

**MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING**  
**City of Chandler, Webex Meeting**

**Wednesday, May 17, 2023, at 4:00 p.m. Meeting 20230517 2255-1**

**CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

**Chair Henderson** called the meeting to order at approximately 4:01 p.m. Mrs. Nancy Jackson completed roll call. Quorum present.

**Members in Attendance:**

**Chair Dan Henderson**

**Vice Chair John Repar**

**Commissioner Dean Brennan**

**Commissioner David Heineking**

**Commissioner Luis Heredia – absent at roll call. Arrived 4:17 pm**

**Commissioner David Lucas**

**Commissioner Molly Pendergast**

**Members Absent:**

**Staff Members Present:**

Ryan Peters, Strategic Initiatives Director

Kimberly Moon, Capital Projects Manager, Public Works & Utilities (call-in)

Dan Haskins, Principal Engineer, Public Works & Utilities (call-in)

Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager

Nancy Jackson, /Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Sasha Pachito, Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Raistlin Snow, Intern, Transportation Policy

Richard Becker, Transit Service Analyst

Sheri Passey, Recording Secretary, Administrative Assistant, Transportation Policy

**Others Present**

Aaron Xaevier, Planner III, Valley Metro

Eileen Yazzie, Y2K Engineering (call-in)

**SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES**

None

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **1. Approval of the Minutes of the Transportation Commission Regular Meeting of January 18, 2023.**

**Chair Henderson** asked for a motion to approve the minutes from January 18.

**Commissioner Lucas** so moved to approve the minutes. **Commissioner Pendergast** seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved 6-0 by **all Commissioners** members present.

## **Action Agenda**

### **2. Election of Officers**

As Vice Chair, **Commissioner Repar** nominated himself for Chair. **Chair Henderson** asked for a motion. **Commissioner Pendergast** motioned. **Commissioner Heineking** seconded. Motion carried unanimously 6-0 by all Commissioners' present.

**Chair Henderson** recommended **Commissioner Heineking** as Vice Chair. **Commissioner Pendergast** motioned for approval, with a second by **Commissioner Lucas**. Motion carried unanimously 6-0 by all Commissioners' present.

## **BRIEFINGS**

**Chair Henderson** We are switching briefing items and placing Chandler Airpark Flexible Transit Study Update first.

### **3. CHANDLER AIRPARK FLEXIBLE TRANSIT STUDY UPDATE**

**Mr. Jason Crampton** introduced Aaron Xaevier with Valley Metro and proceeded with a brief overview and introduction of the Study.

**Mr. Xaevier** Began his briefing with an Overview. This slide discussed the Chandler Flex Background, Study Scope and Purpose, Existing Conditions and the Next Steps.

The next slide discusses the Chandler Flex Background. In September 2021 we completed the Price Road Study – the Flexible Transit Study aimed to figure out a problem serving that area with a fixed route. There were a lot of big business parks with some peak transit service that was doing okay. We had some land use challenges for the fixed routes related to productivity, and we wanted to make sure we invested dollars to the best use possible. So, through that study we were able to target in on the service fee, service hours, what would be needed to roll out the service. In early 2022, Chandler was awarded a grant to implement service, which is currently running throughout the Price Corridor area. The service was rolled out last summer, July 2022 and in March 2023 we initiated this study to see what other potential to the area around the airport.

**Mr. Xaevier** continued his briefing with the Study, Scope & Purpose. The slide shows the planning boundaries. He discusses the extent of the study. The study is east of the current service area of Flex and explores the prospects for flexible transit within that area. There is a lot of good land use that will be reviewed later in the Destinations Map. But it is anchored at the Chandler Airport area and is being done in coordination with Gilbert. The study will also look at the cost, fleet and ridership.

**Commissioner Brennan** I can't make out the street names and asked Mr. Xaevier to identify the major arterials?

**Mr. Xaevier** identified the Study Area - Arizona Ave. to Riggs Rd to Greenfield Rd to Ray Rd.

**Mr. Crampton** injected that it is a pretty wide study area much larger than the current Chandler Flex area. The idea is to start with a wider area and to look at what the needs are within and whittle that down throughout the study.

**Mr. Xaevier** Agreed that once we get into things like travel demand, ridership, where the paratransit folks get dropped off most, we can start to chisel away at some of the most likely routes in those areas.

**Mr. Xaevier** discussed ridership and the transit network (Local Transit Overview slide) of the current service area. There is a heat map super imposed over the line and shows the highest ridership around downtown Chandler and then peters off as you go south.

**Commissioner Lucas** asked about the development and growth that is happening around the airpark and I am assuming that information and projections are being factored in as part of the study?

**Mr. Xaevier** Confirmed growth is being considered with the GIS folks, gathering all the existing, current and future projections for land use. MAG has a lot of the projections as well. We are working very closely with them in terms of getting their modeling data, so we have their projections. When we plan for something that is a moving target, it is important to keep on top of it.

**Commissioner Repar** asked for an explanation on the ridership again, so he understands the coding. This is ridership for actual bicycle travel or is this traffic?

**Mr. Xaevier** This is ridership on the current fixed route transit numbers. These are the bus route ridership and are only boardings - essentially where riders are getting on to the buses.

**Commissioner Repar** asked if this was Flex?

**Mr. Xaevier** this is not ridership for Flex just the fixed route, but that data is available.

**Mr. Xaevier** continued with an overview of Demographic: Population and Density slide which analyzed car ownership, income and age. These demographics are based on the 2020 census. The next slide, Employment Distribution & Concentration gets into population and employment not only existing but projecting. Employment peaks at almost 3,000 jobs per square mile largely centered around 202 and downtown Chandler and then peters off as you go south. When we start thinking about whittling the study area down that make the most sense the higher density employment areas are going to affect the area largely. Depending on the sector you in are

working in, or doing a hybrid working situation, that will impact ridership. We are just finishing up an Origin Destination Study to get a better handle on that. About 17,000 surveys were administered throughout the region to get a better handle on where people are going to and coming from and work patterns. First look since before Covid.

The Workforce Statistic slide showed the magnitude of people going in and going out. About 30,000 coming in and about 45,000 going out and 3,600 live in the area. This is based LEHD or the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data from the most recent 2020 census. Also shows other demographics on employees such as age, earnings, race and top employment sector being retail, health care and accommodations.

**Mr. Xaevier** concluded his presentation with the Next Steps. Getting a better handle on the background of the study area and travel demand analysis which develops MAG's travel demand model. This will include some peer service reviews and service elements that other cities are incorporating into their service.

He completed his presentation and opened it up for questions. **Mr. Crampton** addressed the Chair and Commissioners. We are very early on in the study. We wanted to bring it to you now as a first glance at the study so you can be informed of it early on. Any points, questions, thoughts you may have are welcome to receive those to influence study. This study will be included in our transportation project update agenda item that we take to the Commission every time. There will be an opportunity at future meetings, and we will have updates as a stand-alone agenda item.

**Commissioner Lucas** asked will future grant funding opportunities look at potentially funding this new area, funding the existing area, or splitting it?

**Mr. Crampton** We will look at both options. Currently Chandler Flex has funding for about one more year. We are looking at options to get funding that would last a few years beyond that. Additionally, once the study is complete, I think we would look at opportunities to provide funding for this. The key thing to keep in mind is if we get grant funding for this expanded area, what's likely to happen is we get one, two or three years of funding and then after that ultimately it would be on the city to cover all on-going

in operations, so we have to be very mindful of that. We don't want to over expand and then not have the local funding to be able to continue. That is something we are always cognizant of. We don't want to put the service out there, people get dependent on it, build their lifestyles around the transportation that is available and then have it pulled back. So, any grant opportunities we do pursue we always have that in the back of our mind; what are we going to do for that on-going funding situations? So, we are looking at a number of solutions for that locally, regionally and then federal and state grant opportunities.

**Commissioner Heineking** Stated/asked Valley Metro is obviously invested in this program, they are helping out with the studies. Are there other programs throughout the valley that are similar and is Valley Metro looking to support these sorts of programs as adjacent to the regular transit? Is this the future of transit that we are seeing or is this an experiment right now?

**Mr. Xaevier** We have seen a real big boom of these services come out in the last year, two years. Ridership numbers have come back a little bit but not quite where we want them to be, but we think in part that doing stuff like this will help feed the regional network. Your question about other services out there: We have Glendale, which currently their entire jurisdiction is covered by Via the same contractor as Chandler. Avondale and Goodyear partnered initially on service. They had their own two zones. And now in October Avondale is going to be adding another zone that is adjacent to that zone. We also had Surprise just start one up this spring. And the Pogos which are our sister circulators in the west Peoria are getting cut and they are very seriously considering replacing them with micro transit. Buckeye is also trying to piggyback on that contract from Avondale and Goodyear. And as a last note we had our First Mile, Last Mile in Tolleson that had a contract with Uber and Lyft that subsidized the first eight dollars of every trip with the origin or destination within Tolleson. Definitely a lot of interest. We are still waiting to see how long this lasts or if it is going to be sustainable. It's going to come down to funding. The ridership is shown to be there but when areas, for example in Avondale where they had Zoom, and tweaked the service trying to get the route to perform, it just never came to fruition. Now they have replaced it with microtransit. We are seeing the success and are hoping to see if it's sustainable one or two years from now.

**Mr. Crampton** There is a role, but I don't foresee it to replace all transit. If you look at the efficiency and carrying capacity of a bus versus microtransit, it does not have the same carrying capacity. When there is higher density and more demand for transit, buses are far more cost effective to provide transit trips. In south Chandler, it is especially a great, great service. But it's not going to replace all transit.

**Commissioner Lucas** Given this is a partnership with Gilbert, it's going to involve both jurisdictions, and as you mentioned we might be able to get some initial grant funding to do the initial pilot but after that it's going to be incorporated into operations. Is the discussion already done with the town of Gilbert about that next phase? What does the future look for that?

**Mr. Crampton** That is part of the study looking at how this can operate jointly between Chandler and Gilbert. We have not gotten in-depth on those discussion yet because we don't know the details of the recommendations. As we advance in the study we will get cost estimates, service area analysis and then we can kind get a better picture of what is recommended in Gilbert, what is recommended in Chandler. And then at that point we will have to see if both communities are on board with such recommendations. Maybe it transitions back to just Chandler.

**Commissioner Lucas** Because the study area is in both, but it could eventually be in Chandler only?

**Mr. Crampton** It could be yes.

**Commissioner Brennan** Asked of either Jason or Aaron - what are the current numbers as far as employment around the airport? And what is the projections for employment numbers at build out around the airport?

**Mr. Crampton** We are looking at it. Our city planning staff has that information and has put together those projections but off the top of my head I do not know. **Mr. Crampton** thanked Aaron for coming out to present.

**Chair Henderson** Next item we will move on to the Protected Bike Lane Study Update.

#### **4. PROTECTED BIKE LANE STUDY UPDATE**

**Mr. Crampton** This study update will be provided by Eileen Yazzie, Transportation Planning Practice Manager with Y2K out of Colorado. Used to be out of Arizona working with MAG. This Protected Bike Lane Study we have been working on for several months and now we are getting at a point where we are getting closer to having some recommendations and bike lanes, we can advance for consideration to add protective features. We are looking, based on the results from our Transportation Master Plan feedback looking city wide to advance protected bike lanes, provide more separation in bike lanes as requested by Chandler residents. This study is looking city wide to see where good opportunities would be to place more protected lanes.

**Consultant Yazzi** The last time Jason, myself and Sasha were here was at the end of January. We want to give you an update of all the work we have been doing. We've had a lot of public involvement opportunities, which has been complimentary of the data analysis.

**Consultant Yazzi** reviewed the goals of the Protected Bike Lane Feasibility Study. The overall goal is to increase the number of protected bike lanes. The project outcome is looking for quicker to build and lower costs protected bike lane options, different from the Frye Rd Protected Bike Lane project, which is over \$5 million. And understanding the feasibility of converting existing and planned bike lanes to protected ones. While lanes are kept as is- as in the number of lanes are not reduced and/or streets are not expanded. Hopefully at the end of this developing/recommending or prioritize a list of projects or roadway locations that we can do in kind of groups of recommended tier one, tier two and tier three.

Scope of Work slide – How much room and space are needed for protected bike lanes as well as understanding the cross-section of the needs of the vehicle travel lanes and keeping medians in place. Really understanding the parameters of how protected bike lanes in Chandler are going to work as well as doing the data collection analysis for the feasibility and prioritization and then looking forward to implementation.



Project Schedule slide - We started this in the winter, and we think we will be wrapped up by July and we will be back to see you again to go over results and final recommendations.

Starting off the study she reviewed Community Engagement. We have concluded the majority of our activities: project websites, emails, newsletters, social media, engage with the public at the Family Bike Ride, and conduct an online survey. We were able to use the Family Bike Ride as a center focus of our engagement activity. We were able to ask questions during the registration and really understand the community that was registering - so this was focused on bicycle riders.

The Family Bike Ride Registration survey slide showed that the majority of people, eighty-one percent are recreation bicyclist. Twelve percent use it for transportation to get to places. Respondents feeling that safety and comfort diminishes as they get to larger roads.

Family Bike Ride In-Person Engagement - we were able to be at the Chandler Family Bike Ride and we did two things there. We did a show and tell. We were able to have these out for people to touch, feel and ride through and understand what they are. We had a show and tell with Chandler staff that included operations and management, engineering and planning teammates so we could do a dive down. We also did preference activities. These preference activities were mirrored on the online survey. I believe there was over a 150 people registered for the event.

Top 3 Factors You Would Consider for PBL Location Prioritization slide. We asked them what top three factors they would consider the of prioritization of locations. The big theme came out of this exercise came to connectivity. Connectivity and safety were the big things people wanted to see.

Top 3 Preferences of the Proposed Types of Vertical Barriers slide - Delineator Posts, Rubber Parking Stops and Steel Barriers came up as top three.

Online Survey slide - there was almost 500 responses. The same questions were asked and more on the online survey. But when it came to the prioritization about location, connectivity came in high as well as with bike lanes and paths with current usage and then safety also ranked very high.

Preference was slightly different for Top 3 Preferences of Proposed Types of Vertical Barriers. One of the options while we displayed at the bike ride, we asked the question here – the combination, so more than one vertical element, that ranked the highest. And then Pre-Cast Concrete and Delineators Posts came in second to that.

**Commissioner Brennan** asked on the slide - Agreement On Feeling Safe and Comfortable Biking on Different Types of Roads. The bottom numbers 0, 50, 100, 150 are those the number of responses?

**Consultant Yazzi** I have to double checked but she believes they are.

**Commissioner Brennan** Are these from the Family Bike Ride?

**Consultant Yazzi** Yes, correct. We were allowed through the registration, the online registration form, we added these questions in.

**Commissioner Brennan** Going onto the page where it has Top 3 Factors You Would Consider for PBL Location Prioritization, again we have numbers going on the left from 0 – 60. Again, are those the number of responses?

**Consultant Yazzi** Yes, these are the number of responses. I will note on this one, this slide is, the information here the numbers relate to the attendees that attended the Family Bike Ride in person and stopped by and responded to the boards. And on that they were asked to rank numbers – we had sticky dots with numbers 1, 2 or 3 on them so they were able to say their first, second and third choice. So, on that we would have to do a total of say the first choice would be the total number of people that stopped by the board to participate.

**Commissioner Brennan** So these are people who were at the bike ride?

**Consultant Yazzi** Yes, so doing a quick total about 75 people came and stopped by the boards and participated.

**Commissioner Brennan** And the next page is the same situation. Those are the people who registered?

**Consultant Yazzi** To clarify – these are actually people who attended and stopped by the boards.

**Commissioner Brennan** The Top 3 Factors You Would Consider for the PBL Location Prioritization - are those responses from the people who attended the bike ride or those responses from the survey?

**Consultant Yazzi** These are from the online survey, and it is in gray underneath the question, there were 457 responses.

**Commissioner Brennan** I see that, but it doesn't indicate who is responding. And if we answered the online survey, are we supposed to be receiving notification about the study? You mentioned, I think you said there is an email list of people who responded to the online survey. Are you using that to communicate with the community, people in the community?

**Consultant Yazzi** I don't think I mentioned we have email lists. That said – I believe we do. Having the registration, I believe city of Chandler has those emails. Related to the online survey I believe it was optional to add your email. We can go back and check. City of Chandler just closed that survey about 16 days ago, two weeks ago so, we have not communicated back with anyone.

**Commissioner Brennan** Okay, it does mention your email and existing lists. I was just wondering what lists those are and if it includes people who attended the family fun ride and also includes people who responded to the survey?

**Commissioner Repar** It would be helpful for the source of the information at the bottom of the slides. It's easily to confuse.

**Mr. Crampton** It's a good point that we will take back and look at those email addresses to see what kind of follow-up we can do. We have some contact information, not everybody provided their information.

**Commissioner Lucas** Agreed that to have the citizen's taking the time to participate in a survey, it's good to provide that natural follow-up and keep them engaged.

**Commissioner Repar** The people who show up for that event, the mayor's bike ride, I have been watching that for years. I'm with Kiwanis and we're sitting in Tibshraeny Park handing out water. The numbers have kind of decreased over the last few years as far as the number of people. A lot of those people are not recreational bike riders they are there for the event for the mayor. So, you have to kind of understand that is sort of an unqualified opinion of people that are out for the first time, second time or once or twice a year. Knowing the source of the data is pretty important to recognize the overall weight you want to give to it.

**Mr. Crampton** Good point which is why we have multiple surveys out there. Some of the data is coming from the Family Bike Ride registrants and participants. We also did the citywide survey that didn't target necessarily the Family Bike Ride participants but was more of a citywide push that had a lot of outreach including a couple of news channels that did stories on it to try and get more people aware of it.

**Commissioner Repar** The information is comingled in the report here. So, I would like to have the source identified.

**Commissioner Brennan** Agreed. There are two sources, and it is not very clear of who's who. And again, it is really critical to have those email lists and use those to continue to communicate with the public, so they know what it is going on.

**Chairman Henderson** Really appreciates the comment that "we are going where the people are". And while I don't disagree that people are going on that bike ride to support the mayor, I think that's just another segment of the population that is clearly on bicycles regardless of the reason.

**Commissioner Repar** he just wanted the sources distinguished.

**Commissioner Lucas** asked about the protected bike lanes show and tell. I think it's a great idea. What involvement was there with Chandler staff to

kind of make sure we limit it to only the things that are under consideration by the city? That we are not providing an option out there and people say oh, I really like this, but we are not even going to look at that as far as implementation. I guess I would like a little more information on that.

**Consultant Yazzi** If I can hop to a couple of these slides, I think it will also help the discussion and shape the discussion a little bit.

**Consultant Yazzi** One of the things we have been working very closely not only with Jason and Sasha but the greater transportation team, particularly their engineering team is determining the envelope of what is needed for protected bike lanes. Understanding the gutter pan, looking at the width of the bike lane – the buffer, and also part of the envelope is the vertical options. We have gone through and worked with Chandler staff again including engineer, operations and maintenance team to ensure that with our show and tell was inclusive and understood city preference. I'm going to leave this up (slide Task 2 – PBL Design Guidelines) and Jason can talk about – we did an additional show and tell and kind of more to touch and feel with these vertical options with the staff too.

**Mr. Crampton** The Family Bike Ride happened first and then we did a show and tell with city staff, engineering staff so we could see all these options in person. So, Chandler staff did work with Y2K in coming up with the elements to add to the show and tell. This is kind of informational to residents in trying to get their feedback mainly for aesthetics, level of comfort and things like that. Not necessarily a guarantee that just because residents like this particular item it's not going to be appropriate on every roadway. Some of the items might be very appropriate for very low speed streets, low traffic streets. Others might be more appropriate for higher traffic, higher speeds. This was more just trying to get that information out to residents and seeing what their preference was.

**Commissioner Lucas** - Because O & M is a big consideration, I'm sure. **Mr. Crampton** Yes, absolutely. That is part of the mind with a lot of our staff.

**Consultant Yazzi** And two, if I can note with this slide here these are the four types of barriers of these vertical elements that are recommended from the Chandler project management team. While we had about seven different types of vertical elements out for show and tell. These are the

four that Chandler staff is recommending that do coincide with public input. But also make the most sense to start moving forward to cost out. Again, not fully commit to say this one is going here, and this option is the only option. But these four seem to make the most sense and so we will be moving forward with cost estimating. To allow those options when those locations are prioritized and then furthermore in the future implemented. And one for instance, it's the last bullet, in the bottom two pictures is Tuff Curb. While that necessarily was not presented at the show and tell we borrowed the green Tuff Curb in city of Tempe. City of Chandler staff have seen those also understand they are putting those out in their protected bike lane and see that as a good fit as an option.

**Commissioner Heineking** Which one is the Tuff Curb?

**Consultant Yazzi** It's the bottom two. So, it does not have a delineator post in the middle. The middle of it is the rolled and then you have the harder edges on the side. If you want to see it out on the street, it's on Ash Ave in Tempe.

**Commissioner Brennan** I apologize for this question. When you are talking about protected lanes, I'm trying to understand how any of those items are going to protect anybody if there is a car driving down the street at 45 mph and they lose control. Are these improvements to protect the physical lane or identify the lane because it certainly isn't going to protect the rider. Safety through the Transportation Master Plan and then also discussion in the survey - safety is really what we have heard people talk about and that's why people won't ride in the lanes on the arterial streets because they don't feel safe. I'm not sure any of those will make me feel safe. And I certainly wouldn't allow my grandchildren to go out and ride on a street that had any one of those improvements and pretend it is a protected lane. It's not going to protect anybody.

**Commissioner Brennan** I think it's a concern and we are going to continue to hear that concern from the community. I don't know what kind of comments you had at the ride day but once you start thinking about putting those in place and thinking that's going to protect somebody from a car where the driver is talking on the phone and goes off and over those little bumps, I'm not sure that is protecting anyone.

**Mr. Crampton** With these particular approaches we are looking at lower cost, quicker build types of approaches that we can put in more places. We do have a more capital-intensive project on Frye Road that they are aware of that provides that higher level of separation. And often times in cities what happens is these types of installations occur and then transition into a more capital intensive - constructing a median or broader separation. In some of the streets we are looking at there might not be space for a median, but there is space for this type of protection. Which you are right it's not going to stop a car from drifting but there is a much higher sense of visual separation between a bike lane and a vehicular lane and there's physical objects that will stand in between a car and a bike lane. So rather than drifting over a line with nothing to notify the driver they are in a bike lane now there are items. Of course, it's not going to stop every situation from a car entering a bike lane but it's going to result in a higher level of safety. So good point and it's not going to solve every issue but it's certainly an advancement.

**Consultant Yazzi** If I can also add - I echo everything with what Jason said, and I wanted to focus on a few points. One, a lot of cities across the country are using these types of vertical elements as an initial implementation - let's get out there, let's put something up and let's see if we can get funding to permanently install protection. One thing I will note related to the Tuff Curb on the bottom. The first options that Chandler is still looking at is the Pre-cast concrete, the Parking Stops and Delineator Posts. One thing that is not mentioned in this slide is a combination of these. A lot of agencies in cities across the country they have been using two parking stops and then a delineator post for a continuous feel. So, things like that where you start combining these. The other thing about protection that is proven is these types of elements make the overall street safer. Because it is also a visual and a vertical cue for drivers. That is some of the results of studies across the country. Recognizing it's not a wall. It's not a hard curb that is continuous. Yet the safety benefits of having these elements is a visual cue for the driver like a lot of signs that we experience on a daily basis. Again, it's that vertical element that will jolt the driver so it's two-fold. And that kind of collectively makes that street safer in general for all users. A lot of cities are using this as an interim approach recognizing they want to put in permanent installation of median or continuous curbs for that full protection.

**Chairman Henderson** What I'm encouraged by as someone who rides a bike to work, I'm not necessarily looking for that absolute safety. I am appreciative as a bicyclist of the awareness that things like this begin to create, and the behavior change that subsequently follows that.

**Commissioner Brennan** I understand. But let's not call them protected bike lanes. I mean we are pretending something it's not. We should come up with a different name.

**Mr. Crampton** Some cities call these separated bike lanes. Is that right Eileen?

**Consultant Yazzi** Yes.

**Commissioner Brennan** That is another question I have. Because in doing some background reading, I encountered articles where they used separated and protected interchangeably. And I was going to ask Eileen what the difference is? It sounds like the only difference is who uses the word whether it be protected. I would say that separated is more appropriate, then protected.

**Chairman Henderson** The other thing I might add is through that awareness and through that behavior change I can appreciate the approach of considering these sorts of solutions as a pilot that allows data to be collected. And if the data suggests that more capital improvement dollars dedicated to these things are warranted those are things I'm looking at.

**Commissioner Brennan** I would challenge pilots to test various approaches before they spend money on something that is going to be permanent.

**Commissioner Heredia** Is there any technology, like with our cars and looking to advance with a lot of these curbs have embedded or if there is any technology that could integrate future protections with smart cars? Is there any technology out there that is integrating technology with these curbs that allows you to advance – just start thinking about future enhancements.



**Consultant Yazzi** We can research that question. So going back a few slides (pulled up slide Task 2- PBL Design Guidelines) is understanding the protected bike lane is the buffer. The buffer always has two stripes on it. And the vertical element sits in those strips. A lot of cars right now recognize the stripping as that lane and will give you that protection when you are going over into a stripped lane. Regardless, if it is a bike lane another vehicle lane that type of warning is in cars right now. Verses the vertical elements I can research more about. But having that stripe is going to be that warning. Does that make sense or answer your question?

**Commissioner Heredia** I think it's worthy to look into technology to detect there's actually bike lanes in the area with these added curbs. Just something to research if there is any enhanced technology that could be installed that could give further protection.

**Commissioner Lucas** The vertical delineators show up as traffic cones but also depending on the type of modern vehicle you have it will actually show a visualization of a bike or pedestrian. Those capabilities are continuing to evolve. Having more awareness, it's actually in use. And in the connected vehicle space there is more and more work being done about MRU - Multiple Road Users. Coming up to an intersection or another location just to provide that awareness that someone is actively using this crosswalk and that alert can be sent out to the vehicle. I think that's more align of what you are thinking.

**Commissioner Heredia** I think we have to look at the roads of what's coming up. If we are going to install any barrier, look to advance it as much as you can.

**Consultant Yazzi** Task 3 – Data Collection & Analysis slide. We have GIS files that we are handing off to Chandler, so they have all the data we collected and analyzed. We are doing three steps. One is the inventory and screening. Two is the feasibility. And three is allowing the PBL design guideline options. Step 1 – Inventory & Screening - Arterial and collectors with existing and planned bike lanes. we came up with cross sections minimum and maximum number of feet for vehicular and bicycle lanes for each type of road configuration. That helped identify and helped us start this evaluation process.

Two hundred and ten (210) of the three hundred and four (304) miles of arterials and collectors have a striped bike lane. About seventy percent of your roads have existing bike lanes. It is noted the constraints that this study is working within it not removing a vehicle lane. Not widening the roadway and no removal of concrete medians. And that goes back to implementing lower cost options. If Chandler wanted to look at removing a lane and adding a protected bike lane all that data is there and will be from the study.

Seven foot is the minimum that the team collectively thought that is needed for a protected bike lane. The preferred is eight feet. The total number for seven feet there is now 81 miles available on each side for protected bike lanes. For eight feet it drops down to 66.

Task 3 - Step 2- Feasibility: we looked at the remaining quarters that came out of Step 1. Starting with the 81 miles that have 7 feet available on both sides of the roadway – is it feasible, does it make sense to actually put in a protected bike lane. We looked at the factors or elements of the existing conditions. Are there front facing houses or a high number of residential driveways that face that road. Think of the spacing of these -is it valuable enough to get there if we have to put in a break every 100 feet to have that space or consistency and understanding. Is there existing curb and gutter. And that is related to some of the streets that are not built out to full curb and gutter. We don't think putting in a protected bike lane would be helpful or it's not the right time. Street lighting presence as well as looking at the number of signalized and unsignalized intersections, commercial driveways and we put these. Adding in these factors, the seven-foot bike lane goes from 81 miles of roadways available and drops to 53 that are feasible. And when it comes down to the room for an eight-foot protected bike lane down it drops down to 42 miles. We also added in the off street and multi-use paths. These maps were shared with the community at the Family Bike Ride.

Task 4 – Evaluation for Prioritization – staff will be evaluating those 53 miles for prioritization. Which ones make sense in the first Tier and while we can number but we think there is value in taking the top 15 ten locations and then grouping them in a Tier one and then Tier two and Tier three are category one, two and three. That can allow for flexibility in the location.

For example, if number eight was upcoming in a paving schedule that allowed for the coordination of current stripping efforts to change that roadway. That could be prioritized if that it was in Tier one. We are looking at prioritize them into Tiers.

Task 5 – final study will be in Executive Summary in a Regional Significant report. That does conclude the presentation and overall information.

**Commissioner Lucas** I think a big consideration needs to be connectivity improvement. From the survey and the people in person that was their ultimate concern was providing improved connectivity. That needs to be a consideration when providing that prioritized list.

When I was at the city of Tempe there was a comprehensive plan, they provided a lot of different bike routes and connectivity was a big part of tying into the east valley bike plan, the trail plan with Mesa and other jurisdictions. I think that is something whether people are using for recreation or for commuting they want to be able move between jurisdictions. Each of our jurisdictions don't operate as an island. You want to be able to move around. Connectivity needs to be a big piece of that.

**Consultant Yazzi** Yes and one of the things we have already starting drafting, so we have started doing an initial review of these factors. And one of the things that you just said we brought in all of the surrounding communities off street trails as well as their regional routes.

**Commissioner Pendergast** I agree that connectivity's is a key player but something the citizens that you are surveying may not list real high on their list of importance is deaths. Arizona as a whole is not a safe place for pedestrians. The average Joe might not be concerned about that but as a government as a municipality that should be a top priority is minimizing deaths and injuries.

**Commissioner Brennan** Eileen did you map crashes – vehicle/bicycle crashes?

**Consultant Yazzi** That is what we are planning to do for this task. Is the bicycle crash data. One thing we can look at – going back to my earlier comments about putting in protected bike lanes or these physical barriers

actually makes the collective streets safer. We were planning to look at just the bicycle crash data, but we have all the crash information. We can look at it in two ways - is the collective fatalities and then the pedestrians crashes and fatalities. We think the bike fatalities will be a low number because there is not that many. But we can also look at the vehicle fatality information as a well kind of as a compliment.

**Commissioner Brennan** Are you doing any counts of ridership on some of the arterials?

**Consultant Yazzi** One thing we are doing is fourth bullet down Bicycle Activity we are using Strava data. When it comes to transportation and planning evaluation, we look at Strava data not from actual counts but understanding where people are riding – that route information. If you are an active cyclist where you're that high speed road user you will still look for that path that has good connectivity, maybe feel safer. So, we look for that activity level and we are bringing that in. The nice thing we learned from this project is that MAG, the regional agency, has all that data available for any city in the region to use and understand.

**Commissioner Lucas** I think the safety aspect is big and what Dean was talking about earlier that it isn't necessarily a wall that is going to keep someone from crossing over. We have all driven down the road where it's just a painted bike lane and people are using it as part of the road. Personally, even though it's not an ultimate solution, something like this that provides some type of barriers or notification to the driver that they have strayed to far over will improve overall safety. I think this is a good step forward.

**Commissioner Brennan** Is there any consideration with regards to taking a look at speed limits and lowering speed limits to increase safety and reduce potential for serious collision? Maybe there is an opportunity there to think about how we might be able to reduce the speed and save some lives.

**Mr. Crampton** As a part of this study, it will not be analyzed but I think there are future opportunities with some of the other things we are looking at where that topic could be considered. But it is a valid question.

**Chairman Henderson** Are there any other questions?

**Commissioner Heredia** Process wise - these studies take a long time, and it is hard to find the capital or resources for that. If there is a segment or bike lane that needs to be enhanced because of the data analysis, if it can be elevated to a quicker improvement - we should not wait for a study to focus on the safety corridor if we can improve it quicker.

**Mr. Crampton** We do have a capital improvements program associated with this study. Once the study finishes, we have funding that will allow us to build about a half mile to a mile every two years. So, we do have implementation money behind this. But it is a tenured plan to start adding this in.

**Chairman Henderson** I was looking at some of the percentages of the kinds of bicycling. Transportation is about 12% and then I look at the Upcoming Tasks and some of the prioritization for the corridors for the protected bike lanes. I noticed that connections to schools and parks - love that. Connection to canals and off-street trails - love that. Some of the other activity element will probably bring in some of this but I was curious if prioritization for commuting to work as a by-product of this? I know it's a small sub-set when you have eighty-one percent in the recreation base it might not be the priority.

**Mr. Crampton** asked Eileen - Remind me - I think we have activity centers as one of the prioritization elements. It wasn't scored very high with the public outreach. But I believe connection to activity centers which could be a job center I think is one of the considerations.

**Consultant Yazzie** We can add that and expand it to the job centers. We would have to figure out the boundary, but we can't exclude the region and that connectivity with what you are noting the commute to work. We have to figure out that boundary is from the job centers or job hot spots areas about how far outside of Chandler to go. That information is available.

**Commissioner Lucas** To follow up on that. There is definitely outreach that you can do with community development or with the major employers. They can provide bike lockers, shower facilities things like that. If we have a major employer some of these employers can have a significant impact.

**Chairman Henderson** As I think about how close in many instances in Chandler those neighborhoods are and some of those residents. Think Price Road Corridor, Intel, in and around the airport. You have residential pockets fairly close, a relatively short commute. This is an area is near and dear to my heart. I appreciate that.

**Commissioner Brennan** What are the next steps and what are the plans for a follow-up public meeting?

**Consultant Yazzie** The next step is to start the prioritization and evaluation and to come back to the Transportation Commission at the July meeting to present the results.

**Commissioner Brennan** Will there be a public meeting so residents in Chandler can come to the meeting to provide feedback or react to whatever the recommendations are?

**Mr. Crampton** Through the Chair and Commissioner Brennan there are no plans for another public meeting with this study. The public outreach that we conducted with the Family Bike Ride survey was critical in developing this.

**Commissioner Brennan** They should have an opportunity to review and make comments. That is what the open meeting law is all about. It's providing an opportunity to the public to come to a meeting to talk about or listen to us - what comes out of this study.

**Mr. Crampton** - I hear your point. It is beyond of the scope of this current study.

**Commissioner Brennan** Well then, we may be in violation of the Open Meeting Laws.

**Consultant Yazzie** The parameter of this scope as well as the budget for this work effort – there could be value after the final recommendations is to post them on the project webpage. Also, use the data base of emails and communicate with people – “hey, the recommendations are on the website for your review. If you have questions or comments to respond

back". While it is not in the consultant's scope of work wrapping it up, using the robust email list we have from the registration as well as people who responded to the survey to communicate that with them.

**Commissioner Brennan** Will your Power Point presentation be on the website?

**Consultant Yazzie** We can post that, yes.

**Chairman Henderson** Any other questions? Great thank you.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**Chairman Henderson** next we will go to the May 22 Project Status Update.

**Mr. Crampton** provided brief update:

Cooper Road is completed.

Chandler Heights and Ocotillo those projects are underway. Completion scheduled for the winter of 2023 for Chandler Heights and fall of 2023 for Ocotillo Road.

Chandler Heights Road Phase II - Gilbert to Val Vista is a project that will be under construction probably through the middle of 2024.

Lindsay Road down in south Chandler. That project will probably begin in the summer of 2024.

These other projects are minor, and we have had updates on these so I will skip those. Some of our projects for pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects – Frye Road Protected Bike Lanes is advancing and is close to finalizing the design. The hope is to go out to bid later this year with construction to occur in 2024.

Kyrene-Branch and Highline Canal Shared Use Path hope is to begin design this summer with construction in 24-25.

Ashley and Paseo Trails we plan to begin design and kickoff meeting tomorrow with construction is 24-25.

Hunt Highway Bicycle Improvements we are in a hold with that study to allow the casino to finish their process of open so we can do some renewed analysis after the casino is open and traffic patterns have evolved to that open casino.

Chandler Flex is continuing to operate and move people. At the next meeting we will have more of an update on that.

**Chairman Henderson** Any questions about any of those projects?

**Commissioner Lucas** I have a question Hunt Highway. You mentioned the study has been delayed due to the delayed casino opening? What is the date for the casino opening?

**Ms. Pachito** responded it keeps being pushed from first quarter of 2023 till later because it's past the first quarter. Do you know, Ryan?

**Mr. Peters** It's late summer. Same issue that we are all facing with supply chain issue and construction crews. It's about ten months behind schedule.

**Chairman Henderson** Any other questions?

**Commissioner Brennan** On Lindsay Road I see the design is in progress. Will there be another meeting with the residence in that area once the design is completed?

**Mr. Crampton** asked Kim Moon to address this.

**Mrs. Moon** We do not have any other additional public meetings in the format I think you are referring to until we get closer to construction. We do have other types of public meetings. We're meeting with property owners during right-a-way acquisitions individually as we acquire property. And then any opportunities when we take contracts to Council, we give them an update at that time as well. We do not currently have additional public meetings scheduled individually at this time.



**Commissioner Brennan** Thank you. Then the Ray Road and Dobson Road. You say the study is complete. Were there any public meetings in conjunction with that project?

**Mr. Crampton** Not that I'm aware of. Kim you can correct me if I am wrong. It was more of a technical study.

**Commissioner Brennan** Isn't this the improvement of the intersection?

**Mrs. Moon** That is correct. It was a very small study. Mostly to help identify the constraints being that we have significant overhead utilities lines on either side - north and south and understanding the traffic counts at a very high level are for turning movements. And if we are going to propose to shift the alignment a little bit to the east or west or north or south. So, it is very preliminary and used to prepare the application for some HSIP safety funding. The city was successful in getting some grant funds to help supplement the project. But when the design process begins there will be additional efforts at that time. But not part of the pre-design.

**Commissioner Brennan** Okay. So, there will be public meetings?

**Mrs. Moon** To be clear we don't have anything scheduled at this time.

**Commissioner Brennan** I understand. But you said there will be when you start work on the design?

**Mrs. Moon** We usually have a public meeting during the design phase. That is the typical process. I just don't have confirmation or a date at this time.

**Commissioner Brennan** That's fine. Thank you.

**MEMBER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS** - none

#### **CALENDAR**

**Chairman Henderson** The next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 19, 2023.

Meeting was adjourned.



John Repar, Chairman

Aug 15, 2023



Sheri Passey, City of Chandler

Aug 14, 2023