

Planning Partners

Meeting #12 Summary Notes

Date: July 25, 2013

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

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, Phase II Project Work Product list

Participants: Debbie Albert, City of Glendale; Daniel Cook, City of Chandler; Jason Crampton, City of Chandler; Abhi Dayal, Valley Metro; Matthew Dudley, City of Glendale; Wulf Grote, Valley Metro; Chaun Hill, ADOT; Laurie Kattreh, City of Peoria; Reed Kempton, City of Scottsdale; Ben Limmer, Valley Metro; Mark Melnychenko, City of Phoenix; Molly Monserud, City of Phoenix; Evelyn Ng, City of Scottsdale; Evelyn Ng, City of Scottsdale; Tim Oliver, Maricopa County; Dana Owsiany, City of Phoenix; Jamal Rahimi, City of Peoria; Andy Smith, Maricopa County; Ed Stillings, FHWA; Robert Yabes, City of Tempe;

MAG Staff and Consultants Present: Alice Chen, Bob Hazlett, Micah Henry, Marc Pearsall, Eileen Yazzie; Mike Falini, Dan Marum and Amy Moran, Wilson & Company; Audra Koester Thomas, PSA, Inc.

Meeting convened at 1:05 p.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dan Marum, consultant team project manager, welcomed all in attendance and led participant introductions.

2. Feedback on Previous Work Products

Bob Hazlett, MAG project manager, provided a review of the Phase I Summary Report, Assessment of Improvement Strategies, Interstate 10/Interstate 17 “Spine Corridor” Workshop Summary, and Freeway System Plan, documents that Mr. Hazlett noted help to inform the “NexGen” regional transportation plan. Many Planning Partners provided comments to these draft documents; final versions would soon be posted on the project website.

3. SR-30 Corridor Extension Alternatives Study

Mr. Hazlett provided a review of the high-level study of a potential extension of SR-30 (Interstate 10 Reliever) that could extend from the proposed terminus at SR-202L/South Mountain Freeway to Interstate 17/Black Canyon Freeway. Mike Falini, team member, noted the study narrowed review from five to three routes, ultimately identifying alternatives 1A and 2A as most feasible for further study. Mr. Hazlett noted the technical memorandum documenting the study effort will be distributed soon for Planning Partner review.

Eileen Yazzie, MAG, inquired whether current modeling indicates a direct traffic interchange at Interstate 17 is warranted; the team indicated it was. Ms. Yazzie also asked whether Phoenix's Rio Salado planning efforts were considered when identifying potential SR-30 alignments; it was confirmed that alternative 3 reflected those efforts. Regarding alternative 3, concerns were raised about its compatibility with 19th Avenue; Mr. Hazlett noted that its incompatibility was one of the reasons it was not identified as a viable alternative with which to move forward. Finally, Wulf Grote, Valley Metro, inquired whether a SR-30 extension would put more pressure on an already burdened Interstate 17; Mr. Falini indicated that it does, but noted that some of that traffic was already captured in modeling.

4. DHOV Locations and System Compatibility; Park-and-Ride Connectivity

Mr. Hazlett noted that as part of the Charrette process, approximately 73 locations had been identified as potential direct high occupancy vehicle (DHOV) candidates; of these, the team identified 35 locations for further evaluation (with many of the locations coupled with park-and-ride facilities). Mr. Grote noted that while evaluating the coupling of DHOV's and park-and-rides has merit, the team shouldn't overlook use of the park-and-rides by non-HOV traffic. Mr. Hazlett agreed, noting the evolution of DHOV's would be documented as part of the evaluation and "best practices" research (such as Interstate 5 corridor). It was also noted DHOV's should be as flexible as possible as its potential application throughout the East Valley is significant.

Ms. Yazzie recommended that as part of the evaluation, transit service needs should be assessed to understand whether such applications would be warranted, and particularly when reviewing applicable case studies, she suggested reviewing route frequency and ridership data to further inform the evaluation.

Mr. Marum reiterated that this effort was simply to set the framework for future discussion and study of the application of DHOV and park-and-ride opportunities in the system core.

5. Current Work Efforts

Mr. Hazlett provided a review of ongoing work effort, including study of advanced traffic management system deployment strategies, roadway preservation and maintenance, and diverging diamond interchange (DDI) conversions. Mr. Hazlett emphasized the importance of the forthcoming roadway preservation and maintenance technical memorandum in particular, noting it will initiate region-wide discussions on the long-term maintenance of system infrastructure.

Mr. Grote requested that with the proposed light rail extension along Interstate 10, coordination regarding DDI candidates along that corridor will need to occur. It was also offered that the Bethany Home/101L DDI candidate would need further evaluation pertaining to event traffic management.

Ms. Yazzie recommended that because the project had received significant feedback suggesting street diet and complete street applications, that perhaps an opportunity exists for the team to evaluate and document potential implementation strategies for complete street applications. It was noted that Phoenix's draft and Scottsdale's adopted complete streets policies might inform this effort. Consensus was derived to move forward with this effort.

7. Next Steps and Assignments

Mr. Hazlett concluded the meeting by identifying the next Planning Partners meeting, scheduled for August 29, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. Tim Oliver, MCDOT, recommended that as part of this study, a performance-based evaluation of recommendations should be considered (particularly as it relates to informing future decision making). After discussion, Mr. Hazlett noted that the team would consider the idea and bring back for the group's feedback ideas for such an evaluation in August.

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.