

# TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

June 4, 2007

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on June 4, 2007 at 3:01 p.m.

## COMMITTEE PRESENT

Kyle Jones, Chairperson  
Rex Griswold  
Scott Somers

## COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Keno Hawker

## STAFF PRESENT

Donna Bronski  
Jack Friedline

### 1. Items from citizens present.

Chris Lambly, 2451 N. Terrace Circle, urged the Committee to recommend to the full Council that the South Canal project (McKellips to McDowell) (Agenda Item 2) not proceed forward.

### 2. Hear an update on Shared-Use Path Project Program.

Deputy Transportation Director Mike James displayed a PowerPoint presentation (a copy is available for review in the City Clerk's Office) and provided a brief overview of the status of bicycle and pedestrian pathway projects currently funded in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for the next year. He also thanked Transportation Engineer Mitchell Foy, who will be retiring in a few weeks, for his efforts and hard work during his 30-year career with the City of Mesa.

Mr. James reported that Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) monies are the funding source for 73% of the City's recommended FY 2007/08 bicycle/pedestrian pathway projects. He explained that the City of Mesa also received a bronze designation from the League of American Bicyclists for its nationally recognized bicycle and pedestrian pathways. Mr. James displayed a series of photographs depicting various Shared-Use Path projects throughout the community.

Mr. James advised that for FY 2007/08, it is staff's recommendation to move forward with the following projects: Lehi Historic Trail Phase II; Adobe Road bike lane/safe route to school; and Longmore Multi-Use Path (Broadway Road to Main Street). He noted that the Lehi Historic Trail project is a community-supported effort and said that volunteers would construct the trail and materials would be donated to the effort. Mr. James further commented that the Adobe Road design project would complete the connection for bicyclists between the east and west City limits. He added that the Longmore Multi-Use Path project would connect existing bike routes

from Guadalupe Road to Broadway Road and from Main Street to the Salt River. He displayed aerial views of each of the projects.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that staff recommends the following projects be set aside: South Canal (McKellips to McDowell); South Canal (McDowell to Val Vista); and Mesa Community College (MCC) Campus Pedestrian Link Design; that with regard to the South Canal projects, the neighbors were not supportive of staff's proposed design and both projects have been delayed indefinitely; that because the proposed location of the MCC downtown campus has changed, the project has also been placed on hold; that regarding the Adobe Road design project, staff proposes to obtain sufficient right-of-way to widen Adobe Road in order to accommodate bike lanes in both directions; and that when the area is developed in the future, the City would add curbs, gutters, streetlights and the remainder of the pavement to complete the street.

Mr. James also spoke regarding the costs for the revised FY 2007/08 projects. (See Attachment 1.)

Mr. James briefly highlighted future bicycle/pedestrian pathway projects identified by staff that include the Grand Street Pedestrian Project (Broadway Road to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue); Pepper Place Pathway (Lewis to Robson); and Fiesta Paseo (Extension to the Tempe Canal). He explained that staff intends to redirect "set aside" project funds to those projects that receive community and Council support. Mr. James added that staff would pursue Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) enhancement funding (\$500,000 maximum/project, with a 5.7% local funding match) to construct 15 "green" shelters for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Further discussion ensued relative to the Pepper Place Pathway project, which is designed to widen the sidewalks and reconfigure curb ramps in order to make them ADA accessible.

Committeemember Somers requested that staff provide the Committee with information relative to the source of the local funding for the FY 2007/08 proposed projects.

Chairman Jones thanked staff for the presentation.

### 3. Hear an update on High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis.

Mr. James introduced Wulf Grote, Metro's Director of Project Development, who was prepared to address the Committee relative to this agenda item.

Mr. Grote provided a brief historical overview of the 20-mile light rail project (scheduled for completion in December 2008), which will connect Phoenix, Tempe and Mesa. He reported that as a component of the Regional Transportation Plan, Metro is also developing 57-miles of High Capacity Transit (HCT) Corridors throughout the Valley, with one of those study areas being the Central Mesa Corridor.

Mr. Grote referred to a PowerPoint presentation (available for review in the City Clerk's Office) and offered an overview of the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study. His comments included, but were not limited to, the following: that it will take an estimated nine to ten years from the time the project begins until the line is open for service; that Metro has identified a study area for the Central Mesa Corridor from Main Street/Sycamore to Superstition Springs Mall; that the purpose of the extensive study area is to consider not only Light Rail Transit (LRT), but also Bus Rapid

Transit (BRT); that the Alternatives Analysis requires the identification of the correct alignment for the corridor, as well as the most appropriate technologies to be implemented (LRT, BRT or a combination); and that Proposition 400 monies are the source of funding for the Alternatives Analysis.

Discussion ensued relative to the various features of BRT (reserved lanes or roadway, traffic signal priority, special design, substantial investment in stations, special branding or identity, and frequent service) and LRT (electrified overhead wire, dedicated right-of-way, and steel wheels on welded rails).

Mr. Grote commented that since February, Metro and HDR, its consultant, have been working on the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study. He explained that the scope of the study includes a number of components such as the Alternatives Analysis, Public Involvement Program, Economic Development and Market Analysis, Environmental Impact Statement, Conceptual Engineering, and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Report, which must be completed in order to obtain Federal funding.

Mr. Grote further spoke regarding the status of the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study which has included monthly meetings with City of Mesa staff, developing a Public Involvement Plan, identifying the various stakeholders, analyzing existing and future travel patterns in the corridor, coordinating efforts with MAG and the FTA, identifying potential HCT alignments (i.e., Main Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue) and possible location of Park N Ride lots, conducting an introductory workshop, beginning the public involvement process, and conducting scoping meetings in August and September of this year.

Transportation Director Jeff Martin acknowledged that the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study is a lengthy process. He stated that the selected alignment in the downtown area would not occur until late 2008 or early 2009, which would coincide with the opening of the LRT.

Further discussion ensued relative to the fact that staff has worked extensively with Metro to compile a list of stakeholders within half a mile of the Central Mesa Corridor and would also make a presentation at the upcoming Downtown Mesa Association (DMA) board meeting to provide the members with an overview of the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study and apprise them of the upcoming scoping meetings.

Committeemember Griswold stated that it was his recollection of previous Council discussions regarding LRT that once the system was operational, the Council would assess whether it was a successful venture and if the service should be expanded further into the City of Mesa.

Chairman Jones clarified that the purpose of the Alternatives Analysis component of the Central Mesa Corridor HCT Study is to identify the most appropriate alignment and also which technology would be most suitable. He stressed the fact that the Council would not make those decisions until light rail becomes operational.

Chairman Jones thanked everyone for the presentation.

4. Hear an update on Bus Rapid Transit Implementation on Main Street.

Transportation Director Jeff Martin reported that for the past year, the City of Mesa and Valley Metro have been working on the implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along Main Street. He explained that Proposition 400 monies are available for the operation, which would run from the Sycamore Transit Center along Main Street to Power Road and south to Superstition Springs Mall. Mr. Martin added that staff is exploring this project in conjunction with the Central Mesa Corridor High Capacity Transit Study.

Deputy Transportation Director Mike James displayed a PowerPoint presentation (available for review in the City Clerk's Office) and offered a brief overview of the Main Street BRT. His comments included, but were not limited to, the following: that BRT is an enhanced bus service designed to move riders more quickly than local bus service; that it has limited stops, frequent service, signal priority treatment, real time message boards, enhanced bus styling and a strong marketing component. Mr. James stated that it is anticipated that the Main Street BRT system would open at the same time as light rail transit (LRT), which is scheduled for December 2008.

Mr. James displayed a number of photographs depicting examples of enhanced stations, various components of the station design, the type of vehicles that would be purchased for the project, and the proposed bus alignment and station locations. He explained that the operation that has been identified consists of 8 hours of peak service at 15-minute headways and 10 hours of off-peak service at 30-minute headways. Mr. James added that the Main Street local routes would continue to operate and provide bus stops that are one-eighth or one-fourth of a mile apart.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Tran Systems, the City's partner in the BRT project, initiated the design phase in April 2007; that a planning charrette and field visits were conducted in May 2007 in order to discuss possible station locations; that a steering committee, consisting of transit users, interested citizens and business and property owners, would provide input with regard to the planning/design of the stations this summer; that a public meeting would be held in mid-July; that construction documents would be developed between August 2007 to April 2008; that construction of the stations would begin the second half of 2008; that the project will be 100% funded by the Proposition 400 Public Transit Fund (\$15.2 million for the next two years); that RPTA/Valley Metro will purchase ten 60-foot buses for the service; and that the preliminary project allocation includes \$8 million for construction, \$862,120 for design fees, \$150,000 for project management, and the remainder for right-of-way, construction administration, signal priority, and environmental costs.

Chairman Jones thanked staff for the presentation.

5. Hear a presentation, discuss and make a recommendation on an improved parking prohibition process.

Assistant Transportation Director Dan Cleavenger referred to a PowerPoint presentation (a copy is available for review in the City Clerk's Office) and reported that staff is seeking direction from the Committee regarding the City's current method of authorizing parking prohibitions. He offered a brief analysis of the issue and commented, among other things, that staff often receives "No Parking" requests from homeowners, business owners, the Police and Fire Departments, school officials and Transportation staff; that today's presentation relates to signed parking prohibitions, as distinguished from Red Curb applications (which address

parking concerns near fire hydrants, driveways, community mailboxes and trash collection areas); and that over the last ten years, staff has presented 281 requests for signed parking prohibitions to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB), which have been forwarded to the Council for approval.

Mr. Cleavenger highlighted various reasons for establishing parking prohibitions as follows:

- Traffic Safety Issues (limited sight distance or congestion near intersections).
- Operational Issues (narrow streets, striping configuration, bike lanes).
- Significant burdens (nuisances) to adjacent property owners (heavy/frequent parking near schools, parks and churches, criminal activities, solid waste collection).
- Other Nuisances (neighborhood disputes, including residential or business, enforcement of CC&Rs (Note: The City does not enforce CC&Rs), and other non-safety or non-operational issues.

Mr. Cleavenger stated that in working with Deputy City Attorney Donna Bronski, Transportation staff identified a number of legal concerns relative to the City's current method of authorizing parking prohibitions. He explained that Mesa's current petition process allows parking to be prohibited on public streets for virtually any reason. Mr. Cleavenger advised that it has been the practice of the TAB to hear concerns from residents and stated that if there are no adverse effects of the prohibited parking, it has generally been granted by the Board. He advised that such a process might result in differing zoning regulations in similar traffic conditions. Mr. Cleavenger also commented that last December when staff addressed parking concerns in various industrial parks, they proposed the creation of an ordinance to prohibit parking for the entire subdivision. He noted that after lengthy discussion with the Council and the City Attorney's Office, staff determined that such action was inappropriate and that signage in the field should match the ordinance.

Discussion ensued relative to the timeline for the current process, which can take between two and four months to complete; that staff receives a request for a parking prohibition and assesses the need and discusses potential impacts of the parking prohibition; that staff prepares a TAB report, which is then placed on the monthly TAB agenda; that if the request is approved by the TAB, staff prepares an ordinance for introduction for the next available City Council meeting; and that pending Council approval of the ordinance, it takes 30 days for the ordinance to become effective, at which time staff would install the signed parking prohibition.

Mr. Cleavenger further reported that staff is proposing a streamlined process that would delegate authority to the Transportation Director to establish and implement signed on-street parking prohibitions to address traffic safety and operational matters, as well as significant burdens to adjacent property owners. He commented, however, that staff does not recommend that the parking prohibitions cover other nuisance issues such as neighborhood disputes, enforcement of CC&Rs or other non-operational or non-safety issues.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that among the five major cities in the Valley (Tempe, Phoenix, Scottsdale, Glendale and Mesa), Mesa is the only community in which the approval authority for parking prohibitions is contained in the City Code as opposed to being delegated to a Traffic Engineer or Traffic Engineering Director; and an analysis of the December 2006 industrial park parking prohibition case, and the fact that staff was directed to continue to work on the issue and bring it back to Council for further discussion and consideration.

Committeemember Somers inquired, from a legal enforcement perspective, if there would be a difference between the ordinance process as it currently exists and the proposed administrative action undertaken by the Transportation Director.

Responding to Committeemember Somers' question, Deputy City Attorney Donna Bronski clarified that the establishment of "No Parking" zones would continue to be enforced, with the only difference being the process by which such decisions are made. She stated that when staff presents a draft ordinance to the Council for consideration, if that were the direction of this Committee, staff would establish standards by which the authority could be delegated to the administrator to make those decisions. She added this could also be done in other areas where there would be no delegation of authority and another process would be followed.

Mr. Cleavenger reviewed the following alternatives for the Committee's consideration:

1. Continue routing requests for parking prohibitions for all safety, operational and nuisance issues to the TAB and the Council.
2. Route "No Parking" requests addressing safety, operational and only significant burdens through the TAB and the Council.
3. Staff prepares an ordinance for the Council to delegate authority for parking prohibitions to the Transportation Director within established guidelines/framework. **(Staff's recommendation.)**

Mr. Cleavenger added that Alternative 3 would assist staff in establishing guidelines, increasing efficiency, creating a shorter implementation time, improving customer service, addressing safety issues in a timely manner, and also allowing sensitive/controversial parking issues to be routed through the TAB and/or the Council.

It was moved by Committeemember Somers, seconded by Committeemember Griswold, to direct staff to proceed with Alternative 3, and that the proposed ordinance be brought back to the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee for review prior to being forwarded on to the full Council.

Carried unanimously.

Chairman Jones thanked staff for the presentation.

6. Hear a presentation, discuss and make a recommendation on proposed parking prohibitions on Pomeroy north of Broadway Road and on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue west of Mesa Drive.

Assistant Transportation Director Dan Cleavenger displayed a PowerPoint presentation (available for review in the City Clerk's Office) and reported that the purpose of this item is to address traffic safety and operational issues associated with the picking up and dropping off of day laborers on Pomeroy between Broadway Road and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue between Mesa Drive and Pomeroy.

Mr. Cleavenger referred to a site map of the vicinity and identified locations where staff is recommending full-time parking prohibitions with signs stating "No Stopping, Standing, Parking." (See Attachment 2.) He explained that staff is recommending such prohibitions due to the fact that on a daily basis: 1.) drivers park, stop and stand too close to the intersections making it difficult for others to turn from or onto side streets or arterial streets; 2.) drivers stop suddenly or

stand on Pomeroy and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in through lanes to pick up and drop off laborers, thereby blocking through traffic and endangering laborers as they run to and from vehicles; and 3.) drivers stop or stand on Pomeroy and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and block access to business driveways.

Mr. Cleavenger further commented that staff reviewed the conditions in the area and recommended to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) that “No Stopping, Standing or Parking” signs be installed in the above-referenced areas. (Note: The Board approved the recommendation at its April 24, 2007 meeting.) He added that the City of Chandler recently posted “No Stopping, Standing or Parking” signs in its downtown area to address similar concerns.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Section 10-3-24(D) of the City Code provides the Council with the authority to prohibit parking full-time on designated streets when signs are erected; and that Section 10-3-21(J) authorizes the Development Services Manager (now Deputy City Manager) to determine and designate “No Stopping, Standing or Parking” zones where vehicles would create an especially hazardous condition or cause unusual delay to traffic.

In response to a question from Chairman Jones, Mr. Cleavenger clarified that the “No Stopping, Standing, Parking” signage applies to vehicles as opposed to individuals.

Mr. Cleavenger outlined the following alternatives for the Committee’s consideration:

1. Accept staff and TAB’s recommendation to post “No Stopping, Standing or Parking” signs on the east side of Pomeroy (Broadway to 198 feet north), the west side of Pomeroy (Broadway to 210 feet north) and both sides of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (Mesa Drive to Pomeroy).
2. Do not post the recommended signage and/or consider alternative action.

Chairman Jones clarified that this item was removed from a recent City Council agenda because of concerns that the matter is associated with day laborers who congregate in the area. He explained that from a safety standpoint, it is hazardous for motorists to turn onto Pomeroy because of the tendency for day laborers to run to the vehicles as they turn the corner. Chairman Jones commented that the proposed parking prohibition zone was extended to 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue because even though 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is a wider street with less traffic, once parking restrictions are implemented in the area of Pomeroy and Broadway Road, it is anticipated that traffic would move toward 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and cause greater congestion in the area.

Chairman Jones further stated that although the City of Mesa has no legal means by which to prohibit the day laborers from congregating in the area, is it important for the City to implement a mechanism “to move them to a safer location” and also address the impact on the adjacent business owners.

Committeemember Somers expressed concern that once the proposed “No Stopping, Standing, Parking” zones are implemented, he could perceive the day laborers moving to Broadway Road or Mesa Drive and the potential for motorists stopping along those roads. He also questioned whether it would be appropriate to extend the “No Parking, Standing, Parking” zone around the Circle K located on Broadway Road and Mesa Drive.

City Prosecutor John Pombier responded that because Broadway Road and Mesa Drive are major arterial roads, the Police Department is permitted to cite vehicles for impeding traffic if

they stop and pick up day laborers. He stated that signs have already been posted in the Circle K parking lot which prohibit vehicles from picking up day laborers.

Mr. Cleavenger noted that if the streamlined parking prohibition process (Agenda Item 5) was approved by the Council, because of the sensitive nature of this particular parking prohibition, it might be appropriate for the matter to be heard by the TAB and forwarded on to the Council for consideration as opposed to being handled administratively by the Transportation Director.

It was moved by Committeemember Griswold, seconded by Committeemember Somers, to recommend to the Council that Alternative 1 be approved.

Carried unanimously.

Chairman Jones expressed appreciation to staff for the presentation.

7. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of June 2007. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pag  
attachments (2)