



Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes

Wednesday, August 8, 2013 6:30–8:30 p.m.

Municipal Services Building – San Tan Conference Room

Committee Members:

Chairman Nichols Nichols, Chairman	Present
Vice Chairman Clark, Vice-Chairman	Present
Robin Benning, Council Member	Present
David Bond	Present
Steve Conklin	Absent
Nichelle Williams	Absent
Richard Turman	Present
Alan Turley	Present
Kenn Burnell (non-voting)	Present

Public:

Dick Yano, AMEC	Present
Chris Woolery, Kimley-Horn	Present

Town Staff Members:

Troy White, Public Works Division Manager	Present
Tom Narva, Sr. CIP Project Manager	Present
Laura Moats, Development Services Assistant	Present

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

2. Introductions:

Round table introductions were conducted.

3. Public Comment: None.

4. Items for Discussion and possible action

Item A: Consideration and possible approval of June 13, 2013 minutes Chairman Nichols

Motion by David Bond, to approve the June 13, 2013 minutes, as presented, seconded by Chris Clark. All ayes. Motion carried 4-0.

Item B: Review and Discussion of 70% Design of Rittenhouse Road

Troy White

Public Works Manager Troy White provided a brief background. This project is currently at the 70% design level, and being presented to TAC for its input. Mr. White stated a public open house will be held in mid-September.

Chris Woolery of Kimley-Horn gave an update on the project. This project was initiated in 2008 as Rittenhouse Phase II. The roadway will have two through sections with a raised median in the middle. There will be a sidewalk installed on the south side, as well as in the portion already approved just east of Sossaman Road before the curve. The improvements include tight right-of-way confinements. The total right-of-way for Rittenhouse Road improvements is 95 feet. The roadway is approximately 69 feet wide. There will be a 12-inch water line installed from the Sossaman Road intersection to just past the curve. One of the issues Mr. Woolery explained is there is a 69 kV power line on the south side of Power Road, which will need to be relocated. Kimley-Horn is working with SRP to relocate this line in a narrow area north of Rittenhouse Road next to the railroad. The development of Emperor Estates IV East will be coordinated as part of this project. Mr. Woolery noted there is a private resident located at the corner past the curve in the County island. These roadway improvements will be right up against their existing wall; however an attached six-foot sidewalk and the street alignment will fit up against that wall without having to do reconstruction. In addition, there is coordination taking place with Canyon State Academy (CSA) as part of this project, including drainage improvements.

Mr. Woolery also pointed out that when this project was originally designed in 2008, it was expected the CSA historical building would have to be modified or demolished, but the detailed survey shows the building edge in topographic was the roof overhang. The street alignment fits without touching the building. CSA will be extending their existing wall to the corner at Hawes Road. Additionally, in the future there is a realignment of Hawes Road planned. The ultimate intersection will be built to set up the realignment of Hawes in the future. There will be a new traffic signal replacing the temporary signal now in place.

Chairman Nichols asked for clarification on the intersection with Hawes (curve returns, and what will be there in the interim). Mr. Woolery responded there will be a little jog that will tie into Hawes Road.

Chairman Nichols asked if the retention basins at CSA are going to be installed on the inside of the proposed wall. Mr. Woolery responded CSA has an already developed portion north of their main entrance where there will be a storm drain system to capture the water and take it into the channel that was built for the Emperor Estates development. In the undeveloped portion they will build a permanent basin at two locations: next to entrance and another near the end of the CSA property, which will be a permanent basin.

David Bond how this project is being funded. Mr. White responded CIP funds will be utilized, in addition to development impact funds collected from Emperor Estates and for a portion of the intersection.

Chris Clark asked if the power lines will be relocated closer to the homes, or put underground, in the event SRP is not willing to relocate them. Mr. Narva responded the Town has collected cash in lieu from the two developments to relocate the 69kV lines.

Vice-Chairman Clark asked about the communication lines on the north side. Mr. Narva stated those lines are 12 kV overhead power. The Town has requested an aesthetic assessment to underground these lines. He also stated there are 12 kV lines built underground on Rittenhouse Road west of Sossaman and on the north side. There are 69 kV and 12 kV lines built underground on Ocotillo past the railroad tracks.

Vice-Chairman Clark requested details on the intersection. Mr. White stated staff will send the graphic to the committee, and asked Chris Woolery to bring graphics to the open house.

Chairman Nichols asked if any landscaping was planned. Chris Woolery explained where all the planned landscaping will be installed, and where it will be coordinated with CSA.

Council Member Benning arrived at 7:00 p.m.

Item C. Review and Discussion of 90% Design of Ocotillo Rd and UPRR Crossing Troy White

Dick Yano of AMEC provided background on the project. This project was postponed for funding reasons in 2008/09. Modifications since that time include:

- Four-lane improvements with medians to the left
- Improvements along the frontage of Nauvoo Station
- Two lanes in each direction
- Raised median, sidewalk, bike lanes

Mr. Yano noted the raised medians are a UPRR requirement. There will be dual railroad gates, with arms on both sides to cover the width of road. The railroad requires raised medians to prevent traffic from going around the arms. The railroad improvements will be done by UPRR; the gates will be installed by their crews; they will put in new panels across the tracks. In addition to the roadwork, a new water line crossing will be installed which will cross the tracks at a right angle and connect to the existing line. There is currently a crossing on the east side which will be abandoned. This crossing is an 8-inch line; 12-inch water mains are being installed. Mr. Yano explained the original plans showed the road would taper down to one lane just east of the tracks to get back to the existing alignment eastbound. The plans have since been changed to extend the two lanes up to the culvert crossing and then tapering back to the existing two lanes further east.

The Town will enter into an agreement with the railroad for surface road improvements and utility improvements. Once this agreement is in place, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC), who regulates all railroad crossings in Arizona, will get involved. They require a formal public hearing to get everything approved, which typically takes approximately one year. There will be drainage improvements going within the railroad right-of-way, eventually crossing under the tracks.

Public Works Manager White asked about the extent of the UPRR's work on each side of the tracks. Mr. Yano responded the UPRR will work out to 10 feet from their panels, which will require them to shut down their tracks. This will be part of construction specifications with the contractor. Traffic will have to be shut down while the UPRR works on their panels, but the duration will be from a few hours to a day. The work will be done on non-peak hours, depending on the train schedules.

Chairman Nicholson questioned the likelihood of drivers making left turns at 214th Place into the residential subdivision near the splitter island, and asked if the median could be extended to prevent this. Mr. Yano agreed the median stripe is not that impactful.

Mr. White asked Mr. Yano where the left-turn queue starts. Mr. Yano stated he will further review the possibility of extending the median further east.

Item D. Update on Ocotillo Road from Heritage Loop Road to Ellsworth Loop Road alignment and Study and Review of Alternatives Grading Matrix Criteria

Mr. White explained the existing plan for Ocotillo Road from the Heritage Loop Road to Ellsworth Loop Road alignment shows Ocotillo Road shifting to the north. The Town is looking at shifting the alignment south to mitigate Circle K impacts. Dibble Engineering will be developing two alternatives, which will be presented to TAC. Mr. White distributed the Alternative Evaluation Matrix, which is the tool that will be used to grade the alternatives.

The Alternative Evaluation Matrix compiled by Dibble Engineering includes the following Criteria Topics: **Safety**, (Vehicle, Bicycle, Pedestrian); **Public/Political Support**; **Utility Impacts**; **Right-of-Way Limitations**; **Existing Business Impacts** (Driveway access, Parking, Circulation); **Future Development Impacts**; **Impacts to Existing Improvements**; **Parking** (Supplemental Surface Lots); and **Traffic Calming**. Mr. White stated once Dibble has finished the alternatives, they will be reviewed and each criteria topic will be ranked with each alternative. Mr. White noted he is suggesting that "Political" be removed from "Public/Political Support". He asked for comments and input from the Committee.

Chairman Nichols stated he feels traffic calming is part of vehicular, pedestrian or bicycle "safety", as there is no other major reason to do traffic calming than to provide safety for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. He suggested this could be consolidated, or if left separate, then there may be other components of safety that would allow each to be broken down separately, since vehicular safety may be completely different than pedestrian safety.

Council Member Benning agreed with Chairman Nichols, stating in the past the Committee often discussed vehicle safety versus bicycle and pedestrian safety. He feels those three are distinct and separate and if we were to eliminate the 15% weighting factor currently dedicated to Public/Political support, it would be appropriate to take the weighting factors from Safety, Public/Political Support, and Traffic Calming, and divide those three in another way (i.e. 15% for Safety, and 10% each for bicycle and pedestrian).

Alan Turley suggested a criterion be added related to ranking how the design either enhances or impedes traffic flow. He stated he is seeing an increasing number of incomplete intersections, which he feels should not become standard. The Committee discussed whether or not to add a category/topic for "Traffic Flow". Chairman Nichols pointed out the topics shown in the decision matrix specifically relate to the alignment of the road, with the road being shifted either north or south.

There was brief discussion about speed limits and the downtown area as being pedestrian-friendly. Mr. White stated the speed limit will likely be 25 mph but no official recommendation is being made until design is underway and there will be a crosswalk at Heritage Loop and Ellsworth Road. The Committee also discussed parking criteria, and business impacts. Vice-Chairman Clark noted he has concern that Item 3.1.5 *Existing Business Impacts* sufficiently addresses business owners' concerns, and emphasized this area as being pedestrian-friendly. Mr. White responded the business owners will have direct input and contact with the consultant, including sit-down meetings. Chairman Nichols clarified that Vice-Chairman Clark is referring to whether the alternative will encourage or discourage pedestrian activity in the downtown area, i.e. "pedestrian accessibility".

Chairman Nichols suggested the title of this item be changed from “existing business impacts” to “existing business support” or that the desired language be added to the list. Vice-Chairman Clark agreed, stating he feels there is a difference between the technical aspect and what the businesses really need day-to-day. Mr. White suggested keeping the existing language “existing business impacts”, but adding language for “existing stakeholder support”.

Mr. White asked for further input on the weighting factors for each criteria topic. Chairman Nichols stated the public support will be minimal, since they will not have varying opinions on the alternative. Further discussion took place on the idea of removing “public/political support”, and thereby allowing additional weighting factors to be given to another topic, or only removing “political” from this item, so it becomes “Public Support”. Mr. Benning commented it is difficult to weight “utility impacts”, “right-of-way” and “impacts to existing improvements”, until he knows the cost range, since these items could be extremely costly or have a minimal cost associated with them. Mr. Bond questioned what category the removal of the Circle K fuel tanks would fit into if one of the alternatives included EPA remediation. Mr. White said it would be considered a “utility impacts” if one of the alignment alternatives impacted the tanks. Further discussion ensued on impacts to existing improvements, as well as the weighted factors and scoring for each topic.

Mr. White stated scoring can be figured after the Committee comes to a consensus on the order of the criteria topics. Mr. White re-stated the Committee’s recommendation for the following order:

- 1) Safety
- 2) Utility Impacts
- 3) Right-of-Way impacts
- 4) Existing Business Impacts
- 5) Stakeholder Support
- 6) Future Development Impacts
- 7) Impacts to Existing Improvements
- 8) Parking
- 9) Traffic Calming

David Bond asked if a category will be added for pedestrian accessibility. The Committee confirmed this would be separate from “safety”, as it relates to whether or not the alternative will impede or enhance pedestrian connectivity/accessibility. The Committee requested Existing Business Impacts be moved down on the list, because the addition of “Stakeholder Support” would decrease the weighting factor for “Existing Business Impacts”. Mr. White suggested giving each of those topics a weighted factor of 10. The Committee agreed.

Item E. Update on Regional Projects

Troy White

This item was postponed to the September 12 TAC meeting.

Item F. Annual Work Plan

Public Works Manager Mr. White presented the staff report (attached), and asked for input. Chairman Nichols recommended the CIP transportation projects currently shown as Priority #4 be moved to Priority # 2 or 3. The Committee concurred.

Vice-Chairman Clark made a motion to approve the FY 2013-14 Work Plan as presented, with the amendment to move CIP Transportation Projects from Priority #4 to Priority #2, and all other items to be shifted down. David Bond seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion carried 5-0.

Item G. Discussion and Recommendation of New Chair and Vice Chair positions

Chairman Nichols announced his term is expiring August 31. He is currently serving on the Planning & Zoning Commission. With the adoption of the new Boards, Committee and Commission Bylaws in April, committee members may not serve on more than one committee simultaneously. Richard Turman stated he will be leaving TAC as well. Council Member Benning suggested appointing an interim chair, if that's what the group wants to do.

The Committee unanimously recommended the appointment of Chris Clark as Chair. All ayes. Motion carried. 5-0.

The Committee unanimously recommended the appointment of David Bond as the new Vice-Chair. All ayes. Motion carried. 5-0.

Item F. Request for future agenda items

Vice-Chair Clark

- Regional Update
- Queen Creek Local Transit Study

5. Announcements

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

PREPARED BY:



Laura Moats, Development Services Assistant

PASSED AND APPROVED ON: _____



Chairman Chris Clark, Transportation Advisory Committee Chairman