



Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes

Thursday, August 2, 2012, 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

San Tan Conference Room – Municipal Services Building

Committee Members:

Ryan Nichols – Chairman	Present
Chris Clark – Vice-Chairman	Present
David Bond	Present
Gregory Arrington	Present
Steve Conklin	Present
Nichelle Williams	Present
Richard Turman	Present
Robin Benning, Vice-Mayor	Present
Kim Mlazgar	Absent
Tom Nelson	Absent

Public:

Toni Valenzuela	Rudy's Mexican Restaurant
Ron Bartlow	Song of Life/Queenland Manor Resident
Kenn Burnell	New Committee Member as of August 31, 2012

Town Staff Members:

Troy White, Public Works Division Manager	Present
Laura Moats, Development Services Assistant	Present
Bill Birdwell, Sr. Traffic Engineering Analyst	Absent
Chris Dovel, Town Engineer	Absent

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

2. Introductions:

Members and guests introduced themselves. Ron Bartlow attended the meeting as a concerned citizen interested in hearing committee discussion on various agenda items.

3. Public Comment: None.

4. Items for Discussion and possible action

Item A: Consideration and possible approval of June 7, 2012 minutes **Chairman Nichols**

Vice-Mayor Benning made a motion to approve the June 7, 2012 minutes, with the following change: correct the spelling of Ron Bartlow's last name shown on the minutes as B-A-R-T-O-N to B-A-R-T-L-O-W. Nichelle Williams seconded the motion. Motion passed **unanimously 8-0.**

Item B: Town Center Access Management Plan and Town Center Parallel Parking Discussion

Chairman Nichols provided background information, noting this discussion was initiated a few months back. Since that time some presentations have been made on the initial design plans, and discussion on temporary striping has occurred. At the last meeting, TAC requested additional information on accident counts in order to help the Committee make recommendations in the future. Public Works Manager White noted that no traffic related accidents related to angled parking in this area had been reported. Chairman Nichols asked if staff had seen any type of increase or decrease in traffic, or if staff expects a change in the future that will affect future access. Mr. White responded as more development comes in, there will certainly be more traffic, and pointed out some of the new businesses/development coming in.

Vice-Chairman Chris Clark noted the angled parking would be temporary because nose-in parking was just being asked for by businesses along Ellsworth Road until such time as remaining road improvements go in. Businesses are requesting angled (nose-in) parking, which they feel provides more safety. There appears to be room in the roadway for this. Traffic is essentially the same; although, at some point it will increase, so an adjustment will be necessary. Chairman Nichols stated if any changes are made, it would be a recommendation to modify the Town Center Access Management Plan to specifically allow angled parking. Mr. White passed along the Town Traffic Engineer's recommendation for parallel parking because angled parking would be less safe relative to bike and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. White stated when the parking was formerly angled (nose-in) parking, it was not owned by the Town; therefore, there were no municipal traffic requirements. Now that frontage is owned by the Town, the parking for this area falls under specific guidelines for parking. The Town will need to provide two handicapped parking spaces, which would take more room than angled parking. The maximum number of parking spots in this scenario would be 7-10. Previously, nose-in parking provided space for 14 vehicles. There are currently six spaces. Vice-Mayor Benning noted the parallel spots are unusually long. Mr. White responded Council had asked this be done to allow for dualies (large pick-up trucks).

Vice-Chairman Clark pointed out a multipurpose path goes in front of the parking. This would be temporary until such time as the road is built out. He reiterated the angled parking would not be permanent when traffic increases. He noted, when given a choice, businesses stated they prefer angled parking to parallel parking.

Toni Valenzuela, owner of Rudy's Mexican Restaurant, commented with parallel parking there are people facing traffic (cars meeting each other). There is no parking on the opposite side of the road. Chairman Nichols clarified Ms. Valenzuela's statement, stating if people are northbound, they are parallel parking adjacent to the southbound side.

Vice-Mayor Benning stated one of the challenges is people who will probably park the wrong direction if it is striped as angled parking. MCSO does not issue parking violations

Mr. White noted there is no sidewalk; only a decomposed granite trail. Mr. Benning stated the aerial photograph shows there is 12 feet of newly asphalted pavement between the curb and sidewalk which connects to the decomposed granite multi-use trail.

Kenn Burnell asked if anyone has looked at communities that have angled parking. He has lived in an area with angled parking, and it was not a problem. Chairman Nichols responded this has been discussed in previous meetings. Committee member Richard Turman noted he thought temporary angled parking for the convenience of businesses is what the TAC agreed on.

Chairman Nichols stated his perspective is he is less inclined to go to angled parking for a temporary situation, because the Town would be setting an expectation that this is how it will be long-term. In addition, based on the recommendation of Town Traffic Engineer that angled parking is less safe, he would normally say he does not see any benefit to angled parking. However, based on the unique

circumstances, he is more in support of temporary angled parking. In the future, when the road is widened, the safety issues will be less of a concern, and it will make more sense to go to parallel parking at that time.

Committee Member David Bond questioned if there has been any discussion about sharing the costs among business owners to change to angled parking in the interim. Chairman Nichols responded the TAC recommendation would be to modify the Access Management Plan to allow for angled parking, and as part of that recommendation, Town staff may change something. Mr. White stated if TAC recommends angled parking, the staff report to Council will include where funding to remove the current striping, put in new striping and move the curbs back will come from. Town Staff will present an estimated cost to Council, and ask for direction on funding.

Motion:

Motion by Vice-Chairman Chris Clark to modify the Town Center Access Management Plan to allow for angled parking while interim improvements are made. Seconded by: Richard Turman.

Discussion: Committee Member David Bond asked if a timeline/deadline should be placed on the motion, or if “interim” should be specified. Chairman Nichols clarified the motion would be to allow angled parking (regardless) applying to anywhere in Town Center, in the interim condition, which can be defined as until alternate improvements are installed.

Committee Member Gregory Arrington asked how a Town ordinance would be modified for an “interim” period. It was clarified that the Access Management Plan is a guide, rather than a formal “ordinance”.

Vice-Chairman Clark withdrew the word “interim” from his motion, leaving this portion as discretionary. He stated TAC has focused on just one section of the Town Center, but this can be applied to other areas as well. He does not feel it is necessary to specify this section. Vice-Mayor Benning stated the motion would apply to any areas covered by the Town Center Access Management Plan. Mr. White brought attention to the fact that there are a few areas which are not part of Town Center (i.e. in front of Magma). He added when sidewalks are installed, staff may have to have discussion with Magma on how to put parallel parking in front of their building. In the alternative, the Sidewalk Gap Analysis would need to go back to Council.

Mr. White suggested the verbiage be tied into where there is ample room for angled parking, then allow it. If there is not enough room for angled parking, than adhere to parallel parking.

Vice-Mayor Benning stated he agrees with Committee Member Arrington. The motion should be specific from a policy perspective, specifically stating where angled parking can and cannot be installed, and for what period of time.

Vice-Chairman Clark stated if businesses are given the opportunity to have angled parking, the request should be processed through staff, then potentially TAC and onto the Council . The policy does not have to say there must be one or the other; just that they can have both types of parking in Town Center. Mr. White stated there does not necessarily have to be parallel or angled parking everywhere; there are cities that have Traffic Access Management Plans that allow parallel on some streets and not on others; as well as angled parking on some streets and not others. It does not have to be uniform throughout Town Center area. Committee Member Arrington stated he feels staff has to develop criteria that allows angled parking. Mr. White suggested the language could state if there is sufficient room in a particular area for angled parking, even after improvements are finished, then angled parking is something TAC can consider. This bases the policy on space criteria.

Amendment to the Motion:

Vice-Chairman Clark modified the motion to state, "businesses that already have angled (nose-in) parking can be grandfathered and maintain the angled parking until such time as full road improvements are made".

Mr. White referred back to sidewalks, stating if there is a sidewalk in front of Magma, where full road improvements have not been made, there won't be room for angled parking. Vice-Chairman Clark stated this will fall into this motion, in that angled parking can only be maintained until such time as road improvements warrant parallel parking.

Chairman Nichols asked for design standards for parking. Mr. White responded the Town has design standards for parking lots, but not parking spaces.

Chairman Nichols reiterated that he prefers there be criteria that states either parallel or angled parking could be allowed, as long as it is compliant with set standards within the Town Center area. There was brief discussion about the origination of the current language, which was originally agreed upon for safety reasons, future bike lanes, and increased traffic in the future.

Discussion followed on leaving the existing language for parallel parking in place, but having the motion address conditions which are not the ultimate build-out and allow staff flexibility in design of improvements. TAC is basically trying to maintain the existing language in the Access Management Plan for a number of reasons, mostly related to safety, so it can support businesses by having some on-street parking. It was noted most walk-able communities have on-street parking. In this specific situation, it is being suggested some flexibility be built-into the language where there have been interim improvements and there is a need to build more on-street parking.

Further discussion ensued about allowing businesses that have existing angled parking to maintain that parking until such time as street improvements are made. Vice-Chairman Clark clarified this would mean 45-degree nose-in parking, rather than 90-degree. Vice-Mayor Benning stated in all cases pedestrian safety should trump vehicular access.

Chairman Nichols stated he thinks staff should create design guidelines to take these issues into consideration. At this point, TAC should not include design standards in the motion. Mr. White noted staff will allow Magma to keep angled parking (right now it's on their property, which Town does not want to regulate since it's private property). Once the Town acquires right-of-way when it's ready to proceed with road improvements, the Town will do so according to Uniform Standards.

Chairman Nichols stated the recommendation should include allowing angled parking when design standards can be met. Vice-Chairman Clark responded this puts it back on the Traffic Engineer. Chairman Nichols reiterated Mr. White's concern that anyone who wants angled parking will ask for it regardless of whether or not there is truly enough space. The Access Management Plan can allow angled parking when there is sufficient space to meet standard design criteria.

Second Amendment to the Motion:

Vice-Chairman Clark amended his motion to allow angled parking in areas where it meets design standards as part of the Town Center Access Management Plan.

Seconded by Gregory Arrington.

Discussion:

Mr. White asked for clarification on whether this would mean even when ultimate improvements are done, if there is enough room, the Town will allow businesses to ask for angled parking and they will have to prove they meet the design standards. There was further discussion on whether or not to apply language

regarding “interim improvements”. Members concurred that this language should not be part of the motion.

Chairman Nichols called the question. All ayes. Motion carried. (7-0) (Vice-Mayor Benning abstaining).

Item C. Sidewalk Gap Analysis Presentation

Troy White

Public Works Manager Troy White presented a Power Point on the Sidewalk Gap Analysis.

He noted Staff completed an inventory of the Town Center and surrounding area and made list of where there are gaps in the sidewalks. He stated Council approved \$200,000 in the FY2012-13 budget.

The analysis is separated into the following categories:

- 1) Planned or in progress sidewalk (none there now, but development coming in – Town doesn’t have to spend money on this)
- 2) Priority Projects (staff recommends moving forward with immediately)
 - a) Those without major constraints
 - b) Those with major constraints
- 3) Projects that should wait for development (nothing there – no one using; don’t spend money)

A map of the areas included in the analysis was shown.

Mr. White referred to the timeframe for the priority projects, noting most of these will be completed by the end of November/beginning of December. Those areas which have minor constraints may take a little longer to complete.

Overview on meeting with Union Pacific Railroad

Mr. White noted the railroad crossing at Ellsworth/Rittenhouse roads had been changed on the map from yellow to red. Originally, this area was designated as a “major constraint” because the Town does not have right-of-way in this location. To install a sidewalk would be a major constraint due to the cost, obtaining easements, etc. The Town Center Access Management Plan shows this area as being one lane for the long term; therefore, staff took a proposal to Council to do a Small Area Transportation Study (SATS) to confirm that at build-out this can be one lane of traffic and having one lane would not have a negative impact on the surrounding roads. This study is currently being conducted. If it is confirmed that this lane would not be necessary to mitigate congestion, then the curb can be moved into the lane, and a portion of that lane can be used for the sidewalk; a bike lane can be put in as well. The curb line will be moved out. Mr. White noted the challenge is that the railroad requires a signal to be right next to curb on the outside vehicular travel lane. Normally, the Town would have to pay to move the signal at an approximate cost of \$50,000. Mr. White noted when he met with the railroad representatives, they said they thought they had special funding they could use until the end of August. If the Town could confirm that there is just one lane necessary in this location, and the Town takes on the responsibility of moving the curb, then the railroad will move the signal at no cost to the Town. It is for this reason the sidewalk gap in this section was changed from yellow to red. If the railroad can secure the money, this gap will no longer be a major constraint.

Chairman Nichols commented he thought the sidewalk on the north side of Rittenhouse road between Ellsworth and the commercial development to the south would be a waste of money to complete, due to

the fact there is no access anywhere between these two points. All of this sidewalk could be eliminated and thus save lots of money. Mr. White stated he agrees with this, and therefore, this section is shown in orange. It is not on the list to proceed because the Town does not own enough right-of-way. The Town would need to buy sidewalk from the railroad, which would cost close to \$1M by the time the right-of-way was obtained.

Item D. FY 2012-13 TAC Work Plan

Troy White

Mr. White presented the 2011-12 Work Plan, noting there are no suggested changes for the 2012-13 Work Plan since the existing plan covers new projects, studies and current issues. The 2012-13 Work Plan must be presented to Council for their approval, as this is an annual Work Plan.

Chairman Nichols asked for comments; hearing none, he stated that as we move into a new phase of Town development, TAC is focusing on emerging safety projects/traffic control issues (this seems to be more of the TAC focus rather than regional road projects). He asked that Items No. 1 and 3 on the existing Work Plan be switched, and that Item No. 1 be given 30 minutes estimated time per meeting, with Item No. 3 having 20 minutes estimated time per meeting.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Clark to approve the FY 2012-13 TAC Work Plan, with the stipulation that Items number 3 and 1 be switched. Seconded by Nichelle Williams. All ayes Motion carried 7-0 (Vice-Mayor Benning abstaining).

Item E: Overview of July 2012 meeting with Union Pacific Railroad/ADOT (improvements for railroad crossings)

Troy White

Public Works Manager White provided a brief report on this under Agenda item #C.

Vice-Mayor Benning cited constraints with sidewalk plans at other railroad crossings:

- Ocotillo where it crosses the railroad at Nauvoo Station – there is only one lane there now. There would be many issues (obtaining right-of-way, building a railroad platform to handle sidewalk crossing; moving the railroad arms out which would not be covered by the Railroad). This would be more prudent to do when the road widening project is completed.

Item F: Request for future agenda items

Vice-Chair Clark

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, September 6, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. Items for future agendas include:

1. Introduction on 2012 Major General Plan Amendments, which have significant impact on the Traffic Plan
2. Presentation on Railroad study and copy of SATS
3. Update/Discussion on Meridian Road Design Concept Report
4. Transit Study
5. Update on Town's CIP projects and for surrounding municipalities' traffic projects.
6. Discussion on potential new meeting day.

Chairman Nichols recommended delaying the CIP presentation unless any of the other projects on the list get postponed.

Vice-Mayor Benning suggested scheduling an extra meeting specifically for the Major General Plan Amendment presentation.

5. **Announcements**

None.

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

PREPARED BY:

Laura Moats, Development Services Assistant

PASSED AND APPROVED ON: September 6, 2012

Ryan Nichols, Transportation Advisory Committee Chairman