

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

Wednesday, November 19, 2025, at 4:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Olsen called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Ms. Sheri Passey completed roll call. Quorum present.

Members in Attendance:

Vice Chair Molly Olsen
Commissioner Timothy Johnson
Commissioner Dianne Kresich
Commissioner Dean Brennan
Commissioner Luis Heredia – (Webex)

Members Absent:

Chair David Heineking
Commissioner Dan Henderson

Staff Members Present:

Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager
Hezequias Rocha, Transportation Planning Program Coordinator
Sheri Passey, Recording Secretary, Management Assistant
Daniel Haskins, Capital Projects Manager
Lauren Schumann, Principal Planner
Alexis Apodaca, Mayor and Council Public Affairs Senior Manager

Webex Attendees:

Warren White, Assistant CIP City Engineer
Ray Dovalina, Engineer, PE
Alyssa Siqueiros, Construction/Design Project Manager
Chelsea Heinz-Brown

Public Attendees:

Micheal Grandy, Kimley-Horn, Consultant
Ryan Marks, Kimley-Horn Consultant
Brook Beall - resident
Tracy Eberlein, TYP SA
Siddarth Ramkumur, Mayor's Youth Commission

Srinivas Goundla, TYP SA

Vice Chair Olsen: We have an additional attendee that I would like to give the opportunity to introduce themselves, Sid with the Mayor's Youth Commission.

Mr. Siddarth Ramkumur: I am with the Mayor's Youth Commission. I am in the 11th grade and will be attending the next couple of commission meetings.

Vice Chair Olsen: Thank you. We have a member of the public that would like to speak under Unscheduled Public Appearance. Just a reminder to the commission that we cannot interact or respond to the comments. If you would like further information on this member of the public's statement you can ask to have it added to a future agenda. As another reminder, unscheduled public appearances are limited to three minutes. If the member of the public would like to introduce himself and speak.

SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Hi, my name is Brook Beall. A few months ago, I spoke at a city council meeting and urged the city attorney to contact the attorneys at SRP to find out about the legality of riding e-bikes on the canal. Since then, they have verified it is against the law to ride any e-bike on the canal. The city recognizes this with the web page that has been published. Unfortunately, the police department does not seem to be going along with it. They refuse to enforce the law. I have reported over 500 violations in the past 18 months. It is a violation of Criminal Act 13-1502 with penalties of 30 days in jail and a \$500 fine for riding an e-bike. It doesn't matter whether the bike is powered or not or what class it is. PD refuses to do anything about it.

I am at the point where it's necessary to ask SRP to begin withholding your licenses. You have some items on the agenda today worth \$19.5 million dollars in development work that directly impacts the canal. I will be asking them to withhold your licensing for that project. The 18th annual bike ride is also coming up, and I will ask them to withhold that license. There is no need for this. It's pretty clear it should be enforced. But with the \$19.5 million dollars you guys have, there doesn't seem to be a dime in the budget for the police department to do their job. Unfortunately, we are in a situation where push comes to shove, and I am going to ask SRP to begin taking drastic measures that affect you guys. Thank you.

Commissioner Brennan: Can I ask a question?

Mr. Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager: No, it's not on the agenda therefore we are not allowed to comment.

Vice Chair Olsen: Moving onto our agenda. Can I get a motion to approve the September meeting minutes?

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes – September 17, 2025, Transportation Commission Meeting

Commissioner Kresich: No. I would like to correct some things. I understand that when you speak it's a difficult task to capture every word correctly. On page 9, my last comment on the page, is the word is "likely traveled", not "lightly traveled." Likely is opposite of the meaning of a lightly traveled route.

I don't know what the rules are in terms of how we engage, but whatever I'm saying "This is not data oriented" I'm not sure, exactly. I think what I was saying was that the discussion that had proceeded was more anecdotal, which is fine. But we weren't presented with data, and we weren't talking about data at the moment, so my comment as well was anecdotal. If you think that comes across clearly, I'm fine with that, but I would like that "lightly traveled" to be corrected and the spelling of my name.

On page 13 at the top, I stated that ADOT completed a research study while I was working there and it showed Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons to be effective in terms of safety in certain situations. That study most definitely did not make any statement about anything being warranted and didn't address that in the least. What I request is that if you would allow it to say..." that the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons to be very effective in terms of safety in certain situations/conditions" and strike the rest. Is that acceptable? (This language was removed from the minutes "But agreed that a signal may be warranted due to the speeds on Riggs Road").

Vice Chair Olsen: Do we have any other corrections? Can we get a motion to move the Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes from September with corrections?

Commissioner Johnson: Motioned. So, moved.

Vice Chair Olsen: Can I get a second?

Commissioner Kresich: Motioned. Second.

Vice Chair Olsen: All in favor of approving the Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes from September with corrections say 'aye'. Any opposed? Commissioner Heredia, we were unable to hear your vote of approval of the meeting minutes with corrections.

Commissioner Heredia: Yes. Sorry, I was putting it in the chat. Thank you.

The motion passed unanimously, **5-0**.

Vice Chair Olsen: Moving on to item number two, the 2026 Meeting Calendar.

2. 2026 Transportation Commission Meeting Calendar

Mr. Crampton: This is our suggestion for next year's meeting schedule. We traditionally schedule a meeting every other month, however, the last couple of years we have had a difficult time getting a quorum particularly during the summer. This proposed calendar includes a longer gap between the summer meetings. As always, the meeting time and dates are up to the commission. You are welcome to make modifications, but this schedule is consistent with the last several years.

Vice Chair Olsen: Do we have any discussion on the 2026 meeting calendar?

Commissioner Brennan: My comments are in regard to the time of the meetings. I think 4 p.m. is a very inconvenient time for residents of Chandler to come to a meeting. I know there are a lot of residents that work and that makes it difficult for them to leave their job. They have responsibilities with family and kids, making meals or whatever. I would suggest that meeting be later in the evening.

Commissioner Kresich: Have the meetings ever been held at a different time?

Mr. Crampton: Yes, we used to hold meetings at 7:00 p.m. and there was not any difference in attendance from the public that we noticed. But I hear the point.

Commissioner Brennan: We did have a meeting at 5:00 p.m. in August of 2023 and there were actually two members of the public present, which was two more than we typically get at the meetings.

Commissioner Johnson: As someone that raced here today, I would agree that 4:00 p.m. is tough to make.

Commissioner Brennan: I think, from a lot of discussions I've heard with regards to transparency and community outreach/public engagement, we are missing out on the opportunity for people to attend.

Commissioner Johnson: I would say that 7:00 p.m. is probably a little late, but if we could do a 5:30 or 6:00 p.m. that would personally make my life easier. I know the staff will disagree, but it would be a lot easier for me.

Vice Chair Olsen: How would you feel about meeting in the middle - perhaps at 5:00 p.m. or between four and six or even 5:30 p.m.?

Commissioner Kresich: I'm neutral.

Commissioner Brennan: I would say 5:30 p.m. That provides people with the opportunity to get home, drop off their whatever and come to the meeting.

Vice Chair Olsen: Commissioner, Heredia do you have comments?

Commissioner Heredia: I think 5:30 works. If folks are going to attend, they will make a plan to attend. If we are moving it up in an effort to increase citizen participation, I am fine with 5:30 p.m. People who are attending this type of meeting are going to make a plan to attend.

Vice Chair Olsen: I agree with that.

Commissioner Kresich: For studies and the general plan there is an active outreach to inform people of opportunities to participate. Is there any parallel with this type of meeting or is it just posted somewhere, and people receive that information as opposed to more of a push from the city?

Mr. Crampton: Typically, we don't do a big public outreach post for these meetings. If there are particular agenda items that may be of interest to a specific group, we would notify that group. But no, we don't usually do a lot of media outreach which is common with most commissions in the city, but we do make the information available.

Commissioner Kresich: They make all the information available on the website. Anywhere else?

Commissioner Brennan: Is it the Clerk's office that sends out the agendas? If I want the agenda once I'm no longer on this commission, can I sign up with the City Clerk's office? Currently, I am signed up for the city council agenda so they could sign up?

Mr. Crampton: Yes, people could subscribe to receive the agendas.

Commissioner Brennan: They can sign up which could make the difference. At least that way they would know what is on the agenda and if they were interested, they could attend that meeting.

Vice Chair Olsen: It does sound like the commission is leaning towards the 5:30 start time for these meetings. Can I get a motion to approve the 2026 meeting schedule with the change of the meeting time to 5:30?

Commissioner Johnson: Motioned. So, moved.

Vice Chair Olsen: Can I get a second?

Commissioner Brennan: Motioned. Second.

Vice Chair Olsen: Asked. All those in favor of approving the 2026 meeting calendar with the time change to 5:30, say 'aye'. Any opposed? None.

The motion passed unanimously, **5-0**

BRIEFINGS

Vice Chair Olsen: Moving on to our 3rd agenda item for the General Plan Update.

3. General Plan Update 2026

Mr. Crampton: Vice Chair and Commissioners, we have Lauren Schumann with our planning department to speak on our general plan update efforts.

Ms. Lauren Schumann, Principal Planner: I want to thank the commission for allowing me to come before you today. I am a principal planner and have been with the city for about twelve years. The city hired Logan Simpson as our consultant, but they were unable to attend. They also had subconsultants of Kimley-Horn as well as another company.

The City of Chandler is currently going through their general plan update, which began in October of 2024. The reasons we update the general plan:

- Arizona State Statute requires municipalities to update every ten years.
- In order for a city council to approve a rezoning of a property, it has to be consistent with the findings of the general plan.

The General Plan is the City's long-range policy document guiding land use, circulation, housing, conservation, public facilities, neighborhood revitalization, and other required elements under Arizona State Statute.

General plans set broad, overarching policies, while master plans provide more detailed guidance. For example, a city's general plan may outline wide-ranging transportation goals, but the Transportation Master Plan refines those ideas with specific policies, strategies and goals.

She began her slide presentation:

- General Plan Update Overview
- What's a General Plan
- Hierarchy of Plans
- Requirements for all Municipalities
- Why Update the General Plan
- Changes Since 2016
- Approaching Build Out
- Vacant Uncommitted Land
- Future Land Use Map
- Transit Policies
- General Plan Update 2026 Plan Process
- Innovative Public Participation
- General Plan Update 2026 Plan Process
- General Plan Structure
- 2016 Plan Audit – State Key Findings

The overview discussed the current 2016 General Plan—approved by voters with 85.8% support and described the major demographic, economic, and technological changes since its adoption, including shifts in work patterns, increased vacancies in traditional office and retail spaces, rising prominence of autonomous vehicles, the surge of e-commerce, and a growing regional discussion about water supply and diversified housing. Chandler is now approximately 94% built out, with the remaining 6% of undeveloped land largely designated for employment uses.

The future land use map was reviewed and described the constraints around changing employment areas to residential, and summarized the recommendations of the Resident Advisory Committee, which supported retaining employment designations but allowing campus-style mixed use in limited situations.

There was extensive public engagement efforts conducted over the past year, which included the “Chandler Talks” speaker panel, two full public workshops branded as “Chandler Listens,” three open public surveys, which targeted renter-specific outreach, social media campaigns, participation at community events, and a large immersive 180-degree visualization experience attended by approximately 200 residents. The update process evaluated all existing policies and updated language to reflect emerging issues such as housing, water, transit, microtransit, and multimodal connectivity. A statutory 60-day public review period began on October 1, during which the draft plan was distributed to MAG, regional partners, adjacent municipalities, internal City departments, and the public. All comments must be received by December 1 and will be formally addressed in the final draft. The updated plan will be reviewed by the Resident Advisory Committee on December 9 before public hearings at the Planning and Zoning Commission on January 7

and 21, 2026, followed by anticipated City Council action on February 5, 2026. The General Plan is expected to be placed on the August 2026 primary ballot for voter ratification. She concluded by demonstrating the online document portal and comment submission system. The transportation section is under chapter 3 Chandler Connects and then scroll through.

Vice Chair Olsen: Opened the floor for Commission questions.

Commissioner Brennan: Stated. The update process has been underway since October of last year. My question has to do with meeting with the boards and commissions in the City of Chandler. This Commission has not had the opportunity to provide any input into the process or make any comments about what we see as maybe issues in the future or issues that need to be addressed. We are now finally having that opportunity to hear about the general plan and as you know I've had the opportunity to be involved. I question why it's taken this long for Kimley-Horn to come to this commission and talk about the general plan. I think it could have been part of the process earlier. Is it a thought that the input that we might have isn't important or it hasn't been important? The only reason you are here tonight is because I requested that you come to the last meeting which was in conflict with one of your outreach meetings. That is one concern I have.

I feel that it would have been an opportunity for this group to become more educated as far as what the general plan is all about and the opportunity to have some input. We are appointed by the city council. My expectation is we are appointed as representatives of the residents of Chandler. Otherwise, I'm not sure why we exist if we don't represent the residents. It was an opportunity missed.

Ms. Schumann: Responded through the chair. Commissioner Brennan, thank you for your feedback. After the internal review with the consultant and management team to determine what boards to present in person too, staff believed that the transportation/circulation element did not include major changes from the existing plan. Our apologies for not coming before you to discuss this. We focused our presentations on boards and commissions with areas of significant policy updates. So again, my apologies.

Commissioner Brennan: Responded. Thank you. For me, the issue is circulation/transportation is one of the most critical elements of the general plan. I would have hoped there would be more outreach to the residents, specifically this commission as part of that discussion and opportunity for input.

Ms. Schumann: Responded. Noted.

Commissioner Brennan: Another comment has to do with public participation in general. I think you have done a very good job. You have introduced some approaches to public outreach that I have not had the opportunity to be involved with, and the ones that I

participated in went very well and there was a lot of good information. But on the other hand, there are 280,000 people in Chandler. I don't expect all those people are going to be interested in the general plan, but I think there is a way to actually reach out and get more people involved. I think there needed to be more of an effort to have neighborhood meetings in the various parts of Chandler. I live in north Chandler - I am guessing that I may be the only person in north Chandler paying attention to what is going on as far as the general plan. Part of that is the fact that I was a city planner in the past, so that is just an area of interest, and I have worked on general plans. But I don't want to overshadow what you have accomplished. I think the immersion lab was very interesting and to me it was a new idea. There were a few glitches, but overall, it was an excellent idea, and I hope it is something that could be continued in the future as you do other planning projects.

I had some general questions about various elements of the recommendations or the honors. I'm not sure why the section is called honors, but I guess you can call it whatever you want. Basically, it identifies action steps. I think, in some cases, there is a lack of continuity for the section that has the policies. Action steps are listed, and you talk about some issues that are really important like extreme temperatures. There was a good discussion on that topic and many recommendations or actions steps or response to extreme temperatures. There were a couple of other areas that probably needed more discussion. It didn't really do a good job of addressing what actions steps would be taken.

The biggest concern I had with the action steps is that for each of the action steps, there are no responsibility identified, no indication of which department or city division is responsible for each of those action steps. So, you have a situation where you have action steps and many of them sound really good except you don't tell us who is going to do that. I have been involved with enough planning documents to know that until you identify the responsibility for implementation of the action steps, they are not going to occur, or it is going to take longer than anticipated because nobody wants to step up unless they are specifically told to. I shouldn't say nobody – many people don't like to step up until there are specifically told that this is their responsibility. I think there would be a vast improvement for this particular document if those responsibilities were identified as part of the action steps.

Ms. Schumann: Responded through the chair. If I could add...so everybody knows what we are talking about. The last chapter of our general plan is called Chandler Honors. Historically, when we are done with this plan, it gets put up on a shelf and we refer to it every once in a while, when we want to tell a developer you can't do that because it says it right here. We have decided to add action steps so we can go back before the council every year and say, of those hundred action steps in our general plan we were able to get through six of them. And yes, it could be more clearly identified who would be tasked with that, but we do break it up into land use, housing, parks and open spaces. So, thank you for that and I will look at that more to see if we can further identify persons...

Commissioner Brennan: Injected. Persons or department. Otherwise, things tend to get put off or have a lack of direction. Additional concerns I had with regards to the actions steps, I don't believe there was any discussion of urban forestry, a shade plan, food policy plan, circulation - not a lot of reference to walkability and bike-ability and the need for pedestrian amenities. I don't recall any reference to providing shade for pedestrians. People are not going, or people don't get out and walk in the summer unless they know they can walk in the shade or shade is available.

Ms. Schumann: Responded. We did have that in some of our policy (I just screen shot one) and it actually did say "Enhance tree canopy in city rights-of-way to improve comfort to pedestrians and bicyclists...."

Commissioner Brennan: My point is there are not action steps that responds to that and I think that is really critical and should be addressed and there be someone or some department responsible for that and can report on an annual basis that we have planted this number of trees this year and our goal for next year is another hundred trees or whatever...

Ms. Schumann: You would be happy to know that our Urban Forester did reach out to me a month ago and said he wanted to add an entire page, but I am waiting for that information. He has until Friday to get that information to me. The City of Chandler is forward thinking in the fact that we hired an urban forester to take a look at our tree inventory and figure out how we can do better in providing shade for the community with sustainable types of trees.

Commissioner Brennan: Asked. The heat vulnerability, and I know that was discussed with regards to certain parts of Chandler are more susceptible to heat or more vulnerable to heat but there was no heat vulnerability map in the plan. Will a heat vulnerability map be in the plan?

Ms. Schumann: You may want to put that comment in - because I thought there was one in the plan, but also, please put that comment in.

Commissioner Brennan: There is no map because I specifically looked for it when I read that section. I think that's it for now.

Ms. Schumann: Thank you for your input.

Commissioner Brennan: I guess the 30 comments you received were probably from me.

Ms. Schumann: No.

Commissioner Brennan: Asked. If I wanted to get a copy of our comments, is it possible to do that? My personal comments that have been contributed?

Ms. Schumann: Yes.

Commissioner Kresich: I have jotted down a few things I wanted to ask, but Commissioner Brennan's comments brought a couple of other things. He brought up the recommendations, and I haven't looked at this, I admit, but are they prioritized in any way? Placed into tiers – like most important, so-so, or get to it someday?

Ms. Schumann: Asked for clarification. Are we talking about the recommendations?

Commissioner Kresich: Clarified. Actually, the action steps.

Ms. Schumann: Responded. No, prioritization. We have never included action steps before, so we are really trying it out. We want to be able to go back to and hold ourselves accountable and go before the council every year and say, these items were addressed. We reached out to different departments and asked if there are studies that you would want to do someday or a later date that we could add.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. The state requires a master plan update every ten years, but is there nothing in the requirement at the state level or is there any requirement at the state, local or even county level that requires the implementation of anything? It's just to create the plan and you might or you might not do anything about it.

Ms. Schumann: Responded. I believe there is some language that says that city shall report their action steps and so that's one of the reasons we decided to include it.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. To report or include action steps? Okay. I wrote down shade as well because we need more! You mentioned master plans. Master plans feed into the general plan, is that correct?

Ms. Schumann: Responded. The general plan has a really high-level broad policy, but it is the Transportation Master Plan that further defines what that looks like.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. Does the general plan absorb the master plan? Because Commissioner Brennan is asking...well that's saying that is one of the most important parts of the master plan. Is the transportation aspect taken care of and our participation covered through our involvement with the Transportation Master Plan? Do you

understand what I'm asking? Was there really a role for us in the general plan as opposed to the master plan?

Mr. Crampton: Responded. Through the Vice Chair. The general plan will set very high-level goals, for example, provide high quality transit, provide microtransit in areas that are underserved, very, very general. The Transportation Master Plan will have defined objectives like provide microtransit to this specific area within the next five years. It is more defined. The Transportation Commission is heavily involved when we develop the Transportation Master Plan. We typically have multiple meetings going through the different sections of the Transportation Master Plan and there is a larger role for the Transportation Commission to play.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. Does the proposed general plan call for increased housing density in certain areas?

Ms. Schumann: Responded through the Vice Chair, Commissioner. Ten years ago, when we did our general plan, our average high density was like 25-30. Since then, most of our applications for higher density are above that threshold. So, we had to put some language in the plan where those types of uses are appropriate. The general plan does say for example, along an arterial, along the street in our growth areas, etc. We also have language in there saying if the infrastructure is available that we may not have the ability to service it with the existing waterline and can we upgrade that waterline in order to suffice a four or five story, 200-unit development at an old underutilized commercial corner.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. Open space. It appears that the green spots are very, very close similar in these two maps (existing vs future) and I didn't hear any mention of that space. How does Chandler compare with other cities locally or nationally in terms of, I think there is a statistic often used like acres, park acres per resident. That information?

Ms. Schumann: Responded. I don't have the exact numbers. I do know two general plans ago, and I don't have that exhibit on me, but it was a priority to make sure there was a park...the green spaces you see on this map are parks larger than five acres so not every park is listed on the future land use map, but it was a goal to make sure and ensure that every square mile had an open space of public park for the community. In discussions with Parks, I believe we have a majority of our future parks planned out. We don't have any new ones on the horizon. Not with regard to the total acreage, I don't have that information but would be happy to find it and get it to you.

Commissioner Kresich: Responded. That would be wonderful.

Vice Chair Olsen: Commented. I do not believe the presentation was provided too late in the process, but I would recommend that future updates include presentations to boards and commissions once a draft is available. I know how challenging public involvement can be, and I appreciate everything staff does.

Commissioner Brennan: Responded. I beg the differ on that.

Ms. Schumann: Any other comments or discussions? None. Thank you.

Vice Chair Olsen: Thank you. Moving on to item four on the agenda.

4. McQueen Road Corridor Study: Pecos to North Warner Road

Mr. Crampton: Vice Chair and Commissioners, today we have our consultant on the McQueen Road Corridor Study, Kimley-Horn, Michael Grandy and Ryan Marks who will be presenting. I want to note that we are bringing this to the commission now because the Bond Election was just approved by the voters and this project was part of the approved bond. I will pass it over to Michael.

Mr. Michael Grandy, Consultant, Kimely-Horn: Thank you. I will talk briefly about the project history, some of the results from a public survey and then I will turn it over to my co-worker Ryan Marks. His presentation included:

- Project History
- Public Survey Results
- Traffic Study Findings

This study originated from the City's Transportation Master Plan, which identified the need for future lane-capacity improvements along McQueen Road between the northern City boundary and Pecos Road. The segment between Warner and Chandler Boulevards has a wide median and allows for future widening, however the segment between Chandler Boulevard and Pecos Road lacks this space and will require right-of-way and utility considerations. There was a strong public participation in the corridor survey, with residents expressing concerns about limited bicycle facilities and school-related congestion, and a preference for separate shared-use paths. Crash analysis identified higher collision rates at Warner, Ray, and Chandler Boulevard intersections, with many rear-end and left-turn collisions. These intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service, however future projections without improvements show deterioration to LOS E or F.

Mr. Ryan Marks, Consultant, Kimely-Horn: Presented. Thank you, Michael. His presentation included:

- Alternative Evaluation and Recommendations
 - Typical Roadway Sections
 - Drainage Retention
 - Intersections Layouts
- Alternative Evaluation (Phase 1 & 2)
- Alternative Recommendation (Phase 1)
- Alternative Recommendation (Phase 2)
- Alternative Evaluation (Phase 3)
- Alternative Recommendation (Phase 3)
- Alternative Evaluation (Intersections)
- Alternative Recommendation (Intersections)

In the northern phases, the wide median allows the roadway to be widened with minimal impacts, but the east side of the corridor—characterized by SRP transmission poles, residential walls, and narrow sidewalk areas—creates significant constraints that require shifting the roadway slightly westward. The proposed solution for Phases 1 and 2 includes maintaining an on-street bike lane on the east side while constructing a 10-foot shared-use path on the west side, providing a safer accommodation for most cyclists while recognizing that off-street facilities cannot be added on both sides due to physical limitations. Phase 3 is far more complex because the roadway narrows, the median is insufficient for widening, and both sides of the road contain major utility and right-of-way conflicts, including overhead power lines, private property, and irrigation structures. These conditions will require right-of-way acquisition and drainage system modifications.

Summarizing the intersection alternatives - the first option evaluated a symmetrical widening consistent with the City's standard typical section, accommodating utilities and distributing impacts evenly across both sides of the roadway. A second option narrowed lane and median widths to reduce property impacts but did not offer long-term advantages. After review with staff, the recommended approach is a modified standard widening that maintains symmetrical improvements at intersections, reduces conflicting impacts, and incorporates a continuous shared-use path along the west side of the corridor from Warner Road to just south of Chandler Boulevard. This approach balances safety, multimodal mobility, and the physical constraints present along the corridor.

Commissioner Kresich: Asked. My questions are mostly about pages six and seven, just needing clarification. Your bullet says Lack of Bicycle Safety. Is that a data supported statement or perception of lack of safety from residents?

Mr. Crampton: Through the Vice Chair. These are the survey results, so that is the perception from the public.

Commissioner Kresich: On slide seven Traffic Study Findings – what time period does that first bullet refer to - the one fatal and ten serious crashes?

Mr. Marks: The time period was 2019 to 2023.

Commissioner Kresich: Were those bicycle collisions or did any of those involve bicycles?

Mr. Marks: I will have to go back and confirm; there might have been one or two that did but I believe it was more on the perception side. People will not ride on it because it's not a safe road to ride one.

Commissioner Kresich: The shared-use path. Is that essentially a 10 ft wide sidewalk that would allow people to ride bikes on?

Mr. Marks: Yes.

Commissioner Brennan: Did you do traffic counts based on each mile or did the study rely on corridor-wide data? It would seem that potentially there is more traffic between Chandler Boulevard to Ray or Ray to Warner. In driving this corridor personally traffic volumes seem to be heavier near Chandler Boulevard than in the segments south of Pecos. The stretch on McQueen south of Chandler Boulevard and Pecos needs to be beautified. The area north of Chandler Boulevard the constraints become more pronounced because of existing walls and the narrow right-of-way. Any widening there would have significant impacts on nearby homes by taking part of their property or through noise, and additional traffic. Should the city consider limiting the widening to certain segments—such as from Pecos to Chandler—and leave the northern portion as four lanes, similar to other arterials in Chandler that remain two lanes in each direction? I hope those aren't going to be widened.

Mr. Marks: The traffic volumes are pretty consistent along most of the corridor. However, they change slightly in various segments during different times of the day, and the area depends on school start and stop time. The dynamics change within a few miles of the schools on how busy things are. But the overall corridor is pretty consistent, and the future projected volumes are also consistent within a couple of thousand cars per day which is a pretty small change

Commissioner Brennan: Why put a bike lane on the street? I am sure there are some people who do ride on the arterial streets, but most people say they won't because they fear death riding in traffic.

Mr. Marks: It's something a lot of agencies are re-evaluating right now. I think it goes back to the different user types. The hardcore bicyclists are going to ride on the road whether you put a bike lane there or not.

Commissioner Brennan: I understand that. But isn't the idea to have a bike system for everyone?

Mr. Marks: Yes, and that's what the shared-use path accomplishes.

Commissioner Brennan: So, you are committed to a shared-use path.

Mr. Marks: Yes. I would like to add onto that. What you are referring to is that we have one side of the road with a shared-use path and the other side a bike lane. The reasoning for that is on the east side, there is nowhere to install a wider path because of the overhead power poles and/or the residential walls. So, we are proposing the on-street bike lane going northbound and adding the 10' path that people could use in either direction.

Commissioner Brennan: Would that be both directions?

Mr. Marks: Yes. People could use it in both directions if they felt safer on the sidewalk.

Commissioner Kresich: Is there already an existing 6' sidewalk on both sides of the street in this entire corridor?

Mr. Marks: That is correct. It varied between five to six feet.

Commissioner Kresich: Are bicycles allowed to use that?

Mr. Marks: Yes.

Commissioner Kresich: So, is it already a shared-use pathway, in effect?

Mr. Crampton: It is a sidewalk. A shared-use path needs to be much wider. But state and local laws allow bicycles to use the sidewalks.

Commissioner Kresich: Did you do a count as part of the traffic study to observe how many bicycles were using the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Marks: No.

Commissioner Kresich: Did you look at the schools to see how many bicycles were locked up outside the school? Parents who responded to the survey, or that you spoke with, can't say there are five schools here and there is a perception of a lack of safety and that might be why students are using the existing 6' wide sidewalk to ride their bikes to school. Is that the impression you have from the public or the progression of thought?

Mr. Marks: I understand where you are going with that. From the survey, it was very clear that there was interest in people biking more, but that they didn't feel the facilities were in place or safe enough to do to is currently. A five- or six-foot sidewalk works if you are the only one on it. Once you have somebody come in the other direction, or you have two people, it starts to feel very crowded. That's why the 10-foot shared use path feels much more comfortable. Especially certain people with younger kids that may not always pay attention and kind of wobbling and weaving around to give them more space on that wider sidebar.

Mr. Crampton: If I may add, vice chair. The original plan for this corridor in the Transportation Master Plan was to add on-street bike lanes in both directions. However, the public feedback received through the master plan planning process, and the corridor survey, there is greater support for off-street shared use facilities. Shifting to the shared-use path concept reduced construction costs on this project because the roadway does not need to be widened outward to add an on-street lane on the west side.

Commissioner Kresich: I certainly understand the appeal of riding on any width of sidewalk rather than a bike lane. I didn't know how much that wider multi-use path was adding to the budget, but it's actually cheaper than a bike lane.

Mr. Daniel Haskins, Capital Projects Manager: Through the vice chair. The reason it's the same cost is because we don't have to remove what's existing, we can keep that there and add on. The concrete cost is offset by taking that out.

Commissioner Kresich: And you are providing a more appealing experience in the process.

Mr. Haskins: The other side is difficult with the 69KV's, which requires a certain distance from the roadway, which makes it really hard to determine where you put it versus the line of traffic. That threw the other side off and we couldn't make it up on the other side.

Commissioner Brennan: Are you going to bury the 69KV?

Mr. Haskins: For his project at this time, we are not. We are not in design, but will look at it again, but the costs were too high.

Commissioner Brennan: For 69KV?

Mr. Haskins: Yes. With our budget and going to the bond committee for additional money, we did not feel comfortable asking for additional money to put the 69KV line underground. We are hoping that in two to three years to get all twelve KV lines underground. We will look back at aesthetic funds and see if that is something we can move towards this project but at this time, it was a 'no' for the study, but we will look at it again when we go to design.

Vice Chair Olsen: Are there any other comments or questions?

Mr. Beal: Inquired if he was allowed to speak.

Vice Chair Olsen: Stated she would allow his comments.

Mr. Beal: When you get a 10-year-old riding a class three e-bike at 28 miles per hour on a sidewalk, going in the same direction, nobody's going to be walking on those sidewalks. The problem is they allow e-bikes on the sidewalk. I don't have a problem with the shared-use path. I would like to see everybody required to go in the same direction as in traffic. When you start getting e-bikes on these shared-use paths, it is a recipe for disaster and it's going to get worse. Top speed on these is 28 miles per hour and you don't have a license, and you don't have any age restrictions, I think this is going to become a serious problem for you and it could be resolved by city council prohibiting e-bikes on the sidewalks. I think that is the solution. I think they belong in the bike lane riding in the same direction as traffic.

Vice Chair Olsen: Moving on to agenda item number five, the November 2025 Project Status Updates.

5. November 2025 Project Status Update List

Mr. Jason Crampton: The project list is included in your packets. Are there any questions?

Commissioner Brennan: Commented: Thank you for adding the xeriscape program to the list. We live close to the retention basin at Elliot. That is being converted and it looks incredible. We really appreciate the conversion process. I know the city is going to save water and we have a much nicer looking retention basin. Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Olsen: Is there anything else?

Commissioner Kresich: Are all retention basins going to be converted or just selected ones?

Mr. Haskins: Through the vice chair. The City of Chandler is looking at everything that is city owned. HOA's have their own capability of converting there basins if they want. These are separate from the city managed program. The city is particularly evaluating those that use potable water for irrigation. Most basins north of Loop 202 use large amounts of water and those are being prioritized. Phase 1 is being completed now and we want residents to see the results before moving onto Phase 2, which will include another six or seven basins. Phase 2 is locally funded.

Vice Chair Olsen: What is the approximate amount of the federal grant supporting the project?

Mr. Haskins: The grant was approximately \$3 million and the total construction costs for the project was roughly \$4.5 to \$4.6 million.

Vice Chair Olsen: Is that a federal program?

Mr. Haskins: It is a federal program. I'm unable to remember the name.


Vice Chair Olsen: Is it for water infrastructure?

Mr. Haskins: Yes. The grant is part of a federal water infrastructure program – not one commonly handled by the Transportation or Public Works team. It was a grant received and administered through our Water Conservation Division.

MEMBER COMMENTS / ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chair Olsen: Do we have any additional commission member comments or announcements? Hearing none, our next Transportation Commission meeting will be Wednesday, February 18, at 5:30 p.m. I will now go ahead and end the meeting. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.


David Heineking, Chair


Sheri Passey, City of Chandler