

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP AND THE  
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Tuesday, September 26, 2006 - 9:00a.m.  
MAG Office Building, Cholla Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair, Regional Bicycle Task Force and Acting Chair of the Pedestrian Working Group	*Farhad Tavassoli, Goodyear
*Bruce Meyers, ADOA Gen. Services	*Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Michael Sanders, ADOT	Peggy Rubach, Maricopa County
*Brian Fellows, ADOT	*Mitch Foy, Mesa
*Michael Eagan, ASLA, Arizona Chapter	Brandon Forrey, Peoria
Janeen Gaskins, Avondale	*Katherine Coles, Phoenix
*Thomas Chlebanowski, Buckeye	*Srinivas Goundla, Phoenix
*Michael Normand, Chandler	*Randi Alcott, RPTA
Bill Lazenby, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists	Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale
^Mark Smith, El Mirage	*Reed Kempton, Scottsdale
*Steve Hancock, Glendale	*Eric Iwersen, Tempe
	Bart Wingard, Surprise

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

^Attended via audio-conference

OTHERS PRESENT

Theo Petritsch, Sprinkle Consulting  
Peyton McLeod, Sprinkle Consulting  
Chris Fellerhoff, Sprinkle Consulting

1. Call to Order

Dawn Coomer called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group 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 Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group 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.

There were no members of the public present.

### 3. Staff and Member Agency Reports

There were no agency reports.

### 4. Presentation on the MAG Regional Bikeway Master Plan

Bruce Landis of Sprinkle Consulting presented:

- Task 4.2: Discussion and approach to the eight regional study locations. The Sub-Area Studies are at the 75% stage of completion. Bruce Landis asked for initial feedback on this section.

Scottsdale: Arizona Canal and Scottsdale Road at Camelback Road. There is a mall and two residential condos in the area. When the canal is paved, how will users cross the road? People will travel on both sides of the canal and across the canal. In the southwestern quad, the developer is installing a pedestrian bridge. Dawn Coomer noted that it was an unfunded project but it would allow people to cross the canal. The problem is getting to the street corners. There is a Wier area on the SRP canal. One option would be to cover the spillway. Mechanically there does not seem to be an issue. Then the sidewalk in the northeast corner needs to be improved and widened. Landscaping through the median would encourage pedestrians to use the signalized intersections. “No Right Turn” blank out signs help with conflicting movement when pedestrians and other users such as in-line skaters would like to cross.

Chandler: Price Freeway and Chandler Boulevard. The bike lanes do not quite reach the approaches of the freeway. There is a wide sidewalk that Chandler would like to rebuild and then reconstruct to develop bike lanes plus have the sidewalk. Interim treatment would include a bicycle detector loop, the flashing beacons over the Share the Road sign would alert drivers that a bicyclist would be in the interchange. It is used in tunnels in Colorado. It is a real time alert method.

Tempe: Alameda Drive is a two lane undivided roadway. Bike lanes could be installed with parking on one side of the street. AASHTO suggested that an agency can use contrasting pavement colors indicating bike lanes. A Bike and Chevron symbol signage could be used on Alameda east of Rural.

Peoria: Bell Road has 47,000 ADT. Restriping the cross-section because there are four lanes at 12 feet. The lanes could be narrowed to 11 feet wide. If one foot away is removed, this equates to a 3% drop in capacity. The level of service will not drop below a level of service C even when adding 3% increase in traffic. If a lane was removed, the level of service would be a D. Most jurisdictions tend to adopt level of service D as acceptable.

- Task 5: Update on the development of the List of Gaps
- Task 6: Update on mid-block crossing meeting with the traffic engineers

Bruce Landis introduced Theo Petritsch who gave a presentation on the Midblock Roadway Crossing

Treatments Protocol. A protocol is a methodology not a warrant.

The meeting in April addressed many of the problems pedestrians and bicyclists encounter including a pattern of choosing the convenient route. The goal is to make the safe convenient and the convenient safe. This effort is to develop a protocol to allow bicyclists and pedestrians.

There is a 1983 Federal Highways warrant called the Oxbow warrant. If there are 300 peds/per hour for four continuous hours to warrant an underpass or overpass. Bruce Landis asked if ADOT uses this warrant. Many state DOT's will use this warrant to not install a underpass or overpass. Brandon Forrey reported at 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and McDowell study, that it seemed impossible to meet this criteria even at a school zone.

In an approximation of the MUTCD warrant, more than 100 pedestrians/per hour and 900 vehicles will warrant a light. If you have less pedestrians, there is no warrant indicating a crossing treatment for pedestrians. There is no specific guidance for crossings.

When is a designated mid-block crossing appropriate? Brandon Forrey responded that the distance to an existing signalized crossing. Dawn Coomer responded the number of expected pedestrians is a factor. Janeen Gaskins noted that Avondale engineering department is concerned about the false sense of security. Theo Petritsch reported that a study in California indicated where they only striped situations in which there were pedestrian crashes and thus the report seemed to indicate a false sense of security. Newer reports by FHWA in 2001 indicate that there is no false sense of security. People are aware that stripes do not necessarily protect one from vehicles.

The Total Geometric Pathway User Delay Protocol: How inconvenienced will the user be to get to their pathway such as a nearby signalized intersection or pass. If one has to walk out of their way, that causes delay. If a pedestrian has to walk one more minute out of their way, is that acceptable? What is the criteria? What if it is 70 pedestrians walking one more minute out of their way? The total pedestrian delay is very important. Bruce Landis pointed out that this analytical crafting is consistent with typical traffic engineers study. Where is the threshold? Is 15 minutes of delay the right number? A chart indicating various factors of Geometric Pedestrian Delay was displayed.

What specific measures should be installed? The number of lanes and the volume of cars are essential factors. How many minutes should a pedestrian wait? The committee members responded a half minute to a minute. The threshold would be 10-15 seconds for a low volume roadway. To cross a one lane roadway, a pedestrian would need a 5.4 second gap to cross the roadway. Based on the number of cars in the vehicle stream is the amount of time available for a pedestrian to cross within a gap.

A high volume road if you have less that 6,700 vehicles per day, use table 4. There are tables 5 and 6 for higher volume roads. There are traffic control devices recommended for roadways of varying numbers of vehicles per day on roadway.

A table depicting the various solutions included marked crosswalks, pedestrian crossings signs, advance signs, yield signs, advance yield signs, stop bars, raised medians, and Hawk signals based on the Roadway Volume Greater than 6,700 Vehicles per day Table.

Peggy Rubach reported that most of the development plans coming into the county would end up requiring Hawk signals and feels that this would be a hard sell. Theo Petritsch responded that it is important to consider what would actually work to stop cars for a safe crossing where there is 6 lanes of traffic.

The PXO crossing has a pedestrian initiated strobe light to cross. There are advanced yield lines that help the driver see the pedestrians easier. Motorists need to yield to pedestrians. The uniqueness to this treatment is the strobe.

The HAWK crossing needs a request to FHWA to experiment. The MUTCD sets standards and the HAWK crossing is not in the manual yet. The modified HAWK was removed from the protocol because of comments from traffic engineers in the Valley.

Dawn Coomer asked how to educate people how to use the HAWK. Theo Petritsch responded that motorists understand yellow and red signals. There is an instruction sheet for pedestrians on the HAWK signal.

Peggy Rubach requested a two page summary written in plain language for the Plan and for all the cities to use. Bruce Landis noted that the chapter in the Plan will be easy to understand with the protocol in the Appendix.

#### 5. Meetings for 2006

Meetings for 2006 will be held on the third Tuesday at 1:30 p.m. in the Cholla Room:

October 17 and October 24, 2006

November 21, 2006

December 19, 2006