

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 27, 2015

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Avondale: Jessica Blazina for David Fitzhugh
*ADOT: Brent Cain
*Apache Junction: Giao Pham
#Buckeye: Scott Lowe
*Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell
Chandler: Dan Cook, Vice Chair
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum
*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
*Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi
Gila River Indian Community: Tim Oliver
Gilbert: Leah Hubbard
Glendale: Debbie Albert
*Goodyear: Cato Esquivel
Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten

Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson
Maricopa County: Clem Ligocki for Jennifer Toth
#Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
*Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
*Peoria: Andrew Granger
Phoenix: Ray Dovalina
#Pinal County: Louis Andersen
Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Scottsdale: Paul Basha
Surprise: Mike Gent
Tempe: Shelly Seyler
Valley Metro: Abhi Dayal for John Farry
*Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
#Youngtown: Grant Anderson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Maria Deeb, City of Mesa
*ITS Committee: Marshall Riegel, City of Phoenix
*FHWA: Ed Stillings
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

* Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Jim Hash, City of Mesa
* Transportation Safety Committee: Renate Ehm, City of Mesa

+ - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

John Bullen, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Chaun Hill, MAG
Teri Kennedy, MAG
David Massey, MAG
Marc Pearsall, MAG
Nathan Pryor, MAG
Brian Rubin, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG
Stephen Tate, MAG

Jenny Bixey, Jacobs
Tony Humphrey, Phoenix
Carlos Lopez, ADOT
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Randall Overmyer, The CK Group, Inc.
Brent Stoddard, Glendale
Todd Taylor, Scottsdale
Chris Turner-Noteware, Phoenix
Paul Waung, POINT Engineers
Heather Wilkey, Gilbert
George Williams, Scottsdale
Vamshi Yellisetty, Jacobs

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Dan Cook called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Vice Chair Cook noted that the quorum requirement for the August 27, 2015 Transportation Review Committee meeting was 13 committee members. Vice Chair Cook informed the committee that there were two handouts at the table.

2. Approval of Draft July 23, 2015 Minutes

Vice Chair Cook asked the committee if there were any comments on the draft July 23, 2015, meeting minutes. Mr. Scott Lowe noted that Mr. Jose Heredia had been present in person at the July meeting as his proxy and requested the attendance be corrected to reflect this. Mr. Mohamed Youssef moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Mike Gent seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no public comments from the audience.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Vice Chair Cook invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Anderson congratulated Phoenix on the passage of Proposition 104 and noted that it will provide a major source of revenue.

Mr. Anderson stated that Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues for June were up 4.8% compared to the previous year, which corresponds to an increase of 3.7% over what was estimated. He noted that revenues have still not returned to 2007 levels, but are close. He stated that revenues were \$391 million in 2007 and \$382 million this year, and that he expects revenues to exceed 2007 levels next year.

Mr. Anderson stated that Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenues were up 4% compared to the previous year. He stated that total revenue was \$1.2 billion and noted that 4% growth compares favorably to the estimated 1.6% growth projected by ADOT. He noted that increased revenues are fueled by lower gas prices and higher levels of travel. He stated that oil is around \$40 per barrel and that the price of gas may be down to \$2 per gallon by September.

Mr. Anderson stated that he participated in the East Valley Partnership discussion recently. He stated that negotiations on education funding fell apart on Tuesday. He stated that the chair of the Senate Transportation Committee spoke, who said that all currently available revenue will be allocated to education. He stated that there is no inclination to raise taxes, but that given where gas prices are, there may be an opportunity to extend the sales tax to gasoline at the wholesale level. He stated that if that does happen, how it will be allocated is yet to be worked out, but that revenue would be limited to roads and streets purposes under

the state constitution. He stated that he has heard about something in the works from the Governor's office and that there may be news next month, but he does not know what is being discussed.

Mr. Anderson stated that PARC in Ahwatukee and the Gila River Indian Community have filed suit to stop the South Mountain Freeway. He stated that in the court session the previous day, a schedule was laid out that should yield a decision in April or May 2016. He noted that construction is currently scheduled to begin in May 2016. He stated that right-of-way acquisition is continuing and that demolition has begun on homes owned by ADOT.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG staff are continuing to work on the Regional Freeway and Highway Program rebalancing. He stated that new revenue forecasts should be available from ADOT in October and a new cash flow model should be available in November incorporating corrections to errors and the closeout of projects which had been maintained in the cash flow model despite being completed. He noted that revised budgets based on the cost risk assessment process will be incorporated, which have provided a couple hundred million dollars in savings. He stated that the final piece is the guaranteed maximum price on the South Mountain Freeway project. He stated that hopefully there will be a revised program in place for consideration by MAG committees in spring of 2016.

Mr. Anderson stated that nominations for the vice chair of the Transportation Review Committee will be opening up. He noted that Mr. David Fitzhugh will be stepping down as chair and Vice Chair Dan Cook will become the new chair. He stated that a notice would be sent to the Committee members.

Vice Chair Cook thanked Mr. Anderson for his report.

5. Consent Agenda

Vice Chair Cook directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda items.

Vice Chair Cook asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Grant Anderson requested that in the future the Committee be provided with a list of the projects which did not receive funding as part of the memorandum. Mr. Eric Anderson responded that this will be provided in the future.

Mr. Grant Anderson moved to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Jorge Gastelum seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

5A – MAG Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Design Assistance Program

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, recommended funding the seven top ranked projects for the Design Assistance Program.

6. Request for 2nd Deferral of the City of Phoenix Multiuse Path Project at Indian School Road and the Grand Canal

Vice Chair Cook invited Ms. Teri Kennedy to introduce and Mr. Tony Humphrey of the City of Phoenix to present this item.

Ms. Kennedy stated that there are four items in the MAG policies and procedures that must be met for a request for a second deferral. She stated that the agency must specifically address the problems with the project that were outside of the agency's control, demonstrate commitment to the project, provide a revised schedule, and address how the revised schedule will address the problem.

Mr. Tony Humphrey stated that he is the engineering supervisor for design and construction management for the City of Phoenix, and that he was present to discuss the second deferral process. He stated that his goals were to discuss the importance of the project and to briefly discuss what happened and what the City plans to do to move forward.

Mr. Humphrey stated that the importance of this project is safety and connectivity for the Grand Canal project. He stated that it is vital to provide a safe crossing at 16th Street and Indian School Road. He stated that currently there is funding available from SRP for aesthetic improvements.

Mr. Humphrey stated that the Grand Canal is a unique corridor for recreational users and commuters. He noted that the canal overlaps the major arterial network and light rail system. He noted in his presentation the connectivity point to provide a safe crossing at that location.

Mr. Humphrey provided an overview of the amenities surrounding the intersection. He noted on the southwest corner there is a park and a recreation center, Madison Middle School and the Phoenix Indian Medical Center on the northwest corner, and that a shopping center and a charter school are also nearby. He stated that there is a lot of pedestrian activity at the intersection.

Mr. Humphrey presented some images of the roads and noted that traffic volumes are around 40,000 vehicles per day on Indian School Road and around 28,000 vehicles per day on 16th Street.

Mr. Humphrey stated that the City considered a HAWK signal crossing but that this did not meet guidelines due to the proximity of the intersection.

Mr. Humphrey presented a picture of Indian School Road looking eastbound and noted the presence of a bus bay and a heavily used transit stop. He stated that at peak boarding times there is a queue and with the existing design the queue would create problems for users of the Grand Canal trail. He presented an image of 16th Street looking west and noted there is limited space to add amenities within the existing right-of-way. He stated that they would like to provide landscaping to show the distinction between the trail and space for the bus stop.

Mr. Humphrey presented a plan of the right of way location, highlighting the location of the planned 10-foot pathway with a 4 foot separation. He noted that they would be acquiring right of way from the Phoenix Indian Medical Center. He stated that they initially received

notice to proceed in 2012 and that the first deferral occurred from 2014 to 2015 because the City did not do the required public outreach. He stated that as the project work proceeded, they realized the difficulty in acquiring right of way from the hospital. He stated that since the first deferral, the City has done public outreach and gained the support of the community for the project.

Mr. Humphrey stated that they have made contact with private property owners and Indian Health Services (IHS). He stated that IHS has unique procedures and they are not often approached for acquiring land, so there is a learning curve for both sides.

Mr. Humphrey presented a new timeframe for the project showing the anticipated completion of right of way acquisition in March 2017 with 100% plans by April 2017 and a contract awarded by September 15, 2017. He presented the project funding for each phase, showing locally funded design and right-of-way acquisition and CMAQ funded construction.

Mr. Humphrey summarized his presentation, noting the major issue of the right-of-way acquisition process on Indian lands and the City's objective to meet with the Indian Community to meet the new timeline. He stated that the City is committed to the project and has local funding available as identified. He added that there is neighborhood and community support for this project. He stated that they are asking for a two year deferral.

Mr. Scott Lowe moved to recommend approval of a second deferral by the City of Phoenix to FY 2017 for the Multiuse Path project at Indian School Road and the Grand Canal. Mr. Ray Dovalina seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Valley Path Brand & Wayfinding Signage Guidelines

Vice Chair Cook invited Mr. Alex Oreschak to present this item.

Mr. Oreschak stated that in November 2012, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee requested a project to identify regional wayfinding guidelines and identify a brand for the off-street network. In May 2013, Regional Council approved a work program which included this project. In November 2013, the Regional Council Executive Committee approved Alta Planning as the consultant. The study was a 14 month study which reviewed best practices and national standards, inventoried existing local ordinances and Salt River Project policies regarding canals, developed regional wayfinding sign guidelines and a brand for the regional off-street path network, and created an implementation plan.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the consultant did extensive outreach with MAG member agencies on brand development, including field visits, existing conditions and signage, and determination of current challenges to navigating the system. He presented an example of a brand identity activity which the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee participated in.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the consultant presented five initial brand concepts, which the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee initially narrowed to three, and then chose the "Valley Path" brand with Arizona colors and a silhouette of Camelback Mountain.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the Committee requested the consultant provide guidelines showing the purpose of different types of signage, what the signs would look like, and where they would be placed. He presented various examples of signs from the guidelines. He stated that a logo panel was developed to integrate the brand into existing wayfinding signage being used by member agencies.

Mr. Oreschak presented some examples of pedestrian-oriented signage for trailheads and neighborhood access to paths. He stated that each sign has standard details available for height, colors, text, and materials so that it will be easy for sign shops to reproduce signs to standard specifications. He stated that the guidelines include the usage of standard signage materials in use by member agencies but also provide for optional enhancements to the signage.

Mr. Oreschak stated that the consultant developed situational diagrams with six examples in the guide. He presented an example situation of a gap in the network. He showed where decision signs, turn signs, and confirmation signs could be placed. He noted that there is a common situation where a path that follows a canal or a wash needs to go above or below the street level with a spur connecting to the street itself. He presented locations and designs for signage on the bridge and at the street.

Mr. Oreschak presented an overview of the implementation plan as prepared by the consultant. Jurisdictions would develop wayfinding master plans, including an inventory of the network, signage, and destinations, placement of signs, cost estimates, and phasing. He added that near-term pilot projects are another option for implementation.

Vice Chair Cook asked if the final report will be available for jurisdictions. Mr. Oreschak responded that the draft report is available on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee's website and that the final report will be sent out once final approval is received from Regional Council.

Vice Chair Cook stated that many cities have their own sign shops and computerized design work. He asked if computer graphics will be available so each jurisdiction is able to develop the same brand. Mr. Oreschak responded that each of the standard details in the report will be made available in digital form. He stated that he did not know which specific format would be used but that this information will be provided.

Mr. Mike Gent moved to recommend acceptance of the Valley Path Brand & Wayfinding Signage Guidelines final report. Ms. Leah Hubbard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

8. ADOT Passenger Rail Study: Tucson To Phoenix Update

Vice Chair Cook invited Mr. Carlos Lopez of ADOT to present this item.

Mr. Lopez provided some background on how the passenger rail study was developed. He stated that in 2010, the Building a Quality Arizona (BQAZ) transportation framework identified transportation needs out to the year 2050, and the tone of the major findings was

the need for transportation alternatives, especially in the Sun Corridor. He stated that one of the main products was a state rail plan identifying a vision for passenger rail in the state.

Mr. Lopez presented a map identifying a passenger rail corridor linking Nogales to Tucson to Phoenix along with connections to neighboring states. He stated that the state rail plan identified Tucson-Phoenix as the first portion to be implemented and that they are studying a 120 mile corridor in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima Counties. He stated that the study is being led by the Federal Railroad Administration and that the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration are also working closely on this study. He stated that a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is the main product of this study and presented differences between a Tier 1 EIS and a project level document.

Mr. Lopez stated that the first goal in the Tier 1 EIS effort was to identify the purpose and need of the project. He stated that from BQAZ, transportation alternatives were identified as a need due to anticipated growth in population and employment, which would lead to travel demand. He stated that currently it takes about 2 hours to travel from downtown, which is projected to increase to 2.5 hours by 2035 and over 3 hours in 2050 with all currently planned projects. He noted that the only high capacity facility between Phoenix and Tucson currently is Interstate 10, and that to provide an efficient and reliable transportation system, this study looks at working with I-10 to provide other alternatives for travel within the corridor.

Mr. Lopez presented three final corridor alternatives as determined in the study. He stated that the study is looking at a blend between regional and interregional service. He presented slides comparing the three alternates on projected ridership and cost. He stated that there is a need to provide a route that blends and balances travel time and access to activity centers such as airports, universities, and major downtown areas. He stated that service would be broken down into commuter service, which would access all stations, and intercity service, which would skip some stations.

Mr. Lopez stated that for public outreach they have collected surveys from the public and attended events asking for input from the public. He stated that the yellow alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative between Phoenix and Tucson, and that close to half of surveys received identified the yellow route as preferred.

Mr. Lopez stated that the schedule and next steps include publishing the draft environmental study for public review pending federal approval. He noted that this would include the process, feedback received, and recommendation for input. He stated that there are public hearings planned in Phoenix, Tucson, and Coolidge which would occur in September pending Federal approval. If there are delays in receiving Federal approval, the hearings would be pushed to October. He stated that the goal is to conclude the final environmental study this year with a recommended corridor and implementation plan.

Mr. Lopez stated that there is no funding identified for future studies. He stated that the next step is to do a project specific environmental study that would include exact alignments and station locations, and that this step is pending the identification of funding for the study.

Mr. Paul Jepson stated that ADOT had done a lot of outreach, and a route serving the City of Maricopa was not chosen. Mr. Lopez responded that ADOT had received input from the Gila River Indian Community and that there were many challenges on the green alternative. He noted that the existing right of way does not provide enough room for a passenger rail system. He stated that the vision for the system was to be located adjacent to the existing right of way, which would include many challenges with impacts to cultural properties and allotted parcels. He stated that while nothing had been finalized from the federal agency standpoint, the green alternative has a low likelihood of being selected due to the challenges.

Mr. Jepson stated that the yellow alternative also has right of way challenges. Mr. Lopez responded that it follows an existing corridor owned by the Union Pacific Railroad and that future studies would have to identify opportunities to lease or purchase right of way or build adjacent to the existing railroad.

Ms. Debbie Albert asked how the alternatives had been narrowed to three. Mr. Lopez responded that the effort had included public outreach, a technical analysis including cost and projected ridership, and a high level environmental analysis. He stated that the other alternatives were eliminated due to low support from the public and low support from the technical analysis. He stated that the three alternatives that were carried forward showed an advantage in terms of travel time, projected ridership, and support from the public.

Mr. Jeff Martin asked about the next steps and whether it will include a recommendation to study airport connections, noting that both Sky Harbor and Mesa Gateway airports have asked for a study. Mr. Lopez responded that airport connections will be studied in the next steps. He noted that FRA has strongly encouraged multimodal connections, and that a passenger rail system will link to airports, light rail, streetcar, and bus routes.

Mr. Mohamed Youssef asked whether the yellow route would be a new rail line located next to the Union Pacific rail line and if there was any possibility of using the Union Pacific line, noting major cost savings versus a projected \$5 billion cost. Mr. Lopez responded that there is the option of a future passenger rail system on existing freight tracks. He noted that there are challenges. Union Pacific has developed commuter rail policies for working with passenger rail agencies stating that passenger rail systems would be separate from freight tracks. He stated that the justification includes conflicts with serving freight customers, and that separate from the policies, conflicts with freight traffic would impact efficient operation. He added that nothing has been determined whether passenger rail would be separate from the freight tracks or not. He stated that the corridor itself has been identified but not the specific details.

Vice Chair Cook thanked Mr. Lopez for his presentation.

9. Scottsdale's Northsight Roundabout

Vice Chair Cook invited Mr. George Williams of the City of Scottsdale to present this item.

Mr. Williams stated that he is providing an overview of the Northsight roundabout, which is Scottsdale's first arterial roundabout and has been open for the last year and a half. He

stated that the roundabout is located in the Scottsdale airpark near the northeast corner of Loop 101. He stated that the City started out with a lot of options, which were narrowed down to two: the Northsight extension versus the Hayden Boulevard realignment. He stated that the City moved forward with the Northsight extension due to a lower cost and smaller impact.

Mr. Williams presented the alignment of the Northsight extension, noting the addition of a signalized intersection at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and the Northsight Boulevard extension. He noted that the intersection of Hayden and Northsight was a critical decision point for northbound traffic.

Mr. Williams stated that they thought a roundabout would work much better in that location and that they had to explain to the public what a roundabout is and compare it to older style rotaries and traffic circles. He presented an example of a roundabout replacing an old rotary, noting the removal of high speed weaving areas in favor of slower speeds. He stated that with signalized intersections there are 32 conflict points where roundabouts have only eight. He added that signalized intersections have conflict speeds of 30-50 miles per hour with higher crash severities at those speeds. He stated that they discussed a number of studies showing reductions in collisions and significant reductions in fatalities and injuries. He noted that there are fewer conflict points for pedestrians, and that the lower speeds decreases pedestrian accident severity.

Mr. Williams stated that as they were looking at the design, they determined a signalized intersection would require more right of way than a roundabout. He stated that they initially presented the project to the City Council as an informational item with no voting and it seemed to do well. He stated that they returned a couple months later for a vote on the design contract and the wife of a nearby property owner had organized a campaign against the roundabout and the council voted to remove the roundabout from the project.

Mr. Williams stated that at a later meeting a council member who had voted against the roundabout wished to bring it back for discussion, and the council then voted to return the roundabout to the project. He added that a third vote to remove the roundabout failed.

Mr. Williams presented some before and after views of the intersection. He stated that they only have a year and a half of data for performance. He stated that there has been a slight increase in crashes and a 28 percent increase in vehicles per day. He noted that there has been a 79% increase in the overall injury rate at the intersection, with an 84% decrease in the injury rate by volume.

Mr. Williams stated that the real goal of the project was to reduce the number of left turns at Hayden and Frank Lloyd Wright. He stated that they hoped to split this traffic to allow for more green time on Frank Lloyd Wright to help with the progression at the Loop 101 interchange. He presented peak volumes and before and after comparison of travel times.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that he was skeptical, but the results speak for themselves. He congratulated Scottsdale and stated that the project demonstrated the benefit of a properly

designed, properly located roundabout. He noted the improvement of safety with a reduction in injuries.

Mr. Ray Dovalina asked what Mr. Williams would change about the public outreach process. Mr. Williams responded that he would make sure that all nearby owners or partial owners are involved. He suggested having a study session with the city council to find out what their concerns were. He stated that an expert consultant presented to the transportation commission and that after the presentation, the members with concerns were almost silent. He stated that it is important to have an expert come in and that the project should be designed right the first time. He encouraged any municipality to bring in an expert to help them through the process.

Mr. Paul Jepson stated that the roundabout appears to have a large diameter and asked how it compares to the roundabouts at I-17 and Happy Valley Road. Mr. Williams responded that the Northsight roundabout is about 185 feet in diameter. He stated that he was not sure about the Happy Valley Road roundabouts and added that that area has a lot of challenges, as there was originally a two lane frontage road in an area with a population unfamiliar with roundabouts. He stated that speeds coming into those roundabouts are not as slow as they should be so people are making decisions at higher speeds than they should be. He added that he likes to provide a visual obstruction so people do not see through the middle of the roundabout and focus on the left or right.

Mr. Woody Scoutten stated that roundabouts are usually pretty pedestrian unfriendly and asked how this was dealt with. Mr. Williams responded that there is that perception and concern. He stated that pedestrians do well when traffic speeds are low. He stated that speeds should be down to 20 miles per hour. He noted that pedestrians are crossing two legs of the roundabout at the most, whereas at traditional signals pedestrians have to cross the full width of the road and deal with right turns and left turns. He added that he has talked to business owners in the area who have told him that their employees will cross the street for lunch in that area.

Mr. Mohamed Youssef stated that the contractor pictures showed a level of service A with the roundabout and level of service F with the signal. Mr. Williams responded that there was not a formal level of service study, but that they predicted A or B with the roundabout compared to E before the project.

Vice Chair Cook thanked Mr. Williams for his presentation.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

11. Member Agency Update

There were no updates from member agencies.

12. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, October 1, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 a.m.