

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

Wednesday, December 6, 2023, at 5:00 p.m.

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 Dan Henderson

Commissioner Luis Heredia

Members Absent:

Commissioner David Lucas

Commissioner Molly Pendergast

Staff Members Present:

Ryan Peters, Strategic Initiatives Director

Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager

Nancy Jackson, Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Raistlin Snow, Intern, Transportation Policy

Sheri Passey, Recording Secretary, Management Assistant

John Knudson, Public Works Director

Others Present

Aaron Xaevier, Planner III, Valley Metro - Presenter

Sean Metz - citizen

SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Approval of the Minutes of the Transportation Commission Regular Meeting of August 9, 2023.**

Chair Repar The next item is to review the meeting schedule for next year?

Mr. Crampton Stated Chairman Repar the Transportation Commission minutes are first on the consent agenda.

Chair Repar Apologized and asked so, has everyone had a chance to review the previous meeting minutes?

Commissioner Brennan Stated he would like to make a clarification and can we have page numbers on the minutes. It was on page five of my copy. There was a comment I made (he read the following from the minutes) "Commissioner Brennan asked a question of the Direct Access to School's map. There are a lot of schools shown on the map. Not all are public. What other types of schools? And consultant Yazzi who was giving the presentation said they were charter and private schools," which I could figure out. The question I was asking, the map showed a lot of schools, as I stated in my comments at the last meeting. And it was unclear why all those schools were identified. I think the intent was to show where there was a potential for people riding bicycles to get to the school. And in fact, many of the "schools" were not what we would consider elementary, jr. high school or high schools. But they appeared to be preschools and I think that those should not have been shown on the map. Preschools don't have a lot of kids riding to school and I know as a parent dropping kids off at a preschool, we never rode our bikes to preschool to drop off our kids. I think the map didn't even need to be in the report. And that was my comment. The map was unclear and didn't explain what it was supposed to explain and not necessary as far as...this was in the Protected Bike Lanes.

Mr. Crampton Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the comments. To let you know that map will be removed from the final report so you will not see it carried into the final report. But thank you for clarifying.

Chair Repar Are there any other comments about the minutes from the last meeting before we go any further?

Mr. Peters Asked so staff is clear – we are not making any changes to the minutes, right? The comment is just clarifying what was said because that was transcribe all of audio recording.

Commissioner Brennan Yes, that is fine. As long as you're going to take minutes to clarify. I just wanted to clarify.

Chair Repar Regarding the clarification no change then? With that do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Commissioner Heredia So moved.

Chair Repar Do I have a second?

Vice Chair Heineking Seconded the motion.

Chair Repar All in favor say I. Any opposed? None. Motion passes.

The minutes were approved 5-0 by **all Commissioners** members present.

Action Agenda

2. Transportation Commission 2024 Meeting Schedule

Chair Repar Has everyone had a chance to review the meeting schedule for 2024?

Commissioner Brennan I would like to make a proposal. Rather than showing a meeting every two months, can we show a meeting once a month? And if we don't need a meeting we can certainly cancel. There are issues I believe could be discussed and have not been discussed. I know I have raised issues. I believe it was a year ago January I submitted a list of about ten different topics, and I think one of those topics had been addressed which was the protected bike lane study. Another topic had been discussed in 2022, but it was going to be continued in additional discussions this year for whatever the study found. This was the Downtown Pedestrian Study. I don't know the status of that. And there were several other items I thought could be presented to the commission just from an informational standpoint. I know I asked for three years to have a presentation on...I think three different issues...

complete streets, vision zero. There's been a discussion or a recommendation in the Parks Master Plan for developing a city-wide bike and trails master plan. Perhaps we can discuss that. In fact, I think there was a meeting that was scheduled a year ago in March to have a joint meeting with Parks and Recreation and that meeting was cancelled. It would be nice to have that joint meeting. Oh, the MAG Active Transportation Plan, which is part of what we will be voting or part of the election this fall, Active Transportation Plan. Probably just have a discussion on what we're going to be reviewing or voting on this fall. So, I think there are some other topics that could be discussed. So that's why my suggestion is that we have a meeting at least scheduled.

Chair Repar I think it's a matter of having the agenda to cover the items you bring around more than frequency of the meeting. I don't see the frequency of the meeting doing anything to change that agenda around that's going to make it more convenient. Myself, I don't see a reason to increase having a monthly schedule meeting. What would the procedure be if we had to call an additional meeting?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Brennan we have done that throughout the year and throughout previous years. If we have an agenda item that needs action sooner, we will reach out to the commission and request your availability, which we did with this meeting. In fact, we changed it from November to December to allow for certain project timing. That is something we can do. We can always add an unscheduled meeting if there is something that comes up. We are happy to build a schedule as the commissions wishes. But if we were to list 12 meeting on here, I don't think it would result in 12 meetings occurring. We would have meeting when we have agenda items that need to be discussed.

Commissioner Brennan Maybe in January we can have an item on the agenda to talk about topics on future meetings. I submitted topics of suggestions and I get feedback saying well we'll think about it, and nothing ever happens. I'd like to actually talk about what we might be able to put on the agenda for some of the meetings. I think there are topics the commission needs to hear about with regards to transportation and we're not getting that information.

Mr. Peters Stated. Mr. Chairman, historically, this commission has not met on a regular basis, it was as needed. A couple of years ago we established a

predictable calendar that we can all react from and plan around. As far as Mr. Brennan's concerns about some of these agenda items... as a reminder this is a commission that is appointed by the council, the policy makers, to review what they are interested in talking about. And many of these subjects while interesting and important to consider there is also staff time we have to balance and Council direction and policy parameters that we have to consider as we're representing different items to the commission for action.

Chair Repar Asked would this be something that we would do as your suggestions, put it on the agenda for the next meeting to discuss, frequency of meetings?

Commissioner Brennan Commented. Well, I would like to discuss frequency of meetings and possible topics to have on the agenda. So, we could decide if we end up with six topics, we have six meetings. If we end up with 12 topics, we would have 12 meeting. But I think we need to have the opportunity to talk about what could be discussed or what could be presented to the commission.

Vice Chair Heineking Stated. I do think it would be great that we have a conversation at the table and think about staff time and being able to balance that. I would hope you guys would just be frank with us and let us know it's not something that is not on Council's agenda for the next year. If there's informational items certainly, we can discuss. But I think the other concern I might have with having them more frequently – I know I was late. And I assume required us putting off the roll call until we had a quorum here. If we go more frequently it's going to make it more of a burden for people to get here. I just don't want to overburden if we are already having trouble getting people every eight week or so. It seems like four weeks might be pushing people to lose interest.

Chair Repar Stated. In fact, if there are areas that aren't being covered or have many areas of concern we have to talk about that or put that on some list and pass that through the city to see what can be done to address those concerns.

Mr. Crampton Responded. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Brennan, Vice Chair Heineking appreciate the conversation and just to reiterate what Ryan said. What we are looking to do when we are developing agenda items is

bringing you some of the studies, projects and things that we are working on to meet Council goals, that need citizen review and the Commission's feedback. What we are not looking to do is create items that are not on council's radar, do not comply with the Council's strategic vision, projects we don't have the capacity for the funding or the staff time or whatever if may be to actually advance a certain type of project or policy or maybe it's outside the realm of what Council is looking at. We do develop the agenda with those types of thoughts in mind. Which results typically in about on average of five meetings a year. To come up with those agenda items for you to review, that are valuable. The feedback that we get from this group provides value to the studies and the projects that we work on. As well as some of the contracts that we enter into. Those recommendations before taking an item to Council are great as well. The concern is going outside that scope and creating agenda items that are not on our groups radar which are ultimately driven by Council vision.

Chair Repar Asked. What is the better avenue for this Commission? Go to the City Council meetings to bring items ups? Is that a way to begin bringing items to discussion? They have all kinds of forums you can always go to the council meeting and bring up your concerns.

Vice Chair Heineking Stated. I like my idea. If we put five minutes on the agenda to talk about topics, we could talk about and again there's a conversation saying that's not something that's on the radar in the next year or so it won't make the list.

Commissioner Brennan Commented. I think these topics...I mean Complete Streets have been around for a number of years. I guess I have asked for three or four years to have a presentation on Complete Streets. I don't know if the Council even knows what complete streets are. So, having something come from Council, maybe something should come from this groups to say these are some ideas, new ideas, new transportation ideas. And how about having a briefing on that to the Council so maybe they hear something new, and they could give us feedback. Now if they don't believe in complete streets, that's fine and they can say forget about that. There's been a lot on Vision Zero and using Vision Zero can reduce traffic accidents, traffic deaths, et cetera. I don't know if the Council has ever heard of Vision Zero but maybe they should hear about that and at least provide

opportunities to say yes, take a look at that and come back with some ideas or no we don't care about saving lives, so we don't care about Vision Zero.

Mr. Peters Stated. Mr. Chairman, we are getting off topic of the agenda item which is the calendar. But I also want to contextualize some things. It took us a long time to get the Prop 400 extension through the state legislature because of these lightning rod issues like Vision Zero, Complete Streets, taking away lanes of traffic for bike lanes. It was really difficult. The most important things that we need to do to support infrastructure in the state for the commissioners like you and our City Council. We are not allowed to take an advocacy position for the ballot measures, but we can certainly provide information on Prop 400 and what that means. And the more information that is out in the stratosphere that the City of Chandler is looking at taking away vehicle lanes or all this misinformation out there just makes that task more challenging. That is why we also measure against what our City Council in particular worries about getting across the finish line and things to consider that strikes a balance and driving what our priorities are verses what some of these things. We may get there eventually, but too fast we can jeopardize a lot of funding and other projects in the region that are critically important to us. We consider all these things. Jason and I talk about these things a lot and we figure out the best political timing for them and the presentation when this should be appropriate for council. They do visit with each other annually, semi-annual to talk about their strategic plan, whether it's a neighborhoods or connectivity which this commission falls under. These things are all brought up during those conversations. But again, we are really sensitive to any kind of lightning rod issue that could potentially risk a bad headline that would cause some voters to choose to not invest in the region. That's kind of the conversations Jason and I have behind the scenes. I'm afraid we are also really getting off topic of the calendar.

Mr. Crampton Responded. I just want to reiterate that. Mr. Chairman, I'd advise us to steer back to the calendar and if the commission wishes to consider Commissioner Heineking's suggestion that we talk about this more at the January meeting we can discuss these a little bit more at that point.

Commissioner Heredia Asked, Mr. Chairman. On that topic if we do discuss, as a new commissioner, knowing what is on the horizon based on the calendar year that we are presented with stuff that is already in the pipeline. It would be good to get a rough timeline of how those reports or

presentations arrived to this commission because of some of those topics might already be embedded in larger things. Just understanding our horizon would be good. Not to add more stuff to staff. Knowing what is already in the pipeline and what topics can be added to those conversation that are already part of those presentation and are probably already being discussed at a particular level. It doesn't have to be the topic itself for two hours like we are here today, but whatever is available, and you can take suggestions from the commission on other items that could be a part of those presentations that are already fixed in the timeline.

Commissioner Henderson Mr. Chair back to that calendar. One thing of note March 20 coincides with Chandler Unified School District's Spring break. I thought that might pose of challenge with a quorum. I would urge staff to reconsider that date.

Mr. Crampton Responded. Maybe we can push that to April tentatively. I guess we are going to vote on it so you can make it the third Wednesday of April. Maybe if you make a modified motion.

Chair Repar Asked. So, is the first thing would be a motion to change this March 20 to April? Is that what I hear?

Commissioner Henderson Stated. Anything that does not conflict with spring break in order to accommodate a quorum.

Chair Repar Asked. Does staff have any feeling about that?

Mr. Peters Stated. That is fine. I suggest a motion that says adopt the calendar with the modified changes or with the April date.

Mr. Crampton Responded. The third Wednesday in April, we'll make that change.

Chair Repar Stated – that will be the motion that you make to amend the schedule one to fix this step?

Mr. Peters Responded. You can do it all in motion.

Commissioner Henderson Motioned to approve the 2024 Meeting Schedule with the moving of the March meeting to April 17, 2024.

Chair Repar Asked for a second.

Commissioner Heredia Seconded the motion.

Chair Repar Called for a vote. All in favor say "I". Those opposed. Motion carries. So, we can accept the schedule as is with that change - correct? Or do we need to present this again?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Yes. That was the motion and the vote so we will get that changed before we send over to city clerk.

Commissioner Brennan Asked. Can we talk about topics in January?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Yes, we can bring that item to the agenda to go through some of those.

BRIEFINGS

Chair Repar The first item on our briefing it would be the second item on the briefing Item #4 The Chandler Airpark Area Flexible Transit Study Update.

4. CHANDLER AIRPARK FLEXIBLE TRANSIT STUDY UPDATE

Mr. Jason Crampton introduced Aaron Xaevier with Valley Metro. Appreciate Aaron's patience and waiting so long to get to your agenda item. Apologize about this wait. We did some public outreach on this study that we are excited to share with you. I'll turn it over to Aaron.

Mr. Xaevier Thank you Jason and members of the commission. I'm glad to be back here to talk about our progress in the study. It's a great receptive group and I will be presenting some of the progress we've had. I will go over the background of what the study is and the angle we are coming in at, in terms of the purpose and the context. I'll talk about the public outreach we did, and some of the responses that we got. Service alternative analysis will be next in terms of what the different options were that we looked at

and a brief overview of some of the key statistics and the next steps for the study. Feel free to stop me at any time, raise your hand, ask questions or make comments, or write them down, if there is a question, I can't answer I'll be sure to get back with you.

Brief overview of the study. This was essentially part two of the study that we did previously that culminated in the existing Chandler Flex service, which just got over a year worth of service and looks like the service is doing really well. We wanted to see if there were potential areas, especially to the east around the airpark that we could expand. What would be the best places in terms of the best bang for your buck and the different areas that the public is looking to have served. But also, what does the data support in terms of potentially expanding a service like this?

Commissioner Brennan Asked. Can you identify where there is residential development, or the employment areas? I can see the runway, Chandler airport but I don't know what the boundary is for the airport. Just from a land use area more of a sense what is existing in the area. I know on the map you can vaguely see streets which would indicate there are residential subdivisions, but I think it would help to clarify the map and land use.

Mr. Xaevier Responded. Absolutely and for a little more context. To the west it's Arizona Ave, to the east that's Greenfield, to the north is Ray and to the south is Riggs. And I do have a map that shows all the breakdown of the zoning, so I can share that with the group as well. It's in the existing conditions, so we did that. And we also have the population and jobs projection that we can provide.

We are currently out of the Outreach phase. Got a lot of good feedback from the community both here in Chandler as well as Gilbert. We are analyzing the alternatives. We're going to show you some of the alternatives that raised at the top, some of the statistics that came out of the modeling software used which is provided by Via, who runs the current service.

Public Outreach we provided outreach through many different avenues to make sure that we were covering a broad spot of folks both in Chandler and Gilbert as this is a cross jurisdictional study. We had a project website to give background and a landing page for folks to look at which included a

phone line and email address as well that folks can give input at any time. We did a social media push, some bus stop signage and an online survey which ran from the beginning of October through Veterans Day weekend. We received 107 responses, and I would like to go over some of those results or at least the key ones. We can provide the full list of the survey questions and the results, if you are interested. This is everything we looked through when we talked about alternatives and analyzing the different option available within the study area. And the highlighted one...

Commissioner Brennan Asked. Excused me, going back to the survey. What were the target groups as far as the survey? Just a whole process. I'm assuming businesses around the airport were contacted.

Mr. Xaevier Commissioner – we had a bit of a broad spot. We did a lot of public social media outreach. I don't know if it was targeted so much to particular businesses as it was geographically targeted, trying to reach people within a specific area. Anybody in Chandler or Gilbert was targeted for the online outreach. And for the bus stop signage it was signage within the study area. Any transit (went back to the map) that ran within the study area was targeted. That is the way we were doing the targeting not necessarily knocking on doors.

Commissioner Brennan Asked - so not everybody in all the residential neighborhoods, people in these areas, not all those individuals received surveys?

Mr. Xaevier Responded it was a survey we put online, and we tried to direct traffic to the project website where the survey was. We didn't go out and target specially the neighborhoods. We just had social media and online advertising was targeted for household and businesses within Chandler and Gilbert.

Commissioner Brennan Asked/stated – so for example the businesses in the employment areas specially around the airport, they weren't specifically targeted. I'm sure they all have emails where they could send the survey out to their employees. That was not part of the target effort?

Mr. Xaevier Responded. I guess in so far as they were within the study area. So, they would have probably received a post on social media, and we do have an extensive email list within the agency that we work from.

Commissioner Brennan Stated/asked – I'm just trying to understand how the notifications went out. Were there any public meetings in the area?

Mr. Xaevier Responded no.

Mr. Xaevier Continued his presentation. Through the survey we got a couple of different elements of the alternative analysis that really guide the way we were structuring the zones and thinking about how long the service run, where could people board. Kind of this hybrid model of your door-to-door and corner-to-corner depending how busy the service is. What kind of wait times do people have an appetite for and how far people are willing to walk to their service and how much would they be willing to pay for fares.

I will go through these quick. I will have the full set of result available to you all, so you can see the questions that I excluded. I will just go through a couple of them. This first one, talks about the types of destinations and trips that folks are looking to take. The top results were errands and groceries. Commuting patterns came in third which kind of tell us what the key destinations are that you want to serve and target. Schools are down a little bit. We didn't do any specific targeting for the schools, but in our overall modeling comes from Via. They have all your ridership data and know how a big of part the schools play in the current ridership. As we're going through and modeling this is just one element of land use as far as targeting areas. But this is essential what the general public said when asked. Some other important factors were the common times of the travel. To the left on the graph are the weekday entries and to the right are the weekend entries and that split is kind of mirrored on the top and the bottom of the table. It's a validation of the current service. The three most common responses were between weekday morning and weekday evening between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. and after that in terms of volume of responses was the weekend midday. Not a whole lot of responses came through for the weekend. Validation of the current weekday service of 5:30 a.m. to 9 p.m. I thought it was important to show that potentially in the future if there were expansions not only in terms of geography, but in days of the week.

The likelihood of connecting to transit was a question in the interplay between the fixed route buses the city is making and the flexible transit the potential area has. Sixty-two (62%) percent said they would be somewhat or very likely to use transit service more often if you have a connection like micro transit. Showing the invests you are already making in the fixed routes and the potential of adding new connecting service that solves the First Mile, Last Mile problem.

We asked how long respondents would be willing to wait for a ride. Once you go past 15 minutes, there's a huge drop off in terms of interest. Looking at the last year of data for the current Flex service you are almost exactly at 15 minutes for an average wait time. It seems like the current service is hitting that sweet spot of not over serving and having a bunch of vehicles idling waiting to be placed into the service. Continuing to set that level of service standard is important as we continue to set KPI's and continue to track its performance.

The next one we asked how long people are willing to walk for a ride. This was measured in terms of minutes. People usually think of it in terms of time because it relates to how long they prepare to leave or get to their destination. Just for reference five minutes of a walk is about a quarter mile for most people. Most people are willing to walk up to a quarter mile. Think about the potential to shift from a door-to-door service to a potential virtual stop service which can help with the operational efficiencies and may be shaved down a vehicle and save a lot of vehicle hours doing a really robust service currently with the door-to-door. People do have a bit of a tolerance if you wanted to push it a little bit.

One element of the survey was the map where people could drop pins when asked If you were to go somewhere with the service within the study area where would you be going? The highest hot spot is by the Community College campus. Then a pretty big hot spot in downtown but other than that it was pretty spread out throughout the Chandler side and not a whole lot of hits on the Gilbert side. They did have a little bit of shopping interest on the Gilbert side. Nothing at the hospital which was interesting because we thought it would be an important spot. There is a very disperse set of responses geographically. They almost exclusively split along the Chandler line.

Service Alternative Analysis. This is the meat of the second portion of the study. This looks across different options based on all the survey responses and all the data that we collected in the existing conditions. We made a couple of assumptions when we were modeling the service to get things like the costs and estimate of riders, and the main ones are listed. Essentially it mirrors what you have with the Flex service so, it would be seamless extension of what you already do. That's a Span of Service from 5:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.; Days of Service - weekdays; Average Wait Time - 15 minutes; and it's a Transportation as a Service Model which is the turnkey instead of having to do operations in-house, have your own vehicles, pay your own operators and have a facility they run out of.

To the right you have the Existing Flex Service with the five different data points for the options for a little bit of context so you can see how the existing costs that are actual compared to the estimates of the alternatives I'm about the show.

Option 1 – Is the biggest and most expensive option. Size: 31.9 square miles; Cost per year \$1.36 million; Daily Riders 104 per day; Fleet Need – 4; and covers a Population 92,400.

Option 2 – Paired down but still serving the shopping center in Gilbert and a larger school zone. Note all the KPI's that are showing include the school zone, which can be tweaked. Size: 25.1 square miles; Cost per year \$915,000; Daily Riders 62 per day; Fleet Need – 3; and Population 60,300.

Option 3 – Has no school zone. Extended a little bit outside of the study area down to Hunt Highway – the south most region option.

Mr. Crampton Clarified. Options 3 & 4 are Chandler only options. The first two options also serve into the town of Gilbert so the costs you saw on the first option if it is ever implemented would be split with the Town of Gilbert based on the actual miles of the service in each location.

Mr. Xaevier Continued his presentation. We have done that because part costs are going up for transit and also Gilbert doesn't fund any of their transit with local funds. So, we wanted to present options that we didn't have to break them if they were all crossing the boundaries. We wanted to

have two to refer back to. Size: 24.8 square miles; Cost per year \$1.45 million; Daily Riders 99 per day; Fleet Need – 4; and Population 74,200.

Option 4 – Had two potential school zones on the north that was an extension of the current school zone and one on the south and around some of the county islands and ended at Riggs Road. Size: 20.5 square miles; Cost per year \$1.33 million; Daily Riders 81 per day; Fleet Need – 4; and Population 61,800.

One point on the costs. The costs are incremental in the way they go up. It's not like a bus route that you were to add but a continuous cost spectrum by mile. It is based on if you tip into that extra fleet that is what causes a higher level of cost. If you are able to keep the fleet down to three or four even if you were to expand that zone it would be the same of cost. The wait times might go up a little bit, but costs would be the same because it's based on vehicles run per hour. So, if you are running the same span with the same number of vehicles you can expand or contract that zone. Obviously, it's going to have an impact on the service but that really the big variable in that cost equation.

For Next Steps. To finalize the proposed service zone based on the feedback that we receive and the final calculations that we're working through with the city staff. Draft a service alternative technical memo which is the second part of the overall study. Once they are rolled up together with the existing conditions the operations and implementation technical memo to come later. Have that drafted before the holiday stuff. Final review date for city staff is January 17 with it wrapped up by the end of January. Final report to you by March. Are there any questions, comments?

Commissioner Brennan Asked – what is the involvement of the Town of Gilbert? Have they shared their discussions? I know you have four options so two options I guess were going to be going to Town of Gilbert.

Mr. Xaevier Responded. Yes, they have been with us every step of the way. Scoping with us, coming to the monthly meeting, they bring comments and have been candid about their city's ability to see this happen in terms of the limitation they have politically and financially. They have been supportive of having a couple of options that would have to be able to break

off of the City of Chandler if you guys wanted to go ahead with something. They had input in the outreach to boost that on social media and to push it out to some of the contact they had. They have been very involved.

Commissioner Brennan Asked. At the end of this process there will be one recommendation - one alternative identified as the preferred alternative?

Mr. Xaevier Responded. I imagine they will be ranked so you can look back and see with a fair degree of detail, how must the cost to implement even if I don't really like this one, but the second or third one is going to really appeal to me or there is a fatal flaw in the second one but your not locked into witness the only thing that you have information for we have to extrapolate the data from the other options. We will give a primary recommendation and have rankings with similar levels.

Commissioner Heredia Asked. What is the size of a fleet? Or is it just one car?

Mr. Xaevier Responded. It varies. Usually about three or four in order to keep within the average wait time of 15-minute. You could probably get away with three cars and bump that up to a 20-minutes in terms of an average wait time but during the peak it might get a little dicey. We usually go with a minivan from the amount of folks that need to get in there as I don't think we are really pushing the loads of people over four or five.

Mr. Crampton Responded. Yeah, that's about right. Just to put into perspective the current area that blue polygon in the western part of south Chandler. That area is served by seven total vehicles in the fleet, and one is always kept as a spare. At the highest peak demand times we would either have five or up to six vehicles on the road. With this expansion area we're saying we would need four at the peak due to the lower population density in that area at the airport which has a lot more open space and less homes.

Mr. Xaevier Injected. One other assumption that we have made is that we try and keep ridership assumptions relatively conservative. If It is does start to blow up in terms of demand you probably want to bump it up to another vehicle. But these fleet estimates should get you through the first year and a half to two years of service without really bursting at the seams

or having issues. There are also other ways to deal with issues like that for example with the door-to-door service verses corner-to-corner service. If you start having a lot of demand you want to transition from door-to-door service, which is a little more circuitous in the way the cars are forced to be routed to a corner-to-corner service where they don't necessarily go down a cul-de-sac which takes more time. It's a more efficient use of the fleet that wouldn't increase any cost in terms of the vehicle hours.

Vice Chair Heineking Asked. Is this just cost of operations and any revenue is separate?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Yes, I believe this is gross costs. The fare revenue we are getting isn't huge. The current system does not collect fare revenue from students making trips to and from schools and that is half of our trips. We're only collecting maybe a couple thousand a month which is about two percent of our costs recovered through fare. If we start charging students, we could maybe get up to five percent, but it would reduce the cost some.

Vice Chair Heineking Asked. Do you think the expanded service would generate more revenue? It's never going to offset.

Chair Repar Do we have any other questions/comments?

Commissioner Brennan Asked. If Gilbert decides they're not interested, basically there are two options?

Mr. Xaevier Responded. Yes.

Commissioner Brennan Asked. Are you going to be coming back to this Transportation Commission?

Mr. Xaevier Responded. Absolutely, if they'll have me. Just wanted to thank you all and feel free to reach out with any questions or comments.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Chair Repar We will move onto our breakdown of traffic projects. Has everyone had a change to look at these. Any comments or questions? Any detail?

Commissioner Brennan Asked a question about Lindsay Road. Will we get that again once the design is completed. Would there be another public meeting?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Brennan they held a public meeting early on in the design for Lindsay Road. They are still finalizing the design. I don't believe they plan on holding a second meeting during design. Once we move to the construction phase, typically it's more mailers and that type of outreach, but I don't believe there will be another public meeting. As far as an agenda item on that I'll check with our team. I do plan on having somebody come in and do a deeper dive through this project list so you can get more information at that time. I don't think it will be a stand-alone agenda item but least some more information.

Commissioner Brennan Asked about the Protected Bike Lanes Study?

Mr. Crampton Responded. We are working on finalizing that still. A few things to clean up before we do completely finalize that. We will share with the commission the final report once it is done.

Commissioner Brennan Asked will that be in January?

Mr. Crampton Responded. Hopefully we will have an update in January, but I can't say with a 100% certainty, but we are shooting for that.

MEMBER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Repar Under Members Comments and Announcements there's a note the Kyrene Branch Highline Canal Project the public meeting is going to be held on Tuesday, December 12, from 5:00 –7:00 p.m. at the Chandler Sunset Library.

Mr. Crampton Corrected. Mr. Chairman the time is 5:30 – 6:30 p.m. sorry about that. We welcome any attendance if you are interested in participating in that.

CALENDAR

Chair Repar The next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 17, 2024, at 4:00 p.m.

Commissioner Brennan Asked to clarify we will take about potential topics?

Mr. Crampton Responded. I will plan on having that on the agenda as well as a discussion on the Hunt Highway Study as we finalize that. Those are the two main topics as of right now.

Chair Repar There is no further business I adjourn this meeting.

Meeting was adjourned.

John Repar, Chairman

Sheri Passey, City of Chandler