

December 2, 2014

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Safety Committee

FROM: Renate Ehm, City of Mesa, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, December 9, 2014 - 9:30 a.m.  
MAG Office Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Ironwood Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Safety Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members or their proxies may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

Please park in the garage under the MAG building, bring your ticket, parking will be validated. For those using transit, Valley Metro/RPTA will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Transportation Safety Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

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 Jason Stephens at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions regarding the meeting, please contact Sarath Joshua at (602) 254-6300.

## TENTATIVE AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call To Order

For the December 9, 2014 meeting, the quorum requirement is 12 committee members.

2. Approval of September 23, 2014 Meeting Minutes

3. Call to Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Safety 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 members request 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.

4. Program Managers Report

The following items will be addressed:

- Status of RSA and PA projects
- STSP Update - TSSG Meeting to be held immediately after this meeting
- 2016 UPWP
- 2015 Meeting Dates - Attachment One

5. Network Screening Methodology for Intersections

At the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the committee reviewed a recommendation, related to the MAG Network Screening Methodology, that is documented in the Technical Memorandum No. 4 of the Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (STSP). The STSP project team, consisting of Lee Engineering LLC & Texas

2. Review and approve minutes of the Meeting held on September 23, 2014.

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information, discussion and possible action to modify the MAG Network Screening Methodology (for intersections) by removing Crash Rates from the Intersection Safety Score formula and adjusting the weights as follows:  
Crash Frequency - 25 percent  
Crash Severity - 50 percent  
Crash Type - 25 percent

Transportation Institute staff, has recommended that crash rates should not be included in the methodology as it would create a biased outcome. The committee agreed on adopting this recommendation and requested that committee members be polled via e-mail to provide feedback for the weighting of the three factors. All responses received were in favor of the 25%, 50%, 25% weighting of the CF, CS, and CT, respectively. In preparation of the January 2015 RSA/PA call for projects, MAG staff has prepared the Top 100 list of high crash risk locations for 2011-2013 to demonstrate the revised methodology in comparison with the same list with the current methodology. These lists are included as Attachments Two and Three.

6. Corridor Safety Plan Pilot Project - Consultant Selection

Based on a recommendation by the committee, a new project was included in the MAG FY 2015 Work Program to conduct a pilot for developing a Corridor Safety Plan (CSP), with a budget of \$200,000. This pilot project will be similar to a Road Safety Assessment but would cover several miles of an urban arterial corridor with significant crash risk based on crash data for the most recent three years. This resulting CSP would address road safety issues related to all modes and users of the road system. The pilot project would identify potential countermeasures and strategies, including public information campaigns and increased enforcement for improving road safety. The Indian School Road corridor from 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue to 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue has been selected for this pilot project.

A Technical Advisory Group (TAG) helped refine the scope and also served as the evaluation team for reviewing proposals and recommending a consultant to perform this work.

6. For information, discussion and possible action to recommend the approval of the MAG On-Call Consultant, Michael Baker Jr. Inc for conducting the Corridor Safety Plan Pilot Project.

Four consultants from the current list of MAG ITS and Safety On-Call Consultants were invited to submit proposals in response to a Mini-RFP for the pilot project. Three of the firms submitted proposals. The TAG reviewed all three proposals and have unanimously recommended the team lead by, Michael Baker Jr Inc, for the pilot project.

Upon a recommendation by the committee this action will be submitted to the Management Committee for recommendation and final approval by the Regional Council in January 2015. It is anticipated that the Notice to Proceed would be issued in late February 2015.

7. Transportation Alternative (TA) Non-infrastructure Safe Routes To School

Oversight for programming Transportation Alternatives Non-infrastructure/Safe Routes to School or TA/SRTS projects has been assigned to the Transportation Safety committee. The annual program amount is \$400,000, and the next period to be programmed is FY2016 and FY2017. The oversight for TA Infrastructure projects will continue to be provided by the MAG Bike and Pedestrian Committee. The next call for projects will be issued in August 2015.

The next call for TA/SRTS projects is now planned for February 2015. Based on previous committee discussions, the following guidelines have been identified for the project application process:

- MAG member agencies will be the lead project applicants and will coordinate with all schools participating in the TA/SRTS projects
- Priority 1: Applications for conducting SRTS studies (addressing the scope to be described in a MAG SRTS study template) for K-8 schools. The maximum

7. For information and discussion.

amount for these TA/SRTS applications would be \$10,000 per school for a maximum of 10 schools per single application.

- Priority 2: Applications for conducting SRTS-related support activities (as listed in the list of eligible activities provided as Attachment Four). The maximum amount for these applications would be \$5,000 per school for a maximum of 10 schools per application.
- MAG will notify all public school districts within the MAG planning area regarding this upcoming call for projects.
- The maximum amount allowed in an application will be \$135,000

The above guidelines for TA/SRTS applications will be further reviewed and refined, as necessary, by the SRTS Working Group and presented to the committee at the January 2015 committee meeting.

8. Reports by Committee Members on Transportation Safety Activities

Members will be requested to report agency activities or current issues that are related to transportation safety.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Members will be provided the opportunity to suggest future agenda topics.

10. Next Meetings

The next regular scheduled Transportation Safety Committee meeting is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, January 27, 2015 at 9:30 a.m in the MAG Ironwood Room.

Adjournment

8. For information and discussion.

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information and discussion.

DRAFT MINUTES OF  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING

September 23, 2014  
Maricopa Association of Governments  
Ironwood Room, Suite 200  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave,  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Michael Duhamel for Linda Gorman,  
AAA Arizona  
Tom Burch, AARP  
\*Kohinoor Kar, ADOT  
#Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction  
Dana Chamberlin, City of Avondale  
Chris Lemka, City of Buckeye  
\*Martin Johnson, City of Chandler  
\*Bob Senita, City of El Mirage  
\*Kelly LaRosa, FHWA  
Erik Guderian, Town of Gilbert  
Kiran Guntupalli, City of Glendale  
\*Alberto Gutier, GOHS

#Hugh Bigalk, City of Goodyear  
Mazen Muradvich for Nicolaas Swart,  
Maricopa County  
Renate Ehm (Chair), City of Mesa  
\*Jeremy Knapp, Town of Paradise Valley  
#Mannar Tamirisa for Jamal Rahimi,  
City of Peoria  
Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix  
George Williams, City of Scottsdale  
Suneel Garg for Mike Mecham,  
City of Surprise  
#Steve Horstman for Julian Dresang,  
City of Tempe  
\*Sam Diggins, RPTA

OTHERS PRESENT

Sarath Joshua, MAG  
Margaret Boone, MAG  
Eric Nava, MAG  
Micah Henry, MAG  
Jothan Samuelson, Wilson  
Maria Deeb, City of Mesa

John Willet, CivTech  
Mike Blankenship, AMEC  
Tim Wolfe, Dibble  
Susan Chambers, Dibble  
Shanthi Krishnan, Jacobs  
Natalie Carrick, Michael Baker

\* Not present or represented by proxy

# Participated by teleconference

+ Participated by videoconference

1. Call to Order  
Chair Renate Ehm called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.
2. Approval of July 22, 2014 Meeting Minutes  
Chair Renate Ehm called for a motion to approve the July 22, 2014. Kerry Wilcoxon made a motion to approve the amended minutes, Chris Lemka seconded and the motion passed unanimously.
3. Call to Audience  
Chair Renate Ehm made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the Transportation Safety Committee. None requested.
4. Program Manager's Report
  - Status of RSA and PA projects: Sarath Joshua provided an update on the RSA and PAs scheduled for FY2014. Two RSAs in the City of Phoenix and one in the Town of Gilbert have been completed with Draft Reports anticipated to be delivered in the next few weeks. One RSA in the City of Phoenix and two RSAs for Valley Metro in the City of Tempe are due to be completed in October, and one RSA in each the Town of Guadalupe, the City of Phoenix, and the City of Glendale are scheduled for November. Sarath noted that the November Phoenix and Glendale RSA had been rescheduled from September due to the major storm event which occurred the week before. Three PA projects are underway and all are due to be completed by the end of January 2015.
  - Corridor Safety Program Pilot Project: Sarath Joshua asked Margaret Boone to update the committee on this item. Margaret Boone reported that this item which came before the committee in a prior meeting would be similar to an RSA that would include segments and intersections of the corridor of Indian School Road from 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue to 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This Pilot Project would address all modes of transportation for all users, ages and abilities. The recommendations that may come from the plan could compete for HSIP infrastructure or TA non-infrastructure funding and would address the 4E's of safety. A working group was formed to refine the scope based on previous committee input. This project is programmed in the MAG Work Program with a budget of \$200,000 and would be completed by a MAG Safety On-call consultant. The next steps are to finalize the scope and issue a mini RFP to be forwarded to up to four consultants to submit proposals. The selection of the consultant is anticipated to be approved through the MAG process by February, 2015 and work would begin in March, 2015.
  - Vice Chair: Sarath Joshua reported that MAG Executive Committee appointed Dana Chamberlain from the City of Avondale as the new Transportation Safety Committee Vice Chair.
5. Network Screening Methodology for Intersections  
Renate Ehm noted the agenda item was a follow up item from the previous meeting based on a recommendation from the consultant working on the Strategic Transportation Safety Plan to revise the Network Screening Methodology previously approved by this committee. Sarath Joshua introduced this item stating the history of how the methodology came to be used at MAG as approved by the committee and that as part of the Strategic

Transportation Safety Plan the consultant was tasked with review of the current methodology for consistency with recent safety research. As a result, Karen Dixon from Texas Transportation Institute has recommended exclusion of the crash rate factor to eliminate known biases and reduce redundancy. The committee requested that MAG provide an example to compare the 3-factor ranking and the 4-factor ranking. Sarath asked Margaret to review the comparison provided to the committee and requested that the committee provide a recommendation based on today's discussion. Margaret Boone reviewed the example provided as well as portions of the Technical Memorandum which included discussion of the methodology which stated that including the rate, which uses the crash frequency introduces redundancy. Ms. Boone explained the process of how crash rates are calculated, that not all of the information is available and that calculation would require some subjectivity. Ms. Boone further suggested that for what the methodology is used for at the regional planning level it should be a simple calculation of information easily obtained by MAG and the local agencies and then at the local level, agencies could still apply a rate for their own prioritization/analysis effort. Chris Lemka made an argument to retain the crash rate factor. Kerry Wilcoxon agreed with the difficulties obtaining volumes for the crash rate and that the City of Phoenix would still be using crash rate for their use based on the information they have. Renate Ehm noted that she is in favor of excluding the crash rate factor to increase consistency and the ability to have a consistent and easily obtained safety score for all 17,000 plus intersections. Sarath noted that the recommendation was based on how the rate is applied at the regional level, and stated that the 3-factor calculation is the only way MAG can provide a consistent basis for all 17,000 plus intersections in the region. Eric Guderian stated that in using the 3-factor calculation that local agencies have to take it another step in looking closer and wanted the opportunity to insert the crash rates for use in obtaining funding. Kiran Guntupalli pointed out that looking at Crash Type that severities are also included in that factor and that readjusting the weighting may be recommended. Renate pointed out the recommended weighting adjustment from Technical Memorandum #4 of 25%, 50%, 25% respectively for Crash Frequency, Crash Severity and Crash Type. Sarath noted an error in the agenda summary and the Technical Memorandum and noted that adjusting the weights is certainly an option. Eric Guderian added that increasing the weighting of crash frequency would address his concerns. Mr. Joshua suggested that we poll the committee via e-mail on weighing the factors and then come back at the next meeting for a committee recommendation. There were no objections to the suggestion to polling the committee and then bringing this item back at the November meeting.

6. Recommended Practices for Improving Safety

Sarath Joshua asked Margaret Boone to present this item noting that this was part of Task 5 and 6 in the development of the STSP to identify including safety in the MAG planning process. Ms. Boone gave a brief rundown of the status of the STSP development and requested comments on Tech Memo #7 by November 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Boone went on to describe the working group that was formed in partnership with members of the other MAG committees. The goal of the working group was to identify practices to address pedestrian, bicyclist and persons with disabilities safety in access to transit stops and stations. The working group activity was developed to address Action Areas developed earlier in the STSP process. Ms. Boone outlined the working group meetings and activities, which were attended by members of the MAG Transit, Bike and Ped, and Transportation Safety Committee, including Kerry Wilcoxon, Renate Ehm, and Julian Dresang. Ms. Boone

stated that the MAG Streets and Bike and Pedestrian Committees have already recommended approval of the proposed practices and then invited Kerry Wilcoxon to provide details on the practices recommended by the working group for the committee's discussion and possible recommendation of approval. Kerry Wilcoxon described the eight practices focusing on a recommended practice to encourage submittal of TIP projects that include safety elements, for improving safer access for all modes, by including safety as explicit project evaluation criteria for all TIP projects. Sarath Joshua noted that the recommendation that went to the Streets, Transit, and Bike and Pedestrian Committees. This is required from all technical committees who oversee programming projects in the TIP in order to amend the criteria for evaluating the various projects. Mr. Joshua noted that this committee would guide the other committees on how to include safety in their evaluation criteria but that those committees would have input as to the weighting of safety in their respective processes. Kiran Guntupalli stated that it would be a huge accomplishment to have safety included in all TIP projects and thanked MAG staff for taking the initiative. Sarath gave credit to this committee as being instrumental in this landmark effort to get support on the practice of including safety in every facet of the planning process for promotion into the Implementation Plan of the STSP. Margaret Boone stated that the action before the committee today is a recommendation of the approval of the entire list of practices recommended by the working group. **Chris Lemka made a motion to approve the list of eight practices as outlined by Kerry Wilcoxon, Dana Chamberlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

7. Reports by Committee Members on Transportation Safety Activities  
Chair Renate Ehm requested safety activity updates by members of the committee. None were heard.
8. Request for Future Agenda Items  
Chair Renate Ehm requested future agenda items. None were heard.
9. Next Meeting  
Chair Renate Ehm stated that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. in the Ironwood Room. Chris Lemka requested that MAG staff consider moving the November meeting due to many folks being on vacation for the Thanksgiving Holiday. Sarath Joshua agreed to look at moving the meeting.
10. Adjournment  
Chair Renate Ehm adjourned the meeting at 10:58 a.m.

**2015 MAG Meeting Schedule**  
**Transportation Safety Committee**  
**MAG Ironwood Room**

January 27, 2015	9:30 AM 10:30 AM	Transportation Safety Committee Strategic Plan – Stakeholders Group*
March 24, 2015	9:30 AM 10:30 AM	Transportation Safety Committee Strategic Plan – Stakeholders Group*
April 28, 2015	10:00 AM	Transportation Safety Committee
May 26, 2015	9:30 AM 10:30 AM	Transportation Safety Committee Corridor Safety Pilot Project Review*
July 28, 2015	9:30 AM 10:30 AM	Transportation Safety Committee Corridor Safety Pilot Project Review*
September 22, 2015	10:00 AM	Transportation Safety Committee
October 27, 2015	10:00 AM	Transportation Safety Committee
November 24, 2015	10:00 AM	Transportation Safety Committee

\* Meetings that do not need to be posted to the public but displayed on second floor monitors

## Top 100 High Crash Risk Intersections - 2011 through 2013 - Current 20/60/20 Weights

Rank	Agency	Location	Crashes	CF Score	CS Score	CT Score	Final Score
1	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & 7TH ST	80	0.48	1.00	0.36	0.77
2	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 43RD AVE	116	0.70	0.75	0.73	0.74
3	Avondale	MCDOWELL RD & DYSART RD	99	0.60	0.84	0.43	0.71
4	Phoenix	GREENWAY RD & 40TH ST	50	0.30	0.96	0.31	0.70
5	Glendale	NORTHERN AVE & 59TH AVE	124	0.75	0.70	0.63	0.70
6	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 51ST AVE	114	0.69	0.70	0.66	0.69
7	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 75TH AVE	96	0.58	0.78	0.51	0.68
8	Phoenix	PARADISE VILLAGE PKWY & CACTUS RD	43	0.26	0.92	0.34	0.68
9	Surprise	EL MIRAGE RD & BELL RD	54	0.33	0.92	0.27	0.67
10	Phoenix	GREENWAY PKWY & 16TH ST	33	0.20	0.97	0.23	0.67
11	Mesa	ELLSWORTH RD & BASELINE RD	46	0.28	0.92	0.29	0.66
12	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 19TH AVE	87	0.52	0.73	0.53	0.65
13	Glendale	OLIVE AVE & 59TH AVE	166	1.00	0.38	1.00	0.63
14	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 27TH AVE	87	0.52	0.68	0.49	0.61
15	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 44TH ST	107	0.64	0.61	0.58	0.61
16	Phoenix	BELL RD & 19TH AVE	98	0.59	0.62	0.59	0.61
17	Glendale	PEORIA AVE & 51ST AVE	89	0.54	0.67	0.48	0.60
18	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 32ND ST	90	0.54	0.66	0.48	0.60
19	Phoenix	UNION HILLS DR & CAVE CREEK RD	67	0.40	0.73	0.35	0.59
20	Glendale	BELL RD & 83RD AVE	135	0.81	0.57	0.40	0.59
21	Mesa	MCDOWELL RD & S 2020	17	0.10	0.90	0.07	0.57
22	Phoenix	UNION HILLS DR & 19TH AVE	77	0.46	0.64	0.44	0.57
23	Phoenix	BELL RD & 51ST AVE	73	0.44	0.68	0.33	0.56
24	Phoenix	BASELINE RD & 48TH ST	71	0.43	0.66	0.40	0.56
25	Tempe	RURAL RD & BROADWAY RD	105	0.63	0.58	0.42	0.56
26	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 16TH ST	77	0.46	0.60	0.50	0.56
27	Phoenix	GLENDALE AVE & 43RD AVE	77	0.46	0.62	0.43	0.55
28	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & 43RD AVE	59	0.36	0.65	0.38	0.54
29	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 7TH ST	85	0.51	0.56	0.48	0.54
30	Pinal County	PEART RD & JIMMIE KERR BLVD	10	0.06	0.86	0.04	0.54
31	Phoenix	PEORIA AVE & I 017	91	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.53
32	Mesa	DATE ST & 8TH ST	7	0.04	0.86	0.05	0.53
33	Tempe	HARDY DR & BASELINE RD	61	0.37	0.60	0.47	0.53
34	Phoenix	GRAND AVE & 39TH AVE	6	0.04	0.85	0.04	0.53
35	Phoenix	BELL RD & 43RD AVE	53	0.32	0.65	0.29	0.51
36	Phoenix	BUCKEYE RD & 35TH AVE	59	0.36	0.63	0.30	0.51
37	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 67TH AVE	122	0.73	0.36	0.71	0.50
38	Avondale	VAN BUREN ST & DYSART RD	93	0.56	0.52	0.37	0.50
39	Gilbert	VAL VISTA DR & ELLIOT RD	70	0.42	0.57	0.33	0.49
40	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & CENTRAL AVE	38	0.23	0.58	0.48	0.49
41	Chandler	RAY RD & MCCLINTOCK DR	73	0.44	0.56	0.30	0.49
42	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 43RD AVE	71	0.43	0.55	0.33	0.48
43	Peoria	UNION HILLS DR & 83RD AVE	67	0.40	0.58	0.26	0.48
44	Buckeye	YUMA RD & WATSON RD	56	0.34	0.58	0.34	0.48
45	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 35TH AVE	63	0.38	0.55	0.37	0.48
46	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 36TH ST	61	0.37	0.57	0.30	0.47
47	Mesa	GUADALUPE RD & ALMA SCHOOL RD	60	0.36	0.57	0.29	0.47
48	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & 48TH ST	50	0.30	0.60	0.23	0.47
49	Scottsdale	SCOTTSDALE RD & DYNAMITE BLVD	43	0.26	0.61	0.23	0.46
50	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & RURAL RD	114	0.69	0.33	0.62	0.46
51	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 40TH ST	59	0.36	0.54	0.34	0.46
52	Glendale	GLENDALE AVE & 75TH AVE	51	0.31	0.54	0.39	0.46
53	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & DOBSON RD	129	0.78	0.31	0.60	0.46

## Top 100 High Crash Risk Intersections - 2011 through 2013 - Current 20/60/20 Weights

54	Phoenix	VAN BUREN ST & 52ND ST	53	0.32	0.56	0.27	0.46
55	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 27TH AVE	54	0.33	0.57	0.24	0.45
56	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & I 017	57	0.34	0.53	0.31	0.45
57	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & HARDY DR	52	0.31	0.54	0.31	0.45
58	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 67TH AVE	119	0.72	0.30	0.60	0.44
59	Phoenix	HIGHLAND AVE & 16TH ST	46	0.28	0.54	0.30	0.44
60	Phoenix	HAPPY VALLEY RD & 67TH AVE	52	0.31	0.54	0.27	0.44
61	Tempe	MCCLINTOCK DR & BASELINE RD	61	0.37	0.51	0.30	0.44
62	Glendale	BELL RD & 75TH AVE	73	0.44	0.52	0.19	0.44
63	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 32ND ST	92	0.55	0.33	0.63	0.44
64	Glendale	BETHANY HOME RD & 47TH AVE	40	0.24	0.55	0.28	0.43
65	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & CENTRAL AVE	48	0.29	0.54	0.26	0.43
66	Glendale	GLENDALE AVE & 67TH AVE	82	0.49	0.30	0.77	0.43
67	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 44TH ST	52	0.31	0.52	0.28	0.43
68	Pinal County	OCOTILLO RD & GANTZEL RD	43	0.26	0.56	0.22	0.43
69	Phoenix	SHEA BLVD & 40TH ST	27	0.16	0.59	0.21	0.43
70	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & POWER RD	57	0.34	0.52	0.24	0.43
71	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & S 1010	48	0.29	0.53	0.25	0.42
72	Tempe	UNIVERSITY DR & RURAL RD	147	0.89	0.18	0.70	0.42
73	Mesa	BROADWAY RD & ALMA SCHOOL RD	38	0.23	0.56	0.21	0.42
74	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & HIGLEY RD	61	0.37	0.49	0.29	0.42
75	Tempe	BASELINE RD & I 0101	154	0.93	0.21	0.54	0.42
76	Chandler	WARNER RD & MCQUEEN RD	48	0.29	0.53	0.22	0.42
77	Phoenix	CAMELBACK RD & 20TH ST	48	0.29	0.51	0.29	0.42
78	Phoenix	BROADWAY RD & 19TH AVE	37	0.22	0.54	0.26	0.42
79	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 59TH AVE	113	0.68	0.29	0.54	0.42
80	Phoenix	TATUM BLVD & BELL RD	51	0.31	0.49	0.29	0.42
81	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 32ND ST	51	0.31	0.49	0.31	0.42
82	Gilbert	WARNER RD & LINDSAY RD	51	0.31	0.52	0.22	0.42
83	Phoenix	BROADWAY RD & 7TH ST	43	0.26	0.54	0.19	0.41
84	Scottsdale	MCDOWELL RD & GRANITE REEF RD	27	0.16	0.54	0.29	0.41
85	Phoenix	BETHANY HOME RD & 7TH AVE	43	0.26	0.53	0.20	0.41
86	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 67TH AVE	109	0.66	0.27	0.59	0.41
87	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 75TH AVE	86	0.52	0.33	0.50	0.40
88	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & LINDSAY RD	32	0.19	0.55	0.18	0.40
89	Phoenix	CAVE CREEK RD & CACTUS RD	44	0.27	0.51	0.20	0.40
90	Phoenix	THUNDERBIRD RD & 31ST AVE	25	0.15	0.56	0.16	0.40
91	Phoenix	VAN BUREN ST & 75TH AVE	29	0.17	0.57	0.13	0.40
92	Phoenix	CAMELBACK RD & 32ND ST	46	0.28	0.50	0.22	0.40
93	Phoenix	PEORIA AVE & 28TH DR	41	0.25	0.51	0.20	0.40
94	Mesa	GREENFIELD RD & BROWN RD	27	0.16	0.55	0.18	0.40
95	Scottsdale	THOMAS RD & HAYDEN RD	104	0.63	0.31	0.40	0.39
96	Phoenix	CENTRAL AVE & BROADWAY RD	35	0.21	0.52	0.18	0.39
97	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 40TH ST	34	0.20	0.50	0.23	0.39
98	Phoenix	BROADWAY RD & 35TH AVE	18	0.11	0.54	0.19	0.39
99	Glendale	THUNDERBIRD RD & 55TH AVE	40	0.24	0.47	0.25	0.38
100	Pinal County	GANTZEL RD & COMBS RD	39	0.23	0.51	0.16	0.38

## Top 100 High Crash Risk Intersections - 2011 through 2013 - 25/50/25 Proposed Weights

Rank	Agency	Location	Crashes	CF Score	CS Score	CT Score	Final Score
1	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 43RD AVE	116	0.70	0.75	0.73	0.74
2	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & 7TH ST	80	0.48	1.00	0.36	0.71
3	Glendale	NORTHERN AVE & 59TH AVE	124	0.75	0.70	0.63	0.70
4	Glendale	OLIVE AVE & 59TH AVE	166	1.00	0.38	1.00	0.69
5	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 51ST AVE	114	0.69	0.70	0.66	0.68
6	Avondale	MCDOWELL RD & DYSART RD	99	0.60	0.84	0.43	0.68
7	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 75TH AVE	96	0.58	0.78	0.51	0.66
8	Phoenix	GREENWAY RD & 40TH ST	50	0.30	0.96	0.31	0.63
9	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 19TH AVE	87	0.52	0.73	0.53	0.63
10	Phoenix	PARADISE VILLAGE PKWY & CACTUS RD	43	0.26	0.92	0.34	0.61
11	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 44TH ST	107	0.64	0.61	0.58	0.61
12	Surprise	EL MIRAGE RD & BELL RD	54	0.33	0.92	0.27	0.61
13	Phoenix	BELL RD & 19TH AVE	98	0.59	0.62	0.59	0.60
14	Mesa	ELLSWORTH RD & BASELINE RD	46	0.28	0.92	0.29	0.60
15	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 27TH AVE	87	0.52	0.68	0.49	0.59
16	Phoenix	GREENWAY PKWY & 16TH ST	33	0.20	0.97	0.23	0.59
17	Glendale	BELL RD & 83RD AVE	135	0.81	0.57	0.40	0.59
18	Glendale	PEORIA AVE & 51ST AVE	89	0.54	0.67	0.48	0.59
19	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 32ND ST	90	0.54	0.66	0.48	0.58
20	Tempe	RURAL RD & BROADWAY RD	105	0.63	0.58	0.42	0.55
21	Phoenix	UNION HILLS DR & CAVE CREEK RD	67	0.40	0.73	0.35	0.55
22	Phoenix	UNION HILLS DR & 19TH AVE	77	0.46	0.64	0.44	0.55
23	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 16TH ST	77	0.46	0.60	0.50	0.54
24	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 67TH AVE	122	0.73	0.36	0.71	0.54
25	Phoenix	BASELINE RD & 48TH ST	71	0.43	0.66	0.40	0.54
26	Phoenix	BELL RD & 51ST AVE	73	0.44	0.68	0.33	0.53
27	Phoenix	GLENDALE AVE & 43RD AVE	77	0.46	0.62	0.43	0.53
28	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 7TH ST	85	0.51	0.56	0.48	0.53
29	Phoenix	PEORIA AVE & I 017	91	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.53
30	Tempe	HARDY DR & BASELINE RD	61	0.37	0.60	0.47	0.51
31	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & 43RD AVE	59	0.36	0.65	0.38	0.51
32	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & DOBSON RD	129	0.78	0.31	0.60	0.50
33	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & RURAL RD	114	0.69	0.33	0.62	0.49
34	Mesa	MCDOWELL RD & S 2020	17	0.10	0.90	0.07	0.49
35	Avondale	VAN BUREN ST & DYSART RD	93	0.56	0.52	0.37	0.49
36	Tempe	UNIVERSITY DR & RURAL RD	147	0.89	0.18	0.70	0.49
37	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 67TH AVE	119	0.72	0.30	0.60	0.48
38	Phoenix	BUCKEYE RD & 35TH AVE	59	0.36	0.63	0.30	0.48
39	Phoenix	BELL RD & 43RD AVE	53	0.32	0.65	0.29	0.48
40	Gilbert	VAL VISTA DR & ELLIOT RD	70	0.42	0.57	0.33	0.47
41	Tempe	BASELINE RD & I 0101	154	0.93	0.21	0.54	0.47
42	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & CENTRAL AVE	38	0.23	0.58	0.48	0.47
43	Chandler	RAY RD & MCCLINTOCK DR	73	0.44	0.56	0.30	0.47
44	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 43RD AVE	71	0.43	0.55	0.33	0.47
45	Glendale	GLENDALE AVE & 67TH AVE	82	0.49	0.30	0.77	0.47
46	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 32ND ST	92	0.55	0.33	0.63	0.46
47	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 35TH AVE	63	0.38	0.55	0.37	0.46
48	Buckeye	YUMA RD & WATSON RD	56	0.34	0.58	0.34	0.46
49	Peoria	UNION HILLS DR & 83RD AVE	67	0.40	0.58	0.26	0.46
50	Pinal County	PEART RD & JIMMIE KERR BLVD	10	0.06	0.86	0.04	0.45
51	Mesa	DATE ST & 8TH ST	7	0.04	0.86	0.05	0.45
52	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 59TH AVE	113	0.68	0.29	0.54	0.45

## Top 100 High Crash Risk Intersections - 2011 through 2013 - 25/50/50 Proposed Weights

53	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 36TH ST	61	0.37	0.57	0.30	0.45
54	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 67TH AVE	109	0.66	0.27	0.59	0.45
55	Mesa	GUADALUPE RD & ALMA SCHOOL RD	60	0.36	0.57	0.29	0.45
56	Phoenix	GRAND AVE & 39TH AVE	6	0.04	0.85	0.04	0.45
57	Glendale	GLENDALE AVE & 75TH AVE	51	0.31	0.54	0.39	0.44
58	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 40TH ST	59	0.36	0.54	0.34	0.44
59	Glendale	BELL RD & 59TH AVE	121	0.73	0.18	0.64	0.43
60	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & 48TH ST	50	0.30	0.60	0.23	0.43
61	Phoenix	VAN BUREN ST & 52ND ST	53	0.32	0.56	0.27	0.43
62	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & I 017	57	0.34	0.53	0.31	0.43
63	Scottsdale	SCOTTSDALE RD & DYNAMITE BLVD	43	0.26	0.61	0.23	0.43
64	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 27TH AVE	54	0.33	0.57	0.24	0.42
65	Tempe	SOUTHERN AVE & HARDY DR	52	0.31	0.54	0.31	0.42
66	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 75TH AVE	86	0.52	0.33	0.50	0.42
67	Tempe	MCCLINTOCK DR & BASELINE RD	61	0.37	0.51	0.30	0.42
68	Phoenix	HIGHLAND AVE & 16TH ST	46	0.28	0.54	0.30	0.42
69	Glendale	BELL RD & 67TH AVE	123	0.74	0.21	0.51	0.42
70	Glendale	BELL RD & 75TH AVE	73	0.44	0.52	0.19	0.42
71	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 59TH AVE	111	0.67	0.23	0.53	0.42
72	Phoenix	HAPPY VALLEY RD & 67TH AVE	52	0.31	0.54	0.27	0.41
73	Phoenix	THUNDERBIRD RD & I 017	112	0.67	0.24	0.49	0.41
74	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 44TH ST	52	0.31	0.52	0.28	0.41
75	Scottsdale	THOMAS RD & HAYDEN RD	104	0.63	0.31	0.40	0.41
76	Glendale	THUNDERBIRD RD & 59TH AVE	113	0.68	0.22	0.51	0.41
77	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & HIGLEY RD	61	0.37	0.49	0.29	0.41
78	Phoenix	NORTHERN AVE & CENTRAL AVE	48	0.29	0.54	0.26	0.41
79	Glendale	BETHANY HOME RD & 47TH AVE	40	0.24	0.55	0.28	0.40
80	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & POWER RD	57	0.34	0.52	0.24	0.40
81	Chandler	KYRENE RD & CHANDLER BLVD	94	0.57	0.26	0.51	0.40
82	Phoenix	THOMAS RD & 16TH ST	94	0.57	0.26	0.52	0.40
83	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & S 1010	48	0.29	0.53	0.25	0.40
84	Pinal County	OCOTILLO RD & GANTZEL RD	43	0.26	0.56	0.22	0.40
85	Phoenix	INDIAN SCHOOL RD & 32ND ST	51	0.31	0.49	0.31	0.40
86	Phoenix	CAMELBACK RD & 20TH ST	48	0.29	0.51	0.29	0.40
87	Phoenix	TATUM BLVD & BELL RD	51	0.31	0.49	0.29	0.40
88	Glendale	OLIVE AVE & 51ST AVE	123	0.74	0.18	0.48	0.39
89	Phoenix	DUNLAP AVE & 35TH AVE	103	0.62	0.23	0.49	0.39
90	Phoenix	GREENWAY RD & 32ND ST	85	0.51	0.25	0.56	0.39
91	Chandler	WARNER RD & MCQUEEN RD	48	0.29	0.53	0.22	0.39
92	Phoenix	CAMELBACK RD & 35TH AVE	103	0.62	0.20	0.55	0.39
93	Mesa	SOUTHERN AVE & COUNTRY CLUB DR	105	0.63	0.20	0.53	0.39
94	Phoenix	MCDOWELL RD & 51ST AVE	91	0.55	0.22	0.56	0.39
95	Gilbert	WARNER RD & LINDSAY RD	51	0.31	0.52	0.22	0.39
96	Phoenix	BROADWAY RD & 19TH AVE	37	0.22	0.54	0.26	0.39
97	Mesa	BROADWAY RD & ALMA SCHOOL RD	38	0.23	0.56	0.21	0.39
98	Phoenix	SHEA BLVD & 40TH ST	27	0.16	0.59	0.21	0.39
99	Phoenix	BETHANY HOME RD & 19TH AVE	71	0.43	0.26	0.59	0.39
100	Scottsdale	MCDOWELL RD & GRANITE REEF RD	27	0.16	0.54	0.29	0.38

## D. ELIGIBLE PROJECT SPONSORS

Under 23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(B), the **Eligible Entities** to receive TAP funds are:

- Local governments;
- Regional transportation authorities;
- Transit agencies;
- Natural resource or public land agencies;
- School districts, local education agencies, or schools;
- Tribal governments; and
- Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible, consistent with the goals of subsection (c) of section 213 of title 23.

## E. ELIGIBILITY

For SRTS non-infrastructure projects, traffic education and enforcement activities must take place within approximately two miles of a primary or middle school (grades K - 8). Other eligible non-infrastructure activities do not have a location restriction. SRTS infrastructure projects are eligible for TAP funds regardless of their ability to serve school populations, and SRTS infrastructure projects are broadly eligible under other TAP eligibilities, which do not have any location restrictions.

### SRTS projects eligible for utilizing MAG Region non-infrastructure funds:

- Priority 1: Costs to engage the services of a consultant (either non-profit or for-profit) to develop SRTS framework studies, including data gathering, analysis, and generation of walking/biking route maps.
- Priority 2: Development of program websites to more easily and efficiently promote, track, and report program progress and obtain community feedback.
- Priority 3: Bulk item ordering; best for a lead agency to order for several local agency programs, such as bike helmets, crossing guard vests, stop paddles, 15 MPH rollout signs, etc. These items will need to comply with federal, state, and local standards.

Existing SRTS programs have used non-infrastructure funds for the following purposes:

- Creation and reproduction of promotional and educational materials.
- Bicycle and pedestrian safety curricula, materials and trainers.
- Training, including SRTS training workshops that target school- and community-level audiences.
- Modest incentives for SRTS contests and incentives that encourage more walking and bicycling over time.

## DRAFT – MAG Non-infrastructure SRTS Eligibility

---

- Safety and educational tokens that also advertise the program.
- Photocopying, duplicating, and printing costs, including CDs, DVDs, etc.
- Mailing costs.
- Costs for data gathering, analysis, and evaluation reporting at the local project level.
- Pay for substitute teacher if needed to cover for faculty attending SRTS functions during school hours.
- Costs for additional law enforcement or equipment needed for enforcement activities.
- Equipment and training needed for establishing crossing guard programs.
- Stipends for parent or staff coordinators. (The intent is to be able to reimburse volunteers for materials and expenses needed for coordination and efforts. The intent is not to pay volunteers for their time. In some cases, however, a State may permit paying a stipend to a “super volunteer” to coordinate its local program(s). This is an important possibility to keep open for low-income communities. It may be beneficial to set a limit on the maximum value of a stipend, such as \$2000/school year.).
- Costs to employ a SRTS Program Manager, which is a person that runs a SRTS program for an entire city, county, or some other area-wide division that includes numerous schools. (Program Managers may coordinate the efforts of numerous stakeholders and volunteers, manage the process for implementation at the local or regional level, and may be responsible for reporting to the State SRTS Coordinator.)
- Costs to engage the services of a consultant (either non-profit or for-profit) to manage a SRTS program as described in the prior bullet.