

# Planning Partners

## Meeting #10 Summary Notes

**Date:** April 23, 2012

**Location:** MAG Ironwood Room (302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.)

**Handouts:** Meeting Agenda, Charrette Summary Report, Charrette Small Group Summary maps, TED Process Assumptions, Bundle Development, Draft Bundle A map, Draft Bundle B map, Draft Bundle C map

**Participants:** Joshua Bednarek, City of Phoenix; Stuart Boggs, RPTA; Rob Cox, City of Phoenix; Jason Crampton, City of Chandler; Robert Darr, City of Glendale; Ken Davis, FHWA; Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix; Terry Johnson, City of Glendale; Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale; Shawn Kreuzwiesner, City of Peoria; Denise Lacey, MCDOT; Ben Limmer, METRO; Jyme Sue McLaren, City of Tempe; David Meinhart, City of Scottsdale; Mark Melnchenko, City of Phoenix; Molly Monserud, City of Phoenix; Tim Oliver, MCDOT; Shane Silsby, City of Phoenix; Ed Stillings, FHWA; Robert Yabes, City of Tempe;

*MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Monique de los Rios-Urban, Bob Hazlett, Jorge Luna, Tim Strow, and Eileen Yazzie; Dan Marum and Amy Moran, Wilson & Company; Peggy Fiandaca and Audra Koester Thomas, PSA, Inc.*

**Meeting convened at 1:30 p.m.**

### **Welcome**

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

### **I. Charrette Overview**

Mr. Hazlett provided a brief overview of the March Charrette. He requested participants review the Charrette Summary Report and identify any ideas that were not captured or ideas that were unclear. He referenced the small group Charrette maps that captured the feedback provided by each group, as well as the combined map that reflected all ideas provided at the Charrette. It was asked if the underlying projects identified in the base map for each small group were also reflected in the summary maps, and Amy Moran, deputy project manager, responded that she'd go back to ensure that they were.

## II. Tier 1 TED Database Development/Examples

Ms. Moran introduced the project database, noting that the Charrette generated over 200 individual transportation projects. She reviewed the TED Tier 1 assumptions and how each project's performance was evaluated.

Regarding the evaluation criteria "Does the potential cost of concept implementation align with perceived benefits," Stuart Boggs, RPTA, inquired as to why subway and commuter rail were assigned a "0". Ms. Moran responded that without further study, it was unknown if the benefit would align with the substantial investment. She went further, explaining that in this initial subjective analysis, projects scored if only it was decisive in response to the question. Mr. Boggs continued, inquiring as to whether it was valuable to score projects as "yes", "no" and "maybe", as to not exclude projects immediately from analysis. Dave Meinhart disagreed, stating the "yes" and "no" responses provided some distinction at this early phase of analysis.

Discussion regarding the TOPS corridor ensued particular to how small groups applied their use in the Charrette. The conversation continued, discussing whether quality or speed of transit was more valued and TOPS use of dedicated and/or grade separated right of way.

Regarding the evaluation criteria "Does the concept improve transportation connections to Title VI neighborhoods and other populations with specific needs," Mr. Boggs inquired as to how the taking of land and other Title VI impacts were being accounted for. Ms. Moran reiterated that this was a high level screening, and specific details related to land takings was not considered at this time.

Regarding the evaluation criteria "Does the concept modernize or expand infrastructure that supports freight movement and delivery," Mr. Boggs wondered if the upgrades that might come with commuter rail might support freight as well. Because the conclusion was not clear at this level of screening, Ms. Moran indicated that it wasn't scored as to supporting freight.

## III. Bundle Creation Process

Mr. Hazlett reviewed the criteria for each bundle development and introduced each bundle.

Regarding Bundle B, Distributed Growth, Mr. Hazlett indicated that the Rio Salado Streetcar was missing from the bundle and would be added.

Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale, remarked that bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure seemed to be missing from Bundle B, as well as the other Bundles.

Mr. Meinhart noted that the exercise was short, and it did not allow for the inclusion of improvements that his community, for example, has spent years vetting with the public to include in future plans. He continued, remarking that he hoped this would complement regional planning and investment. Mr. Hazlett responded that additional improvements on the

mile grid were welcomed. Discussion ensued regarding potential future transportation improvement investments.

Regarding Bundle C, Focused Corridors, Ms. Jyme Sue McLaren noted that an east/west corridor seemed to be missing in the proximity of Glendale/Indian Bend. Mr. Meinhart noted that TOPS/transit oriented parkway conversions were shown in two of the three options and wondered if the corridors would be studied at that highest level, or lower infrastructure levels; Mr. Hazlett responded that they could be tested at different levels and that they'd clarify "conversions" and "high capacity" infrastructure with and without the use of a transit alternative. It was also suggested that TOPS corridors be reclassified on the Bundle maps as 'Transit' improvements, rather than 'Arterial' improvements.

Terry Johnson, City of Glendale, inquired on the use of Thomas versus Indian School on Bundles B and C. Ms. McLaren inquired as to whether a robust express bus element was included; it was not, but the team noted they'd review inclusion of express bus elements as part of the Bundles. She also asked for the legends to be classified by mode.

Mr. Hazlett asked that participants take the Bundles and review them closely so that discussions on additions or edits could occur at their next meeting on May 14; additions or edits were requested by May 7.

Discussion ensued regarding the underlying land use scenario (8 million population) and how alternative land use scenarios might be tested as part of this project.

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

Mr. Hazlett reviewed upcoming activities, including Bundle refinement and public outreach.

**The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.**