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
Second: Commissioner Lloyd Thomas
Decision: Approved

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:
• 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