



DRAFT

Transportation Advisory Committee Minutes

Thursday, October 6, 2011

6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

San Tan Room – Development Services Building

Committee Members:

Ryan Nichols – Chair	Present
John Alston – Council Member	Present
Chris Clark	Present
Gregory Arrington	Present
Kim Mlazgar	Absent
Nichelle Williams	Absent
Patricia Conrad	Present
Richard Turman	Present
Tom Nelson	Absent
Steve Conklin	Present

Public:

None

Town Staff Members:

Bill Birdwell, Sr. Traffic Engineering Analyst	Present
Chris Dovel, Town Engineer	Present
Laura Catanese, Sr. Administrative Assistant	Present
Tom Condit, Development Services Director	Present

1. Call to Order:

Committee Chairman, Ryan Nichols, called the meeting to order at 6:33p.m.

2. Introductions:

Chair Nichols introduced new member, Steve Conklin, to the committee. Steve Conklin then gave a brief self-introduction.

3. Public Comment:

There were no public comments.

4. Items for Discussion and possible action

Item A: Consideration and possible approval of August 4, 2011 minutes

Vice-Chair Chris Clark made the first motion to approve the August 4 meeting minutes. Greg Arrington made the second motion to approve. Motion was carried **UNANIMOSLY**.

Item B: Update on AZ State Land Department Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Pinal County)

Tom Condit

Staff updated the TAC on Arizona State Land Department’s “Superstition Vistas” Comprehensive Plan Amendment, focusing on the transportation and land use changes that are being requested. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment includes 275 square miles of Arizona State Trust land commonly known as Superstition Vistas located in north central Pinal County. Should the Comp Plan Amendment be approved by Pinal County, the Town will initiate a major General Plan Amendment next summer.

Discussion:

Members asked questions concerning the reasons for Pinal County’s Planning and Zoning Commission’s recommended denial? The primary reasons for the recommended denial were: the reduction in employment lands around the railroad corridor; the elimination of “open space” designation in a military overflight area in the southeast portion of the plan area; and the increased densities in many areas throughout the plan area. They believed this plan is proceeding too early and is too detailed to adopt at the present time. This matter will be considered by the Board of Supervisors in October and if revisions are proposed, will go back to the Planning and Zoning Commission and then final consideration by the Board of Supervisors in November.

TAC members also asked about Apache Junction’s General Plan, which does overlap with the Town’s general plan near the CAP canal and the Germann Road alignment.

Item C: Discussion on roadway cross-sections and engineering standards

Bill Birdwell

Staff recently visited a City of Scottsdale subdivision retrofit near Scottsdale/McDowell roads employing the following traffic calming measures:

- Center Landscaped Island (collector street)
- Intersection Bulb-out (local residential/collector street)
- Center Landscaped/Bulb-out (one side combination)

While each of these methods has its merits, staff presently reviews traffic calming on a case-by-case basis and enjoys some flexibility in determining site-specific traffic calming measures. A recent example involves the Church Farms development south of Ocotillo between Signal Butte and ½ mile east of Meridian. Based on staff comments, the submittal has been revised to reflect the implementation of traffic calming measures for the collector streets. The cross-sections were upgraded to include raised median and traffic calming measures.

To address the initial TAC concerns regarding some existing collector roads with little or no traffic calming measures, the following note has been added to the Town’s Roadway Cross Section – Major Collector Standard Detail (R-103) and also to the Roadway Cross Section – Urban Residential Collector Standard Detail (R-105):

NOTE: Use of this cross-section is subject to the application of traffic calming measures. Town staff will work in conjunction with project design staff to determine the appropriate measures to include in new design submittals

Discussion:

Members asked the following questions/made the following comments:

- Are buses able to easily navigate the circles? The engineering design criteria we are using does include adequate turning radius for larger vehicles.

- Can we include a maximum length for a residential street on standard details; for example, 800 feet? Staff can revise and update our Standard Notes at any time.
- Are the notes on the standard details overkill? Staff believes the addition of the note is helpful for the engineering consultants, and alerts them to the fact that the Town is reviewing these roads for traffic calming measures.
- The roads in parcel H are too long/linear. Staff will continue to work with the Church Farms developer to address this concern.

Item D. Quarterly Update – ITS Phase II and emerging traffic control and safety projects
Bill Birdwell

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects: Referring to ITS DRAFT map (attached), staff pointed out that blue lines indicate phase 1 of the ITS implementation, red lines indicate phase 2 or current installation (anticipated to bid by the end of November), and green lines indicate the final/phase 3 installation. Since these projects are federally funded, the Town must use the funds by October 2012 as the federal budget calendar year runs from October to October. This may push some projects in phase 2 into the Towns FY 12/13 budget year.

Safe Routes to School: The Town has partnered with Higley to share in driver feedback signs.

Traffic Signal (Village Loop South at Rittenhouse): Staff met with the engineering firm contracted for the design of Village Loop South/Rittenhouse intersection; and anticipates the construction contract to be ready for Council action in December.

Empire Road Pavement Markings: The Town was awarded approximately \$60,000 in grant funds by CAAG (HSIP grant) to upgrade pavement markings on Empire Road.

Discussion:

Do our cameras record information that is available to the public (i.e., subject to a public records search)? Cameras are for traffic monitoring purposes only; the Town is not licensed for collision recording (which must then be saved for 10 years as they are public records). Pictures the cameras records are saved for only 7 days, then the cameras record over the data.

Item E. Update on MCDOT Special Projects Fund Request (project request by Queen Creek)
Tom Condit

Staff updated members on MCDOT Special Projects Fund request, which includes the following projects:

- 198th Street & Rittenhouse
 - Project Cost \$177,500
 - Town share 15% (\$26,625)
 - Volume capacity (v/c) ratio exceeds 1.0
- Cloud Road & Rittenhouse Road (need new traffic signal)
 - Project cost \$212,000
 - Town share 15% (37,500)
 - Volume capacity (v/c) ratio exceeds 1.0

\$1.5 million in funding is available; and MCDOT received more projects than they have in available funds. Therefore, the selection will be competitive, based on MCDOT's criteria. The Town was scheduled to make a presentation to MCDOT's Transportation Advisory Board in September; when that meeting was cancelled, the meeting date has now been pushed back to November 15. Staff will keep the TAC updated once we hear more about the approval status.

Item F: Request for future agenda items

Chair Nichols

Members asked that the following items be brought forth on the next meeting agenda:

- ULI final report: Transportation recommendations, including: 1) discussion on Old Ellsworth and Dibble design; 2) any impacts on the Town's 17-acre parcel marketability; and 3) connectivity between Queenland Manor / Nauvoo Station across the railroad.
- Regional Transportation Project Update;
- Germann Road Corridor Study Update (Wilson will present this to the TAC);

5. Announcements

No announcements were given.

6. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 8:07PM

PREPARED BY: Laura Catanese

PASSED AND APPROVED ON: _____

Ryan Nichols, TAC Committee Chair