**Transportation Commission**

**MEETING DATE**  
Tuesday, November 8, 2016  
7:30 a.m.

**MEETING LOCATION**  
Tempe Transportation Center  
Don Cassano Room  
200 E. 5th Street, 2nd floor  
Tempe, Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
<th>ACTION or INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Public Appearances  
The Transportation Commission welcomes public comment for items listed on this agenda. There is a three-minute time limit per citizen. | Don Cassano, Commission Chair | Information |
| 2. Approval of Meeting Minutes  
The Commission will be asked to review and approve meeting minutes from the October 11, 2016 meeting. | Don Cassano, Commission Chair | ACTION |
| 3. Recognition of Outgoing Commission Members | Shelly Seyler, Public Works | Information |
| 4. City Preliminary Long-Range Financial Forecast and Transit Fund Update  
Staff will provide an update on the city’s long-range financial forecast along with an update on the transit fund. | Ken Jones. Deputy City Manager - Chief Financial Officer | Information and Possible Action |
| 5. Streetcar  
Staff will present an update on the Tempe Streetcar Project. | Eric Iwersen, Public Works | Information and Possible Action |
| 6. Fifth Street Streetscape Project  
Staff will present an update on the status of the Fifth Street Streetscape project and present design concepts. | Eric Iwersen, Public Works | Information and Possible Action |
| 7. Department & Regional Transportation Updates  
Staff will provide updates and current issues being discussed at regional transit agencies. | Public Works Staff | Information |
| 8. Future Agenda Items  
Commission may request future agenda items. | Don Cassano, Commission Chair | Information |

According to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, the Transportation Commission may only discuss matters listed on the agenda. The city of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-4311 (voice) or for Relay Users: 711 to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting.
Minutes of the Tempe Transportation Commission held on Tuesday, October 11, 2016, 7:30 a.m., at the Tempe Transportation Center, Don Cassano Community Room, 200 E. Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona.

(MEMBERS) Present:
- Ryan Guzy
- Don Cassano (Chair)
- Philip Luna
- Brian Fellows
- Peter Schelstraete (via phone)
- Pam Goronkin
- Lloyd Thomas
- Susan Conklu
- Charles Huellmantel
- Shereen Lemer

(MEMBERS) Absent:
- Kevin Olson
- Jeremy Browning
- Cyndi Streid
- Charles Redman
- Bonnie Gerepka

City Staff Present:
- Shelly Seyler, Deputy Public Works Director
- Sue Taaffe, Public Works Supervisor
- Tony Belleau, Transportation Planner
- Julian Dresang, City Traffic Engineer
- Chase Walman, Transportation Planner
- Joe Clements, Transportation Financial Analyst
- Laura Kajfez, Neighborhoods Services Specialist
- Robert Yabes, Principal Planner
- Marge Zylla, Government Relations Officer

Guests Present:
- Pete Peterson, resident
- Art Jacobs, resident
- Clifford Anderson, TBAG
- Roger Ramirez, resident
- John Altman, resident
- Steven Hardy-Braz, visitor
- William Terrance, TBAG

Commission Chair Don Cassano called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Public Appearances
Clifford Anderson spoke about Agenda Item 6 - McClintock Drive Traffic Lane Configuration. He stated that traffic count, crash data and science should be included in the discussion as it relates to traffic congestion. He also stated that the methodology needs to be statistically significant, and he posed the question did the bike lanes cause the traffic congestion or was it already there. He does not want the bike lanes removed.
William Terrance spoke about Agenda Item 6 - McClintock Drive Traffic Lane Configuration. He asked the Commission to think about how infrastructure is built in Tempe and that decisions should be based on facts not public opinion. There will be more bike facilities in the future and these connections need to remain.

Steven Hardy-Braz spoke about Agenda Item 6 - McClintock Drive Traffic Lane Configuration. He stated that he is travelling across the country on his bike and stopped in Tempe for the Tour de Fat. He has stayed because of Tempe’s good bicycle infrastructure and spent money in the city because Tempe is bike friendly.

**Agenda Item 2 – Minutes**
Chair Cassano introduced the minutes of the September 13, 2016 meeting and asked for a motion. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

**Motion:** Commissioner Charles Huellmantel
**Second:** Commissioner Lloyd Thomas
**Decision:** Approved

**Agenda Item 3 - Transportation Commission Annual Report**
Sue Taaffe presented the draft 2016 annual report. The Commission reviewed the annual report including the goals for 2017. Don Cassano asked for a motion to approve the 2016 Transportation Commission Annual Report.

**Motion:** Commissioner Pam Goronkin
**Second:** Commissioner Susan Conklu
**Decision:** Approved

**Agenda Item 4 - “Prop 500” Regional Effort Discussion**
Robert Yabes provided the Commission with the history of Propositions 300 and 400. He reviewed the list of funded and unfunded projects currently included in Prop 400 including:

- Increased bus frequency:
  - Route 30 – University: Planned for 2020
  - Route 40 – Main: Funded/Complete
  - Route 48 – 48th/Rio Salado: Unfunded
  - Route 56 – Priest/56th: Unfunded
  - Route 61 – Southern: Funded/Complete
  - Route 72 – Rural/Scottsdale: Funded/Complete
  - Route 81 – Hayden/McClintock: Funded/Complete
  - Route 108 – Elliot: Unfunded
  - Express 520: Funded/Complete
  - Express 521: Funded/Complete
  - Express 522: Funded/Complete
  - Dial-a-Ride and Mobility: Funded/Complete
- Improved ADA Service: Funded/Complete
- Replacement Buses for Orbit: Funded/Complete
- Streetcar: Funded/In Design
- Bus Stop Improvements: Funded/Complete
- ASU Transit Center Rehab: Unfunded
- South Tempe Transit Center: Unfunded
- EVBOM Construction/Upgrades: Funded/Complete
- Scottsdale/Rural Link: Unfunded
He also reviewed the list of possible freeway-related projects that are currently being considered for Prop 400 as funding fluctuates, which include:

- Bicycle/pedestrian bridge at Loop 101 and Balboa Drive: $3.5 million
- Bicycle/pedestrian crossing at Western Canal/Baseline Road and I-10 (I-10 Near-Term Improvements, East Valley): $7 million
- Art enhancements for Alameda Drive and I-10 pedestrian bridge (I-10 Near-Term Improvements, East Valley): $500,000
- Bicycle/pedestrian underpass at Highline Canal and ADOT Retention Basin/Pit Park at Knox Road (I-10 Near-Term Improvements, East Valley): $3.7 million
- Traffic interchange improvements at US-60 and Mill Avenue: $20 million
- Traffic interchange improvements at I-10 and Baseline Road: $50 million
- Fiber optic on SR-143 from I-10 to Loop 202: $5 million

Robert presented a list of possible projects for “Prop 500” including:

- Fund all capital and maintenance costs of all required American with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements at arterial streets, bus stops, rail stations and along all bus and rail transit routes.
- Fund all existing regional, express, local and planned transit routes to meet or exceed adopted regional transit operation standards. At a minimum, all regional transit routes and ADA services.
- Fund all other required city and regional ADA upgrades as identified in city compliance plans to meet federal requirements.
- Fund design, construction and maintenance of shared use paths and streetscape projects.
- Fund design, implementation and operation streetcar extensions.
- Fund design, implementation and operation of all existing and proposed high capacity transit routes such as light rail, commuter rail, streetcar, bus rapid transit and upcoming new high capacity technologies.
- Fund maintenance and reconstruction cost of major arterials or roads with regional significance, not just state roads and freeways. At a minimum, maintenance and reconstruction costs should be shared with jurisdictions prorated based on the regional significance of the street.
- Fund repair, maintenance, and replacement of bridges at arterial streets.
- Fund construction and maintenance of a complete regional bikeway system that provides grade separated and signalized crossings, where appropriate.
- Fund the design and construction of:
  - grade separation of light rail at University Drive,
  - systemic safety improvements, and
  - safety improvements at high crash intersections.
- Fund design and implementation of integrated corridor management strategies.

Marge Zylla then explained the next steps in the process. The Commission requested that the following be added to the proposed project plan:

- Explore north/south connections from south Tempe to downtown
- Increased bus frequency including Orbit Saturn
- Include new transit elements in “Prop 500” and not just expanding on existing
- Include bike/ped crossings at railroads

Don Cassano asked for a motion. A motion was made to support staff’s list of proposed projects including the ideas mentioned by the Commissioners.

**Motion:** Commissioner Pam Goronkin
Agenda Item 5 - Facility Naming Request
Shelly Seyler introduced the facility naming request agenda item and explained to the Commission the process, which includes a presentation at an Issue Review Session and depending on Council’s action, a resolution at a Regular Council Meeting. Art Jacobs spoke about Joe Pospicil and asked the Commission to consider naming a transportation facility after him.

The following ideas were discussed by the Commission:
- Add a bench with a plaque to one of the multi-use paths
- Plant a tree and add a plaque to one of the multi-use paths
- Name the bridge over the Western Canal at Lakeshore after Joe
- Add a plaque to an existing seating area along one of the multi-use paths
- Name the rental code policy after Joe

Don Cassano asked for a motion. A motion was made to refer the naming request back to the Mayor for another Board or Commission to select a facility that closer fits with Joe’s accomplishments and interests like Neighborhoods, Schools or Policies.

Motion: Commissioner Lloyd Thomas
Second: Commissioner Phillip Luna
Decision: Approved

Agenda Item 6 - McClintock Drive Traffic Lane Configuration
Julian Dresang presented the Commission with traffic data and resident feedback gathered over the last 12 months for the section of McClintock Drive between Broadway and Guadalupe roads. He reviewed the history of the project and the before and after lane configuration with the Commission. He also presented the methodology and results of vehicular traffic counts, bicycle traffic counts, travel times and safety/crashes. In general:
- traffic counts are lower than in 2004,
- bicycle counts fluctuated over the summer months, but remained steady when comparing January and September 2016,
- travel times are consistent between January 2016 and September 2016, and
- crashes are similar at major intersections between August 2014 to June 15 and August 2015 to June 16, but are lower at minor intersections and in mid-blocks.

Between April 2015 and March 17, 2016, the City received 532 comments of which 482 were unduplicated. Of the unduplicated comments, 234 people were against the bicycle lanes and 244 were in favor. Between March 17, 2016 and September 21, 2016, the City received 54 comments of which 38 were unduplicated. Of the unduplicated comments, 30 people were against the bicycle lanes and 8 were in favor. Comments were received via email to either staff, Council or through the web site and phone calls to either 311, Council or staff.

Options that will be presented to the City Council for consideration on Nov 3 include:
- Continue to collect data and track safety.
- Restripe southbound McClintock from Apache to Broadway: $10,000 and take 2 business days.
- Restripe McClintock from Apache to Guadalupe: $130,000 and take 10 business days.

The Commission asked the following questions, and staff responded as follows:
- Has a comparison of traffic volumes between Rural Road and McClintock Drive been conducted? Comparisons were made at the March 2016 Council presentation, but due to limited staff resources, not all data for Rural Road is available for comparison.
- Does staff know the types and severity of the crashes? At this time no, but staff can research that question.
- Were the bollards involved in any of the accidents? Staff will have to research that question.
- Has staff received feedback specifically about the bollards? To date, not really.
- Are bollards being hit and if so, is it because of where they were placed? Originally, staff identified 300 areas for bollards and reduced the number to 100. Additional bollards were removed near US 60 after the initial 100 were installed. Staff believes that most of the bollards are struck due to distracted drivers.
- Were the bollards the only part of the project that was a pilot? Yes. It was a test to see if the bollards provided protection to the bicyclists and deterred vehicles from driving in the bicycle lane.

Don Cassano asked for a motion. A motion was made to keep the bicycle lanes on McClintock Drive.

**Motion:** Commissioner Lloyd Thomas  
**Second:** Commissioner Ryan Guzy  
**Decision:** Approved

**Agenda Item 7 - Small Area Transportation Plan Update**

Shelly Seyler presented the Commission with the methodology and status of the Small Area Transportation Study which will create an interactive model to help the City Council understand impacts of potential developments. ASU and Tempe in a joint effort commissioned a “Small Area Transportation Study” with CivTech to examine the existing and future conditions of downtown and the facilities district. Over the last six months, city, ASU and CivTech staff have met regularly to discuss the elements of the modelling and provide input on the data collected to date. Tasks included:

- Identifying the study area, which has been defined as the SR202 Red Mountain Freeway on the north to Apache Boulevard on the south, from Priest Drive to Price Road.
- Collecting existing traffic data.
- Analyzing the needs of the network areas.
- Modelling all modes of transportation allowing the city and ASU to pin-point areas that need attention and identifying short term and longer term strategies to ensure the system is operating as efficiently as possible.
- Identifying areas in need of pedestrian treatments, additional mode transfer beyond that already predicted to occur by 2040, and roadway limitations with regional solutions considered.
- Evaluating traffic and pedestrian trips using the current entitlements, parking locations, future masterplans (where provided) and future transit improvements planned by 2040.

A final document will include recommended improvements and a projected level of vehicular, pedestrian and transit trips in the study area with the improvements in place. The report will also include the feasibility of the alternatives given known constraints such as topography, right-of-way, and engineering criteria.

Commissioner Goronkin commented that this study is essential and will alleviate the transportation infrastructure patchwork approach that has been conducted in the past.

**Agenda Item 8 - Department and Regional Transportation Updates**

There were no updates.

**Agenda Item 9 - Future Agenda Items**

The following future agenda items have been previously identified by the Commission or staff:
Transportation Commission
October 11, 2016

- Fifth Street Streetscape Project (October)
- Small Area Transportation Study (October)
- Transportation Commission Annual Report (October)
- “Prop 500” regional effort Discussion (October)
- McClintock Drive Bike Lanes (November)
- Rio Salado @ McClintock Drive MUP Underpass (November)
- Streetcar (November)
- Transportation Commission Annual Report (November)
- Long-Range Forecast Presentation (November)
- Market Research Survey (January)
- Commission business (January)
- Bike Hero (January)
- Leading vs. Lagging Left Turn Signals (January)
- Long-Range Forecast Presentation (February)
- FY 2017-18 Media Plan (February)
- North/South Railroad Spur MUP (May)
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Signal Activate Operations Update (TBD)

Commissioner Conklu requested that the maintenance of multi-use paths and the budget for upkeep for these paths be added to the list of future agenda items.

The Commission’s next meeting is scheduled for Nov. 8, 2016. The December 2016 meeting has been cancelled.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Prepared by: Sue Taaffe
Reviewed by: Shelly Seyler
DATE
October 28, 2016

SUBJECT
City Preliminary Long-Range Financial Forecast and Transit Fund Update

PURPOSE
Staff with the City Manager’s Office will discuss the City Preliminary Long-Range Financial Forecast and Transit Fund Update.

BACKGROUND
The Municipal Budget Office prepares an initial Long-Range Financial Forecast in October each year to set the tone for the beginning of the budget process. An updated February forecast provides a long-term view of how current budget proposals will impact the City’s future finances. Ensuring that current budget decisions can be sustained with projected future resources is consistent with the City Council’s stated priority of long-term financial sustainability.

FISCAL IMPACT
None

CONTACT
Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager - CFO
480-350-8504
ken_jones@tempe.gov

ATTACHMENTS
Nov. 3, 2016 IRS Memo
PowerPoint
Memorandum

City Manager’s Office

Date: October 26, 2016
To: Mayor and Councilmembers
From: Ken Jones, Deputy City Manager, CFO
Cecilia Robles, Municipal Budget Office Director
Through: Andrew Ching, City Manager
Subject: Long-Range Financial Forecast Update

Introduction
Every year, in the spring and fall, the Municipal Budget Office compiles updated economic information and reviews the financial conditions of all major operating funds of the City to produce a long-range financial forecast. The fall forecast sets the tone for the upcoming budget development process by providing a long-term perspective on how current budget proposals will impact future City finances.

During your November 3rd Work Study Session, we will review the latest forecast and highlight significant changes since the February 2016 forecast. The financial forecast does not represent a budget recommendation; rather, it is intended to provide context for the development of the City Manager’s recommended budget. We use the forecast to demonstrate the projected costs of status quo operations and the potential financial impacts of clearly-defined variables. This is an opportunity for Councilmembers to explore the financial impacts of potential policy changes and examine improved service strategies.

General Economic Conditions and Projections
The City’s overall financial condition is strong and stable and current financial policies have provided opportunities for continued investment in programs and services that make Tempe great. The City has experienced steady revenue growth over the past few years and our five-year forecast for revenues remains positive, anticipating moderate growth in taxable sales at both the local and state level. Incredibly strong recent development activity is expected to taper-off, but the impact on revenue should not overshadow continued growth in other segments of the local economy. Growth of taxable sales in Tempe’s hotel industry remains strong. Increases in other local taxes should provide for a stable local tax revenue stream for the remainder of the current fiscal year and into fiscal year 2017-18, with moderate growth projected in the subsequent years of the forecast. An economic downturn is inevitable at some point in our cyclical economy. We do not assume an economic downturn in this forecast but we do project healthy fund balances to overcome moderate recessionary trends.

Improved Forecasting Methodology
The Municipal Budget Office employs sophisticated modeling techniques in the development of long-range revenue projections for the City’s wide-ranging revenue sources. Revenue projections have been very accurate in the largest and most critical revenue categories over the years. In this forecast, the Budget Office has incorporated a new approach into the forecasting models to improve the accuracy of the projections. Regression analysis has been used in Tempe’s revenue
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forecasting models for quite some time — plotting past revenue to develop patterns predictive of future revenue. The regression analysis is now being strengthened by analyzing the bias in the underlying economic data used in the models by comparing past revenue predictions with actual outcomes and adjusting our projections based on an acceptable risk of deviation. The result is a more risk-aware, bias-adjusted forecast. Revenue projections are slightly higher throughout the forecast with the introduction of the improved forecasting technique and, I believe, more indicative of future revenue.

Projections of Retirement System Employer Contributions

Contributions to the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System (PSPRS) continue to represent a large expense in the General Fund ($19 million) that has the potential to change from year to year. PSPRS employer contribution rates for Tempe are 45.68% for Police and 48.95% for Fire employees (net of the Fire Insurance Premium Tax credit) in the current year. PSPRS has provided estimates for future rates, which continue to increase, but only slightly. Recent legislative changes to the PSPRS system are supposed to have a positive impact on employer rates sometime in the future, but there is a case (Hall v EORP) under consideration by the Arizona Supreme Court that could have large negative impacts on future contributions.

The City’s required contribution to the Arizona State Retirement System will decrease from the current rate of 11.48% of employee pay to 11.47% in 2017-18.

Potential Budget Challenges

1) The State Department of Revenue has taken over sales tax audits and is planning to take complete control of sales tax licensing, collecting and administration in January 2017. The forecast does not anticipate any negative impact on revenues, but we have concerns about the State maintaining our current levels of audit assessments and revenue collections.

2) Proposals are being developed by individual legislators to further “simplify” construction sales taxes. The early versions we have seen would negatively impact Tempe’s revenue from construction activity. We are working with the League of Arizona Cities and Towns to thwart negative legislation.

3) No economic downturns are incorporated into the five-year forecast.

Recent Policy Direction Provided by the City Council

1) Contributions to the Municipal Arts Fund — By ordinance, a transfer equivalent to 1% of annual budgeted capital expenditures must be made to the Municipal Arts Fund. Specific direction was given by the City Council to suspend the transfer from the General and Transit Funds during the most recent economic downturn. After the introduction of the Arts Master Plan at the beginning of the current fiscal year, direction was given to restore the annual 1% contribution. The contribution is included in every year of the forecast and is estimated to be approximately $217,000 from the General Fund in 2017-18.

2) Use of restricted cash/revenue — The City Council placed restrictions on the GPLET lease revenue from the Zaremba, Liberty and Grigio/Picerne developments, as well as the land sale proceeds from the Liberty development. In the past two years, $6 million of the restricted cash was transferred to capital projects for park improvements at the City Council’s direction. There is a current restricted balance of
approximately $1.7 million. In the current fiscal year, $700 of the restricted cash was pledged to ensure completion of the McClintock pool upgrades in the event that parks and recreation bonds were not approved in November. If the bonds are approved the pledge of cash will not be used. Projected revenue going forward is as follows:

- Zaremba GPLET lease and parking revenue
  - Continuing revenue stream of $600k-$900k per year through 2042

- Grigio/Picerne GPLET lease revenue
  - Continuing revenue stream of $100k per year through 2020; $128k per year 2021-2031; $178k-$315k per year 2032-2043

- Liberty GPLET lease and land sale proceeds
  - Subsequent revenue is dependent upon future development and land sales

3) Supplemental budgets tied directly to strategic planning – The budget planning process includes opportunities for departments to request supplemental funding. In the past, this process has involved a prioritization of the supplemental requests, which has been somewhat subjective and has not been guided by any formal performance measurement process. With the City Manager’s initiative to formalize the City’s strategic planning process, we have an opportunity to allocate resources based on measurable performance standards, tied directly to City Council priorities. Supplemental budget proposals by the City Manager for 2017-18 year will be based on more clearly-identified strategically-defined needs.

4) Employee compensation strategy – The forecast assumes that compensation provisions contained in employee group Memorandums of Understanding (MOU’s) will be honored and that renewed MOU provisions for 2017-18 and beyond would provide for 3% step increases for employees moving through pay ranges in groups that do not have formal pay plans. It also assumes that pay ranges will be adjusted based on market study results.

This forecast incorporates a compensation strategy based on several principles and current policies that were discussed during the last forecast presentation to the City Council:

- Compensate employees fairly, based on pay ranges that are adjusted for changing conditions in a defined market;
- Continue the practice of moving employees through pay ranges as they gain experience in their positions;
- “Fair compensation” is negotiated with each employee group;
- The compensation of one employee or group of employees should not impact the determination of fair compensation for other employees.

Forecast Models for Individual Operating Funds
The following pages contain comments on significant changes to the forecasts of the City’s operating funds. Throughout this document dollar amounts are expressed in thousands of dollars, so add three zeros to the numbers in fund models.
The figure above provides detail for budgeted accounts within the General Fund, with “sample” budget decisions incorporated from the interactive model appearing on the following page:

1) Projected growth in annual compensation represents the projected cost of contributions to retirement systems, salary step increases included in current MOU’s, 3% step increases for employee groups subsequent to the expiration of current MOU’s, projected market adjustments to the salary ranges and increases to health/dental/life insurance plans as
provided in the detailed assumptions on the last page of this report. Personnel costs also reflect the varying amounts necessary to fund Group 3 employees’ retiree health reimbursement accounts as the employees reach 10 years of service. For example, there are very few employees who reach the 10-year milestone in 2017-18, which leads to a smaller annual increase in personnel costs. Personnel costs in 2017-18 also reflect the elimination of approximately $800,000 of one-time funding budgeted in the current year.

2) Recurring and non-recurring non-personnel costs have been included in each year of the General Fund model to address potential supplemental funding to maintain and enhance service levels.

The forecast includes a measured spend-down of fund balance without jeopardizing the stability of the fund in the future. This General Fund model is consistent with the City’s strategy to use fund balance to soften the impact of the expiration of the temporary .2% sales tax in June 2014. The projected growth variables displayed in the model are not recommendations by management at this point, but examples to demonstrate how projected resources could be allocated in future years and still comply with the fund balance policy. The graph on the right side of the figure shows how the unassigned fund balance stays above the policy minimum of 20% throughout the forecast period, as required by policy.

This forecast for the General Fund shows improved revenue forecasts and fund balance projections from the last forecast. Several non-recurring revenues helped bolster the fund balance. For example, the City received $3 million related to a re-negotiated lease of the Buttes Hotel site and another $740,000 as a result of a change in ownership at the same hotel.
The Water/Wastewater Fund is stable. The forecast assumes continued rate adjustments in line with recommendations presented by Public Works in the recent Water & Sewer rate study.
The Solid Waste Fund has been spending-down fund balance in a planned effort to avoid rate increases for customers during the recent economic downturn. This model assumes continued implementation of the rate adjustments presented to the City Council by Public Works as a result of their comprehensive rate analysis study, which will stabilize the fund.
The Golf Enterprise Fund continues to generate increased revenues and is projected to perform slightly better than break-even in the remaining years of the forecast. Projected surpluses in future years will be used for asset maintenance/replacement, while maintaining a fund balance at or above the 15% policy level. Improvements to the irrigation system at the Rolling Hills Golf Course should further stabilize the fund. User fees in 2015-16 and 2016-17 reflect a short shutdown of Rolling Hills during the irrigation system repairs.
The Transit Fund is relatively stable with a healthy fund balance. The model includes estimated operating costs for the proposed streetcar project and the expansion of Orbit bus services farther south in the City. The model also includes a $13 million commitment to fund a portion of the construction of the streetcar project, as well as the offsetting $13 million revenue anticipated from the formation of a special assessment district.
The Transportation Fund receives the large majority of its funding from State-shared Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF). The City uses the money to fund street improvements. After sweeping over $6.8 million from the City’s distribution from 2004 through 2014, the Legislature partially restored the annual appropriations. For FY 2015-16 and forward, HURF tax collections are expected to improve slightly, providing additional cash-funding for street projects. The “CIP Pay as You Go” line item will be increased during the City’s CIP process this year.
Approximately 90% of the revenue in the Performing Arts Fund is derived from the City's 0.1% Arts Sales Tax. The rest is received from users of the Tempe Center for the Arts (TCA).

Revenues have not been sufficient to cover expenditures and the fund balance has been depleted. Half of the debt issued to build the TCA was retired in 2015-16, resulting in a $2.5 million reduction of the annual debt service cost. Going forward, an annual surplus will grow to approximately $2.3 million by 2020, when the Arts Tax expires and the remaining debt is retired. The ongoing structural deficit after 2020 is projected to exceed $2.5 million per year.
### Forecast Growth Rates - November 3, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>FY 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Sales Growth</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Sales Tax Revenue (1)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sales Tax Rate</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fund</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Fund</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Property Tax Levy Growth</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed Tax Taxable Sales Growth</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Population Growth</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Population Growth</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Shared Income Tax Growth</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Shared Sales Tax Growth</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Vehicle License Tax Growth</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Trades Growth</td>
<td>-40.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Recreational Growth</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Fines, Forfeitures Growth</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Licenses Growth</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>FY 19/20</th>
<th>FY 20/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs Growth (2)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA (% of payroll)</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Retirement (% of payroll)</td>
<td>11.48%</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>10.69%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Retirement (% of payroll)</td>
<td>45.68%</td>
<td>45.58%</td>
<td>45.58%</td>
<td>45.61%</td>
<td>45.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Retirement (% of payroll) (3)</td>
<td>48.95%</td>
<td>48.88%</td>
<td>48.93%</td>
<td>49.01%</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Dental, Life Actives</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Dental, Life Retirees</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediflex Growth</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fringe Benefits Growth</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inflation</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Inflation</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Inflation</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Inflation</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Inflation</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) The 0.2% temporary sales tax expired 7/1/14.
(2) Excluding OPEB Trust Fund Advance/Withdrawal
(3) Net of Fire Insurance Premium Tax credit
GENERAL FUND OUTLOOK

Projected Revenues and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15/16 Projected</th>
<th>FY 16/17 Projected</th>
<th>FY 17/18 Projected</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Projected</th>
<th>FY 19/20 Projected</th>
<th>FY 20/21 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>203,732</td>
<td>197,347</td>
<td>202,080</td>
<td>209,810</td>
<td>218,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>190,893</td>
<td>198,288</td>
<td>205,701</td>
<td>211,285</td>
<td>218,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>12,839</td>
<td>(941)</td>
<td>(3,622)</td>
<td>(1,474)</td>
<td>(165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Personnel Cost Increases</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Personnel Costs (bonus)</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Number of Positions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Adjustments to Non-personnel Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Adjustments to Non-personnel Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP &quot;PAYGO&quot; % of GF Revenue</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to Assigned Fund Balance</td>
<td>(3,325)</td>
<td>(1,279)</td>
<td>(1,308)</td>
<td>(1,340)</td>
<td>(1,372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Fund Balance</td>
<td>80,993</td>
<td>78,774</td>
<td>73,844</td>
<td>71,030</td>
<td>69,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Revenue</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unassigned Fund Balance as a Percentage of Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 15-16</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
<th>FY 18-19</th>
<th>FY 19-20</th>
<th>FY 20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Unassigned Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Revenue</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/12 Actual</td>
<td>12/13 Actual</td>
<td>13/14 Actual</td>
<td>14/15 Actual</td>
<td>15/16 Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>50,180</td>
<td>54,375</td>
<td>56,831</td>
<td>61,344</td>
<td>61,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>48,615</td>
<td>50,389</td>
<td>53,379</td>
<td>54,668</td>
<td>55,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>6,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer from Transit Capital Fund</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unassigned Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>72,956</td>
<td>27,571</td>
<td>31,070</td>
<td>37,770</td>
<td>45,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unassigned Fund Balance as a % of Revenue</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance Assigned for Debt Retirement</strong></td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION FUND (HURF) OUTLOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11/12 Actual</th>
<th>12/13 Actual</th>
<th>13/14 Actual</th>
<th>14/15 Actual</th>
<th>15/16 Projected</th>
<th>16/17 Projected</th>
<th>17/18 Projected</th>
<th>18/19 Projected</th>
<th>19/20 Projected</th>
<th>20/21 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>9,481</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>10,099</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>11,758</td>
<td>12,322</td>
<td>13,459</td>
<td>13,719</td>
<td>14,129</td>
<td>14,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>10,433</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>10,041</td>
<td>12,216</td>
<td>9,852</td>
<td>12,967</td>
<td>10,947</td>
<td>11,355</td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td>11,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>(952)</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(771)</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>(645)</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>2,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrual Basis Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>6,747</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>9,224</td>
<td>8,579</td>
<td>11,091</td>
<td>13,456</td>
<td>16,071</td>
<td>18,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance as a % of Revenue</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE
October 28, 2016

SUBJECT
Tempe Streetcar Update

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo is to provide an update on the status of the Tempe Streetcar Project and introduce upcoming efforts and critical decisions related to project development.

BACKGROUND & PROJECT STATUS
The Tempe Streetcar Project is a three mile urban circulator rail transportation technology with fourteen stops, six vehicles and two connections to light rail. The project will connect Tempe Town Lake and the development of Rio Salado, through the downtown core, linking ASU and Tempe’s oldest neighborhoods. In February 2016 the Streetcar Small Starts Grant Request of $75 million was included in President Obama’s budget and months earlier (late 2015) the project received a rating of “medium-high” (a positive rating).
Small Starts Grant Agreement & Correspondence with the Federal Transit Administration
The SSGA is the next required step to secure the $75 million Smalls Starts Grant request from the Federal Transit Administration to fully fund the project. A final signed SSGA is anticipated in fall 2017. Staff continues to coordinate directly with the FTA and Valley Metro to meet all “roadmap” steps needed for the grant. The Tempe lobbyist efforts are also contributing to successful inclusion of the project in the fiscal year 17 budget. With the passage of the FAST Act (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act), the Tempe Streetcar was re-submitted (initial submittal request was fall 2015) in September, along with other cities (Sacramento, Ft Lauderdale) advancing streetcars not yet having a signed SSGA. In addition to quarterly meetings with representatives from FTA, staff continues to meet with the monthly Project Management Oversight Consultant (PMOC) hired by FTA to review status of the project.

Preliminary Engineering
Preliminary engineering has been completed for the project, which includes track location, specific stop and platform sites, and utility and right of way needs identification. The project team continues to work closely with all stakeholders, utilizing this preliminary engineering information to share with the public and serve as the baseline for the formal design team and contractors that will take the project into final design and construction.

Vehicle Procurement
Procurement of the streetcar vehicles continues to advance as proposals are in the process of review by city and Valley Metro staff, as well as technical review by the consultant team, CTE (Center For Transportation and the Environment). In May, the Request For Proposals was released for six vehicles. Submissions limited vehicle length from 65-82 feet, and wireless options with a battery technology were encouraged. The two wireless portions that the RFQ allows for consideration and proposal are: Mill Avenue, from University Drive to Rio Salado Parkway, and Ash Avenue from Rio Salado Parkway to University Drive. Submittals have been received as of late September and Valley Metro and Tempe staff are working towards negotiations with a single vendor, with final award slated roughly for February 2017.

Design and Construction Procurements
A formal design team and a Construction Manager at Risk are currently in procurement and are expected to be on contract by end of the December.

Public Art
Public art elements will be developed for each of the fourteen stops, with four public artists assigned to one of the four design zones along the streetcar route. The installations will be critical to capturing sense of place, creating unique system identity, and garnering community support for the project. The Regional Rail Advisory Committee, Tempe and Valley Metro staff will oversee the public art process. In October four community stakeholder teams selected an artist for each zone of the alignment. The selected artists will be presented to the Valley Metro board for approval at their December meeting. Public meetings with project artists will be scheduled to shape the work. The budget for each stop is set at $52,500 and artists will be working closely with the final design team. ]
Public Outreach & Next Steps
Efforts to inform and include the public in project updates continue to expand as staff meets with stakeholders; including character area neighborhood meetups, DTA merchants, Marina Heights, Hayden Ferry Lakeside, and ASU.

Staff hosted an open house for the project on October 26th in the Cassano Room of the Transportation Center, which was promoted widely by Tempe Today, postcard/fliers, downtown distribution, social media, radio and television. Valley Metro staff presented a project summary, including goals, milestones, projected dates and preliminary artwork related to the streetscape design and function. Staff represented the project and was on hand to answer questions and record feedback by those in attendance.

In early 2017 the Commission will be involved in Streetcar decisions related to vehicle branding, fare policy, and design aesthetics of the project.

FISCAL IMPACT
n/a

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

CONTACT
Eric Iwersen, Principal Planner
eric_iwersen@tempe.gov
480-350-8810

ATTACHMENTS
Public Meeting Presentation/PowerPoint
Tempe Streetcar

Transportation Commission

November 8, 2016
Future Transit System

LEGEND
- Valley Metro Rail
- Northwest Light Rail Extension Phase II
- Gilbert Rd Light Rail Extension
- Tempe Streetcar
- Capitol/I-10 West Light Rail Extension Phase I
- Capitol/I-10 West Light Rail Extension Phase II
- South Central Light Rail Extension
- West Phoenix/Central Glendale Transit Corridor Study
- Northeast Transit Feasibility Corridor Study
- 50th Street Light Rail Station

Map showing future transit system with key dates 2018, 2019, 2020, 2023, 2026, 2034.
Project Overview

- 3 miles
- 14 stops
- 6 vehicles
- 2 LRT connections
Rio Salado Pkwy. (East of Mill Ave.)
Mill Ave. (North of University Dr.)
Mill Ave. (South of University Dr.)
Apache Blvd.
Ash Ave.
Photo Simulation: Mill Ave. and 3rd St.
Photo Simulation: Ash Ave. and 5th St.
Urban Design Guidelines

- To provide a general framework for the design team
- Based on guidelines previously developed with a community working group
- Elements addressed include:
  - Circulation and safety
  - Shade
  - Landscaping
  - Signage
  - Finishes (e.g. paving and seating materials)
Streetcar Stops

- Stops to include:
  - Seating
  - Shade canopy
  - Schedule and system information
  - Trash receptacles
  - Fare vending machine
  - Landscaping
Public Art

- Four public art and design zones
Public Art Process

- One artist selected for each of the four zones
- Zone artists selected by panels comprised of:
  - Stakeholders (from that zone)
  - Regional Rail Arts Committee members
- Every streetcar stop will receive artistic treatment
Procurement Timeline

LATE 2016

Designer

Contractor

Vehicle Manufacturer*

EARLY 2017

Project Artists

*Request For Proposal (RFP) includes language seeking:
- Off-wire capable vehicle for portion(s) of route
- A 65 to 82-foot-long vehicle
Milestones and Next Steps

- **2016**: Artists Meet and Greet
- **2017**: Final Design
- **2018**: Construction
- **2019**: Business Outreach and Assistance Program
- **2020**: Operations

CONTINUING PUBLIC OUTREACH
DATE
October 28, 2016

SUBJECT
Fifth Street Streetscape Project (Farmer to College)

PURPOSE
The purpose of this memo is to provide the Transportation Commission with an overview and update of the Fifth Street Streetscape Project.

BACKGROUND
This streetscape project extends from College to Farmer avenues along Fifth Street in downtown Tempe, and includes and connects to Tempe City Hall, Mill Avenue, a Union Pacific Railroad crossing, ASU Campus, Sun Devil Stadium, City of Tempe Courts and Police Administration, Tempe Transportation Center, light rail, regional and neighborhood transit service, high volume bicycle and pedestrian use, the Streetcar, mixed-use high density development including multi-family housing, the North South Rail Spur Path, Hayden Butte/A Mountain, and historic and redeveloping adjacent neighborhoods including Riverside Neighborhood and the Farmer Arts District.

The project was first identified as a need through the 2014-2015 Kimley Horn Downtown Parking Study, which encouraged the City to look at maximizing the on-street parking availability and to reconfigure the street to be more multi-modal; alleviating strain on parking demand and providing comfortable alternatives to driving.

This project will specifically involve the development of design and construction documents that may include short term and long term improvement / phasing options for the street. The final documents will be for a buildable project that will strive to enhance landscaping, increase and improve bicycle, pedestrian and transit access, improve parking availability, preserve vehicular access in the east and west bound lanes and ensure optimal ADA design. The project will look at landscape architecture and traffic, civil and structural engineering and a review of lighting and public art opportunities. The project will also explore creative shade, parklets, gateway treatments, enhanced bicycle lanes, landscape median islands with left turn pockets, back-in angled parking and improved pedestrian areas. The project aims to create an iconic downtown street with a focus on sustainability and providing mobility for all.

In October, presentations of the project were presented to the Sustainability Commission for an overview and feedback, as well as at a public meeting on Oct. 19 inviting local stakeholders to comment.
on the goals and project scope. Staff will also be presenting to the Mayors Commission on Disability Concerns, the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Advisory Board and others.

NEXT STEPS
Feedback collected from these preliminary meetings will be used to inform the work moving forward, including conversation with a newly-formed staff advisory team; representing all areas of the city, from operations to landscape, traffic to public art. Additionally, representatives from ASU and the DTA will be part of the guidance for the project.

FISCAL IMPACT
Design and construction document creation is funded through the Downtown Parking fund. There are no funds allocated for construction at this time.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff would like to receive feedback on design elements for the project. Staff is also requesting three to five Transportation Commissioners to represent the project on an ad-hoc subcommittee in partnership with the Sustainability Commission for the remainder of the design process.

CONTACT
Eric Iwersen
Principal Planner
480-350-8810
eric_iwersen@tempe.gov

Project Website: www.tempe.gov/5thStreet

Attachments: PowerPoint
Streetscape - 5th Street
Farmer Avenue to College Avenue
Transportation Commission
November 8, 2016
5th Street & Downtown Tempe
5th Street Streetscape Project History

- **2014**
  - Downtown Parking Study

- **2015**
  - Identified in Tempe Transportation Plan 2020 Improvements
  - City Council supported design project for 5th St, Farmer to College
  - Design funded through Downtown Parking Fund

- **2016**
  - CollectiV design team hired through RFQ process
  - Begin public involvement, data collection
5th Street Existing Conditions

- Half mile collector street heart of downtown Tempe
- Multi-modal, 3500-4000 vehicles per day
- Links established/historic & redeveloping neighborhoods with downtown & ASU
- Historic structures, contemporary infill, public art, LEED Platinum TTC, & Hayden “A Mountain” Butte
- Some on-street parking
- Varying quality of sidewalk, ADA, street, bicycle & landscape
Guiding Documents
Guiding Documents
5th Street Design Goals

- Enhance multi-modalism (improve bike, ped, transit & ADA)
- Utilize innovative transportation design (NACTO)
- Maintain vehicular & special event access & integrate traffic calming
- Expand & improve landscape & shade options, particularly tree coverage
- Address heat island & user comfort, utilize Low Impact Development techniques (water harvesting, solar)
5th Street Design Goals

- Balance design with cost control & long term maintenance
- Connect to neighborhoods, protect & create gateways/ transitions
- Ensure access to existing utility infrastructure, and accommodate for future expansion of utility corridors
- Create innovative, sustainable, iconic street with mobility for all
Project Limits
Surrounding Context – Tempe Land
Surrounding Context – City Facilities
Surrounding Context – ASU
Alleys, Vias, Paths & Trails
Alleys, Vias, Paths & Trails
Surrounding Context – Recreation/Park Links
Surrounding Context – Recreation Opportunities
Surrounding Context – Recreation Opportunities
Surrounding Context – Connected Streets
Surrounding Context – Neighborhood Link
5th & Ash
5th & Mill
5th & Myrtle
5th & Forest
Surrounding Context – Mill Avenue
Sidewalks
Sidewalks
Crosswalks
Community Festivals
Residential/Hotel Uses
Surrounding Residential – Hanover on Mill
Surrounding Residential – University House
Surrounding Hotel – Mission Palms
Surrounding Hotel – Marriott Properties
Transit Shelters
Streetcar
Parking On-Street and On-Lots
On-Street Parking
Bike Lanes
Bike Lanes
Existing Tree Locations
Tree Canopy Coverage

*EXISTING TEMPE AVERAGE CANOPY COVERAGE - 13.4%

*EXISTING TEMPE/ASU/DOWNTOWN CANOPY COVERAGE - 12.1%

*TEMPE R.O.W. CANOPY COVERAGE - 1.6%

EXISTING R.O.W. 5TH STREET STUDY AREA CANOPY COVERAGE - 8.3%
Light Fixture Locations
Light Fixtures
Light Fixtures
Traffic Analysis – Current Average Daily Data

- Consistent volume of traffic
- No major traffic issues
- Higher volume on east side connection to ASU
- Seven intersections
- Access to off-street parking and building entries
Multi Modal, Smart, Green, Distinctive Street Possibilities
Street Possibilities

Parallel Parking
Street Possibilities

Angle Parking
Street Possibilities

Reverse Angle Parking
Street Possibilities

On-Street Motorcycle and Scooter Parking
Street Possibilities - Parklets

Street Parklets and Pop-up Patios
Street Possibilities - Parklets
Street Possibilities

Street Tree Formations
Street Possibilities

Special Event Spaces
Street Possibilities

Raised Crossings at Intersections
Street Possibilities

Mid-Block Crossings
Street Possibilities

Bike Lanes – Adjacent to Parking
Street Possibilities

Bike Lanes – Green Lanes
Street Possibilities

Buffered Bike Lanes
Street Possibilities

Bike Lanes – Physically Protected / Cycle Tracks
Street Possibilities

Painted Transit Lanes
Street Possibilities

Bicycle Boxes at Intersections
Street Possibilities

Stormwater Planters / Water Harvesting
Street Possibilities

Open Tree Trenches
Street Possibilities

Bike Share Stations
Street Possibilities

Public Art
Street Possibilities

Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
Street Possibilities

Decorative Paving Treatments
Street Possibilities

Historic & Contemporary References in Paving
Street Possibilities

Street Medians
Street Possibilities

Street Medians
Timeline and Next Steps

- **Fall 2016**
  - Develop Concept Alternatives

- **Winter / Spring 2017**
  - Public Meeting #2 - Review Concept Alternatives
  - Boards & Commissions
  - City Council Direction

- **Summer / Fall 2017**
  - Prepare final Construction Documents
  - Develop phases, temporary & permanent solutions
Stakeholders

- **City of Tempe Leaders & Commissions**
  - Mayor and Council
  - City Departments
  - Transportation Commission
  - Commission on Disability Concerns
  - Historic Preservation Commission
  - Municipal Arts Commission
  - Parks and Recreation Board
  - Sustainability Commission

- **Key Stakeholders**
  - Downtown Tempe Authority
  - ASU
  - Neighborhood/Homeowner Associations
  - Tempe Bicycle Action Group
  - Valley Metro
  - Residents, business and property owners adjacent to 5th Street
DATE
October 28, 2016

SUBJECT
Future Agenda Items

PURPOSE
The Chair will request future agenda items from the commission members.

BACKGROUND
The following future agenda items have been previously identified by the Commission or staff:

- Commission Business (January)
- Bike Hero (January)
- Transportation Program Market Research Survey (January)
- Streetcar (January)
- Traffic Congestion Market Research Survey (February)
- Long-Range Forecast Presentation (February)
- Rio Salado @ McClintock Drive MUP Underpass (February)
- FY 2017-18 Media Plan (February)
- Country Club Way Bike/Ped Project (March)
- ASU Bike Registry Outreach Efforts (March)
- Streetcar (March)
- Leading vs. Lagging Left Turn Signals (March)
- Maintenance of MUPs (April)
- North/South Railroad Spur MUP (May)
- Streetcar (May)
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Signal Activate Operations Update (TBD)
- Small Area Transportation Study (TBD)

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

CONTACT
Shelly Seyler, Deputy Public Works Director – Transportation
480-350-8854
shelly_seyler@tempe.gov