CITY OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 2002
City Hall - KIVA
3939 Drinkwater Boulevard, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Present: Vice-Chair David Bentler
Mark Gilliland
David Hill
Mark Melnychenko
John Rooney
Jeffrey Schwartz

Absent: Chairwoman Vivian Johnson

Staff Present: Rose Arballo
Aaron Iverson
Michelle Korf
Fran LaPrairie
John Little
Dave Meinhart
Patrick McGreal

Others Present: Don Hadder, Planning and Development Services
Teresa Huish, Planning and Development Services

Vice-Chair Bentler called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2002
COMMISSIONER MELNYCHENKO MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STUDY SESSION AND REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2002. COMMISSIONER GILLILAND SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR
None.

GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW
Mr. Hadder gave an overview of the planning processes and discussed the status of the General Plan with regard to transportation planning.

Mr. Hadder stated that the beginning of any major planning process in Scottsdale starts off with a community visioning process that includes strong citizen involvement and citizen direction in how the city develops their plans. Previous citizen groups involved with evaluating the city's General Plan are the Scottsdale Town Enrichment Program (STEP forums), Vision 2000, Scottsdale Visioning, and CityShape 2020.

Over the years, planners in the City of Scottsdale have used various transportation plans as drivers when reviewing the General Plan and looking at how the planning processes work. The various transportation plans include the:

- County Streets Plan, which is a land use plan developed in 1961 by Maricopa County;
- Comprehensive General Plan developed in 1967 as part of the STEP forum process;
- Streets Right-of-Way Map and Bikeways Plan, which is documentation of existing right-of-way;
- Combined General Plans, which allowed city staff to develop the first in-house comprehensive General Plan in 1981;
- Citizens for Better Transportation report which was done in the early 1990's; and the
- Growing Smarter Update, which consisted of many hours of public and staff involvement.

Mr. Hadder stated that staff is focusing on the following goals and approaches when making key decisions and achievements in the future:

- Work on the development of transportation master plans in an effort to have specific master plans that deal with streets, street design, planning standards, etc. The concept is to have more specific information available on the master plans and less specifics in the General Plan.
- Focus is being placed on planning policies and principles to look at the types of things that drive the way the city's transportation system is established.
- Focus is being made on character area plans to see how local street networks work out and what the design characters in the city should be.
- Other programs being focused on are Local Area Master Plans, Capital Improvements Program, and Traffic Calming.

Mr. Hadder stated that some of the key issues staff is facing in developing plans is the history of the community where there are four different sets of street standards in terms of right-of-way, widths of lanes, medians, etc. Staff is having to shift focus from new development to redevelopment, which is going to become a significant part of the future in Scottsdale. It is believed the city will need to take a higher profile role in implementing and funding transportation improvements. Mr. Hadder explained that the development of new planning processes is an ongoing evolution in that the community is changing in unpredictable ways. Habits in how people use transportation systems, where they want to go, and how they want to get there shifts over time.

With regards to character area plans, Commissioner Hill asked how many character area plans exist in the city and the status of their adoption. Mr. Hadder stated that 24 character areas have been preliminarily identified. Two character area plans have been completed and adopted and the Downtown Plan and Cactus Corridor Plan are still active in terms of policy. In addition, approximately four character area plans are in the process of being brought forward for adoption.

Pertaining to the streets master plans Commissioner Gilliland asked for an explanation on how the old engineering type thoughts tie in to the current engineering ways in regards to the how rights-of-ways are set, etc. There is confusion as to the General Plan showing a certain classification of streets versus the different right-of-way standards and different improvement standards currently existing on streets. Mr. Hadder believes it is easier to use the streets master planning that contains more specifics to process to direct and understand specific issues rather than trying to use the General Plan to do broad categorizations and classifications.

Commissioner Schwartz commented it is important for both staff in the Planning Department and the Commission to understand the land uses that may come about in the future due to redevelopment. Staff should plan ahead for the future and assess those areas needing improvement to avoid street improvements every 10 years.

Commissioner Rooney asked what the process is if at some point it is desirable to change the community mobility element. He also questioned when the General Plan goes to the Planning Commission for review and if it is possible for the General Plan to also go before the Transportation Commission for review, particularly if it does impact the community mobility element. Mr. Hadder stated that amendments to the General Plan are done once a year and that the TIMA (Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis) process will be evaluating applications. The process for amending the circulation element could be done in two ways; (1) through a developer based application, which is done with a large master plan community development in terms with the transportation plan or (2) through a city initiated process through the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Hadder added that mobility element changes are not required by State Law to be a major amendment as major amendments only apply to land use cases.

Commissioner Hill asked what the process is if a neighborhood is interested in changing the character designation of a specific street. Mr. Hadder indicated that it is staffs' goal to amend these types of changes on the Streets Master

Plan rather than changing the General Plan. However, the full process on how these amendments will be handled has not been defined at this time. It is staffs' goal to have a more defined process in place by the end of the year.

CHAPARRAL ROAD BRIEFING

Ms. Korf gave an overview on Chaparral Road between 78th Street and Miller Road to acquaint the new commissioners with this issue.

It was mentioned that the freeway has alleviated much of the north/south traffic in the city and has increased traffic in the east/west routes. Recent traffic counts from 2001 show that this segment of Chaparral Road is currently experiencing a traffic volume of 20,000 vehicles per day. If this segment of Chaparral is built out to its projected cross-section of approximately two lanes in each direction, staff projects that this segment will carry about 38,000 cars per day. It has been determined that higher traffic volumes are a result of having interchange or freeway access.

Listed below are concerns brought forward from residents who live on Chaparral Road between Miller and 78th Street:

- Setbacks are short. Residents' driveways or front doors are approximately 50 feet from the curb.
- High traffic volume.
- Residents have difficulty backing out of their driveways.
- Quality of life issues with regard to pollution.
- Vehicles driving over the posted speed limit.
- High volume of large construction or delivery trucks.

Staff has been working diligently over the past several years in an attempt to mitigate some of the residents' concerns by:

- Providing increased police enforcement;
- Improving signage;
- Letters have been sent to trucking firms and associations reminding them that this segment of Chaparral Road is restricted to large trucks;
- Restriping of the road has been done to narrow the road to add bike lanes and to change the character of the road to encourage traffic to slow down; and
- City staff has met with representatives of the Homeowners' Associations to discuss possible solutions.

Ms. Korf stated it is important to address concerns to avoid relocating them to another neighborhood. It is important that staff continue to find a solution to find ways to address neighborhood concerns about traffic volumes. It is also critical that staff look at the effects any solution might have on the transportation network.

A petition from residents living in this segment of Chaparral Road requesting to initiate a General Plan amendment to change the designation of Chaparral Road from a major collector roadway to a residential roadway has been received by city staff. This by itself will address the traffic volume issue, but will be the first of many steps that will lead to some changes on that roadway. By law, the City Council and Planning Commission are the only bodies that can initiate the General Plan amendment. The role of the Transportation Commission is to recommend, if they so choose, to the City Council or Planning Commission that a General Plan amendment be considered. Ms. Korf stated that Transportation staff suggests that a preliminary evaluation of the petition be made so that the Transportation Commission can have a full understanding of the impact of any amendment to the General Plan to change Chaparral Road.

Commissioner Melnychenko commented that due to the high traffic volume on Chaparral Road, it appears that a major change on this segment of roadway needs to be made and asked if staff has determined a cost on the option of purchasing and relocating the affected residents who live in this segment of Chaparral. Ms. Korf stated that staff has found the purchase of homes would be destructive and costly, and that dealing with the 69Kv lines that have existed

since the development of the community on Chaparral is part of the high cost estimate of addressing whether or not to widen Chaparral Road.

Commissioner Gilliland asked if all options for further calming or enforcement have been exhausted. Ms. Korf stated that staff is pursuing a couple other options. One option is to put landscaped medians east of 78th Street to give motorists the perception that they are entering the neighborhood. In terms of engineering solutions, it is believed that staff has looked at several alternatives, but feel there might still be some effective short term solutions.

Commissioner Gilliland also asked if any work-studies have been made by staff or consultants on potential impact for the surrounding communities for further calming measures. Ms. Korf stated some modelings and traffic projects have been done and that there is a need to do more micro level traffic projects to see how the intersections perform. Mr. Little added that it is staffs' intent to continue to work in trying to understand different alternatives and what the results of those alternatives might be in the street network not just on Chaparral Road but surrounding areas as well.

In trying to understand the street network system, Commissioner Schwartz asked what cause and effects resulted from the alterations made on Chaparral Road west of Scottsale Road; specifically due to the section along the north side of the Finova building that restricted traffic to a stop sign, then redirected it back on Chaparral to help slow down traffic. Commissioner Schwartz has seen that traffic in this area continues to flow at a high rate of speed and feels that a direct link to Chaparral is necessary. Ms. Korf did not have this information available at this time and will report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Hill asked for a status report on the Commission's recommendation forwarded to the City Council in July 2001 regarding traffic calming on Chaparral and expressed his concern on the issue not being agendized by the Council. Ms. Korf stated she is not aware that the Council has chosen to act on this issue and feels it could be a possibility that they may need more information. Mr. Little added that Chaparral residents at this point have asked to make an amendment to the General Plan. Staff supports their decision and will supply the necessary analysis for policymakers and the various Commissions to ultimately make a policy decision.

For information purposes, Commissioner Rooney requested that a copy of Ms. Korf's presentation be provided to the Commission.

Due to the newly adopted General Plan projecting Chaparral to be two lanes in each direction with a center lane, Commissioner Rooney asked if the city has acquired the necessary right-of-way. Ms. Korf stated there would be a need for additional right-of-way in order to build Chaparral to a full cross-section. Commissioner Gilliland suggested spending more time to review the General Plan amendment to see what can be anticipated, evaluate all options, etc.

Ms. Korf commented that a stakeholder public involvement process would be required as part of the General Plan amendment process. She will report results to the Commission within the next couple months.

In regards to the Commission's recommendation submitted to the City Council in July 2001 and the petition from the homeowners on Chaparral requesting that action be taken on this issue, Commissioner Rooney expressed his concern on the frustration Chaparral residents are experiencing. Ms. Korf commented that the City Council is aware of the residents' petition, but at this time has not been contacted by Council members with regards to direction for this petition.

Mr. Little commented that the Commission will possibly have three options to recommend to the City council; (1) that a change be made to the General Plan changing the designation of Chaparral Road; (2) Recommend to the City Council that the current designation be maintained; or (3) the Commission could listen to the testimony and go through the process and recommend any other alternative the Commission feels is appropriate to the the City Council.

McCORMICK-STILLMAN RAILROAD PARK MULTIUSE PATH ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Meinhart discussed potential alternatives and presented staffs' recommendation for connecting McCormick Railroad Park and the Indian Bend Wash path system.

This project is intended to provide an 8 to 10 foot-wide multi-use path connection between two of the city's major recreational amenities, the Indian Bend Wash path system and McCormick-Stillman Railroad Park. This pathway would provide cyclists, pedestrians, skaters or any other mode of human-powered transportation a means to access the Railroad Park without having to drive and to park an automobile. The main Indian Bend Wash Path currently acts for a more effective link from the Indian Bend Wash Path to the park and other destinations near Scottsdale and Indian Bend Roads.

Listed below are the alternatives staff has developed:

Alternative 1 - Drainage Corridor option.
Alternative 2 - Indian Bend (Silverado) option, which starts in the vicinity of the Silverado Golf Course up to the Indian Bend corridor and ties into the park system near the existing parking lot entrances.
Alternative 3 - Lincoln/Scottsdale alternative that contains an existing path from Lincoln north up to around the overflow parking area for the Silverado Golf Course.
Alternative 4 - Indian Bend (from Hayden) alternative that will follow the Indian Bend Road alignment from the park area to the existing path system.

Based on the evaluation of the above alternatives, public input, and costs, staff is recommending that the Commission give authorization to continue the planning process to use the Indian Bend Road corridor between Scottsdale and Hayden Roads as the preferred alignment for a new multi-use path connecting the McCormick-Stillman Railroad Park area with the Indian Bend Wash multi-use path system.

Commissioner Melnychenko agrees this is the best alternative because it provides a direct connection with the existing pathway and activity centers (retail/housing/park).

Due to the results of a citizens' survey in February, Commissioner Hill questioned why the Silverado Golf Course option was not included among the public input. Mr. Meinhart explained that the survey was sent out about 1 1/2 months prior to the February public input meeting in which the Silverado Golf Course option evolved at this time from public input received.

Commissioner Rooney asked what road improvements are planned along Indian Bend and how those will address the drainage issues that often close the road. He also asked if any barriers would be installed to make sure there are no safety concerns during pedestrian usage in the path. Mr. Meinhart stated that the Indian Bend Road corridor between Scottsdale and Hayden Roads is budgeted for improvements from two lanes to four lanes with center turn lanes and medians. It will also have sidewalks on both sides with some separation off the curb.

Commissioner Rooney and Commissioner Schwartz concur that the Silverado option would have been nice if connections were made. Mr. Meinhart stated this option is the most expensive because this major drainage facility would have to be rebuilt.

In regards to right-of-way, Commissioner Schwartz questioned if the right-of-way for the various alternatives is owned by the City of Scottsdale or if it needs to be purchased. Mr. Meinhart stated that additional right-of-way would be necessary.

Due to Commissioner Hill's concerns regarding bottlenecks and closures of Indian Bend to cross the McCormick Ranch Lakes area everytime it rains, Commissioner Hill questioned how an 8 to 10 foot wide multiuse path will fit

into this bottleneck. Commissioner Hill also expressed his concern in that the Indian Bend alternative is half the cost of the Silverado option. Mr. Meinhart stated that the area that is currently bottlenecked actually has about 110 feet of city right-of-way and there is a flood control and roadway easement that was incorporated in part of this facility. Mr. Meinhart also clarified that the main thing that affects the difference in cost is the work that needs to be done on the two slope crossings in the Silverado option that will cost approximately $400,000.

The following citizens spoke in favor of the Hayden/Indian Bend Wash multi-use path system:

Thomas J. Taylor, Lincoln Place, Scottsdale, AZ

Expressed his concern on the issues of safety and security of alternative 1 (the Drainage Corridor option) in which this area is a long straight path with no oversight. Mr. Taylor provided photos of the wall at the 7600 block and Lincoln Place in which the stucco is starting to crack and submitted letters from other residents in the concerned area supporting the Indian Bend/Hayden alternative. Mr. Taylor commended staff on their hard work and encouraged the Commission and staff to support the Indian Bend/Hayden option.

Jane Sundeen, 7454 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250

Commented that residents from Lincoln Place, Casa Bella, 7600, and Riding Rock attended quarterly zone meetings with Transportation Department staff to discuss this issue. Residents expressed their concerns with crime and safety if Alternative 1 was pursued. Residents agreed that the best option costwise and safetywise is the Indian Bend/Hayden alternative.

Larry Beckner, 6712 North Rocking Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250

Commended Mr. Little, Mr. Meinhart and city staff on their efforts and believes that the Indian Bend/Hayden alternative is the best and safest alternative.

The citizens listed below did not speak, but submitted a comment card in favor of the Hayden/Indian Bend Wash path:

Mari Foutz Flanery, 7451 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Fred Horne, 7430 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Robert Barlar, 7422 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Jay Stein, 7458 East Sierra Vista Drive, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Audrey S. Horne, 7430 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
June Schwartz, 7462 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250\
Nancy Barlow, 7422 East Cactus Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Leonard Litvak, 7411 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Sylvia Litvak, 7411 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Amy Beckner, 6712 North Rocking Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Sam Hilton, 7459 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Marion Hilton, 7459 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Harold Pachtman, 7447 East Sierra Vista Drive, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Edith Pachtman, 7447 East Sierra Vista Drive, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Tommye Jean Taylor, 7446 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Lou Klein, 7435 East Cactus Wren, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Janice Isbell, 7424 East McLellan Lane, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Robert Isbell, 7424 East McLellan Lane, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Sidney Zuber, 7457 East Tuckey Lane, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Irwin and Shari Kanefsky, 7421 East McLellan Lane, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Neal S. Sundeen, 7454 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Cecil A. Flanery, 7451 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Earl Schwartz, 7462 East Cactus Wren Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85250

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION TO USE THE INDIAN BEND ROAD CORRIDOR BETWEEN SCOTTSDALE AND HAYDEN ROADS AS THE PREFERRED ALIGNMENT FOR A NEW MULTI-USE PATH CONNECTING THE MCCORMICK-STILLMAN RAILROAD PARK AREA WITH THE INDIAN BEND WASH MULTI-USE PATH SYSTEM. COMMISSIONER HILL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

CIP PLANNING PROGRAM – ENGINEERING CONTRACT

Mr. Meinhart gave a brief overview of the Capital Improvement Program and reviewed the upcoming project staff is considering with the next Engineering Services Contract.

Program goals for potential year two projects are to complete transportation/drainage improvements that are safe, cost-effective, timely and well coordinated; involve citizens earlier and more comprehensively; and have major projects under construction within three years of public participation startup.

The public involvement approach consists of the city being divided into six project zones in which quarterly meetings are held in each zone and quarterly newsletters are mailed to residents.

Mr. Meinhart stated that the output for the program is to take the identified projects and focus on public involvement/alternatives/identification/project justification; assessment/mitigation of environmental/sound issues; design and right-of-way constraints; and cost estimates and schedules so that projects can be "ready to go" for final design and construction.

Staff is proposing that emphasis be made on street and intersection improvements for the next fiscal year. Currently 13 street and intersection improvement projects, 4 drainage/flood control projects, 5 bikeways/transit projects, and 13 roadway capacity projects have been identified. As soon as a fee proposal is received from the consultant team to look at the total cost of analyses, staff will forward a contract to City Council for their approval in early summer.

It is estimated that 20,000 manhours is required to do this level of analysis. City staff spends a majority of time on public outreach so that the consultants can complete the engineering analysis and plan sheets. The estimated fee at this time is approximately $2 million.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the fee of $2 million is a fixed fee in an effort to eliminate overruns. Mr. Meinhart stated that the contract will indicate a "not to exceed" amount. Mr. Little added that there are provisions in the contract that address change orders.

Commissioner Melnychenko asked if the engineer does any federal environmental documentation necessary and if it is part of the engineering fees. Mr. Meinhart answered yes and that any environmental documentation that is required to get federal funding to assist in paying for that program will be incorporated into the cost estimate to avoid dipping into allowances.

In regards to the approval of the Hayden/Princess project approved on April 16 by the City Council, Commissioner Hill asked Mr. Meinhart to give a recap on the Council's vote. Mr. Meinhart commented that to his knowledge, this project was approved on the consent agenda for final design in the amount of $1.3 million. Commissioner Hill asked if the whole project list or different elements of the list will move forward to the Council. Mr. Little stated it is the Transportation Department's recommendation that the complete list go forward to the City Council subject to internal review and modifications.

Commissioner Hill also asked for further information regarding the Park and Ride on Pima/Princess and if it was going to be shared with other entities. Mr. Meinahrt stated that the exact vehicle capacity has not been determined yet, but is comparable to some of the larger lots the City of Phoenix is trying to set up. The primary intent for this

Park and Ride would be for transit park and ride use. Under the Federal funding guidelines, it is uncertain if this facility could be shared with other entities for other uses or not.

Mr. Little explained that at this time, this agenda is for information only and will come before the Commission once more before it goes forth to the City Council for recommendation. At the Commission's discretion, the Commission can request to see individual projects come back for further review and discussion.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Mr. Little commented that the Parks and Recreation Commission has indicated an interest in joining the Transportation Commission in a joint meeting to discuss work on rights-of-way and what process should be used in making decisions with the appropriate level of public input. This joint meeting will focus on the specific effort to work together to define a process that serves the Parks and Recreation Commission's interest as well as transportation interest in determining how to decide what goes into cross sections.

A potential date for this joint meeting has been scheduled for June 5th at 4:00 p.m. Location is yet to be determined.

COMMISSIONER HILL MOTIONED TO TAKE POSITIVE ACTION ON THIS AGENDA ITEM TO HAVE A JOINT MEETING WITH THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ON JUNE 5TH. COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Vice-Chair Bentler again welcomed Commissioner Rooney to the Transportation Commission.

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AT 8:26 P.M. COMMISSIONER MELNYCHENKO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Arballo
Recording Secretary