

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

APPROVED

HELD ON July 19, 2022

The Transportation Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met in the Lower Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on July 19, 2022, at 5:30 p.m.

<u>TAB Members Present</u>	<u>TAB Members Absent</u>	<u>Others Present</u>
Michelle McCroskey (Chairperson)	Ryan Wozniak (Vice Chairperson)	Ryan Hudson
Tara Bingdazzo	Sam Gatton	Erik Guderian
Ashley Gagnon	Rodney Jarvis	Jason Coon
Mike James	Megan Neal	Anna Janusz
Daniel Laufer	David Winstanley	Sabine King
Melissa Vandever		Mark Venti
		Joe Draper

Chairperson McCroskey called the July 19, 2022, Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:33 pm.

Item 1. Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on May 17, 2022.

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

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – McCroskey – Bingdazzo – Gagnon – James – Laufer – Vandever

NAYS – None

Item 2. Acknowledge new Board Members Ashley Gagnon and Tara Bingdazzo.

Chairperson McCroskey welcomed new board members, Tara Bingdazzo and Ashley Gagnon. Board members Bingdazzo, Gagnon, Laufer, McCroskey, James and Vandever introduced themselves.

Item 3. Items from citizens present.

None

Item 4. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to approve the installation of speed cushions on 64th Street between McKellips Road and Hermosa Vista Drive (Council District 5).

Mr. 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 64th Street between McKellips Road and Hermosa Vista Drive, a street segment residing in Council District 5.

Mr. Hudson gave an overview of the speed hump policy process. He then went on to explain the staff recommendation for speed cushions on the subject street segment, showing three proposed speed cushion locations on 64th St between Hermosa Vista Drive and McKellips Road. Mr. Hudson stated that this street is posted at 25 mph, the recorded 85th percentile speed was 38.5 MPH, and average daily traffic volume is over 1,000 vehicles per day. Additionally, the Fire Department does not object to speed cushions on this street segment. Mr. Hudson also detailed the public feedback received for the proposed speed cushion installation and informed that 70% of those within the affected area are in favor and 91% within the secondarily affected area are in support. He also provided a summary of public comments received during the 2-week open public comment phase.

Board Member Bingdazzo asked if not responding to the survey would be counted as in support of the speed cushions.

Mr. Hudson informed that would be correct for the secondarily affected area but those in the affected area that do not vote or mark as no opinion are then counted as in opposition of the speed cushions.

Board Member Bingdazzo asked if this was a consistent process.

Mr. Hudson confirmed that it was a consistent process.

Board Member James asked what the main reasons for opposition to the speed cushions were from the public.

Mr. Hudson said the main reasons were that the speed cushions are a burden for those that follow the rules and that they did not perceive speeding as an issue on this street segment.

Mr. Hudson read details from three online comment cards for the board.

Joan Loper 2343 N 64th St – in favor

Michael Spam 6401 E Heather Dr – in favor

Charles Newton 6402 E Heather Dr – in favor

The board heard comments from members from the public that requested to provide comments on Item 4:

Peggy LaShier 2216 N 64th St – in favor

Mory LaShier 2216 N 64th St – in favor

Don French 2230 N 64th St – in favor

Melanie Giancola - 2250 N 64th St – in favor

Angela Alsbury 6462 E Rustic Dr – in favor
Kevin Brown 6462 E Rustic Dr – in favor

Chairperson McCroskey asked about getting speed humps across the whole road instead of the speed cushions like it has been done on other streets.

Mr. Hudson explained that since it is a fire route, only speed cushions can be installed. He also added that for all installs, a traffic study is done before and after speed humps/cushions are installed to measure the traffic calming impacts and how effective the features are on the subject street.

Chairperson McCroskey asked if staff notices that the speed cushions do not help to slow down traffic can it be changed.

Mr. Hudson explained they will look at the data and may investigate other options.

Board Member James asked why there was a higher number of speed humps planned for this stretch of road and now it is down to three.

Mr. Hudson said speed cushions are placed every 400-500 ft while making sure that there is a certain distance from intersections, proper separation from driveways, and a certain distance from stop signs. With all those variables, it was decided that three could be installed on this street segment. If approved, staff will lay out the proposed locations and make sure that there are no other obstacles in the field. He said they paint the device outlines in the street before they install them to make sure everything lines up and all conflicts are avoided. He added that if a resident responded to the acceptance survey that they do not approve of the speed cushions being installed within 50' of their property, the City will not install a device within that distance to the subject property line.

Board Member Laufer asked about possibly adding plastic bollards along the bike lane.

Mr. Hudson explained that no further bike lane enhancements are recommended at this time for this street segment.

Board Member Laufer asked if there are sidewalks along both sides of the road.

Mr. Hudson said there are no sidewalks.

Chairperson McCroskey asked where residents walk.

Residents in the audience responded that they typically walk in the bike lanes.

Chairperson McCroskey acknowledged the residents' comments and explained that this proposal for speed cushions may be seen as the first step in their neighborhood. She then asked Mr. Hudson to address the process to request crosswalks.

Mr. Hudson said that he is guessing this area was annexed in from Maricopa County, and he explained that this is a normal look for a County Island neighborhood that was built with no

sidewalk facilities throughout. He explained that crosswalks and sidewalks are not traffic calming items, they are pedestrian enhancements. He said staff is focusing on traffic calming tonight but that pedestrian facilities could be looked at as a separate effort.

Chairperson McCroskey asked what the process would be to get crosswalks in the future.

Mr. Hudson explained staff would have to evaluate if crosswalks would be warranted. He said without sidewalks, normally they would not add crosswalks. He said they do not install crosswalks indiscriminately throughout neighborhoods. He said they want to put them in when warranted and at specific locations that warrant the pavement markings.

Chairperson McCroskey stated that there were residents with raised hands in the audience and appeared they wanted to speak. She asked what the process for this was.

Mr. Hudson explained they have already gone through the process of reading comment cards and letting residents speak at this meeting. He said if there are other requests, residents can contact Transportation staff.

Board Member Bingdazzo asked what the timeline was to make changes if the speed cushions are not an effective resolution.

Mr. Hudson explained that approximately a month or two after they are installed, staff will do another speed study. If staff determines there was not a reduction in speed, then they would assess and decide if something else should be done or analyzed.

It was moved by Board Member Vandever, seconded by Board Member Laufer, to approve the installation of speed cushions on 64th Street between McKellips Road and Hermosa Vista Drive.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – McCroskey — Bingdazzo – Gagnon — James — Laufer — Vandever

NAYS – None

Item 5. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph on 1st Street between Mesa Drive and Country Club Drive (Council District 4).

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on the staff recommendation to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph on 1st Street between Mesa Drive and Country Club Drive (Council District 4).

Mr. Hudson provided context for where the subject street segment resides, its proximity to Main St and the Downtown Area, and the adjoining segments of 1st Street to the east of Mesa Drive and west of Country Club Drive. To the east of Mesa Drive and west of Country Club Drive the 1st Street roadway cross-section changes to more of a local, residential street cross-section

where the existing posted speed limit is 25 mph. Mr. Hudson showed images of the existing street cross-section on 1st Street, including lane configurations, on-street parking stalls, and some of the adjacent land uses. He also explained how the area is changing with addition of ASU campus and other transformations, such as additional high-density residential and other new developments and re-developments. With the changing land uses and the urban street environment, we are expecting more on-street parking and more pedestrian traffic. This street segment, 1st Street from Mesa Drive to Country Club Drive, is currently listed under City Code Section 10-4-6 for streets with a posted speed limit of 30 mph. The recommendation to reduce the speed limit to 25 mph would require amendment of Section 10-4-6, and then the 25-mph speed limit will allow for the street segment to fall under the purview of Section 10-4-7 which covers the default speed limit of 25 mph, not requiring specific street segments.

It was moved by Board Member Laufer, seconded by Board Member Vandever, to approve the staff recommendation to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph on 1st Street between Mesa Drive and Country Club Drive (Council District 4).

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – McCroskey — Bingdazzo – Gagnon — James – Laufer — Vandever

NAYS – None

Item 6. Hear and discuss an update on the Mesa Moves Bond Program.

Erik Guderian, Deputy Transportation Director, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation and an update on the Mesa Moves Bond Program.

Mr. Guderian gave an overview of where they are at with the Mesa Moves Bond Program. He started by explaining the history of the Mesa Moves Bond Program, most of which has been presented in previous TAB meetings. He brought up a map that showed improvements that have been done (mostly in southeast Mesa). He announced that the first project at Williams Field Road and Ellsworth Road was completed in January 2022. He stated that Signal Butte Road from Williams Field Road to Germann Road is under construction and scheduled to complete in December or January. He said they have started construction at the intersection of Sossaman Road and Baseline Road. He explained that the goal is to have all these projects completed by 2025. He then went over the areas that are scheduled to have arterial reconstruction and their current status. He highlighted active Transportation Projects and gave details about them. He explained that staff will be back every year to give an update on the Mesa Moves Bond Program.

Board Member James mentioned the canal improvement north of Brown Road around Horne and asked when it will be completed.

Mr. Guderian said in next couple of weeks. They plan to have a walk-through next week. He added that it has taken longer than expected since there are issues getting some construction materials and they had planned to have it done in June.

Board Member Vandever stated with the way the economy is going supplies are limited and at a higher cost. She asked if this was going to delay some projects or will they be delayed on purpose to get a better price.

Mr. Guderian said it was a great question and it is something they must watch. He said they are using 2018-to-2020-dollar figures that were the basis in determining the 5-year program and now through design and construction we are trying to make it all fit. He said they have seen delay in construction but have not talked about purposely delaying any projects. He said if they start to go 20% over budget then they will have to have those discussions and those types of schedule changes would likely be brought back to the board.

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

AYES – McCroskey — Bingdazzo – Gagnon — James — Laufer — Vandever

NAYS – None

Meeting adjourned at 6:46 pm