

# TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

## APPROVED

HELD ON September 17, 2024

The Transportation Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met in the Lower Council Chambers, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street, on September 17, 2024, at 5:30 p.m.

<u>TAB Members Present</u>	<u>TAB Members Absent</u>	<u>Others Present</u>
David Winstanley (Chairperson)	Lea Bertoni	Ryan Hudson
Melissa Vandever (Vice Chairperson)	Tara Bingdazzo	Ryan Stokes
Dana Alvidrez	Rodney Jarvis	Sabine King
Rob Crist	Daniel Laufer	Yung Koprowski
Daniel Hartig		Erik Guderian
Mike James *		
Michelle McCroskey		
<i>*arrived at 5:46 pm</i>		

Chairperson Winstanley called the September 17, 2024, Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:32 pm.

**Item 1. Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on July 16, 2024.**

It was moved by Board Member McCroskey, seconded by Board Member Hartig, that receipt of the above-listed minutes be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

**AYES** – Winstanley – Vandever – Alvidrez – Crist – Hartig – McCroskey

**NAYS** – None

**Item 2. Acknowledge outgoing Board Member Ashley Gagnon.**

Chairperson Winstanley acknowledged outgoing Board Member Ashley Gagnon.

**Item 3. Acknowledge incoming Board Member Dana Alvidrez.**

Chairperson Winstanley welcomed incoming Board Member Dana Alvidrez.

Board Member Alvidrez introduced herself to the board.

**Item 4. Items from citizens present.**

None

**Item 5. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 25th Street between Adobe Street and Covina Street (Council District 1).**

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on the staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 25th Street between Adobe Street and Covina Street.

Mr. Hudson provided an overview of the proposed speed cushions and displayed an aerial view of 25th Street to show the street segment characteristics and proposed speed cushion locations. He detailed the features of the street and surrounding area, which includes Poston Junior High School, sharing a street view for additional context. He stated that the posted speed limit is 25 MPH, while the recorded 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is 34.4 mph with a daily traffic volume of 2,178 vehicles. He further added that 73% of affected property owners support the installation of speed cushions.

Board Member McCroskey noted the absence of bike lanes on this stretch of road and inquired about how children are biking to school.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that there are no designated bike lanes, explaining that this segment of 25<sup>th</sup> Street serves as a local, shared street facility. Bikes either ride in-street or students likely ride on the sidewalks.

Vice Chairperson Vandever inquired if the school drop-off area is located on 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that it is.

Vice Chairperson Vandever followed up by asking whether the speed cushions would interfere with school drop-off and pick-up activities.

Mr. Hudson responded that the speed cushions would not impact any turning movements for vehicles entering and exiting the school during these times.

Board Member McCroskey inquired if the school was involved in the decision-making process.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that the school, as a property owner, had been involved in the public survey portion of the Speed Hump Policy process and expressed support for the installation.

Chairperson Winstanley then invited citizens present to speak.

Dewey Ray – 631 N 25<sup>th</sup> Street – voiced opposition to the speed cushions, explaining that his 91-year-old mother, who uses a walker, has to walk in the street because the driveway approaches and expansion joints are too difficult for her to navigate on the sidewalk facilities. He expressed

concern that the speed cushions would further make walking in the street more challenging for her.

Espy Everhart – 701 N 25<sup>th</sup> Street – expressed support for the speed cushions, citing frequent issues with burnouts, speeding, and vehicle crashes. She advocated for the installation of speed cushions as a safety precaution.

*\*Board Member James arrived at 5:46 pm*

Matt Everhart – 701 N 25<sup>th</sup> St – expressed support for the installation of speed cushions, noting that his work van, commonly parked on this segment of 25<sup>th</sup> Street, is covered in retroreflective material. Despite this precaution and the use of safety cones, his van has been hit twice due to speeding. He hopes that speed cushions will help slow down drivers.

David Smith – 640 N Windsor – supported the speed cushions but suggested relocating the proposed southernmost set on 25<sup>th</sup> Street from south of Windsor to north of Windsor, so residents of Windsor wouldn't have to drive over them, as they are not the ones causing the speeding issues. He added that the only location where burnouts generally occur is north of Windsor and asked if the southernmost speed cushion location could just move north of Windsor.

Mr. Hudson explained that the recommended locations for the three sets of speed cushions were based on the entire corridor. The southernmost proposed location is proposed so that the first device for northbound traffic approaching the school property is set as close as possible to the shift in land use. This also allows for there to be three sets of speed cushions for this corridor considering a target spacing of 500' to 400' between devices. He added that the speed cushions were initially planned to be placed further south, just north of Covina St, but existing drainage infrastructure will prevent that from being a suitable location.

Board Member McCroskey asked where the burnouts were occurring along the road.

Mr. Smith pointed out the area in front of 721 N 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Hudson then read the two online comment cards related to this agenda item that had been received.

Paula Smith – 640 N Windsor – opposed to the installation of speed cushions, voicing concerns that the proposed design would mirror the installed ones on 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, north of McKellips Road, which she describes as undrivable.

Judy Ray – 655 N 25<sup>th</sup> St – expressed support for the installation, mentioning speeding on the street, late-night burnouts, and cars doing donuts in the parking lot before racing onto the road. She noted that the street is wide and long with children walking along it to and from school.

Board Member McCroskey then asked Mr. Ray for more details regarding his mother's preference for walking in the road rather than on the sidewalk, assuming the sidewalk would be smoother.

Mr. Ray reiterated that walking on the road is easier for her because it is flat, whereas the slopes of driveways and sidewalk expansion joints present difficulties for someone using a walker.

Board Member McCroskey pointed out that as this is a school zone, temporary speed limit signs are typically placed during school hours. She asked if a school zone exists on 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Hudson explained that there is no existing 15-mph school zone on 25<sup>th</sup> Street. There is such a crossing and zone on Adobe Street at 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Board Member McCroskey asked where students and parents can safely enter and exit 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Hudson explained that the 15-mph school zone sign would only be at a marked crossing, and since there is no yellow school crosswalk on 25<sup>th</sup> Street, such a sign is not placed there. These school crosswalks and 15-mph school zones are warranted based upon student walking routes, pedestrian connections to/from school campuses, and in coordination with the respective school since these crosswalks require crossing guards. All of these warrants exist for the crosswalks that exist at Adobe Street and 25<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Ray asked about the distance between the curb and the edge of the speed cushion.

Chairperson Winstanley explained that there is a city-standard distance, adding that there should be sufficient space for someone on a bike or using a walker to navigate around the cushions, though part of the space may overlap with the concrete gutter.

Mr. Ray asked for the exact footage.

Chairperson Winstanley said he did not have that information, but it would be a city standard.

Vice Chairperson Vandever mentioned resistance from residents on Windsor and asked whether the speed cushions could be relocated.

Mr. Hudson explained that relocating them would place them too close to other the other proposed speed cushions and reiterated staff's current recommendation for three sets of speed cushions.

It was moved by Vice Chairperson Vandever, seconded by Board Member Crist, to approve the installation of speed cushions on 25<sup>th</sup> Street between Adobe Street and Covina Street.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

**AYES** –Winstanley – Vandever – Alvidrez – Crist – Hartig – James – McCroskey

**NAYS** – None

**Item 6. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on Meseto Avenue between Alma School Road and Patterson (Council District 3).**

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on the staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on Meseto Avenue between Alma School Road and Patterson.

Mr. Hudson began by showing both aerial and street views while providing details about the street and the proposed placement of the speed cushions. He explained that, due to the relatively short length of this road segment, only one set of speed cushions is recommended. He noted that the speed limit is 25 mph, with the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed recorded at 33 mph and a daily volume of 1,460 vehicles. Additionally, 81% of the affected property owners were in favor of the speed cushion installation.

Board Member McCroskey asked whether the driveway on Meseto Avenue serves the church, school or if it is shared.

Mr. Hudson responded that it is a shared driveway for both the church and the Catholic school, explaining that vehicles enter from Meseto Avenue and exit onto Alma School Road.

Board Member McCroskey inquired about their feedback regarding the speed cushion proposal.

Mr. Hudson replied that both the church and the school were in favor of the speed cushion installation based upon the speed hump policy public survey process.

Board Member James mentioned that other parts of Dobson Ranch have shared bike and parking lanes and asked whether that would be appropriate for this section of roadway.

Mr. Hudson responded that they could explore the option of adding striping on Meseto Avenue.

Board Member McCroskey expressed support for Board Member James's request to explore striping options on Meseto Avenue.

Mr. Hudson agreed, stating that it is something they will look into given the curb-to-curb width of this street section.

Board Member Hartig referred to the presentation, noting that there were 21 secondarily affected property owners, and asked if they had received 21 responses as part of that survey.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that they did not receive 21 responses from the secondarily affected property owners. Those that did not respond to the survey are considered to be in support. This is similar to how those that do not respond to the acceptance survey are considered to not approve of the speed cushion installation.

Board Member Hartig then questioned why the nonresponses were counted as being in favor of the speed cushions, rather than being logged as nonresponses.

Mr. Hudson explained that within the primarily affected area, no responders are considered to be in opposition to the speed cushions. However, in the secondarily affected area, no responders are considered to be in favor of the speed cushions, because the purpose of surveying this group is to gauge whether they want to halt the project. If at least 70% of the secondarily affected property owners are opposed to the installation, the project would be stopped. Therefore, if they do not respond, it is assumed they do not wish to stop the installation and are thus counted in favor.

It was moved by Board Member McCroskey, seconded by Board Member James, to approve the installation of speed cushions on Meseto Avenue between Alma School Road and Patterson.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

**AYES** – Winstanley – Vandever – Alvidrez – Crist – Hartig – James – McCroskey

**NAYS** – None

**Item 7. Hear and discuss a presentation on the Mesa Safe Streets for All Safety Action Plan.**

Sabine King, Supervising Engineer, introduced herself and indicated that she would be giving a presentation on the Mesa Safe Streets for All Safety Action Plan with Yung Koprowski from Y2K.

Ms. King began the presentation by explaining the progress of the project, stating that phase one of their outreach had been completed and they were now moving into phase two.

Ms. Koprowski detailed the public engagement elements and displayed a slide listing upcoming events where more engagement will be targeted. She also mentioned that their online survey would remain open until November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Chairperson Winstanley asked if the Eastmark Safety Fair was part of the regular Saturday morning farmers' market or a separate event.

Ms. King explained that they were informed about the event only a few weeks ago, so they added it to their calendar. However, they have not received confirmation, and if they do not hear back, they might not attend.

Ms. Koprowski continued her presentation by discussing the updated fact sheet, strategy refinement process, and strategy prioritization. She provided examples for both infrastructure and non-infrastructure strategies and described how they condensed the strategies into eleven simplified statements for public feedback.

Board Member McCroskey asked how law enforcement had been incorporated into the plan.

Ms. Koprowski referred to a slide showing the 11 strategies for the public survey. She explained that law enforcement efforts were part of non-infrastructure strategies, such as promoting safer speeds, increasing penalties, and preventing driving under the influence. She added that they are proposing to expand or enhance these measures further. Ms. Koprowski also elaborated on

their online survey and their in-person feedback method using dot polling, before outlining the next steps in the process.

Board Member McCroskey referred to strategy number three of the public survey strategy list “Separate Peds and Bikes from Vehicles” and asked if any innovative ideas were being considered to accomplish it.

Ms. Koprowski responded that while she did not have all the detailed strategies in front of her, they were considering options such as paint and post or permanent reconstruction. She also explained that separation of pedestrian from vehicles could be achieved either by time or space, such as through overpasses, underpasses, or pedestrian leading intervals at signalized intersections.

Board Member McCroskey brought up how Scottsdale had implemented bike paths along sidewalks to separate cyclists from traffic and encouraged the City of Mesa to adopt similar measures. She emphasized that cyclists wouldn’t feel safe unless they were physically separated from traffic.

Ms. Koprowski agreed, noting that they had identified 14 short-term, high priority projects, many of which focused on improving the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure for those corridors.

Board Member James inquired if the city was considering using curb bulbs (also known as curb extensions) on collector streets to reduce pedestrian crossing time.

Ms. Koprowski confirmed this, explaining that curb bulb outs were part of strategy number four on their public survey strategy list, “Design for Safer Speeds”.

Board Member James then asked if on-street parking spots would be lost due to these design changes.

Ms. Koprowski responded that on-street parking near intersections wouldn’t be affected since parking is already prohibited within a certain distance from a stop sign.

Board Member James noted that while many streets already have good bike lanes, making them safer would be a great improvement.

Ms. Koprowski encouraged the board to reach out to the staff with additional comments on specific strategies and mentioned that staff could provide explanations if certain ideas were or were not included.

Board Member McCroskey inquired if the board’s input was wanted feedback through the survey.

Ms. Koprowski confirmed that they would like the board members to participate in the survey.

Vice Chairperson Vandever requested the survey website address.

Ms. Koprowski shared the website, [MesaSaferStreets.com](http://MesaSaferStreets.com).

Ms. King asked the board to share the survey with friends, family, neighbors and others in their community.

Board Member McCroskey inquired about the deadline for survey responses.

Ms. Koprowski reiterated that the deadline was November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Board Member McCroskey suggested that Mr. Hudson remind the board about the survey closer to the deadline.

Ms. Koprowski added that for their in-person events, they were using physical boards for feedback, which they intended to convert into an electronic public survey. She noted that participants were being asked to include their zip code, as they aimed to receive responses from across all areas of the City of Mesa.

Vice Chairperson Vandever inquired if the City of Mesa was collaborating with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) or any other entities to educate the public, not only in the City of Mesa but across the state.

Ms. Koprowski said she did not have any specific information about collaboration with ADOT, but mentioned that for education and encouragement strategies, they were collaborating with global organizations like AARP, schools, and other agencies.

Erik Guderian, Assistant Transportation Director, introduced himself and elaborated on the city's efforts to work with other departments and external organizations. He explained that for the past few years, they have been meeting with various departments to discuss issues and next steps. Communication representatives from each department were engaging with other cities and the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) to develop regional solutions. He acknowledged the need for collaboration beyond the City of Mesa.

Board Member McCroskey asked for their thoughts on education programs within schools and whether any new, creative methods were being used to engage students and refresh their understanding of traffic rules.

Chairperson Winstanley suggested including electric bikes in that discussion.

Vice Chairperson Vandever then asked Officer Stokes if the police department was distributing bike safety brochures to schools.

Officer Stokes confirmed that they were.

Ms. King mentioned that their bike and pedestrian program has been in place for many years and actively engages with schools. She noted that they have events like Walk to School that include safety talks for students and teachers, and bike rodeos which are aimed at children 2-5 years old where they teach them traffic laws in a playful manner. Additionally, they teach safety classes for bicyclists and distribute hundreds of bike helmets annually. Events such as Helmet



Pop-ups, Bikes to Books contests, the Reindeer Roll and Stroll, and CycloMesa are part of their efforts to promote safety. She added they are trying to get into the schools more, working with the police department and trying to get more engaged every day. Strategies outlined as part of this plan will include enhancements to these events, programs, and educational focus areas.

Board Member McCroskey inquired if certain schools were more engaged than others and requested information about which schools were participating to be shared at a future meeting.

Ms. King reminded the board that the plan was still in development and would move into the implementation phase next year, which would include new strategies and creative approaches. She explained that they will be looking at ways to enhance their educational programs, secure additional funding and increase engagement.

Board Member McCroskey suggested tracking the progress of the project, noting the current status and future goals for implementation.

Board Member James requested an update on the Center Street improvement project leading into downtown and inquired about any progress.

Mr. Guderian explained that they had completed a study and presented their findings to the Transportation Advisory Board earlier this year as well as the Sustainability and Transportation Committee (SAT) which is a city council subcommittee. The project's cost is significant, so they are exploring funding options. Initially, the project was included in the bond initiative for Mesa residents to vote in the fall, but since it is relatively new, it was not included in the final list. He mentioned they are continuing to seek funding opportunities.

Board Member James acknowledged the challenges with funding but expressed hope for future opportunities.

It was motioned by Board Member Vandever, seconded by Board Member McCroskey, to adjourn the meeting.

**AYES** – Winstanley – Vandever – Alvidrez – Crist – Hartig – James – McCroskey

**NAYS** – None

Meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm