

November 12, 2015

TO: Members of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

FROM: Jim Hash, Mesa, Chair of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at **10:00 a.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. If you are attending in person, please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as 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.

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 three business days before the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

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 Tim Strow 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 August 21, 2013, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership based on the attendance of the three previous Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee meetings. If the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed that a legal meeting cannot occur and will subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. Please contact Tim Strow at (602) 254-6300 or tstrow@azmag.gov if you have any questions or need additional information.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order

For the November 17, 2015 meeting, the quorum requirement is 12 committee members.

2. Approval of the October 20, 2015 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

2. For information, discussion and action to approve the meeting minutes of the October 20, 2015 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. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Application Presentations

Committee members will hear presentations on project applications

5. For information and discussion.

from the Call for Projects for the MAG Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP-MAG) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ). A total of 17 presentations were heard at the October 20, 2015 Committee meeting, with the remaining 20 presentations to be heard at this meeting.

6. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will have the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics.

7. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Ironwood Room at **1:00 p.m.**, except where otherwise noted.

Tuesday, December 15, 2015

6. For information and discussion.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 20, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Jim Hash, Mesa, Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Steve Careccia, Goodyear
Jose Macias, El Mirage, Vice-Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Mike Gillespie, Litchfield Park
Michael Sanders, ADOT	* Ryan Wozniak, Maricopa
Raquel Schatz, Apache Junction	Denise Lacey, Maricopa County
Alison Rondone, Avondale	Brandon Forrey, Peoria
Phil Reimer, Buckeye	Katherine Coles, Phoenix
* Stacy Bridge-Denzak, Carefree	* Sidney Urias, Queen Creek
* Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek	Susan Conklu, Scottsdale
Ann Marie Riley for Jason Crampton, Chandler	Stephen Chang, Surprise
Kristin Myers, Gilbert	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Purab Adabala, Glendale	Amanda Leuker, Valley Metro
	* Robert Carmona, Wickenburg
	# Grant Anderson, Youngtown

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Margaret Boone, MAG	Rob Giles, Gilbert
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Mark Venti, Mesa
Alex Oreschak, MAG	Jeremy Knapp, Paradise Valley
Tim Strow, MAG	Dawn Marie Buckland, Paradise Valley
Bob Beane, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	Eileen Yazzie, Phoenix
Kenneth Steel, MCDPH	Troy White, Queen Creek
Chris Hamilton, Avondale	Matthew Behunin, Queen Creek
Jason Crampton, Chandler	Jason Harrington, HPD
Chris Howser, El Mirage	Brian Fellows, AMEC Foster Wheeler
Rod Buchanan, Gilbert	

1. Call to Order

Chair Jim Hash called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the September 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Alex Oreschak noted that Ryan Wozniak had mistakenly been recorded as not present, when he should have been recorded as attending via audio conference. Kristin Myers moved to approve the amended meeting minutes of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee for September 15, 2015. Jose Macias 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. Those wishing to comment on action agenda items were given an opportunity at the time the item was heard.

4. Staff and Member Agency Reports

Susan Conklu stated the City of Scottsdale's City Council would have the Arizona Canal Path project construction on the consent agenda on Tuesday, November 10. Purab Adabala noted that Glendale and Peoria held a grand opening of the New River Path segment from Bethany Home Road to just south of Olive Avenue on October 12, with about 100 people attending. Alex Oreschak noted that the MAG Regional Council had accepted the Valley Path Brand & Wayfinding Guidelines Final Report, and had also approved the ranked list of design assistance projects as recommended by the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee. Mike Sanders noted that on September 24, AASHTO approved ADOT's application request for designation of USBR 90 from the California border to the New Mexico border.

5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Application Presentations

Alex Oreschak explained that the Committee would be hearing approximately half of the 37 project application presentations at this meeting, with the remainder to be heard at the November 17, 2015 Committee meeting. Alex noted that Committee members were given three handouts at the table. One handout listed the projects along with clarifying questions that had been submitted by reviewers. Another handout displayed the quantitative and qualitative scores and ranks that had been given to the projects, and the current interim project rank order. A third handout included two blank columns for Committee members to write down draft and final Committee Rank scores, to be determined after hearing the presentations. Alex reminded Committee members and presenters that each presenter would have no more than 10 minutes for their presentation, with no more than 5 additional minutes for questions and answers from the Committee, and that the presentation order and approximate timeline were provided in the agenda packet. There would be a break for lunch around 12:00, and an additional 10 minute break in the afternoon if necessary.

Raquel Schatz from Apache Junction presented on the Winchester Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project. Following the presentation, Margaret Boone asked if any bicycle/pedestrian crossings were identified as part of the project, and if any enhanced crossings would be included. Raquel replied that no enhanced crossings were identified, and that most cross streets are low-volume

residential. Margaret also asked what the speed limit on Winchester was. Raquel replied that the speed limit was 30 m.p.h. Brandon Forrey asked if there is sufficient right-of-way to provide wider sidewalks. Raquel answered that there is only enough right of way for 5-foot attached sidewalks. City guidelines include standards for a detached sidewalk, but this would not fit in the existing right of way. The City is also just starting design of the corridor, and will consider asking adjacent property owners to donate right of way on the west side to either make a detached sidewalk or an 8-foot sidewalk. Kristin Myers asked if there are drainage concerns, or if design assistance identified any drainage issues. Raquel replied that the City included a drainage component in the design, and that they are looking into whether there are any additional drainage requirements or if other utility work is needed. There is an initial recommendation to include a new storm drain because major storms with 50-year floods have caused issues on the corridor recently. Mike Sanders noted that the proposed 5-foot sidewalk meets ADA requirements, and that the bike lane provides a buffer for pedestrians.

Chris Hamilton from Avondale presented on the Agua Fria Trail Phase II Project. Chris addressed clarifying questions that had been previously submitted during the application process. A question was submitted asking Avondale about any coordination they had done with ADOT on the project already. Chris noted that Avondale and ADOT had a previously approved JPA on the Agua Fria Corridor for a previous project, which would continue with this project. Another question was submitted asking what alternate routes exist for users to cross I-10 in the area. Chris replied that the only way to get from south of I-10 to Friendship Park and McDowell Road would be taking Van Buren Street to Dysart Road to McDowell Road. Dysart has heavy vehicle volumes, and the other north-south option, Avondale Blvd, does not have continuous sidewalks. There is no convenient way to cross the I-10 here without this project. Chris also noted that this project was part of an ongoing effort from the City and neighboring jurisdictions to provide a continuous trail along the Agua Fria and El Rio corridors, and that the major challenge is getting up to McDowell Road. Avondale has future plans to connect north to existing trail systems. Susan Conklu asked what the schedule for Phase I of this corridor was. Chris replied that Phase I would be under construction in 2017, and that Phase II would go to construction in 2018. Design for both phases was underway currently, and being done all at once for both phases.

Jason Crampton from Chandler presented on the Chandler Boulevard Bike Lanes: I-10 to 54th Street Project. Following the presentation, Susan Conklu asked what the main destinations and trip generators that Chandler wanted to connect to were. Jason noted that there are multiple centers throughout the area, including hotels as well as retail on the main frontage. There is also multi-family development in Phoenix that will be accessible as a result of this project.

Chris Howser from El Mirage presented on the Varney Road Sidewalk Connection Project. Following the presentation, Chris addressed clarifying questions that had previously been submitted during the application review process. A question was asked about the cost of relocating utilities in this project. Chris stated that APS is planning to move an existing switch cabinet across the street, so that it will no longer be in the path of the proposed sidewalk. Another question asked what the total length of sidewalk would be, and whether it would be attached or detached. Chris added that there is about ¼ mile of sidewalk proposed for the project, and that the sidewalk would be mostly attached to the back of curb, but will detach occasionally to get around existing light poles. Katherine Coles asked what the speed limit is. Chris replied that the speed limit on Varney Road is 25 m.p.h.

Rod Buchanan, Rob Giles, and Kristin Myers from Gilbert presented on the Western Powerline Trail Grade Separated Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Project. Following the presentation, Susan Conklu asked what current barriers are in place to prevent people from crossing the railroad tracks. Kristin replied that jersey barriers had been erected by UPRR, and that the railroad has said that they will fence the whole area, though they have only fenced off the Neely Street crossing so far. One of the clarifying questions that had been previously submitted during the application review process asked if there were any bike lanes on Gilbert Road or Elliot Road. Kristin replied that there is currently no bike lane on either of those roads. Another clarifying question asked what the speed limits were on those roads. Kristin replied that the speed limits were 25 m.p.h. and 35 m.p.h. currently. Kristin also noted that there are future plans for bike lanes in those corridors, and that the Heritage District Master Plan identified the locations for bike lanes. Certain sections of Gilbert Road are too narrow for bike lanes, though, so those segments will be painted with sharrows in 2017. Another clarifying question asked if the bridge would be equestrian friendly. Kristin noted that Gilbert takes all users into consideration, but that Gilbert's Trails Master Plan identified that equestrian activity is more focused around Lindsay Road and the southern part of Gilbert. Kristin noted that the overpass would be AASHTO compliant and will have a 12-foot fencing height in the pedestrian area, and would likely accommodate horse riders, depending on the height of the horse. Mike Gillespie asked what accommodations for access to the school were provided. Kristin noted that Gilbert had completed a feasibility study to address school access with a spiral bridge, but even that would not allow seamless access. There would still be conflicts resulting from being too close to the railroad right-of-way and tracks.

Purab Adabala from Glendale presented on the Camelback Road, 79th Ave to 83rd Ave Sidewalk Improvements Project. Following the presentation, Purab addressed clarifying questions that had previously been submitted during the application review process. A question was asked about whether the sidewalk would be detached from the curb. Purab noted that the goal is to have a buffer between the sidewalk and the curb, but that Glendale must take into consideration the existing utility lines. A question was asked about whether Camelback Road would include bike lanes. Purab answered that no bike lanes were planned at this point, but that Glendale is currently updating the City's transportation plan, and as part of that, Camelback Road is being analyzed for future bike lanes. Brandon Forrey asked what the width of the existing sidewalk on the north side of Camelback is. Purab stated that the north-side sidewalk is likely a 5-foot wide sidewalk. Brandon asked if the intent of this project was to match the existing width or to provide additional width on the south side. Purab replied that the intent of the project is to match the existing sidewalk width.

Purab Adabala from Glendale presented on the Paradise Lane, 55th Avenue to 59th Avenue Sidewalk Improvements Project. There were no questions from the Committee on this project.

Purab Adabala from Glendale presented on the SR101L, Bethany Home Rd to Maryland Ave Pathway Improvements Project. Following the presentation, Purab addressed clarifying questions that had previously been submitted during the application review process. A question was asked about what Glendale needs to do to obtain an easement from ADOT for the project. Purab replied that an existing easement with ADOT will be used to connect to Maryland Ave on the north. Brandon Forrey asked if there was an exhibit showing how the Grand Canal path connects to the New River path. Purab did not have an exhibit available, but described that the Grand Canal path would follow on the north side of Bethany Home, cross 99th Ave with a signal, and utilize an existing access road to connect to the New River path at the 107th Ave alignment. Jose Macias asked Purab to clarify how Glendale describes multi-use trails. Purab replied that in Glendale, multi-use means non-motorized, primarily bicycle riders and pedestrians. Equestrians do not prefer paved surfaces, and Glendale does not provide

separate unpaved surfaces with their multi-use trails, so equestrians are not generally included in Glendale's multi-use trail plans.

Purab Adabala from Glendale presented on the 67th Avenue and Orangewood Avenue Sidewalk Improvements Project. There were no questions from the Committee on this project.

Purab Adabala from Glendale presented on the 71st Avenue and Orangewood Avenue Roadway Improvements Project. Following the presentation, Susan Conklu asked if Purab could provide average daily traffic (ADT) numbers directly along the corridors. Purab replied the two corridors are both collectors and do not have high volumes, and that the traffic volumes that were collected were for the nearest arterial roadway, 67th Ave. Mike Sanders asked whether there was a high school nearby. Purab replied there is a high school at 63rd and Myrtle. Near the high school, a HAWK beacon was recently completed there, and a Safe Routes to School project is being advertised currently for construction bids. Jose Macias asked if there were future plans to put bike lanes on Orangewood or 71st Ave. Purab replied that Glendale typically puts bike lanes on all collectors and half-miles so these two roads would be good candidates. Bike lanes have not yet been installed in part due to missing curbs on these two roadways.

Mark Venti from Mesa presented on the Southeast Pathway (Phase 2): Elliot Road to Hawes Road Project. Following the presentation, Mark addressed clarifying questions that had previously been submitted during the application review process. A question was asked about what coordination had been undertaken with ADOT for this project. Mark replied that extensive coordination had taken place between Mesa and ADOT over many years to develop Phase 1 of the corridor. Mesa and ADOT have extended that relationship moving south to the design of Phases 2 and 3. Susan Conklu asked what the population density is in the corridor, as it looked like there was a mistake in the application. Jim Hash from Mesa noted that he would send updated information on population density to the Committee.

Mark Venti from Mesa presented on the South Canal Shared Use Path: Consolidated Canal Shared Use Path to McDowell Road Project. Mark noted the speed limit on McKellips is 45mph. Susan Conklu asked how much of the original design could be used for this project. Mark replied that everything would need to be looked at for current standards and updated surveys, but that most of the existing design should be able to be utilized. Susan asked what traffic volumes are like on McKellips Road. Mark replied that volumes were in the mid-20,000s. Once the 202 was built, volumes on McKellips Road really dropped. Mesa is working to enact lane reductions on some arterials and McKellips Road might be a good candidate. It is still a major arterial.

Mark Venti from Mesa presented on the Southeast Mesa Shared Use Path (Phase 3): Power Road to Hawes Road Project. Kristin Myers asked what exactly would happen with the path at the RWCD canal. Mark noted the path would climb along the existing ADOT ramp berm and then come back down after going over the RWCD canal. RWCD wanted Mesa to match the elevation ADOT provided over the RWCD canal. Jose asked if the path was located on county land. Mark replied that all right of way is within the ADOT right of way, and not in county land. Jim Hash noted that the County would still be included within the design process, but that all of the right of way is owned by ADOT. Mike Gillespie asked whether access to adjacent properties would be provided as part of the projects. Mark noted that a discussion on that would occur during the design phase, and provided an example from the previous phase. Kristin noted that one of ADOT's strategic goals is to become more multi-modal and that should be emphasized with this project.

Brandon Forrey from Peoria presented on the 83rd Avenue Sidewalk and Bike Lanes Project. Susan Conklu asked what transportation improvements would be required by the developer in the future and whether this project would be able to stay when developer improvements come in. Brandon replied that 36 feet of new asphalt would be paved with this project, and that when a developer comes in, there would be 28 feet of asphalt on each side. So the outer eight feet would likely be removed when full improvements arrive. The sidewalk would stay in place on the west side, though if development comes in on the west side, they may be required to provide larger sidewalks up to eight feet wide and possibly detached. Raquel asked if design has started yet and what the funding source for design is. Brandon noted that the construction would be in the fiscal year 2018 capital improvement program, and that the project has support from Council and management. Local funds would be used for design, but are not secured yet. Susan asked if getting federal funding for a project helps get design funding secured. Brandon replied that it does help.

Brandon Forrey from Peoria presented on the New River Multi-Use Path: Pinnacle Peak Road to Happy Valley Road Project. There were no questions from the Committee on this project.

Jeremy Knapp and Dawn Marie Buckland from Paradise Valley presented on the Lincoln Drive Sidewalk Expansion Project. Susan asked about the vacant property shown in segment five and whether there could be sidewalks done in that section by the developer. Jeremy replied that the proposed project is on the south side, and that the developer on the north side will provide sidewalks when they go in.

Troy White from Queen Creek presented on the Queen Creek Wash Trail Extension Project. One of the clarifying questions that had previously been submitted asked why Queen Creek was using asphalt instead of cement. Troy replied that asphalt is immediately added to Queen Creek's pavement preservation program for maintenance, just as if it were a roadway, so it will be very well maintained. Jose asked who owns the land on which the project would be built. Troy replied that a small portion of the corridor is privately owned, but the Town of Queen Creek owns the majority of it. The private landowners are very supportive of the trail system and want to be a part of it.

Teri Kennedy thanked the committee members for their diligence in evaluating a long list of applications, and said that MAG could not do this without the Committee. At the November meeting, the Committee will hear the remaining presentations and finish evaluating projects. At that time, the CMAQ Air Quality score will be provided to the Committee. The Committee will address programming scenarios at the December meeting after all Committee comments and scores are turned in. At the conclusion of the programming process, MAG will come back to the Committee, ask how the process went, and see if there are things that can be done to improve the project evaluation, and possibly split up the review of projects in the future to make it easier on the Committee.

6. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Jim Hash indicated that members of the Committee had the opportunity to request future agenda items to appear before the Committee. Michael Sanders requested an update from MAG on the "Spine" study.

7. Next Meetings

All meetings will be on the third Tuesday of the month in the Ironwood Room at **1:00 p.m.**, except

where otherwise noted.

Tuesday, November 17, 2015 (**10:00 a.m.**)

Tuesday, December 15, 2015 (**possibly noon**)

Chair Jim Hash adjourned the meeting at 1:27 p.m.