

November 1, 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, November 13, 2012 at 12:30 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](mailto:mdecindis@azmag.gov).

## TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the October 23, 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. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

MAG staff will present two concepts for the committee to consider as planning projects for the UPWP program.

6. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Presentation

MAG staff will present an explanation of the findings of the Air Quality scores on

2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the October 23, 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meeting.

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. For information and discussion.

bicycle and pedestrian projects for the TIP 2015, 2016 and 2017.

7. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Bicycle and Pedestrian Applications Discussion

Committee members will have three minutes to present the best qualities of their project applications submitted for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Committee members will then rank the projects.

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.

December 11, 2012 (noon - luncheon)

January 15, 2013

February 19, 2013 (Chaparral Room)

March 19, 2013

April 16, 2013 (need to move)

May 21, 2013 (need to move)

June 13, 2013

July 16, 2013

August 20, 2013

September 17, 2013

October 15, 2013

November 19, 2013

December 17, 2013

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 23, 2012 at 12:30 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	Thomas Chlebanowski for Julius Diogenes, Litchfield Park
Tiffany Halperin, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Robert Wisener, Buckeye	Jim Hash, Mesa
D.J. Stapley, Carefree	Brandon Forrey, Peoria,
Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek	Katherine Coles, Phoenix
* Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	Anissa Janovich for Ben Limmer, RPTA
Jason Crampton, Chandler	Karen Savage, Surprise
* Mark Smith, El Mirage	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
^ Nicole Dailey, Gilbert	Mark Hannah, Youngtown

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Vince Lopez, Maricopa County Public Health	Lee Jimenez, MCDOT
Jason Harrington, e group	Emile Schmid, Apache Junction
Joe Perez, Phoenix	Raquel Schatz, Apache Junction
Vern Wolfley, MAG	Alex Oreschak, MAG
Giao Pham, Apache Junction	Teri Kennedy, MAG
	Mani Kumar, Phoenix
	Frank Henderson, Ritoch Powell

1. Call to Order

Reed Kempton called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the September 18, 2012 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Jim Hash moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for September 18, 2012. Margaret Boone 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 wished to speak.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Reed Kempton said that he brought in a hand out with an approach to clarify the rights for bikes on crosswalks. Committee members were asked to review the draft version and get input from their city departments.

5. Electronic Version MAG Regional Bikeways Map

Vern Wolfley, MAG staff gave a short presentation on the newly developed version of the Regional Bikeways map for the smart phone. Vern Wolfley noted that the new version will be very detailed and MAG staff needs committee members to help verify the exact location of the routes and the bike shop information. The version of the map will work cross platform on smart phone or desk top. He requested for a small working group to assist with some issues. In the end, it was decided that all members will review the routes in their respective jurisdictions.

Reed Kempton asked those who have smart phones to check it out on their phones.

6. Bicycles Count Proposal

The Bicycles Count Evaluation Working Group will present their recommendation of a consultant to conduct the MAG Bicycles Count project for recommendation for approval. Katherine Coles made a motion to approve and Denise Lacey. Reed explained that this was the top project by far. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Bicycle and Pedestrian Applications Discussion

Committee members conduct a question and answer period reviewing and analyzing the applications submitted for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Members gave their responses to the questions asked.

APJ- BikePed-1	Apache Junction	Southern/Winchester Sidewalk Installation
-------------------	-----------------	---

Emile Schmid, City of Apache Junction, Public Works - Engineering Division addressed some concerns and questions on the Apache Junction application submitted to this committee. As part of my

presentation I have provided a handout with photographs in the project area and the current Apache Junction Sidewalk System Map highlighting aspects of this project.

A portion of the City of Apache Junction corporate limits lies within Maricopa County. The City is an active participating member of MAG, and as such is afforded the opportunity to apply for MAG funds, even for projects within City limits that may not physically lie within Maricopa County. The City is also completely contained within the current 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area dated May 21, 2012.

Percentage of population age 60 and over is 20.6%, extrapolated from Census 2010 dated provided by MAG GIS Program staff.

This project will help Apache Junction with sidewalk installation along older subdivisions (Palm Springs Units 10, 11, & 14) were developed between 1955-1970 prior to City of Apache Junction incorporating in 1978. Curb/gutter & sidewalk were not required at that time. The south side of Southern Avenue is lined with un-subdivided parcels where historically offsite road improvements such as curb/gutter and sidewalk are not required. With these deficiencies being identified and noted on our City-wide sidewalk system map, the City can address those and try to fill in the gaps, so to speak, as internal funding and alternate funding sources such as this allow. The handout includes a few photographs of the area showing existing conditions.

Sidewalk will be installed where there is existing curb & gutter: on both sides of Southern Avenue, and on the east side of Winchester Road. There is no existing curb & gutter on the west side of Winchester between Southern and 16th Avenues. The proposed sidewalk will be detached, 2 feet from back of curb on the south side of Southern due to constraints within the ROW, 4 feet from back of curb everywhere else.

Unit costs for the cost estimate are taken from recent CIP projects completed by the City, including the Winchester Road project that this project would tie into.

The Apache Junction Bicycle System Map and Sidewalk System Map were created 2010, and are not included in the current MAG Metro Phoenix Bike Ways Map. Apache Junction Comprehensive Transportation Study has identified that Apache Junction has very limited bike paths and bike lanes in both the downtown core and the rural areas. Apache Junction has already prepared preliminary plans to expand the pedestrian, bicycle, and trails (including equestrian) facilities throughout the study area.

Southern Avenue was improved 4 years ago between Royal Palm Road and Winchester Road. This project was HURF funded, and sidewalk was not installed during the 2008 construction project due to lack of funding. At that same point in time the City started preparation for a variety of City-wide maps Sidewalk System Map a current version of which is included in the handout.

Constraints with distances between existing curb and gutter and existing edge of pavement prevent the City from accommodating a bike lane while keeping the same vehicle lane configuration. However this corridor is designated as a bike route so in the future any road improvements involving replacement of curb/gutter and sidewalk would be installed such that bike lanes will be accommodated then.

This missing segment of sidewalk will close one of several gaps and add to approx. 15 miles of connectivity within the City limits, with three connections at the border of Maricopa County providing connectivity to existing regional sidewalk systems. The 15 miles within City limits was calculated based on identifying existing segments of sidewalk along major and minor arterial roadway corridors. An exhibit is included in the handout showing the existing sidewalk and proposed sidewalk and highlighting the streets the City is using to calculate connectivity distance. The sidewalk connectivity will allow pedestrians to reach City library, City multi-gen center, City Hall, churches, Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, & High School, Central Arizona College (CAC), medical facilities, commercial & office areas on a sidewalk without having to walk on dirt shoulders or in pavement with traffic. The handout includes a crash location exhibit from the Apache Junction Comprehensive Transportation Study completed May of this year. Shows that accidents did occur in the project area, but it does not state the type or nature of those accidents.

AVN-BikePed-1	Avondale	Agua Fria Asphalt I-10 Underpass
---------------	----------	----------------------------------

Margaret Boone explained that this project was originally submitted for Enhancement Funds.

You don't need any x in the pedestrian category. OK.

You write that this is an asphalt concrete pavement? Which one is it? All asphalt has some concrete mixture. This is from the technical term "Asphaltic-Concrete Pavement". We will replace with asphalt to reduce confusion. Maureen DeCindis suggested referring to it as concrete.

A shared-use path or pedestrian underpass or 8' wide sidewalk - which one is it? Will remove check next to 8' min sidewalk, it is Shared-Use path and will require an underpass at I-10.

What are the "Culvert Extensions" in the cost estimate form and why so many? This cost represents 71% of the hardscape construction cost. This will be costly but necessary for the structural aspect of the underpass per our discussions with ADOT on their preferred method.

Does the trail stop at the Park or continue through and past park? Does trail continue in other direction? Are there bike paths on McDowell and Van Buren? Yes. A 10' wide path continues through the park to a signalized intersection on McDowell which continues on the north side of McDowell and across the Agua Fria.

This project is located on 98% ADOT right-of-way – ADOT letter of commitment missing from application. We were told we would not need it as we originally submitted as an Enhancement project. We are seeking additional direction from MAG. We will provide whatever is determined we need.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over?

- 50 years + = 649,920 (13% of population)
- 65 years + = 843,865 (5.1 % of population)

BKY- BikePed-1	Buckeye	Rainbow/Lower Buckeye 10' Shared Use Path
-------------------	---------	---

Robert Wisener passed out a map indicating all three projects. This project is to design/construct a .6 mile 10' wide concrete shared use path to connect the Sundance Community of 20,000 people to a new 30 acre park that recently opened. Path from Durango south to Lower Buckeye Road, then will jog west 500' feet along Lower Buckeye Road.

Conditions exist because of development that occurred in a County island (Skyline West) in the early 1970's. No sidewalks were installed at the time. The Town is trying to rectify the situation by putting in a dedicated shared use path, which is very much needed since vehicles are often traveling in excess of 60 mph instead of the posted 50 mph as revealed during a recent traffic study.

The path will connect the Sundance Community to an existing 30 acre park (the destination), which at this time is the largest community park in the Town. It features multi-use sports fields for soccer/football, softball, baseball, a dog park, large playground, and volleyball courts. The Town owns an additional 30 acres to the west where a library, community center, and aquatic facility are planned. In the future, the proposed path will connect further south from the park by numerous master planned communities. Future west/east pathways will be constructed on the north side of the RID Canal and another path will be built along the powerlines to the north of the park that are on a diagonal alignment throughout the Town, making the park a hub for non-motorized paths.

The Sundance Community located north of the County's Skyline West houses 20,000 people, which is 40% of the Town's 51,000 people. There is an active adult community as well, which comprises about 1,500 of the 20,000 people. There is an existing shared use path that traverses throughout the community, however these paths end at its boundaries, making it difficult for non-motorized users to travel outside their community.

The right of way for this project is in the County and they have submitted a letter supporting the application. Since the path will be located more than 20 feet away from Rainbow Road, signage will be installed along the path as you approach Gibson Lane for users to yield and/or stop to oncoming traffic. At this time, there are no plans to underground or relocate the electrical lines to keep project costs down.

Low water use trees and shrubs will be planted along the corridor. A hydroseed mix of native plants including creosote and brittle brush will be applied to the disturbed construction site. Public Works staff will use a water truck to water the landscaping during periods of low precipitation.

BKY- BikePed-2	Buckeye	Watson Road 10' Shared Use Path
-------------------	---------	---------------------------------

This project will design/construct .5 miles of a 10 foot wide shared use path along the east side of Watson Road from Durango Street south to Lower Buckeye Road. Watson Road is one of the busier roads in Town and home of one of the few commercial centers.

The shared use path will connect existing sidewalks on Watson Road north of Durango south to a sidewalk along the north side of Lower Buckeye Road, providing a connection to and from Youngker High School to over 800,000 square feet of existing commercial space. At build-out, there will be 1.1 million square feet of retail space. There is no dedicated path in this area because of development that occurred in the early 1970's in Skyline West, a County island. At that time, there were no requirements for sidewalks to be installed. To travel south of Durango, non-motorized users must use a dirt shoulder. There are high rates of speed since Watson Road is posted at 45 mph. Students attending Youngker High School will benefit from the path, since it will provide a critical link between existing sidewalks in Sundance to the path on the north side of Lower Buckeye Road. Users of the shared use path will be directed to stop or yield to oncoming traffic at road crossings at Watkins, Hammond and Magnolia. This project will benefit the active adult community in Sundance (1,500 population estimated).

This project will also have low water use trees and shrubs planted along the corridor as well as hydroseed mix for areas that have been disturbed.

The Town owns all of the required right-of-way for this project.

BKY- BikePed-3	Buckeye	Lower Buckeye 10' Shared Use Path
-------------------	---------	-----------------------------------

Project 3: Shared Use Path on Lower Buckeye Road from Watson Road east to approx. 500 feet east of Lower Buckeye Road (basically in front of a Rural Fire District fire station) from Durango to Lower Buckeye Road.

This project will design/construct .9 miles of a 10 foot wide shared use path along the south side of Lower Buckeye Road alignment from Watson Road east to Rainbow Road. This project will connect the previous two discussed projects. Maricopa County owns the right-of-way required for the sidewalk and they have submitted a letter of support for the project.

CHN- BikePed-1	Chandler	Western Canal Crossing improvement at UPRR
-------------------	----------	--

Jason Crampton reviewed the questions and responses. UPRR has a long standing rule that does not allow at grade pedestrian crossing across their facilities, have you established any positive progress with UPRR that would change that outlook? Chandler has worked with UPRR on this crossing and made some progress. Chandler is also working with the Arizona Corporation Commission to convert this crossing to a public crossing . Once it becomes a public crossing, we feel confident that the crossing will be allowed.

No mention of the Chandler Regional Rail Crossing Guidelines project (was to be taken on by MAG) – What's the status? This project is still moving forward. MAG is currently developing a project scope. We hope to have a consultant on board and begin the project by January. The Regional Rail Crossing Guidelines will provide preliminary design concepts for this project and will provide guidelines that can be applied to other bike/ped railroad crossings throughout the MAG Region.

#6 states that SHPO commented that “there does appear to be any known environmental issues”, I am assuming the word NOT is missing? Correct.

Will this project connect directly with existing bike lanes on both west (Chandler) and east (Gilbert) sides? Yes. The west side (Chandler) is already built and continues for 3.5 miles in Chandler into the City of Tempe. The east side (Gilbert) has an existing path built approximately 30 feet south of the canal. Currently, bikers and pedestrians can use the existing path. Gilbert Staff has indicated, however, that they plan to construct a path adjacent to the canal that would better match the existing Chandler path. Gilbert Staff has indicated that this project is in the CIP.

CVK- BikePed-1	Cave Creek	Cave Creek/Carefree Bike Lanes
-------------------	------------	--------------------------------

Ian Cordwell reported on this project. How many shops (approximately) in the Cave Creek Town Core Shops and Cave Creek downtown? There would more than 10 destinations. The commercial centers include:

- CAREFREE TOWN CENTER has 225 total businesses. Approximately, 90 shops and tourism destinations (hotel, resort, spas, grocery, salons, retail, restaurant, galleries, fitness, Desert Gardens, etc.). Carefree Resort and a Golf club are nearby the Town Center
- CAVE CREEK TOWN CORE has 230 businesses. Approximately 100 shops and restaurants, Tumbleweed Hotel and Success Timeshares Rancho Manana Resort and Golf Club.

This road work was not completed that long ago, why were the improvements not part of that project? The Town has not had recent street improvement projects. The streets were inherited from the County without bike lanes. The most recent projects were for pavement preventative maintenance, and not funded for the construction aspects in this application (See examples below).

- 2009 maintenance on Cave Creek Rd. – ARRA Funds: A slurry seal maintenance project was managed by the State. The federal/state agency overseeing the project did not give the Town the option to add bike lanes given funding limitations.
- 2012 Maintenance on Town Darlington/Pima Road: This was for pavement preventative maintenance (crack seal, fog seal, overlay, repairs), not capital improvements.

After a series of citizen surveys in 2011, the Town Council considered this project in a list of proposed capital asset proposals adopted in January 2012. In prior years, the Town attempted without success to obtain a grant through MAG and fund bike lanes.

The updated Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Plan in the General Plan Update was not adopted by Council until May 2012, and is on the November 6, 2012 ballot.

Funding mechanisms available elsewhere are not present in Carefree. The Town’s only regular revenue streams for street projects are HURF and the general fund, which is fed by primarily by local sales taxes and state shared revenues. Impact fees expired in 2012 as a result of the change in state law. The Town has not issued a bond for years for many reasons, primarily given the small population and lack of a local property tax increment.

CAVE CREEK: The last street projects in Cave Creek were a sewer line repair and an asphalt overlay paid for under the ARRA funds. The ARRA project did not provide additional funds for bike lanes. Reductions in medians, tight ROW fronting businesses in the Town Center, and other areas of concern warrant a more expansive study not in the scope of the ARRA project.

Typically, a restriping project does not take a great effort or expense what makes this project different than a typical restriping project? This application is being submitted on behalf of two municipalities. Both Towns have struggled in the past to achieve the necessary funding through MAG when applying separately, while in the meantime other cities have continued to benefit from grant funds.

As indicated in the application, this project will provide bike lanes on miles of arterials streets. Insufficient pavement width, change in street geometrics upon entering the Town Centers, landscaped medians ranging from 3' to 16' wide, desire to put the streets into a more pedestrian-friendly situation, and lack of available funding mechanisms seen elsewhere, make bike lanes a more challenging task than is typically seen elsewhere.

Applying the cost metric resulted in a much more expensive cost than is being applied for. We then took that cost down substantially to arrive at a more realistic expectation.

ADT estimates are based upon count in 2008, is there potential that traffic has increased in this area since that date? CAREFREE: We deduce that traffic counts have either held steady, or possibly declined on the arterial streets since 2008. This is based on a decrease in tax revenues between 2008 and 2012 and more recently between 2010 and 2012. Also, construction activity has declined in neighboring communities. CAVE CREEK: Traffic counts have maintained approximately the same rate since 2008. All commercial spaces with the exception of Stagecoach Village (30% occupancy in a commercial condominium center) are now occupied.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? Census data is provided below. However, beneficial bike lanes are for our under-served the senior population, that issue is not the most relevant factor. Though many locals will use the bike lanes, the fact is this project reflects one of the most used bicycles routes in this region. Large numbers of younger cyclists from Scottsdale and Phoenix make use of this route on a weekly basis, which explains why these other jurisdictions support this application. Phoenix and Scottsdale have bike lanes nearby and know that this project is a critical link for the northeast quadrant of the metropolitan Phoenix area by closing a big gap in the loop.

As indicated previously, both Towns have struggled in the past to achieve funding through MAG when applying separately, while in the meantime other cities have continued to benefit from grant funds. Today, Cave Creek and Carefree are joining together with support from Scottsdale and Phoenix for this regionally significant bike lane project. This may be the Towns' only opportunity to secure the necessary funding to complete this vital gap in bike routes.

Census 2010 Data: CAREFREE: 60+ = 50.5%      CAVE CREEK 60+ = 29.6 %

D.J. Stapley noted that Cave Creek and Carefree are submitting this as a joint project. Both city councils are supporting this project. This loop is the most significant bike route for both jurisdictions and this CMAQ funding is the only opportunity to get construction funds.

GLN- BikePed-1	Glendale	55th Avenue Widening for Bike Lanes and Sidewalk
-------------------	----------	--

Steve Hancock reported:

- The percentage of age 60 and over is 12.6%
- No traffic lanes will be added; there will be two lanes as is now the case.
- The current traffic lane width is 10' at narrowest point; the new lane width will be 14'.
- The sidewalk width will now be 5' wide.
- The sidewalk will be 5' tapering to the existing 4' sidewalk.
- The city is comfortable with the \$3,000 with no expectation the ditch will have any historical significance.
- The Functional Classification for 55th Avenue is as a collector street.

GLN- BikePed-2	Glendale	Neighborhood Connections to Shared Use Pathway
-------------------	----------	--

Steve Hancock reported:

- There are 6 bus stops in ¼ mile and 5 more in ½ mile.
- The percentage of age 60 and over is 12.5%

GLN- BikePed-3	Glendale	New River North Shared Use Pathway
-------------------	----------	------------------------------------

Steve Hancock reported that:

- There are no bus stops within ½ mile of the project.
- The thickness of the concrete path will be 6".
- The traffic counts would be about the same or even less than in 2007 due to fewer new homes being built.
- The percentage of age 60 and over is 15%

LPK- BikePed-1	Litchfield Park	6' Sidewalk on Old Litchfield Road
-------------------	-----------------	------------------------------------

Thomas Cheblanowski reported that this project will install concrete sidewalk on Old Litchfield Road. The neighborhood dates back to before the 1960's . There was no policy at that time to connect sidewalks and neighborhoods. There are commercial and medical facilities to the north. This project is unique because of the old growth palm and orange trees providing aesthetic appeal. The project will fill a critical gap and helps those in need. There is sufficient width so no palm trees will need to be removed.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? With the cooperation of MAG, based upon the 2010 Census Block Data Area, 22% of the population is 60 years of age and older.

The AASHTO bike guidelines selection was mistakenly checked and is not applicable because this a sidewalk pedestrian project. The proposed cross section is misleading as it shows a 10' wide sidewalk, it should be a six foot sidewalk.

MES- BikePed-1	Mesa	Rio Salado Shared Use Pathway - Segment 3
-------------------	------	---

Jim Hash thanked the committee. Regional connection that will benefit people biking to 18-20%. Temporary connection at Dobson and then will continue at a later date to connect to other Mesa facilities a bond project that will be voted on in two weeks. This will connect 24 miles of pathway for spring training.

MMA- BikePed-1	Maricopa County	5' Bike Lanes on McDowell Road, 76th St to Usery Pass
-------------------	-----------------	---

Denise Lacey reported on this project. Will there be a shoulder outside of new bike lane? What material will it be? Sidewalks exist at some locations along the project area; in these locations there will be no additional shoulder. In areas where sidewalks do not exist, a bladed dirt shoulder (4 to 6 feet) in width will be added as part of the project.

Samir Hatab is no longer with the County who will be new contact person? Denise Lacey (602) 506-6172, deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov will continue as the contact throughout the funding process. Bill Hahn; (602) 506-4611; billhahn@mail.maricopa.gov will become the contact as the project moves into design.

#7, There is a conflict in statement that the agency owns all ROW needed and yet ROW needs to be acquired, please explain? Looking at existing roadway and right-of-way should indicate initial idea of ownership. Two parcels at the northeast corner of 76th Street and McDowell Road are currently in private ownership. The County will follow our ROW acquisition procedures to obtain the right of way necessary for the project.

#10 Who owns the power poles? Salt River Project owns the power poles.

#11 The statement was cut off, please explain what statement was. Construct 5 ft. wide bicycle lanes by widening the existing pavement and/or restriping the existing pavement where the roadway width is adequate. Extend culverts and construct new headwalls as needed to provide proper clear zone widths. Update street signs along the project. Relocate utilities interfering with construction.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? 18.9% are over the age of 60.

Where is the graphic indicating the project site, not just the vicinity? The map has been revised.

#17 - The answer to this question should emphasize the bike safety aspect rather than the ability of vehicles to use the bike lanes for "evasive" maneuvers. This project provides a designated area for cyclists, increasing the comfort level while enhancing safety through the separation of motor vehicles and bicycle riders. In providing the designated cycling riding space, it encourages motor vehicles to share the road.

PHX- BikePed-1	Phoenix	Roosevelt Row Bike Lane and Sidewalk Improvement
-------------------	---------	--

Katherine Coles reported that this project is part of the Arts District. This funding will help complete the project. This segment is from 4<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> Street. What will the through lane width be? Eastbound, westbound and center turn lanes will each be 10' wide. Lane widths were narrowed at the request of the community during scoping meetings held during the Transportation Enhancement project (Roosevelt: Central Avenue to 4<sup>th</sup> Street).

The narrative description says that bike lanes will be added but the project description only checks off wide sidewalk. Phoenix will check off bike lanes also.

How will this funding augment previous enhancement funding? Previous enhancement funding narrowed Roosevelt Row between Central Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. CMAQ funding will complete narrowing of Roosevelt Row between 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Streets. Existing roadway widths to the west in the Roosevelt Historic District, and to the east in the Garfield Historic District, are already narrow.

The application says that Code designates 1<sup>st</sup> Street as an enhanced pedestrian route. 1<sup>st</sup> Street is not a part of this project. Does the code or any plans identify Roosevelt Street as an enhanced Pedestrian Route? Question #26 should read "Downtown Code designates Roosevelt Street as an Enhanced Pedestrian Route with streetscape.

How much width is dedicated to automobile lanes right now in the corridor (both thru and turn lanes)? How much width for on-street parking? How much of this width will be rededicated toward bike/pedestrian space, and how wide will the resulting bike lanes be? Right now the curb-to-curb width is approximately 55 feet. Travel lanes are 15 feet and the center turn lane is 12 feet. Painted on-street parking areas are 8 feet. The project proposes new 10-foot wide travel and center turn lanes. Bike lanes will be 5.5 feet wide and the pedestrian zone will be approximately 20 feet wide. The pedestrian zone includes area for landscape planters, outdoor seating and display areas and an 8-foot wide clear sidewalk.

PHX- BikePed-2	Phoenix	32 <sup>nd</sup> Street Bike Lanes: SR51 To Reach 11
-------------------	---------	--

Katherine Coles reported on this project. Part C says that the federal cost is \$445,568. The cost estimate sheet says \$3,082,477. Which is correct? After looking at the cost estimate further, Phoenix realized they had submitted an incorrect cost estimate sheet that has since been corrected. Additionally, we caught a few other corrections that have been changed. For example, we were missing a right-of-way acquisition cost estimate of \$10,000. Our Part C is now consistent with our cost estimate sheet to reflect a federal cost of \$483,288 (rounding up).

Does this project include both a 5-foot bike lane and sidewalks along the whole corridor? Potentially yes, it does include a 5-foot bike lane and sidewalks along the whole corridor. Currently we have hired Gavan & Barker, Inc. to provide a preliminary design concept layout along 32<sup>nd</sup> Street that would be specific to this area.

What gap in the bike network does this fill? This project is ideally situated between two large recreational areas: the Phoenix Mountains Preserve, with a highly used regional shared-use path on the south end, and a nice regional recreation area to the north, the Reach 11 Recreation Area across the CAP canal. In addition, there are a multitude of community centers, Paradise Valley Community College, middle and elementary schools, parks and various transit routes that make this corridor a great area of multi-modal users including bikes, pedestrians, transit users, and traditional vehicular traffic. Why not do this when a routine maintenance project removes the strips? It would cost almost nothing at that time. At this time we have no planned maintenance project for this corridor. We have been given direction by the City Council Office to pursue creative means, local dollars and federal funding to look at a re-purposing of 32<sup>nd</sup> Street because it is a high priority for this Council district.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? 16% of residents are over the age of 60.

Does this restriping need to occur as its own project? Are there any current planned projects within the roadway right-of-way that would require re-striping anyway? Can this project just be appended to one of those projects? At this time, we have no CIP funds to do any work associated with 32<sup>nd</sup> Street even remotely close to the project area. Additionally, Councilman Gates has given staff direction to work with the community to create a complete street that will encourage a more walkable and bikeable community along this corridor.

PHX- BikePed-3	Phoenix	Rio Salado 12' Shared Use Pathway, 32nd Street to 40th Street
-------------------	---------	---

Katherine Coles reported that a multi-modal pathway is a paved pathway intended for both pedestrian and bicycle use. This portion of the Rio Salado pathway will be constructed on top of a levee. The five-foot wide natural surface shoulders will provide a buffer between the pathway and the river bank (north side) and back of levee slope (south side) so that handrails will not be required. See cross-section below.

PHX- BikePed-4	Phoenix	First Street 8' Sidewalk project
-------------------	---------	----------------------------------

Katherine Coles reported on this project. The current posted speed is 25 mph on this section with 462 cars a day. How will narrowing the road reduce the speed? The existing curb to curb roadway width is approximately 75-feet. Although it is posted 25 mph, the excessively wide roadway encourages speeding. Narrowing the curb to curb width of the roadway and adding bump-outs for parallel parking will encourage drivers to slow down. Wider sidewalks will encourage foot traffic instead of vehicular traffic.

The current surface condition states that it has 5' sidewalks. Yes, Question #14 states that the current surface condition of the proposed project has an asphalt roadway that is approximately 75-feet wide and concrete sidewalks that are each 5-feet wide. Existing planters are bare. (Total R/W = 100-feet). Narrowing the roadway provides the opportunity to construct new 12' clear sidewalks with landscape planters and both parallel and angled parking.

What facility does this connect to equal two miles of facilities connected? Question #20 states that the total length of a facility connected by this project will be two miles. 1st Street is the final leg of a

highly used two mile pedestrian loop which includes Adams and Monroe Streets, Second Avenue (Round 4 and Round 11 TEs) and Roosevelt Row (Round 18 TE) as discussed in Question #13. This project, if funded, will complete the final leg of this 2 mile pedestrian loop, therefore connecting 2 miles of a facility.

Only one destination (Library) shown on the map links directly to this project. First Street ends at Margaret T. Hance Park which not only is home to the Burton Barr Library, but also Phoenix Center for the Arts, the Irish Community Center and newly opened Irish Library, and the Japanese Friendship Garden which are shown on the vicinity map. The Margaret T. Hance dog park is also scheduled to open in January 2013.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? As asked and answered in the application, the project does serve a population over the age of 60.

What is the total width of the proposed widened sidewalks, and how much right-of-way will remain dedicated to auto uses? Question #12 states that sidewalks will be widened to 12-foot clear. This is required by the Phoenix Downtown Code. The north and southbound travel lanes will each be 12-foot wide. Angled parking bays will be 18-foot deep and parallel parking bays will be 8’.

PHX- BikePed-5	Phoenix	Shea Blvd: 32nd St to SR51
-------------------	---------	----------------------------

Katherine Coles reported on this project. What is this project? There is no project description. This project is a roadway diet to narrow the roadway by removing curb and gutter and restriping to accommodate that narrowing of roadway.

As a bike/ped project, what does this link to? Shea Boulevard from 32<sup>nd</sup> Street to SR 51 has a diverse use of mass transit with a large park and ride abutting Shea Boulevard at SR 51, a commercial/business area along Shea Boulevard, and a large regional bike facility that runs along the SR 51 bringing bicyclists for recreational and transit uses to the businesses, commercial and residential areas nearby. Narrowing the roadway here will provide for a better transition of multi-modal users including bikes, pedestrians and vehicles so that they can share the road more appropriately. In addition, this area attracts other community users as well, such as folks seeking higher education at Paradise Valley Community College, and patrons of the Paradise Valley Mall that is relatively close to this area.

How long will it take to get agreements with each of the property owners for the egress/ingress of their driveways? Have you notified the property owners? What was their initial response? We anticipate it taking about a year and a half to finalize any agreements with property owners, similar to what it would take to obtain environmental clearance. Currently, city staff, the Council district office, residents and business owners have been engaged and are familiar with the goals of the project. City staff will continue to pursue public involvement efforts and get through all these agreements as the project develops. Presently, both residents and business owners are on board with the conceptual nature of this project.

Part C says the federal cost is \$364,941. The Cost sheet says \$1,358,207. Which is correct? After looking at the cost estimate further, we realized we had submitted an incorrect cost estimate sheet for this project. We also caught a few other corrections that have been changed. Our Part C is now

consistent with our cost estimate sheet to reflect a federal cost of \$488,474. Both the Part C and the cost estimate sheet will be resubmitted. The map does not show the correct project location. Project locations map needs to be corrected.

Is there any ADOT right-of-way? Very short segment (0.14 mile): explain transition to meet existing ADOT cross-section. This has been corrected. We originally noticed the error before the submittal; however, the erroneous map was submitted inadvertently. The electronic CD of GIS that we submitted with our applications did have the corrected map for the Shea Boulevard project. We do not intend to do any work in ADOT right-of-way.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? As asked and answered in the application, the project does serve a population over the age of 60.

What exactly is being done with the extra 30 feet of space gained from reducing the roadway width? At this time, we have hired Gavan & Barker to do a preliminary design layout for this project. We are looking for creative transitions that can add buffer to our bike and pedestrian users. We will wait to see what creative ideas our designer comes up with for this area.

What does “the horizontal adjustment of such curb reduction of roadway width will require a vertical profile adjustment to accommodate 5-lane section for the length of the corridor” mean? It means that some engineering will need to be done to accommodate the roadway diet. Exactly what this is at this time is not known, however it will be looked at during the design. Has any effort been made to contact property owners to start discussions regarding access management? Yes, the Council District office and other City staff have been in contact with business groups and residents to discuss this project and the potential impact to access management. They are all on board and are looking for creative ways to accommodate multi-modal users in order to benefit everyone.

PHX- BikePed-6	Phoenix	Regional Bike Share Along Metro Rail Corridor Phx to Tempe
-------------------	---------	---

Katherine Coles reported on this project. The Cities of Phoenix and City of Tempe have been interested in bikeshare for sometime now. Here are a few general notes about bikeshare planning and design. The bikeshare locations shown on the joint CMAQ application demonstrate viability as determined by city staff. But they are only proposed. The public will also be consulted on where bikeshare locations could be. City staff will perform a field review of each location to determine feasibility and number of bicycles that could be positioned there. The maps are intended to demonstrate that there are many plausible locations for bikeshare. Greater analysis will occur to distinguish between tourism destinations (higher revenue) and local destinations (higher annual membership). Similar to other projects submitted for CMAQ grants, 100% plans will be realized subsequent to award and concurrent with a rigorous public process.

Why wouldn't a private business fund this? Is there not enough demand for bike use to make this a profitable business? Bikeshare systems can be run by private businesses (Deco Bike), Non-Profits (Nice Ride Minnesota), government (Capital Bikeshare) and universities (UC Irvine). Phoenix and Tempe do not expect bikeshare to be an enterprise program but there is likely to be an advertising and sponsorship concession with a profit sharing clause in a contract with the system operator if the system is highly profitable. One function of government is to create the conditions for private businesses to

invest and take risk. Phoenix and Tempe believe the time is right for bikeshare. There are 25 bikeshare operations in 20 different states and the District of Columbia.

Here is an edited description from wikipedia: "A bicycle sharing system, also known as bikesharing, is a service in which bicycles are made available for shared use to individuals who do not own them. Bicycle sharing systems can be divided into two general categories: "Community Bike programs" organized mostly by local community groups or non-profit organizations; and "Smart Bike programs" implemented by government agencies, sometimes in a public-private partnership. The central concept of these systems is to provide free or affordable access to bicycles for short-distance trips in an urban area as an alternative to motorized public transportation or private vehicles, thereby reducing traffic congestion, noise, and air pollution. Bicycle sharing systems have also been cited as a way to solve the "last mile" problem and connect users to public transit networks. Public bike sharing programs address some of the primary disadvantages to bicycle ownership, including loss from theft or vandalism, lack of parking or storage, and maintenance requirements. There is a limit to the number of places where bicycles can be rented or returned so the service is a form of public transit, and is therefore less convenient than a privately-owned bicycle capable of point-to-point transportation." Like any public project, Phoenix and Tempe realize that implementation is extensive and chronological. There will be public meetings, polling of potential sites, right of way analysis of proposed sites, contracts, procurement of equipment, selections of sites, deployment, advertising, membership and maintenance, etc. Bikeshare operation at user interface can be seen online: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qQ62cQiGFI8>.

What is the target audience that will pay for the annual fee and the hourly fee? Bikeshare is designed for anyone older than 16 years old. Bikeshare appeals to tourists and residents alike. Tourists provide a great deal of revenue to a bikeshare system as they pay at least \$5.00 per day and additional monies when their ride exceeds ½ hr. Annual fees can vary from \$48 to \$144 per year.

How many people will Phoenix need to use the bikeshare program on a daily basis to recoup expenses? According to the description, 7,500 people would need to pay \$75/year for membership on a continuing basis just to pay for the annual maintenance of \$562,500. A person can buy a bike at Walmart for one year's membership.

Operations and Maintenance is estimated at \$4.11 per day per bike so the system is sustainable if each bike is used once per day by a tourist at \$5 per day. Other revenue in the form of advertising and sponsorship may also be negotiated with system operator. Given the choice from a used jalopy to a new Ferrari, people buy a car based on many factors. Bikeshare presents a similar choice. Buy a car and continue to pollute or buy a bike from Walmart or join bikeshare. Bikeshare increases transit options. Bicycles from Walmart are not as reliable or secure as bicycles managed by a private operator.

Is there an agreement in place with Tempe for sharing costs and revenues? As this is a joint application, negotiation of cost and revenue sharing will certainly take place on a future date. The maps are not clear as to the destination locations that would attract the 7,500 new riders a year. The maps are intended to demonstrate that there are many plausible locations for bikeshare. Greater analysis will occur to distinguish between tourism destinations (higher revenue) and local destinations (higher annual membership).

A successful bikeshare program has stations at highly desirable bikeable locations. A successful

Bikeshare program encourages people to walk and ride instead of driving a single occupancy vehicle. Bikeshare locations will be determined by the public, by system usage, and by GPS tracking. A highly desirable bikeable location is in the eye of the beholder. If 30 bikes are motionless for an hour in front of a comic book store everyday, then that store probably merits a bikeshare station.

Is there an agreement with METRO to fit the racks on the stations that already have limited space? City of Phoenix and Tempe own the right of way that contains each METRO platform in their jurisdiction. We will negotiate appropriate rack locations for platforms that are selected through the public process. If there is no room on the platform, then the nearest location visible from the platform will be the next priority.

What was the basis for choosing kiosk locations? Kiosk location is based on many factors, job density, proximity to light rail, residential density, adjacent to bike lanes, etc. These are preliminary locations. Other factors such as tourism, shopping and adjacent transit centers are important too. The initial map is conceptual. Each location was chosen by City of Phoenix and Tempe staff. We expect that the rigorous public process will determine initial preferred locations. If a location proves to be underutilized then it could be moved to a new location.

This appears to be an excellent project!!! Would there be any measures of effectiveness to determine its success? I.E., Scorecarding of the implementation plan out over a period of time from completion? Yes, a number of measures will be used to track success. From individual locations to system-wide operations, ridership can be measured for any period, daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, etc. <http://capitalbikeshare.com/system-data> this data can be used to add bicycles or relocate stations. Bikeshare system data will be open source and the bikes will have GPS units on board to determine paths, destinations and idle time. GPS data can then be used to plan new bike facilities. An annual user survey will be administered and published. A sample can be found here: <http://capitalbikeshare.com/assets/pdf/Capital%20Bikeshare-SurveyReport-Final.pdf>.

The location of proposed bike-share stations in Phoenix suggests a very limited usage pattern. Locations are only proposed so a usage pattern cannot be inferred. During system operation, patterns will be documented and adjustments will be made. Phoenix and Tempe will accept the balance of funds after all 2015 projects are awarded to maximize bikeshare deployment.

Most bikeshare systems are successful because the docking stations are generally within a couple blocks of each other. As the system begins operation a number of adjustments will be made as demand fluctuates. Because the docks are portable and modular, additional open docks can be added to receive bikes. 10 bikes and 20 parking positions is a typical arrangement.

How will the system accommodate users if they reach their destination docking station, but it is full? When a docking station is full, users are granted extra time (15 – 45 minutes) to find another docking station. Docking stations are monitored real time and alerts are given as docking stations approach 100% full or empty. The system operator will suffer a penalty if stations are 100% full or empty.

I can see this as an issue, for example, at station 19 (LR stop), which is the closest proximate station to docks 9, 13, 17, and 18. Will each LR station have enough dock capacity to handle all the potential commuter-driven demand patterns for nearby docking station locations? Yes, ideally, every bikeshare location would always have parking available and bikes available. A typical configuration is 20 bike

capacity: 50% full of bikes for departures, 50% open for new bike arrivals.

Will there be a process to quickly and efficiently relocate bikes between docks to ensure a seamless experience for the user? Bikes will be redistributed as part of daily operations.

I can't see a user picking up a bike at #19 (Steele Indian School), biking north to station #13 on Camelback, finding a full docking station, and being willing to bike back to #19, or bike west to #11 at 19<sup>th</sup>/Montabello, to drop off the bike at an open dock and return to their destination 1+ mile away. Users will be granted extra time if the station is full. We see users willing to ride bikes a little further or walk a little further if necessary, on rare occasion. Users would also be frustrated to arrive at a station to find no bicycles available. The operators 2<sup>nd</sup> highest goal is to ensure that every bikeshare location would always have parking available and bikes available. The first goal is safety.

Would there be a plan in place for rapid deployment of additional docking capacity if high demand warrants more stations? Yes. The docking stations are modular and portable and can be relocated based on demand patterns. At special events which require bicycle accommodations, docking stations could be located on a temporary basis. A significant procurement of new capital equipment would be the purview of the city manager offices.

Does Phoenix have a ridership forecast and/or financial plan to project either ridership or program deficits? Does Phoenix have funding identified for any operations/maintenance costs beyond that listed in Part C, #10 (\$562,500), in case ridership and user fees do not meet the annual costs? Will Tempe be required to cover a portion of these costs? If so, how much? Similar to implementation of a light rail system, anticipated ridership is supported by residential and employment densities as well as desirable destinations for residents and tourists. The bikeshare has 24-hour access, making it a complementary addition to a multi-modal system. There are many bikeshare programs across the country operated by for and non-profit entities and their operational business plans will serve as models for the Phoenix/Tempe bikeshare program, including the addressing of deficits. Funding sources are anticipated through advertising, sponsorship and donations. Upon award of the grant an agreement will be negotiated between Phoenix and Tempe to facilitate the operation of the bikeshare in the respective jurisdictions.

The project description (Section B, #11) states that additional equipment can be acquired in increments of \$4000. What exactly will each \$4000 buy? \$4000 is the aggregate/average cost of a bikeshare system procurement & deployment per bicycle. The amount represents the per bicycle cost for software, hardware, membership cards, maintenance vehicles and tools and spare parts to launch the bikeshare program. Once the system is operational, subsequent additions to the system are less costly as the initial system capital has been invested. Bicycles, equipment, tools will be individually purchased once operations begin.

Will this system place high dollar amount holds on users credit/debit cards when they check out a bike? If so, how much will that hold be, and how quickly will that hold be released once the bike is returned? Bikeshare typically does not charge a security deposit for subscribers of 30 days or more. A hold is an operational question and is something the operator will determine as part of their risk profile.

Do Phoenix and/or Tempe have plans to improve bike facilities (lanes, routes, off-street paths) near proposed station locations/between proposed station locations? For instance, a station is proposed at

Tempe Marketplace in Tempe, but the nearest LRT bikeshare station, #5 at McClintock/Apache) does not have a safe/direct biking route to Tempe Marketplace. Yes, bicycle facilities may need to be improved around the light rail and bikeshare system. Usage data could be utilized to prioritize implementation of improvements.

Other bikeshare systems have found success by connecting neighborhoods with destinations, in addition to connecting transit lines to destinations. Was there any consideration given to expanding this system beyond being, essentially, an extension of the light rail system (for instance, providing stations at parks, central areas of neighborhoods, nearby shopping centers, etc.)? Four proposed stations in Tempe (#7, #8, #9, #10) have no destination bikeshare docks within a short distance. Where is it anticipated riders will go with these bikeshare bikes? Did Phoenix/Tempe consider stations at, for example, Papago Stadium, Phoenix Zoo, or Tempe Center for the Arts to serve as destinations for some of these docks? One of the exciting aspects of this program is that it can be expanded as ridership and revenues increase. As the system is not permanently affixed to the ground, locations that are underutilized could be relocated to activity centers such as the Zoo, Tempe Center for the Arts or the State Fairgrounds. Initial locations and future expansion will be determined through on-going engagement of users and potential users. The cities of Phoenix and Tempe have myriad opportunities for engaging the community and will bring their resources to bear to facilitate well located bicycle share infrastructure.

Reed Kempton noted that question 20 indicates that this project connects 30 miles of bikeways. It was clarified that this project does not connect any bike paths or bike lanes.

PHX-BikePed-7	Phoenix	10' Detached Shared Use Pathway 107th Ave
---------------	---------	---

Katherine Coles reported on this project. Additional right of way needs to be acquired. Have you received agreement from the current property owners? We anticipate some right of way needs as a part of this project. On the east side of 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue we hope to acquire an easement to install a 10-foot multi-use path. At this time, we have no formal agreements yet. We have made initial contact with a few of the stakeholders in the area including Salt River Project and the Roosevelt Irrigation District, and will continue to work toward agreements that are acceptable. At this time, we are in preliminary discussions.

Clarification is needed on what this project will accomplish. Street widening is not CMAQ eligible. What is being widened? Are you adding one more lanes between Campbell and Camelback? The eastern half states sidewalk or multiuse path. The western half states 5' sidewalk. Are there two different facilities on different sides of the road? This grant submittal is ONLY asking for the bike and pedestrian elements to be funded as a part of this project. Any roadway widening aspect will be the City's responsibility. This project does call out for completing a 5-foot sidewalk on the west side where it is not continuous. In addition, we would like to tile a Salt River Project pipe and work around an irrigation ditch to put in a 10-foot multi-use path on the east side of 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Clarify: Roosevelt Irrigation Ditch needs to be tiled. SRP canal needs to be piped. There really isn't a distinction between tiled or piped, they are basically one and the same. It is recommended that the Salt River Project canal be piped right now because there is no barrier to protect the Salt River Project canal. For that reason curb and gutter is needed for overall safety.

Under Safety Issue: it states that there will be a 5' bike lane. We currently have J2 under contract to work through safety issues. The bike lane is a planned striped facility to differentiate vehicular traffic and bike traffic.

What gap does this fill in the bikeway system? We hope to expand an existing bikeway system that is adjacent to our project that will incorporate this corridor. A few recreational destinations include: Dust Devil Park at the northern terminus of the corridor, as well as Camelback Ranch Ball Park at the NWC of 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Camelback. If expanded, connects to the Bethany Home Outfall Channel which leads into Agua Fria Trail System.

Part C lists federal cost as \$1,500,000. Cost sheet lists it as \$3,204,517. Which cost is true? Since the Project Cost was so high and some of the costs are associated with roadway widening, the City decided to ask for a fixed dollar amount of \$1,500,000 which is less than the total project cost. We felt this was equitable since we were bringing other money to the table for the widening. The City is willing to re-evaluate based on the committee's recommendation on what percentage to use. We can have that reflected on the final resubmit.

Applications list different options (5' sidewalk vs. 10' path) – which one will it be? Will this project widen vehicle travel lanes? There is an existing 5-foot sidewalk on the west side which has small gaps that will be completed as a part of this project. In addition, we are looking to add a 10-foot multi use path along the east of 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Yes, this project will add travel lanes, however, those funds will be paid with City participation.

Why such a large local match. Don't we have to use the same percentage on all projects? We have a large local match because a part of the scope is not eligible for CMAQ funds for example, roadway widening.

#8 Who is the owner of potential ROW acquisition? We don't anticipate purchasing right of way. We anticipate obtaining an easement from the Roosevelt Irrigation District.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? As asked and answered in the application, the project does serve a population over the age of 60.

Significant irrigation delivery ditch issues, would there be any benefit to relocate to the west side of 107th Avenue? If not, depending on the age of the delivery structure, would there be any SHPO issues? J2 is working through the design feasibility and any potential coordination with SHPO will be done.

Project proposes 32 feet of new AC pavement (Section B, #11). Will any of this new pavement be used for roadway widening or addition of new thru or turn lanes, or will it be exclusively for bike lanes, sidewalks, and/or multi-use paths? All the AC will be roadway widening.

PHX- BikePed-8	Phoenix	12' Shared Use Pathway Rio Salado Pathway-40th street to SR143
-------------------	---------	--

Katherine Coles reported on this project. Many airport employees bike to work. Did Phoenix discuss with Sky Harbor the possibility of building a bicycle connection to the airport from this path (perhaps to the East Economy garages or the new transit center at 44<sup>th</sup> St/Washington)? Yes, discussions with

airport personnel did take place. Currently, there is not an easy way to cross the river bottom to access the airport from the south. Rio Salado Pathway users would have to access the airport from either 24<sup>th</sup> Street or Priest Drive. Bicyclists cannot access SR 143 and right now, 44<sup>th</sup> St does not have a bike lane and is elevated above the Salt River. Airport staff is not currently supportive of allowing bike traffic on Sky Harbor Blvd/44<sup>th</sup> St. Sky Harbor staff prefers bicyclists to access the airport from the Light Rail where there are secure bicycle parking facilities available.

Was there any consideration given to extending this path north to the Grand Canal pathway system? The distance between the south bank of the Salt River and the Grand Canal along 44<sup>th</sup> Street is approximately 7,000 feet. A study could look at the feasibility of striping bike lane connecting the south bank and the Grand Canal along 44<sup>th</sup> Street if Aviation staff would support it. A ramp from the pathway up to the elevated 44<sup>th</sup> Street could be studied. It would be easier to make a Rio Salado/Grand Canal connection in Tempe where the two amenities are closer in proximity. At Priest Drive, the two amenities are approximately 2,000-feet apart.

Is there a planned continuation of this pathway in Tempe from SR-143 to Priest, to connect to existing pathways? If so, when will the Tempe pathway be constructed, and will these two paths offer a seamless connection? Tempe has a project called “Rio Salado Multiuse Path – West”. This path begins at Priest Drive and extends west along the top of the south bank of the river for approximately one mile. The path extends to just east of the SR 143 which also represents the boundary between the cities of Tempe and Phoenix. The City of Tempe anticipates that construction will be complete in the fall of 2013.

SCT-BikePed-1	Scottsdale	Shared Use Pathway West World/Indian Bend
---------------	------------	---

Susan Conklu reported on this project. Why should CMAQ funds be used for the "Trails" and "Equestrians" elements of this project? What is the cost of the "Trails?" The trail surface can be used by pedestrians and runners. The city is including an unpaved surface on all our paved path projects where possible, because it's used by runners and pedestrians.

The cost of the trail is approximately \$170,000.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? 19.3%.

SCT-BikePed-2	Scottsdale	Shared Use Pathway Shea Tunnel Access / 124th St
---------------	------------	--

Susan Conklu reported on this project. This was the highest priority project for the city. There is an existing tunnel that will connect neighbors from the south to the three schools to the north. South of Shea there is no sidewalk. Many people run and walk in the neighborhood.

Why should CMAQ funds be used for the “Trails” and “Equestrians” elements of this project? What is the cost of the “Trails?” There are a lot of pedestrians/runners and equestrians in this neighborhood and destinations for both that are separated by Shea Boulevard. This would provide a convenient, comfortable crossing for all non-motorized users. The cost of the trail is approximately \$130,000.

The city is including an unpaved surface on all our paved path projects where possible, because it's used by runners and pedestrians.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? 23.7% of residents are over the age of 60.

Are the connecting trails north and south of the Shea tunnel access paved or unpaved? From Cochise to Saguaro the project will be paved, approximately 1,364 linear feet. North of the tunnel there are streets, paved sidewalks and an unpaved trail. South of Saguaro there is a paved street and there will be 2,138 feet of unpaved trail connecting to existing unpaved trail at the CAP Canal. There is no sidewalk south of Shea on 124<sup>th</sup> Street to access the signal.

What is the length of the tunnel, and will there be any visibility issues for people entering/exiting the tunnel (sharp turns, blind spots, etc)? The length of the tunnel is approximately 140 feet. It is straight, and there will be no sharp turns or blind spots. Scottsdale has 49 tunnels on similar roadways. These do not have visibility issues or safety issues.

SRP-BikePed-1	Salt River Indian Community	8' Sidewalk Longmore Road Pedestrian Project
---------------	-----------------------------	--

Jennifer Jack reported on the project. SRPMIC has 22.4% of the population over the age of 60. A new map was distributed clearly identifying the project and including a key. Jennifer Jack noted that the project is on the SRPMIC Long Range Transportation Plan and connects to a MCDOT sidewalk facility along McDowell Road. She also emphasized that the project connects two major activity centers within the Community with employment, parks, churches, and other destinations and provided a recent example of residents walking along the shoulder with a baby stroller to the food bank. Jennifer noted that there are eight school bus stops at unimproved locations along the project used by both Salt River Community Schools and Mesa Public Schools and the dangers of children waiting for the school bus unprotected from the traffic. This project has been specifically requested by the Tribal Council and will benefit a pedestrian dependant population within the region.

SUR-BikePed-1	Surprise	5' Sidewalk Reems Road
---------------	----------	------------------------

Karen Savage explained that this is a 6 foot sidewalk. \*The City is requesting a 6' Sidewalk for this project. Is this project specifically listed in General Plan or CIP? Yes, the sidewalks are a portion of a larger project in the City's CIP.

Why doesn't this proposal meet Surprise's design guidelines for sidewalk width on an arterial street? Question 2 indicates this is an arterial. Surprise Standard Detail 3-02 and 3-03 both show 6' sidewalks separated from the street.

The City's application identifies Reems Road as an arterial which does meet Surprise's design guidelines for sidewalk with (6') as stated on in Part B #2. The Reems Road detail provided identifies a 6' detached sidewalk. Please advise if this is not the case elsewhere in the application.

Question #15b: No additional safety improvements shall be included with the pedestrian facilities.

Question #28: This question should not have been left blank. To gauge customer satisfaction of the proposed improvements, the City intends to include on its website a survey for those to rate and provide feedback on the new sidewalk improvement.

Sidewalk already exists on east side of Reems Road. No sidewalks exist on Peoria either east or west of Reems Road. No sidewalks exist on Reems Road south of Peoria. Sidewalk already exists on east side of Reems Road north of Cactus. No sidewalks exist on Cactus Road west of Reems Road. No developments, residences, destinations directly on west side of Reems Road that would utilize this sidewalk. Why can't residents use the eastside sidewalk until there is some sort of destination/connections on the west side?

Residents of the Greer Ranch Subdivision, on the west side of Reems Road, do not have a safe way to cross to the eastside of Reems Road at the Cholla Street (midway between Cactus and Peoria). Cholla is an unsignalized intersection and does not provide for safe crossing, which occurs at the Cactus and Peoria intersections. This project will install sidewalk on the west side connecting these intersections with Cholla. Current shopping, dining, and banking destinations exist on the southeast corner of Cactus and Reems.

SUR- BikePed-2	Surprise	5' Sidewalk West Point
-------------------	----------	------------------------

Karen Savage explained that this project meets the guidelines for collector streets.

Question #28 – no answer is provided

Question #28: This question should not have been left blank. To gauge customer satisfaction of the proposed improvements, the City intends to include on its website a survey for those to rate and provide feedback on the new sidewalk improvement. Will do a survey for those to rate the new improvement.

No 6' requirement on collectors.

Website survey for new sidewalk improvement.

Completes network of sidewalks within Westpoint community; connection to school.

Both developments occurred in the past, before sidewalk requirements were in place.

Landscaping wasn't included because it already exists and/or to keep the costs low.

These will connect Litchfield. These are missing links to create a network. Will connect elementary school and five lane connector. Landscaping will be preserved. These have been identified as missing links. New standards have been developed. These are needed because the developments were put in before these amenities were required . Trying to keep costs down.

TMP- BikePed-1	Tempe	10' Shared Use Path on 8th Street
-------------------	-------	-----------------------------------

Eric Iwersen reported on this project. The description needs clarification. Will a multi-use path be built where the current sidewalk is? Will it be on both sides of the street? Will there be bike lanes on both sides of 8th Street. A shared use path will be built on the north side of 8th Street, from Rural to west of McClintock, with a northern connection to University Drive through several multi-family complexes and a mixed use district. The path will be built on the decommissioned Creamery Branch Rail Line corridor; today the line is remnant trackway, unsightly and unusable. The existing sidewalks and bike

lanes will remain on both sides of the street. This proposed path is a minimum of 15" north of existing sidewalk on the north side of 8th Street.

Will current on-street parking remain? On-street parking will remain. The corridor is filled with a unique blend of historic buildings occupied by new uses, and redeveloping high-density residential. The lots are shallow and there is an effort to minimize surface parking; on-street parking allows for a more urban form. The street character and the pathway will be slow speed, with areas that serve as activity nodes (including special events in the street), and with all travel modes having greater equality in the roadway.

How much space is available for activity nodes? How many nodes? The activity nodes are part of the overall project design for the path and for the street. In later project phases along 8th Street, there will be two 1-block zones where the road will be raised to the pedestrian level and the surface will be pavers. This will give a calming effect. The intention is to allow street closures for food/art festivals in these nodes. Along the pathway with this project, there will also be activity nodes at two large locations near mixed use zones to provide strong linkages from the pathway to area businesses as well as locations for rest. Additionally, 3-5 smaller rest areas with benches, trash receptacles and public art/history information will be built as part of the shared use path.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? The ½ mile area surrounding the project area shows that 2% of the population is 60 and over. These particular block groups reflect a more youthful, college-oriented, younger/small family, and ethnically diverse demographic.

What is the percentage of households under \$26,000? 42% of households in the ½ mile range of the project area are under \$25,000 according to current census tract data.

Is this project proposing improvements directly adjacent to the roadway on 8th Street? Directly adjacent to the rail line, with a setback/landscaping separation from the roadway? A mix of both? Please be more specific. This project is proposing a shared use path along an abandoned rail line now under City control. The rail line is adjacent to the north side of 8th Street and the path will be separated and set back from the sidewalk and street with an extensive landscape buffer. The path project is part of larger street improvements that will happen in later phases. The path will link directly to apartment complexes, a light rail station at Rural Road, and several businesses along 8th Street.

There is already a bike lane on both sides of 8th Street from Rural to McClintock. Where will the proposed bike lane (Section B, #1) go? The bike lanes on both sides of 8th Street will remain a part of the overall re-characterization of the street.

There is already a sidewalk on both sides of 8th St from Rural to McClintock. Where will the proposed 6' minimum sidewalk (Section B, #1a) go? The sidewalks on both sides of 8th Street will remain and/or be upgraded to 6' in width where appropriate.

TMP- BikePed-2	Tempe	Shared Use Path Priest Drive Underpass
-------------------	-------	--

Eric Iwersen reported on this project. How do peds/bikes cross Priest Drive currently? Is there a crosswalk at this location? This underpass project would connect an existing shared use path along the

Tempe Rio Salado on the east side of Priest Drive to a CMAQ-funded and programmed path on the westside of Priest Drive that will be completed in late 2013. This future path connection location does not currently have a crosswalk (or signal) for path users to cross. There is a signalized intersection approximately ¼ mile away (Priest Dr. and Rio Salado Parkway) that will serve as the city recommended street crossing to connect these two paths. There is not currently a recommendation to have an at-grade crossing solution at this path/arterial intersection because of Priest Drive volumes, speeds and road grade.

What is the percentage of age 60 and over? This project is located in the far northwest corner of Tempe in a recreationally and industrially zoned part of the community. While it is a critical link in the Tempe Rio Salado Path system and the regional Salt River Path network, there is no residential land within a half mile of the area.

What is the percentage of households under \$26,000? See question 2.

Project description (Section B, #11) mentions a new multi-use path west of Priest Drive to SR-143. When will this path be constructed? The new one-mile shared use path west of Priest Drive extending to SR 143 will be completed in late 2013. It is anticipated that successful CMAQ funding for the underpass will eventually provide a much more accessible and functional connection between the two paths, for both the region and the city of Tempe.

VMR-BikePed-1	VMRPTA	School Resource Officer Training Program
---------------	--------	--

Anissa Janovich reported on the Valley Metro School Resource Officer (SRO) Training. Some municipalities have removed SRO’s from schools due to budget constraints and others may do so in the future. Was this considered in developing this program? This was definitely considered in the development of this program. It is true that some municipalities have removed SROs from schools due to budget constraints in the past. Based on research and currently working with multiple schools in the MAG region, there is a high demand from principals to have SROs at their schools to help monitor the safety of their school campuses, their faculty and their students; especially in high crime areas. With such a high demand, it is projected that SROs will remain with support from the Arizona Department of Education.

Why only use schools in the City of Phoenix for Pilot? Valley Metro has positive support for this training program from current SROs in the City of Phoenix. Valley Metro’s bicycle and pedestrian program coordinator currently works with school districts throughout the City of Phoenix implementing various bicycle and pedestrian safety projects for youths and adolescents. The City of Phoenix SROs expressed their need for a bicycle and pedestrian training program to help educate the students at their schools. With the need, as well as the positive support, Valley Metro chose the City of Phoenix for their pilot program. It is hoped that future phases of this program will allow for expansion. Lessons learned through the pilot program will increase the success of future phases. Valley Metro welcomes any opportunity to implement this SRO training program to other MAG jurisdictions interested in the program. (Please refer to Part B-1 of the final application).

The application indicates “consultant assistance to develop training materials,” but who will be doing the training? (e.g. VM staff, police officers, certified cycling instructors, etc...), and who will be

conducting the testing and assessments in Phase II? Like all federal-aid projects, details will be refined during scope development. The current plan is to have a highly-qualified Valley Metro staff member, as well as a highly-qualified consultant, work together to implement the trainings to the SROs. The testing and assessments will take place before and after the trainings and will be conducted by both the consultant and the Valley Metro staff.

Would there be any measures of effectiveness to determine its success? I.E., Score carding of the implementation plan out over a period of time from completion? Yes, there will be measures of effectiveness to determine the success of the SRO training program. Phase III of the project scope is fully dedicated to determining the measures of effectiveness of the training program. (Please refer to Part B-15 of the final application). Phase III will evaluate the objectives that are stated in both Phase I and II of the project, as well as assess and evaluate the SRO trainings, assess and evaluate the student's knowledge of bicycle and pedestrian safety techniques, and compare bicycle and pedestrian crash data statistics surrounding Phoenix schools where SROs were trained.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members had the opportunity to suggest future agenda items.

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.

~~November 20, 2012~~ November 13, 2012 (12:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.)  
~~December 18, 2012~~ December 11, 2012 (noon - Holiday Lunch)