

# Planning Partners Meeting #2 Summary Notes

**Date:** June 14, 2010; 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

**Location:** MAG Cholla Room

**Handouts:** Meeting Agenda, Planning Partners revised list, Revised Project Phase I Schedule, Planning Partners Planning Advance (Meeting #1, May 10, 2010) Summary Notes, Livability Principles, Existing Conditions Performance Measures list and associated graphics, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, revised Initial Project Outreach (Task 3) handout, MAG Regional Transit Framework Executive Summary

**Participants:** Chris Andres, City of Phoenix; Dan Cook, City of Chandler; Jason Crampton, City of Chandler; Robert Darr, City of Glendale; Eric Johnson, City of Phoenix; Carol Ketcherside, Valley Metro RPTA; Jim Mathien, Metro Light Rail; David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale; Mark Melnychenko, City of Phoenix; David Moody, City of Peoria; Scott Omer, ADOT; Robert Yabes, City of Tempe

*MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Monique de los Rios Urban, Bob Hazlett, Micah Henry, and Tim Strow, Maricopa Association of Governments; Peggy Fiandaca and Audra Koester Thomas, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.; Dan Marum and Amy Moran, Wilson & Company, Inc.*

**Meeting convened at 1:05 p.m.**

## **I. Introduction**

Bob Hazlett, MAG's Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study (CPHX) project manager, welcomed all in attendance and participants were introduced.

Mr. Hazlett introduced Micah Henry from MAG. He also introduced new Planning Team members Dan Cook from the City of Chandler, and Jason Crampton and David Moody with the City of Peoria.

Mr. Hazlett reviewed with participants the Planning Partners Planning Advance (Meeting #1) Summary from May 10, 2010; no changes to the summary notes were made.

Mr. Hazlett mentioned that per a Planning Partners suggestion, the HUD/DOT/EPA Livability Principles will be used as part of this study. Mr. Hazlett noted that the Livability Principles are something the study can use as a guide as we move forward. The Livability Principles were distributed in the meeting packet and everyone was asked to review.

Mr. Hazlett concluded his introduction by reminding Planning Partner participants of the importance responding in a timely fashion to the consultants when data and other information are requested to keep the project on schedule.

## **II. Existing Conditions Data Overview**

Dan Marum, project manager representing the Wilson & Company consulting team, gave an introduction to the “Existing Conditions Data” that the team is pulling together. Mr. Marum noted that the goal of this effort is to reach general consensus on the items of “Existing Conditions Performance Measures” (see meeting packet). Mr. Marum noted that the existing conditions list was developed by building upon the work that MAG has been doing in terms of performance measures and that we will be working with stakeholders to ensure that everyone is comfortable with the use of these network characteristics to provide a snapshot of the existing transportation system.

It was also discussed that some of these measures may also be carried through for analysis of future network operations. This led to a discussion related to the future conditions model and socioeconomic data inputs. Mr. Marum noted that the team will be working with each of the Planning Partners to determine if there should be any changes to the projection, allowing for any sensitivity analysis to occur to test scenarios during Phase II. 2035 is the study year horizon.

Mr. Hazlett mentioned that this sensitivity analysis would allow Planning Partners to include their community’s current thinking about long range planning or redevelopment to be considered in this analysis. He mentioned as an example, the City of Glendale’s downtown redevelopment might need to be considered.

David Moody from the City of Peoria noted that because they were doing an update to their general plan, the latest land use information is not currently reflected in the MAG model. Mr. Hazlett requested that Mr. Moody and other Planning Partners forward any revised land use and related data to the consulting team (Wilson & Company) as soon as possible so that the model reflects the current thinking about future planning.

Dave Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale suggested that the study include development plans for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC), noting that significant development is underway or projected for SRPMIC that will have an impact on the model.

Mr. Marum continued, noting that the goal is to arrive at a socio-economic dataset that the team feels confident addresses the vision for the Existing plus Committed network condition; in doing so, the team intends to provide the 2035 growth projections that MAG has developed and asked that participants review the information prior to attending the August Planning Partners in order to reach agreement on the inputs to the model for Phase I. As noted earlier, Phase II will provide an opportunity to do sensitivity modeling related to land use and economic development plans.

Mr. Marum then continued to review the existing conditions graphics (see meeting packet) and requested that any updated data or corrections be submitted to Amy Moran, assistant project manager, with Mr. Hazlett and Mr. Marum copied.

Mr. Cook referred to the Existing Conditions Performance Measure list and remarked that some of the items listed were simply depictions of factual information, not analysis of system performance. Mr. Cook suggested that level of service as an indicator might be a more relevant performance measure. Mr. Marum agreed, and noted that speed is another performance measure with which the average person can relate and noted that MAG has good speed data on the selected arterials. Mr. Meinhart concurred with Mr. Marum, and suggested that the average travel time and average travel speed are easier for the public to understand than level of service or roadway segments and encouraged use of measures that gets closer to travel time rather than classic level of service.

Mark Melnychenko from the City of Phoenix noted that “Level of Service” and “Fixed Route Service” might not be the best measures to use and encouraged the team to consider another performance measure, such as “on-time performance”, as a transit performance measure instead of just stating frequency.

Robert Yabes from the City of Tempe suggested adding a performance measure for bus capacity. Mr. Marum responded that it will be important to make the bus capacity measure relevant to this study by tailoring it to the study area.

Dan Cook from the City of Chandler asked what is year for the existing conditions data and Mr. Marum replied that the team has a good FY 2007-08 dataset to use to make the connection to 2010 (specifically to capture performance data regarding light rail and transit that occurred after FY 2007-08)

The meeting continued with a PowerPoint presentation from Monique de los Rios-Urban of MAG on its performance measure project. During the presentation, Carol Ketcherside from Valley METRO asked if MAG has data on how many people are within a bus stop and suggested that such data be considered as part of the CPHX study. Mr. Marum noted that he looked forward to discussing with Ms. Ketcherside what transit data should be used to determine future performance. Mr. Yabes asked if MAG had any performance measures data for the bikes and Ms. de los Rios-Urban responded that acquiring this sort of data has been difficult. Mr. Cook wondered if environmental impacts would be part of the study; Mr. Hazlett confirmed that the study team would be incorporating such data, including PM 10.

Ms. de los Rios-Urban concluded her presentation by introducing participants to MAG’s Multimodal Transportation Performance Measurement Web site and INRIX’s real-time, web based traffic Web site.

Mr. Cook asked how far outside of the study area would the team be collecting data. Mr. Marum replied the team would be looking no more than a mile outside of the study area and that regional data would be used within the study area and that outside the study area the team would use adopted datasets.

Mr. Yabes asked about the O/D information. Ms. de los Rios-Urban explained that the speed survey data was collected for every route. MAG provided direction to the consultant doing the study that the O/D pairs would be on the freeways because they represent regional malls and stadiums, etc. While the consultant collected a sample for AM/PM peaks and Mid-Day, it was not an extensive study and the O/D pairs were not commute-based. Ms. de los Rios-Urban noted that for CPHX study, additional O/D pairs could be identified if desired.

Mr. Marum and Ms. Moran also provided clarification that these performance measures being discussed were being presented to provide a snapshot of existing conditions, and that additional discussion would be required at a later stage in the study regarding appropriate performance measures for evaluation of future network performance. Ms. Moran also reiterated that all future network alternatives would be evaluated relative to the future *Existing plus Committed* base network, not existing conditions, since the performance criteria generated by the model would be based on a set of socioeconomic data that was consistent among this base condition and future network alternatives. Mr. Hazlett continued, noting that some simulated base case data might be considered.

### III. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Audra Koester Thomas, public outreach task member, provided an overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, outlining the kinds of outreach activities anticipated as part of Phase I. No comments were provided.

Ms. Thomas also introduced an instrument that the study team would be using to collect additional feedback from the Planning Partners: a post-meeting feedback instrument. Ms. Thomas noted that after each Planning Partners meeting, a link to an online feedback instrument would be emailed to participants to provide any additional feedback regarding items discussed at the previous meeting.

### IV. Outreach Efforts

Ms. Thomas referred to the Initial Project Outreach outline provided within the agenda packet, and discussed each method of outreach.

**Focus Groups** – Ms. Thomas outlined the five topical focus groups and requested that participants provide any additional contacts that should be invited to participate in these dialogues on July 19 and 20. Ms. Thomas noted that the focus group invitations would be sent this week and that she'd forward the invitation to the Planning Partners as well.

**Key Leadership Interviews** – Ms. Thomas provided an overview of the Key Leadership Interview process, noting that the team would be asking the Planning Partners directly to assist in setting up the meeting within their jurisdiction. Ms. Thomas noted the team would be targeting early August for these interviews. The purpose of this approach is to touch base with key stakeholders to explain what the study is about and what the anticipated outcome will be.

It was suggested that information be distributed ahead of the interviews, such as potential discussion questions, so that the interviewees can be prepared.

**Geographically-Based Dialogues** – Ms. Thomas explained the purpose of the Geographically-Based Dialogues and referenced the proposed seven potential geographic areas (developed purposely ignoring city boundaries). Ms. Thomas noted that the purpose of the dialogues is to discuss regional connectivity. Mr. Hazlett asked the group if the seven proposed geographic areas made sense and there were positive responses.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that the study's first e-newsletter will be distributed in July and would provide a project overview and serve as the invitation to participate in the geographically-based dialogues.

#### **V. Next Steps**

Ms. Moran asked if anyone had problems logging onto ProjectWise and Scott Omer noted have some difficulty. Ms. Moran requested that participants log on within the next day or so and report any problems via the Planning Partners post-meeting feedback instrument, or directly to Ms. Moran.

Mr. Hazlett noted that the July Planning Partners meeting would be canceled. The next meeting will be held on August 9, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. where discussions would continue regarding existing conditions, as well as a presentation on governance.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.**