



Minutes City of Tempe Transportation Commission February 12, 2013

Minutes of the City of Tempe Transportation Commission held on Tuesday, February 12 2013, 7:30 a.m., at the Don Cassano Community Room, 200 E 5TH St., Tempe, Arizona.

(MEMBERS) Present:

Charles Huellmantel
Aaron Golub
Pam Goronkin
Sue Lofgren
German Piedrahita
Benjamin Sanchez

Don Cassano
Ben Goren
Nikki Gusz
Kevin Olson
Gary Roberts
Peter Schelstraete

(MEMBERS) Absent:

Philip Luna

Charles Redman

City Staff Present:

Don Bessler
Elvia Franco
Greg Jordan
Shelly Seyler
Teresa Voss

Joe Clements
Eric Iwersen
Nancy Ryan
Sue Taaffe
Robert Yabes

Guests Present:

Megan Padish (ASU), Alisha Garrison (ASU)

Commission Chair Charles Huellmantel called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Public Appearances

None.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Meeting Minutes: January 8, 2013 and January 15, 2013.

Commissioner Cassano motioned to approve the January 8, 2013 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner Golub seconded the motion.

Commissioner Huellmantel suggested revisions to the January 15, 2013 Transportation Commission meeting minutes.

Commissioner Goronkin motioned to approve the January 15, 2013 Transportation Commission meeting minutes as amended. **Seconded the motion:** _____.

The following minutes were approved:

- Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes – January 8, 2013

The following minutes were approved as amended:

- Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes – January 15, 2013

Agenda Item 3 – Commemoration for Commission Member David Strang

Presented by Greg Jordan, Deputy Public Works Director – Transit, Public Works

Commissioner Huellmantel introduced the agenda item regarding the commemoration for Member David Strang.

Greg referred to the last commission meeting when the remembrance for Commissioner Strang was discussed and staff was requested to present one or two options for considerations at this meeting. The Commissioners were presented with two pathways for consideration, one being Crosscut Canal (Mill to Marigold) and the other Western Canal (Rural to Kiwanis Park). As an alternative to pathways, it was recommended the commission consider other areas such as College Avenue where David Strang lived. Another suggested option was other types of ties to the Commission which involved David Strang such as dedicating a tree or bench in his name along Mill Avenue. Greg explained the course of action for the commission presented would be the naming of a pathway which requires Council approval or a commemoration that would not require the level of Council approval. Greg provided the facility guidelines and explained it was to the Commissioner's discretion as to their decision and staff will accommodate the option chosen.

Commissioner Huellmantel thought it was a good idea to provide more than one option for Council.

Commissioner Schelstraete stated it would be nice to have a tree along a pathway by David Strang's house or on the path suggested by Commissioner Huellmantel last month. It was also suggested dedicating one of the new tree's being placed at one of the rest stops at Crosscut Canal near the stream where there are benches. Commissioner Schelstraete indicated a tree would be appropriate since it is long lasting and Eric shared although it looks like a stream it's actually an SRP canal, but it is not paved, not channelized like other canals.

Commissioner Lofgren agreed and added the commission could name one of the paths in Strang's honor.

Commissioner Roberts followed by stating he agrees with Commissioner Schelstraete with regard to dedicating a tree and asked if it would be possible to have a plaque displayed and/or a seating element. This would allow users of the path to stop to sit and take a break under the tree where the plaque could be read. Greg responded by stating a tree is certainly doable and staff can look into the type of seating appropriate given the seating nearby.

Eric explained a location already exist just north of Curry and east of Van Buren—it's a nice little plaza area where there is a rest node along the Crosscut Canal. Commissioner Schelstraete shared there is also solar lighting. Commissioner Roberts added he was not familiar with the area, but was open to the area if there was somewhere to display a nice plaque. Greg offered to replant or provide a new tree.

Commissioner Goronkin stated she liked this idea as it sounds like a pretty spot, assumed a plaque would be embedded in or near the tree and felt it was a lovely way to commemorate David's work in our community. Commissioner Goronkin finished by stating if that is the general consensus, she moved to

approve the recommendations presented. Commissioner Huellmantel followed by asking if there was a second motion. Commissioner Cassano seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cassano followed the motion by asking if anyone discussed this idea with the Council. Commissioner Huellmantel explained naming facilities becomes a little more controversial, putting David Strang's name into controversy is probably not in keeping with the message of remembrance. Commissioner Huellmantel thought it was a great suggestion and supported the idea of having a tree especially a new tree verses an existing tree represents some symbolism, a place to rest a place for shade. David Strang was focused in creating quality of life in Tempe in many ways and indicated the tree idea is really fitting. Commissioner Huellmantel asked staff what action was needed from the Commissioners to make this happen.

Greg replied by stating no action was needed and explained staff would come back with a more complete concept for the site to give the Commissioners a sense of what the area might look like. Commissioner Schelstraete offered to take a picture and email to show the area is a beautiful spot.

Greg also shared staff can draft language of what the plaque might say and will reach out to David Strang's family to make sure they support and are involved in the commemoration.

Commissioner Huellmantel asked Commissioner Cassano if he would be opposed to withdrawing the second motion and Commissioner Goronkin withdrawing the first motion to approve until staff returned with additional information. Both Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Huellmantel concluded the discussion by stating the Commission has direction and said thank you to the Commissioners and staff.

Agenda Item 4- Roadside Memorials

Presented by Shelly Seyler, Deputy Public Works Director – Traffic Engineering and Operations, Public Works

The purpose of this item is to discuss management procedures for memorials adjacent to City owned roadways and land.

Shelly indicated that information on the management practice that we will be moving forward with was included in the packet. In the recent months we have had some questions raised by the community on exactly how we address roadside memorials so we felt it was prudent to put into place a practice that established the procedures by which we allow memorials. We recognize that this is a very sensitive issue especially for the families who have lost loved ones but also recognize the need to have a management practice in place. Staff on occasion comes upon issues while conducting work with memorials being in the right-of-way and they don't know what they are supposed to be doing. We felt it was prudent to put together a policy that manages the memorials. The practice that we have provided does allow for a long term option, and allows the family or others the opportunity to adopt a path, a street or park in place of the memorial. This allows the person to continue to be memorialized in the future and assist the city with cleaning up our pathways and streets. No action is needed on this item as it is a management practice and for information only, but staff would be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Goronkin asked about the visibility and how often the identities are known for the families that are placing the memorials along the roadway.

Shelly said fatalities in Tempe do not occur that often, typically when they do happen we know because it is raised to a level that we find out about it. We are also able to work with the police department if it is related to a pedestrian, bicycle, motorist fatality and they would typically have the information which would allow us to work with the families when the time came and if necessary. Sometimes the families aren't as involved, example given on University and Ash, our staff had to go out there and do some work, we tried to contact the family and say we are going to need to remove the objects that were placed around it and

we got no response from the family. Sometimes its groups that do this and the families are involved to an extent. Sometimes families are not local to Arizona. We do have the ability to get with them but we may have to go through the police department to obtain the information. Eric was nice enough to share information regarding the ghost bike on University and Ash.

Commissioner Cassano stated he had to deal with memorials on highways a number of times. Encroachments on the highway right-of-way by memorials that are put in place sometimes become a hazard.

Commissioner Huellmantel said adding more distractions is not a good thing and indicated he did not get the sense that there was a widespread series of complaints.

Commissioner Huellmantel asked if there were any questions or comments. Commissioner Cassano stated we should have a policy in place so if something becomes a problem we can fall back on the policy and give some justification on necessary actions.

Commissioner Golub asked if the language could be changed so it's a minimum of 90 days or until the item becomes a problem. Whichever is the longer if that makes sense?

Shelly shared we are trying to manage it from all sides, looking at it from all perspectives. While some might think the memorial is a good thing to have in place for a longer period of time, there are also others who have raised concerns. Community members have mentioned that those who have been involved in the collision and may not be at fault may have to drive by the memorial regularly and be reminded of the situation. We want to be sensitive to the issue but we also feel like there should be a date or timeframe in which it ends. If the family or others feel it's important to recognize this person more publically they can adopt a path or street and we can install a sign in support of that effort that says, "in memory of [person's name]" or something that they feel is fitting with certain limitations. We want to offer alternatives but also want to end that period with a date certain.

Commissioner Schelstraete stated this appears to be more of a western state cultural thing and it seems like memorials do have a positive impact on rural areas. He indicated he was not sure they fit within the city.

Commissioner Lofgren asked will this be retroactive with dates.

Shelly shared there will be a point in which we say this is the date the practice is in place and we move forward from there. It wouldn't be fair to go back in time but instead we would establish a date certain. We will be informing the Council and then we will determine a date and keep a log of those that exist and move forward. The numbers of fatalities that do occur in Tempe are very few.

Agenda Item 5 – General Plan and Transportation Master Plan

Presented by Eric Iwersen, Interim Transportation Planning Manager and Nancy Ryan, Development Project Manager, Community Development

Eric shared with the commission the intent of the memo included in the Commission packet is to reschedule the timing of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to coincide with the work being done with the City's General Plan (GP), specifically, the chapter of the GP that talks about transportation. The commission has done a lot of work establishing goals and objectives for the TMP over the last eight (8) months and we want the work to be forwarded to the General Plan 2040 Community Working Group (CWG). Commissioner Cassano will sit on the committee and staff will also participate in the process over the next several months. This would allow us to come back with a clearer picture of GP efforts and how to invest time to the specific updates to the TMP. Nancy will talk about the schedule for the GP with

a change to a summer timeline instead of later this year in November/December when we will really look into the specific update to the TMP.

Commissioner Schelstraete stated he thought the commission already did this in the work shop which is in writing and sent on to this and other commissions. It doesn't make sense to get them to augment and get more public feedback and then send that back to commission. Eric responded by stating that is exactly what staff is proposing. We want to take the work done by the commission and provide to the GP CWG and let that influence the changes to the Transportation chapter of the GP. This commission would have the opportunity to weigh in on that chapter before we go into the specific update of our plan.

Commissioner Schelstraete asked if the information was already sent to the committee. Eric indicated it was not.

Commissioner Huellmantel shared a discussion with staff regarding a more productive process. Eric explained further by stating the commission had approximately 15 goals and objectives from the meeting and workshop that will be forwarded to the CWG. Staff participating in the group will make efforts to fold in this information with what is the GP today and come back to the commission with a draft of what the document looks like in May or June. At that time, the commission would be able to adjust and influence the final chapter.

Commissioner Schelstraete asked what needed to be done to move the items over to the committee. Eric stated provide the support to sequence our work on the TMP by taking the work done and moving it to the CWG and then have the changes come back to the Commission. Commissioner Schelstraete motioned to approve.

Eric shared we would like to look at getting a consultant team on board to really help advance the efforts and get a great document for the TMP. We are recommending a possible planning fee of \$50,000 to \$100,000. Commissioner Goren asked if we had staff to provide the service. Eric replied we do, but expressed the influence would be beneficial. Greg also responded by stating even when we had a lot more staff, we had a consultant do this type of work. It is vital this go around and outside support help would technically and analytically make the TMP in the GP a much more robust document.

Commissioner Roberts asked if we had to go out and bid for the consultant and where the funds were coming from. Greg shared we have on call consultants and funds would come from the existing program and would not add to our overall program cost.

Commissioner Schelstraete made motion to approve the sequence of the update to the TMP to follow the GP as shared by Eric and to support the staff effort to bring a consultant team on board to assist with the Transportation Plan.

Commissioner Goronkin seconded the motion.

Agenda Item 6 – Regional Bike Share Program

Presented by Eric Iwersen, Interim Transportation Planning Manager, Community Development
Eric referred the Commissioners to the map and memo included in the packet sharing the purpose of the presentation was an opportunity to provide information on the new regional project to implement a bike share program in multiple cities; discuss outreach and the timeline.

Regional Bike Share has been an effort that was initiated in several cities a year ago; several cities do it around the country in the last seven years. Tempe joined the city of Phoenix last fall in applying for federal dollars to get capital to initiate the program. We were successful in getting that in addition to other transportation grants, however, the funds will not be available until 2015. The city of Phoenix has been initiating a process of a RFP to get the vendor to operate a bike share system for the region and city of

Tempe, city of Mesa are joining the RFP with the City of Phoenix. The RFP will be released in a couple of weeks and we are expecting to review submissions by the end of March. This will help us better understand what type of companies are submitting interest and examining if they can operate this type of operation with the dollar amount attached before we can initiate the program. The capital money that Tempe has at this point is set for 2015 which will be available the summer of 2014. We do have the CIP request that has been forwarded to our Council for 200,000 which will go through the process with Council as an information item. We wanted to let the commission know about the bike share program and are seeking support. Additional information will be provided at a future commission meeting.

Eric shared images of other similar cities programs explaining the basic concept includes stations around the community that provide rental bikes.

Commissioner Huellmantel asked how many people have been to cities where they have seen this in operation. Eric responded by stating it is partnered program and done in urbanizing areas in college towns and areas where you have a lot of bike ridership; it is intended to be coupled really nicely with transit service because that is where there is a lot of the bike demand. With high transit use we certainly will involve ASU and Valley Metro. The operation of the system allows a person to walk up with a credit card or money (operated hard cash--we don't know what that looks like right now) and use a bike for an hour, a day or longer.

Commissioner Huellmantel stated you don't have to bring the bike back to the same place. Eric replied there would be multiple convenience stations. Ideally we would like to partner this with transit pass; monthly pass might be able to access also. There are discussions to be made with regional partners. We have done some studies to make sure there is a demand working with ASU. We have established a high bike ridership attached to transit with the downtown Tempe, ASU, and Light Rail stations. A staff exercise was used to determine potential locations for bike sharing stations and were able to identify 18 stations in or around downtown area. The next step is to take the information and make it available to the public through our Public Works website so we can get some feedback. We will continue having discussions with the city of Phoenix; see how the RFP goes; involve Valley Metro and ASU; and then bring the information back to the commission.

Commissioner Schelstraete asked is that map based on our bike corridors. Eric said it is attached to high activity centers like ASU or Tempe Beach Park and is linked to areas where there is high ridership like College Avenue and strong transfer areas like the Tempe Transportation Center or 3rd and Mill.

Commissioner Roberts asked what percentage of the grant funds was expected to support the expenses. Eric said it will cover the installation and the startup—about 94.3% of the cost with a 5.7% match from Tempe.

Commissioner Goren asked if this something that is the size of the system that would be expected 10 years from now or will it grow and if so, how big. Eric responded by stating we don't know as we have not done a lot of research but indicated this could be a starter system and then grow in south Tempe or over to Marketplace. ASU is now just coming on board; there are campus locations that could grow. Commissioner Goren asked about other cities and the idea of a user picking up a bike in Tempe and ride to Phoenix or Scottsdale. Eric explained the system would be connected between cities and Phoenix is looking between 7th Avenue and 7th Street as far as Camelback and down south to Downtown. Mesa is looking just further downtown with 10 to 8 stations.

Commissioner Piedrahita stated if cash based, what happens if users want to ride off with the bike. Eric responded by saying the bicycles will have a GPS and there will be an agreement outlining applicable fines. It will be the responsibility of the operators to come up with the system and the RFP process will help us understand what they will propose.

Commissioner Goren asked if they will also be responsible for maintenance.

Commissioner Huellmantel thought the program was a great start but eventually will need to move out into the neighborhoods as well so people have access. Maybe there is a way for existing or new projects to buy into the process.

Commissioner Cassano expressed a community bike program did not work.

Eric stated there is more personal responsibility attached to this project. We would authorize the locations in our right-of-way and would share a percentage of our revenue, but the other model shows the operator can make their profit and then we would keep whatever percentage. That's part of the RFP process to understand. We don't encumber huge operating costs. We want to come back when we have more information, but want to say the program has been pretty successful in other locations.

Commissioner Olson asked if there are any other cities in the valley looking on using the same system. Commissioner Huellmantel responded by saying the city of Mesa's Mayor is pushing for the program. Eric added there are currently three cities involved.

Agenda Item 7 – Proposed Highline Canal Multi-use Pathway Project

Presented by Eric Iwersen, Interim Transportation Planning Manager, Community Development

Eric referred the Commissioners to the memo included in the packet and made note the map in the packet is outdated. Eric explained this project is similar to the bike share; and emerged in recent discussion with Salt River Project (SRP), town of Guadalupe, Maricopa County Flood Control and city of Phoenix. The Highline Canal in Tempe is the blue line shown on the map from Baseline Road down to Knox Road in our city limits and extends to west Phoenix in the Ahwatukee side as well as the South Mountain neighborhood. The town of Guadalupe has been pursuing some kind of pathway enhancement along the Tempe border and has approached Tempe to open the discussion. SRP has been involved as well. We want the commission to be aware of the discussions; advise of the possibility of a new project; seek support as the project can potentially lead to a Transit tax dollar request in the future; and inform commissioners a CIP request has been forwarded to Council.

Agenda Item 8 – Department and Regional Transportation Updates

Presented by Public Works, Community Development, and Community Relations Staff

Eric provided an update of the ADOT State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan now underway, which affects all freeways in Tempe and encouraged the commission to visit the website for the plan.

Agenda Item 9 – Future Agenda Items

Meeting adjourned at 8:39 a.m.

The Commission's next meeting will be held Tuesday, March 12, 2013 at 7:30 a.m. Don Cassano Community Room at the Tempe Transportation Center, 200 E. 5th St., Tempe, Arizona.