



**AMENDED  
SUMMARIZED MINUTES**

**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2011**

**KIVA – CITY HALL  
3939 DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Howard called the Regular Meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission to order at 6:08 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:**

William Howard, Chair  
Josh Weiss, Vice Chair  
Carleton Cole, Commissioner  
Terry Gruver, Commissioner  
Donald Maxwell, Commissioner  
Paul Ward, Commissioner

**STAFF:**

Dave Meinhart, Transportation Director  
Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator  
Annie DeChance, Public Information Coordinator  
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation  
Reed Kempton, Principal Transportation Planner  
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Manager  
Robin Rodgers, Capital Project Management

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jim Coffman, Consultant  
Kammy Horne, URS Consulting  
Stuart Boggs, RPTA (Regional Public Transit Authority)

**2. Election of Officers**

**CHAIR HOWARD OPENED THE FLOOR FOR NOMINATIONS OF CHAIR FOR 2011. COMMISSIONER MAXWELL MOVED TO NOMINATE VICE CHAIR WEISS. COMMISSIONER WARD SECONDED. VICE CHAIR WEISS ABSTAINED. THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).**

**CHAIR HOWARD OPENED THE FLOOR FOR NOMINATIONS OF VICE CHAIR FOR 2011. COMMISSIONER WEISS MOVED TO NOMINATE COMMISSIONER GRUVER. COMMISSIONER MAXWELL SECONDED. COMMISSIONER GRUVER ABSTAINED. THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).**

**3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

- Study Session of the Transportation Commission – November 18, 2011
- Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission – November 18, 2011

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE STUDY SESSION AND REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2010. COMMISSIONER WARD SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**P.F. Leyva**, commented that the bus stop on the northeast corner of Hayden/McDowell is now lit.

**5. TRUCK ROUTE ORDINANCE UPDATE**

Mr. Meinhart introduced Mr. Porell to give an overview and status update on the proposed implementation of the truck route policy. Staff has been working on this issue for a number of months as part of the Transportation Master Plan's recommendation to update the City's Truck Route Ordinance on roadways that have four or more travel lanes (existing or as planned). Mr. Meinhart also commented that significant comments on this item have been received since December 2010.

Mr. Porell provided background and history information on the current truck route ordinance that has not been updated since 1985, and reviewed a map of the current truck routes. He also indicated that some routes to be added to the ordinance include: Dynamite, Happy Valley, Pinnacle Peak, Legacy Boulevard (Union Hills), and Frank Lloyd Wright. Mr. Porell explained that extensive public outreach was conducted as part of staff's efforts in developing the draft

revised ordinance to implement a new truck route designation within the City. Based on significant input received, staff has considered additional revisions to the draft ordinance.

In addition, as a result from input received from residents, staff is proposing that the draft ordinance include the recommended exceptions as follows:

- Via Linda from 90<sup>th</sup> Street to 130<sup>th</sup> Street
- 96<sup>th</sup> Street from Via Linda to Shea Boulevard
- Cactus Road from Loop 101 to 96<sup>th</sup> Street
- Mountain View from Hayden to 90<sup>th</sup> Street
- Thunderbird Road from 87<sup>th</sup> Street to Frank Lloyd Wright
- Legend Trail Parkway from Pima to Stagecoach
- McCormick Parkway

Mr. Porell stated that the copy of the draft ordinance provided to the Commission for review is part of City Code.

Chair Weiss opened the floor for public comment:

**Jane Myers**, Scottsdale resident, is opposed to Mountain View, specifically between Hayden and 90<sup>th</sup> Street, being a truck route due to a school and city park nearby. This will create added noise and pollution, and believes big trucks have no reason to be in this area. Ms. Myers asked the Commission to consider adding Mountain View to the list of exceptions.

**David Black**, President of Casa Buena Homeowners Association, echoed Ms. Myers' comments to consider adding Mountain View Road to the list of exceptions. He supports the need to modernize the ordinance but does not agree with the arbitrary designation based on major arterial or number of lanes without regard to where these streets go. This street goes to no commercial property at all--Shea is an alternative route. Mr. Black encourages the Commission to exclude Mountain View between Hayden and 90<sup>th</sup> Street from being a truck route, and extend this to Scottsdale Road due to lack of commercial use. He also commended Scottsdale Ranch residents for their input and participation.

**Elaine Rosing**, resident of The Racquet Club, is opposed to the truck route proposal for 96<sup>th</sup> Street and Via Linda. Ms. Rosing represents 400 units that are equal to approximately 600 senior residents. Along with increased noise and pollution, a lot of seniors already have a problem crossing Mountain View/96<sup>th</sup> Street due to no crosswalk in the area to get to the medical center nearby. Ms. Rosing asks that Mountain View be considered an exception.

**Sherry Leonescu**, resident of Vista Del Rincon, reiterated that children are at school in this area that is posted at 35, 25, and 15 m.p.h. Thunderbird Road being a truck route would be very dangerous to children, families, and elderly walking their dogs. This road does not lead to the 101 Freeway or any other commercial area. Shea and Cactus are alternative routes. This is a

residential area with schools, parks, and a school bus route that stops every couple blocks. Ms. Leonescu asks the Commission to reconsider Thunderbird from being a truck route.

**Kathe Barnes**, Executive Director of Scottsdale Ranch Community Association, understands that this is to be considered a mandate from the 2008 plan, but does not believe that the “one size fits all” does not fit the City of Scottsdale. It is understood that trucks need to come to homes to deliver goods, but to have big trucks/semis, or to have traffic use Via Linda as a cut-thru creates a safety hazard. Ms. Barnes asks the Commission to adopt the draft ordinance that excludes 96<sup>th</sup> Street from Shea to Via Linda, and Via Linda as it goes from 90<sup>th</sup> to 136<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Gayla Coletto**, President of Vista del Rincon Homeowners Association, represents 168 homes and surrounding neighbors of Cadillac Ranch and Madrid. She presented a map to the Commission showing there is no access to the 101 Freeway in this area. She commented that Redfield and Thunderbird are residential areas with schools and parks. To put large heavy trucks would cause increased noise and pollution, and would pose a danger to the community. Ms. Coletto encouraged the Commission to remove Redfield and Thunderbird from being a truck route.

**Randall Stout**, resident of the Camelot community, represents Thunderbird Road. Mr. Stout commented that this is a residential area populated with 4-way stops. He asked when a traffic light would be installed when exiting the 101 Freeway to get to Thunderbird. He commented this is a blind intersection that would be very dangerous for large heavy trucks.

The following non-speaker cards were submitted and read for the record by Chair Weiss:

**Harriett Fireored**: “Against trucks being allowed on Thunderbird due to safety reasons, family and children. Please allow on Raintree.”

**Bonita Small**: “Against trucks being allowed on Thunderbird. Safety reasons for children and neighbors.”

**John McCrory**: “Register opposition to designating Via Linda from 90<sup>th</sup> to Shea and 96<sup>th</sup> Street from Via Linda to Shea as truck route. I understand the Transportation Commission has changed the recommendation to exclude these from truck routes and urge Council to vote in favor of that recommendation.”

**Bruce Myers**: “We at Country Horizon located on Mountain View Road oppose the truck ordinance for obvious reasons regarding safety and noise between 90<sup>th</sup> and Hayden.”

**John N. Simon**: “Oppose truck route proposals on Via Linda.”

**Terry Barnes**: “Request Thunderbird to be excluded as a truck route as it is a neighborhood street with schools and parks. This road is at 35 m.p.h. speed limit with 4-way stops also.”

Chair Weiss opened the floor for comments from the Commission:

Commissioner Howard referred to the presentation slide showing the additional requested exceptions (Mountain View, Thunderbird, and Legend Trail Parkway) and agreed it is reasonable to add these to the list of exceptions. Commissioner Maxwell agreed and added he has observed no commercial traffic in these areas.

Commissioner Ward understands the purpose of truck routes and how they work; however, expressed concern with the number of truck routes that are spaced a mile apart. He is aware that a lot of those streets are four lanes, and not all serve the purpose for moving goods. He has also experienced dangerous situations near the school and on Thunderbird. Commissioner Ward suggests staff take another opportunity to look at all truck routes not just the ones being commented on tonight.

Vice Chair Gruver agreed with Commissioner Ward's comments and added that the verbiage is a bit confusing in that it appears to not instruct, direct, or recommend that trucks use specified routes. She also expressed concern in that there were no interests from commercial businesses. Although Vice Chair Gruver agrees with Commissioner Ward's comments, she does not oppose staff's proposal.

With regards to Commissioner Ward's concern on Section 17-60 (d) pertaining to passenger buses, public utility vehicles, and government vehicles, Mr. Porell explained that the City has numerous resort developments that cater to charter buses bringing their patrons to the facility and then going on tours. Therefore, the element of commerce within the City should be unencumbered by this ordinance. With regard to utility and government vehicles, Mr. Porell clarified the definition of utility vehicles and indicated that to encumber utility and city vehicles with the ordinance would be non-productive to good operations within the City.

Mr. Porell ensured Vice Chair Gruver that staff has no objections or issues to the exceptions proposed by the Commission or listed in the draft ordinance as a result of public comment received.

Commissioner Howard and Chair Weiss agree that it is possible for the Commission to look at exceptions for future changes.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT ORDINANCE AS PRESENTED TO INCLUDE THUNDERBIRD ROAD FROM 87<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD, REDFIELD ROAD FROM 92<sup>ND</sup> STREET TO FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD, LEGEND TRAIL PARKWAY FROM PIMA ROAD TO STAGECOACH PASS, MOUNTAIN VIEW ROAD FROM SCOTTSDALE ROAD TO 90<sup>TH</sup> STREET, AND MCCORMICK PARKWAY FROM SCOTTSDALE TO HAYDEN ROADS TO THE LIST OF EXCEPTIONS. COMMISSIONER COLE SECONDED. COMMISSIONER WARD OPPOSED. THE MOTION PASSED FIVE (5) TO ONE (1).**

## 6. MOUNTAIN VIEW/124<sup>TH</sup> STREET TRAIL

Mr. Meinhart introduced Robin Rodgers, Capital Project Management, and Jim Coffman, the consultant working on this project. He also introduced Mr. Kempton who will present this item and provide background on other trail projects funded thru the Bond 2000 Program. Staff will review and ask for direction from the Commission on the preferred alignments between Stonegate Equestrian Park and Lost Dog Wash Trailhead before these projects go into a final design contract.

Mr. Kempton provided background information on the three trails currently in design. These trails include the Via Dona Trail (approximately 95% complete); Mountain View Trail (approximately 30% complete), and Doubletree Trail which has just started design. The cost of constructing all three trails will likely exceed the funds available for trail construction from Bond 2000. Once accurate cost estimates are prepared, funding options and possible phasing of the projects will be explored.

Mr. Kempton reviewed specific construction and right-of-way issues at identified locations between Stonegate Equestrian Park and Lost Dog Wash.

Mr. Kempton stated that a public meeting was held on December 7, 2010, in which comments received were incorporated into the corridor selection process and a preferred alignment on 125<sup>th</sup> Street was developed.

Mr. Coffman spoke on the positive effects of the preferred alignment that provides a more direct route between Stonegate Equestrian Park and Lost Dog Wash.

Chair Weiss opened the floor for public comment:

**Hillary Haseley**, Scottsdale resident for 10 years, owns horses and dogs, and walks the trail four times per week. This trail, if approved, will be ADA compliant and will benefit families with strollers. It will also serve two parks to allow children to get there. Ms. Haseley supports the trail going from Lost Dog Wash to the Equestrian Center.

**Martin Flick**, Scottsdale resident of 22 years, owns horses, dogs, bikes, etc. We use this trail regularly. Mr. Flick commented that 124<sup>th</sup> Street/Shea is a major corridor and people do not have access east or west because of a stop light. If you are there anytime during the day, it is a race track. A code enforcement officer has observed heavy traffic and speeding vehicles. Mr. Flick fully supports the trail system and preferred trail off of 124<sup>th</sup> Street. He does not walk or ride horses on Shea and 124<sup>th</sup> Street is not a friendly street to walk on. A fatal accident occurred about one month ago on 124<sup>th</sup> Street and Shea. Mr. Flick supports the 125<sup>th</sup> Street preferred alignment.

**Al Hoffman**, former board member of NESPOA, supports some of staff's comments and opposes the trail on 125th Street. 124<sup>th</sup> Street is a speedway. We were not notified that this was coming into place. Not sure if there is a plan that can go further east.

**Judith Brown**, resident on 124<sup>th</sup> Street/Shea, owns a security company and has experienced crime increasing as populated areas are opened up to the public. She has seen a victim of a home invasion and there is an increased demand for gated communities. The accessibility of the public to private property promotes the easy casing to your property, your families, and you. Burglars can come back when they want which makes for the ultimate break-in and home invasion. People can easily go along easements, throw a rock, and break in. It is dangerous.

**William Smaltz**, Scottsdale resident since 1967, indicated that when he bought his property he was told there would be a trail on 124<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Smaltz lives at the entrance to the Stonegate Equestrian Center and is in favor of this project. Although there are some disagreements with other residents, he feels they can be worked out. Mr. Smaltz also indicated he signed an agreement for a 40-foot easement on his property to allow the City to come across his yard. For the purpose of kids, horses, dogs, etc., he encourages the Commission to recommend the continuation of this project.

**Ross Stuart**, Scottsdale Ranch resident, owns a property that abuts the culvert on Shea. He indicated that the proposed trail will run thru his property. He opposes this trail due to the City not having the right to build a trail on a GLO road easement. He referred to a copy of a 2005 City of Scottsdale memo he received defining the purpose of a GLO road easement to provide road access to a property by necessity that would otherwise be landlocked. This right-of-way created when the land was patented was for street and utility access only. A trail such as the Mountain View trail is not a roadway nor public utility. Building such would require an appropriate separate trail easement dedication. The trail configuration is unfair to my property even if a GLO road easement were available. The configuration presented to the Commission encourages the length of two sides to my property. The south side and the entire west side for 33 feet on each side, totaling 30,000 square feet. This far exceeds any other property touched by the trail. The most impacted properties are approximately 6,000 square feet, rather than 30,000 square feet. Mr. Stuart does not believe there is a formal maintenance plan for this trail. The website states that the City of Scottsdale will maintain trails without associations. This is an over simplification of the trail and how it will be managed going forward. The maintenance of the trail needs to be defined and assured that animal waste, trash, plant growth, etc. will be taken care of. Mr. Stuart stated there should be a service level agreement that states these items. This is necessary to make sure that if the trail is implemented, it is the best trail for the community. Mr. Stuart suggests that the Transportation Commission not approve this trail at its current proposal. The City of Scottsdale should offer an alignment that takes into consideration proper easement dedication, fairness in alignment among property owners, and a thorough maintenance plan. I am open to discuss other alternatives and conditions that are more fair and reasonable in regard to my property.

**Harvey Plant**, resident in this area for 37 years, opposes this trail. He feels that the route of this trail was misrepresented at the first meeting when asking for a vote of homeowners to approve or disapprove. He stated that he approved it because he thought the route was going to be in a different place; however, came to find out that this is going to be about 35 feet closer to his property line. Mr. Plant stated he is sorry that people do not have a place to ride horses. If the speed limits were observed it would be safe to walk on Mountain View. Unfortunately, on 124<sup>th</sup> Street, there is a dip and people like to speed thru. Residents have asked for traffic calming and nothing has happened.

**Susan Stanleel**, former City of Scottsdale employee and resident for 12 years, indicated that this conversation has been going on for a long time. She owns horses, dogs, and has children. She believes this area is very unsafe. For the amount of people on bikes, she has observed them in full gear trying to get back and forth. It has been a long process. This area was photographed by the newspaper about five years ago commenting on how the trails are wonderful and have no connections to get from one end to another. While some people seem to focus on horses, focus needs to also be made on people with baby carriages, bikes, and kids. There has been little acknowledgement about speed issues. It is always an accident waiting to happen. Many people in favor of this have lived there longer. This area was supposed to be an area where you could enjoy walking or riding bikes. To not join these two areas after all this time would be an awful thing. If you want to see why 125<sup>th</sup> makes more sense than 124<sup>th</sup>, you don't have to come at any certain given time—it is always unsafe.

**James Jaskie**, Scottsdale resident, indicated that putting in trails is wonderful. However the proposed trail makes no sense. He presented a picture of Mountain View Road. It is nice rural neighborhood. This plan is talking about taking out mature vegetation and making a gravel trail that will not accommodate strollers, bikes, etc. It will only accommodate horses. Mr. Jaskie suggested doing traffic calming and installing roundabouts or speed tables to slow down traffic for people who use it. He also referred to a picture of 124<sup>th</sup> Street where people who ride horses do not want to use Mountain View to 124<sup>th</sup> Street. I agree with them. By the shrubbery that has been there for years, you can tell nobody uses, maintains, or rides this trail. So why would you damage a neighborhood by ripping up beautiful foliage and plants to put in gravel to hook up to this unused trail. I am sure some people would like to use it, but I don't really see the number of users that would justify this. For the cost involved in doing this, the City could buy vehicles to haul horses to the equestrian park up to Lost Dog Wash. A better idea would be to install traffic calming to make it less dangerous for kids that are playing, bicyclists, and walkers to use the trail safely. The few people that have to take horses can take them on a safe road where there would be no damage.

**Norman Kawar**, resides at 120<sup>th</sup> Street/Mountain View. He expressed his excitement about having a citywide trail system. It will get everyone out there to take a walk, hike, etc. As far as it is planned now, the easements show that the trail should be on the south side of the road. Mr. Kawar feels that more clarification is needed on this. There is also a safety issue that if this trail

was to be put in on the north side of Mountain View Road, people would have to cross the street to go south to Stonegate Equestrian Park, but there is only a stop sign going east and west. If people are speeding down 120<sup>th</sup> Street making a left turn, there is a safety issue there. There is also a barrier that needs to be installed between the trail and private residences. Mr. Kavar does not want horses wandering into his yard. He stated that residents have not received adequate information on design of the trail. He indicated that his driveway is on 120<sup>th</sup> Street and access is on Mountain View. He does not want that blocked off. Mr. Kavar requests that no action be taken on this portion of the trail, but would like to see trail get to Lost Dog Wash. A big concern is getting to 124<sup>th</sup> Street; it is not good for bikers, equestrian, etc. The whole project should be completed at once.

**Bruce Wiegand**, resident for 1 ½ ears works out of his home. He commented that he has only seen 10 horses at the most that have used the trail to the south along the canal line. The biggest problem is the street--124<sup>th</sup> Street is a nightmare. He suggests that 124<sup>th</sup> Street needs to be changed to slow down traffic. Then the horse path can be created there. He has observed about 100 bikers that go thru 124<sup>th</sup>. He commented that if the trail is put on 125<sup>th</sup> Street, the City is just putting a band-aid on it. Also, merging traffic into different pathways costs too much money. He has seen 124<sup>th</sup> Street with young children, horse waste has sat there for over a month, and no one has cleaned it. The riders do not clean up. People need to control 124<sup>th</sup> Street and Mountain View. The city needs to do something. Mr. Wiegand suggests making 124<sup>th</sup> Street and adding roundabouts, along with taking care of Mountain view.

**Jeffrey Lehrer**, part of the Canyon Ridge group, owns the northern most home in that community. Mr. Lehrer does not understand why there has to be an equestrian trail between Stonegate and Lost Dog Wash because south of Shea has a 2-5 acre horse property. The problem in this area is that there are tract homes that are considered a real residential area. This neighborhood should not have horses walking thru the neighborhood. There is a wall on the east side of the neighborhood that when a horse goes by the wall, the head of a person riding the horse is about five feet over the wall looking directly into people's yards. Also, the trail the way it is designed abuts Mr. Lehrer's wall along with other homes in that area. These homes are going to lose their privacy. Another thing Mr. Lehrer questions on this trail is that in the last several years since the parking lot has been developed, he has seen few horse trailers there. He believes that if people want to use those trails, they should bring their horses in horse trailers. He commented that we are asking for problems which include the sanitation issues. He is not aware of any maintenance plan. He expressed concern with security risks at Anasazi School. Mr. Lehrer believes this plan does not need to happen and prefers that there should not be an equestrian trail thru a neighborhood that was not meant to have an equestrian trail.

**Harrison Bewley**, Scottsdale resident, mentioned that the trail between Cochise and the underpass on Shea is along his property. Although Mr. Bewley does not have horses, he is in favor of the trail. It is very dangerous in that community and the traffic on 124<sup>th</sup> Street is unreal. Everyone speeds. It is unsafe and something needs to happen. Mr. Bewley supports the plan the way it is aligned on 125<sup>th</sup> Street because it gets horses away from 124<sup>th</sup> Street, which poses

a danger. Although it is a sacrifice for folks, safety comes first. This alignment is satisfactory. The utility of a trail is needed.

The following non-speaker cards were submitted and read for the record by Chair Weiss:

**Linda Meredith**, “This trail will benefit all that live in this community, including equestrians. I have lived here for over 15 years and have been patiently waiting for this trail. This trail will finally link users to other trails in the area. For those of us that enjoy being outdoors, this will be a welcome relief. It is especially needed South of Shea where there are no sidewalks or trails for walkers, bicyclists and horseback riders. I purchased my house many years ago based on the City’s plan for this trail. I chose where I bought based on information supplied by the City. This trail will provide a safe area to walk and ride (bike/horse). It is long overdue.”

**Kevin Flynn**, “This trail is a must to complete the trail system. Walkers, joggers, moms and kids, bikes and strollers, and horses walk to the park daily on 120<sup>th</sup> by using a dangerous street.”

**Antschlatter Flynn**, “Yes, I would like the trail system to be completed. Not only is it wanted, but is needed for safety issues. Heavy fast traffic is dangerous for equestrians, walkers, bikers, and children at play. I would also like to see speed tables put on 120<sup>th</sup> Street, south of Mountain View and/or speed roundabouts on that corner.”

**Morley Meredith**, “A trail along Mountain View and 124<sup>th</sup> Street to Lost Dog Wash and the Preserve is long overdue. It should be open to all users. This is a traffic safety issue.”

**Elizabeth Brown**, “I am vehemently opposed to Mountain View Trail; (a) no reason to have a horse trail near a six-lane road—it is extremely dangerous; (b) until the General Plan is resolved, this trail system is premature; and (c) property owners should not have to sacrifice property for this purpose.”

**Judith Robertson**, “In favor of agenda item #6 on 125<sup>th</sup> Street.”

**Kim Wilkinson**, “Regarding the multi-use trail between Cochise and the canal, there is no good reason why the trail cannot follow the original plan to be along 124<sup>th</sup> Street. Placing the trail along 125<sup>th</sup> places the trail 20 feet from my bedroom window, and disrupts our NAOS. There is no NAOS or homes close to 124<sup>th</sup> that would be disrupted.

**Ralph and Betty Magih**, “The Mountain View/124<sup>th</sup> Street trail should not be built for the following reasons: (1) It is too costly in the present climate when other City facilities are being closed, e.g., libraries; (2) the trail would invade property owners’ privacy by allowing users on horseback viewing into owners’ property; (3) the trail is not justified for the nuclear (small) people who would utilize it; and (4) the problem of horse waste being left to lie would be

unsightly; and (5) it would conflict with middle school and high school operations, especially when discharging and picking up students.

**James Flynn**, "In keeping with the theme Scottsdale has established, I believe this trail would be a vital asset to the City. It provides a connection from the equestrian park to the Preserve.

**Esta Finley**, "I am in favor of agenda item #6."

Chair Weiss opened the floor for comments from the Commission:

With regard to Vice Chair Gruver's questions regarding the maintenance policy of trails and next steps of this project, Mr. Kempton explained that trails are maintained by property owners or the City's Parks and Recreation Department. However, when Council approved design of this trail, it was decided that the City's Parks and Recreation would maintain this trail. Mr. Kempton is not aware of the frequency, but indicated that City staff responds to any calls regarding service. Mr. Kempton also explained that the next step for this project is to get direction from the Commission to move further out into the design phase of this project on one of the preferred alignments.

Commissioner Cole expressed concern with the overwhelming feedback received from residents regarding speed and safety on 124<sup>th</sup> Street and Mountain View and asked what studies have been conducted. Mr. Porell explained that studies have been conducted on 124<sup>th</sup> Street and Mountain View, which have identified these streets as part of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. As a result, staff has been working with residents on a series of speed tables on Mountain View and two raised median islands to be constructed on 124<sup>th</sup> Street.

Due to safety and privacy concerns expressed by residents, Commissioner Howard agrees with a citizen's request asking for more design information on this trail. He suggests that the Commission focus on the preferred alignment and asks staff to provide more detail on the design to see if it alleviates some issues with privacy. Commissioner Cole agreed as the design detail provided tonight was a bit vague. .

In response to Chair Weiss' questions, Mr. Meinhart defined GLOs (Government Land Office patent easements) and clarified that this trail will be a multi-use trail, not just an equestrian trail.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOTIONED THAT THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT PROCEED WITH DESIGN PRIMARILY ALONG THE PREFERRED ALIGNMENT USING 125<sup>TH</sup> STREET, RATHER THAN 124<sup>TH</sup> STREET SOUTH OF SHEA, AND THAT STAFF RETURN TO THE COMMISSION WITH MORE DESIGN DETAILS FOR FURTHER REVIEW. VICE CHAIR GRUVER SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

## 7. DRAFT ROADWAY NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY

Ms. Huish reviewed options and criteria considered by staff on the draft Noise Abatement Policy.

She mentioned the items considered as follows:

- When and how should a noise study be conducted?
- What factors should be included in that study?
- What threshold or decibel level would trigger noise mitigation?
- What should the maximum cost cap of abatement be?

Ms. Huish also commented on the importance of being aware of other City policies such as the environmentally sensitive lands ordinance and foothills overlay in the northern sections of the community because some of those noise barriers may conflict with those policies. Other things to consider are that if the criteria are not specifically noted in the City of Scottsdale draft policy, ADOT policies and criteria for noise mitigation will be followed. In addition, should this policy be adopted by the City Council, this policy will supersede Section 10.0 of the Policy Element and Section 6.6 of the Streets Element of the Transportation Master Plan.

Chair Weiss opened the floor for public comment.

**Suzan Curtin**, Sands East II HOA, provided some proposed minor edits to page 1 and 2 of the draft policy. She asked for an explanation on the "...access management..." as noted in section I of page 1.

The following comments/concerns were provided by the Commission:

Commissioner Ward expressed concern with the "no harm, no foul" concept in that the City's form of fouls and what has to be done for mitigation has been defined; however, no mention has focused on the form of fouls of property owners. In response to this concern, Mr. Meinhart and Ms. Huish referred to the introduction paragraph of the policy and paragraph G. Commissioner Ward suggested the possibility of modifying Section I or II.

Vice Chair Gruver asked how staff plans to address suggested edits by speaker, Suzan Curtin. Mr. Meinhart and Ms. Huish repeated Ms. Curtin's proposed edits for review and consideration.

Commissioner Howard suggested that a footnote or other text that describes turning movements be contained in the draft policy.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE DRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY AS PRESENTED TO INCLUDE THE SUGGESTED CHANGES MADE BY THE COMMISSION. COMMISSIONER WARD SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

## **8. BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) STUDY UPDATE**

Mr. Meinhart introduced Ms. Horne of URS who is a lead consultant working on this study, and Stuart Boggs of RPTA.

Ms. Horne gave a presentation on the Scottsdale/Rural Road Alternatives Analysis that included an overview of the objectives of the study. She explained that a Technical Advisory Group made up of RPTA, City of Scottsdale, City of Tempe, Valley Metro Rail, and Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) reviewed study materials, provided technical advice, and participated in conducting community outreach. A map of the study location and duration, study background, and purpose and need of the project were reviewed.

Ms. Horne also gave an overview of the four alternatives evaluated that represent different and increased levels of transit for the corridor, and reviewed the Downtown Scottsdale alignments considered. An overview of the two-level screening and evaluation process (required for federal funding), along with conclusions was also presented.

Ms. Horne briefly reviewed some alternative BRT service levels based on available operating funds. She also mentioned that total capital cost for a project in the federal Very Small Starts grant program cannot exceed \$50 million, or \$3 million per mile.

An overview on travel time and results, and estimated ridership was reviewed. Study recommendations are that alternative 2, which is the most basic type of BRT service using shared lanes with limited stops, be implemented. No recommendation could be made at this time for Downtown Scottsdale on whether or not to use Scottsdale Road or Drinkwater for an option thru Downtown. It is recommended that this be taken on in the next phase of the project during development of the Design Concept Report.

Ms. Horne reviewed some outstanding issues as follows:

- Local and sales tax revenue continue to fall below projections.
- This has necessitated service reductions and project deferrals by Valley Metro member agencies.
- The current funding uncertainty has implications for the Scottsdale/Rural Road BRT corridor in which regional operating funding is currently only programmed for the Scottsdale portion of the project, and local operating funds would be required for the Tempe portion of the route.

Ms. Horne stated that RPTA is recommending accepting the Study, suggesting deferral of adoption of a Locally Preferred Alternative, and development of the Design Concept Report until the operating funds issue has been resolved. RPTA is also recommending that they continue to work with the Cities of Scottsdale and Tempe on interim service improvements, possibly including limited stop bus service, to address travel demand within the corridor.

Chair Weiss opened the floor for public comment.

**P.F. Leyva**, rides the north/south corridors and uses 44<sup>th</sup> Street because it is faster. He believes that stopping at every mile on the Scottsdale Road corridor does not make sense. If a route is going to be ten minutes faster, routes overlapping are not an improvement. Also, the LINK has no service to Gilbert Road. Service north of Mayo Boulevard is long. The Scottsdale Road route is one hour long from north to south. Not sure if the idea of using a limited stop during rush hour was considered.

Commissioner Howard expressed the following concerns:

- Questioned the title of “Scottsdale/Rural Road Alternative Analysis” as stated on the PowerPoint presentation versus what was noted on the meeting agenda as “BRT Study Update.” (Mr. Meinhart explained with regards to the language on the meeting agenda, it was staff’s choice based on what the study results appeared to be heading towards.)
- Concerned that numerous assumptions made in the presentation are not supported by quantitative data. He suggests that number figures should be provided, specifically for estimates of travel times, ridership, and costs. Commissioner Howard referred to the actual number of ridership provided in the amount of 3,375 for Route 72 is inaccurate and suggests that more justification needs to be given. (Ms. Horne explained the process used in determining ridership and indicated an actual on-board count was done in conjunction with Route 72. Commissioner Howard asked to be provided with this information.)
- Expressed concern with funding. Although Commissioner Howard is a proponent of mass transit, he feels that using large amounts of federal capital dollars will not solve Scottsdale’s problems. In essence, spending large amounts of capital money can result in huge operating expenses. (Mr. Boggs explained the challenge on how to address capacity of traffic on Scottsdale Road when lanes can’t be added and other ways to move people through that corridor have to be looked at.)
- Questioned the process in organizing focus groups and advertising of public meetings to invite the residents and business owners. (Ms. Huish indicated that advertisement was done via newspaper, news releases, website, articles written by reporters who attended the meetings, along with an announcement at the July Transportation Commission meeting. Mr. Boggs explained the process taken to form the focus groups and added that public meetings were held on July 19, July 21, October 27, and October 28, 2010 at various venues. In addition, members of the focus groups helped advertise public meeting by going back to notify their neighborhoods.)

To further address Commissioner Howard’s concerns regarding quantitative data, Ms. Horne stated that the MAG travel model was used as a basis of this study and technical information that went into advising on the alternative is available. Commissioner Howard asked to review this.

Commissioner Gruver commented that she understands the 3,375 number is actual ridership. She indicated that she did attend one of the public meetings and feels this issue will be challenging as opinions are diverse. In talking to business owners, she received explanation on riders who are interested in accessibility versus those concerned about speed. Commissioner Gruver asked for information on what stage the study is in currently and what could be expected in the future. In response, Mr. Meinhart provided an explanation regarding actual ridership and provided a bit of background information on the increase of operating costs. He pointed out that one of the reasons this item has been presented to the Commission is that there is no recommendation at this point to move this immediately into its next step of the Design Concept Report because it is a big challenge from a financial perspective.

Chair Weiss commented that he supports looking at alternatives, however, feels this plan does not show the character of Scottsdale. This plan does not recognize that mass transit's primary users are people trying to get to their jobs in Scottsdale versus people who live in Scottsdale trying to get to their job elsewhere. He still feels there is an issue with the Park and Ride on Thunderbird not helping people get to their jobs at the Airpark.

Mr. Boggs indicated this study is available on the Valley Metro website.

## **9. TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET UPDATE**

Mr. Meinhart mentioned that focus on this item will be on review and possible approval of the CIP program budget for FY 2012/2016.

With regards to the CIP budget for Transportation for FY 2012/2016, Mr. Porell gave a brief overview on changes from the 2011/2015 CIP, funding source breakdown, and funding by program area. A summary of the 36 capital projects and programs included in the Transportation CIP for 2012/2016 was also provided.

The next step in the process is to forward the Transportation Commission recommendations on the draft CIP to Budget Commission and City Council.

**COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL AND BUDGET COMMISSION APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT PROPOSED CIP BUDGET AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MAXWELL SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

With regard to the operating budget, Mr. Meinhart commented that approximately \$500,000 in savings this year will be carried into next year's budget for transit contract costs with RPTA. In the event the Governor's budget proposal is released, there is a proposal to shift some of the Highway User Revenue Funds (approximately \$20 million statewide) that currently go to cities and counties to remain at the state level. This could then have a \$0.5 million impact to the

Transportation Fund. As a result, there could be a potential temporary closure of Loloma Station and possible modification to Route 81 on the northern end of the Airpark.

Additional information will be provided at the next meeting on February 17.

**10. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment was received.

**11. OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS**

Mr. Meinhart mentioned that a new hospitality trolley route went into effect on Monday, January 17<sup>th</sup> and explained that this pilot program was approved by City Council on January 11, 2011. More detailed information will be provided to the Commission at next month's meeting.

As an additional effort to reach out to the public, Mr. Meinhart mentioned that the City's Boards and Commissions now have their own comments page on each of their individual sites within the City's website.

**12. IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, Chair Weiss adjourned the Regular meeting at 10:06 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

Rose Arballo  
Transportation Coordinator

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