment letter from Manager.
- The project and local funds must be documented in an approved local CIP/budget document.
- Project Development Schedule - Project sponsor must show continuous progress towards obligation and completion of the project. Failure to work continuously on project development will result in deferral or deletion of the project.
- Project sponsor submit the status of the project development milestones twice a year.
- If project not obligated by expected date, project is "past due" and investigation started.
- Peer review committee reviews the information and provides input to staff.
- Staff can recommend for an extension or that the project be deleted.
- Sponsors can appeal to the Board.

- Failure to meet second deadline results in an automatic staff recommendation for deletion.
- Dispute resolution is through TIP Subcommittee, Transportation Coordinating Committee, the Transportation and AQ Committee, and the Board.
- If progress not made then there is a potential loss of funding. A 60-day period is provided to correct the problem before the process to remove the project is started.

Progress Reports every 6 months would include:

Project Development details on the schedule, deletion, deferral, advancement, etc.

- This feeds into the Dynamic TIP process showing an efficient use of federal funds.
- Scope Changes – there is guidance for project changes
- Appeals Process is thru the Regional Council
- Deleted federal funds will be considered within each mode.
- A project can be deferred only once.
- Second time - agency does not show continuous progress – project is deleted.
- However is a second time deferral is requested due to an external factor such as ADOT delay – project may be rescheduled.

The first project status report will have 88 projects identified. Priorities for FY 2012 Close Out priorities will be in December/January. This will allow twelve months to process.

Reed Kempton pointed out that the photo on the power point does not have bike lanes.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics. The committee would like to discuss the proposed UPWP projects in detail at the December meeting.

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.

December 13, 2011 (noon) (note change)
January 17, 2012
February 21, 2012
March 20, 2012
April 17, 2012
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)