

Planning Partners

Meeting #5 Summary Notes

Date: January 10, 2011

Location: MAG Cholla Room

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, Outreach Summary, Potential 2011 Planning Partner Meeting Dates, Phase I: Initial Project Outreach Summary Report, Review of Transportation Improvement Concepts, PowerPoint presentation handout

Participants: Eric Buskirk, City of Phoenix; Daniel Cook, City of Chandler; Rob Cox, City of Phoenix; Robert Darr, City of Glendale; Wulf Grote, Metro Light Rail; Teresa Huish, City of Scottsdale; Carol Johnson, City of Phoenix; Terry Johnson, City of Glendale; Paul Katsenes, City of Phoenix; Carol Ketcherside, Valley Metro RPTA; David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale; David Moody, City of Peoria; Connie Randall, City of Phoenix; and Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix

MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Bob Hazlett, Micah Henry, and Tim Strow, Maricopa Association of Governments; Dan Baxter and John Conrad, CH2M HILL; Audra Koester Thomas, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.; Dan Marum, Amy Moran, and Jim Townsend, Wilson & Company

Meeting convened at 1:00 p.m.

I. Introductions and Project Update

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

a. I-10 Local Express Lanes – Mr. Hazlett noted that a draft EIS is currently in production and public hearings are expected later in 2011.

b. South Mountain Freeway – Mr. Hazlett noted that the study team is awaiting feedback from Community Member meetings being held throughout the Gila River Indian Community to present and discuss potential alignments for Loop 202, including one that traverses the reservation.

c. I-17 Corridor Update – Mr. Hazlett reminded participants that the project was underway and that the study team had met with MAG. Mr. Hazlett also reported that managed lanes and other alternatives, including a transit envelop, might be considered as part of the project. Mr.

Hazlett noted that he'd request the study team to provide an update to the Planning Partners at an upcoming meeting.

d. Southeast Corridor MIS Update – Mr. Hazlett reported that the project is still underway, with the study team hosting its charrette January 12 and 13.

e. South Central High Capacity Transit Study – Mr. Hazlett announced that a firm has been selected and is currently in negotiations, with a contract award anticipated in March.

f. MAG Transportation/Land Use Study – Mr. Hazlett reported that the project is underway and its initial meetings anticipated by late winter/early spring.

g. Managed Lane Study – Mr. Hazlett reported that MAG received and is reviewing seven proposals to look at the feasibility of managed lanes throughout the Phoenix system. As with CPHX, Mr. Hazlett noted that a "Planning Partners" team is anticipated as part of the project.

h. Freight Framework – Tim Strow, MAG, reported that the Freight Framework kicked-off in December 2010 and data collection is currently underway. The 18-month project is being led by PB.

i. Non-Recurring Congestion (Event/Incident Management) – Mr. Hazlett reported that a study is underway and noted that early results indicate that non-recurring congestion is likely more prevalent than previously realized.

j. Inner Loop Traffic Operations Model Update – Mr. Hazlett shared that there has been great progress made on the model and shared with participants progress made on coding streets, ramp meters, light rail, runways, intersections, etc., and demonstrated some of the 3-D images the model depicts and shared a request for any additional downtown features created in 3-D (SketchUp) to add to the model. Mr. Hazlett noted that he anticipates validation of the model in May 2011.

Terry Johnson, City of Glendale, suggested that future updates might include other freeway design concepts, and Wolf Grote, Metro Light Rail, suggested an update on transit technology selection for the I-10 corridor.

II. Project Outreach Update

Audra Koester Thomas, public outreach task member, provided an overview of the outreach efforts to date and provided highlights of the *Phase I: Initial Project Outreach Summary Report* that contained summary notes from each of the focus group and regional dialogues held throughout the summer.

III. Buildout Socioeconomic Data (SED)

a. Review of Final, Approved Buildout Assumptions for Travel Demand Modeling

Mr. Hazlett introduced and reviewed the datasets, assumptions and methodology used to develop the final SED model and thanked the member agencies for their cooperation and assistance in reviewing and helping to finalize it over the last several months.

b. Study Area Population and Employment: Existing, 2035 & Buildout

Dan Marum, Wilson & Company's CPHX project manager, reported that based on the data, assumptions and methodology, the model estimates an existing population of 2.3 M, a population of 2.9 M in 2035, and a buildout population of 3.1 M. Mr. Marum continued, reporting the model estimates existing employment at 1.3 M, 2 M in 2035, and estimated employment of 2.5 M at buildout.

c. Population and Employment in Geographic Subareas: Existing, 2035 & Buildout

Mr. Marum reviewed how the model projections distribute population and employment across the seven geographic subareas: Northwest, Southwest, Southeast, Papago, Downtown, Camelback, and Northeast.

Dan Cook, City of Chandler, remarked that the projections appeared to depict population growth to be static while employment numbers show tremendous growth and wondered if the assumption was that there would be a growth in commuting. Mr. Hazlett reported that based on the general plan data provided by member agencies, it does appear that more job growth is anticipated compared to population growth. However, Mr. Hazlett noted that there is an opportunity to consider alternative land uses in later phases of this process. Mr. Cook asked if the projections considered growth outside of the CPHX study area and Mr. Marum responded that the carrying capacity of the greater Phoenix area is approximately 10 M.

Carol Johnson, City of Phoenix, added that there is a local academic looking at the residential carrying capacity of the transit corridor.

Mr. Johnson noted that the land use data submitted for the model may not depict the future urban form, and as such, may simply be an exercise in planning with an emphasis on employment-related uses. Ms. Johnson concurred, noting that the model may be a more useful planning tool, specifically in scenario testing. Mr. Johnson suggested use of a jobs-to-housing balance scenario for CPHX. Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix, concurred, noting a desire to find 'balance' in the model and apprehension for a model that promoted sprawl.

IV. Initial Buildout Modeling

Mr. Marum continued his presentation, reviewing the initial mobility performance measures for buildout. Mr. Marum started by outlining the 18 key activity center zones and nine travel/origin-destination (O-D) pairs.

Mr. Cook noted some concern that the initial travel pairs might not accurately depict true travel patterns across the study area. Mr. Hazlett noted that the nine pairs was simply a place to start the analysis.

Mr. Grote inquired if Tempe activity centers were missing, specifically one that captured activity in and around ASU. Mr. Marum noted that the activity center near Sky Harbor Airport generally covered that area, but that the node could be moved.

David Moody, City of Peoria, inquired what the product of this exercise would be; Mr. Marum reported that the product would be projected travel times by mode between activity centers.

Mr. Cook acknowledged continued concern regarding the O-D pairs, specifically noting a desire to identify the key destinations from each activity center (origin). Mr. Marum noted that this was a dynamic process and the purpose of this analysis was to identify key modal investments throughout the study area. Mr. Silsby offered a suggestion of modeling am peak, pm peak, post-peak and non-employment activity for each pair, along with explanation as to why the trip patterns (O-D pairs) were selected (noting the reason to modeling a Glendale to Ahwatukee pair, for example, isn't necessarily intuitive).

David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale, noted his interest to see how the need-based transit modes model-out.

Mr. Marum continued the presentation, presenting the proposed vehicle and person cutlines. Mr. Cook suggested adding another cut line closer to Downtown (perhaps at Thomas). Mr. Hazlett concurred, recommending boxing Downtown, Tempe/ASU, and Sky Harbor Airport.

V. Review of Transportation Improvement Concepts and Transportation Innovation

a. Overview of Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) with Video

Mr. Hazlett welcomed Jim Townsend, Wilson & Company, to provide an introduction to the concept of Diverging Diamond Interchanges. Mr. Townsend provided an overview of the advantages and uses of DDI's across the country, noting the success of DDI's in converging activity within small, constrained footprints. As part of his presentation, Mr. Townsend showed simulations of how DDI's operate and a dashboard video of a recently completed DDI in Utah.

Mr. Meinhart noted his interest in seeing how DDI's address pedestrian movements to protected medians, instead of the traditional design of directing pedestrian movements to the outside/perimeter of infrastructure.

Mr. Cook asked if there were driveway cut restrictions when applying DDI's and Mr. Townsend acknowledged that the Missouri Department of Transportation did employ access management to reduce the number of driveway cuts adjacent to the infrastructure.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. due to an unexpected evacuation of MAGs offices.