

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

APPROVED

HELD ON July 16, 2024

The Transportation Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met in the Lower Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on July 16, 2024, at 5:30 p.m.

<u>TAB Members Present</u>	<u>TAB Members Absent</u>	<u>Others Present</u>
David Winstanley (Chairperson)	Rodney Jarvis	Ryan Hudson
Melissa Vandever (Vice Chairperson)*	Ashley Gagnon	Anna Janusz
Lea Bertoni		Cory Simon
Tara Bingdazzo		David Calloway
Rob Crist		Brian Pessaro
Daniel Hartig		Michael Book
Mike James		Marty Ziech
Daniel Laufer		Erik Guderian
Michelle McCroskey		Yung Koprowski
		Mark Venti
		Vamshi Yellisetty
<i>*arrived at 5:37 pm</i>		

Chairperson Winstanley called the July 16, 2024, Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Item 1. Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on May 21, 2024.

It was moved by Board Member Laufer, seconded by Board Member Crist, that receipt of the above listed minutes be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Winstanley – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Crist – Hartig – James – Laufer – McCroskey

NAYS – None

Item 2. Acknowledge incoming Board Member Daniel Hartig.

Chairperson Winstanley acknowledged incoming Board Member Daniel Hartig.

Item 3. Items from citizens present.

None

Item 4. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 8th Street between Harris Drive and Gilbert Road (Council District 1).

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and explained that he will be giving presentations on staff's recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on three segments: 8th Street, 32nd Street, and Norwood. He also mentioned that all road segments presented in the agenda items 4, 5, and 6 met the warranting criteria for speed cushion installation per the Mesa Speed Hump Policy. He then proceeded to explain the difference between speed cushions and speed humps. Mr. Hudson explained the function of speed cushions, noting that they are designed to allow fire trucks and other emergency service vehicles to drive over them without slowing down as much as they would have to for speed humps. The determination of having to install cushions versus humps is per direction from the Mesa Fire Department. Mr. Hudson identified that all three street segments to be discussed tonight are for speed cushions.

Mr. Hudson then proceeded with the presentation on staff's recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 8th Street between Harris Drive and Gilbert Road, per agenda item 4.

He provided an overview of 8th street and the proposed location for the speed cushions. He reviewed survey results, stating that the street has a posted speed limit of 25 MPH, with the 85th percentile speed being 35 MPH, and a daily traffic volume of 1,595 vehicles. He added that 77% of affected properties approved the installation, while less than 70% of the secondarily affected properties opposed it.

**Vice Chairperson Vandever arrived at 5:37 pm*

Chairperson Winstanley invited residents to share their comments.

Dave Kurtz at 1909 E 8th St. expressed his support for the speed cushions. Mr. Kurtz explained that many people, including children walking to and from school, use 8th Street. He said that installation of speed cushions on that stretch is a matter of health and safety.

Linda Kurtz at 1909 E 8th St submitted a comment card showing her support for the speed cushions, but she chose not to speak.

Richard Berman at 1935 E 8th St voiced his support for the speed cushions. He said that he has 5 grandchildren aged 2 to 13, and he is afraid of leaving them in the front yard due to speeding on 8th Street.

Harry Miller at 1757 E 8th St also spoke in favor of the speed cushions. He said that drivers have no regard for people's safety, noting that Amazon, UPS, and City of Mesa truck drivers speed on

8th St. Since there are not sufficient police officers to patrol the streets, there are no consequences for speeders. He emphasized the importance of children's safety.

Don Templeton at 1841 E 8th St supported the speed cushions and mentioned that his wife also favored them. He explained that the street's condition worsened after the canal was paved. He also mentioned his personal experience when somebody passed him at high speed because they were testing a car.

Board Member McCroskey inquired how the street got worse.

Mr. Templeton explained his history of living along the subject street segment, dating back to when the street was not paved. However, problems began, once it was paved and the bridge over the canal was constructed long ago.

Sheryl O'Neil at 1841 E 8th St stated that she is Don's wife and supported the speed cushions. She elaborated that people who do not live on the street are speeding and have no regard for safety.

Mr. Hudson read the on-line comment cards that had been submitted for this agenda item which included the following:

Maurice Carey at 815 N Harris expressed support for the speed cushions.

Gwen Carey at 815 N Harris also supported the speed cushions.

Derrick Mendel at 1729 E 8th St shared his support for the speed cushions.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired whether public comment signs were installed to notify drivers that they can call in to give comments during the public survey period.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that they could, and this information was posted on signs along the street segment for two weeks. The results of the two-week public survey reflect that specific outreach effort.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired whether the other half of 8th Street had speed cushions.

Mr. Hudson affirmed that 8th St/Adobe St east and west of the discussed segment has speed cushions.

It was moved by Board Member McCroskey, seconded by Board Member Laufer, to approve the installation of speed cushions on 8th Street between Harris Drive and Gilbert Road.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Winstanley – Vandever – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Crist – Hartig – James – Laufer – McCroskey

NAYS – None

Item 5. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 24th Street between Hermosa Vista Drive and Leonora Street (Council District 1).

Mr. Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be presenting staff's recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 24th Street between Hermosa Vista and Leonora Street. He provided an overview of 24th Street, highlighting the locations where staff recommends installing speed cushions. He explained that the street has a posted speed limit of 25 MPH, with the 85th percentile speed being 34.6 MPH and a daily traffic volume of 973 vehicles per day.

He added that 76% of the affected properties approved installation, while less than 70% of the secondarily affected property owners opposed it.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired whether there were any citizens present who wanted to comment, but none were present.

Mr. Hudson then read the online comment cards submitted for this item which included the following:

Amanda Misinco at 2206 N 24th St expressed support for the speed cushions.

Michael Rosenfield at 2420 E Hermosa Vista Dr voiced opposition to the installation of the speed cushions.

Kalli Jandel at 2318 N 24th St commented in favor of the speed cushions.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired whether there are speed cushions on Hermosa Vista Drive, both west and east of 24th Street.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that there are existing speed cushions on Hermosa Vista Dr between Old Gilbert Rd and Lindsay Rd, west and east of this subject street corridor on 24th St.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if the intersection of Hermosa Vista Drive and 24th Street is an all-way stop.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that it is indeed an all-way stop-controlled intersection.

Board Member Bertoni inquired whether the intersection of Lenora Street and 24th Street is a stop controlled intersection.

Mr. Hudson replied that he was not certain but believed there was a stop sign at that intersection. He explained that it is a T-intersection so the stop sign would be for the southbound approach to Leonora St.

It was moved by Board Member Laufer, seconded by Board Member Crist, to approve the installation of speed cushions on 24th Street between Hermosa Vista and Leonora Street.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Winstanley – Vandever – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Crist – Hartig – James – Laufer – McCroskey

NAYS – None

Item 6. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on Norwood Street between Lindsay Road and 32nd Street (Council District 1).

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be presenting staff's recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on Norwood Street between Lindsay Road and 32nd Street. He provided an overview of Norwood Street, where staff recommends four sets of speed cushions. He explained the street has a posted speed limit of 25 MPH, with the 85th percentile speed being 34.7 MPH and a daily traffic volume of 510 vehicles per day. He added that 70% of the affected properties approved the installation, while less than 70% of the secondarily affected property owners opposed it.

Chairperson Winstanley invited residents to share their comments.

Sarah Polasky at 2811 E Norwood St spoke in favor of the speed cushions. She explained that she witnesses drivers speeding on Norwood, especially in the morning while she is walking her son to school.

Mr. Hudson then read an online comment card for this item.

Jared Dutton at 2842 E Norwood St expressed support for the speed cushions.

Board Member James inquired whether the daily traffic volume criteria for speed cushion installation was met.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that it was over 500 vehicles per day, meeting the traffic volume threshold contained within the Mesa Speed Hump Policy.

Board Member Hartig asked what is considered the affected area.

Mr. Hudson explained that houses within 300 ft along the street segment corridor are considered within the affected area, while properties within 300 – 600 ft are considered the secondarily affected area.

Board Member Hartig asked if a house located behind the street, not directly on the subject street, could still be within the affected area.

Mr. responded that this is possible and is indeed the case for this segment of Norwood.

Board Member Bertoni inquired whether there are speed cushions on 32nd Street. She was curious if drivers are using Norwood to avoid speed cushions on other streets, such as 32nd Street.

Mr. Hudson clarified that there are no speed cushions yet on 32nd Street, but they are approved, and the Transportation Department is actively working on installing them there this month. This was a previous TAB agenda item.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired whether there was a recent speed change on 32nd Street.

Mr. Hudson confirmed this. At the prior TAB meeting, the board approved staff's recommendation to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph on 32nd St between McDowell Rd and McKellips Rd.

Board Member McCroskey asked what determines whether a street is striped with the bike lanes. She noted that there is striping on some streets but not on Norwood.

Mr. Hudson explained that Norwood is a typical residential street with a width of 40 feet. He said that adding striping for bike lanes, would require removal of on-street parking. He mentioned that 24th Street and 8th Street are 48 feet wide, they can accommodate bike lane striping while also maintaining on-street parking. So, striping residential streets depends on street width, street characteristics, and the traffic patterns on that particular street segment.

It was moved by Vice Chairperson Vandever, seconded by Board Member Bertoni, to approve the installation of speed cushions on Norwood Street between Lindsay Road and 32nd Street.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Winstanley – Vandever – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Crist – Hartig – James – Laufer – McCroskey

NAYS – None

Item 7. Hear and discuss a presentation on the Rio East-Dobson Streetcar Extension.

David Calloway, Transit Coordinator, introduced himself and indicated that he, along with Brian Pessaro, Principal Planner, and Michael Book, Community Relations Coordinator, from Valley Metro, would be presenting on the Rio East-Dobson Streetcar Extension.

Mr. Pessaro stated that Marty Ziech, Capital Planning Manager with Valley Metro, was also in the audience and would also assist with the presentation or questions as they arise. He mentioned that the City of Mesa was selected to receive \$15.9 million in grant money, which will allow them to proceed to the next phase of the streetcar extension project, including the 30 percent design and environmental analysis. To prepare for the streetcar, they have extended Route 48, enhanced Routes 30 and 45, and initiated service on the Fiesta Buzz circulator.

Mr. Calloway explained that the Fiesta Buzz circulator connects the Mesa Riverview area with Southern Avenue, and it is interlined with the Downtown Buzz.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if the items are currently operational.

Mr. Calloway confirmed that they are in operation now, preparing for this project.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired about ridership numbers.

Mr. Calloway responded that the Fiesta Buzz has gained 5,000 riders per month.

Mr. Pessaro continued the presentation by explaining the difference between the light rail and the streetcar. He stated that the streetcar extension will come from the City of Tempe along Rio Salado Parkway then go down Dobson Road to Main Street. In the current study and design concepts, they are determining where stops could be located and how to operate the streetcar on the road: in a streetcar-only lane (dedicated) or in a shared lane with traffic (mixed flow). He then showed the activity centers that the streetcar would pass by and provided information about their community outreach and the next steps with a timeline.

Board Member McCroskey asked which options were most and least favorable in their public meetings.

Mr. Pessaro responded that they are still tabulating the results of their public outreach, but that Mr. Book could provide a summary of some preliminary takeaways.

Mr. Book mentioned that approximately 70 percent of respondents favored a dedicated guideway instead of mixed traffic. They also collected public feedback on preferred stop locations but are still processing that information.

Board Member McCroskey noted that a dedicated lane would require widening Rio Salado Parkway from 65 feet to 95 feet, per the presentation, and asked if right-of-way would be taken from the north side of Rio Salado Parkway since homes are on the south side of the road.

Mr. Pessaro said that much of Rio Salado Parkway, in Tempe, has transit easements, which are areas set aside for transit.

Board Member Bertoni inquired about feedback on the mixed lane use in the City of Tempe for the existing streetcar operations.

Mr. Pessaro asked for clarification on the question.

Board Member Bertoni asked if the mixed lane usage was confusing for the public and how it works in the City of Tempe – has the team reached out and received any feedback from City of Tempe on this?

Mr. Pessaro and Mr. Ziech both said they were unaware of any customer feedback specific to the mixed lane in the City of Tempe.

Board Member Bertoni emphasized the importance of learning from existing projects to improve future implementations.

Mr. Calloway agreed and said they will check with their counterparts in the City of Tempe regarding feedback on the existing mixed lanes to make that part of the considerations for the alternatives.

Mr. Book clarified that the public was informed that it could be a mix of both options dedicated and mixed lanes, not an all-or-nothing scenario.

Mr. Calloway added that both roadway profiles are feasible.

Board Member McCroskey asked when the streetcar is expected to be operational if this project continues on schedule.

Mr. Pessaro estimated an opening in 2031 at the earliest.

Board Member McCroskey expressed surprise at the seven-year timeline.

Mr. Pessaro explained that such projects take time to develop, fund and deliver.

Board Member James asked if the board's comments tonight would be part of the official report or just used for insight.

Mr. Book stated that while tonight's comments won't be included in the report, they will be included in stakeholder meetings and the respective outreach feedback.

Board Member James recommended dedicated lanes instead of mixed traffic to reduce potential conflicts with cyclists, pedestrians, driveways, businesses, and buses.

Board Member McCroskey agreed with Board Member James.

Chairperson Winstanley inquired about the decision process for this route and why it was prioritized over southeast Mesa.

Mr. Pessaro said there were two previous studies that narrowed down numerous corridors to five, then three, and the route was presented to City Council in November of 2020. He said the previous studies identified the current route and the preferred alternative based on numerous factors.

Mr. Calloway added that the Fiesta District Alternative Analysis, a study conducted years prior, looked at high-capacity transit and various technologies, which was part of the process leading to the current route.

Mr. Pessaro said that the Fiesta District Alternative Analysis study identified a longer route, expanding further south on Dobson Road to Southern Avenue, then east to Country Club Drive and back up to Main Street. It is phase one of a two phase plan for the City of Mesa.

Mr. Book said the reports and studies are available on valleymetro.org. He advised looking up the study for the final reports.

Chairperson Winstanley expressed concern that the decision favored west Mesa over southeast Mesa, which has a significant employment population. He asked if the Mesa City Council already approved the plans.

Mr. Pessaro confirmed that the City Council approved the study findings.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if this is how the decision is validated.

Mr. Pessaro confirmed this.

Chairperson Winstanley then asked about an upcoming council meeting.

Mr. Pessaro said they must present the study findings to make it official, as required by the Federal Transit Administration.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if the route was effectively approved by City Council.

Mr. Pessaro confirmed this.

Board Member James stated that this project is a part of Prop 400 and will be on the ballot as Prop 479. He emphasized that the regional community participation plan, was run through Maricopa Association of Governments, identified the regional plan.

Chairperson Winstanley remarked that southeast Mesa would remain suburban with no transit options.

Mr. Calloway stated that rail funding is not included in Prop 479.

Board Member James inquired about its initial inclusion.

Mr. Calloway confirmed that it was initially included.

Mr. Pessaro explained that a compromise made by the state legislature allows Prop 479 funds to repair rail but not for new rail projects.

Board Member James suggested discussing funding options at a future meeting.

Vice Chairperson Vandever inquired about the streetcar's operational frequency and if there would be another parking hub besides the one near Dobson Road.

Mr. Pessaro replied that the streetcar currently runs every 20 minutes, seven days a week with plans to reduce it to every 15 minutes. He noted that streetcars are designed for local use, not meant for park-and-ride type operations.

Mr. Calloway also confirmed that the service times would match those already running in the City of Tempe.

Board Member McCroskey asked if it operates 24 hours a day.

Mr. Calloway responded that it does not and mentioned that he wasn't exactly sure of the service span.

Mr. Ziech noted that it operates from approximately 5:00 am to a little after midnight.

Chairperson Winstanley noted that the streetcar would be beneficial for events.

Mr. Book mentioned receiving feedback about ensuring a connection to light rail.

Board Member Bingdazzo inquired about future phases for the Mesa Riverview area or a stop there.

Mr. Calloway said he was unaware of specific plans but noted it is a regional destination, so there would likely be a stop between Mesa Riverview Park and the shopping center.

Board Member Bingdazzo mentioned seeing it on the map and wondered about future plans.

The Board thanked the speakers for their presentation.

Item 8. Hear and discuss a presentation on the Mesa Safe Streets for All Safety Action Plan.

Erik Guderian, Assistant Transportation Director, introduced himself and indicated that he would be presenting the Mesa Safe Streets for All Safety Action Plan with Yung Koprowski from Y2K Engineering.

Ms. Koprowski provided an update on phase one public engagement, highlighting response percentages by zip code, areas of greatest concern, behaviors of greatest concern, and strategies for enhancing transportation safety. She also explained that they were seeking community members to join a group for additional feedback on road safety. She then explained their status and next steps, concluding with an overview of phase two public engagement.

Board Member McCroskey asked where recommendations like separating bike lanes from vehicular travel lanes come in.

Ms. Koprowski responded that one focus area that will be covered in the comprehensive safety action plan is vulnerable road users, such as bicyclists and pedestrians, which includes strategies in that category. They are also focusing on a combination of strategies and complimentary projects addressing issues like high left turn crashes, potentially involving lighting, dual left turns, and signal timing.

Board Member McCroskey asked if the plan would include red light running cameras or other measures to discourage unsafe actions.

Ms. Koprowski replied that some strategies include automated enforcement. She added that the federal road safety initiative includes safe roads, educational information for road users, and safe speeds. They aimed for a layered approach to address safety from all angles.

Mr. Guderian emphasized that the current project establishes a plan. He added that there is a list of 100 strategies, which needed to be prioritized to determine their implementation time, whether now, next year, or in 3-5 years.

Ms. Koprowski mentioned that the police department fights annually to keep automated enforcement a possibility. Loosing this capability would remove a crucial tool from their toolbox.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if this Safety Action Plan was more strategic or is it more tactical.

Ms. Koprowski explained that this plan complements the Transportation Master Plan. Avoiding the duplication of efforts and incorporating the safety strategies from the Transportation Master Plan.

Mr. Guderian added that this plan is one of the early identified action items in the Transportation Master Plan.

Board Member James asked how they prioritize the 100 different strategies.

Ms. Koprowski explained that those 100 strategies can be found in the FHWA Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse. They are beginning to group the specific strategies into a hierarchy of prioritization, with tier one focusing on reducing speeds and tier three on managing conflicts. For example, a raised crosswalk might fall into a category allowing more design flexibility. This grouping helps the city implement the best strategies for their issues in their future designs. She also offered to provide a previous presentation on their top 10 collision profiles for anyone that missed it.

Board Member McCroskey asked when that presentation was given.

Ms. Koprowski replied that it was in May.

Mr. Guderian noted that that Y2K is challenging staff to step out of their comfort zone to identify traffic safety solutions that are creative and would be new for Mesa.

The Board thanked Mr. Guderian and Ms. Koprowski for the update on the comprehensive safety action plan, looking forward to future updates at the upcoming TAB meetings this year.

Item 9. Hear and discuss a presentation on the Transportation Master Plan Update.

Mark Venti, Senior Transportation Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be presenting the Transportation Master Plan with Vamshi Yellisetty from Kittleson and Associates.

Mr. Venti mentioned that the final product has been delivered as a draft and is available for review on their website as <http://www.mesalistens.com/transportation-plan>. He noted that they are already receiving comments and proceeded to navigate the website, showing the board all the information available on the plan. He advised the board that comments are being accepted until August 5th and recommended that they share the website with friends and family to gather additional feedback. Once the feedback is organized, it will be presented to the Mesa City Council in September. He added that they would likely return to the Transportation Advisory Board meeting in September or later in 2024 to discuss post plan concepts.

Board Member McCroskey expressed her appreciation for breaking down the plan by travel sheds, saying she liked being able to focus on the area where she is most active and using the find button to search for specific terms, streets and projects. She mentioned that some corrections are needed in the plan and asked if it would be easiest to specify the page needing correction.

Mr. Venti responded that she could pass comments through Mr. Hudson or online, whichever worked best for her.

Board Member McCroskey said that emailing Mr. Hudson would work best for her, and it might be the best way since he would know which comments came from the board.

Mr. Venti stated he would prioritize comments from the board and mentioned that others have added comments directly onto the pages with Adobe Pro.

Board Member McCroskey asked if one method was easier than the other for him.

Mr. Yellisetty replied that any method of receiving comments works for them.

Vice Chairperson Vandever thanked them for reading all the comments, acknowledging the volume of reading involved. She noted that many comments addressed items discussed over the years.

Mr. Venti explained to the board that the back two pages contain comments from phase one and two.

Board Member James commended the mapping and level of detail, saying it was well done and easy to read. He looked forward to reading it more in depth.

Chairperson Winstanley expressed his gratitude and was impressed by their forward- thinking approach in defining metrics for success and including them in the plan.

It was motioned by Board Member James, seconded by Board Member Laufer, to adjourn the meeting.

AYES – Winstanley – Vandever – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Crist – Hartig – James – Laufer – McCroskey

NAYS – None

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm