

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

Wednesday, April 29, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Heineking called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Can we have roll call, please.

Members in Attendance:

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

Members Absent:

None

Staff Members Present:

Jason Crampton, Transportation Planning Manager
Hezequias Rocha, Senior Transportation Planning Program Coordinator
Sheri Passey, Recording Secretary, Management Assistant
Nancy Jackson, Senior Transportation Planning Program Coordinator

Webex Attendees:

Daniel Haskins, Capital Projects Manager

Public Attendees:

Aaron Xaevier, Valley Metro

SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

Chair Heineking: We do not have any members of the public here so we will move on to our first action item.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes – February 18, 2026, Transportation Commission Meeting

Chair Heineking: Has everybody had a chance to review the minutes from the last meeting? Does anyone want to make a motion to approve the minutes?

Commissioner Johnson: Motioned to approve the minutes from February 18. 2026.

Commissioner Brennan: I second.

Chair Heineking: There is a motion from Commissioner Johnson and a second from Commissioner Brennan. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye? Any opposed? None.

Ms. Passey: Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Chair Heineking: Jason our next item is the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) IGA for Transit Services for FY 2026-27

Mr. Crampton: Mr. Chair, did you want to check public appearance first. It looks like we had someone come in.

Chair Heineking: Is there anyone that would like to make a comment before we get started? No. Back to item #2. Jason, I will turn the time over to you.

2. Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) IGA for Transit Services for FY 2026-27.

Mr. Crampton: Thank you. I will turn the time over to Hezequias. He is going to present the Valley Metro IGA that we bring to you every year. He will walk you through this year's amendment to the agreement.

Mr. Hezequias Rocha, Senior Transportation Planning Program Coordinator:

Thank you, Jason. Thank you, Chair and Commissioners. I'll be talking about our Intergovernmental Agreement with Valley Metro for our public transportation transit services for fiscal year 26-27.

- Agreement Terms – First annual amendment
- Services Provided – Fixed Bus Route, Paratransit, RideChoice
- Funding Sources – PTF, ALF, Federal Grants, City General Fund
- Proposed Motion - Move to recommend that City Council authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Regional Public Transportation

Authority (RPTA) and the City of Chandler to provide fixed route bus, paratransit and RideChoice services in Fiscal Year 2026-27.

Chair Heineking: Any questions?

Commissioner Johnson: Chair. How is the \$310,000.00 of Arizona Lottery Fund considered the City's portion – is that not a state funding?

Mr. Crampton: Through the Chair, Commissioners. We have always considered the lottery fund as a local fund when dividing out payments. Prop 479 is a regional sales tax. The general fund is the city fund based on local sales tax and our base budget. Regarding the lottery fund, Valley Metro provides the city with an annual payment of approximately \$700,000, and it is the city that determines how to use those funds for public transit.

Commissioner Johnson: So, the \$700,00 we have \$310,000 here. What are the remaining funds going to?

Mr. Crampton: Chandler Flex, some administrative uses and some bus stop capital improvements.

Commissioner Johnson: Does that amount fluctuate? For example, If people stop buying lottery tickets, does that go down and we have to dip into the general fund?

Mr. Crampton: Typically, that does not have a high level of volatility. It's pretty high in the pecking order of lottery proceeds. If there is a big influx of people buying lottery tickets, it's going to be \$700,000. If there's less activity, unless sales are very, very low we will still get \$700,000.

Commissioner Johnson: How does this compare to last year's numbers? I'm most concerned with the \$949,766. How does that compare to last year's general fund number?

Mr. Crampton: Last year, our local responsibility was around six or seven hundred thousand. The reason for the higher number is we are now moving into Prop 479 rules. Last year, we were still under Prop 400 rules. Under Prop 479 there are different rules for Paratransit and RideChoice eligibility. Last year, we had a set amount programmed under Prop 400, which happened to be a little bit higher regional funding. This year, we cannot apply any regional funding to trips that are outside of our federally mandated service area, which includes southeast Chandler because we do not have bus service in that area. We are not required to provide Paratransit or RideChoice service in that area but that has been a local choice to serve that area. That is an enhanced service for our residents and under Prop 479 we are responsible for paying for that with local funding

sources. Additionally, we provide service on RideChoice for people that are over the age of 65 that may not have gone through a certification process with a certified disability. Those are two services that we provide for our residents that go above and beyond what is federally required. As a result, with the new regional funding mechanism, if we provide those trips, we are required to fund those trips. That is why our local amount has increased.

Commissioner Johnson: It is increasing almost 50%.

Mr. Crampton: I would have to look it up to get you the exact number but yes, it is about that. And next year, it is going to be even more significant because we will have to pay for a portion of the fixed bus route cost. We historically have had to pay a portion of the fixed bus route costs, but for the past five years we have been able to utilize some regional savings that the City of Chandler had to pay for all the fixed bus routes but that ends starting next year. Next year, Chandler will have to pay somewhere between six hundred thousand and \$1.2 million. These numbers are still very uncertain for the for the fixed bus route on top of these additional costs of Paratransit and RideChoice.

Ms. Nancy Jackson, Senior Transportation Planning Program Coordinator: Chair, if I may just add to that as well. The number of accessible trips has gone up. The number of accessible trips are increasing, the costs are increasing and trips outside the service area – all these factors continue to increase our costs.

Commissioner Johnson: For Paratransit and RideChoice are we charging anything for that service?

Mr. Crampton: To passengers?

Commissioner Johnson: Yes.

Mr. Crampton: Yes. There is a four (\$4) dollar fare for Paratransit and a three (\$3) dollar fare for RideChoice. RideChoice is a cheaper service for the city to provide so we charge a lower fare to encourage people to use that service instead of Paratransit

Commissioner Johnson: Has there been any discussion about increasing the rate they are charged?

Mr. Crampton: No, unfortunately we cannot increase the Paratransit fare. We are federally required to charge no more than two times the bus pass which is two (\$2) dollars. So, unless the bus pass increases, we cannot increase the fare for Paratransit, and we don't want to increase the fare for RideChoice because people would not be incentivized to take the lower cost service.

Commissioner Kresich: You were referring to last year - comparing these numbers to last year. Are last year the numbers that were in the initial IGA that was established?

Mr. Crampton: Yes.

Commissioner Kresich: Was that not under the new proposition's rules?

Mr. Crampton: Last year was fiscal year 2025-26 Proposition 479 came into effect January 1, 2026. Because it was a half a year of each proposition it would have made for a very confusing and cumbersome transition, so MAG and Valley Metro worked with the cities to allow us to use Prop 400 rules for all of last year.

Commissioner Kresich: The Proposition rules start now?

Mr. Crampton: Yes.

Chair Heineking: Any further discussion or questions? Would anyone like to make a motion?

Vice Chair Olsen: I will make the motion to recommend that City Council authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) and the City of Chandler to provide fixed bus, paratransit and RideChoice services for Fiscal Year 2026-27.

Commissioner Henderson: Second.

Chair Heineking: Motion was made by Vice Chair Olsen and Commissioner Henderson seconded. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? None. We are unanimous.

Ms. Passey: Motion passes, 7-0.

Chair Heineking: Jason, our next item is the Valley Metro Bus Network Redesign.

3. Valley Metro Bus Network Redesign

Mr. Crampton: Thank you, Chair. We have Aaron Xavier, Service Planning Manager for Valley Metro, presenting tonight. Aaron will be presenting on bus network redesign which is looking at the entire regional bus system but has recommendations that might be region-wide and some that might apply to the City of Chandler. I will turn the time over to Aaron for the details.

Mr. Aaron Xavier, Service Planning and GIS Manager VM: Thank you, Jason, Chair and commissioners, it's a pleasure to be here. We are currently undergoing a bus network redesign, or the more formal term is comprehensive operational analysis. Typically transit agencies will do this about every ten years. Valley Metro hasn't done one in about 20 years, so we are well overdue, especially after COVID a lot of things changed (the way people get around). The travel demand is just how people's travel patterns have changed quite a bit. It was time to take a fresh look at what travel patterns look like, make sure that we are realigning the services that we provide to meet that demand and not to essentially keep serving up the same old thing. We need to make sure it's fresh, it's relevant and not on the tide of some of the troubling trends we have seen but make the service more relevant.

Agenda

- BNR Background and Progress
- Key Findings
- Opportunity for Improvement
- Connection with 479
- Next Steps

Bus Network Redesign Overview

Why is a Bus Network Redesign Important

Phase I Public Engagement

Key Finding

State of the System

Characteristics of Valley Metro Riders

Areas of Immediate Attention

Ridership Overview

Top 15 Route Carry Almost Half of Riders

Ridership and Service by Time of Day

Valley Residents Use Transit Too Much For Work

Valley Residents Spend too Much Time on the Bus

Service Priority for Riders (Survey)

Service Priority for Non-Riders (Survey)

Commissioner Kresich: Were those priorities that you provided, are they ranked or did they come up with these?

Mr. Xavier: I believe these were pre-populated.

Commissioner Kresich: I don't see faster service or shorter rides like you are talking about or spending too much time on the bus. I guess, more frequency might be interpreted that way, but not really. It's not the same.

Mr. Crampton: I believe maybe Limited Stop Service will get to that, maybe because you're not stopping at every corner, you're every one mile, so the bus would travel faster you may have less time on the bus. But it's not the direct question you're asking.

Commissioner Kresich: It's Implied. Is there a reason you didn't ask that question directly?

Vice Chair Olsen: I think more direct service and fewer transfers - the second most popular one, that's how I interpret that one as well.

Commissioner Kresich: I think they are telling you they want faster service, but it's indirect.

Mr. Xavier: Continued his presentation:

Chandler Service Evaluation

- Cost per passenger

Commissioner Kresich: This is operating costs correct?

Mr. Xavier: Operating net costs, including fare revenue.

Commissioner Kresich: Not the capital costs of the equipment?

Mr. Xavier: No, capital costs.

Mr. Crampton: But capital costs like acquiring the bus is included in the rates that we pay. The bus depreciation would be in there, although we get 85% of the bus cost paid for with federal money so that would not be included (the federal side). But the fifteen percent we pay locally for the bus should be included in this number, right?

Mr. Xavier: Yes, that will be in there. Things like the bus stop would not be included.

He continued with his presentation:

Chandler Service Evaluation

- Recovery Percentage by Route – Local Routes

Chandler Resident Survey Results

Commissioner Kresich: I'm not sure I'm understanding. Is this telling us that Chandler residents who completed the survey, NONE, ranked frequency as the most important? Is that correct?

Mr. Xavier: The scale is one is the lowest importance and five is the highest importance. So, frequency nobody said it was not important, and the same response for distance.

Mr. Xavier continued with his presentation:

Opportunities for Improvement

Ongoing Challenges

Service Frequency and Access

Cost Structure Implications

- Mileage-based payments
- Jurisdiction-based funding

Connection with 479

Original RSTIIP (\$2020) VS Updated RSTIIP (\$2027)

TLCP Preservation Options

Tough Tradeoffs

Next Steps

- Engage city staff and management through mid-summer
- Present draft network plan to Board in September
- Solicit public feedback fall 2026
- Present final plan to Board of Directors early 2027

Commissioner Kresich: Am I correct in understanding the plan will be specific to individual groups with mapping changes and such? It's not just strategic in general like some plans?

Mr. Xavier: Yes, this is definitely not an exercise in philosophy. We currently have a comprehensive list of changes by every route in each city, including schedule modifications, alignment changes, comparisons of conditions before and after the proposed updates and how these changes affect mileage, which in turn will influence the funding allocations for the agencies involved.

We are continuing to work through these details through the summer. This information may be shared with you at a later date or may be provided before it is released to the public. Our team will continue refining the analysis and recommendations for both organizations. We have a preliminary draft in place and have reviewed it with Jason and his staff to gather their feedback. We have developed a complete set of recommendations, which really represents the substance of this entire effort.

Chair Heineking: We have a question online from Commissioner Heredia.

Commissioner Heredia: I have a question on jurisdictional based routes. Are there problems with our bordering cities (Mesa and Gilbert), and routes that are not making it?

Is there something we can do about that, to try and make the system or network have more value and a little bit more efficient?

Mr. Xavier: Commissioner, that is an interesting question. I don't know that we have too many issues with the actual design. There are concerns about the level of available funding. As we revisit forecasts of Prop 400 and 479, especially the formula most jurisdictions anticipated on receiving additional dollars to invest in transit, but those expectations did not materialize. As a result, agencies are becoming more cautious and evaluating ways to reduce costs and preserve services levels. Mesa is probably one of the more proactive cities in taking that approach. Gilbert is in a similar position, especially since their entire system is funded solely through the regional tax. They are closely examining their options and asking what adjustments they can make to operate more efficiently.

There are certain things outside of your borders. For example, on Route 108, we proposed to take away a deviation to the ASU research campus. Tempe decided, even though it was really inefficient picking up maybe one or two people a day and costing them a hundred thousand dollars a year they wanted to keep it. For the benefit of Chandler it doesn't really impact because essentially that is coming out of Tempe's pot

As we begin examining services more closely, we're uncovering a number of political sensitivities. In many cases, as we analyze the data and recommend inefficiencies or ask why it is being operated this way, we are finding the decisions are sometimes driven less by operational efficiency and more by political considerations.

But when you look at the line on the graph and it is all aggregated together, that is going to make it look like this route represents Chandler and it's really inefficient even though the inefficiencies are not within our jurisdiction. That is one of the drawbacks I have seen. For example, Route 156, which goes to Gilbert Emergency Hospital. It's not just about the people that go there but the people that travel through it. If you have to go from Chandler to the ASU campus at the end of the line at the beginning of Mesa at Power Road, you are really taking a lot more people's time incurring the costs of that which picks up very few people. We have been told that it will help them preserve the paratransit service and access to that hospital for everybody in the regional system. It's saying people from Chandler can go to Mercy Gilbert Hospital. But it's also being done at the expense of the base funding, to keep something alive for the Paratransit funding available and it's on a line that you operate when people are trying to travel from one point to another and probably not going to that place. You see how there's certain inefficiencies baked in that are sensitive and you can't really weed them out. But we are trying to work and get as many of the inefficiencies out of the system as possible without upsetting people

Commissioner Kresich: I don't know what the latest thinking is in the transit industry. But is there any trend towards providing service on some of these less traveled lines using less expensive - smaller vehicles?

Mr. Xavier: Possibly. There are a couple of ways we can make vehicles cheaper. One is not having a diversified fleet, which we have done poorly in the past. For example, at the MCI, we have some really fancy coaches on the express services, which adds costs to maintenance. We have looked at which routes have lower loads that we could put a short vehicle on them to reduce the amount of fuel. We have been trying to target that as well and on routes like 685 that goes to Ajo which we have been using mini vans. It is a balance. Do we add another type of fleet type. What is the package cost of the maintenance with that, as well as the ongoing maintenance cost of the fuel costs.

Mr. Crampton: That is challenging to do also. A lot of times you see buses that are on the street that maybe only have a few people in it. A lot of people think we should get a smaller vehicle, for example if you look in the middle of the day it is kind of empty. But if you look at it during the peak hours, that bus might be full. It doesn't make sense to run a smaller vehicle in the middle of the day and then switch to a bigger vehicle in the peak hour. There are some routes that probably could work like maybe Ray Road – route 140 and Chandler is one that you could probably get away with a little bit smaller vehicle, but there is probably not that many routes around the region. Maybe a select few.

Mr. Xavier: That's a good point. Because the blocks – essentially what the bus does for an entire day – it could be running not only that route but another route what we call interlining to make it scheduled even more efficient to reduce the amount of waste of time. Even if this route is very low, it's probably more efficient to run that higher capacity bus on the lower demand route if we are going to interline it with a higher demand route. The human cost (the driver) is usually the highest cost we incur.

Commissioner Brennan: A quick comment about the physical environment. I think it is absolutely critical particularly where someone lives and where they get on the bus, as well as where they get off the bus and then where they get off to go to their job that takes a lot of coordination with various municipalities. I am hoping that will be part of the process to make those kinds of physical improvements so that people are more inclined to ride because its comfortable, at least relatively comfortable, to get from their home to the bus stop and to get from the bus where they get out the bus to where they work.

Mr. Xavier: Commissioner. You guys have a pretty good example here with Chandler Flex. People took to that so much especially people that are used to riding transit. It kind of feels like being pampered when somebody is not going to make you walk on the hot pavement or a quarter mile to a bus stop. And it does really reduce that entry to have that kind of service. But I think your point, not everybody in the region is so happy to have that kind of service. We are not only doing that in this effort, getting the public feedback, targeting where people are saying the heat is a big issue. We are also undergoing what is called a spider-dirty mapping exercise, which is more on the

qualitative side. We will be interviewing people while they ride from point to point and getting their feedback on the qualitative challenges, things they see that might not be as easily captured in a survey. We are actually getting a lot of feedback about this place is safe and safe from the time of day and how diverse, seasonally and really digging into things that you can't really get out of checking a box or giving a short answer. The region is different from other states. In other states they own all the bus stops. Here we coordinate with our regional partners – they own the stops and we must coordinate with them.

Commissioner Brennan: I appreciate that. As someone who rode the bus for many years from Chandler to downtown Phoenix, there is that distance from home to where you get on the bus and typically that is the distance or that area you are probably walking, so that's critical. The design of the bus stop is very critical. When you get to the bus stop and it's facing east in the morning and get off across the street at night and that one is facing west somebody didn't use their good sense to come up with the design that is responsive to the physical environment. The other question I have is really sort of off the subject. When I worked with the City of Phoenix they gave employees free bus passes. Is there a program that Valley Metro works with employers to encourage and either give free bus passes or discounted bus passes?

Mr. Xavier: They do. I believe they are trying to use that a little bit more. We work in conjunction with the City of Phoenix, so they may actually administer that. It's not only to employers, but schools that we try to potentially get the kids engaged. Talking about the barriers of entry, not just walking to the stops, but actually how do I pay the fare, the education, the dissemination of those passes has been improved in the last few years.

Commissioner Johnson: Looking at one of your slides – about half the people, the vast majority are using transit for work and now after COVID, with so many people working from home, I assume that really has taken a hit. So, the fact that we are about half of what our peers are as far as 12 passengers per hour versus 22 – it seems to be there would be a lot of room for reducing the number of buses out there. I know that is not what you guys want to hear - reducing things. But how much of this is we have to keep because Mesa is going out to the research center or going through Chandler. Are we stuck with a route because they are forcing the issue? Is that something that you guys have conversations with your peers?

Mr. Crampton: Yes, through the Chair, Commissioner Johnson. We are constantly talking with Valley Metro, Tempe, Mesa, Gilbert about bus service changes. There are a few cases like that where we are kind of in the middle and Elliot Road between Gilbert and Tempe is an example of that. The only route I can think of that would be a good example is on Priest Dr. over on the western side. There is a route that runs down Tempe, comes through Chandler, goes to Phoenix. The City of Phoenix, when they re-upped their transit sales tax, they increased the service on that route, running it until 11

p.m. or midnight. Our standard in Chandler is typically to end service about 9 p.m. On that one we are stuck. The good news is that the City of Phoenix when they added that they offered to pay for those extra trips that run through Chandler. Usually, there is some sort of negotiation we can work out if it is something we really don't want to add in Chandler. We also experience the opposite side of that as well. For example, on route 542 express route which goes to downtown Phoenix directly. Before COVID that route was very popular in Chandler. We wanted to add service to it. Typically, we would split the cost with the City of Phoenix because half of it is in Phoenix and half of it is in Chandler. But Phoenix didn't want to add service, so we just agreed to pay for the whole extra trip. We do work together with agencies like that regularly. I definitely hear you on the lower ridership compared to other regions many residents both in Chandler and elsewhere that come to Chandler to work do rely on the service and when we start cutting too much of it – it becomes unreliable for people to use for any purpose. It's very challenging to make massive cuts to the whole network that people and business rely on and need to do their jobs. Despite the upcoming service changes discussed earlier Chandler will receive a significant share of the regional prop 479 funding to pay for more than 90% of Chandler's bus service. We definitely wouldn't want to cut bus service beyond that because we wouldn't realize any savings. However, there is potentially a little bit of room to make some service reductions that could impact the City of Chandler budget.

Commissioner Johnson: When we are looking at the cost per passenger and there was a couple of – I guess – 140 and 154 – looking at 27 to 30 dollars how does that compare to RideChoice or Paratransit in costs per passenger?

Mr. Xavier: Commissioner. I'm a little rusty on the fare side of transit but my general understanding is \$25 would be at least half the cost of a typical RideChoice trip and three times less than a Paratransit trip. I'm estimating about \$75 for a Paratransit trip.

Commissioner Johnson: We are paying about \$50 for RideChoice?

Mr. Crampton: It's a little lower in Chandler. I believe we are around \$34-\$35 per trip for RideChoice But yes, it is about \$75 for paratransit and for Chandler Flex we are about \$22 per trip.

Commissioner Johnson: I would be interested to see if some of these routes are empty most of the day or if there are only a couple of people on them. If we swap them into RideChoice. Is that a possibility? Because my biggest concern is that whenever we have a 50% bump this year for the city and it is going to be 100% next year, I'm a fiscal guy, that's a big concern for me.

Mr. Crampton: Just a little more background on that. Chandler has been lucky in the last four or five years we have not had to pay for bus service. Before that, we did have

to pay a couple of million dollars every year for bus service. We have been able to leverage regional funding over the last five years to realize savings. That increase that we will see next year is getting us back closer to where we have been historically but still paying less than we used to. But it is still tough because we were saving so much over the past five years. But again, we are getting back to our typical local expenditure.

Commissioner Johnson: On the last slide you said the reports going to the board of directors. Who is the board of directors?

Mr. Xavier: That's the Valley Metro Board which is the local elected officials.

Mr. Crampton: Council member O.D. Harris is our representative on the Valley Metro Board.

Chair Heineking: The next item is a briefing on Jacaranda Parkway.

4. Jacaranda Parkway Protected Bike Lane Project

Mr. Crampton: Introduced and turned the time over to Mr. Rocha.

Mr. Rocha: Thank you Chair and Commissioners. I will very briefly speak to you on the Jacaranda Parkway Protected Bike Lane Project. It is our newest project for our bike infrastructure in the City of Chandler (presentation):

- Why Jacaranda Parkway

- Current Conditions

- Proposed Improvements

- Timeline

Chair Heineking: What is the speed limit on that road?

Mr. Rocha: I believe it is 25 mph because it is a residential street.

Commissioner Johnson: What is the demand for this? I know you just said that there were some folks that were excited about it coming in. What is the demand that is pushing these programs – for projects like this?

Mr. Rocha: The Protected Bike Lane Study looked at that. We have some counts as well. It didn't show that number of cyclists there and we didn't have anybody directly contact us about this specific project, but we have heard from people wanting increased comfort and cycling infrastructure. We have heard from organizations like Bike Chandler that is a local group that wants to see more of that in the city, not specifically this project, but the need for enhanced bike infrastructure in the city as a whole. We also used the fact that this specific project was identified in the protected bike lane study

and chose one to go first and test out this new methodology different from the primary protected bike lane to make sure it works.

Mr. Crampton: Through the Chair. When we developed the Transportation Master Plan Update, we did a robust public outreach and surveyed over one thousand Chandler residents. The feedback that we received was consistent – we want to bike in Chandler, but we don't feel comfortable doing it in bike lanes on streets. We need to have more protected bike lanes, more separated paths and more things like this to make people feel comfortable and safe when biking. I think there is a public demand out there. There is not going to be as many people on bikes as there are cars on streets, but there is certainly a demand for it.

Commissioner Johnson: You stated low cost - how much is the cost on this one?

Mr. Crampton: We haven't gotten our final cost estimated from the design, but I think we are going to probably be in the two-to-three-hundred-thousand-dollar range. We plan to use city forces to install the posts. It is very low cost. It may not sound that low, but it is a four-mile-long project, and we are doing both sides of the road so it's really eight miles of bike lanes, and we are under \$100,000 per mile. It is pretty impressive in comparison to other protected bike lane projects.

Commissioner Brennan: You said you had counts for the bicycles on that loop?

Mr. Rocha: Yes, but I don't have them on top of my head.

Commissioner Brennan: Okay. Have there been any bike versus vehicle incidents where there have been injuries to a bicyclist?

Mr. Rocha: One I can report on. It was an accident that happened about a year ago or less. It wasn't exactly in the loop, but it was somebody that was riding on Ocotillo Road trying to do a left hand turn to access the loop and got hit by a vehicle close to that intersection as they were trying to merge left to be able to access the loop. Other than that, I don't know if Jason is aware or any other reports.

Mr. Crampton: No, not off the top of my head, I'm not sure.

Commissioner Brennan: So, there haven't been a lot of accidents or incidents except, just that one.

Mr. Rocha: Not that we have heard of. But again, this could be because people don't feel comfortable or safe riding.

Commissioner Brennan: I think I would feel safer on this street than I would on most arterial streets. Just a comment. As a member of Bike Chandler, we talk to a lot of residents at the innovations fair and also prior to the family bike ride and everybody we talk to have stated that they do not ride on the arterial streets because they are extremely dangerous. At least they feel that they are dangerous or they don't feel safe. They certainly don't allow their children to ride on the arterial streets. We have one member of Bike Chandler, who last year rode 6,000 miles, he rides on the arterial streets, he is the only one. The concern is that we, and I understand this is a fairly low cost project, but I would hope in the future we could focus on some of the streets where there may not be any accidents just because nobody rides on the bike lanes. I think we need to think more about having to protect bike lanes on some of our arterial streets that are basically very unsafe for children, but certainly for adults too who don't want to lose their life because someone's going forty-five or fifty miles an hour. Or maybe we can lower our speed limit on our arterial streets.

Mr. Crampton: Through the chair. We are going to be conducting a safe streets for all road safety action plan coming up that this group will be heavily involved with. We will look at all kinds of things regarding road safety. So very good thoughts there. One thing I will mention is with these protected bike lanes, we are focusing more on collector streets than arterials because of the high speeds on arterials and the limited space that we have is not very conducive to placing these types of amenities in the roadways. We have gone back and forth with some different groups in the city on this. But as of now, the desire is to focus on collectors. But I agree wholeheartedly that arterial bike lane safety is definitely a challenge we need to figure out.

Commissioner Kresich: I wanted to check my understanding. You said, I think after your presentation, that this was identified in a previous study project for like a demonstration project. Is that what this is essentially to test the activists or something of those horizontal – I'm sorry -the vertical separation?

Mr. Crampton: It was not ranked as the number one project but was still a highly ranked project. However, It was the most shovel ready project from our feasibility study. This project is the first and best project due to ease and quickest way to advance one of these projects. In a way it is a demonstration project. We do have a capital improvement fund that as of now is programmed to provide about three hundred thousand dollars every other year for these types of projects. Depending on how this goes, how it is received, how we can maintain it, things like that will kind of formulate what we do moving forward with other types of low-cost, quick-build projects like this elsewhere in the city.

Chair Heineking: Thank you. Next is information items.

Information items

5. April 2026 Project Status Update List

Mr. Crampton: Quick update on the project status list. We will begin the Roadway Safety Action Plan soon. That is going to council next week for the contract with a design consultant Y2k Engineering. We will be back to the commission to discuss that.

The Frye Road Protected Bike Lane. Wanted to update you since we will not be meeting again until after July. Frye road will be closed west of Arizona through about mid-May and will reopen with new medians installed in the center of the roadway, as well as medians separating out the bike lanes from the vehicle lanes. Then east of Arizona Avenue installing the rest of the stripping, the green paint and the vertical elements, which will separate the bike lanes from the vehicles beginning in late May or June, so it will actually look like a protected bike lane.

Ashely Trail Project, we have contractor on board so we should start construction activities soon. They are waiting on acquiring some parts like the traffic signal. So once that comes in, that will get to the construction activities.

Chair Heineking: Any questions on the projects list?

Commissioner Brennan: I have a comment on Frye Rd. At the intersections the bike lanes are raised or go up which I think is a great idea.

Members Comments/Announcements

Chair Heineking: Next is Members' Comments or Announcements.

Mr. Crampton: Through the chair. I have a couple of announcements. The first is the city of looking at an ebike regulations. You may hear about it in the news. We had a council work session recently and on May 21st we will take the ordinance to council for consideration for adoption. It's a direction that council wanted to go to get some policy in place. All the other cities around Chandler have regulations on ebikes and we were like the last one standing without regulations. We are moving forward with this, and I can come back and provide a presentation on what the regulations are, which mostly pertain to the Class III ebikes, which are faster and putting some age restrictions, restrictions on riding on sidewalks, as well as helmet requirements for youth.

Finally, I wanted to announce that Commissioner Brennan, this is his last meeting. He has been with us for six years now. We very much appreciate his service and has been a great addition to the commission over the years. We have a little parting gift for you, Commissioner Brennan.

Commissioner Brennan: Thank you. I didn't know they had Brennan cups. Very nice. Thank you very much.

Chair Heineking: I think I've been doing it for four or five years now and I always appreciate your comments. It's been a pleasure serving with you.

Commissioner Brennan: It been a wonderful experience. I've done my entire career in a planning profession, and I was on the other side of the table so to speak. This was the first time on the citizen side of the table.

Chair Heineking: Anyone else? I will also mention that this will be my last meeting as chair. Think about it you want to nominate yourself or someone else for Chair at our next meeting. I guess will start out as chair and then transition.

Commissioner Kresich: When did you say the next meeting was?

Ms. Passey: The next meeting will be on August 19, at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Heineking: We are adjourned.

ADJOURNED: 6:52 p.m.