



**APPROVED AS AMENDED
DRAFT SUMMARIZED MINUTES**

**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
PATHS & TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE**

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2021

Meeting Held Electronically

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Paths & Trails Subcommittee was called to order at 8:30 a.m. A formal roll call confirmed the presence of Subcommittee members as noted below.

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Donald Anderson, Chair – Transportation Commission
Kyle Davis, Subcommittee Member
William Levie, Subcommittee Member

ABSENT: Kent Lall, Commissioner – Transportation Commission
Teresa Kim Hayes-Quale, Commissioner – Parks and Recreation Commission

STAFF: Susan Conklu, Senior Transportation Planner
Kiran Guntupalli, Principal Traffic Engineer
Greg Davies, Senior Transportation Planner
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Manager

2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF AND COMMITTEE MEMBER

Susan Conklu, Senior Transportation Planner stated that Teresa Kim Hayes-Quale was now officially a member of the Subcommittee.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Chair Anderson called for modifications and approval of the minutes. A grammatical correction was made.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER DAVIS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1, 2021 MEETING AS AMENDED. SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER LEVIE SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED 3-0 WITH CHAIR ANDERSON, SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS DAVIS AND LEVIE VOTING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES.

4. TRANSPORTATION ACTION PLAN

Ms. Conklu stated that the focus is on refinement of the existing transportation system as opposed to adding extensive new infrastructure. The goal is to have livable street and community over rapid traffic thruway. For the streets element, the proposal is for several reductions in street classifications through the draft TAP, due to long-term traffic volume trends and 2040 travel demand forecasts. Type changes include: Major arterial to minor arterial; couplet to minor arterial; minor arterial to minor collector. Specific streets for each category of classification change were reviewed. Some opportunities created through street reclassifications include paint diet coordinated with pavement treatment; road diet; minor collector with no center turn lane.

Subcommittee Member Davis asked about the reasoning between choosing a road diet versus restriping. Ms. Conklu stated that they try to coordinate as much as possible with the street operations maintenance program. Project integration is utilized when possible. If no opportunities for integration are anticipated for several years, alternate approaches include working through a CIP or a paint diet outside of the pavement maintenance program. It is notable that the TAP looks at the next ten years, as opposed to the Transportation Master Plan updates, which take a longer range approach. Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Manager, stated that the draft TAP states that road diets would be considered as opposed to a paint diet when remaining travel lanes will still have enough capacity to add growth in travel demand.

Chair Anderson inquired as to the definition of livable street. Ms. Conklu said that the term complete streets is also used and is defined under all modes. Livability addresses quality of life. Mr. Meinhart said livable streets and communities as well as complete streets, focus on the concept of a comfort level using the corridor under any mode. The roadway is not seen as a barrier to the community, but as part of the neighborhood. Residents do not feel unsafe using the corridor. Speed is a significant factor in terms of safety perceptions.

Chair Anderson referred to minor collector streets with a center turn lane. At times, the center turn lane is removed to add protected bike paths on the side and he asked whether speed limits are taken into consideration. Mr. Meinhart said that primary factors are the volume and character of the street in terms of decisions to remove the center turn lane.

Ms. Conklu addressed proposed changes to the path system. This includes adding to the planned network. Side paths in some cases may be attached the curb, wider than a sidewalk, but not as wide as a ten-foot shared use path. Additions to the existing network include conversion of sidewalks to side paths. Some are being deleted from the planned network, due to the lack of

feasibility or costs. Other significant challenges included availability of existing right-of-way or easements. The proposed changes apply to approximately 12 miles in the network. Specific areas of the proposed network changes were discussed.

Subcommittee Member Davis noted that in Transportation Master Plan, side paths had assigned priority ranking and he asked whether they would continue priority ranking in the TAP. Ms. Conklu concurred that previous plans had Tier 1, 2, 3 ranking to assist with prioritization. The current approach focuses on primary paths. Mr. Meinhart said that in terms of side paths that have not yet been constructed, they will be looking at priorities such as filling in gaps, connections to regional systems, ability to leverage development contributions and federal grants. A separate element, the implementation program, sets priority factors, including how to invest limited resources.

Subcommittee Member Davis asked about potential plans to stripe sidewalks that are considered to be side paths, as this assists riders in terms of identification of paths. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that the City will be looking at striping more side path sections. One example of concentration is the Shea Boulevard Corridor. Subcommittee Member Davis pointed out high priority plans in the southern part of the system that seemed to be proposed as deletions, including the extension of the path along Indian Bend Road between Hayden and Pima. This portion was identified as a high priority path in the Transportation Master Plan and he would like to see it included in the update. A high priority path was also identified on Osborn between Hayden and Scottsdale, which is not shown in the update. He would like to see this portion also included in the plan. Ms. Conklu stated that staff could double-check, but she did not believe they were removed from the plan.

Subcommittee Member Davis referred to proposed deleted path at Pima following the alignment of the 101. From his understanding, the sticking point was in regard to the cost of crossings at major intersections. He is opposed to removing it in the plan, as it would be such a great north/south corridor. It may be a potentially good project down the road. Ms. Conklu said one of the big challenges is having right-of-way and easements in place. They have looked at neighborhood routes on either side of the freeway to be the nearby alternatives. Mr. Meinhart added that this has been looked at several times over the years. The freeway widening is all occurring within ADOT's existing right-of-way and they will not be acquiring additional right-of-way. The challenge of doing grade-separated crossings at Shea Boulevard, Cactus Road and Thunderbird Road across the CAP canal is daunting and beyond aspirational. The challenges are enormous compared with potential benefits.

In response to a question from Subcommittee Member Davis, Mr. Meinhart confirmed that this could always be reconsidered at a later time. Chair Anderson agreed that it is a great corridor, however he understands that the cost and location deems it likely not viable. He inquired as to a plan to look at alternate routes. Mr. Meinhart stated that beyond neighborhood bikeway alternatives on 84th Street and 90th Street, they are proposing to bring back side paths (the majority of which is already constructed) on the Hayden Road alignment on the west side and on the 92nd/94th alignment, there are opportunities to add to the east of the freeway in terms of completion of side path. There is also a proposed active transportation corridor improvement as part of the list of capital projects that would provide another north/south option.

Chair Anderson stated that he has received public comments asking why the City does not use the Central Arizona Canal (CAP) to get around in the area and asked if this is because there is no access. Ms. Conklu stated that there are existing areas east of the 101, where the rest of the CAP Canal is planned. The path would be south of the Canal itself. There are plans to continue

prioritizing that as a local and regional connection. There are challenges in terms of available space. Mr. Meinhart added that the Bureau of Reclamation allows no access to the canal banks. They have reserved an easement on the south side of the canal in most places that could be used for paths and trails. There is no legal access provided to the canal bank.

Ms. Conklu continued the presentation by discussing the proposed neighborhood bike corridors consisting of 26 miles at present. This includes refining the existing system along streets. Low stress routes provide access to a rider range of abilities, ages and users. Proposed locations were identified.

Mr. Davies discussed the proposed trail system changes, which currently consists of 150 miles of existing trails. This does not include the trails within the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, which includes 220 miles of trails. There are two main objectives with the trail element in the TAP, including enhancing the neighborhood trail network as well as having connections that link to the Preserve. Easements are required for the construction of paths or trails. Some areas are unfeasible for construction, due to terrain issues. Proposed changes were reviewed. The anticipated timeline is 40 years to complete the system.

Chair Anderson asked how the proposed trails at Desert Mountain got into the program originally. Mr. Davies stated that the City has been in trail and path planning since the mid-1960's. Many of the segments were added years ago.

In response to a question from Chair Anderson, Mr. Davies confirmed that the City is planning for potential pathways through State land parcels, as they are sold/and or developed.

5. GUIDELINES TO IDENTIFY PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TREATMENTS

Kiran Guntupalli, Principal Traffic Engineer, provided a brief background on the development of the document, which establishes an evaluation procedure and prioritization on the installation of pedestrian crossings. References used in the development of the document include: Federal Highway Administration Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) Resources; Arizona Department of Transportation's Pedestrian Hybrid Beach Evaluation Sheet and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The evaluation procedure includes three steps: identification and description of crossing location; traffic data collection and operational analysis; crossing evaluation. Considerations include: Origin and destination; pedestrian volume, vehicular volume, distance to the nearest defined crossing; posted speed limit; crossing distance; median type; roadway illumination; collision history; sight distance. Crossings are evaluated via an evaluation score sheet, with a minimum score of 30 points to have more controlled crossing. Crossing treatment options include: Improved street lighting; high visibility striped crosswalk; in-pavement signage; raised crosswalk; bulb-out/curb extension, unmarked pedestrian refuge; rectangular rapid flashing beacon; pedestrian hybrid beacon; traffic signal and separated grad crossing. Costs for various treatment were reviewed.

Chair Anderson asked for clarification on the 30 points necessary in the pedestrian crossing evaluation. Mr. Guntupalli clarified that 30 points are required in order to identify higher level crossing treatments such as a rectangular rapid flashing beacon or a pedestrian hybrid beacon. For local streets with fewer crossings, they typically use marked or unmarked crossings. For lesser treatment such as these, 30 points are not necessary to warrant the treatments.

6. OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PROGRAM STATUS

Ms. Conklu and Mr. Davies provided a brief updates of the following projects:

- Old Town Scottsdale Bicycle Master Plan
- McDowell Road Bike Lanes
- Osborn Road complete street project
- Path wayfinding signage
- Mountain View sidewalk
- Thomas Road sidewalk
- Dynamite bike lanes

7. SUBCOMMITTEE IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The following items were identified:

- Bicycle and related devices and e-scooters update, including proposed regulations
- Civic Center renovation

8. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved by Subcommittee Member Davis and seconded by Commissioner Quale, the meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

AYES: Chair Anderson, Subcommittee Members Davis and Levie and Commissioner Lall.

NAYS: None

SUBMITTED BY:

eScribers, LLC

***NOTE:** These are summary action meeting minutes only. A complete copy of the audio/video recording is available at <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/boards/Transp.asp>