

ISSUE	COMMENTS	CONSULTANT/STAFF RECOMMENDATION
New TI at Loop 202 & Mesa Drive	Residents concerned about neighborhood impacts of new TI	Include language in the report that states that the project is conditional based upon further analysis and public input
New TI at US 60 & Lindsay Road	TAB and subcommittee had considerable discussion about the benefits of a new TI at Lindsay	Include language in the report that states that the project is conditional based upon further analysis and public input
Higley Parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAB and subcommittee concerned about need for parkway on Higley and impacts to adjacent properties JMPC approved motion to change wording in report that Higley would be converted to a parkway "only" if it is continued across the Indian community to "especially" if. 	The current language that states Higley would be converted to a parkway "only" if it is continued across the Indian community be retained.
LRT on Main Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAB and subcommittee recommended to keep the alignment on Main Street without any conditions in the report. DDC asked that both Main Street and 1st Avenue be retained as options JMPC recommended that LRT be shown on Main Street conditional based upon further analysis and public input 	Staff recommends existing language in the plan, which calls for a Main Street alignment through Town Center
Six-lane streets in the SE area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAB and subcommittee recommended to show six-lane streets in the SE without any conditions in the report. JMPC recommended that six-lane streets be shown in the SE conditional based upon further analysis and public input 	Show streets with six-lane cross sections in the plan, revisit issue through a SE sub-area study
Plan is not realistic-cannot be funded	JMPC discussed and the consensus was that it is a plan for the future and should show need, however, the funding shortfall was a concern	No changes to the plan Clearly state in the executive summary and the finance plan that there is a funding shortfall that must be addressed.
Maintain existing facilities versus new construction	JMPC members discussed the importance of maintaining the existing transportation system first if revenue is limited	Report discusses the importance of maintaining the transportation system as a priority

Errata Sheet: Mesa Transportation Plan (April 30 Draft Final)

Proposed Change	TAB/JMPC Transportation Subcommittee May 21, 2002	JMPC May 30, 2002	Council Transportation Committee June 6, 2002	City Council June 24, 2002
<p>Page 4-27, Figure 4-9: Recommended Street Plan Map Add a note indicating that the Higley Road Parkway, US60/Lindsay Traffic Interchange, and 202L/Mesa Drive Traffic Interchange are all conditional, pending further analysis and public input.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 5-16, Figure 5-4: Short-Term Transit Improvements Include a light rail transit park-and-ride facility at Main and Longmore.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-2 \$1,000,000 per year is allocated in periods 1-2 for freeway enhancement (e.g., landscape, art, added turn lanes on city streets on arterial streets at freeway interchanges to improve access).</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-2 \$300,000 per year is allocated in periods 1-5 for arterial street landscape rehabilitation</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-5, Figure 10-1 Amend figure to summarize costs by plan element – Streets (Capital and Operations), Transit (Light Rail and Other Transit), Shared Use Paths, Pedestrian Enhancements, and Town Center Plan.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-6, Table 10-1: Transportation Plan Costs Insert a column for Town Center Plan costs.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-6, Table 10-1: Transportation Plan Costs Divide Transit Capital Costs into two columns: LRT Capital and Other Capital</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-9, Mesa Quality of Life Sales Tax In May 1998, Mesa voters approved a 0.5 percent sales tax for Quality of Life Improvements. At the end of 2006, 0.25 of the tax will expire, and the remainder will continue for on-going operations and maintenance needs in the various program areas. These improvements included specified funding for transportation activities (including transit) and for highway advancement. Based on the City's adopted expenditure plan for 1999-2008, a portion of the Quality of Life funds are to be used for transit operation and management, and the balance for capital needs funding for the following: 1) public safety (police and fire); 2) Library, Recreational, and Cultural; 3) Arts and Entertainment; and 4) Transportation (primarily transit). Total transportation funding accounted for approximately 15% of the Quality of Life Sales Tax. Streets activities included funding for left turn lanes and Intelligent Transportation Systems. Transit activities included funding for bus pullouts, transit capital, transit maintenance, and service expansions.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-15, Community Facilities District (CFD) Community Facilities Districts are used for certain defined areas that meet defined policy requirements. CFDs are not used as funding sources for an entire city.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 10-15, Transportation Utility Only two states were identified as allowing utility districts, Texas and Oregon. Receiving such authority in Arizona would likely be quite difficult.</p>	Approved	Approved		
<p>Page 6-7, Figure 6-2: Future Bicycle Facilities Identify additional mid-section bicycle crossings over the Red Mountain and San-Tan freeways.</p>	Added and approved	Approved		