

Planning Partners

Meeting #9 Summary Notes

Date: March 5, 2012
Location: MAG Chaparral Rm. (302 N. 1st Ave.)

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, Charrette Notebook

Participants: Chris Andres, City of Phoenix Aviation; Karen Apple for Eric Buskirk, City of Phoenix; Rob Cox, City of Phoenix; Wulf Grote, Metro Light Rail; Terry Johnson, City of Glendale; Michael Kies, ADOT; Carol Ketcherside, Valley Metro RPTA; Shawn Kreuzwiesner, City of Peoria; Jyme Sue McLaren, City of Tempe; David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale; Tim Oliver, Maricopa County Department of Transportation; Scott Omer, ADOT; Connie Randall, City of Phoenix; Robert Yabes, City of Tempe; Stuart Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA; Dovalina Ray, City of Phoenix; Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale; Denise Lacey, Maricopa County Department of Transportation

MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Monique de los Rios-Urban, Bob Hazlett, Jorge Luna, and Tim Strow, Maricopa Association of Governments; Mike Falini, Amy Moran, and Dan Marum, Wilson & Company, Inc.; and Curt Dunham and Peggy Fiandaca, 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. Charrette Attendees

Tim Strow provided an update of the Charrette attendees registered to date. Mr. Strow said that there were 22 confirmed, 3 tentative, 1 declined, and 5 MAG staff. He encouraged everyone to solicit participation. The goal is for 4 groups for a total of approximately 44 - 50 participants. Mr. Strow said the confirmations were needed as soon as possible.

Fire alarm went off at approximately 1:42 p.m. Meeting was reconvened at 1:58 p.m.

Participants discussed who else should be invited. It was mentioned to invite someone from ASU. Mr. Hazlett agreed to send the list of registrants to everyone to review and to examine the last round of outreach efforts to see if any participants should be invited.

III. Framing the Charrette Discussion

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Peggy Fiandaca discussed the charrette objectives, outcomes, process, and things to think about. Mr. Hazlett discussed post charrette activities, bundle evaluation and creation process, transparent evaluation determination (TED), and issues identified to date. Dan Marum walked the participants through the charrette binder materials. Mr. Hazlett wrapped up the presentation by discussing how the participants can ensure the charrette's success.

Following are comments and suggested changes made by the participants:

1. Consider housing type as part of the evaluation criteria because it can inform the type of trips. Mr. Hazlett suggested that at this phase of evaluation the livability principles will be used but as the TED process evolves additional criteria could be applied.
2. How will the study address projects that transcend the boundaries? Mr. Hazlett said that it is important to identify and address the connections outside the study area. Everything should be identified and compiled into the database.
3. How will capital and operation investment going to be handled and what is the modal split? Mr. Hazlett said that the study is fiscally non-constrained and these issues are not a charrette issue.
4. Page 47 – clarified that the 8 million population projection covers the MAG planning area that includes a portion of Pinal County, need to add notation to table
5. Add existing population and employment density maps for the MAG region and study area in the appendix
6. Maps 3 & 4 consider reformatting as 3D topographical maps
7. Map 10 – the BRT funded projects shown were questioned; should projects for which funding has been eliminated still be included in Phase 2-4 of the RTP graphic? Also note that the BRT on Grand Avenue is actually the Grand Avenue Limited – a follow up meeting with Valley Metro may be required – MAG to confirm all transit graphics
8. Map 11 – re-title the graphic to reflect that the map is showing first priority projects if funding become available
9. Map 12 – the map appears misleading because some of the express service is currently in place; MAG to confirm all transit graphics
10. Maps 9-12 – consider adding reference to Prop 400 in the title
11. Map 13 – the graphic appears to be missing some projects like the high capacity corridor on Scottsdale Road; also include future rail corridors; MAG to confirm all graphics
12. Map 15 – include a notation describing the TAZ numbers used on the graphics
13. Map 15 & 16 – it is important to see the relative change, produce additional maps that show absolute increase by TAZ to compliment the change in density maps
14. Map 28 – need to modify legend to indicate what “density of boarding” represents (i.e. daily boardings)
15. Page 129 – add dial-a-ride to the rideshare by mode and change title to “Total Ridership by Transit Mode”

16. Page 129 – consider adding pie chart to depict percent travel for all modes (single-occupant vehicle, HOV, transit, bike, walk), focusing on the peak period – MAG to confirm whether applicable data is available given the last household survey was completed in the early 2000s prior to opening of the light rail
17. information by time; change title to “Total Ridership by Transit Mode”
18. Page 130 – reverse order the data older to newer
19. Universe of Improvement Concepts – include roundabout on arterials
20. Include canals and rivers on charrette base maps because many will be future bike paths and trails
21. Add existing and planned transit centers and park-and-ride lots
22. Add cost/mode information; accidents, energy usage, and cost per mile for each mode to assist in provide comparison across modes – MAG to confirm which of these datasets are available
23. Add current bike map

VII. Next Meeting: Charrette March 26, 2012

Mr. Hazlett thanked participants for attending and reminded Planning Partners of the next charrette on March 26th and the next Planning Partners meeting scheduled for April 9, 2012. It was suggested to invite charrette participants to the April 9th meeting so they could see the results of the input received at the charrette.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.