
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the April 12, 2016 City Council Work Study and **has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.**

A copy of the agenda for this meeting, including a summary of the action taken on each agenda item, is available online at:

<http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2016-agendas/041216SpecialAndWorkStudyAgenda.pdf>

An unedited digital video recording of the meeting, which can be used in conjunction with the transcript, is available online at:

<http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/scottsdale-video-network/council-video-archives/2016>.

For ease of reference, included throughout the transcript are bracketed "time stamps" [Time: 00:00:00] that correspond to digital video recording time.

For more information about this transcript, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 480-312-2411.

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:12]

Mayor Lane: So I would call to order the April 12th, 2016 city council work study session, and we'll begin with a roll call. Let's just duplicate that.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:27]

City Clerk City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Mayor Jim Lane.

Mayor Lane: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor David Smith.

Vice Mayor Smith: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilmembers Suzanne Klapp.

Councilwoman Klapp: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Virginia Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Linda Milhaven.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Guy Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Acting City Manager Brian Biesemeyer.

Acting City Manager Brian Biesemeyer: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Attorney Bruce Washburn.

City Attorney Bruce Washburn: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Treasurer Jeff Nichols.

City Treasurer Jeff Nichols: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: And the Clerk is present.

Mayor Lane: Thank you again. So we are now in a work study session.

And I would only want to emphasize that this is a little bit different type of council meeting, in that there is no action taken on these items other than guidance given to staff from the councilmembers. As a matter of fact, generally on the basis of consensus on issues that may be in conflict with one another, we try to get consensus for direction. But those actions or those motions, I should say are not -- do not constitute anything other than guidance to staff to implement those items of guidance that we would hope to perfect for ultimate -- ultimately for a vote in a regular council meeting. So this is more of an open conversation on a specific topics with staff members and that's the primary reason for a work study versus something else.

PUBLIC COMMENT

[Time: 00:01:49]

Mayor Lane: We have for comment on a work study and I will say that this is an accommodation through the years to have up to just five three-minute, no combining of time, but up to five individuals to speak on these work study items and public testimony. And we'll start with Wayne Ecton. And next would be Bob Pejman. Former councilman Wayne Ecton, I would say.

Wayne Ecton: Thank you, Mayor. I'm happy to see everyone here tonight. I had the honor to serve on city council for two terms, but also served most of those two terms with RPTA, which is the organization that controls the transportation in the valley, and determines how the money is spent on transportation that comes out of our taxes. During that period, I became exceedingly aware of the transportation issues that Scottsdale has and that the entire valley has. I was a member of the group that organized and established the rules for RPTA, and hired the leadership of RPTA at that time. Since then, it has changed to light rail, RPTA, and it's a totally different organization that controls both buses and rail, the whole business.

As a matter of RPTA, I served as a chair of the financial advisory committee. I was vice chairman and I was also chairman of that group for a period of time. In this position, I traveled to Washington several times lobbying for money for transportation in the valley, as well as Scottsdale when I had a chance. Most of the conversations evolved around getting consideration five or ten years from then, and that was five or ten years ago. And at the point we are now, if you go to Washington, and try to talk about money for something in the community, you are going to wait 20 to 25 years. So we've delayed being able to do that.

After the voters rejected light rail to even be considered, the years have passed, technology has changed and it's improved. They can do things that we don't know an awful lot about at this time, but other cities are doing things a different way. I think that some form of multimodal transportation has to be -- needs to happen in Scottsdale, whether it's bus, whether it's trolley, whether it's rail, I'm not here supporting rail per se. I'm here trying to leave the -- trying to convince council to leave the words in there so that every option can be considered. I don't want to block us out of even more years than where we are right now. The risk of being bypassed by state and federal funds is tremendous to the city. Other cities are getting it. Other things are happening, and please don't remove the multimodal options from the plan. Thank you very much.

Mayor Lane: Thank you. Please, we do not applaud or boo or otherwise express our opinions. I very much appreciate the sentiments but nevertheless, just to maintain the decorum. Next would be Bob Pejman.

[Time: 00:05:58]

Bob Pejman: And to quote Donald Trump, the system is rigged here. So we have just me talking

on -- as far as being against light rail than the other ones, the other four -- or at least three are for it. That to me is a rigged system.

Having said that, I want to read a letter that I just got an hour and a half ago, a merchant on 5th avenue that tells you some facts that you may not have thought about. I can speak very directly on this topic. My store Kitten Retro Glamour used to be corner of 7th Avenue and Coolidge in Phoenix. We were a few short blocks south of camelback and 7th avenue, right by the light rail station. One of the reasons that I chose that location was because the local merchant association from the Melrose neighborhood poured a lot of time to Preserve the neighborhood to present a robust shopping experience. Then the light rail went in. It brought higher levels of crime and an open rail system for homeless people to escape the heat. The neighborhood rapidly declined and crime became a major issue with four of my neighbors that got robbed in 14 months. I moved because I had to call police several times for assistance with the violence outside of my store. I became afraid to work in my own store.

The light rail is not a positive addition to a high-end or midrange shopping or dining experience, although in theory, it may seem to be a great idea, it is not. The large construction period negatively affects access to businesses, and some of you will go bankrupt. People that utilize the light rail will not be coming to shop. If you don't believe me, or are curious, I would challenge all of you to ride the light rail and visit the Melrose shopping district as a live, true example of what light rail's presence does to a shopping neighborhood. I saw homeless people camped at every station, every day. I watched large groups of transient people come in and after light rail and proceed down the street, causing trouble as they went. I had to call police to have groups of vagrants help to move along for my porch of my store because they would camp out and block my door. I saw drunk vagrants nearly get hit by the train several times. It was unfortunate and very sad and at the same time, the reality that the light rail doesn't elevate a neighborhood, it actually degrades it. I moved my store from Fifth Avenue to improve the experience for the customers of my store, I absorbed the quadrupling of my rent in order to do this. I would have never chosen my current location, if I knew the light rail would be built anywhere near my location, signed by Jennifer Wamsley, Kitten Retro Glamour.

If that doesn't sink in, something is wrong with all of you.

Mayor Lane: Your time has expired. So please wrap it up.

Bob Pejman: I will say this, light rail is for redevelopment. It's not for mass transit. Uber, Lyft and extending the trolley system will solve that. It's a gift of developers. It's a gift to the bars. It's a gift to Fashion Square. It's a gift to criminals and it's a gift to homeless and vagrants and the list goes on and on. Thank you.

[Time: 00:09:40]

Mayor Lane: Thank you. Next is Steve Bonniwell followed by Mark Hiegel.

Steve Bonniwell: My name is Steve Bonniwell and I'm a resident of Scottsdale. I'm not speaking on

rail. I would like to thank Mayor Lane and the Scottsdale Department of Transportation. My wife Kathy and I are 17 year residents at Troon Village area and I'm an HOA board member. We have two major concerns.

Concern number one is 128th Street from ranch scape north to Dynamite has been removed as a minor selector -- collector, arguments for keeping 128th open. It's a logical access point for the 750 new housing units to be built in this area. It is also the logical access point for all construction traffic to enter off Dynamite. Number two, Serrano canyon and tiara state ordinances that were voted in favor of and approved by the Mayor and the city council stipulated that the developers will construct and pay for 128th Street as a minor collector before any building permits are issued. Number three, construction of 128th Street would be at no cost to the city of the Scottsdale voters are taxpayers as the developers are to pay for it. It would relieve the developers of the expense of improving 128th Street, a huge gift to them, while the surrounding -- to the surrounding residents and it is unfair and it gives the appearance of a city council ignoring needs of the community.

Number five, Happy Valley east of Alma school is a scenic corridor and a new truck zone. It was never intended to be a truck zone. Built out of Cavalliere ranch and it's estimated to take ten years and could generate approximately 7,000 additional daily trips per day. One of the stated city planning goals is to protect neighborhoods, from negative impacts, and to ensure streets designated as scenic corridors remain scenic corridors. Number six, chief fire marshal Jim Ford discussed expectations for the new developments in terms of safety access and explained the need for primary and secondary access to private properties, closing 128th Street would close off secondary access from Ranch Gate Road.

Our recommendation, we strongly urge the council to vote in favor of reinstating the 128th Street between ranch gate and Dynamite as a minor collector to be fully constructed at the expense of the developers, per the ordinances already approved. Number two, to stipulate all Serrano Canyon Cavalliere Ranch construction traffic enter via Dynamite and 128th Street. Number three restrict and enforce all construction transportation east of Alma school as this is a new truck zone.

Concern number two, the transportation plan identifies Happy Valley east of Alma School as a minor arterial. It would appear this section of Happy Valley doesn't meet the minimum standards required for a minor arterial. Happy Valley should be classified number one, it's zoned rural residential. It doesn't resemble other minor arterial, such as Dynamite, Indian school, Indian bend and up like the minor arterials mentioned. Number two, Happy Valley is not wide enough to be a minor arterial. There's no room for bike lanes or sidewalks. Number three, the roadway has not received asphalt for over 19 years.

Mayor Lane: Your time has expired if you could please wrap it up.

Steve Bonniwell: I will. Bottom line, we ask you as elected city councilmembers to make these recommended changes. This is an election year and there are many voters in the Troon Village communities who are upset by what is happening. In closing, we are not against growth. We are, however, against growth without the proper infrastructure to protect our investment, safety, and

welfare. Thank you for your time.

[Time: 00:13:49]

Mayor Lane: Thank you Mr. Bonniwell. Mr. Hiegel.

Mark Hiegel: Thank you, Mayor and city councilmembers. I'm not here on behalf of light rail. I'm here on behalf of high capacity transportation. I want to make that clear. It's not specific to light rail.

The future of high capacity transportation in Scottsdale has a major impact on the Scottsdale Area Chamber of Commerce clients. I call them clients instead of members because I'm here to serve their needs by increasing the relevancy of the chamber. I also considered the city of Scottsdale my client by advocating on behalf of our businesses, we hope to help maintain the vibrancy of the city we live, work and play in. We help to -- we hope to attract more quality businesses, help keep the ones we have stay here, while ensuring the wonderful character of our city that we all love. Companies moving to Scottsdale need to understand that we are looking ahead to their future transportation needs. Specific businesses like healthcare and resorts just to name a few, need to get their workers in and out of the city. As well as their staff. This not only includes their current workforce needs but their future talent, attraction and retention needs. And the impact that they have on their customers' experience. In fact, at our recent Scottsdale forum, where over 300 businesses and community leaders were attended, 75% thought we should have light rail in Scottsdale.

We don't know what we'll need in the future, but we know we need some kind of high capacity transportation, whatever that might be, by including multimodal options in the transportation master plan, it will not guarantee any specific route or type of transit. It simply allows the city to be included in future cities and discussions. A world-class city does not rely on cars, buses and trolleys to create connectivity between major economic and residential hubs, community centers and the entertainment recreation zest nations. The most connected economies in the world are the most financially productive and prolific. A robust transportation system that includes diverse transportation options played a major role in the connectivity and the success of these economies.

Scottsdale's style of transportation choices that includes streets, bikes and pedestrian trails and walkways, major arterials and freeways create the foundation for a world-class city. The transportation master plan proposes to continue building on the foundation by adding multimodal transportation options to the palate of choices and connecting Scottsdale to the regional system. We strongly support keeping these elements in the plan. Please direct staff to bring the transportation plan back in May with multimodal options in order to further research and assess the future needs of the community. We at the chamber want to partner with the city to determine the best transportation options to keep our city vibrant. Our kids and our kids' kids will appreciate. Thank you for your time.

[Time: 00:17:05]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Mr. Hiegel. Next will be Dale Fingersh.

Dale Fingersh: Mayor and Council, thank you. My name is Dale Fingersh, I'm a citizen of the city of Scottsdale. I lived here 18 years. I moved here from Denver, Colorado. I love this city. I'm basically asking to you consider the study of the transportation plan, so that this city can thrive in what it needs to do. My wife happens to be a director for Honor Health, and between the two-thirds and 70% of her employees and the employees of Honor Health, have to come into the city. They don't live in the city.

And there's a great deal, even in driving if you come off the 101, Indian school and Shea Boulevard are totally congested with people trying to get to work. We need to at least have this studied so we can see if there is a need for this for the city of Scottsdale. Thank you.

[Time: 00:18:25]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Mr. Fingersh. That does complete the five speakers. I'm going to take a point of personal privilege, though, because this is in spite of any concerns about -- that somehow or other this is by virtue of five cards which can he stand by for our work study sessions because we do not -- it is not set up for the same kind of testimony as we do when we give decisions or making decisions. I want to reiterate, no decisions are made today, except for some correction to staff in the refinement of whatever product is here in front of us.

But I do want to take a point of personal privilege just to recognize the fact that Marilyn Atkin who I know would like to have spoken tonight is outside the realm those five, but I do want to just say that she is here, and, of course, she's a long standing and honorable merchant in downtown Scottsdale and she just indicated to all of us, I would just like to indicate for the record, that she is representing 212 property owners and merchants in downtown Scottsdale and they are opposed to light rail in this. There's no precedence set with that, but I wanted to acknowledge that was there.

ITEM 1 – TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Mayor Lane: So with that, we now have the presentation of the one and only item that is on our work study session which thankfully is the one item of the transportation master plan. And here seating himself at the table at this point in time for presentation is Paul Basha our transportation director. Welcome Mr. Basha.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you Mr. Mayor and members of the city council. I would like to begin the presentation by approximately a dozen slides that are small percentage of the traffic and related data that was discussed by the Transportation Commission over the past a little over a year.

The Transportation Commission devoted approximately 15 meetings over a 12-month period to the topic of the transportation master plan. The commission received summaries of resident testimony pertaining to the transportation master plan. Many of those were through various electronic media,

and many of those comments came in public meetings in front of the commission in this Kiva.

The data I will be showing you at this time is very much part of the development of the transportation master plan. First slide is kind of interesting. These first data points are people who live in Scottsdale and work somewhere. 71% of the employees who live in Scottsdale work outside the city. The second data point is the number of people who work in the city of Scottsdale. 83% of the people who work in Scottsdale live outside of our city limits. This is quite a significant statistic. Many of the cities in the metropolitan area such as Mesa, Gilbert, Goodyear, Avondale, they have one-way travel. People leave their city and go into essentially downtown Phoenix to work. They leave in the morning and then we return in the evening.

Scottsdale doesn't have that luxury. We have a different luxury. We have people who want to live here and work elsewhere. We have people who want to work here and live elsewhere. That means we have two direction traffic every day -- every work day. It's a challenge to time traffic signals for two different directions of travel. There's also conflict. There's traffic on both the north-south streets and the east-west directions. This increases the congestion per vehicle. Especially those that are bedroom communities such as Mesa, Avondale, Goodyear and such.

Excuse me. If you would like, please interrupt me at any time.

Mayor Lane: Thank you. We have taken license with that.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: This is an interesting set of data, a little bit embarrassing to report. But this data is from the two most recent census years in Scottsdale. And it shows some interesting demographics with our city. People over the age of 74 years old represent a greater percentage in Scottsdale than in metropolitan Phoenix and it did increase in 2010, compared to 2000. It's also unfortunate to note, but the traffic collisions that occur in Scottsdale approximately 12% of those collisions involve people over the age of 74 years old. People over the age of 74 are over represented in the number of collisions in Scottsdale. A little bit sobering.

The next age group, 65 to 74 years old, that's also increasing. We have an older demographic than the rest of the valley. It's important to note quickly that the people live in Scottsdale over 65 years old are very, very active. Many of us work. Many of us work full-time, many work part-time and many of us are very, very involved in the community, even as volunteers about the Preserve or the Museum of the West or the Scottsdale center for the arts. These very active people who travel a lot on a very, very regular basis.

And then the third category on the screen, 45 to 64 years old, once upon a time, that was considered middle aged. I personally think that means young adults. And we have approximately a third of our residents in this age group. We obviously want people who are over 45 to stay in the community, as they age, and live here for the remainder of their lives in the 70s and 80s or whatever it might be. For all of these three age groups, we need choices in transportation. That is what this statistic tells the Transportation Commission and the transportation department.

Let's look at two of our highest employment areas in the city. First is downtown Scottsdale. You have 43,000 employees. Approximately a little over a third travel less than 10 miles to work. Just under half travel 10 to 24 miles, and then 17% of us travel more than 25 miles. This data comes from 2014. That's the most current data that our planning department was able to locate. There was a 10% increase from the year 2013 to the year 2014 just in employees in ZIP code, 85251.

The people who travel less than ten miles typically would drive on arterial streets, the mile streets such as Scottsdale, Hayden, McDowell, Indian school, Shea, Frank Lloyd Wright. People who would travel 10 to 24 miles to work typically would use a combination of the freeways. And then obviously people who travel 25 miles to work would use freeways if they drive or helicopters, perhaps.

Let's look at the location where these people come from. Many come from Mesa, Chandler, Gilbert and many come from Phoenix and the rest are scattered, relatively evenly throughout the eight directions. This tells us that -- that the southeast valley, the -- a little less than 10,000 employees who are working in Scottsdale are probably using the 101 and the 202 to get to downtown Scottsdale and that tells us we need to have strong arterial connections between downtown and the east of the 101 and to the south, to the 202. And then we also have a large number of employees coming to downtown Scottsdale, coming from Phoenix and perhaps the northwest valley of Glendale and Peoria. So we also have to have strong arterial connections to the west and to the northwest.

Next let's look at the airport, where we actually have more employees than in downtown Scottsdale. The travel distance is approximately the same. A little bit more in the 10 to 24 miles and a little bit less in the 10-mile travel distance. And then again the directional travel dominating from the west, from the city of Phoenix, and then from the south, which is essentially Scottsdale, but also Phoenix and Mesa and Chandler. Notice that the traffic is much less evenly distributed coming to the airport to downtown.

[Time: 00:28:15]

Mayor Lane: Excuse me. Just a note or observation or maybe a question and that is all of these figures that I see coming in from each point on the compass, all coming in to 85251. So this does not include the rest of the city as far as these numbers are concerned? It is strictly as to what's coming in 85251?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that's correct and the same is true with the airport.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So there will be separate -- or you may be looking at those as well in your presentation. I haven't gone through your PowerPoint thus far. So separate numbers for the Shea Boulevard corridor and for the second largest employment center in the state, the airport, we'll have numbers on those as well.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, we only have data for two locations. One is downtown Scottsdale and the other is the airport. We did not examine this.

Mayor Lane: But this is exclusively coming into 85251.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Two slides ago, that's correct. This particular slide is the airpark.

Mayor Lane: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. I got behind a little bit. I'm sorry. Okay. But the one I'm looking at as far as the 85251, these are the numbers for it. Okay. And there's nothing for Shea Boulevard?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. Mayor. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Okay.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: We gathered data on daily traffic volumes every even numbered year. This particular slide is our most recent from 2014. Again, arterial streets are the mile streets. Scottsdale, Hayden, McDowell, Indian school, Shea and Frank Lloyd Wright, those sorts of streets. The collectors are the half mile streets.

[Time: 00:30:00]

Mayor Lane: Pardon me again just for point of clarification. The airpark, one ZIP code?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I'm sorry, Mayor Lane, I believe it's more than one ZIP code but I don't know that for a fact.

Mayor Lane: But these numbers may include Shea Boulevard.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: They do not include Shea Boulevard. They do not go as far south as Shea Boulevard. I have to think the southern border is Thunderbird and Raintree and the northern border is north of the 101.

Mayor Lane: The only reason I ask about that, because in the master plan as it's been drafted at this point in time, it takes three distinct areas, downtown, Shea Boulevard, and the airpark. With two of them being much more intense, trafficked by commuter traffic than the -- well, two. Airpark being primo as far as the traffic in the area and our ability to handle it. And the next was Shea Boulevard and our ability to handle it and our solutions we are looking to provide for that. And then, of course, downtown.

If I were just to compare these numbers, I suppose if this is just the airpark, I'm a little -- I am a little surprised that being one of the premier employment centers within the state, and frankly probably attracting a great deal more, that the difference from the west is only -- is less than -- well, it's about 4,000 coming from the west. Just surprised me a little bit, because particularly given our graphics as to the intensity and the need for traffic solutions in the airpark and on Shea Boulevard. And this doesn't include Shea Boulevard, I understand that, but I didn't realize that downtown -- these are

commuter traffic. This is workforce issues, right?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that's correct.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So I mean -- I'm a little surprised that our downtown, you know, scores as heavily as it does in comparison to the airpark but just an observation at this point.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct, Mayor Lane and the Transportation Commission noticed that as well. The difference is the airpark has relatively small businesses, a lower of employees per business compared to the downtown. The downtown we have several large employment centers such as Honor Health and the Galleria and city hall and Fashion Square. These are all large employee -- employer -- sorry, large employee businesses.

Mayor Lane: But do -- and I understand and I appreciate that observation, but when we talk about employment center, we are talking about the number of employees, no matter whether it's big or small.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, sir, that's correct.

Mayor Lane: Businesses that employ them. So it's still -- that contrast still is a little bit surprising to me. Thank you.

[Time: 00:33:01]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: You're welcome. Thank you.

To the 2014 daily traffic volumes we have arterials and collectors. We separated the percentage of capacity into three different categories. On arterial streets, the segments that are over or near capacity are approximately a quarter of our street segments. The sweet spot, if you will, the traffic volumes between 50% and 80% of capacity are a little less than half and then those where we have less than half of our capacity are a third of the arterial streets.

Obviously, arterial streets with a capacity -- excuse me. Arterial streets with greater than our capacity is bad. That's congested streets and intersections. We also would suggest to the commission and the council that almost a third of our arterial streets having less than half of their capacity is also bad. That simply means we are devoting too much of our resources to not enough cars. We have too much land devoted to arterial streets. We have too much asphalt and too many traffic signals and too much maintenance responsibility for those streets. So it is both bad to be over capacity and to be less than 50% of capacity.

The positive areas are the 45% that are between 50% of capacity and 80% of capacity. And those are arterial streets. So it's a different subject for the collector streets. Again, collector streets are the half mile streets. Think of Miller and 68th Street and Granite Reef and Cholla those sorts of streets. They are typically one lane per direction.

So we have more -- we have approximately three-quarter of those streets that are less than 50% of capacity. That's fine. We can't make a street less than one lane per direction. We tried. It doesn't work.

8% over capacity is a bit of a concern but it's a small percentage, obviously. It is most likely just a few streets here and there that we could improve, either for the entire is segment or the entire section.

[Time: 00:35:25]

Mayor Lane: And before you move on from that, and I may be a little picky being near or at capacity -- or near capacity, versus being over capacity is a bit of an important element to recognize, I suppose, even in our analysis here. Are there numbers that would tell us what percentage are over capacity?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, yes, we have that data. I don't have it with me, but the near capacity means it's close to being congested, close to being over capacity and the decision we made with the 80% of capacity.

Mayor Lane: Well, if capacity is an acceptable condition. If capacity is an acceptable condition, or is capacity a problem?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane --

Mayor Lane: Do we have a problem?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, capacity is a problem. It's not acceptable.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So when we say anything close to 100% capacity, we already have a problem and condition that needs to be addressed.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. What we are saying is anything at 80% of -- any street segment at 80% of capacity or greater is a problem that needs to be solved.

Mayor Lane: Okay. The term capacity. We build a road for a certain level of capacity but if we know that that capacity is a problem, we should have built in the first place to larger capacity. I'm not trying to parse words on the thing and so I will leave it go at that.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, you are exactly correct. We in the transportation department, the Transportation Commission, if I can speak with them agree wholeheartedly with your statement. We should have built the street larger, more lanes, if we are at 80% of capacity now. And you will hear me say in the next couple of slides that we have capital improvement plans to improve streets that are in this over or near capacity.

Mayor Lane: Let me put it another way. If I were to build a street that -- I'm building a street to this level of capacity, I mean, if -- it would just seem to me that that would be a workable condition, which you just described to me is that at capacity it's a problem.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, Mayor Lane, that's correct.

Mayor Lane: Okay. I get it. It's got to be a transportation issue. So, I mean -- and terminology. Again what I was looking for here is what was over capacity, figuring that that was the problem area. Let's continue.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, if I may, let's stay on that topic for just a moment. As we are all struggling through some of this more than others, the Pima freeways being widen from eight lanes to ten lanes at a cost of \$100 million to the taxpayers of the region. Prior to that widening the freeway was at level of service f. The worst in the rating scale of transportation professionals. After that widening, if there is no additional traffic on that freeway, it will still be level service F. Adding those two lanes does not change its level of service. It will still be congested. And what we will experience, if we are -- if we drive on it, is traffic will increase. One of the unfortunate realities of streets and highways is that they induce travel. One maxim of freeway development in the United States, and I will exclude Canada in that, in just the United States, is if freeways solve traffic congestion, then Los Angeles would be heaven.

Mayor Lane: Well, and I appreciate from where you come from on this, Paul, but I would just say that obviously we built more capacity and maybe more people will drive it, but the fact remains, is you build capacity to lessen the load on the overall for peak periods, principally, and so, you know, there used to be just the standing logic whether it be in electronic traffic or whether it be highway traffic, that if you get beyond about 35 or 40%, you start to induce slowness in traffic. And the propensity for collisions at least in the electronic world, and so what we are really talking about is when does it become a problem? If you are at 80%, now I'm thinking what you are talking, about you are anything over 80%, you've got a real slowness problem. You may not be stuck in gridlock, but you've got a slowness problem. So you've got an issue that you have to address.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, once again, you are exactly correct. Over 80%, you have congestion. You have noticeable slowing. You have the potential for increasing collisions. You are also exactly correct with your figure of 35% to 40%. That is the highest speed on the freeway system is that approximately 40% of capacity.

Mayor Lane: We'll talk about this later when I talk about each of the areas before, the airport, Shea Boulevard and downtown and by our own estimates at least, from what I read and understand from the study, we've got two major problems. One is in the airport that we are talking about at peak loads, peak requirements and the other is Shea Boulevard. My personal experience, you can tell on both cases, there's a huge problem to the point of near gridlock. And so I think that as we go through this, one of the points that I think is important in this study, and frankly that we'll have to face is how do we resolve those issues on a more immediate basis than some of the others?

But anyway, that's -- I will leave it go at that for right now. Please continue otherwise we could go on forever. As long as you keep saying I'm exactly right, I want to continue to engage you.

[Time: 00:41:30]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Mayor Lane. The next two slides will list the highest 21 capacity street segments in the city. This slide will have the first 10, the highest 10. All of these are over capacity. Of these 10, I would like the council to note that four of these segments are on Indian School Road.

This is Indian School Road between downtown Scottsdale and the 101 freeway, and recall the slides I showed you on the direction of travel for the -- people employed? Downtown Scottsdale, that's the direct connection between downtown Scottsdale and 101, that's Indian School Road. Approximately eight years ago, the city of Scottsdale had a debate about whether Indian School Road between downtown Scottsdale and the 101 should be widened to six lanes or should remain four lanes. As we are all painfully aware, the decision was made to keep it at four lanes and a very expensive project of essentially a beautification project was turn lanes and very important bicycle lanes kept the motor vehicle lanes at 4 lanes. As the direct consequence of that, four of the ten highest capacity -- sorry, the highest congested street segments in the city are on that road, and that's -- pardon me, Mayor Lane, I like to encourage you, but you are again, exactly correct. We should have built Indian School to six lanes. We should have done that. We should have recognized the capacity needs in the far distant future 2016 and should have widened the street to six lanes.

[Time: 00:43:24]

Mayor Lane: Yes, Councilman Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Excuse me if I can call you Paul.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Please do.

Councilman Phillips: You talked about the freeway system and you said it doesn't matter how lanes you have, you have more cars and now you said we should have added more lanes to Indian School, and it would have just brought more cars to Indian school. It doesn't seem like there is a conflict there.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I would agree with your statement, adding lanes to arterial streets does induce traffic demand, but it's not the same as freeway, but your point is well taken and correct.

Mayor Lane: Okay.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Other two locations on this top ten of capacity are on Shea, east of the 101 from the 101 to 92nd Street are in the top 10. Now, let's look at those street segments

ranked 11 to 21. Most of these are in northern part of our city. A couple are on Cactus and one is on Shea. One is near Fashion Square on Camelback Road. Most of these 11 streets are in our capital improvement plan, either in the five-year plan or the 20-year plan. And that would be widening these streets to the ultimate cross section as included in our current transportation master plan, adopted by the council in 2008.

This is an interesting slide. It takes a little bit of explanation. This was the data that we used to develop this slide comes from the Texas Transportation Institute, one of the foremost transportation analysis centers in North America. They have analyzed 101 metropolitan areas throughout the United States, since 1982. And they analyzed the data every single year. The particular data that we are displaying here is the number of vehicle miles traveled per day, per person, and each of these 101 metropolitan areas.

We in Scottsdale are incorrectly included in metropolitan Phoenix and, in fact, the Texas transportation institute calls it the Phoenix Mesa metropolitan area. These purple lines show the highest daily vehicle miles traveled per person in those 101 metropolitan areas, and the lowest daily vehicle miles traveled per person in each of those metropolitan areas. And, again, the city of Scottsdale is included in the city of -- in the metropolitan Phoenix area, which I will show you next.

Since 1982, the daily vehicle miles traveled per person has reduced dramatically in metropolitan Phoenix. I neglected to mention this is for arterial streets only. It does not include freeway and that's why the metropolitan Phoenix area has seen a decrease in miles traveled, because this is arterials.

When I arrived in Scottsdale, in 1984, Phoenix had two interstate freeways and they didn't connect. You had to use McDowell Road if you wanted to get from I-10 to I-17. And since the mid-1980s as we are all keenly aware, we built a large number of freeways and many lanes on each of those freeways and that has resulted in a decrease in daily vehicle miles traveled per person on arterials.

Next, the yellow line will be metropolitan Tucson and as most of us are aware, metropolitan Tucson has very few freeways. So its daily vehicle miles traveled per person has remained relatively steady for the past 30 years.

The next data points I will show you will be for the city of Scottsdale, and these data points are included in the green line, but we separated that data out, because we collect data every even numbered year in the city. The daily vehicle miles traveled per person was higher than the highest metropolitan areas in the country.

We travel a lot in our city. There are a number of reasons for, that then let's look at what happened when the 101 and the 202 were constructed there was a dramatic increase in the daily vehicle miles on the arterial streets but still, we are at the very high end of metropolitan areas in the United States.

Let me stop there for a moment. I see a lot of quizzical looks.

[Time: 00:48:37]

>> Mayor Lane: Yes, councilman.

Councilman Phillips: So doesn't this -- doesn't it matter -- I mean, Scottsdale has like three major roads. So you are talking about arterials. Phoenix has ten times as many as we do. So that will lower the numbers. You are talking about number of cars per road as an average, or, you know, because you could see there's no way all the cars in Phoenix will fit in Scottsdale. So obviously we would be higher. How could we possibly be lower. We don't have enough roads, you know, we are long and skinny.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Phillips, this does consider the length of the roads and the number of roads by stating vehicle miles. That is the number of cars per miles of road. So that is considered -- it is both of number of vehicles as well as the number of miles of road, and the number of people in the community.

Councilman Phillips: Well, there's got to be some kind of an anomaly then because I can drive around Scottsdale and Shea and the 101 can get backed up, but you go down into Phoenix and you are not going anywhere. So it just doesn't seem to make sense. You know, Phoenix has more roads. You think there would be less traffic but they are all filled. So what's the -- how do you explain that?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: They have more roads and more miles of roads but they also have more people traveling. So this is a normalized number, if I can use that term. It considers three aspects, the number of people, the number of vehicles per day, and the number of miles, the number of miles of road.

Councilman Phillips: I'm just not getting how we can have more than that and I think something else we need to take into consideration, because were a tourist city, we have all of those people coming in for events and coming back out and I don't know if you are factoring that in, and that's why it looks like we have more because you have an event, you know, like the Phoenix open, you have 600,000 people come here for a day, of course we will throw this average off.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Phillips, that's correct. This -- the vehicle miles traveled does include all vehicles not just commuters and not just shoppers or people who live here. It does include those special events. It is on an annual basis. So when we have special events like the one-week golf tournament, that's included in the consideration. There's another 51 weeks of the year. So yes, that one data point would be very high, but the other 51 weeks of the year, we don't have that high of a data point. You are exactly correct.

The tourism is one of the reasons our daily vehicle miles traveled per person on arterial is higher than most communities. It's not necessarily bad that we travel so much. It just tells us we have a challenge. And we have a responsibility to provide a transportation system that accommodates that large point.

Councilman Phillips: Those in the north have come down here recently. There's nothing up there. They have to come down here to shop or golf or whatever they want to do. That creates a lot more driving too.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: That's correct, Councilman Phillips. That's another reason for this data.

Councilman Phillips: Okay. Thank you.

[Time: 00:51:54]

Mayor Lane: Yes, Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I was wondering with the construction and the increase for the 101 that we are undergoing right now, how do you anticipate that to affect our transportation on the arterials?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Littlefield, personally, I walk a lot more. The congestion caused by this two years of construction of the 101 has transferred to our arterial street system. Primarily Hayden Road, and also some of our east-west streets and even Scottsdale Road. Yes, the construction disruption has been great. Unfortunately, it's almost over.

The freeway -- yes, the freeway widening that's underway will be completed about six months earlier than anticipated. We would have been completed this spring, except for the rain we had last week. We lost a weekend and it's anticipated we will lose another weekend or two this spring. The paving cannot occur in the summer months because it's too hot for the asphalt. So paving now will not be completed until the fall. And as we are all aware, the freeway repaving has to close the freeway. So we only close the -- well, Arizona Department of Transportation only closes the freeway for the paving on weekends not on weekdays. Did I speak to your question?

Councilwoman Littlefield: I was wondering how would you anticipate once the freeway has been expanded, widened, and is finished, how you would anticipate a change if any on the arterial roads due to that increase in capacity to the 101.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Councilwoman Littlefield. I apologize for misunderstanding your question. We are in the process of analyzing that sort of data. We don't -- we don't have that to report yet. But what we have noticed is with the 101 freeway in the past, our traffic congestion on Scottsdale Road and Hayden road has decreased more so on Hayden than on Scottsdale. On some of our east-west streets, the traffic volumes have increased as a result of the 101. We expect that -- that pattern to continue now that there are ten lanes on the freeway instead of eight lanes. So yes, there will be a benefit on some streets. But there will be a detriment on other streets. And we'll be discussing that with the Transportation Commission in May.

[Time: 00:54:50]

Mayor Lane: Yes, Councilwoman.

Councilwoman Klapp: Wouldn't this slide correlate with the slide earlier that said that we are importing such a large number of people for working in Scottsdale, compared of other communities, wouldn't that compare with the vehicles traveling that we have so many people we are importing into town on a daily basis.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, I'm not sure why we have a transportation department. It sounds like the experts are here surrounding me. You are exactly right, councilman Klapp. All the data we have shown you this evening and the additional data we showed the Transportation Commission is all consistent. Part of the reason why we have such a high travel on our streets in Scottsdale is because we have two-way commuting. People coming in every morning, leaving every evening and people leaving every morning and I think I said that wrong but you know what I meant.

[Time: 00:55:45]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Vice Mayor Smith?

Vice Mayor Smith: Thank you, Mayor. I assume we have now gone through the 11 slides. So this is the predicate for the plan? I mean this is the launching point if you. I guess what I'm looking for but haven't seen is anything that gives me a preview of coming attractions. I mean, this is sort of where we are today. Normally when I look at a plan, I look at projections of where we'll be tomorrow. That's the need I'm trying to address.

I think to that point and maybe you will be able to address that in subsequent slides but some of the things that you have highlighted as being, if you will, problems that we're dealing with in our community, the first one you described, I think, as the unfortunate age demographics. I will let that comment go for the moment. But I'm not sure what that is telling us about the travel needs of the city. I mean, you said they are active people. And it's true. Some of them even come to council meetings.

We normally travel -- we the older generation usually travel at other times than 8:00 in the morning and 5:00 in the afternoon. I'm not sure you have explained the current problem with that demographic, nor have we necessarily set the foundation for something we need to address in the future. So I'm a little perplexed with -- other than being an interesting statistic, and, in fact, something that's been characteristic of the community for a good, long while. I mean, we are a retirement community. I'm not sure that that falls under the heading of a problem. God has a plan for us older people.

The other thing, it's probably more material, is when you talk about the ingress and the egress characteristics of the community, and we do know that, they are fairly profound, the number of people who live here and leave every day to go work, and the number of people who don't live here and come to town every day to work, it is a problem. It's the -- I wouldn't call it a problem. It's the

characteristics of the community, but unless I see this is going to be getting worse or better or know where it's headed in the future, I'm not sure that it is informative to the transportation plan.

And so I'm looking for -- I'm looking for is this something we are doing to aggravate this problem and make it worse or will it get better in the future? I don't see any population projections. I don't see any jobs projections. I don't see any impact on the ingress/egress problems. I don't see any other phenomena that may be happening in our community as well as the world at large, remote offices, self-driving cars, any of this sort of thing.

So my question is: Do I have a -- do I have a foundation for a plan or do I just have a current situation with a few problems that I need to fix? Maybe that's my question.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, we have a foundation for a plan and the foundation is our current transportation system and that dictates to us where we have current problems. We are continuing to predict future traffic volumes in Scottsdale in the year 2035. We use a Maricopa association transportation and we refine that work in the -- in the city of Scottsdale. Again, more so than any other community in the metropolitan area. So we are continuing -- we are continuously evaluating future land use patterns and the traffic that is generated by those future land use changes. That is an ongoing exercise. And it will affect our street system in the future. It will affect our transportation system. And we do include that. The transportation master plan.

Vice Mayor Smith: I'm sorry, you include that where, in this package tonight?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: No, not in this package tonight and not in the 2016 transportation master plan. It was also not in the 2008 transportation master plan, but it is part of our ongoing activities in the transportation department, and part of our discussions with the Transportation Commission and their recommendations to you in the future. This is a -- a general document. It is a direction and a guidance document.

The specific transportation improvements are included in the capital improvement plan which is adopted by the city council as you well know every year, and we will use this transportation master plan to assist us in the efforts for the next five-year plan a year from now and we will use the predicted 2035 traffic volumes in the development of that capital improvement plan. We're an ever evolving community, which is very, very good also, and we never have a stopping point. We are -- we are continuously evaluating our transportation system, continuously evolving -- continuously analyzing our transportation system, and we bring recommendations to the commission and to the city council on an annual basis for improvements.

Vice Mayor Smith: Okay. Well, I hear all of that and I think I'm -- I'm -- I would fully appreciate and expect that you do in the confines of your office look at plans and future needs and whatever. But I think you are going to be asking us to approve a variety of future initiatives and I for one find it hard to do that if I don't know what future you are trying to address. And there's nothing in here that's giving me the slightest remote idea of what the future is and so I'm -- I'll be hard pressed tonight to make any -- to approve any future plans to address a need which has not been identified. Thank you.

[Time: 01:02:50]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Vice Mayor. Please continue Mr. Basha.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The next slides. We get into the recommendation of the Transportation Commission and the transportation department to you pertaining to the transportation master plan. I will quickly say this is the 2016 transportation master plan.

It is the 2008 transportation master plan. It's 400 pages but that's not all. It has a 300-page appendix. We are much more succinct with the 2016 document. The information that's contained in the 2008 transportation master plan still exists. It contains the history of transportation in Scottsdale and even the history of Scottsdale. That's all in the 700 pages. And that's still a valuable resource.

But the 2016 transportation master plan is essentially a series of maps indicating the transportation system that we need to have in the immediate future.

[Time: 01:04:03]

Mayor Lane: Mr. Basha, to what extent do statistics and the transportation from the 2008 master plan used in what was once dubbed the update to that master plan? Now, it's more or less a stand-alone document. One of the reasons it's as succinct and concise as it may be is the fact that it did rely upon a certain amount of information from the 2008, the original -- not the original, of course, but that master plan. But it goes to the question to what extent were the statistics, the numbers, the facts, the figures, the population, I'm presuming that as you have indicated with some of the screens, the difference between 2010 and the present day, the age factors into some of those demographics.

But what about the extent of traffic situations on these streets? Has it been updated with current information from the 2008? And what was used and what wasn't used? What was actually updated in the way of statistical information?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, the 2008 transportation master plan data was used as a foundation for the 2016 transportation master plan. But the traffic volume and the population data was extensively updated and it is every two years we publish a traffic volume and collision report. This is our most recent, which is for the year 2014. And we used that information on a regular basis to evaluate specific intersections and streets for improvement. That would be both volume and collision data. The specific transportation data in the 2008 transportation master plan, pardon me is obsolete. It helps us to develop trends but other than that, it's obsolete.

Mayor Lane: So it was not relied upon for any of the conditions we were talking about here?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. The data we used for the 2016 transportation master plan was the 2014 data and the 2012 data.

Mayor Lane: Okay.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The information that was -- that is still valid is historical and narrative information in the 2008 transportation master plan.

Mayor Lane: You know when we get to that section that we are talking about, the answers that are being suggested for each of the overcapacity or near or over capacity situations that we have, I'm going to want to suggest that we look at those numbers. Maybe I was questioning sort of just from the standpoint of development and as I was look at 85251 and I see what's coming from the north and coming from the south on what I guess would only presumably be Scottsdale Road in this illustration, and the extent of coming from the east-west traffic, coming from -- theoretically from the southeast and, of course, coming from the west, almost entirely dependent upon particularly given these numbers, the city streets, this is in the 85251. So just to get some type of thought -- you know, how do you respond to the intensity of that 9300 coming in from the southeast, undoubtedly, it's coming -- it's coming from 60 to the 101 or the 202 to 101, and coming up the 101 until they have some east-west passage into downtown.

As we see from your other statistics, a lot of our east-west streets are over capacity by your illustrations. I'm talking about Indian School, Chaparral, some of those streets that would be coming in off the 101. So I'm -- when I ask about that and when I talk about that, the reason I'm pointing it out, is that the solution that seems to have been devised even on the multimodal side is Scottsdale Road centric. It's not really addressing where this traffic is coming from and how it would displace it. It's coming up the 101. It's coming down the 101, potentially, coming in from the east primarily. Otherwise, coming in from the west is coming into the city streets and we are not addressing that either. I don't know whether people would change their patterns or not, but that's not been my area of study, but that just seems like one thing about that mar area that concerns me.

The other two areas of suggestions, and that being the airpark, but notwithstanding anything to the contrary, is a major attraction for workforce. So it is a major component as far as traffic conditions during -- during commuter -- the rush hour kind of times. So the answers that we have suggested in the -- in the craft as we have it right now seem to go -- draft as we have it right now, seem to go directly to answering that problem, in a much more specific way. I'm talking about the frequency of 72 and the trolley system that's being suggested and so I'm just to put it on the record, I think that's an excellent place for us to make sure we concentrate our efforts and our funds is right there. Because it is an important component for us, as far as our economic development and the businesses that are in the airpark.

But just south of it, not so very far that it sometimes is almost included in that area is what's happening with Shea Boulevard. Another major east-west corridor. So we have -- we have some suggested recommendations there around increasing frequency of buses and maybe even some trolleys. I'm not sure whether that's a component on that one.

But addressing that issue seems to be a paramount issue in the here and now. The 101's expansion,

even though it will undoubtedly entice more traffic, it may be enticing more traffic back off of Hayden, you know, and, in fact when they built the freeway to begin, with our east-west streets were encumbered with traffic because there was no other alternative. And at that point we had to complete Pima Road too. Once they were built, that was almost completely alleviated that traffic congestion on our city treats for years, until it sort of built up to the point it is now and then during the construction periods obviously we are back at that.

I'm interested that you mentioned that the numbers came from 2014 because 2014 would -- would probably be outside the start date of the construction on the 101. So those figures would have been untainted with that, but, of course, also the impact of a growing economy is also not within those figures in 2014. I think between those two years, the two years, there there's been some growth as well.

Anyway, just to summarize, I think the approach that's been taken in the draft here, with regard to the airport, I think is an excellent one. It's -- it looks like an efficient and effective way to address the immediate problem. And I know that we have taken some steps with regard to the frequency of bus route 72, and a near express routing -- or at least that's part of the suggestion here, to really be able to facilitate better activity into that area, and the trolley obviously being a tasteful effect. So I wanted to mention that in contrast to what we are proposing in the south, whether it's addressing the problem.

The south when we concentrate on Scottsdale Road, as we look at this number coming into 85251, had of 6100 cars from the south, most of them coming in from the southeast or the west, directly from the west, it doesn't seem that Scottsdale is really the focus of attention to the preponderance of traffic coming into 85251. So observation at this point, but it may end up with sort of sealing some of the conclusions I might have later on. I have just wanted to point that out if you have some comments on any of it.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, yes. I have some comments and you are exactly correct, later in the presentation, we will be discussing some of the solutions. Let me preface my remarks by saying most of the streets that were included in the 2008 transportation master plan for widening have not happened. We have a capital improvement plan. Every year, you only see first five years of that plan. But those of you who serve on the regional council see the 20-year document. And it simply takes a long time to build streets and it's very expensive. We no longer have the high revenue years that we had in the '80s and '90s.

Mayor Lane: Well, if I might -- and I appreciate your response on this. But one of the things that we did in 2008, in that time period, give or take a year or two, was to continue to route in off the 101 off Chaparral, which was by design, why we made that exit and didn't include camelback road which is another -- an issue that was developed at that point in time because of school and residential community and that. But the bottom line is we didn't make any significant change to Chaparral. So it's a bottleneck other than two lane left turns to get down to camelback or some routing there.

Then the other decision, and there was a time where they were funds available, was Indian School and

you mentioned this earlier. Rather than expand it, and this was for the sake of the business and the community alongside that, it was -- it was actually contracted a bit, and made certainly a much more visible and nice entrance point into downtown Scottsdale, but its capacity was actually restricted somewhat from what it could have been.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that's correct. The comments about Indian School are correct. Your comments about Chaparral, prior to the construction of the freeway, in 1996, there were several segments of Chaparral that were widened from one lane per direction to two lanes per direction. That was prior to the freeway being constructed so we did prepare for that. There was one two-block segment that remains as one lane per direction.

Mayor Lane: Remained at that time but also in the second period of decision, it was still held to that situation. So, I mean, it was a decision the council and the staff made at that time, for whatever reasons, but the bottom line is it still remains one of those that are over capacity, maybe even the segments that were expanded, but it certainly is probably over capacity in that two-block section that you are referring to and I'm presuming it's a little bit more than two blocks. You are talking about between Hayden and Miller.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It's actually between Miller and 78th street and you are correct, that is the second most congested street segment in the city. Second only to Shea Boulevard at the 101 interchange.

Mayor Lane: Well, my point is only to the point that if there are solutions we are looking for in 85251, it may be in other places other than we have addressed in the draft.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Mayor.

[Time: 01:16:34]

Mayor Lane: So please continue.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Now we can discuss various aspects of the transportation master plan. We begin with policies and I would like to -- in the next slide, note a flaw that we discovered in the last month. The 2008 transportation master plan stated this, and initially the Transportation Commission recommendation for the 2016 transportation master plan says the same. And the document before you this evening says the same.

It says that only the Transportation Commission can authorize deviation from the transportation master plan policies. That's obviously a legal error. That's certainly not true. The city council has the authority and should have the authority to make transportation master plan deviation.

The suggestion that we have to you this evening is this, a little more simple, but giving the authority where it belongs with the city council and the city council may or may not wish to consult with the deviation from the transportation. That's something that we are suggesting we make in the 2016

transportation master plan prior to city council adoption.

[Time: 01:18:28]

Mayor Lane: I guess it brings up the question as to what the bylaws state for the Transportation Commission. I thought they were an advisory commission.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, you are exactly correct. The Transportation Commission is an advisory body to the city council. It has no decision making authority. It can provide suggestions to the transportation department, such as for traffic calming and it can provide recommendations to the city council.

Mayor Lane: So this suggestion really is only putting things in the proper order of where they should be?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that's exactly correct.

Mayor Lane: Yes, Councilwoman.

Councilwoman Klapp: If you are looking for approval from us, absolutely.

Mayor Lane: I think it's even a correction.

Councilwoman Klapp: If you want a correction from us, then I would say that any deviation for the transportation master plan will only occur with the approval of the city council.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Councilwoman Klapp. Let me ask Bruce Washburn if this wording is correct before we continue.

Mayor Lane: Well, remember this is not an action item. So whatever we are doing here is just guidance to make these changes for ultimate decision.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Understood, Mayor Lane. Thank you.

City Attorney Bruce Washburn: Yes, the language that's up there right now, yes, that would be acceptable.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Bruce.

Mayor Lane: Is there any opposition to that change as far as -- it's easy to say that the consensus then is give that direction?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, yes, I jokingly just looked at the chairman of the Transportation Commission to see if there was any objection and certainly there was not.

Mayor Lane: All right.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: This conversation is entirely too tame. Let's see I can change that.

Mayor Lane: I can see it coming.

[Time: 01:20:30]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: This is one of the policies that the Transportation Commission and the transportation department has included in the 2016 transportation master plan. It's the only policy that I'm including in the presentation because obviously this has had some controversy in the city. The suggestion is that roundabouts be the first choice of any new or improved intersection in Scottsdale between a one-lane per direction or two-lane per direction pair of streets. This is a direct result of the overwhelming success of the Hayden north side roundabout and you saw a presentation of that in a study session where traffic volumes have increased substantially and the number of commissions has remained the same, but the number of injuries per vehicle have dropped dramatically on the order of 84% in the number of injuries per vehicle at the roundabout. And furthermore, we are in the process of finalizing the design of the raintree connection from Scottsdale Road to Pima road and our consultant has discovered all of those intersections will operate at level of service a with roundabouts and most of those intersections will operate at D or E with conventional traffic signals.

[Time: 01:21:58]

Mayor Lane: Mr. Basha, what would prompt the specific analysis that you are talking about in this second part of this?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, this particular analysis would be prompted by a review of collisions and review of traffic volumes at street segments or intersections that indicated improvements were necessary. It's the process we have used for the 30 years I have been associated with Scottsdale and I'm sure before that.

Mayor Lane: So even though this would be the priority I suppose in consideration, we're still talking about it in just about every case we would be looking at this to make sure that it isn't prompted by some specific circumstance that might make it otherwise?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, yes, let me try to understand your question. The process would be our review and listening the town council and the Transportation Commission and the citizenry would discover a location that needed to be improved be it traffic volume or congestion or delay or collisions. Once we begin that analysis of what improvement is appropriate, then we would consider a roundabout first.

We would also consider traffic signals and other improvements such as turn lanes or additional through lanes. But our first thought would be roundabouts. We would analyze the operation with traffic signals as well and if the signal proved more appropriate, then we would recommend that improvement -- a single installation. If a roundabout suggested that that would reduce delay and reduce collisions then we would recommend a roundabout. The problem would occur first and then we would respond to an existing problem.

Have I spoke tone your question?

Mayor Lane: Yes, yes you have. Thank you, Mr. Basha. Yes Councilwoman Korte.

[Time: 01:24:04]

Councilmember Korte: Thank you, Mayor. So roundabouts improve traffic and traffic movement. They also have -- we have seen that they reduced the number of accidents and the severity of injuries when accidents do occur. Could you speak to the cost of roundabouts versus traffic signals and the cost not only of installation and maintenance but also is there more right-of-way required in roundabout versus signalized intersections, things of that nature?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Councilman Korte. There's not a one size fits all answer to that question. If an intersection currently is unsignalized, a roundabout would be less expensive than a traffic signal. If an intersection is currently signalized and it has a large number of turn lanes, then a roundabout would be less expensive. If an intersection is currently signalized and has very few turn lanes, then the improvements to the signal may be less expensive than a roundabout.

Roundabouts can require more right-of-way or less right-of-way than a signal. It simply depends on the number of turn lanes that are necessary. An advantage of roundabouts is it forces every driver to make a right turn. So you immediately eliminate -- I mean, yes. You immediately eliminate the need for left turns. You immediately eliminate the need for two left turn lanes, and two through lanes. So an intersection can go from a five-lane approach to a two-lane approach. And at 12 feet per lane, that's a substantial reduction in the amount of land that is needed. So in that circumstance, the roundabout would require less right-of-way. The Hayden Northsight roundabout required less right-of-way than a commensurate benefit with a traffic signal.

Did I speak to your question?

[Time: 01:26:33]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Vice Mayor Smith?

Vice Mayor Smith: Thank you, Mayor. And I don't think I need any comment back on it, but I'm not a big fan of roundabouts, just from a very personal point of view. I'm sure every intersection will consider roundabouts, will consider traffic signals. That's your job. You can look at all of that stuff.

If I were to do anything with this language, I would probably say that roundabouts shall be a consideration rather than the first consideration. I mean, they will be considered along with every other alternative. My own personal anecdotal party of one experience is yes, they are very safe because I can't figure out a way to go around there faster than 20 miles per hour. So accidents are very, very few, I'm sure. Confusion is at a very high level, but I would just somehow neutralize the field and say roundabouts will be a factor to consider as well as traffic signals and everything else. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Vice Mayor. Councilman Phillips?

Councilman Phillips: Of course you know that I oppose roundabouts. So you won't be too shocked to hear this. I appreciate the Vice Mayor's comments and's why I thought it was too far reaching but that's a good idea. If you just say that roundabouts shall be a consideration, instead of be the first consideration.

And I don't like the line that should only be installed or remain, because the specific analysis justified the superiority because then it will -- I don't know. I will say allow or persuade staff to, well, we have a lot of accidents at this one. Let's put in a roundabout. And we have a lot at accidents at this one and let's put in a roundabout. And pretty soon the city is full of roundabouts. Maybe they are safer as you go 20 miles per hour but the irritability level is ten times higher and people don't like them. And it's just a fact of nature that people don't like them and to turn Scottsdale into a city of roundabouts I think is a bad idea.

If you want to give it a consideration on a future intersections that are coming up that a roundabout is a consideration, I can understand that, but not to make it the first consideration and not to make it for the ones that we already have no go out and do analysis to find out if we should start changing all the ones that we do have, and I think that would have to be -- I don't know, it would -- it would have to be pretty specific. I know you said that it might be addressed by the public first, or something like that, but I don't want to see staff spending a lot of time and money going around the city trying to find places where we can put more roundabouts. So obviously I would not be for making this a policy element. Thank you.

[Time: 01:29:29]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Well, we either have a policy where we give first consideration for roundabouts or we don't have a policy, because by taking first out, then that just moots the entire policy. I'm not a traffic engineer. I don't pretend to be a consultant. I leave that to you, Paul. Though I do know and I have read enough to know that roundabouts are commonly used in many other communities and they have been used for hundreds of years in Europe, to move traffic and while, yes, I find them confusing when I first approach them, for the first time, they are pretty easy to navigate and most of us can do that. And if you don't like it, you can always find a way around them,

right? A roundabout of a roundabout.

But to remove first -- first consideration to a consideration then just moots the policy. I would prefer to maintain that first consideration as a policy.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. I'm -- I happen to be a fan of them but I think for the reasons that they create better traffic flow. They have proven to be safer and they are certainly lower maintenance in the long run. We don't have the dependency on signals in order to continue to have traffic. Signals go out and we have a need for individuals standing out there in a very sun safe situation, generally sworn officers, to try to make up for it. So I think there's a lot of huge advantages to them.

And I also certainly would like to give them a priority on that basis and the use of word "first," I think is not harmful to other considerations and those circumstances where they don't fit the mold somehow or other, and that's why I asked what might prompt that analysis a little earlier. So I think that leaving first hand, I think is an important component because we have acknowledged through our studies and that, that it provides for a better flow of traffic and a safer flow of traffic overall. As I think back to my previous comments of the east-west streets that feed into almost all of our employment centers, some of these might be candidates for better flow. There may be an answer -- I certainly don't want to take it off the table as an item that might respond to that.

And further, for those who are -- I don't want to be driven by fear of roundabouts, particularly since then five or six years we will probably be in autonomous vehicles and we will have the computers worry about the whole thing. So I think that's also probably something that will add to the enhancement and the utilization of our streets and our highways as far as some of that technology is coming along that might -- it's in a lot of different ways inclusive of dealing with roundabouts.

[Time: 01:32:52]

Councilwoman Milhaven: I was just going to weigh in to say that I agree with the Mayor.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Milhaven, me too. Mr. Mayor, you are exactly correct with the connection between our overcapacity streets and roundabouts. There's a direct link between them. We simply cannot afford, nor should we in the transportation department's opinion widen all of our streets to ten-lane streets, however we need to review the travel time, reduce the delay and reduce congestion and roundabouts are one technique that really reduce the delay, travel time, congestion and collisions. So that is the reason this policy was suggested in the transportation master plan.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Paul. Councilwoman Klapp.

Councilwoman Klapp: I also agree, I would leave the policy statement as it is.

Mayor Lane: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Well, I'm not so enamored with roundabouts, especially the two lane ones. I don't see them as the preferred traffic control devices for all intersections with one or two lane direction streets. Especially the two-lane direction. People I talked to don't like them. They are afraid of them. They avoid them. Oftentimes they go out of their way to miss them so this redirect traffic in other ways. And I don't think that's particularly a good thing.

One lane roundabout traffic circles don't have the fear or the negativity attached to them as the two-lane ones do. I have found pretty much universally the two-lane roundabouts are not liked. They are not preferred by our citizens and I don't support putting them in as a preferred traffic control device. I don't have a problem saying they are an option for consideration and it should be along with our other options and devices that we look at for controlling our traffic flows but I don't think that that should be the one we do first and foremost and everything else only if that doesn't work out. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. You know, one final thing and it's an anecdotal observation, really, and what has occurred at Northsight and Hayden as the basis of that roundabout that was installed. It was huge and it was a significant improvement during the season, the height of the open and of Barrett Jackson and otherwise, when it was really in trouble, really in trouble. It's been monumentally improved and really is, I think, served us well.

I think you probably understand that the consensus is to leave it as a first -- as a first option. A first consideration.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Lane: Okay.

[Time: 01:36:11]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The next topic of conversation is the Preserve area and one of the speakers this evening spoke to -- spoke to this topic, my good friend Steve and his wife Kathy. This is a diagram of the Preserve area south of Dynamite. The transportation master plan suggests removing 128th Street from the Preserve. This was a suggestion of the Sonoran Preserve situation. We have added by incorporating in the transportation master plan a narrowing of the streets in the vicinity of the Preserve and those are outlined in gray those four streets.

When Dynamite Boulevard was first conceived back in the 1980s, as an aside, I rode on horseback to determine the alignment of Dynamite Boulevard. It was quite fun for about two or three dozen of us. It was planned to be a six-lane facility expanding from our west border to the east border with six lanes. With the advent of the Preserve, we no longer have all of those houses and businesses and we do not need it to be six lanes.

The 2008 transportation master plan reduced it from six lanes to four lanes, and the recommendation

with the 2016 transportation master plan is to reduce it further to two lanes. One lane per direction. The suggestion is to retain the six lane right-of-way for Dynamite Boulevard, in the event that we are wrong which never happens with transportation engineers, incidentally. But in the event it does, we have the land to make it six lanes.

Jomax Road has changed over the years from being a four-lane street to a two-lane street, and if you drive on that street now, you can see parts of it constructed as four lanes and parts as two lanes, and parts as little more than one lane. The suggestion in the transportation master plan is to make it also one lane per direction, retaining the right-of-way where it is currently four lanes total.

Likewise, 128th Street south of Ranch Gate Road, excuse me, that little served street with the reverse curve, east-west is Ranch Gate Road that Mr. Bonniwell mentioned. That has been constructed as one lane per direction. We have been in conversations with the state land department which owns the property north of the street, and they are very much interested in this proposal. What they can do is leave the existing street for eastbound travel and then construct a raised landscape median and westbound lanes in addition just north of the existing street.

As Mr. Bonniwell mentioned, 128th Street south of Ranch Gate Road has been required as a stipulation in a development agreement for better -- better said, not as a stipulation, but as a condition within the development agreement for a Cavalliere Ranch and its name is changing, it's now being called story rock, incidentally. That development is required to construct 128th Street full width for the full length from Ranch Gate Road to the Tom Thumb trail head. Not north of Ranch Gate Road. That development was not constructed to construct 128th Street through the Preserve. That portion should be retained in our transportation mastery plan, contrary from the recommendation of the commission and the department. That street would need to be constructed by the citizens of Scottsdale, either through our local sales tax or regional sales tax.

[Time: 01:40:25]

Mayor Lane: Mr. Basha, just so I can get my bearings and maybe others too. Ranch Gate is where?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Excuse me, it's an east-west street, it's the gray line with the first curve in it. I'm sorry, for some reason, the little -- it's this road right here.

Mayor Lane: Oh, all right. All right. So what is indicated there as a black line from that intersection with 128th Street south of ranch gate, that is to be constructed or is currently in the plan? Just to the -- to the Preserve? And not through the Preserve?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I'm sorry, sir. I'm having difficulty with this.

Mayor Lane: The little dash --

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The little black line.

Mayor Lane: The little black line at Ranch Gate and 128th Street.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, I understand.

Mayor Lane: Is that a built road right now?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It is not. It's a dirt road and it serves a home that is not part of the story rock or Cavalliere Ranch property.

Mayor Lane: I see.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: So that street does need to exist --

Mayor Lane: It's a private road.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It would be a public street, and I need to quickly say that we would retain the right of way through the Preserve for 128th Street and that would become an emergency access for firefighters and police and ambulances as necessary. So that little black stub to the north of ranch gate on 128th Street would be paved and there would be a paved road through the Preserve, but only for emergency access and it would be gated.

Mayor Lane: Would it be some lesser quality, not up to standards how is it that that would be? Is it dirt or gravel or fully paved road?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It would be fully paved.

Mayor Lane: So it's also something that the citizens of Scottsdale would be paying for?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that's correct. It would be narrow. It would be only 20 feet of pavement and then it would have minimal shoulders. Not a typical street of 22 to 34 feet wide. It would also not meet geometric design requirements for hills and valleys. It would only need to meet fire vehicle travel.

Mayor Lane: They sometimes have stiffer standards than a normal for off road four-wheeling vehicle.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, they certainly do, especially with turning radii. But not with hills and valleys and downgrades and upgrades and such.

Mayor Lane: All right. Okay. So the recommendation is to build it through the Preserve but not to have access to the use of it?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Mayor Lane: For normal traffic?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It would be emergency access only.

Mayor Lane: That's what the recommendation is on the table? And what is being requested is that it be completed as a road, is it?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The Transportation Commission and transportation department recommendation is to remove the street as --

Mayor Lane: I'm sorry, what was suggested here?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: What was suggested here, what was suggested on this slide.

Mayor Lane: Okay. I'm sorry. Yes, Vice Mayor?

[Time: 01:43:50]

Vice Mayor Smith: Thank you, Mayor. And in the interest of full disclosure, I live on Happy Valley Road. That's not necessarily a conflict. It's probably just a statement that we had more awareness of what is happening there than perhaps other citizens might. But eliminating this road that was going to be the extension of the completion of 128th Street eliminates one point of ingress, egress, whatever you want to call it for the new residence in Cavalliere Park and all of these other areas; is that right? I mean, their only point of egress now will be Ranch Gate Road?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, that is correct.

Vice Mayor Smith: You said, Mr. Basha, at one point in late 2014, when you were testifying to the Preserve commission, that we need a minimum -- in communities of the city, we need a minimum of two points of access. About a year later you seem to have changed your mind. Can you share with me and everyone else why you changed your mind?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, again, you are exactly correct. Representing the transportation department, there was a change in our opinion, and that change occurred in deliberation with a large number of different disciplines in the city represented, including police and fire and various different planning agencies and the parks and recreation -- the community services division as well. Approximately two to three dozen people deliberated on this issue over a number of months. And what we discovered is there's a fairly large number of developments in Scottsdale with more homes than exist in Cavalliere Ranch, the proposed Cavalliere Ranch, with only one means of access.

Vice Mayor Smith: Well, that's not particularly relevant in my mind. If we have problems elsewhere in the city that doesn't mean we create a problem here. I'm just talking about this area.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The point is there's no other problems in the other areas. They function quite well.

Vice Mayor Smith: That's why I'm not talking about the other areas one way or the other. That's why I'm just talking about here.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, and our point is this one means of access for those homes serves fewer homes than other successful areas where we have one means of access for a larger number of homes.

Vice Mayor Smith: Let me interrupt you. I have thought the ingress/egress issue was a matter of safety as much as it was convenience of residence. In other words if there's only one way out of dodge, which is what you are proposing here -- because this road you build through the Preserve will be locked on both ends, right?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, sir.

Vice Mayor Smith: So we will build a road and then we will install locks? And we will build this road, I presume, because somebody, probably the fire marshal said we need a way to get in there and for the people to get out.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, that's true.

Vice Mayor Smith: Do you realize how bizarre that sounds?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: No, sir.

Vice Mayor Smith: Well, then let me tell you how bizarre that sounds. Because you are somehow concluding that we do not need a road through the Preserve or should not have a road through the Preserve and I don't know whether you are doing that so that the animals will be able to follow this twisting trail to get from the north to the south part of the Preserve, and if you are, trust me, the animals will find their own way. They don't follow the transportation established routes.

We are going to build a road but we are going to tell the residents they cannot use that road, unless and the potential circumstance that the entire area catches fire, then they should be prepared to use that road to exit their home site and somebody will come out and remove the locks? I'm as much of a fan and supporter of the Preserve as anyone, but I do not see that this would be invasion of the Preserve acreage to allow people to travel on the road that you are going to build anyway, and it is not, in my judgment likely to inhibit the free flow of animals from east to west in the Preserve, because frankly, if they get across this road, you are going to build but not use, then they travel only a quarter of a mile north and they run into another road that you have built and are using which is Dynamite.

I don't think we can adopt a policy that puts the interests of animals above the interests of our citizens.

And in my judgment, the citizens who are living there -- and by the way, if I had been here, I probably wouldn't have voted for these developments anyway, but they are there. They are going to be built, and we will have fellow citizens living there. And as long as we do, I cannot in good conscience put their rights and interests beneath the rights and the interests of animals that might want to migrate from east to west, across a road. And I also cannot put the interests of the people who live along Happy Valley that bought it with an anticipation of a certain amount of traffic over time. I cannot put them at a disadvantage of suddenly capturing all the traffic from these people, even if the people want to go north, even if the people want to go to Dynamite and go to the east. They'll still have to go on Happy Valley, some portion of Happy Valley and it's -- the construction traffic on Happy Valley, the traffic from the developments, to shift all of this traffic dynamic to Happy Valley, just so we can avoid using not building but using a road that we will build through the Preserve -- I repeat, I think it sounds bizarre. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Smith: And I would be against it.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, we have a large number of our roads that are built then gated and can only be used by certain people. And if the fire or the police department need to enter those communities through those gates they have to stop and get out of their vehicles and unlock the gates. It's been quite successful.

Vice Mayor Smith: I'm giving you my council advice and I'm not trying to engage in an argument with you. I think if we are going to build a road, we allow the residents to use it in this case. That's my recommendation.

[Time: 01:51:32]

Mayor Lane: Okay. Thank you. Councilman Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Yeah, and then, you know, to vice Mayor's comments, I don't want to upset the Preserve people, but I don't even see why we purchased this land for the Preserve. It's odd that we would jump around and go there and connect again and where are we going with this thing, you know? But we did and now we have developers wanting to bill all the way around it and now we want to take out a road.

You know, there just wasn't a lot of planning going on here and I can see that, you know, maybe you are now stuck between a rock and a hard place of trying to find the solution. But I don't think we should be putting this in the master plan because I don't think we have a solution yet. You know, I don't know if we have to go back to the developers and say, well, you know maybe we need 120th street to go through around that curve, do we have another way out or widen 118th Street or something.

I'm up there all the time too. I don't live there but the people that live in Troon live there. I know

Happy Valley and I was up there the other day and when you get stopped at the Happy Valley and Alma School, which probably would be a good roundabout, from then on it's kind of -- it's a four lane road, but it's got the island in the middle and it's very rural. I saw three dump trucks coming up there. I thought, wow, it's just tearing up the road. I can't see this. I can't see that being used for that. It's just not big enough. It's not wide enough.

And then I'm surprised to hear you say that you will cut down on Dynamite because I know down about 175th avenue and Dynamite, they are building like 400 or so homes. It seems like they are selling like hot cakes down there. So I don't see where someone came up with the idea that Dynamite is not going to be a busy road. It is. You certainly don't want to go it less than two lanes, but it's already getting backed up. So I don't understand that either but I think we needed to get with these developers, you know, council allowed the developers to up zone the properties and build more homes than they should have and now we are stuck with this problem.

I would say and I don't know if this was vice Mayor Smith's idea, but just not to include this in the master plan at this time, because I don't think this is mixed. I don't think it's right. I don't think it's going to work and I think we have to another solution to this. So I would say before we put it on the master plan, let's find something that actually works.

[Time: 01:54:06]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman Phillips. Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Thank you, Mayor. Well, there was a lot of planning on this Preserve and this particular area of the Preserve. I believe it's called the goose neck.

It was planned long before the -- well, it was planned -- it was planned along -- long before the 2008 transportation master plan but I don't believe it was purchased until -- well, I can't remember but Kroy is standing up there. It was probably around 2010, somewhere around in there it was purchased. So the 128th Street right-of-way was there. But to say that this goose neck is not an important part of this Preserve, I think is one of the critical parts of the Preserve, because it is that connection between the southern portion of our Preserve that incorporates the mountains to the northern section of the Preserve that incorporated all the Brown Ranch and Granite Mountain.

And that connectivity is critical. I can speak with my biology hat on. It's critical to wildlife and wildlife corridors. And you might think that animals are not going to follow that cute little curve. Well, that -- that goose neck is about two and a half miles wide, I'm thinking. One and a half miles. Thank you, Kroy, but one and a half mile wide, that is a significant swath that protects that important corridor for wildlife and that is one of the primary reasons that I'm supporting the Transportation Commission's and the transportation department's recommendation to close that off from public use.

[Time: 01:56:14]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Yes, Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Mr. Basha, I understand speaker's concern about the construction traffic going through their neighborhoods but if I recall, Happy Valley is not a truck route. Could you explain the truck routes and where the construction traffic would be allowed or not allowed to travel to the already approved but not yet constructed development?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Milhaven, Happy Valley road is a truck route from Alma School to Pima Road. To the east --

Councilwoman Milhaven: Okay it again. So east.

Councilwoman Milhaven: East of Happy Valley it is not a truck route.

Councilwoman Milhaven: So construction traffic would have to either go up Dynamite to 118th Street, to get to that little piece that's embedded in the goose neck or it would have to be you will to Happy Valley and then north on Alma School? Is Alma School a truck route?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, Alma School is a truck route. However, our truck route ordinance allows trucks on non-truck route streets if it is the shortest distance between an origin and a destination. We all move one time or another in our lives and we all purchase things that are too big to fit in our cars. So we need to allow trucks on virtually all trucks if they have a reason to be there and construction is a reason to be on a street.

The 118th Street does not exist between Ranch Gate Road and Dynamite Boulevard to its appropriate width. There is some pavement in certain areas of it. The transportation master plan for decades has included the extension of Happy Valley Road to north to connect with Dynamite Boulevard. The 2008 transportation master plan included that. The 2016 transportation master plan is suggesting to include 118th Street.

The -- the capital improvement plans that you will see in the future will include 108th street -- 118th Street's construction sometime in the future. There was never a plan to construct 128th Street through the Preserve. It's never been in a capital improvement plan, not even our 20-year plan. So this is really not a change in terms of construction -- constructing a street.

As Councilman Phillips and Councilwoman Milhaven recall, we met with the board of directors of one of the homeowners associations in the vicinity, and they requested that 118th Street be included in a future capital improvement plan, and representing the transportation department, I committed to including 118th Street in a future capital improvement plan and not this year, because we were well underway with that planning, but next year we will include 118th Street somewhere in our next five-year capital improvement plan. That street would provide access to Dynamite Boulevard.

When it comes to construction truck traffic, we can designate truck routes and, again, Councilman Phillips and Councilwoman Milhaven, when we met with the Four Peaks Desert Views Homeowners Association, they expressed gratitude that Dynamite was a designated truck route for the construction

of the old Reata pass property and Dynamite to Alma School was the designated truck route for that construction activity and we could certainly have that same requirement for the development of story rock and other developments in that area. Requiring trucks to use Dynamite to Alma School to Jomax to 118th Street to Ranch Gate Road. Those -- the critical part would be the portion of 118th Street between Ranch Gate and Jomax. It does not exist as a standard street.

Councilwoman Milhaven: So that would -- I think I followed what you said, was to do whatever we had to do to keep the construction traffic out of those neighborhoods. I think what he was saying is 128th would be an option versus 118th Street but if we have to construct two roads -- I don't see that we have the resources to construct two roads.

And then the other is, you know, driving -- I have driven that Dynamite through 128th Street down to Ranch Gate and I can't see us investing much money in improving that road and no development is going to happen on either side of that section to make that happen. So I don't see that that will be a reasonable option for construction traffic and trucks. We won't improve it to a level that will be usable.

So I'm -- I guess I'm comfortable with what you have got here but I would sure like to see what we could do to in order to redirect construction traffic to minimize the impact on the neighborhoods. Thank you.

[Time: 02:02:03]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you. I do not agree with closing 128th Street right now. We need that street. I think it should be improved by the developers of Serrano canyon as per the improvements agreed upon as part of the conditions of their projects.

I think that -- I went out with my husband. We drove all around there. We looked at all the streets. We drove down 128th Street in his little Corolla. He needs a few improvements. But the fact that it runs through the Preserve, it's really not a nonstarter for me, because we already have a street running right through the Preserve and through that neck if you look at Dynamite.

I think at a minimum, a very minimum, 128th Street should be improved and it should stay open at least until all the construction of those three projects are completed. This is to keep the construction at a minimum, and the traffic at a minimum through those nearby neighborhoods that the trucks go through. It will be a lot of traffic. It will be a lot of trucks and it will be a long time to try to put that kind of load on the residents in the Troon Villages. Construction of these developments when it's been completed, then further consideration should be made to see if we want to gate it off at that point in time or if he with want to keep it going.

We should build 118th Street through. It dead ends right now. You can't get through. So you can't use that street at all right now, in order to go from Dynamite and down into the areas where the

construction is going to be. So that has to happen first before we close off 128th Street. Again, to keep the traffic away from Troon.

I believe it's too early in the process to close 128th Street right now on the hope of a future construction of 118th as a permanent replacement. We know for a fact the estimated time for the construction traffic is going to be a major factor for the next ten years. That's a long time to make people endure that kind of heavy duty traffic through their neighborhoods. And frankly, on roads that aren't designed right now to carry that much heavy duty traffic. And I think we should keep both of these options open for now, for later consideration when these things are done, and when the traffic -- or the construction has been completed. Thank you.

[Time: 02:04:48]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Mr. Basha, I guess I will have to weigh in on the side of whether or not -- I should say of whether or not this stretch of 128th Street should be closed. But my first question is do we have any other parcel -- any other place within the Preserve where a city street goes through the Preserve?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, the only other location is Dynamite that you see on this graphic.

Mayor Lane: Okay. And do we have any -- so I have got to believe that there is not any particular ordinance within the Preserve ordinance that restricts that?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, it does not because the land where 128th Street would be is dedicated right-of-way. It is not part of the Preserve.

Mayor Lane: So just on that basis alone, it couldn't be precluded from being a developed road by a prefer serve ordinance?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: That's correct.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So, you know, I think one of the points that was made that sort of sticks with me is the Vice Mayor talks about the idea that if this is about safety, just being able to get in and out of the area, there's something about that that seems to make some sense to have alternatives. I think part of the issues that we are talking about here is who is going to use these routes and if they are stipulated not to be truck routes, then presumably they won't be built -- well, maybe they will be built to the same standards. I'm not sure or just as a regular street but they won't be looking to try to sustain heavy truck traffic.

You did mention the fact that if something is closest route, that they can end up, obviously in delivery of appliances or something like that, that their trucks can use it. But in the -- in the general overall use of it, it's not to be a truck route, it's just a normal city street. But there is something.

It either goes to the idea of holding off to make this decision, but building this road on some maybe less than standard way and then gating it off, for that once -- you know, once in a very, very unique occasion, I would suppose, that it would be open for access and I frankly don't know what that program is, if we are talking about a fire road or otherwise, that it would be a very, very, very limited hopefully. I just don't see us building it and not allowing another way in and out of this area.

And I'm a bit concerned about the concentration of traffic as this gets built out, coming through this area. 118th Street, I think you had mentioned earlier, that it has been incorporated into the -- the C.I.P. for that road, that we've got a --

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, not yet.

Mayor Lane: Pardon?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Not yet. 118th Street is not in our capital improvement plan.

Mayor Lane: But there's a commitment to do that.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. Next year.

Mayor Lane: Sure. So that's something that will come along that will help the area, I suppose. So I don't know. My feeling is either it doesn't get done now or I would say plan on it being built and not being blocked off. I just think that that makes some sense. At the other end, the 128th Street, if my memory serves me correctly, that was to be built by the developers in that area.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Excuse me, Mayor Lane, are you referring to the southern part of 128th Street, from Ranch Gate to --

Mayor Lane: The gray or white line that we are talking about, yes, south of --

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, that is correct, as a condition of the development in the development agreement, the developers of Cavalliere Ranch are required to build the full width from 128th from ranch gate to --

Mayor Lane: So it's fair to say that road will not be built until they develop it?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So at this point in time, I would say we either build the entire road when it is built, with that development, and then build it through the Preserve without the gates. That would be my thinking. I think it just seems to make sense to be able to provide that community better ingress and egress.

So that's -- I'm not sure we are a little bit split on this with the one -- I think councilwoman Littlefield

said to put it off and I suppose I would be satisfied with that and this was the others if we are going to put it in the plan to show it being built. If I'm not mistaken, Councilman Phillips, you and Vice Mayor, you were on that basis? Oh, yeah. But is that correct in my assumption?

[Time: 02:10:07]

Vice Mayor Smith: Let me state for myself and Councilman Phillips can state for himself, you know, I would definitely want the road built and usable by the pedestrians, never gated and never prevented. It's usable by the citizens for egress. And when you build -- I mean, I suppose you build it when you have people there.

There's enough dump trucks going over there that they are either building a mausoleum or they are building a housing development. But you have a lot of truck traffic that is going on Happy Valley, out here into this area for the construction of these housing developments. It would be ideal if you could put that truck traffic in a way that is relevant to the construction, in other words out Dynamite and down Dynamite taking 128th Street south into the development area. I mean, otherwise, we should do for Happy Valley what we did years ago for the people on Pima and this is build some walls to protect them from all of this noise and traffic. It's -- it's an incredible inconvenience to impose on the citizens in this area.

All of the -- and it's not the casual trucks that Mr. Basha indicated, the furniture trucks and whatever. This is a daily convoy of trucks going up Happy Valley out to this area for construction. And they shouldn't be going that way. So they are not going that way -- I mean, this err going that way because we have -- they are going that way because we told them they can and we haven't finished 128th Street.

By the way, just as a clarification, this Preserve area, the comment was made, it's two and hey half mile wide area. I don't think that's quite right. I have think if you look at the map, it's about a half mile wide on the goose neck there. This goose neck, well it's going from 128th Street to 120th street, that's about eight blocks, that ought to be about a mile. And then two miles long on the goose neck.

Anyway, it's not -- we have made the point before. It's -- we are putting the interest of the animals ahead of the interests of the citizens. So my recommendation is to do it and do it now.

Mayor Lane: Well, and that was my question. So I appreciate that answer, but we do have one further comment from Councilwoman Klapp.

[Time: 02:12:42]

Councilwoman Klapp: 128th Street right now from Dynamite to the green line of the Preserve, what kind of a road is that?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Klapp, it's a very substandard road. It's sometimes pavement and sometimes gravel.

Councilwoman Klapp: And then what you would be planning is some sort of substandard road across the Preserve, is that what you are thinking or 20-foot wide minimal pavement? Is that your intention for the -- you know, for the police and the fire traffic in the Preserve?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Klapp, that would be a 20-foot of asphalt road. It would be -- it would not be substandard. It would be standard thickness.

Councilwoman Klapp: Asphalt.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: But it would only be 20 feet wide and very critical in this area, the vertical alignment would not adhere to typical standards.

Councilwoman Klapp: And then you said 118th Street is only improved down to Jomax and then it's a dirt road?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Parts of it are almost full width. Much of it are either dirt or nonexistent.

Councilwoman Klapp: So the possibility of the 118th Street being a road is sometime away, it appears even if we get it in the capital improvement plan, ten years away?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Hopefully not, Councilwoman Klapp, but it is into the future.

Councilwoman Klapp: Yeah.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: And, again, 128th Street is into the future. They both are.

Councilwoman Klapp: My inclination then was -- my thought was piqued by something that councilwoman Littlefield said, and that would be to leave the road open across the Preserve, at least for a temporary period, whatever period that might be determined by transportation, and if there is an improved 118th Street road in the future, then revisit this concept of closing that road, but since there isn't much of a road at 118th Street, it does make sense to me to heave that path open, along the 128th Street now for whatever time it takes to determine whether or not there's an improvement -- a road that's improved enough that traffic could be diverted up to Dynamite and then -- and then over to Dynamite. I would tend to agree with the concept of -- this is not forever, but for a period of time to be determined later and probably come back to council at that time to leave that -- that opening there across the Preserve so that there can be a use of 128th Street. I think that makes more sense to me.

[Time: 02:15:38]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Klapp. Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Thank you. I think I take issue with saying that closing 128th Street puts animals and the animals' needs before the people. I really take exception to that, because this Preserve has been purchased by our citizens and our visitors, taxpayers. We spent \$800 million on it, and after debt services, it's going to be over \$1 billion. And our citizens time and time again say, this is our Preserve, and we need to protect it. So to say that this is butting animals or the pre -- putting animals or the Preserves in front of people's needs, that's just rhetoric for me.

I enjoy -- I certainly would support Councilwoman Littlefield's suggestion that this remain open on a temporary basis, and meet the needs of that construction traffic, and then be closed in the future.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. And I would certainly weigh in on that as well. I think that's a reasonable approach for it. We've got some timing issues, certainly, that are here but also what type of use of this road across the Preserve, of 128th Street would be ultimately used for, and for reconsideration at a future date as to whether or not it needs to be blocked off or not. So I think that's the essence of that. And I think that gives the guidance that you are looking for.

Councilwoman Littlefield, you have a question on it?

Councilwoman Littlefield: Mayor, I just want to make one other thing, we keep it open while the construction is going on. Then one of the side things on that is you have to look at 118th Street because it's dead ended right now and you can't really get through at all, unless you have a four-wheel Jeep or something, I guess. So you would have to keep 128th Street open until you do do something with 118th Street so that you have an alternative road to go through, and if you need the -- at that point, depending on what the traffic turns out to be, when all the these things are built and designed, then go back and just revisit it, not necessarily close it, but take a look at what the needs are and what we need to do at that point.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, councilwoman. Yes, Mr. Basha, I think that's certainly what I would agree with the conversation from Councilwoman Klapp, and I think also if I were to just to confirm just a yes or no -- councilwoman, yes? So pretty clear guidance as far as that is concerned.

Good. All right. If you want to continue then.

[Time: 02:18:40]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: This next slide simply shows the cross section of the gray or light roads that were on the previous slide. It would have a raised landscape medium, one 12-foot motor vehicle lane and one 8-foot bicycle lane. The intention is there would be very few access points along these roads, be it Dynamite or Jomax or Ranch Gate, or 128th Street south of Ranch Gate.

And the 20 feet of asphalt that would exist between the motor vehicle lane and the bicycle lane would accommodate emergency vehicles, be they fire or police and furthermore with 20 feet of pavement, should it be necessary one side of the median could be used for traffic, obviously with traffic control, and Shea Boulevard is also so designed and there was an incident not long ago where Shea Boulevard

needed to be used for two directions of travel on one side of the median and that was all police controlled. And the thinking is that could exist with these one lane arterials.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Basha. So if you -- I'm sorry, councilman.

[Time: 02:20:01]

Councilman Phillips: Where is this at?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: That one lane arterial would be on these white streets.

Councilman Phillips: So making Jomax into a one-lane arterial?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Councilman Phillips: If you are going to do, that obviously the trucks can't take Ranch Gate Road so you would have to go through 128th Street if you are going to cut it down to one lane each way and have a bicycle riding alongside it.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Pardon me, Councilman Phillips. All of our lanes are 12 feet wide at maximum and a truck could certainly use a 12-foot lane and an 8-foot bicycle lane would give a bicycle plenty of clearance from a truck.

Councilman Phillips: So it's just bicycles from 118th Street and Ranch Gate Road over to 128th Street?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: No, sir. There would be one lane per direction for motor vehicles, exhibited here by a car going into the screen and the motorcycle.

Councilman Phillips: Just that section.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: For all of those white-lined streets.

Councilman Phillips: Can you go back to it? So Jomax -- oh, are you talking about Dynamite too?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Where it's shown as a white line, Dynamite west of 118th Street.

Councilman Phillips: Well, Dynamite is one lane.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Councilman Phillips: So you are going to widen it and put an island and a bike lane and another island and a walking path?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Phillips this would be only one island. It would be the median.

Councilman Phillips: Yeah, you show a little one in between the walkers and the bicyclists.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. That's not really a median. That's a separated sidewalk.

Councilman Phillips: You are saying that's what Dynamite will look like?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: That's what the transportation master plan envisions.

Councilman Phillips: Dynamite has to be widened. You have 400 homes being built down 175th and there's a lot more on the way and that's the only way out, unless you want to go through Fountain Hills. So there's no way I could agree with this. If it would work with four lanes for cars, but even then it's kind of dangerous. If you want to have just bicycle and take out the little tree things between the bicycle and the walkers. Nobody is walking out there. I'm sorry.

You know there's a lot of bicyclists, especially in the colder times, a lot of them. So I could see the bike lanes. We need the bike lane, but doing this and keeping it to one lane for infinity, I don't think that's a good idea.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you.

[Time: 02:22:46]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Yeah, I kind of agree with that. That's the main road in and out of there, and the only other way is to go all the way down the valley and you need two lanes each way. I think I would keep it a little larger. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. When you first talked about this Mr. Basha, I was a little concerned about that as well. I have some friends that have homes out there, and, you know, the extent of development out there is significant. Some of it is not even in Scottsdale, of course, but they are still going to be looking for the same routing into town one way or another. So I'm a little concerned about that and even to the practical aspect of the sidewalk.

I'm wondering whether in any sort of profile on this road, whether or not it might be sort of a multiuse path, even a horse path like we have along cactus east of the 101 rather than a sidewalk. And I don't that, you know this has been specifically designed, but I -- I certainly share the concern that there's not a lot of people walking down that hill, up and down that hill. It's quite a distance, as that goes. But they might be riding a horse.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I misspoke. I did not mean a paved sidewalk. I meant a trail. That would be dirt.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Okay. But other than, that I think before this actually gets initiated, I wonder whether this profile needs to be studied for capacity issues that would develop.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, we have. We examined projected 2035 traffic volumes with the developments that would be outside of our borders. And it would be accommodated by one motor vehicle lane per direction.

Mayor Lane: You know, I think it's wonderful in concept, but I am just a bit concerned. There's a little bit of reliance on this study, and on your analysis, in accepting this as far as I'm concerned. So -- yeah, Councilwoman Korte.

[Time: 02:25:05]

Councilmember Korte: So Paul, on Dynamite, we have got some broad or wide bicycle lanes there. Do we have a count of the number of bicyclists that use Dynamite? I understand it's quite large and one of the favored routes of the sport. Do we have any numbers there?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Korte, we know that it is very popular in terms of bicycle use. We do not have counts of the number of bicycles on any one day.

Councilmember Korte: Okay. And then one lane each way. So those were -- so this design was based on what a 20-year look of -- of all of the construction not only in Scottsdale, which Scottsdale border goes to 136th street.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: A little bit further east. 144th street.

Councilmember Korte: 144th street, but we looked at potential population growth east of that into that Rio Verde valley area?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Korte, yes that's correct.

Councilmember Korte: So this design and construction for Dynamite meets those needs of our neighbors east of there?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Korte, yes.

Councilmember Korte: Okay. And Rio Verde, there are two ways to get back into that Rio Verde area, is there not two ways? From Dynamite and then one through Fountain Hills also?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Councilmember Korte: Okay. Okay.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, if you want travel west from Fountain Hills, you have only two choices, Dynamite or Shea.

Councilmember Korte: Okay. You know, at some point, you know, I have to say that I'm not a traffic engineer. I didn't look at the traffic counts and I'm relying on not only the hours spend by our transportation department, but the hours spent by our Transportation Commissioners. They spent a lot time looking at these counts, the data and I -- I honor that and I support that.

[Time: 02:27:44]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Korte. Any other comments on this? I suppose there's a bit of reluctance on the practicality of this, but there seems to be an acceptance to be with the studied issue.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Let me talk about process. This is sort of our wish list. This is if we had all money and the resources in the world and we could do everything simultaneously, these would be the things we want to work on. But we don't have all the resources in the world, we will have to walk down the road and we have to prioritize the projects and some are next year, five years and 10 years and 20 years out and when we get to these projects you will revisit the traffic counts and building permits and update all of these things. So if the day comes that we are going to update Dynamite in that section, when that gets to the top of the priority list, you are going to revisit does this one lane arterial meet the current need?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Milhaven, that's correct.

Councilwoman Milhaven: We will cross that bridge when we good there. I'm all good.

Mayor Lane: I have to agree if that's the way it's handles but with the master plans, we set things in motion with the prescription of cost and sort of the format. So I have no problem handling it just that way and I think there's some justification -- certainly there's a real justification for it, but I would just say this that generally when we put a plan together, it's a guideline to the kinds of structures we are going to do for funding and getting it into the C.I.P., all of those things sort of go into that realm.

But it is a matter of timing. If, in fact, it's ten years from now, and I think we'll be probably discussing some of this kind of timing issue later here too, is that -- I don't know whether we even actually have to have that profile in here right now. You know, it's -- it's just sort of like maybe a wish list, but we don't know whether it really will be practical in its application ultimately.

Vice Mayor, just be --

>> Councilwoman Milhaven: Just one clarifying question. If and when we do any of these, these come back to the council for approval?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: That's correct.

Councilwoman Milhaven: So we're not authorizing anybody to spend anything or do anything. We are saying go work on it and bring it back to us for council approval in the future, which may be us or maybe somebody else. Okay. Thank you.

[Time: 02:30:21]

Mayor Lane: Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Smith: Thank you, Mayor. The portion of Dynamite that runs between 118th and 128th right now, that ten-block area, the proposal is to make it a one-lane arterial. What is it now?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It is a one-lane arterial.

Vice Mayor Smith: So why is it colored -- it looks like it's shrinking from black to white, but it's not shrinking anything. It's already what you are going to make it; is that right?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. The transportation master plan shows the ultimate classification and the width of the streets, and the black line indicates four-lane street.

Vice Mayor Smith: So that's the reservation of rights for the future?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. And the right-of-way that we have been requiring of adjacent developments actually accommodates a six-lane street.

Vice Mayor Smith: Okay. So it is now a one lane arterial. And then I think I'm lost in terms of what you are proposing, that it will be a one-lane arterial. I mean, we are already there.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, the difference would be the 8-foot bicycle lane. That does not exist now.

Vice Mayor Smith: If that's all we are talking about, who cares? It's a road capable of handling truck traffic as a one-lane arterial? Fine. I don't even know what -- let's move on. I move we move on to the next subject.

Mayor Lane: I think we -- that directive, I suppose is really what we have already concluded because I think there's an acceptance to leaving it in there, subject to certain evaluation of this profile of the street. So, yes. Okay. Thank you. And let's go ahead and continue.

[Time: 02:32:32]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Thank you, Mayor Lane. The next segment is on transit. We

have a few slides of our existing transit operations and then a few slides of three proposed new transit roads.

The first slide shows our downtown -- excuse me, shows our trolleys in downtown Scottsdale and parts south. The blue route is our neighborhood trolley, the brown is the Miller Road trolley. The purple is our downtown trolley, and green is the Camelback Road trolley.

And -- it must be something I said.

Mayor Lane: We just barely have a quorum. I don't know what it is that you said. You can continue, though.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I assume I can continue.

Mayor Lane: Yes, you can continue.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: These are our existing trolley routes and we serve the southern part of the city quite well with these four trolley routes. 9 buses --

Mayor Lane: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: We have two bus companies essentially that operate in the city of Scottsdale. The red lines are for Valley Metro and the green lines are for city of Phoenix. And these are the existing routes in the southern part of -- of the city. And then the north of Shea Boulevard, we again have the Scottsdale Road and Hayden Road buses operated by valley metro and we pay for that service.

Notice in this part of the community the Hayden Road bus is not on Hayden Road. It's on 94th street, and then again, we have four east-west routes. The transportation master plan recognizes that we have these existing routes. It does not dictate bus frequencies. That is something that the city council decides upon recommendations from the Transportation Commission and the transportation department as part of its operating budget, the annual operating budget. And we do have recommendations for the future of increasing our service on all of the eight east-west city of Phoenix routes that you see on this slide and the slide before and that's critical.

Because of your comments earlier, Mayor, about the Shea Boulevard corridor, as well as your comments pertaining to east-west service between downtown Scottsdale and the freeway to the east. It is envisioned that we will have increased frequency on all eight of these city of Phoenix routes. The transportation master plan includes two new trolley routes and one new bus route.

These next few slides will be slightly reversed -- well, completely reversed from the packet we provided. First diagram is the route and then the second page for each route is the costs. The solid blue line is a definitive route envisioned for the cactus trolley and then the dashed blue line would be determined in the future as the day of operation that comes closer. This route is dominated -- this

route is dominated by serving Honor Health and the medical campuses around the Pima freeway, Shea Boulevard interchange. And it also serves the Via Linda Senior Center and Scottsdale Ranch Park. It serves five different schools. It serves a number of neighborhoods. It also serves a number of retail centers, particularly in the vicinity of the Pima freeway and the Frank Lloyd Wright interchange. This blue route over 94th street would allow the Hayden Road bus route to be on Hayden route, north of Shea Boulevard.

This -- this part of our community for 20 years has been deficient with trolley service and our residents have continuously requested that they be treated as well with trolley service as those of our residents in south Scottsdale and that's why it's here. We envision this route occurring in two years, and the transportation master plan is critical in terms of providing the service in two years, because there's a two-year wait between ordering a bus and receiving that bus.

[Time: 02:37:37]

Mayor Lane: I just -- we have a question or a comment. Councilwoman Klapp.

Councilwoman Klapp: Hallelujah. This is great. This is a transit wasteland in this area. There's just no way to get around, and so this is -- I was happy to see this in the plan, obviously. This, as you said, serves the Via Linda Senior Center. We have served the Granite Reef Center for years but not the Via Linda Center and the surrounding communities. This will be a great addition to that part of Scottsdale.

And so this is probably the one that excites me more than anything in the plan. So thank you for adding it, and it has been asked -- requested and discussed for a long, long time. I think the plan for the way you would do it, it sounds great. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Klapp, if I could add to that, in speaking for the Transportation Commission, and the transportation department, if only one part of the transportation master plan is adopted, it's this page.

Councilwoman Klapp: Hallelujah.

[Time: 02:38:44]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The next slide isn't quite as pretty. We have suggested 15 minute service for 12 hours, six new vehicles, \$600,000 per vehicle. I think the -- yes, that number is not quite there, but it would be \$3.6 million just to purchase the vehicles and then there's a \$1.4 million annual operating cost for the cactus trolley by itself which is similar to the neighborhood trolley and the Miller trolley in the southern part of the city.

Our next trolley that we are including in the recommended transportation master plan is the airpark

trolley. This would serve east and west of the runway and it would connect at the existing park and ride facility at the southeast corner of Scottsdale Road and Thunderbird Road. The intention here is to serve all of the businesses in this area.

When the airpark was first conceived in the 1970s and 1980s, it was intentioned that it would be office and warehouse and air plane hangar combined, as the airpark has evolved there's far more offices than office warehouse combinations. So we have more employees than were anticipated. We have fewer parking spaces to serve those offices. So the intention of the airpark trolley would be to allow people to either park in the park and ride and then use the trolley to get to their place of business, or to use one of the east-west routes from Phoenix to the park and ride and then transfer to the trolley.

Again, Mayor Lane, you were perfectly correct in -- in referring to those arrows, those eight arrows serving the airpark -- serving the airpark area with the very large number of employees coming from the west, and that's the intention here, that people who are employed in the airpark could use one of the three east-west routes come to the Thunderbird park and ride and transfer to a trolley.

[Time: 02:41:20]

Mayor Lane: Let me just make a comment, number one, with regard to both the cactus trolley and this one, which I'm particularly enamored with. I think this is a fantastic politician. It's not without cost, which we are about to talk about too, but the same time, I think this is really an effective and efficient use of these kinds of funds.

I think you are about to move off of this slide on to the bad slide, the one that talks about costed associates, but, nevertheless, one of the things that we have tried to explore a little bit because through M.A.G., with much depleted funds through prop 400 because of the downturn in the economy, some 30% off whatever projected numbers are coming anybody's direction has been modified to a lesser position. But the monies that we were supposed to receive for bus rapid transit, as a replacement for the -- well, actually for the mass transit corridor on Scottsdale Road, what was planned and what was in M.A.G.'s plan for Scottsdale was the BRT. And I don't know what's become of all of that, but I'm -- I do know that starting in 2016, okay, you will tell me and I appreciate it. That's one of the reasons why I'm framing up this question.

Nonetheless, you know, I did know that that was starting in 2016 and that there's been some application, some pushback on this fund too. But why don't you -- if you could, just address that. I realize it's just one component of costs but it does have some bearing on what we are trying to attempt in a master plan here.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, the funds that were previously dedicated to the bus rapid transit along Scottsdale Road are being spent beginning late this month, and that would provide ten minute service for Scottsdale Road route 72, between fashion square and the city of Tempe. And then the city of Tempe is paying for that ten minute frequency from essentially their border to the Tempe transit center on the A.S.U. campus. So those BRT funds are all spent.

Mayor Lane: Well, they weren't that extensive, even with the -- with the amount because the BRT was meant to run the entire thing and as it was originally presented to us years ago, it was going to be an isolated lane. It was going to have a lot of the same components and some of the same detractors as light rail would have had, but nevertheless, what you are telling me it, it sounds like a pittance. I don't know what that cost in the way of additional buses to facilitate this ten minute cycle. I'm sure that's part of the expenditure but then also operating costs or just the equipment.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: It's both operating costs and equipment. The bus rapid transit would have been a relatively infrequent service, which was part of the issues. The ten minute service, that's what the big boys do. That's what a metropolitan area bus service would be, is a ten-minute frequency.

And interestingly enough, I was asked the question, do we have ten-minute frequency anywhere else in the valley? We do not. There are a couple of buses in Phoenix, central avenue is one that does have ten minute service for part of the day. But the only existing ten minute frequency is Scottsdale's downtown trolley. This would be the first bus system in metropolitan Phoenix that has ten minute frequency for its entire schedule.

And so that is part -- that is the dominant reason why it's expensive and we are using all the funds with the bus rapid transit. This was a lengthy discussion with valley metro, whether we should have the bus rapid transit that had long been planned or not. Part of the reason why we are not recommending bus rapid transit on Scottsdale Road, I hope no one from Chandler is listening, the Chandler bus rapid transit was a failure. It simply has very low ridership and it's very expensive. It's a beautiful big bus, but it's not been popular and there are many reasons for that.

A large reason is there's no east-west routes. Sorry, that's an exaggeration, there's a minimal east-west route to Arizona avenue where the Chandler bus rapid transit operates. There was another bus rapid transit in Mesa that also had limited operation. We like to be first in everything we do here in Scottsdale. But if we are not first, we are certainly going to learn lessons from the people who go first.

Mayor Lane: Well, if we are going first, we want to make the right decision. If someone else has seen less than successful exercise, we certainly want to learn from that. So I appreciate that very much. So in any case, you have answered my question, as far as the use of those funds. And I'm presuming there's also a sharing, a city sharing dollar involved with that along with potentially some federal monies that were put into that equation.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, our bus service is different from our street expenditures. You are exactly correct, the street expenditures there is a local contribution required to receive region one federal funds, not so with bus service.

Mayor Lane: I see.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The bus service, be it city of Phoenix or valley metro is funded

entirely with Region 1 federal funds.

Mayor Lane: Operating costs.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Operating costs too. It's included in our budget, because we have to -- I don't know why I'm telling you this, but we have to have our revenues and expenditures balanced and it has to be shown in the budget.

Mayor Lane: Geez, who would have thought?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yeah, who would have thought? So we have to record money coming in, and we accept that money into our revenue side of our budget, and then we just spend that money to the city of Phoenix and Valley Metro to provide the service.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

[Time: 02:48:03]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: On to the next ugly slide. The airport trolley, again, would be 15 minute frequency. We are suggesting 10 hours of operation. It would require four vehicles. Each vehicle costing approximately \$600,000. And \$700,000 annual operating cost for this service.

We are exceptionally excited about this new bus service. We're calling it Scottsdale limited. It would have only two stops. The Scottsdale Thunderbird park and ride and the Scottsdale Fashion Square. What we have learned in the transportation industry over the last decade or two is that there are a large number of people in North America that are very, very happy to use light rail, and are completely resistant to using buses.

And we have been trying to explore and understand reasons for that. One of the reasons we believe in the industry is travel time. No, you are fine. It's travel time. The problem is buses stop an awful lot. They stop every two blocks. And this proposed Scottsdale limited would not stop, except at the end points. The travel time would be competitive with a private vehicle.

This, again, harkening back to the first slide I showed you, where over 70% of the people who live in Scottsdale and work, work outside the city, and over 80% of the people who work in Scottsdale live outside the city. We have two direction travel, both time periods, both peak travel periods and this service would provide a ten minute operation in both directions all day long. So it would be very, very easy to use.

One of the maxims in transportation service is if you need to have a bus schedule, you do not have us about service. If you have ten minute service, you don't need the bus schedule. Just go to where the sign is and wait and soon there will be a bus to take you where you are going.

This Scottsdale limited would be on top of the existing Scottsdale bus route 72. So people who are

between these two stops and want to get one of these stops would use a route 72 bus for a while or two and get to the closest end point and then have a quick trip to the other end point.

[Time: 02:50:49]

Mayor Lane: If I were to go back to the 85251 slide, and I'm looking at from the northwest 6800, 44 and 4478 coming from the north, these potentially are candidates coming down Scottsdale Road to south Scottsdale. So the park and ride to this is a component there. I'm talking about 85251. But I'm presuming that most of what was judged to be a need here in the airpark is the 9867 coming directly from the south, somewhere in the south. And then, of course, the 12,000 coming -- that actually, I suppose would be. 8900 coming from the west into the airpark, might also be doing this.

But in any case, I'm assuming that analysis has been done and I say that because I'm sure it has been but nevertheless, of passenger loads between these two destinations. Obviously, you get rid of the stops that's great, but you really have to tag where the market is for those end points in a big way. If you go down to Fashion Square, what is the east-west bus that's coming out of Fashion Square?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, there are actually two. There's the city of Phoenix, Camelback Road bus route 50, which comes from the west and returns to the west, and then there's the Camelback trolley which is a Scottsdale-owned vehicle, to and from the east, connecting Scottsdale Fashion Square to Scottsdale Community College.

And you are exactly right. The reason this red line exists is because we examine those eight arrows at both the airpark and downtown Scottsdale, and saw the strong employee connection. And, again, the intention would be that people would ride one of the east-west routes to get to either the park and ride or the fashion square stop in the morning and then use it in reverse in the evening.

Mayor Lane: So the market it's sold to is the businesses in the airpark, but also as we might -- as you are saying, not to consider a bus schedule is not to have the bus service.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Mayor Lane: Because it's of that question mark that's raised in everybody's mind. How do we make -- mind. How do we make sure that it's marketed, which you know that's for another time. It's dependent upon the acceptances and the implementation, that's something that we will have to deal with.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct. And thank you for your confidence in us, misplaced, as it was. At this point, we have not accomplished ridership in the future, referring back to council Milhaven's comment about the transportation master plan being a wish list and a director in guidance and the serious analysis occurs in the future, just prior to spending the money. That's what we would do with bus service as well. Bus ridership is much more difficult to predict than -- than car volumes.

Mayor Lane: Well, I will refrain from any misplaced confidence in you again. Thank you.

Councilwoman Klapp.

[Time: 02:54:40]

Councilwoman Klapp: Question. The Scottsdale Limited route, would that be implemented at the same time as the airpark trolley route since you are having the airpark trolley route feed in. Is it my assumption that those two work together and you would probably implement them at about the same time.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilman Klapp, misguidance all over the place. That would be our hope. We would not request that large of an expenditure in the same fiscal year.

Councilwoman Klapp: Which one would you do first?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: We would do the airpark because the bus route exists now. And it serves the park and ride. The Cactus Road trolley in two years and Scottsdale Limited in four years.

Councilwoman Klapp: Okay. That answered my question, thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, councilwoman.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: And this would be the expense. 10 minute frequency for 13 hours a day. We estimate we would need five new vehicles and there are two different options for this. One would be the Scottsdale trolley, the vehicles owned by our city. That would have a million dollars in annual operating costs. We would first have to write a check for \$3 million to purchase the five new vehicles at \$600,000 apiece.

The other option would be to let Valley Metro buy those buses and that would be approximately a \$3 million annual operating cost. Our current expectation is that this would be a Valley Metro bus service, though the opportunity exists for it to be a Scottsdale trolley.

[Time: 02:56:36]

Mayor Lane: Mr. Basha, you mentioned that we could buy the vehicles and then we would have the entire operating costs with it. I notice with the Valley Metro, it's \$2.9 million per year, understood, but that's part of the vehicles and the operating costs. Do we have any idea how much it would cost for us to operate them?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, Mr. Mayor, the \$1 million operating cost would be for our vehicles.

Mayor Lane: So we would have -- if I were to use those costs, and apply that to Valley Metro, the \$1.9 million per year in equipment costs? That would be part of their equation? I know it's labeled

as operating costs, because we let them do the entire thing, inclusive of buying the vehicles.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: I'm not sure I understand your question well, but let me try to respond.

Mayor Lane: I think I have at least an idea of what you have got here and I'm okay with what's indicated here. The other thing about us handling the operations as well as the purchase of the vehicles is we're -- we're getting ourselves deeper and deeper into our independent run, and right now, we don't have any facility for fare box return. And I'm only presuming that if we did it, we would follow that same track.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Mayor Lane: We have no collection of fare box return.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct.

Mayor Lane: In our current system. Of course, they are already established with that. I don't know if anybody has figured the cost of trying to implement that, but sooner or later with our own city bus system, we probably need to get on to some kind of fare box return, particularly if we are on a standard route like this.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, I have had conversations with our city auditor, Sharron Walker on exactly this issue. There is a -- a belief, that it's more expensive to charge fares than to not charge fares. And Sharron and I both have a difficult time with that belief and Sharron is an auditor. She will find out for us. And so we will use that analysis to help us make this kind of a decision, whether we should purchase the trolleys and operate them ourselves or valley metro or and if we operate the trolleys ourselves, should we charge a fare?

Mayor Lane: Well, I don't know what the percentage of fare box return, we have towards our operating costs, even through the Valley Metro system. But for most mass transit, it's somewhere in the area of about 25 to 27% of the operating costs on your fare box return. Which leaves, let's just round it to 75% of your costs that aren't covered. And at the very same time, you have to invest in that collection system which is no small matter in and of itself. I'm sure that will be studied when we get to that point.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Yes, Mayor Lane.

Mayor Lane: I hope that was not unfounded confidence.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Was very appropriate.

[Time: 03:00:01]

Councilwoman Klapp: How much would the five vehicles cost if we bought them.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Approximately \$600,000.

Councilwoman Klapp: So it's \$3 million. Okay. So we will spend that \$3 million if we do it with Valley Metro, but it's absorbed in a different way.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Correct, it is.

Councilwoman Klapp: Yeah. Okay.

Mayor Lane: And you have to maintain them too. Yeah. Yes, councilwoman.

Councilmember Korte: Thank you, Mayor. Speaking of costs. I have been trying to keep a tally of our wish list here. From the new trolley routes to this new designated Scottsdale route and we would be looking at over \$300 million of operating costs additional and over -- and about \$9 million of capital costs in vehicles. So it's very costly.

But why I bring that up, I don't know, I was just kind of putting it together and saying well, wow, we are talking about some real dollars here.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Councilwoman Korte -- I'm sorry.

Councilmember Korte: And so to implement these, that I think all of us would support, and believe that they are great ideas and thank you, Paul, and your department and the Transportation Commissioners, but it's going to take a plan. It's going to take -- it's going to take some looking into the future to figure out how we are going to do this.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Any other comments on this particular bad slide? No, that's -- well, at the time we are talking about money, I suppose that takes on a different tone. Okay. If you want to continue, Mr. Basha.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, I do not. I want to go home right now.

Mayor Lane: All right. I didn't mean to frame it as it was an option.

[Time: 03:02:24]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The next series of slides have caused a little bit of conversation in our beloved community. The transportation master plan includes potential railroads at the direct request of the Transportation Commission.

When we first proposed the transportation master plan to our Transportation Commission, there was no discussion of rail at all. And that was the direction of the city manager, Fritz Behring at the time,

that we not consider rail at all in the transportation master plan. The Transportation Commission had a different opinion. They directed us by unanimous 7-0 vote to include real roads in the transportation master plan and, it was a mildly uncomfortable conversation I had with Fritz about what we should do with that recommendation. And Fritz said the Transportation Commission consists of seven Scottsdale citizens, appointed by the city council to advise on transportation matters. We take their advice. We include the railroads in the transportation master plan and if we concur with their recommendation, then we include a city transportation department recommendation for the specific rail routes.

So that's why we are here today with a discussion of potential railroads in Scottsdale. Oh, pardon me. One other comment, my counterpart with Valley Metro should be somewhere behind me his name is Wulf Grote. And he's the director of the operations and accessible transit with Valley Metro and if there are questions that I can't answer and I'm sure this will be, that the council has, Wulf would be happy to respond to those questions.

The first of the recommendations in the master plan route. This is the Fashion Square to Rural in Tempe. There's an incredible amount of misinformation. The rail routes that are included in the transportation master plan do not -- do not -- do not, do not include Scottsdale Road and downtown Scottsdale. Do not, do not, do not, do not, in spite of newspaper articles to the contrary, in spite of commentary from various sources. There is no rail route included in the transportation master plan on Scottsdale Road in downtown Scottsdale.

When I was interviewed by television reporter yesterday, she was stunned when I said that. She said everything that I have heard and read talks about rail in downtown Scottsdale on Scottsdale Road. Well, that's wrong. It's just is simply wrong.

As this graph indicates, the potential railroads would use Goldwater Boulevard west of Scottsdale Road, and Drinkwater Boulevard east of Scottsdale Road. And the Transportation Commission wanted both roadways to be considered and then the route would extend on Scottsdale Road from essentially Osborn Road south to our border with the city of Tempe. So we call this route the Fashion Square to rural route.

The next -- the blue route is somewhat similar.

Mayor Lane: Yes, I'm sorry. Vice Mayor?

[Time: 03:06:24]

Vice Mayor Smith: Just a question of clarification, if you are having these routes go on either Goldwater or Drinkwater Boulevard, how do you navigate the underpasses? Of both of them?

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, that's a detail of design that would occur in the next 15 to 20 years and --

Vice Mayor Smith: Unless you get levitation of design. You can't go down and back up with a train.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, I'm not certain how to respond to that question. But there are a number of systems that are sometimes subway and sometimes at grade and sometimes below grade.

Vice Mayor Smith: And do you know what the extenuation is? If you are talking about a train that will do a quick dip either on Goldwater or Drinkwater Boulevard, trains do not do quick dips. So you have a 4-mile grade.

I'm disappointed that we are talking about this -- well, I'm disappointed about a lot of things about this but the idea that we can diffuse the notion that this train might otherwise go down Scottsdale Road by simply indicating that, well, we will put it over here and dip it down or put it over here and dip it down. Is simplistic at best, and deceptive at worst. I mean, talk to somebody who knows how a train works and they don't just dip down and come back up. That's my only point.

Mayor Lane: Mr. Basha, I don't know, but you were going to -- and this is only to -- I see that there's a bit of a stop point here. I'm not sure whether there's an explanation or not, our gentleman friend from Valley Metro looks like he's chomping at the bit to weigh in on this. It's up to you.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Mayor Lane, that would be just fine if Wulf would like to comment on that. I can -- I can comment a little bit as well. Wulf is coming to join me.

Mayor Lane: Yeah. Whatever you decide as far as that is concerned.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: The potential railroads are designated as potential railroads. There would need to be extensive analysis. That analysis wouldn't include a preliminary design, and preliminary cost estimates. And yes, of course, we understand that the grades for cars are not appropriate for grades for trains.

So we understand that completely and all this, including these yellow, blue and red rail routes in this transportation master plan would do is allow the analyses to begin. It certainly would not result in final design any time soon. As -- as we have discussed in the Transportation Commission meetings, if we were to decide as a community this month, that we wanted to have rail in Scottsdale, construction would not begin until 2035 or later. This is a very long-term concept.

With those words, Wulf, if you would.

Valley Metro Director of Planning and Accessible Transit Wulf Grote: Mayor and members of council, again, I'm Wulf Grote, I'm the director of planning and accessible transit for Valley Metro.

I wanted to answer -- help to answer the question that the Vice Mayor had here a moment ago about the grades. Light rail vehicles are much different than -- or streetcar vehicles too, are much different than a railroad. Railroads are very shallow grades that can take light rail can do up to a 6% grade,

and, in fact, we are doing a project in south Phoenix. If you are familiar with south Central Avenue, just as it comes out of downtown, it also dips down under the railroad there and then comes back up again. And we're able to make that grade.

You know, there's always a little bit of an adjustment. It is a design study that we have to do later on, but we are able to take a much more significant grade with a rail -- a light rail type of projects than you can on like a conventional railroad just as a clarification.

[Time: 03:11:24]

Vice Mayor Smith: What is the approach and what do you need on both sides of the underpass?

Valley Metro Director of Planning and Accessible Transit Wulf Grote: Vice Mayor, I don't have the dimensions. I can certainly provide that information for you. I don't have that at the -- at my fingertips here, but, you know, there is -- in addition to the grades. There's also the curvature going into the grade and at the bottom and there's a -- there's a minimum curvature that you have and I just don't have that in my head.

Vice Mayor Smith: I appreciate your answer. Mayor, my only reason for bringing this up was the comment that one should never be alarmed that the train will go up Scottsdale because clearly the picture indicates it's not. I think what is clearly indicated is that we haven't the slightest idea how it can go up these other two roads and that is why people are concerned about this going up Scottsdale Road, because they don't see a feasible alternative. That was my point.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Vice Mayor Smith, if I can continue on. The underpass on Goldwater at Fashion Square is north of Camelback. The railroad would not need to travel that far. It could stop at Camelback. Likewise, on the Drinkwater Boulevard side, the underpass is very close to us here, south of the Indian School Road and the light rail line wouldn't have to go underneath that underpass either. That would -- those sources of decisions would be determined in the future.

Having these three lines in a transportation master plan is not a commitment to design and operate. It's not a commitment to a specific alignment. It's a guidance document. It's a -- it's a direction.

Mayor Lane: You know, I just want to add a little something to this too. I think the Vice Mayor is referring to additional cost that be associated with this type of routing, no matter what, whether it's 6% or 4%, you are talking about significant additional cost over what is already pegged between, depending upon if you use the current numbers or the more standard numbers, somewhere between 80 and \$100 million a mile. So you are just adding to that figure.

As near as I can estimate, we are talking about somewhere between maybe 5 and 6 miles to the border. So we're talking about somewhere close to half a billion dollars or more to get to the border. And I don't know what the motivation or what the plan would be even for Tempe to pay for the routing through north Tempe. And I have heard some concerns that they would expect us to pay for a good percentage of that as well. Now, I don't know -- you know, that's -- we are far removed from

those actual determinations.

But I will go back to something I talked about earlier and that's the application of limited funds and maybe you are for the first time using those terms right now. As I looked at the 85251 graph that you indicated and I looked at the directions that the traffic was coming from and how this application of this significant amount of money is, I would say ill applied, because it does not -- it does not address a significant number of passengers as it is right now, and into a very limited market on the southern end of the city. We talked a little bit about the amount of money and I think that -- Councilwoman Korte quantified it for us and it's a lot of money that we have to spend on some of our immediate problems and that really truly do address issues of traffic and in some instances it might be gridlock. Sometimes it's a major component and frankly, a very unattractive aspect of Scottsdale I think from a business standpoint and the economic engine, as well as also our residence and the people here in town. So I'm concerned with the entire thing.

I don't care whether it has to go under a bridge or not. I have a real concern with even the contemplated concern of light rail. And the expense to meet what mission and who are we really serving with this expenditure of funds. And I think we know right now that there is not penny one in our M.A.G. Prop 400 numbers that we have right now to pay for this. So this is entirely on the citizens of Scottsdale with whatever federal funding they might apply for as well but nonetheless, this is something that we have to muscle through.

On top of that, I think we have a significantly advancing technology and answers that are coming to us that are going to change the entire dynamic here. And I would hate to see us invest in something. Now I just heard -- and I'm not surprised by it, but at the same time, it's on record and we are probably talking 20 years or so before this would happen. There is also going to be a call for the prop 400 or however it's labeled and I would say that with the intensity of design and determination to get a statewide unified transportation plan with more emphasis on our highway systems, the relief on our highway systems, which thus relieve our city streets, and autonomous vehicles and other solutions that are coming down the pike, but as it relates to the use of our mass transit corridors for a mass transit commuter transport system, not hard rail that's been studied by the ADOT for the last three years and, of course, come to deck with just a massive number whether they use existing rail, hard rail, right away or whether they end up going to a new right-of-way, either way, it's extremely expensive prospect.

But to get some immediate relief on I-10 and the 101 and 202 and certainly the same developing situation on some of the smaller highways in between, but also the 303. The spine that we have between -- on the 101 moving down through town is almost an immediate issue that has to be addressed because there's no further expansion on these freeway systems. And it's backing up into the city streets. But for us, what I see is we're along and relatively narrow. We have a pager corridor certainly right through the middle of town. There is not any doubt about that and we have a freeway system just to essentially to our immediate east. Having and developing greater access on our east-west passages as I was talking about before off of that, from all the southeast and the northwest and the west and even to the south -- the southwest, all of those things are better served if we concentrate on that.

But to think about expending this kind of money for this kind of use, and for this kind of answer to a problem doesn't even come close to some of our other problems, I think is just -- I think it would be foolish, even to put it into play in our master plan without having full acknowledgment of our continued discussion on multimodal answers on a broader scope than what we are looking at. It's too defined and too definitive and frankly it's too costly for us to consider putting it into a plan that we may evaluate in the future.

But I think that we want to keep ourselves as open as possible to advances and the changes and the efficiencies that we will see with new innovations and new transportation solutions. And I realize that's out there, but if we just think about what's happened over the last five years, and now with the autonomous vehicles that we will be operating here in town in the very near future, and some of the coupling ideas, for mass transit and then the autonomous vehicle that you can drive to work and then send it home. So we may solve the parking problem. That may sound space age or George Jetson type of thing.

I'm only here to say I'm very, very cautious about keeping this as it is, but keeping a perspective on the technology of multimodal transportation options that will be available to us, I do think we need to continue that quest and I think when it works into answers for us that's the time that we will initiate that study and look at it freshly. So my comments and thoughts on it.

Yes, Councilwoman Klapp?

[Time: 03:21:07]

Councilwoman Klapp: I find the -- I guess I would call it the specificity of this route troubling. Because you have eliminated the use of Scottsdale Road and you are using the couplets but for the -- from the perspective of the people that are doing business in downtown while those couplets are being constructed with light rail that means all the traffic now goes down Scottsdale Road. Right now those couplets are supposed to be an alternative for letting people through downtown and you have just taken the bypass or the express route and tied it up with construction. So now that means that Scottsdale Road becomes even more congested than it is now. And that would take a considerable length of time.

So I believe that putting in maps like this with this kind of a route and pinning it to light rail and in my estimation, it doesn't advance the conversation. I think it hinders the conversation. It causes everybody to put their red flags up. And say, my gosh we had a good plan up until now and now we are into a whole different territory with very specific routes, very specific technology, when I think we should not be pinning down the technology and we should not be pinning down routes that we need to serve in downtown area.

You know, I think what the Mayor is saying is what I'm thinking is that it needs to be less specific instead of being so specific, so that we can tie into the regional planning for the stiff of Scottsdale. My feeling is that -- and I have heard from others about this too, that, you know, why are we looking at

light rail, which in some people's mind is old technology. And why aren't we thinking outside the box to other -- other solutions that might be needed over the course of the next 25 years that could be done more quickly for less money and might better serve the people that are going to be served in this area, in the next, as I said 20, 25 years and that could be any number of things, as the Mayor is bringing up.

There are -- I mean, for example, the -- the Uber phenomenon is a kind of game changer in some ways. And so as you look at the -- the use of other types of transportation that could take place over the course of many years, ride sharing is now, you know, becoming far more acceptable and perhaps there's some method that you could tie ride sharing to larger groups of people with other types of vehicles that could be shared and you can move those routes around and they are not so rigid because the beauty of the airport trolley right is that it can be moved if it doesn't work and maybe we find some of those streets are better served by moving the trolley route. Once this is built, it is built. And then we would decide, gee, we wish we put it somewhere else.

We need to remove this kind of light rail specific portion of the plan, and say, yes, we want multi modal, but high capacity. High capacity with mean something other than light rail. It has wheels on it that handles more wheels and is more efficient and is not necessarily tied to a rail in the middle of the street. My recommendation would be that we do not include this type of map that has the light rail system and we change the language so that it's less specific and go with the desire to work with valley metro and M.A.G. in order to have the proper analysis done of what could be done in this area to tying it down to specific language. I appreciate the desire of the Transportation Commission to take this on, but I think that this is -- this is type of language that pins down a problem that we ought to address and remove them and say something else, saying we are committed to having high capacity transit and not tie it to light rail and specific routes.

[Time: 03:26:21]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Klapp. Councilman Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Thank you, Mayor. Well, I guess since we are already talking rail and I don't want to cut your presentation short, but it sounds like we are. You always hear the talk of forward thinking. If you want to believe in forward thinking, how about that Tesla drive. When you take the Tesla out on the freeway and the car drives itself. It's scary but it's exciting. It has a video screen in front and it shows you the cars going by. It's already there. What did they get, like 127,000 preorders. So you already have that.

I have taken Uber a number of times. Why do you want to get on and off a train when you have Uber, and you can go exactly where you want and it's a nice vehicle.

When I came, in a gentleman said, hey, take a look at my electric bus. It looks like a regular bus but it's electric. It doesn't run on power lines and a grid and a fixed rail. It doesn't run on gas. I told him I didn't have time to look at it. But you have electric buses. People are coming up with stuff. Google has a driverless car that they are working on. There are a lot of exciting innovations.

I have talked to Brian. I have a video of things they are coming up with, if you indulge me. And this is fun, if Brian will show this for me. It's from China, the great innovators.

(Video presentation)

Councilman Phillips: Is that insane or what? The amazing stuff that they come up with. I think it's funny too that it has VW on the front. We know who will try to take over that design. There you go. That's just an idea of things that people are coming up with.

And, you know, the Mayor and the Councilwoman Klapp mentioned that, you know, in the future who knows what will happen 5 or 10 years from now or 20 years from now. We don't want to go into a billion dollar boondoggle and build fixed rail and everyone else is tearing theirs out because they came up with a better idea.

In my opinion, rail is kind of archaic. I think the age of the dinosaur is over. And we have 212 merchants that said they don't want light rail. I'm with them in saying we don't want light rail. We do want the HTC and we want the multimodal transportation in the plan. Let's take light rail and modern streetcar off of it and leave it at that.

[Time: 03:30:38]

Mayor Lane: Thank you.

Councilmember Korte: Thank you, Mayor. So going through the facts of the presentation by Paul, and the number of vehicles on our roads. 83% of our workforce comes into Scottsdale every day. 73% of our residents go out of Scottsdale every day. So in downtown alone, every day we have almost 36,000 employees come into downtown Scottsdale.

I believe the most important conversation we need to have is connectivity to the neighboring cities and if we could connect to the public transit systems of our neighboring cities and get it into the southern part of the city and get the employees into other parts of our city, it makes a little bit more sense.

But we have to also remember that, you know, there is a change in lifestyle patterns. So J.D. Power did a poll and 10 years ago, 18 to 29-year-olds, 19% of them did not have driver's licenses. Today that 18 to 29-year-old, 29% don't have driver's licenses. They choose not to have driver's licenses because sometimes they can't afford a vehicle. And number two, it's not part of this irrelevant lifestyle. I think that's something that we need to look for and look towards the future in some of our decisions of this changing lifestyle.

I think we need to take into account our tourists, that's 35% of our economy. And Scottsdale CVB has identified transportation and as an issue for the tourists and the tourist community. They base that on research. And I'm not a transportation engineer. I'm not a researcher, but I do rely on the staff

and I do rely on our CVB to provide the information that we use to make decisions.

I believe it's premature to talk about technologies. We can talk about Uber and self-driving cars, it's not taking the cars off of our street. We need to solve the problem of moving a greater number of people. So I look forward to including language in this transportation plan that takes us a step forward to better identify the needs of our community. We really haven't done that. Ten years ago, we said, okay, we are tired of this conversation. Ten years ago, we were a different community.

And if we are to make decisions based on what our future needs are and this is a big decision, we really need to identify what the needs of our community are today and project what they are going to be tomorrow and those needs are not only our residents. Our businesses, our visitors, and our elders. There's a whole elder population and we saw the numbers that were aging in this community and more and more people are aging in place and they can become very isolated and we all know that. They become very isolated when they lose their means of transportation.

So it's very premature to talk about technologies. It's very premature to talk about routes, but let's talk about how we move forward with the discussion, and how we move forward with the research, the guidance to give us the best data to make that decision for the good of our community.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Korte. Councilwoman Klapp.

[Time: 03:35:57]

Councilwoman Klapp: Paul, if I might offer up, I took a stab at how this ought to be stated in the plan. First of all, as I mentioned, I would eliminate the figures. I think it was 30, 31, 32, those three maps that are included in the plan and I would revise the language at the bottom of page 32 and the top of page 33 and I have it written here, which I can read off or I can give it to somebody and they can put it on an Elmo or I will just read it off to you. But it says some of the things that we discussed up to this point so it sounds like we are heading in somewhat the same direction on this.

It would be that it's guidance that the transportation department consider multimodal transportation options for further study and assessment in order to meet the needs of congested street segments and regional connectivity. The purpose of this action is to communicate physical feasibility to conduct community outreach and to initiate public agency evaluation of economic development, environmental and socioeconomic impacts prior to any potential future action.

And the -- the next paragraph would be the final one, the process for implementing high capacity transit decisions and then it's very similar to the language that's in the -- in the document already. High capacity transit decisions in the United States requires regional supported approval in the Phoenix metropolitan area this includes valley metro and M.A.G., alternatives, analyses, environmental analyses and F.T.A. approval and support. Federal transit administration and support, they would direct these analyses with the city of Scottsdale direct participation.

So it removes the references to rail, including comments about high capacity transit, and also that we

want to consider multimodal transportation options for further study and assess. I will be happy to pass it down to you.

Mayor Lane: And regional connectivity.

Councilwoman Klapp: And regional connectivity.

Mayor Lane: I would certainly be in favor of that language myself. Councilwoman?

[Time: 03:38:30]

Councilwoman Milhaven: Yeah, and I can support that as well. Right? So, you know, a group of citizens got together and they said, gee, we are concerned about connecting regionally and I do think that further study is required.

You know, we -- Mayor you mentioned that the conversation is starting about renewing or extending the tax. I would certainly like to be at that table. You know, we got less than our fair share of the Prop 400.

Mayor Lane: 23 cents out of every dollar.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Exactly. We are paying for everybody else's transportation solutions and we are not getting much benefit for it. If there's a Regional conversation about extending the tax, I want to make sure that we have a seat at the table. If we say it's important to connect regionally, in my opinion, I absolutely think so. Where do we connect, I think needs to be part of a broader regional conversation for us to take advantage of the county sales tax and any federal money that may be available.

I think looking at multimodal is absolutely the right thing to do. You know, although hover craft is interesting that may be further away and if we will rely on hover craft, then we should avoid the \$100 million improvements on the freeway, if we are waiting on the hover craft or wait for Scottie to beam me up. I think we have to respond to what our current needs are.

Maybe light rail does make sense, connecting from the airport to SkySong or from Tempe up to Osborn, to connect with circulators and we are all entitled to our opinion, but I think we need to be open to yes, definitely we have to connect. We need to be open to what routes are appropriate given the regional plan, what is the technology that's most appropriate. I would not exclude light rail.

I would keep our minds open because the decision will probably be up to another council, given the timing of all of this work and so I'm certainly supportive of the recommendation and keeping an open mind and make sure that we have the best possible connections and get more -- at least our fair share of any extended tax. Thank you.

[Time: 03:40:37]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. First, I would like to say that this council is extremely blessed to have an expert on rail sitting amongst us. I think it behooves us to listen to him, he may know what he's talking about.

For myself, I'm against light rail in Scottsdale. Citizens have said and even voted that they did not want light rail here, and now because it's considered on the transportation master plan, the rumblings are louder. 10 miles would cost somewhere around \$1 billion, something our citizens do not want and do not need and it adds up to higher taxes for everybody. For something that we don't need. And we have been talking about things that we do need, that we do want in Scottsdale, for a lot less money and cost, and movable, if you want to move it to one street or another, we can do so. It's extremely versatile.

We have had many conversations on light rail here in Scottsdale. I don't think that we need another one. We need to get rid of it, once and for all.

One of the things I really do believe in -- it's not coming in for another 20 years and we have no idea what possibilities are available 20 years from now. We have already mentioned several that are coming up, and that may expand into something that we are not even considering yet. I don't want to put in outdated technology at this kind of cost along our streets. We have a connection to the light rail system for those who want to use it. And we keep our streets open, and our downtown businesses are alive and vibrant.

Light rail will destroy our main north-south street, Scottsdale Road, which is designated corridor for light rail here in Scottsdale. I know this for a fact. My husband tried to change it a couple of years ago. Many years ago. And we could not do so. If light rail comes, it will be Scottsdale Road. Cars will have a harder time driving along Scottsdale. And people will simply not come and take the 101 around east and skip old town Scottsdale and the downtown area all together.

Our tourism will be hurt. Our well-do multimillionaires who come here to Scottsdale didn't come here to hop the rail. This is a direct attack on old town, open its reputation and on the businesses that are located there. They will be hurt and they probably won't recover. I believe tourism which is our back bone industry here in Scottsdale will be deeply hurt and everything in Scottsdale that is tourism related will be hurt also. We just become more and more any town U.S.A., one of many towns. We will have light rail, just like Tempe, just like Phoenix, just like Glendale. Nothing special here, folks. Just move along. Take light rail out of the transportation master plan and keep it out. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Councilwoman, would you favor the language that was suggested by Councilwoman Klapp?

Councilwoman Littlefield: No, I don't, thank you.

[Time: 03:44:47]

Mayor Lane: Yes, Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Smith: Thank you, Mayor. I got so concerned about talking about the grade of the dips on the couplets a while ago that I didn't say what my real problem is. First of all, I definitely agree who say that these pages ought to come out. It's premature to talk about a light rail system. It hasn't been designed or thought about or whatever, but more fundamentally, it's not so much a discussion of light rail but a vision for the city. The city doesn't have a vision that they want a rail going east west, north south or any direction. They expressed that in a vote.

I don't want anything that we agree to, to seem to be giving credence to the fact that well, we can prove the case. Maybe this is a viable solution. It's not the Scottsdale vision, it's not how it hopes to be in the future. It is true.

It is -- as everybody said, it's a highly inflexible system. You have to build the rails 4'8" and a half inches apart and run them wherever you are. I mean, that's why Amtrak that Councilwoman Littlefield was referring to that I have some familiarity. That's why it goes through stupid towns -- not through stupid towns. It goes through towns line Maricopa. It's stupid in terms of only the passengers that they get out of Maricopa. It goes to places that no one wants to ride the train. It goes this because that's where the tracks take it.

It is as the Mayor said an enormously expensive undertaking. It would be a burden for the citizens. But my real problem as bad as those kind of problems are, is not just that. It is that this is the not vision of Scottsdale. And I would prefer to have some kind of a discussion and it's not a transportation discussion. It's -- yours will build off of that, but what are very doing to the vision of Scottsdale? Is light rail the only option? Are we pursuing a vision that's consistent with the voters desire?

I think Councilwoman Korte says we need to identify the needs the community. I couldn't agree more. I made this comment three hours ago. This package talks about the transportation challenges we have today. It doesn't talk about whether we'll have a denser urban system. More housing and if we are, that will be a problem.

But it doesn't talk about alternative solutions, the cute little cars that we saw on the screen or Uber cars or ride share. I don't find any vision in this document, a vision of what the future is going to be, and given that future, how do we respond in a transportation environment to that. I couldn't agree more.

We need to identify the needs of the community. If we are going to build more office buildings and apartment buildings where people live and then leave town, if that's going to be the template of the future and the future growth of the city, then by all means let's look at that and evaluate the transportation requirements in that respect.

I think it's good to have this item out and now to the question of whether I would agree with this wording, I would like to offer two or three modifications to that. Because it says the Mayor and the council said to direct the transportation to consider multimodal. I don't know what multimodal transportation options are. It makes me a little nervous. What do we mean? And may I ask somebody who made the motion what that means?

Mayor Lane: Sure.

Councilwoman Klapp: All modes of transportation. Buses --

Mayor Lane: Many, multi.

Councilwoman Klapp: Biking, hover craft.

Vice Mayor Smith: Okay, if it's everything under the --

Councilwoman Klapp: Every possible transportation option should be considered, the attempt here is to not pigeon hole us into saying we just want to go into light rail and to the downtown area. Or other areas.

Mayor Lane: Let me make sure it's clear part of that motion is to remove those maps, and those diagrams with those indications. So that would be pulled out. This is replacement language that goes to the idea of looking for maybe that vision or what answers we need to have.

And thus far, I think we have got the three of us here.

Vice Mayor Smith: And you are libel to get me too. Let me ask two other questions.

Mayor Lane: What am I doing? I'm sorry.

Councilwoman Milhaven: He might agree with us.

Councilwoman Klapp: Before it's over.

Mayor Lane: Oh.

Vice Mayor Smith: So I understand the words or the hyphenated word multimodal to even every mode of transportation options. It goes on to say meet the needs of the congested street segments. What I would much prefer to have is another word that says the projected needs or the projected needs -- the needs of projected -- something that looks to the future. And third, in the second paragraph, it's saying that the process includes a decision of, you know, regional support and approval of the Phoenix metro area and somewhere we have to get the citizens in this and maybe it's in the regional support.

Councilwoman Klapp: In the first paragraph, it says conduct community outreach that means we will do just that, find out what the citizens' needs under that community outreach function.

Vice Mayor Smith: Okay. Makes me nervous. We already had a vote from the citizens on this particular mode and it seems to keep cropping back up. So -- but at any rate, I do support the idea of continuing to discuss multimodal transportation options.

I do support removing this lightning rod from the package. And I would prefer that it -- I mean if I were riding, I would say every option, except rail, but -- I hope we have a means of actually engaging the citizens and respecting their views and genuinely figuring out what the future needs of city are, rather than trying to build a system and hope resolving a problem.

There may be other ways to solve the problem if we stop aggravating the problem than moving more people here, and building more office. We need a better match between the two.

[Time: 03:52:28]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Vice Mayor. Councilman Phillips?

Councilman Phillips: Okay. So I see a consensus developing here. And I want to make sure which way we are going. Councilwoman Klapp's revised language up here, are you saying -- are you including light rail?

Councilwoman Klapp: I'm saying that we keep all options on the table, and we do not -- we do not delineate light rail as being any one specific solution. It may very well be that there are other solutions and I think we just leave the options open. That's my whole problem with this section is that it's very specific and it just pinpoints one method of transportation and in certain routes, my feeling is that we need to ask the community what they want. We need to get community needs assessed, and we need to find out what's the best solution and then we can better evaluate at some point down the road what that solution or solutions might be. This is general enough so we don't get into the specifics, any multimodal plan would consider light rail but it certainly doesn't say we will include light rail. We are considering it along with all the other -- all the other options that are open today.

Councilman Phillips: Okay. So 100 or so multimodal options we have -- I would want to say, excluding light rail or modern streetcar. If you don't want to exclude that, I can't agree to that.

Councilwoman Klapp: It's not putting it anywhere in particular in the city.

Councilman Phillips: The business owners want it taken out. They want this thing to be dead then want to drive a stake through the heart and get rid of this light rail. Let's forget about it. Let's embrace innovation and go to the other 100 other options that we have and drop this light rail once and for all. This is the chance to do it. That's why I can't agree to do it.

[Time: 03:54:41]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I agree with Councilman Phillips. If we take out light rail, I can agree with that, with the changes that Vice Mayor Smith made but only if we take out light rail as a consideration.

Mayor Lane: All right. Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: To say that businesses don't want multimodal, I think is inaccurate. I think we have many businesses represented here tonight. We have representatives from the healthcare industry. We have representatives from the Realtors. We have representatives from the tourism. We have representatives from the chamber of commerce and they are all supporting a multimodal.

So with that, I know we don't make motions, but my motion is to direct staff to incorporate this language in the transportation master plan with a future projected needs inserted and remove all routes from the transportation master plan.

Mayor Lane: To keep clarity. This is not a motion action, other than direction to bring back something on this line that would be something we would consider and deliberate and discuss before a vote and acceptance of this in any case. So this is not a final decision.

The motion was made to adopt that language or remove those maps from the draft of the master plan, for our future consideration.

Vice Mayor Smith: I'm hearing the discussion and I asked the question what multimodal was and it's everything. But I'm nervous that somehow this is not -- no one is willing on the affirmative side here to parenthetically say except light rail. And time really -- I think I'm with the people unless we drive a stake through the heart. I don't see any multimodal discussion that can include light rail. I think it's so far removed from the vision of Scottsdale and so far removed from practical reality.

So I see it as an excluded item but I'm getting really nervous that it will be simmering on the back burner. So my view is going to be that unless it says, you know, non-light rail, multimodal transportation options, I wouldn't find it acceptable.

[Time: 03:58:00]

Mayor Lane: All right thank you, Vice Mayor. I have to say that I did not really believe that we were talking about light rail when we excluded this. We are talking about keeping options open. I understand the fears that are present with regard to light rail being redirected into this conversation again. I sort of against deleting anything, but I'm also against light rail on Scottsdale Road.

I'm thinking about the answers overall, where we move forward, whether it is a commuter service or

otherwise and those are things that may have a completely different application when we talk about connectivity and when we talk about the location or the application of this kind of -- any kind of multimodal situation. So I'm reluctant, but I might. I'm reluctant to consider the idea of excluding it.

I guess my greatest concern has been not only the idea of the damage that it does, particularly on our mass transit corridor and what it does our businesses during construction but also the impact whether it's responding or answering to any question. I would much rather phrase this as a cost effective method of multimodal transportation to meet our needs and demands. But I don't -- and I don't think that light rail fits into that equation. I personally just don't feel it does.

But I'm going to say -- well, okay. I was just going to say, my feeling really is, if, in fact, this council at some future date or -- well, a different group of councilmembers all together, if this somehow gives them license to move back into the realm of light rail, then that's -- I suppose that is a difficulty for me. So I would probably go with striking the light rail component too.

Yes?

Councilwoman Milhaven: Your change about cost effective certainly makes a lot of sense and I would be supportive of that. My reluctance in excluding light rail.

Well, let me come at this another way. I managed a business in this community and occasionally the city goes in and rips out the street and replaces the street and my business was impacted by replacing the street. So while I'm sensitive to the fact that business may be interrupted, business is going to be impacted by street construction as well. And so I think we need to manage to try to mitigate those. I don't see that that's a good enough to reason to eliminate light rail.

The other concern I would have is, you know, does it make sense -- if it makes sense from a regional perspective connect from the Tempe transit center or SkySong or to connect from the airport, I have know -- I sit in on the -- not the transportation -- the tourism master plan group, and I know they have spent a lot of time talking about how do we get tourists from the airport to -- to downtown Scottsdale that it may make sense for regional connection from the airport to SkySong. You know, whatever we do today isn't going to stop a future council from making a different decision. So -- but I think it could seriously damage our ability to contribute to the regional conversation and so -- and I sometimes think that people think I was born with the superpower to install light rail and I don't have that power.

We as a community will decide whether or not we want light rail. We do not have the financial resources in the city of Scottsdale for the seven of us to decide to have light rail. We are going to have to as a community contribute to light rail and in my mind that's going to require a public vote. And so the seven of us can sit around and say whether or not we think the community wants it or not and the business people you talked to say they don't want it and the business people I talk to say they do want it.

The tourism community says it's important that we connect. And the people you talk to say I don't

want to do that and so I think the only fair thing to do is to leave all of our options open, explore it, give the citizens of our community the information they need to make the decisions about what are the routes and what are the modes and to exclude one or the other, I think would significantly limit our ability to lever any future sales -- regional sales tax. And I would be reluctant for us to do that today, especially when a future council could make a different decision.

[Time: 04:03:06]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Milhaven. You know, unfortunately, that kind of -- as far as the cost effectiveness is, it's certainly an important element for me, but I'm concerned now really that the sort of underlying desire to not only keep it in the equation is to have it make it be a prominent choice or potential choice.

One thing you said is absolutely true, no matter what happens here, it doesn't die, if the future councils decide to resurrect it. That's the way the system operates. There is no stake in the heart kind of vote that's taking place in any case.

But I'm concerned about the idea that light rail still -- now seems to be -- as I said before, I don't like to shut out options, but this is one that I would rather not see. I certainly do not want to see it up Scottsdale Road.

I will share something else that's been at least talked about and that's the tribe financing what I would hope to be rather a commuter service but nevertheless, on the 101.

The be that as it may, I will stay -- I like the language. If need be, I think from the standpoint of living some assurances to the public that this is not something that will be considered by this council anyway, and that's to eliminate the light rail component, to exclude it. Yes, go ahead, Councilwoman.

[Time: 04:04:53]

Councilwoman Klapp: I don't want to see light rail up Scottsdale Road. I don't want to see it into downtown. The only place that I was even contemplating it ever could even be considered might be down in the far southern part of Scottsdale maybe on McDowell Road.

However, if there seems to be this feeling that -- if we don't exclude light rail, that we are in some way sanctioning it, I guess is what you are saying to me, that if we don't exclude it, we are sanctioning it anywhere in the city, and if that's what the majority wants, I will agree with it and we'll put that wording in there because I do not want anyone to believe that I am sanctioning light rail into downtown because I have never, ever supported it.

Mayor Lane: And I'm sorry, Councilwoman, the wording you are referring to.

Councilwoman Klapp: The wording being to exclude light rail or modern streetcar. I think is what

the wording was that was suggested to be added to this.

Vice Mayor Smith: The suggested wording, I think, Mayor was to say that we would consider non-light rail multimodal transportation options. That's a mouthful, but the non-light rail multimodal transportation options would be everything but that.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Yes, Councilwoman. Excuse me, I'm sorry. Excuse me, no, that conversation is not allowed. I'm sorry.

[Time: 04:06:30]

Councilwoman Milhaven: Could we -- I understand the concern about running it through downtown Scottsdale. Could we put geographic limit on it to say, excluding light rail north of -- I don't know -- some street, because I do think that McDowell Road may be an appropriate consideration, and I don't want to exclude that investigating that. But I do -- I do share -- I do recognize some of the concerns.

Mayor Lane: Yes, okay. Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Some people say that I want light rail to go all the way to the airport from southern Scottsdale on north. Light rail is disruptive. It's big. But, again, I'm not the engineer.

And we have yet as a community to today, ten years ago -- ten years ago we said no. Today we are a different community. And I believe we deserve to have the conversation and that conversation should include all modes.

For us to specifically eliminate light rail sends a message to the RPTA and the Maricopa association of governments saying, well, Scottsdale is not a player, and we are going to continue to get our 23 cents on the dollar. I believe it is best for us to remain open to remain open to all options because the decision that we make today, we are not going to realize for 30 years, 25, 30 years.

How can we say today that it is a good thing to eliminate light rail when -- when we know how we have changed in ten years. I can't imagine how we are going to change in 20 years. That's what I'm saying. It is -- it is not futuristic. It's not looking forwards future.

I do not believe that it is best for this community to exclude light rail, and I am not saying that I want light rail down Scottsdale Road, but I do believe that there is a connectivity that -- that whole idea of connectivity, whether it's to the airport or whether it's to Tempe or whether it's to east Phoenix, that that connectivity is critical or we're going to be become an island. We're going to become an island in this valley.

[Time: 04:09:30]

Mayor Lane: Thank you Councilwoman. Councilman Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Well, I kind of have to take issue with that because number one, I think Scottsdale should be an island. I think this is where people go as a refuge from the rest of the crazy world and day-to-day hard work and travel and stuff that they do. They want to go to Scottsdale. They don't want to go to Phoenix. They don't want to go to Mesa.

We have to be different but as far as the light rail, you know, you say the voters voted against it ten years ago. And you say, well, it's different people now. It's not different people now. It's the same voters. The only difference now is that we have allowed developers to build 10,000 apartment units to bring in the 20,000 people that will vote for the light rail. And it's transit oriented development. That's what it's called. And the idea is that they will always try to get rail in.

I don't think that M.A.G. will say that you don't want light rail, and you are off the table. I think what they will say, we don't have to contribute \$10 million or whatever -- or \$100 million or whatever it is to Scottsdale's light rail plans. Instead, we can contribute to all the bus systems that Paul Basha brought up and all modes of transportation and they will see that Scottsdale is innovative and the way we go about it instead of following the trend of everybody else trying to grab these federal dollars.

So I don't see any wrong with taking light rail out. I think it shows a little courage on behalf of our city and on behalf of this council and on behalf of our merchant and business owners saying, hey, we can do better. We can do better than light rail.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman. Well, I think you have got an idea of where the language and/or the language that has been agreed upon.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Actually Mayor Lane, I think I do too.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So obviously, this is just direction. Bring it back to us and then, of course, that's -- we'll undoubtedly inspire some further conversation otherwise, but nevertheless, that's where we are at.

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Understood, Mayor Lane. And we have two more slides, if Brian could go back to that.

Mayor Lane: Oh, yes, absolutely. I wasn't calling for adjournment quite yet.

[Time: 04:12:00]

Transportation Director Paul Basha: Actually, a few more slides. The last element of the transportation master plan recommended by the commission and or the department concerned non-motorized vehicles. Okay. Four slides.

We have two different types of non-motorized vehicle transportation. We have paths, which are multiuse and are paved typically white concrete, though some are black asphalt and then we have

trails which are unpaved, either gravel or stabilized soil and these would be trailed outside of the Scottsdale Preserve. The Scottsdale Preserve is not considered part of the transportation master plan.

The master plan does include desired project maps and lists separated by three different levels of priority and they are essentially the same paths and trails included in the 2008 transportation master plan, and the 2009 path and trails plan. With bicycle and multiuse paths we have approximately 300 separate projects identified with a total length of approximately 200 miles. And then with trails, again, outside of the Preserve, we have approximately 300 different segments and this time approximately 140 miles of length.

Mr. Mayor, members of the council that concludes our presentation on the transportation master plan.

Mayor Lane: All right. I'm glad we covered those last couple. Any questions with regard to those items? If not, then I would thank you from the full council. Thank you for the presentation and for everything being put together and we'll look to see this element in its entirety coming back to us.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 04:13:55]

Mayor Lane: So with that, our business is concluded. I thank everybody -- a motion to adjourn. Seconded. All of those in favor of adjournment, please indicate by aye. We are adjourned.