



Minutes City of Tempe Transportation Commission June 13, 2017

Minutes of the Tempe Transportation Commission held on Tuesday, June 13, 2017, 7:30 a.m., at the Tempe Transportation Center, Don Cassano Community Room, 200 E. Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona.

(MEMBERS) Present:

Don Cassano (Chair)	Lloyd Thomas
Ryan Guzy	Susan Conklu
Brian Fellows	Kevin Olson
Charles Redman	Cyndi Streid (via phone)
Jeremy Browning	Shana Ellis
Nigel A.L. Brooks	Paul Hubbell

(MEMBERS) Absent:

Charles Huellmantel	Shereen Lerner
Bonnie Gerepka	

City Staff Present:

Shelly Seyler, Deputy Public Works Director	Laura Kajfez, Neighborhoods Services Specialist
Sue Taaffe, Public Works Supervisor	Sam Stevenson, Senior Planner
Shauna Warner, Neighborhoods Program Manager	Mackenzie Keller, Public Information Officer
Eric Iwersen, Principal Planner	Julian Dresang, City Traffic Engineer
Braden Kay, Sustainability Program Manager	

Guests Present:

Laura Ashbrook, Griffin and Associates	Lauren Kuby, Councilmember
Zina Alam, resident	Cliff Anderson, resident
John Federico, resident	Kim Gresham, resident
James Winfrey, Arizona State University	Jennifer Rode, resident
David Rice, resident	Robert Herz, resident
William Terrance, resident	Kristian Dook, resident

Commission Chair Cassano called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Public Appearances

See Attachment 1 for comments about agenda item #3.

William Terrance spoke about the Road Construction Traffic Mitigation agenda item. He informed the Commission that in Washington DC it is required for construction areas to maintain the bike lane even if it means closing a traffic lane. He also pointed out that the plates that cover construction areas can have sharp edges and be slippery when wet, which is a hazard to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Agenda Item 2 – Minutes

Chair Cassano introduced the minutes of the May 9, 2017 meeting and asked for a motion. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Kevin Olson

Second: Commissioner Lloyd Thomas

Decision: Approved

Agenda Item 3 – McClintock Drive Street Configuration

Julian Dresang made a presentation about the McClintock Drive street configuration. Topics of the presentation included:

- Traffic Counts
- Bicycle Counts
- Travel Times
- Crashes
- Stakeholder Feedback
- Segment Scenarios
- Public Input
- Options which include:
 - Maintain current configuration
 - Restripe to original configuration
 - Implement the collaboration scenario
 - Select a different combination of alternatives

The Commissioners asked the following questions and made the following statements.

- What is the level of service for McClintock Drive? Staff did not perform an analysis; however, experience would lead staff to believe that it performs at a level B or C during non-peak and a D or F during peak, which is consistent with other arterials in Tempe.
- How was the crash data presented to the public? Staff responded that the March public meetings focused on the corridor alternatives only. Crash data had been presented at previous Council meetings and was available online. Staff prefers to have three years of crash data before drawing any conclusions even though the trend of crashes going down.
- Letting the public know that this project could reduce crashes might be helpful.
- Will adding a third southbound lane near the US 60 encourage more people to use McClintock Drive instead of the freeway? Staff stated that it is unknown how adding the third lane southbound near the US 60 will affect traffic.
- Did we receive much feedback from the retailers along McClintock Drive? Staff responded that businesses were notified of the public meetings and Steve's Espresso commented on a preference for returning the street to its original configuration.
- Bicyclists riding on the sidewalk should be counted because one goal of the project is to get people off the sidewalk and into the bike lanes.
- How were the bike counts collected? Staff said that video counters were used as well as a third party vendor to collect the data. The presentation numbers include only those bicyclists using the bike lane.
- Do we know what the shared path at the railroad underpass width will be under the collaborative scenario? Staff said that removing the planters will likely add four or five feet.
- Part of the problem is the Council summary. The Mayor states the consensus after each meeting about this project, but when the Council discusses it again, the direction and previous consensus changes.

- If the City removes the bike lanes, we will at some point in the future have to consider adding the bike lanes back to McClintock Drive because of growth.
- The bike lanes are part of a larger transportation network.
- When heading southbound toward Broadway Road, how would the bicyclist merge from the shared area with the barrier wall to the bike lane? Staff said that at this point the designs are at 15% and that would be something for the engineers to determine.
- It is stated in the memo that bicycle traffic is low when compared to vehicular traffic. What is the comparison of bicycle traffic on McClintock to other arterials with bicycle lanes? Staff responded that excluding the downtown area, there aren't any other north/south arterial corridors that have bicycle lanes to compare.
- The sharrows under the railroad are not a good idea.
- Bicycle and pedestrian crashes were not included in the presentation. That information would have been good to know in order to see if bike and ped crashes have decreased since the bike lanes were added.
- There were traffic delays on McClintock Drive prior to the reconfiguration and there will continue to be delays.
- None of the scenarios take into consideration that widening the road will increase pedestrian crossing time.
- This is a safety project.
- The collaborative scenario would cost \$5 million dollars and that may not be the best use of funds.
- Because the area under the railroad seems less controversial, maybe that should be considered a separate motion.
- Having lived off of McClintock Drive, traffic begins to back up southbound at Don Carlos.
- Adding a third southbound travel lane will reduce travel times.
- The reduction of accidents is good for everyone.
- If the data supports adding back in a third southbound travel lane then Option C (collaborative scenario) may be the best option.
- The collaborative scenario may need to be phased.
- The delays southbound actually start at Rio Salado Parkway.
- Anything less than a buffered bike lane is unsafe and an unreasonable compromise.
- Parks and homelessness are safety issues for the Council and the McClintock bike lanes should also be about safety.
- Widening the street will only add traffic and increase the heat island.
- Taking out the buffer and adding shade would be a preference.
- The economic impact of spending \$5 million dollars should be considered. If there is an addition \$5 million in the fund, then this probably isn't the best project to use the money for.

A motion was made to support keeping the street configuration the way it currently is today. (Option A)

Motion: Commissioner Brian Fellows

Second: Commissioner Kevin Olson

Decision: Approved

Agenda Item 4 – Road Construction Traffic Mitigation

Julian Dresang made a presentation about road construction traffic mitigation. Topics of the presentation included:

- Tempe Barricading Manual
- Telephone Survey Results
- Peer Analysis
- Night Project pros and Cons
- Barricading with No Visible Construction

The Commissioners asked the following questions and made the following statements.

- During rush hour, why would there be barricades in the roadway? Staff stated that the main reason for barricades to be in the street during rush hour is poor communication between the contractor and barricade company or due to logistics. In addition, staff will allow more barricading to occur in the peak hours in the summer when traffic volumes are much lower.
- It is great that another technician has been hired.
- What is the process for those contractors who don't remove the barricades when they should? Do they get fined? Currently there are no fines. Staff has discovered that once the contractor has been notified that they are noncompliant the behavior changes.
- Who should people call during off hours if they see an issue with barricades? Staff stated that residents may call the non-emergency number or the hotline number located on the project construction sign.

Agenda Item 5 – Department & Regional Transportation Updates

None

Agenda Item 6 - Future Agenda Items

Commissioner Brian Fellows requested that "Crash Data and Enforcement" be added as a future agenda item. Chair Cassano requested that discussing bike lanes on McClintock Drive between Broadway Road and Apache Boulevard be added to the current future agenda item for November titled Plan for Expansion of Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths. The following future agenda items have been previously identified by the Commission or staff:

- July 11
- August 8
 - Leading vs. Lagging Left Turn Signals
 - Bus Security Program
 - Streetcar
 - Small Area Transportation Plan
 - 1st Street/Ash Avenue/Rio Salado Pkwy Intersection
- September 12
 - Highline Canal MUP Final Design
 - Country Club Way Streetscape Design
 - Annual Report
 - Commuter Rail Study
- October 10
 - Fifth Street Streetscape Design
 - Western Canal Expansion MUP Final Design
 - Annual Report
 - Alameda Drive Streetscape
 - 8th Street Streetscape
 - Autonomous Vehicles
- November 12
 - Plan for Expansion of Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths
 - North/South Railroad Spur MUP
 - Bike Share
 - Streetcar
 - Maintenance Procedures for Sidewalk Shade Trees near Overhead Power Lines
- December 12
- January 9

- Speed Limits
 - February 13
 - March 13
 - April 10
 - TBD: Bicycle/Pedestrian Signal Activate Operations Update
 - TBD: Prop 500

The July 11, 2017 meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for August 8, 2017.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Prepared by: Sue Taaffe

Reviewed by: Eric Iwersen and Shelly Seyler