

# TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

## APPROVED

HELD ON February 16, 2016

### TAB Members Present

Troy Peterson, Vice Chairperson  
Louis Stephen  
Jennifer Love  
Ron Wilson  
Michael Schmidt  
Kay Henry  
Vern Mathern

### TAB Members Absent

Bruce Hallsted, Chairperson  
David Camp  
Ian Murray

### Others Present

Erik Guderian  
Sabine Ellis  
Renate Ehm  
Julie Christoph  
Susan H. Detwiler  
Lt. Gina Nesbit

Vice Chairperson Troy Peterson called the February 16, 2016 Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:29 pm.

Item 1.            Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Board Member Vern Mathern moved to approve the minutes as written. Board Member Kay Henry seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 2.            Items from citizens present.

None.

Item 3.            Hear a presentation and discuss the Mesa Drive, 8th Avenue to Main Street, Design Concept Report.

Julie Christoph, Supervising Engineer from the City of Mesa's Engineering Department, introduced herself and Ms. Susan H. Detwiler, Project Manager for Dibble Engineering. Together, they presented to the Board the Design Concept Report for Mesa Drive – 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Main Street. Ms. Christoph presented the background on the project, accomplishments to date and the next steps for the project. Ms. Christoph discussed the goals of the project as outlined in the presentation. Ms. Detwiler continued the presentation and discussed various design considerations and reiterated the goals of the project. Ms. Detwiler addressed the importance of integrating the goals of other projects into the Mesa Drive project being discussed. Ms. Detwiler discussed with the Board the limitations of available right of way and the impacts to business and existing features close to the right of way. Ms. Detwiler went on to present proposals for the intersection of Mesa Drive and Broadway Road. There were five different options presented, each with a different level of impact on existing parcels. Option number five was shown and recommended as the best option for design. Ms. Detwiler highlighted that option five has the lowest impact to existing parcels and existing right of way constraints such as Salt River Project (SRP) Irrigation,

COM69kV and the Circle K fuel lane. Ms. Detwiler noted that the recommended option conflicts with an SRP irrigation line and indicated that the City would have to work with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to coordinate the land exchange. The time impacts of working with the BOR have been built into the schedule. Ms. Christoph then presented the Board with project costs and reviewed the project schedule. Ms. Christoph told the Board a 30% design would be completed by March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016, and a public meeting will be held at a 60% design around August 2016. Construction is anticipated to start between the summer of 2017 and fall of 2018.

Board Member Louis Stephen inquired about the driveways of the nearby properties and whether or not they would lose a buffer to backing into the street. Ms. Detwiler addressed Board Member Stephen's questions and expressed that the proposed construction design will maintain the access they currently have. Ms. Christoph also added that the project would add bike lanes to the roadway.

Board Member Kay Henry asked if the aesthetic elements on Mesa Drive north of the US 60 will continue as part of the project addressed in the presentation. Ms. Christoph informed the Board that the intent is to have a cohesive transition between the projects. The exact design element may not be carried through, but the public can expect to see elements of stainless steel and a similar color pallet incorporated into the new project.

Board Member Vern Mathern inquired about arterial life cycle reimbursement and where that funding comes from. Ms. Christoph told the Board the program is part of a regional funding program through the Maricopa Association of Governments and confirmed that it is part of Proposition 400.

Vice Chairperson Troy Peterson inquired as to how the priorities of the \$23M project have been determined. Ms. Christoph described to the Board that the project will improve operations and safety along the corridor, tying in the aesthetic theme and multimodal aspect of previous projects. This project will close the gap between previous projects while creating a continuous link through that part of Mesa.

Vice Chairperson Peterson inquired about pony walls on the roadway and asked if those would be continued throughout the project. Ms. Detwiler informed the Board that the pony walls are an important aesthetic part of the project, though they are not continuous throughout. The existing pony wall close to the right of way will likely get moved back and the exact location will be identified by the landscape architect during the final phases of design.

Vice Chairperson Peterson inquired how many of the existing driveways would be eliminated as part of the project. Ms. Detwiler informed the Board that about 30 driveways would be eliminated. She went on to explain that many driveways are remnants of development that has since come and gone and are no longer used. Some driveways will also be consolidated in the final design process.

Board Member Stephen inquired as to whether or not the residents and business owners along the corridor will be given notice to attend a public meeting. Ms. Christoph explained that the Real Estate department will contact the affected property owners giving them proper notice. A public meeting will be held over the summer which will give the residents and

business owners the opportunity to attend an open house forum where they can ask questions. The notice provided will be given to them at least 30 days prior to the meeting.

Vice Chairperson Peterson inquired as to why neither of the cross sections presented show any streetlights on the east side. Ms. Detwiler explained that the details will be defined in the final design. She went on to state that it is likely streetlights will only be installed on one side of the road due to constraints with utilities and landscaping.

Board Member Stephen requested to review the area via satellite map. Ms. Detwiler and Ms. Christoph reviewed the map, described the residential properties, the characteristics of the corridor and discussed the driveway proximity to the property lines.

Item 4. Discuss and take action on staff recommendation for revisions to Mesa City Code related to sidewalk width.

City Traffic Engineer Sabine Ellis presented to the Board an update to the suggested revision to Mesa City Code related to sidewalk width.

Ms. Ellis explained to the Board that after the last meeting, staff received clarification on the ability of the new sidewalk width to accommodate all utilities and ensured there is a variance for developers allowing them to deviate from the standard layout without going to City Council. Ms. Ellis provided a brief summary from the December 15<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. She explained that staff met with the City of Mesa Engineering Department to ensure there are no issues with the implementation of the five foot width and that all public utilities can be accommodated. She went on to state that the Engineering Department is aware of the revision to the Code and recommends going to the five foot width. She explained that as long as a developer can accommodate the ADA requirements, they may work with the City Traffic Engineer to deviate from the Code requirements. Ms. Ellis went on to discuss the specific code language and identified the changes being made. She explained that Mesa Standard Details are also in the process of being updated to incorporate the five foot sidewalk width.

Board Member Stephen asked if all sidewalks in the future would be installed at a five foot minimum. Ms. Ellis said yes that all sidewalks in residential areas would be installed at a five foot minimum width.

Vice Chairperson Peterson inquired as to the acceptable installation of streetlights outside of the right of way with PUFÉ. Ms. Ellis explained that is an acceptable way of implementing streetlights.

Vice Chairperson Peterson inquired as to whether or not there needs to be language supporting the City Traffic Engineer approving variances. Ms. Ellis explained that the Code will be addressed the same way as other codes that give the City Traffic Engineer that type of authority.

Board Member Kay Henry motioned to approve the proposed changes as given. Board Member Mike Schmidt seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.