



**SUMMARIZED MINUTES  
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2009  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BLVD.  
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Howard called the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission to order at 6:14 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** William Howard, Chair  
Josh Weiss, Vice Chair  
Terry Gruver, Commissioner  
Kelly McCall, Commissioner (departed at 10:04 p.m.)  
Howard Sukenic, Commissioner  
Paul Ward, Commissioner

**ABSENT:** Donald Maxwell, Commissioner

**STAFF:** Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager  
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director  
Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator  
Annie DeChance, Public Participation & Outreach Manager  
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering and Operations Director  
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner  
Bruce Dressel, ITS Manager

Jennifer Bohac, Senior Traffic Engineer  
Reed Kempton, Principal Transportation Planner

**GUESTS:** Soyoung (Sue) Ahn, ASU Assistant Professor  
Howard Myers, Ad Hoc Citizen Trails Task Force  
Amanda Rutherford, Ad Hoc Citizen Trails Task Force

**SPEAKERS:**

Benjamin Belkin  
Karla Crall  
Tracey House

Janice Kruglick  
Dave MacDonald  
Thomas Mundar

Gena Zischke  
Nancy Stuebe

2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- Study Session of the Transportation Commission - February 19, 2009
- Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission - February 19, 2009

**COMMISSIONER GRUVER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2009 STUDY SESSION AND REGULAR MEETINGS, AS AMENDED. COMMISSIONER WARD SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

3. **Public Comment**

**Dave MacDonald** recommended the website [www.pluginpartners.org](http://www.pluginpartners.org) as a source of information on what cities across America are doing regarding plug-in vehicles. He said the Volt being built by General Motors is designed to get 40 miles on a purely electric charge and at least 300 miles on a tank of gas.

4. **Scottsdale and National Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Programs**

Ms. Ahn provided an overview of traffic congestion solutions. Congestion occurs when demand exceeds the capacity of transportation facilities. This wastes time and fuel, has a negative environmental impact, and lowers the quality of life. Capacity can be increased by building new, or expanding existing facilities, but it is not possible for a community to build its way out of congestion. Operational improvements, higher occupancy modes, and demand management are alternative countermeasures.

Ms. Ahn spoke about emerging trends. Managing roadway sections, and intersection and incident management can achieve operational improvements. Adaptive signal control is becoming quite popular. Rather than timing signals based on historical data, this strategy optimizes timing based on real-time information collected from roadway sensors. Signal synchronization controls traffic at a series of intersections so that drivers do not have to stop as often. Several groups are also working to address incident management. Incidents are the cause of approximately 25% of congestion. Demand management includes new options such as charging drivers based on the mileage they drive. There is a lot of research going into dynamic congestion pricing, in which the pricing scheme would change depending on the level of congestion or inflow to the city. New algorithms for adaptive signal control are being developed, and existing ones enhanced. IntelliDrive uses dynamic short-range communication technology to allow vehicles to communicate with each other and with roadside units to obtain traffic information. Commissioner McCall inquired about the VII system. Ms. Ahn responded that VII consists of an onboard unit in emergency vehicles that would enable them to communicate with signal control and request preemption.

Vice Chair Weiss said the Commission is interested in knowing how the City could grow the ITS program beyond addressing special event and bottleneck congestion using the existing infrastructure. What other types of infrastructure should it invest in, and what other things should the City anticipate doing over the next several years? Ms. Ahn responded that innovative technology would allow Scottsdale to optimize its current use of ITS. Rather than requiring an operator to monitor the performance of roadways at all times, it could be automated and

optimized. Scottsdale could follow some cities in coordinating ramp metering with the local arterial signals. This would result in reduced queue spillovers from the onramps. Commissioner McCall inquired about the level of investment that would be necessary to implement adaptive signal control beyond what Scottsdale already has. Ms. Ahn said Scottsdale already has cameras at most intersections, and it would be a matter of turning them into a detection system. Inductive loop detectors installed at intersections could be utilized as well.

Chair Howard said Scottsdale's problem is less about optimizing a signal street or road, and more about optimizing the traffic flow in a region of the city. Ms. Ahn responded that the objective function of the algorithms is to minimize total delay over all vehicles. A local optimum is seen as a better alternative than a heuristic approach. Chair Howard inquired about what would happen in situations where volume is more desired than delay is, such as when a city has to be evacuated. Ms. Ahn responded that they are closely related. Maximizing throughput through a certain point also means reducing the total delay. In response to a further inquiry from Chair Howard, Ms. Ahn said two members of the faculty at University of Arizona are currently approaching adaptive signals with the goal of maximizing the performance of the whole network.

Commissioner Gruver inquired whether there are any trends toward predictive techniques that could help professionals understand where problems might develop in the future. Ms. Ahn responded that one faculty member at Arizona State University analyzes travel demand models, predicting how population is expected to grow, and how traffic would be distributed. Those predictions are based on land use and social characteristics. Ms. O'Connor said Scottsdale implemented a local version of the regional transportation model in part to make predictions about specific areas of the City. She also clarified that Scottsdale has a varying degree of density throughout the city that affects transit decisions. The Airpark is a dense employment center and the downtown area is a relatively dense mixed-use center.

## 5. Trails Task Force Recommendations and Mescal Park Overview

- **Review and discussion of Ad Hoc Citizen Trails Task Force recommendations**

Chair Howard welcomed members of the Trails Task Force. Ms. O'Connor identified the Task Force members in attendance, in addition to Ms. Rutherford and Mr. Myers, who will provide an introduction. Ms. Rutherford said the Task Force was a great experience, and felt the product is something Scottsdale could be proud of. Mr. Myers said he has been working on trails for the last 12 years, and hopes the City will now move on to implementation. The cost of building trails is a key issue. Scottsdale is not going to be able to build many trails at \$100,000 to \$300,000 per mile. The new trails classification should help with that. The abandonment policy addresses the City's tendency to give away rights-of-way that could be used for trails. The setbacks were established to ensure safety and an enjoyable experience. Even if he never uses the trails himself, he enjoys what the equestrian community brings to Scottsdale. It is important that their needs are addressed. They have the most to lose if this plan is not implemented.

Mr. Kempton noted that the Task Force was self-selected and open to any member of the public. Initially 79 people signed up. The first meeting had 50 participants and towards the end, the average was 25. Fifteen meetings were held between August and March. Recommendations were arrived at by consensus, and minority statements were included.

The first recommendation was on implementing the Neighborhood Trails program. They said the City should prioritize trails, work with the community to purchase easements and determine whether they are properly located. A substantial majority supported condemnation as a last resort, but five members felt that condemnation should never be considered. The Task Force felt that property owners should be financially responsible for removing obstructions in the easements, unless the City permitted those obstructions in the first place. If they do not want to remove the obstruction, they should be financially responsible for any realignment that is acceptable to the City. The group emphasized that the City should acquire undeveloped land for new trails, especially if doing so would connect or complete important trails. Mr. Kempton said the Task Force developed new scoring criteria to determine trail priorities. The trail system was divided into 360 segments in six geographic areas. The top 60 segments overall were identified as top priorities, as were the top 10 in each area. They identified secondary and tertiary priorities as well. Staff intends to use this list to physically evaluate priority segments to determine their status and identify any safety issues.

The group also provided input on trail design guidelines, standards and classifications. Overall, trailheads and easements got wider, and the grades became less steep for each classification. They chose to combine neighborhood and local trails, and create a new classification called rugged trails. These are minimally improved, non-paved trails designed for the equestrian, hiker, runner, and mountain biker, and placed as far away from traffic as possible. This classification would essentially allow trails that are exempt from ADA guidelines, either because of character issues, terrain, or other considerations.

The Task Force felt that any future bond programs should include funding for trails, and that the City should continue to look for increased funding for maintenance and enforcement activities. They recommended that the City maintain trails adjacent to individual properties, while requiring that HOA's and commercial entities maintain trails in their areas. Penalties for violations per the ordinances on trails and multi-use paths should be synchronized, and an awareness campaign initiated to educate the public on trail etiquette. A phone number should be posted for people to call with trail maintenance and enforcement issues. Chair Howard complimented the Task Force for producing a report with clear, consistent, and quantifiable logic.

Commissioner McCall praised the report, but expressed concern about rugged trails. She felt that the proximity to an accessible trail option should be quantified. Does that mean it is within a dozen feet or a mile? This should not be used as a way to get out of making the trails system accessible to all users. She addressed Mr. Myers' comments that rugged trails are a solution to the high cost of making trails. She understood the rugged trail definition as being most helpful in areas where there is already a primitive trail available, and the City would want to minimally maintain it in order to keep it part of the system and retain its character. She said Scottsdale should be building accessible trails, while including existing rugged trails into the system.

Mr. Meinhart explained there was much discussion on this item. Rugged trails are intended to be in the same basic corridor as paved trails. Ms. O'Connor added that the definition also incorporated elements from the Outdoor Developed Areas guidelines from the U.S. Access Board, which describe exceptions allowed to an accessible trail facility. It is possible that given those constraints, rugged trails could be built in areas where they might be the only option available. However, the City would always try to have a related or parallel trail available in the corridor.

Commissioner McCall suggested that at least the trailhead and first mile of a trail be made accessible. Mr. Myers responded that the Task Force spent an extreme amount of time on this definition. There are few sidewalks in the northern area, and equestrians would rely on these

trails to connect to their homes. Many of them go through washes and there are ways to make horses accessible to all users. To pave them would severely alter the character of the land, and at enormous expense. Rugged trails would not make sense in the more urbanized areas. Without providing this new option, Scottsdale would just not be able to build many trails.

Chair Howard said the National Park Service designates trails as non-maintained, so that no public monies are spent on them. Ms. O'Connor said the Task Force drew a distinction between facilities that are located in parks and those that are located in other public rights-of-way. There are different requirements for each type of facility. Mr. Kempton added that the vast majority of trails outside the Preserve are in roadway corridors.

Chair Howard appreciated the inclusion of minority reports. He felt the recommendation with regard to HOAs is an unfunded mandate. Some HOAs refuse to maintain the trails in their neighborhood because they simply do not want hikers there. He asked whether there was consideration as to how the City might enforce a reasonable maintenance responsibility on HOAs. Mr. Myers responded that the Task Force considered HOAs as common property with a different set of circumstances from individual properties. HOAs would be required to maintain the trails and keep them clear of obstacles. Chair Howard said he agreed with that recommendation but had doubts about its enforceability.

**COMMISSIONER WARD MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE AD HOC CITIZENS TRAIL TASK FORCE DRAFT FINAL REPORT, IN LIGHT OF COMMENTS MADE DURING THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S DISCUSSION. COMMISSIONER SUKENIC SECONDED.**

Commissioner McCall summarized the issues she felt needed to be addressed. Ms. O'Connor suggested that such a summary be included in a supplemental packet that would accompany the report, rather than amending the report itself, as many people worked hard to wordsmith specific language. The Commission's comments would be noted during the Council presentation as follows:

- Quantify the acceptable distance of alternative pedestrian options.
- Provide more background on how the definition of rugged trails was determined and what it attempts to accomplish.
- Allow trailheads and the first portion of trails to be accessible to all users.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

- **Overview of costs and alternatives for Mescal project, including right-of-way acquisition**

Mr. Kempton provided an overview of the Mescal Park area trails. Council recommended investigation of the public utility easement (PUE) as the first option for a north/south trail connection between Cactus Road and Mescal Park. The utilities that use the corridor and adjacent property owners have provided their input. There is currently no public access on the PUE. There are 35 separate adjacent properties, and 11 of the owners have indicated an unwillingness to sell. The appraised value of the PUE converted to a trail easement is \$460,000. Mr. Kempton displayed a series of photographs of the PUE.

He said Arizona Public Service (APS) is most concerned with maintenance vehicles hooking wires and pulling the utility poles down. Many guy wires that hold the poles up would have to be moved. The cost of design and construction of the trail itself is estimated at \$149,000. Qwest

estimated that the cost of burying its lines would be about \$37,000. Cox provided an estimate of from \$40,000 to \$50,000. Raising the APS lines would cost between \$273,000 and \$373,000, while burying them would be up to \$632,000. The lowest estimated base cost for the project is about \$687,000, and the highest is about \$1.4 million.

Several north/south and east/west options are proposed which use local streets to connect to Mescal Park and the surrounding neighborhood. The most viable option is a combination of 68<sup>th</sup> Place, 68<sup>th</sup> Street and Cholla. There is extra right of way width and asphalt could be restriped or removed along 68<sup>th</sup> Street, allowing room to build a four to six-foot wide trail in the right-of-way. Some obstacles would still have to be removed, but the majority could be addressed by meandering the trail. Some on-street parking would be reduced. Cholla has an average speed of 24 m.p.h., and 68<sup>th</sup> Street an average of 29 m.p.h. The traffic volumes on these streets would not be an impediment. The cost for the 68<sup>th</sup> Place/Street/Cholla option is about \$178,000. Due to strong property owner objections to easement purchase, and the cost associated with utility modifications, staff recommends using one of these local street alternatives, specifically 68<sup>th</sup> Place/Street/Cholla, instead of the PUE.

Chair Howard invited public commentary.

**Janice Kruglick** said she has been working for years to get trails in Mescal. The community needs to work together to get this job done. The horse facilities across Cactus cannot currently get to Mescal Park. It is disheartening to see people blocking off the easement, instead of working together on a solution.

**Tracey House** has been working for three years to get the easement dedicated as a legal access trail to Mescal Park. Everybody in this area has a PUE behind their house, and many are protected by City plat as equestrian easements. There are a large number of horse properties in Scottsdale, especially around Mescal Park. The local street options would eliminate on-street parking, and require horses to ride near roadways. The costs for these alternatives are deceptively low because more money would be necessary to make them safe.

**Karla Crall** said her family has long used the PUE because it feels safer than the streets. Any established trail leading from Cactus to Mescal Park would open up the community. She wants what is best for the entire City. Scottsdale must work together to preserve what it has. One neighbor who lost three llamas to the mistakes of a passerby, chose to educate the community rather than block off the easement. She wished more people would handle difficult situations in this same manner. The guy lines in the PUE have never been a problem. The costs might be prohibitive, but Scottsdale has to preserve something.

**Gena Zischke** noted that school budgets are being cut, and requested clarification on the funding allocation for trail projects. She would like to see what Cholla would look like if it were going to remain an option. Equestrians deserve safety, and the PUE deserves a close look.

**Nancy Stuebe** said Mescal has been a welcoming and close community. This divisiveness of this issue has been disappointing. A trail on Cholla would cause problems for homeowners because it is narrow. Removing landscaping along Cholla would be expensive, and a trail already exists behind the houses. It runs parallel to Cholla from Cocopah and empties into the park, requiring only a half a block on the street. The retrofitted streets would not be safe.

Chair Howard read a comment submitted by Maureen and Peter Gagnot who said the City should use the existing trails designated for horses, hikers, and bicycles. City dollars should not be used for horse trails when there are so many other extremely important issues to address.

Ms. O'Connor explained that funding was available from the Bond 2000 program to implement the Trails Master Plan. Some money has already been spent to implement the top ten recommendations from the 2004 plan. In September, Council directed staff to spend the balance of the funds, totaling less than \$2 million, on neighborhood trail implementation. Additional funding could come from potential future bond measures.

Commissioner Sukenic said horses and cars do not mix. Anything alongside a road should not be considered as an option. Commissioner Ward agreed. He inquired what the buffer would ultimately look like if a street option were used. Mr. Kempton responded that the curb could be moved out and a landscaped buffer created. Mr. Meinhart added that the only place where buffering would be possible is on the north/south section of 68<sup>th</sup> Street, which represents approximately 1/4 mile of the corridor. There are no simple answers in this case. The reality is that in some places an un-landscaped buffer would only be two to four feet from the curb. Many portions of the City's trail system are closer to roadways than are ideal for horses, but the system is being built for all users.

Commissioner Ward summarized that the Commission must choose between an expensive PUE, a less expensive street side option, or choose to leave things the way they are and concentrate on a better project. He questioned whether the City was trying to force this project at an inopportune time. Ms. O'Connor said some people in this community have been discussing different options for at least five years, and would like to see some resolution. There are other choices between the high and low cost options. Commissioner Ward felt that none of the options provided was favorable to both users and the community at large.

Vice Chair Weiss expressed disappointment that safety issues have arisen regarding the PUE, and that they threaten the entire project. This was not a concern when the proposal was first made, and now it will be impossible to put it back. He inquired what residents are doing now that the easement is closed. Mr. Kempton responded that since there are no sidewalks in this neighborhood, people walk in the street or at the edge of front yards. Ms. O'Connor clarified that this issue has been around for a while, but the Transportation Department took it over when it became responsible for the non-Preserve trails program in 2008. Even though people were using the PUE, it was not legal to do so. The perception of a safety problem was likely always there; it has just been clarified as the process has gone on.

Vice Chair Weiss questioned whether the Commission would be making the situation worse by taking action. Some people may prefer one particular option, and might not use the trail if another one is selected. Ms. DeChance polled the Mescal residents in attendance and reported that they all ride in the street or on people's property, except where there already is a trail or an easement in place to get to the park. They all use different routes depending on where they live. Vice Chair Weiss said the solution might not actually solve anything, which is a concern given the current budget issues. Mr. Kempton said he firmly believes that any facility off the street is an improvement for the majority of users, who are mainly pedestrians.

Vice Chair Weiss said he was drawing a distinction between safe sidewalks and using the PUE as an equestrian or multi-use path. Ms. O'Connor said the best-case scenario would be for the City to provide access that works for pedestrians, equestrians and other non-motorized users. She said Jan Hancock made a presentation to the Ad Hoc Citizen Trails Task Force which represents the state of the practice; in that presentation, paved paths serve as buffers for adjacent unpaved paths. These guidelines would be preferred wherever possible. The PUE option is further hampered by the litigation resulting from the unwilling sellers, and the dissension

that it would cause in the neighborhood. Vice Chair Weiss questioned whether any of the other options would fix the problem, given that the PUE no longer seems viable.

Chair Howard asked whether staff would still recommend the PUE, given what is now known about the cost. Ms. O'Connor responded that if it stayed under the \$1 million range the recommendation would likely stand, but if it exceeded that amount it would be harder to support it. That cost would be higher than a standard project, but consistent with other major projects. Chair Howard said that even with the right-of-way cost removed, the cost of the PUE project would be higher. Mr. Meinhart said right-of-way and unwilling sellers are bigger issues than construction costs.

Commissioner Gruver said the PUE situation has gotten out of control, and can no longer be reasonably considered. On the other hand, there are many attractive things about the 68<sup>th</sup> Street/Place option. It best addresses the specific issue that the Commission is trying to fix. She did express concern about the setback however, since it only takes one car to cause a problem. She also requested a clearer idea of what the cross sections would look like on this route. Mr. Meinhart said the closest example would be Cactus Road east of 96<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Ward agreed that the PUE has gotten out of control. He said the 68<sup>th</sup> Street/Place option has promise, just not in its current form. Vice Chair Weiss questioned whether the community has reached consensus on the 68<sup>th</sup> Street/Place alignment, now that it has become clear that the PUE is no longer viable. If the residents do not want it, the City should not be spending money on it.

**COMMISSIONER SUKENIC MOVED TO TABLE THIS ITEM FOR TWO MONTHS. VICE CHAIR WEISS SECONDED.**

Ms. O'Connor noted that staff will make a presentation to the City Council on this topic in a week, and staff would like to include meaningful feedback from the Commission. There is still strong community support for the PUE, and as long as people feel they have that option available, they are not going to support something else. Commissioner Ward felt that if people could see a more clearly defined vision of the 68<sup>th</sup> Street/Place alignment, they might be more inclined to support it.

Vice Chair Weiss said the Commission is on record for having supported the PUE. He suggested that it now be removed as a practical option, and the 68<sup>th</sup> Street/Place alignment be proposed to the community for feedback. Commissioner Sukenic said Council should note that the Commission supported the PUE until it became clear that the mediation did not work.

**VICE CHAIR WEISS MOVED TO RECOMMEND REMOVAL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT AS A PREFERRED OPTION, GIVEN THAT MEDIATION HAS FAILED AND LITIGATION FEES WOULD MAKE IT UNDESIRABLE, AND TO RETURN TO THE COMMUNITY TO GET PUBLIC INPUT ON THE DESIRABILITY OF THE 68<sup>TH</sup> STREET/PLACE ALIGNMENT. COMMISSIONER SUKENIC SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

## 6. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) Project Requests

Ms. Bohac presented two NTMP projects, one on Granite Reef Road between Osborn and Thomas, and the other on 86<sup>th</sup> Street between Earll and Thomas. The public outreach for both projects was handled at the same time, since they affected the same neighborhood. Both projects qualified under the old Neighborhood Traffic Management policy speed and volume criteria. Commissioner McCall noted that the old criteria were being used in the new process, even though it is irrelevant to it. Ms. Bohac responded that they were brought forward as exceptions because they had been in the program a long time.

The roads had 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 35 m.p.h. Granite Reef had 37% of traffic exceeding 30 m.p.h., and 9% exceeding 35 m.p.h., while 86<sup>th</sup> Street had 55% of traffic exceeding 30 m.p.h., and 18% exceeding 35 m.p.h. The average number of vehicles per day was 2,200 on Granite reef and 1,800 on 86<sup>th</sup> Street. Fifteen residents attended the May 2008 meeting and expressed concern about speeds, school-related speeding, enforcement as a short-term solution, the desire for improved aesthetics, and pedestrian crossings. Complaints were made that the roads are being used to avoid the Thomas and Hayden intersection. Fifteen residents also attended the second meeting in October 2008. Three options were presented to this group. A fourth plan was developed based on resident feedback.

The preferred plan for Granite Reef was a series of raised median islands along with intersection narrowing and curb bulb-outs at Earll. Drainage analysis made the bulb-outs infeasible, so speed tables were substituted instead. On 86<sup>th</sup> Street, the preferred plan consisted of two raised pedestrian crossing islands. A third meeting was held in February 2009. The approximate cost of the Granite Reef project is estimated at \$93,000, while the approximate cost for the 86<sup>th</sup> Street project is \$49,000.

Chair Howard invited public commentary.

**Benjamin Belkin** said the proposed speed table at Earll and Granite Reef would be a poor form of traffic calming compared to other measures. He said he approached residents with a proposal for a traffic circle instead. Forty-one of the residents he talked to signed his petition. He encouraged the Commission to install a landscaped neighborhood traffic circle instead. It will slow traffic, complement the proposed landscaped islands, and enhance the aesthetic value of the neighborhood.

**Thomas Mundar** said he is against traffic calming in general, particularly speed tables and speed humps. They increase wear on vehicles, and punish everyone for the behavior of a few. Granite Reef does not meet the speed requirements for traffic calming, and fewer than 50% of the houses actually have a driveway on the street. He said he has nothing against the traffic circle or the raised median.

Commissioner McCall said Granite Reef fails to meet the speed criteria, reaching only 37% instead of 40%, and 9% where it should have 20%. The average speed is 29 m.p.h. She opposes traffic calming on that segment. The 86<sup>th</sup> Street segment has a park, and meets the speed criteria. This would be a worthwhile project.

Vice Chair Weiss noted that out of 600 residences notified, only 15 showed up to the meeting, which is a consensus of 2.5%. There does not seem to be a large number of people who see this as a problem. Forty people responded to the citizen petition, which seems to be more effective at reaching people than mailings do. He questioned whether those 40 would have chosen no traffic calming if they had been given that option. Ms. Bohac said a traffic circle was

discussed at the first meeting, and the consensus was that the neighbors would not support it. Ms. O'Connor said this is one of the oldest remaining projects that qualified under the old criteria. It would not be fair to tell the neighbors that they did not meet the new criteria since the City's process has been so slow.

In response to an inquiry from Chair Howard, Ms. Bohac said a roundabout option on Granite Reef road would cost \$160,000 instead of \$93,000. Chair Howard said he shared Commissioner McCall's concern about speed criteria, especially on Granite Reef. It is not satisfactory to say that a project should qualify because it has been in the works for a long time. Commissioner Ward suggested another reason it has taken so long is because there is little interest in the project.

Ms. O'Connor said the new NTMP was an attempt to establish objective criteria. Criteria related to land use and aggregate scoring were removed. These projects would have been built by now if the City had not stalled them. They meet enough of the criteria to qualify, even if it is not an overwhelming project. Ms. DeChance reported that of the 44 people Mr. Belkin contacted, only three preferred no traffic calming at all.

Vice Chair Weiss questioned whether the projects would qualify under the new criteria, and if more updated measurements were taken. This might alleviate some of the concerns. Commissioner Gruver suggested that the low turnout at the meetings could be taken as a sign that there was widespread assent. People are motivated to show up when they do not want something to happen. She felt it was reasonable to move forward on the project without gathering additional data, and it would not be fair to penalize the hard work of the neighborhood for the City's bureaucracy. Commissioner McCall said if people fail to show up, it could mean they really do not care either way.

**COMMISSIONER MCCALL MOVED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE 86<sup>TH</sup> STREET PROJECT, BUT NOT THE GRANITE REEF PROJECT. THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

**COMMISSIONER SUKENIC MOVED TO APPROVE BOTH THE 86<sup>TH</sup> STREET PROJECT AND THE GRANITE REEF PROJECT. COMMISSIONER GRUVER SECONDED.**

Commissioner Gruver felt clarification was needed on whether the project should have a speed table or a traffic circle. Chair Howard suggested a vote on the existing motion first.

**THE MOTION FAILED TO CARRY BY A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO TWO (2), WITH CHAIR HOWARD AND COMMISSIONER MCCALL DISSENTING, AND VICE CHAIR WEISS ABSTAINING.**

Ms. O'Connor noted that at least 41 people were not apathetic to this topic. That would be considered good turnout for issues with a much larger scope of impact. Vice Chair Weiss explained that he abstained because he could not be sure whether the 41 petition signers would support a speed table instead of no traffic calming at all. He questioned whether it would be reasonable to double the cost with a traffic circle without knowing whether it would qualify under the current guidelines. Ms. O'Connor said an \$80,000 traffic circle would not be an unreasonable or excessive cost for an NTMP project, since NTMP projects average around \$250,000. In response to an inquiry from Vice Chair Weiss, Ms. Bohac said a traffic circle would fit within the City's existing right-of-way.

**COMMISSIONER SUKENIC MOVED TO APPROVE AND FUND THE 86<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND THE GRANITE REEF TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECTS, INCLUDING THE TRAFFIC CIRCLE/ ROUNDABOUT OPTION. COMMISSIONER GRUVER SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ONE (1), WITH COMMISSIONER MCCALL DISSENTING.**

7. **Noise Abatement Policy**

Ms. Huish presented an information packet related to noise abatement. The packet contains noise level measurements from sample sources, provides an overview of sample mitigation and policy options, and offers criteria for analysis.

Commissioner Ward said when this process started, he was under the impression that it was supposed to address the City's responsibility regarding noise relative to changes in the roadway. As the discussions have progressed, it seems to be more about noise in general. Chair Howard doubted whether the Commission would be able to get much done on such a complex subject at the end of an already long meeting.

Chair Howard said some proposals for noise mitigation are tied to the threat of revoking permits for businesses that continuously violate noise policies. However, much of Scottsdale's problem lies with mobile noise sources. The City will have to be able to define what acceptable noise is and what is not. Once there is general agreement on what is unacceptably loud, then Scottsdale could establish a criteria for doing something about it. If there is no reasonable way to do that, something else has to be tried. Ms. O'Connor noted that Council expects the Commission to make a recommendation on whether to expand the existing roadway noise mitigation policy approved as part of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The Sands East neighborhood submitted a petition identifying things residents would like to see addressed. Chair Howard felt it would be best to give Council a framework within which to make those decisions, not to try to answer any particular problem specifically.

Commissioner Ward said the City has to determine whether it has caused harm by making a change, and whether it is responsible for mitigating it. This topic should be addressed first, before moving on to the users of the road. Vice Chair Weiss said noise is noise regardless of the source. Once the noise tolerance is established, the other issues could be settled quickly. Commissioner Ward says it falls into three areas, noise increases caused through City projects, noise emitting from stationary sources, and from mobile sources.

Commissioner Gruver said the Commission was tasked with refining the roadway noise abatement policy. For the Commission to discuss bars and nightclubs would be inappropriate. Scottsdale does lack policies that address circumstances where the roadway is not widened. The Commission should be asking what negative impacts the City's transportation projects are potentially having, and what should be done about them. Chair Howard suggested tabling this issue until the next meeting when the Commission could address it with fresh minds.

8. **Transportation Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Operating Budget**

Ms. Huish summarized the changes that have been made to the CIP budget since the last presentation. The biggest change is the addition of the Thunderbird/Raintree Loop preliminary design to the fifth year of the CIP. Most of the projects are already in design or construction and will be completed soon. Vice Chair Weiss said the Thunderbird/Raintree Loop should be given a name that better describes the project.

Commissioner Ward said he understands the rationale behind capitalizing staff time behind a project because it is a stronger way to manage a program. He noted the line item for CIP advanced planning, and expressed concern that it could be taken too far, with everything being included in the CIP. The City has a responsibility to develop a list of projects. Once the list is generated, the scoping process for any given project should be part of its CIP. Mr. Meinhart responded that once a project is ready for recommendation, it would be set up with its own capital budget. The advanced planning line item has been included in the budget to allow for flexibility, but it never exceeds \$200,000 per year in City funds.

**COMMISSIONER WARD MOVED TO APPROVE THE CIP AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER SUKENIC SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0). COMMISSIONER MCCALL WAS NOT PRESENT**

9. **Other Transportation Projects**

No report was presented.

10. **Public Comment**

No members of the public wished to address the Commission.

11. **Identification of Future Agenda Items**

No items were identified.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to conduct, Chair Howard adjourned the regular meeting at 10:27 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics, Inc. DBA AVTranz.

**NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.**