

Planning Partners Meeting #8 Summary Notes

Date: January 30, 2012

Location: MAG Ironwood Room (302 N. 1st Ave.)

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, Project Update/Schedule, CPHX Charrette Transparent Evaluation Determination (TED), TED Process graphic, Sample Improvement/Concept Strategy Index, Sample Improvement/Concept Strategy Review Sheet, Issue Identification handout, Year 2026 Cutlines and Cordons with Demand Over Capacity (for vehicular traffic), Year 2026 Cutline Analysis table, Estimated Travel Times in AM/PM Peak Periods (2008, 2026 and 2031; person mobility), Estimated Change in Travel Times in the PM Peak Period (2008 - 2026)

Participants: Eric Buskirk, City of Phoenix; Rob Cox, City of Phoenix; Robert Darr, City of Glendale; Ken Davis, Federal Highway Administration; Wulf Grote, Metro Light Rail; Michael Kies, ADOT; Carol Ketcherside, Valley Metro RPTA; Chris Kowalsky, City of Phoenix; Shawn Kreuzwiesner, City of Peoria; Ben Limmer, Metro Light Rail; Jyme Sue McLaren, City of Tempe; David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale; Tim Oliver, Maricopa County Department of Transportation; Connie Randall, City of Phoenix; Ed Stillings, FHWA; Michael Traylor, Arizona Department of Housing; Robert Yabes, City of Tempe

MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Monique de los Rios-Urban, Bob Hazlett, Jorge Luna, and Tim Strow, Maricopa Association of Governments; Mike Falini and Dan Marum, Wilson & Company, Inc.; and Curt Dunham, Peggy Fiandaca and Audra Koester Thomas, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

Meeting convened at 1:32 p.m.

I. Welcome

Bob Hazlett, MAG's Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study (CPHX) project manager, welcomed all in attendance and led participant introductions.

II. Project Update

Mr. Hazlett reported that MAG and the project consulting team had been spending the past two months: finalizing cutline and O-D travel time analyses of Year 2026 and Year 2031 networks for the Population 8 M scenario; drafting Working Paper #2 (to be submitted to Planning Partners in February for review); establishing Charrette goals, objectives and process; assembling materials for the Charrette participant notebook; and developing the Transparent Evaluation Determination (TED) process for Tier 1 strategy evaluation.

III. Revised Schedule

Mr. Hazlett reviewed several scheduling updates, including:

- Cancellation of the February 13 Planning Partners Meeting
- Rescheduling of the February 23-24 Charrette to March 26 (10 am to 4 pm)
- Rescheduling of the March 12 Planning Partners Meeting to March 5
- Confirmation of April 9 Planning Partners Meeting
- Scheduling of stakeholder and public outreach in May and June
- Cancellation of the May 14 Planning Partners Meeting
- Cancellation of the June 11 Planning Partners Meetings
- Confirmation of the July 9 Planning Partners Meeting

Tim Strow indicated he'd send out revised meeting invites reflecting these scheduling changes.

IV. Charrette Expectations

Peggy Fiandaca, outreach manager, facilitated a dialogue with the Planning Partners regarding expectations for the Charrette. Dan Marum, Wilson & Company project manager, noted that the participants' Charrette notebook will include technical background information, including deficiency data and potential strategies (including facility capacity and operational improvements from the I-17 Black Canyon Freeway Corridor Improvement Study/EIS and Southeast MIS projects).

Planning Partners provided the following dialogue regarding Charrette expectations:

- From a policy perspective, what will be the "split" between freeway strategies and transit strategies; in other words, what is the scope of multimodal strategies to be employed
- Outline the assumptions that have been made for the 2026 model, providing background information on how the model was created so that participants can better understand what demand the exercise must serve
- Using corridor information from the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study (STLUIS) study might be helpful
- Expecting that we'll be applying multimodal solutions; as such, it might be helpful to have information describing strategies and even potential strategy costs
- Identify where the true high density center are or will be located
- Need to discuss not just location of transit lines/corridors, but the frequency/standard of service to those corridors

Dave Meinhart, City of Scottsdale, asked about the status of the micro simulation model. Mr. Hazlett provided a brief update, and indicated that a demonstration might be possible at the next Planning Partners meeting. Mr. Marum noted that the micro simulation model will be utilized as part of this process, and that the Planning Partners would be helping to determine when to apply the tool to the project.

Robert Yabes, City of Tempe, inquired on where the majority of the population growth was occurring within the Population 8 M scenario. Mr. Hazlett reported that the majority of the growth is occurring outside of the study area, particularly the West Valley, with approximately 1 million population growth within the CPHX study area.

V. Transparent Evaluation Determination (TED) Process

Ms. Fiandaca introduced the “TED” process as the transparent process that evaluates the concepts/strategies identified as part of the Charrette, or Tier 1, effort. Ms. Fiandaca went on to describe that the screening process used the Livability Principles identified early in this effort for means of concept/strategy evaluation, and that each concept/strategy would be scored for its performance against the Livability Principles.

Mr. Hazlett introduced the sample concept/strategy index and review sheet included in the agenda packet, describing that each concept/strategy identified during the Charrette would be tracked as to why it did/did not make it into one of the three distinct bundles.

Tim Oliver, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, asked when the Planning Partners would be included in the concept/strategy scoring. Mr. Hazlett indicated that the study team would first organize and score all concepts/strategies, and then ask the Planning Partners to review and provide feedback.

Mr. Yabes asked if any project before or after 2026 were to be included in the exercise; Mr. Hazlett responded that the exercise planning horizon is targeted for 2050 to 2060. Mr. Yabes continued, inquiring as to how to ensure transit and person-modal concepts/strategies are included, as often pedestrian and bicycle options aren’t seen as competitive. Mr. Hazlett reinforced that the effort is multimodal. Mr. Marum went on, explaining that a bicycle framework would contribute in some way to the CPHX vision. Ms. Fiandaca continued, emphasizing using the Livability Principals as part of the evaluation help to keep focus on a multimodal solution.

Mr. Oliver noted that this project could become the basis of a future transportation plan for Maricopa County, and if we could not guide land use as part of this effort, would the recommendations that came of this study actually serve the future land use pattern. Mr. Marum reminded Planning Partners that as part of this process, a land use sensitivity exercise would occur where land use changes could be tested and ultimately reflected.

Mike Kies, ADOT, asked when the three bundles would be presented. Mr. Hazlett reported that the draft bundles would be presented to the Planning Partners at the April meeting. Mr. Kies continued, indicating that it would be helpful to understand the theme/philosophy of each bundle, and Mr. Marum indicated that the team has been careful to balance predetermination of what the bundles will be prior to receiving the concepts/strategies provided by the Planning Partners at the Charrette.

VI. Issues for Charrette

Mr. Marum introduced the vehicular travel performance cut lines graphic, articulating that its summarized traffic volumes across corridors. Tables, that sort data by corridor, can be provided to identify where performance issues are really occurring. It was suggested that definitions of technical terms, such as “cut lines” or “cordon” be included in the legend.

Mr. Marum then introduced the estimated person mobility travel times graphic that illustrated the estimated time it would take to move between activity centers, averaged across modes. Mr. Marum explained that they used the model to help identify the key activity centers based on trip generation. He then introduced a graphic estimating the change in travel times between activity centers from 2008 to 2026.

Carol Ketcherside asked why the downtown activity center did not appear to have any important trips to the East Valley. Mr. Hazlett responded graphics reflect the highest traveled corridors, but indicated that spider diagrams (depicting trips from one activity center to all others) could be generated for a select location.

Jyme Sue McLaren, City of Tempe, noted that concentrating on the percent change in travel time might be misleading, especially if travel times between pairs was still at acceptable performance levels in 2026. Mr. Grote remarked that absolute time or travel speeds between pairs might be a better analysis.

Mr. Meinhart suggested that a change in employment map to compare estimated travel times might be useful.

VII. Next Meeting: March 5, 2012

Mr. Hazlett thanked participants for attending and reminded Planning Partners of the next meeting, scheduled for March 5, 2012. This meeting, he indicated, would include several important project milestones, including acceptance of the TED process and review of the Charrette notebook.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.