

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

Wednesday, August 9, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. Meeting 20230807 1948-1

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Repar called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. Ms. Sheri Passey completed roll call. Quorum present.

Members in Attendance:

Chair John Repar

Vice Chair David Heineking

Commissioner Dean Brennan

Commissioner Luis Heredia

Commissioner David Lucas

Members Absent:

Commissioner Molly Pendergast (excused)

Commissioner Dan Henderson (excused)

Staff Members Present:

Ryan Peters, Strategic Initiatives Director

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

John Knudson, Public Works and Utilities Director

Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager

Nancy Jackson, Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Sasha Pachito, Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Raistlin Snow, Intern, Transportation Policy

Sheri Passey, Recording Secretary, Administrative Assistant, Transportation Policy

Others Present

Sanjay Paul, HDR

Eileen Yazzie, Y2K Engineering (call-in)

Shawn Metz, citizen

Jared Pager, citizen

SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Transportation Commission Regular Meeting of May 17, 2023.

Chair Repar asked for a motion to approve the minutes from May 17, 2023.

Commissioner Heredia move to adopt. **Vice Chair Heineking** seconded.

The minutes were approved 5-0 by **all Commissioner's** present.

Action Agenda

2. Amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) and the City of Chandler

Chair Repar Introduced the Action Agenda item Amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) and the City of Chandler and turned the floor over to Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager.

Jason Crampton introduced Sasha Pachito to present the item.

Sasha Pachito presented the FY 2023-2024 Amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement with Valley Metro. It's the 5th of 6 annual amendments. The proposed amendment will run through June 30, 2024. Service funding for FY 23-24 is \$465,573.

Funding Sources include Public Transportation Funds (PTF) which is funded by the half cent sales tax through Prop 400. Arizona Lottery (ALF) is the proceeds from the Powerball revenues in the amount of approximately \$700,000. Federal Grants allocated at \$58,696 for RideChoice Services. There is no impact on the city general fund due to leveraging the PTF for this amendment.

The total allocations through Other Funding Sources (PTF and Federal Grants) are \$13,366,792 while through Local Funding Sources (ALF and city general fund) is \$465,753. The amendment encompasses services for the fixed bus route services, Paratransit and RideChoice.

She concluded by outlining the proposed motion to recommend approval of the amendment.

Chair Repar Asked for any discussions? With no discussion, he requested a motion to approve the amendment.

Commissioner Lucas So moved.

Commissioner Heredia Seconded but questioned the cost effectiveness of Paratransit (approximately 28,000 trips at a cost of \$2 million) versus RideChoice (approximately 26,000 trips at a cost of \$800,000).

Mr. Crampton RideChoice is more cost effective and encouraged usage whenever possible. Paratransit is more expensive to operate due to the larger vehicles and a more door-to-door service. More independence or mobility is needed to use RideChoice.

Chair Repar Asked if there were any other questions? There was a motion by Commissioner Lucas and a second by Commissioner Heredia. He called for a vote. Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

BRIEFINGS

Chair Repar Introduced the briefing of the Protected Bike Lane Study.

4. PROTECTED BIKE LANES STUDY

Mr. Crampton Introduced presenter Eileen Yazzie, of Y2K. He stated this is the third and final review of the study. The study will be finalized, published, and shared with City Council.

Consultant Yazzi Briefly reviewed the Study Approach and Prioritization Results. The project goal was to increase the number of protected bike lanes based on previous plans mobility objectives and public input. The project outcome:

- Design Guidelines for quicker to build and lower costs
- Feasibility of converting existing and planned bike lanes to protected bike lanes
- Developing a prioritization list

The Scope of Work encompassed community engagement, design guidelines, data collection/analysis, feasibility analysis, final report and implementation strategies. The study identified 107 feasible locations for a 7-foot protected bike lane totaling 53 miles.

Corridors were prioritized based on connection to schools, parks, and activity/employment centers; connection to off street paths/canals; connected and length of connected PBL; bicycle activity; and bicycle crash data. Tiers are used for flexibility of implementation.

A point evaluation system was used to prioritize locations. Nine Data Factors/Points were used and included crash data, type of accessibility, high use bike activity and areas federally defined as transportation disadvantaged areas. Categories and rankings: Safety Needs - 4; Land Use Connectivity - 3; Bike Connectivity - 4; High Amount of Current Bike Activity - 2; and Disadvantage Areas - 1.

The highest number of points a location could score was fourteen. Completing the data analysis, the greatest amount any location received was nine points (two locations). The lowest number of points was zero (eleven locations). The scoring identified the Tier's, number of locations and number of miles in each Tier.

Safety Needs: This map showed fatal or seriously injured bike or pedestrian crashes over a five-year period.

Connectivity – Land Uses: Three categories used. If a feasible PBL location had direct access it received a point. First category was direct access to a park. Twenty-eight locations were identified with direct access to a park and 79 had no direct access. Second category is direct access to schools. Twenty locations were identified with direct access and 87 with no direct access. Third category was activity/employment centers showed several feasible PBL locations with direct access.

Bike Network Connectivity: Looked at feasible PBL locations with direct access to canals or trails which incorporated jurisdictions beyond the city borders. Eleven locations with direct access to canals or trails were identified and 96 locations had no direct access to those types of amenities. The longest segment of connected feasible PBL locations ranges from 0.07 (shortest) to 4.47 (longest) miles.

Current Bike Activity: Strava data used. It does not provide the number of people biking, but the most used paths which usually indicates where people feel safe to bike.

Disadvantage Areas: Identified using the USDOT Equitable Communities Transportation Explorer tool. Three feasible PBL locations were identified.

Results of Prioritization Approach Tiers:

Tier 1	7 to 9 points	20 Feasible PBL Locations	12.6 miles
Tier 2	5 to 6 points	29 Feasible PBL Locations	16.9 miles
Tier 3	3 to 4 points	21 Feasible PBL Locations	10.5 miles
Tier 4	1 to 2 points	26 Feasible PBL Locations	9.5 miles
Tier 5	0 points	11 Feasible PBL Locations	2.8 miles

Implementation has five interrelated factors. They are design, cost estimates, funding, installation, and community input and prioritization. These five factors should be considered together when moving forward with implementation. That concluded her presentation.

Chair Repar Asked for any questions from the Commission?

Commissioner Brennan Asked/stated that there is no way to determine the number of trips in the High Activity Corridors? He indicated it's not clear what Strava measures.

Consultant Yazzi Confirmed his statement and then provided clarification. Riders using the Strava app - it draws a line of the bike route. For each individual (using the app) it draws a new line. That data is collected and compiled into a heat map to show how many are riding their bikes on a specific road in Chandler.

Mr. Crampton Acknowledged Strava is not the perfect data source because it relies on people having the app. He stated bike counts have been done at specific locations around the city but nothing comprehensive that covers every street in Chandler.

Commissioner Brennan Asked a question on the Direct Access to Schools map. There are a lot of schools shown on the map. Not all are public what other type of school would there be?

Consultant Yazzi Charter and private schools. The data was accessed from the Maricopa Associations of Governments.

Commissioner Brennan Stated there is an area showing a high concentration of schools. I am positive there is not that many schools in that area unless you include preschools.

Commissioner Brennan What I find interesting is the Crash maps. Two primary corridors where most crashes occur are Chandler Blvd and Arizona Ave. Those two corridors do not have bike lanes. What is being done to provide bike lanes along Chandler Blvd. and Arizona Ave? The existing system is incomplete. What are the plans for filling in those gaps and what are the plans to address the safety issues along Chandler Blvd and Arizona Ave?

Mr. Crampton Acknowledged there are existing gaps in the bike lane network. He did clarify there are bike lanes running the entire length on Chandler Blvd. But you are correct about Arizona Ave not having bike lanes north of Chandler Blvd. There is a Transportation Master Plan that recommends adding bike lanes on many streets in north Chandler. The challenge is those projects are very capital intensive and very expensive. But the Master Plan does identify to complete that grid of arterial bike lanes.

Commissioner Brennan Suggested that Chandler Blvd should be a high priority for addressing issues of safety and is a good candidate for separated lanes.

Mr. Crampton We can look into opportunities along Chandler Blvd.

Commissioner Lucas Question/Comment on the Data Factor Points and the assignment. Was there any sensitivity analysis done to see how important that ranking was? More specific on the Bike Connectivity to canal or trail access is 0 to 1 and the potential for connected PBL is 0 to 3. I would argue that the canal or trail access is essential providing access to a protected facility. That should be equal to the potential of a protected bike lane. How sensitive is your prioritization to those numbers?

Consultant Yazzi We used input from the public, the community, and the Commission to determine the points from the category perspectives. A separate analysis was run with different points analysis, up to 16 points, without much impact

or difference. We refined a few things which didn't create a significant difference between the top three categories of safety, land use and bike connectivity.

Mr. Crampton We did play around with some of the weights based on input. Y2K will be providing the city with a written report, all the GIS data and mapping so we can modify the report as needed. We have Tiers and the opportunity to give higher prioritization to certain elements. We can look at canal connectivity when prioritizing projects.

Commissioner Brennan A follow-up comment on the Public Engagement highlights. The 4th bullet point states "online survey respondents strongly support protected bike lanes on Arizona Ave and Chandler Blvd". I think that does reflect appropriately.

Commissioner Heredia Commented after reading some of the comments and through his various travels he has observed different concepts or protected routes but there is no perfect system in place. In Denver for example some areas are a little more advanced they still converted multi-use sidewalks or paths to complete linkage and save money. We don't live in an unlimited resource environment. Patching different networks together to deal with connectivity and safety is used in many cities due to limited resources and layouts which results in a fragmented map.

Chair Repar Any further questions from the Commissioner's? None. Any public comment? Please state your name and address for the record.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Shawn Metz, 1382 N Salida Del Sol. My observations – they may be beyond the scope of this specific project but could be worth considering. He stated that the use of Strava for the bicycle count was an excellent point to bring up. He is a recreational bicyclist but also a transportation bicyclist. He stated the problem with Strava is it is typically used by competitive or more comfortable bicyclist. It is typically not used by individuals who bike for transportation or those who are low income/disadvantaged. This may explain some of the metrics for Arizona Ave. A commuter in that area is probably not using Strava which may account for a higher fatalities/injury in that area. One more note on Strava...Jacaranda scored very highly on the route. He stated it very comfortable, very slow and low traffic. There is a triathlon shop directly on it so there may be a number of cyclists using it which may skew your data. I thought those are some points worth considering. Also wanted to note that Arizona Ave. and Chandler Blvd. are not addressed in this plan as well as most north of the Loop 202. Looking at the responses to the survey around 50% were north of Loop

202, 25% had no preference and 25% were south of Loop 202 but the map seems to support that area specifically. Mr. Metz pointed out some areas within Arizona, Tucson and Oro Valley, there are some examples for protected bike infrastructure being used today. He acknowledged some of his other points have been discussed in addressing fatalities.

Jared Pager, 1604 S Villas Lane. I use Strava to record my exercise and metrics. I do not use Stava for my recreational biking. I think that data is going to be skewed towards people using for it for exercise. The majority of people using it are less likely to adjust their routes. The irony of the metrics is there has to be enough room but the roads that need better protection are the ones that are immediately outside the analysis. I understand you have to take the problem as it is given. There are better ways to protect biking as opposed to protected bike lanes. We have a lot of bike lanes, and it makes sense to add protection to those that is the most efficient and beneficial. I grew up in Gilbert and I used to bike to school daily. There is no way now If I was six years old that I could bike to school because I would have to cross Germann Rd. which is a six-lane road. The type of biking I would like to see come to Chandler is something that can become a daily activity as opposed to drive to the canal and ride my bike. I hope we can get more than the 51 miles. I also throw my support at Chandler Blvd and Arizona Ave. as two important roads because of the high visibility.

Mr. Crampton Thanked both public speakers for their comments. He stated that we hear your concerns about the Strava data and it's not perfect. He pointed out we are only applying one point out of all the weighting factors so it's not skewing things dramatically. But we do hear your concerns and Commissioner Lucas' comments as something we can look into as we implement and consider how Strava may have affected one corridor getting into a different Tier. Appreciate the feedback.

Commissioner Heredia Asked a question on the pedestrian crash. Is that a nexus to bicycle situation or is it just a pedestrian incident? I am asking a question about the data point. Is it just a pedestrian crash or related to a bicycle lane?

Consultant Yazzi Responded. The data we are showing are both bike and pedestrian crashes. All the gray dots mean it was a vehicle to a bike crash. All the purple dots are a vehicle to a pedestrian crash.

Commissioner Heredia continued, not to negate the importance of Arizona Ave. and the safety concern, but it is our highest corridor both with downtown and

incidents. I think there are a lot of improvements that can be made along that route but the data it's collecting is because it is high use and has a lot of pedestrians. I am trying to look at the data as... is it a nexus next to a bicycle lane or is it a data point where we have to be observant of safety concerns.

Mr. Crampton The pedestrian dots could be an area where there are no bike lanes. It could be where someone is crossing an intersection. It is a good point that it could be an area with more pedestrians because of downtown. This study did not go into depth to analyze what is the per capita rate as far as pedestrians on the street and number of crashes.

Commissioner Brennan Commented I would like to thank our two members of the public who joined us this evening. I have served on the Commission for over three years, and this is the first Commission meeting I have attended where we have had members of the public participating. I am very grateful, and I thank you very much. He asked what happens at this point in regards with the streets identified as suitable? This may sound like criticism but there's no connectivity except in the southwest area. There are pieces of bike lanes that aren't continuous and don't seem to go anywhere.

Consultant Yazzi Responded. We can take the results and overlay the existing bike lanes so there is a more comprehensive picture of the bicycle network. Where it shows the existing bike lanes and shows the locations of those bike lanes with the feasibility to add in protection. Would that be helpful?

Commissioner Brennan Commented yes. It will provide a clearer picture of what could be accomplished particularly as it relates to connectivity. For example, on Arizona Ave. it looks like there is a couple miles south and then there is a gap and then a mile or so then there is nothing north of that. There are segments of bike lanes that don't really connect to anything.

Consultant Yazzi Responded I think they connect to the rest of the bicycle network.

Commissioner Brennan Commented I understand that. You are going from an unprotected bike lane to a protected bike lane and then an unprotected lane. Why would anyone ride on that? You ride on a protected bike lane from a safety standpoint and those kinds of gaps don't provide you with that safety except in certain areas.

Mr. Crampton We are working within the fabric that we have. Unfortunately, there are not a lot of great examples of streets in Chandler where it is feasible to put a protected bike lane across the entire city. The concerns are valid, but we are working within the restraints of not widening the roadway or removing a lane of traffic. These are the opportunities we have. Commissioner Lucas remarked on the importance of connecting to the canal or off street - although it may only be a half mile or mile of protected bike lane it would get you that connection to that non-traditional bike route. The other thing that could be a benefit to a shorter route is connectivity to a park, school or shopping center. These are important things to consider as we look at how to implement this.

Commissioner Brennan Commented my thought is that maybe we should take the existing funding that's been set aside for protected bike lanes and complete the existing system. And then make some improvements to Arizona Ave. and Chandler Blvd to make people feel safer riding on those two streets that have a high number of pedestrians-bicycle crashes and injuries, or people being killed. It would be a more comprehensive approach rather than a disjointed approach. As a follow-up - there was approximately a little less than a million dollars in the CIP for separated bike lanes. What was the timeframe for that?

Mr. Crampton Responded that was a ten-year CIP. We have funding every other year to add a mile or so of protected bike lanes.

Commissioner Brennan Commented by the year 2123 we might have a system that is completed as far as having the fund available to make the improvements.

Chair Repar Stated funding is always an issue.

Commissioner Brennan Responded I understand, but why start something if it's going to take that long to complete. Why not complete what we have which is the existing bike system. Get that done and if there are other sources of funding then begin to look at what streets do we need to consider to make them safer for bicyclist. Make those improvements continuous. If we have to narrow those traffic lanes than that's what has to be done. We don't build streets like that. We build one lane, then two lanes and eventually three lanes in each direction. I think there needs to be a more comprehensive approach to how we build our bike lanes.

Mr. Crampton Responded not to discount your points, but some background information on this study. The magnitude of expenses associated with widening

streets to add bike lanes are really two different discussions. It's ten - twenty times different in costs. This is looking at lower costs. The other item is the Transportation Master Plan what we heard from the public feedback less of an interest with traditional bike lanes on arterial streets next to high-speed traffic and more focus on paths, separated protected bike lanes and off-street networks. That is why this study originated and we started with a modest CIP amount to get this started. If this is successful it's not to say it couldn't be changed.

Chair Repar Stated or requested the use of letters or numbers as opposed to colors to help him distinguish the data. He thanked the public for being present and moved onto the next item Hunt Highway Traffic Calming and Separated Bike Lane Study.

5. Hunt Highway Traffic Calming and Separated Bike Lane Study

Mr. Crampton Stated Sanjay Paul will be presenting on the Hunt Highway study. We talked about this study once. We are getting close to moving on to the next phase which is public outreach. There will be opportunities for this item to come back to the Commission. We will look to wrap up this study at the end of the year. He turned the time over to Sanjay of HDR for his presentation.

Mr. Paul Started his presentation providing some background information. Maricopa Association of Governments is the funding agency, and the City of Chandler is the owner. Our scope of work, apart from the project assessment, is investigating the existing conditions, identifying a few potential solutions, and then get public feedback.

The slide showed the map study area. The scope goes along Hunt Highway from Cooper Rd. east to Val Vista with subdivisions on the north side of Hunt Highway and the Gila River Community on the south side. That segment of the corridor has a rural environment with unique characteristics and when driving in the area people speed up. The new casino is adding to the problem. There have been a couple of fatalities on the corridor. Is that correct Jason?

Mr. Crampton Responded yes, within the last three years.

Mr. Paul Continued his presentation showing Existing Conditions in the study corridor. There are unprotected bike lanes, one-way in each direction. There is a two-way left turn lane at the center and at the major intersection there are dedicated left hand turn lanes. Traffic volume data and speed data was collected. Approximately

fifty-five hundred vehicles per day drive the corridor (weekday). Apart from our data we received traffic impact data from another consultant hired by the casino. The volume data from both studies was combined and projected for another 20 years. Results show one lane in each direction will easily be able to handle the capacity. The posted speed limit is forty-five miles per hour with 85% driving fifty-five miles per hour in the corridor. However, 4 – 5% of drivers were traveling at speeds close to 80 miles per hour, especially during weekends. The goal is to provide a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists and reduce the speed of the corridor by providing other engineering measures.

He stated a list of Potential Treatments was initially developed with solutions. We met with Jason, Sasha and the traffic engineering folks and narrowed the list down to three. The plan is to take these three to the public sometime in October. One option is the multi-use path of widening the sidewalk to provide space for both pedestrian and cyclists, which is a low-cost option. There are no issues with the pavement or Right-of-Way acquisition. The second option is providing a protected (physical separated) bike lanes on both sides of the corridor. Third option is a dedicated bicycle track which provides a channel for bicyclist in both directions. But this option comes with other challenges especially when the bicyclist needs to cross the main road. But the south side of Hunt Highway is a rural area without any potential for development there.

For speed reduction we talked about narrowing down lanes, so drivers feel that site friction. We also discussed installing roundabouts but there is already a traffic signal at the major intersection of Gilbert Rd.

Option 1 – Protected Multiuse Path (three different cross sections): We have a wide enough roadway. The intent is not to move the two lanes which keeps the cost low and non-capital intensive. We are widening the existing sidewalk making it 10 or 12 feet so both pedestrians and bicyclists can use it. Reducing speeds by narrowing the lanes and installing a center median with vegetation and/or trees.

Option 2 – Protected Bike Lanes: Keeping the bike lanes along both sides but adding either pavers or a median with some low maintenance landscape to separate the bicyclist from traffic.

Option 3 – Protected Bike Track: The top left cross section shows both east and west bound bicyclists along the north side of the corridor. There is room for an area between 11 and 14 feet with both bicyclists using a dedicated channel and a physical

median separating bicyclists from traffic. Two-way traffic will be on the south side of the corridor with lane width of 12 feet which will provide side friction and hopefully make the driver slow down.

These are the three alternatives discussed with the planning department and traffic engineering staff. We plan to go to the public sometime in October to receive their input on the three alternatives, how frequently they use the corridor and what kind of improvements they want to see. I would like to welcome the Commissioners to review the options and give us feedback.

Project Timelines/Upcoming Milestones - Public outreach and stakeholders meeting in October. Finalizing the Draft Project Assessment Report in November. The draft report will be shared with the Commission. Addressing all the comments/feedback the final report is scheduled for some time in December. Mr. Paul concluded his presentation and turned the time over to Jason Crampton.

Mr. Crampton Thanked Sanjay for his presentation.

Chair Repar Asked if the money for making this – is it coming from Chandler or from Maricopa County?

Mr. Crampton Responded the money for the study is coming from MAG (Maricopa Association of Governments). We do not have any funding in our Capital Improvement Program to construct anything yet. Future funding to be determined. It could be a grant or locally funded.

Chair Repar Asked if it would be Chandler funding?

Mr. Crampton Responded it would be Chandler that pursues and obtains the federal grant. Chandler maintains the Right-of-Way and It will be a Chandler project.

Chair Repar Asked the Commissioner's if there were any further questions?

Commissioner Brennan Asked several questions about the cycle track concept. Is there any area in the East Valley where that has been used? How successful is it? Is it preferred by cyclists, or do they prefer separate lanes on each side of the street?

Mr. Paul Responded to Commissioner Brennan's question. In the East Valley I do not know. City of Phoenix has a section in the downtown area with a cycling track.

Mrs. Pachito Responded - one of Tempe's more recent bike improvement projects the Cycle Track was proposed. It's the project that goes down toward US-60 to Kiwanis Park and goes north.

Mr. Paul Stated it does come with challenges when there are a lot of bicyclists crossing the main intersection. But in this context, we don't have a lot of people crossing the road.

Jared Pager – public comment – I have used a cycle track before. I wouldn't say that one is better than the other. The problem being I had to cross the road to go back up.

Chair Repar Asked if there were any further discussion on this? No responses. He thanked Mr. Paul for his presentation. Moving on to Information Items. Are there any comments on the packet of information from the Commissioner's?

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. August 2023 Project Status

Mr. Crampton Responded Mr. Chairman we are not going to do a presentation on the transportation projects, but you did receive the list. If there are any questions you can ask now or later.

Commissioner Brennan Asked the question. The construction of Ray Road and Dobson Road are you going to do anything innovative as far as bicycle lanes through that intersection? It might be a good opportunity to try something different.

Mr. Crampton Responded Commissioner Brennan the concept is to keep standard bike lanes going through the intersection in all directions. Adding a protective element at an intersection like that is very challenging – probably one of the most challenging places so I don't think it is being considered, but I will check with the project team.

Commissioner Lucas Asked the question to follow-up on Commissioner Brennan's comment. On future roadway projects - are there plans to help complete the incomplete bike network that's in place now? Is it a requirement that future roadway projects include bike lane projects if not already present?

Mr. Crampton Responded Commissioner Lucas yes, that is a requirement. All our capital projects (currently under construction) Lindsay Road, Chandler Heights, Ocotillo Road – all these projects will add bike lanes to those roadways. As we move forward with implementing the Transportation Master Plan to do projects on McQueen and Warner bike lanes will be added as well.

MEMBER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Repar Asked if there were any further comments or announcements?

Mr. Crampton Responded Mr. Chairman one brief announcement. Recently Proposition 400 passed through the legislature who provided authorization to send that to the ballot for voters to decide.

CALENDAR

Chair Repar Our next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 20, 2023. Any comments on that? Is there any further business before we adjourn? Again, I was to thank those in the audience for your attendance. We really appreciate your input.

We adjourn the meeting (6:27 pm).

John Repar, Chairman

Sheri Passey, City of Chandler