

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 13, 2002

The Transportation Committee of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on March 13, 2002 at 4:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT	COUNCIL PRESENT	OFFICERS PRESENT
Jim Davidson, Chairman Pat Pomeroy Claudia Walters	None	None

(Committeemember Walters participated in the entire meeting through the use of telephonic equipment.)

1. Discuss and consider Transit Program funding and service level reductions.

Transit Administrator Jim Wright and Transit Coordinator Christine Stava addressed the Committee regarding this agenda item. Ms. Stava reported that at the February 19, 2002 City Council meeting, staff was requested to provide information regarding anticipated FY 02/03 funding reductions and to identify potential service modifications to the City of Mesa's transit program. She explained that this was the result of a request from the City of Tempe that Mesa fund transit service within the City that is currently subsidized by Tempe. Ms. Stava stated that the purpose of today's presentation is to update the Committee on those issues and also to discuss staff's recommendations for modifications to Route 77 (Baseline Road).

Ms. Stava advised that staff is anticipating an estimated \$1.3 million reduction and/or elimination in funding sources for FY 02/03 including State Lottery Funds (LTAF II), Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) and City of Tempe subsidies, Quality of Life sales tax revenue and City of Mesa general funds. She noted that staff has also identified a variety of administrative and operational cuts and/or deferrals to accommodate the projected budget shortfall. (See Attachment 1.) Ms. Stava commented that among the budget adjustments, staff is recommending a reduction in evening bus service (7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.) frequency from 30 to 60 minutes on Route 120 (Mesa Drive), Route 128 (Stapley Drive) and Route 136 (Gilbert Road). She assured the Committee that the reductions would have a minimal impact on customers. Ms. Stava added that in response to a request from Mayor Hawker, staff has also completed a prioritization analysis of Mesa's bus routes. (See Attachment 2.)

Ms. Stava reported on the issue of Route 77 and said it is the recommendation of staff that the route be funded by the City of Mesa with a route modification. She stated that the modification

would allow passengers who are traveling from the cities to the west the ability to transfer to local Mesa routes to reach major destinations such as Desert Samaritan Hospital, Mesa Community College and Fiesta Mall. Ms. Stava explained that the annual cost of the route with the modification is estimated at \$74,000. She also noted that staff has discussed this issue with representatives from the City of Tempe, and they have agreed that the route modification would be an acceptable solution. Ms. Stava added that pending Council approval of staff's recommendation, the route modification would take effect April 15, 2002. Ms. Stava indicated that Greg Jordan, a representative from the City of Tempe, is present in the audience to respond to any questions from the Committeemembers.

In response to a question from Committeemember Pomeroy, Ms. Stava clarified that funding for Route 77 would be available due to the reduction in the frequency of evening services on Routes 120, 128 and 136.

Mr. Wright briefly outlined the Proposed Route 77 Modification (Attachment 3) and explained that staff's proposal is to "short-turn" or terminate Route 77 at Dobson Road. He noted that passengers will still have access northbound on Dobson Road via City Route 96. Mr. Wright added that the current Route 77 enters Mesa along Baseline Road, travels north along Dobson Road, and turns around in the Westwood/Grove area east of Fiesta Mall.

Discussion ensued relative to staff's prioritization analysis of Mesa's bus routes.

Committeemember Walters commented that although she is sorry that transit service reductions must be implemented, staff's recommendations address many of the concerns previously expressed by Council.

It was moved by Committeemember Walters, seconded by Committeemember Pomeroy, to recommend to the Council that staff's recommendations to fund bus service for Route 77 (Baseline Road) with a route modification, be approved.

Chairman Davidson concurred with Committeemember Walters' comments and thanked Ms. Stava and Mr. Wright for their efforts and hard work relative to this issue.

Carried unanimously.

2. Discuss and consider funding and design of US 60 artwork.

Deputy City Engineer Jeff Kramer addressed the Committee and provided brief historical background relative to this agenda item. He reported that in December of 2000, Council approved the expenditure of \$2.4 million for landscaping enhancements and the addition of retaining wall art along the US 60 Freeway corridor to be implemented in conjunction with the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT) widening project. Mr. Kramer noted, however, that ADOT's design-build team proposed significant time and cost savings during the selection process, which resulted in the elimination of the retaining walls that had been planned for the proposed artwork and also modified the landscaping by increasing the density of plant material. He explained that in June of 2001, the Council requested that staff research aesthetic treatment alternatives for the US 60 Freeway corridor to create an entry statement into the City. Mr. Kramer stated that a variety of alternatives were developed for consideration such as upsizing

plant material, landform graphics, structural art elements, bolt-on overpass graphics, and a freestanding entry monument between Price and Dobson Roads along US 60.

Mr. Kramer said that it was the opinion of staff that a freestanding entry monument was a viable option for an enhancement, and in December of last year, staff reviewed the area between Price and Dobson Roads along the US 60 Freeway for potential locations. He explained that staff subsequently submitted a letter to ADOT highlighting five locations and requesting feedback, approval and/or conditions with regard to the sites. Mr. Kramer advised the Committee that staff has not yet received a response from ADOT, but they were informed that a similar request by the City of Tucson was rejected.

Mr. Kramer commented that the implementation of a freestanding entry monument would not be dependent on the design-build project on the US 60 Freeway corridor and that it could be completed as a separate project under permit from ADOT. He explained that it is the recommendation of staff that the City continue to pursue development of this enhancement for future implementation.

Mr. Kramer reported on the bolt-on overpass graphics alternative and stated that staff evaluated several potential concepts which were presented to this Committee and ADOT in November of last year. He said that based on feedback and subsequent meetings with this Committee and the Council, only the Mirage Concept has been retained. (See Attachment 4.) He commented that ADOT has provided a cost estimate of \$70,000 per bridge to change order the enhancement into the current construction contract at Dobson Road and Alma School Road or, in the alternative, to add these locations into the Mesa Drive project and obtain competitive bids which may or may not result in a lower cost to the City. Mr. Kramer added that all other bridge locations would be added to the ADOT bid packages for competitive bidding and are estimated at \$70,000 for each location in current dollars for planning purposes. Mr. Kramer also stated that staff had considered the possibility of installing the graphics at the entryway bridges on either end of the City (Dobson and Meridian).

Mr. Kramer advised that staff is seeking direction from the Committee relative to the extent and method of aesthetic enhancement implementation.

Committeemember Walters expressed concerns relative to proceeding with the implementation of the bolt-on overpass graphics without knowledge of all associated costs. She also suggested that it might be worthwhile for the City itself to bid the project on the Dobson Road contract.

In response to a series of questions from Committeemember Walters, Mr. Kramer clarified that the \$70,000 cost estimate includes fabrication, finish, delivery and installation of the artwork as well as a 15% ADOT markup fee charged for administration. He explained that if the City bid the implementation job itself, it would incur additional costs which ADOT would not assess such as obtaining the necessary permits, the preparation of traffic control plans and freeway closures. Mr. Kramer added that in response to an earlier question from Committeemember Walters, an ADOT representative in the audience indicated that ADOT could bid the bolt-on overpass graphics implementation as an alternate in the project.

Committeemember Walters requested additional information from staff regarding whether the City would realize a cost savings if it bid all three bridges rather than just one.

In response to Committeemember Walters' inquiry, Development Services Manager Jack Friedline clarified that it would be necessary for the bid to be location specific, and the City would have to determine which three locations the City wanted for one alternate and which one location it wanted for the other.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the pedestrian screening on the bridges on Alma School Road and Dobson Road is curved on top while on Country Club Drive and Mesa Drive the screening is angled at the top, which would necessitate two different fabrications.

Committeemember Walters stated that if the City could implement the bolt-on overpass graphics on only one bridge structure in Mesa, she would prefer its placement at Dobson Road.

Committeemember Pomeroy expressed the opinion that he would like to see aesthetic enhancements at the entryways to the City. He voiced support for the bolt-on overpass graphics to be located at Dobson Road, Power Road, Country Club Drive and Mesa Drive.

In response to a question from Committeemember Pomeroy, Mr. Kramer reiterated that the pedestrian screening on the Country Club Drive and Mesa Drive bridges is angled on top, Dobson Road is curved on top, and the screening on Power Road is an older style of pedestrian fencing which will be impacted in a future construction project.

It was moved by Committeemember Pomeroy to recommend to the Council that staff's recommendation that they proceed with the implementation of the bolt-on overpass graphics (Mirage Concept) at Dobson Road, Country Club Drive and Mesa Drive, be approved.

Committeemember Walters said that she would second the motion for discussion purposes.

In response to a question from Chairman Davidson, Mr. Kramer clarified that the implementation costs for the Dobson Road bridge could be included on the change order proposal the City received from Meadow Valley Contractors through ADOT. He added that he would propose that the Country Club Drive and Mesa Drive enhancement implementations be included in the bid package for the Mesa Drive project and that ADOT be permitted to bid it for the City.

Additional discussion ensued relative to the fact that the Mirage Concept artwork was a joint design effort by a committee consisting of City and ADOT staff; the fact that the design is oriented to the visual pleasure of the driving public as opposed to pedestrians crossing the bridges, and the fact that the HURF Bonds funding can be utilized only for enhancements and general improvements to the freeways and not for transit-related issues.

Carried unanimously.

Chairman Davidson thanked staff for their presentation.

3. Hear a presentation from ADOT regarding landscape maintenance responsibility for Red Mountain Freeway from Country Club to Gilbert.

Chairman Davidson stated that this matter was placed on the agenda per his request.

LeRoy Brady, a representative of ADOT, addressed the Committee and provided a brief overview of a February 28, 2002 letter authored by State Engineer Dick Wright to Mayor Keno Hawker. He reported that due to the State's severe budget reductions which have impacted ADOT's administrative and maintenance funds, it has been determined that ADOT can no longer continue to increase its maintenance responsibilities which have arisen as a result of the completion of over 30 miles of new freeways. Mr. Brady explained that based on that fact, Mr. Wright reached the conclusion that no new landscaping projects will be awarded without a commitment from local jurisdictions to maintain the additional landscaping until adequate funding becomes available. He stated that the award of the landscape construction project on the Red Mountain Freeway between Country Club Drive and Gilbert Road is pending such a commitment. Mr. Brady also noted that Mr. Wright has requested that the City of Mesa consider assuming the landscape maintenance responsibilities, estimated at an annual cost of \$50,000 per mile, to ensure the project's construction. He added that without a commitment from the local jurisdiction, ADOT will modify and re-bid the landscape project to include landscaping along the City-maintained crossroad areas and that the mainline will be seeded to protect against erosion.

In response to a question from Committeemember Walters, Mr. Brady clarified that ADOT will not request that West Valley communities, for example, subsidize landscape maintenance costs on freeway segments where the landscaping has already been completed. He added that Mr. Wright's proposal relates to new landscaping projects only.

Committeemember Walters expressed the opinion that because the City has been obligated to wait for the construction of freeways in the East Valley for many years, it seems only reasonable that other Valley communities should be expected to pay their fair share of the costs for freeway landscape maintenance and that Mesa should not be unduly burdened.

In response to Committeemember Walters' concerns, Mr. Brady advised that ADOT has considered various interim funding solutions and stated that Mr. Wright's proposal to Mayor Hawker specifically addresses the Country Club Drive to Gilbert Road freeway segment.

Committeemember Walters commented on the fact that most of the new freeways are being built in Mesa and the freeways on the west side of the Valley are now completed. She requested that ADOT consider alternative funding mechanisms for freeway landscape maintenance costs which would be shared equally by all Valley communities.

Committeemember Pomeroy concurred with Committeemember Walters' comments and added that Mesa residents have waited a long time for the freeway system to reach the East Valley.

In response to a question from Chairman Davidson regarding why Mesa was selected to assume the landscape maintenance costs of the Red Mountain Freeway between Country Club Drive and Gilbert Road, Mr. Brady clarified that it is the first bid since budget constraints have been imposed on ADOT. He added that landscaping projects on freeway segments in other East Valley communities have already been completed or are near completion.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that Mesa tax dollars have contributed to the acceleration of freeway construction in the East Valley, and the fact that the acceleration program has resulted in a financial savings to ADOT.

Chairman Davidson concurred with Committeemember Walters' comments. He also requested that Assistant Development Services Manager Jeff Martin provide the Committee with additional information relative to the cost savings to ADOT as a result of the City's financial contribution to accelerate the construction of the freeway between Country Club Drive and Gilbert Road.

Chairman Davidson thanked Mr. Brady for his presentation.

4. Discuss and consider funding and design issues for artwork and landscaping enhancements for future ADOT freeway projects.

Deputy City Engineer Jeff Kramer addressed the Committee relative to this agenda item. He referred to staff's report and briefly outlined ADOT's overall schedule for the coordination of landscaping, wall treatments and aesthetic treatments for future freeway segments on the Red Mountain and Santan Freeways. (See Attachment 5.) He explained that the schedule includes the start dates for the structural and landscaping aesthetics for the various segments, and added that ADOT has requested the City's input and coordination to ensure that all of the freeway enhancements/landscaping issues are thoroughly addressed prior to construction of the respective freeway segments.

Mr. Kramer stated that staff is seeking direction from the Committee relative to ADOT's proposed design for the landscaping of the Red Mountain Freeway between Gilbert Road and Higley Road. He provided brief historical background and reported that at the May 7, 2001 Transportation Committee meeting, ADOT presented a landscaping scheme for the Red Mountain Freeway which was intended to depict the Country Club Drive to Higley Road concept in general, although the presentation specifically addressed the Country Club Drive to Gilbert Road component. Mr. Kramer stated that subsequently, the Council approved \$480,000 from HURF Bonds funding for enhancements to the Red Mountain Freeway segments between Country Club Drive and Higley Road.

Mr. Kramer advised that ADOT presented staff with a proposed design for the development of the Gilbert Road to Higley Road freeway segment which includes the City's enhancements, as well as additional changes proposed by ADOT since its original presentation last year. He commented that the proposal consists of the installation of two different landform graphics, as well as a freestanding enhancement element identified as the Citrus Landform.

Mr. Kramer briefly outlined for the members of the Committee the landform graphic named the South Canal, a geometric pattern which would be located on both sides of the freeway between the South Canal and the Greenfield Road ramps. He noted that the pattern is approximately 60 feet wide and would be utilized in place of landscaping. Mr. Kramer added that the colors and border materials have yet to be determined.

Mr. Kramer explained that ADOT's second proposed landform graphic is a pair of snakes which would be located adjacent to the Greenfield Road bridge on all four quadrants. He advised that the snakes, which vary in width from 18 to 26 feet and range in length from 400 to 515 feet, would be primarily composed of River Rock mulch, decomposed granite, colored pavers and a

colored decomposed granite frame. Mr. Kramer added that like the South Canal landform graphic, no trees or shrubs would be incorporated into the design enhancement.

Mr. Kramer noted that the final component of ADOT's proposal is the installation of a freestanding enhancement element identified as the Citrus Landform, a three-foot diameter polystyrene sphere placed atop a triangular pedestal. He stated that the sphere would be painted orange to represent citrus, and that the landform would be placed in groupings at significant locations along the corridor to coordinate with the orchard landscape theme.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that ADOT's overall cost estimate for the project is \$3,779,050, including the additional landform graphics and the City-funded enhancements; the fact that based on ADOT's previous estimate in the range of \$3.5 million to \$3.7 million for the base level of landscaping for this segment of the freeway, staff would have expected costs in the range of \$4 million to \$4.3 million for the base landscaping, Mesa funded enhancements and the additional landform graphics proposed by ADOT, and the fact that the estimate is \$250,000 to \$520,000 less than anticipated due to the elimination of plant material from ADOT's base level landscaping and the utilization of landform graphics instead, which would result in lower long-term operation and maintenance costs.

Mr. Kramer advised that staff is proposing two alternatives for the Committee's consideration, Alternative A, to accept ADOT's proposed landscaping scheme using the three graphical elements in lieu of plant materials, or Alternative B, to return to the original concept of adding more landscaping material to this segment of the freeway and to eliminate the landform graphics. He stated that staff's recommendation is to proceed with Alternative B.

Committeemember Walters voiced a variety of concerns relative to this issue and questioned whether agenda item 3, which addressed the potential that the City would be required to contribute financially to freeway landscape maintenance costs, may impact this matter; inquired whether a "middle ground" option existed between Alternatives A and B, and asked whether this matter could be delayed to provide staff with sufficient time to research agenda item 3.

Chairman Davidson acknowledged staff for providing the information to the Committee in an efficient and timely manner.

In response to a series of questions posed by Committeemember Walters, Mr. Kramer said it is conceivable that staff and ADOT could reach a compromise on the proposed design enhancements, and said that if that is the Committee's direction, staff will proceed in that manner. He commented that the 60% plans for the project are nearing completion, and said that staff will be given the opportunity to offer suggestions/comments during the review process. Mr. Kramer stressed, however, that once staff receives ADOT's final plan development (95% plans), it may be too late in the process to request design changes.

Committeemember Walters stated that although she understands the concept of the Citrus Landform as it relates to Mesa's citrus groves, she is unclear as to the aesthetic value of the snakes landform graphic. She added that when she is unsure how to proceed on an issue, her inclination is to follow staff's recommendations, and in this instance, she is uncertain in which direction to proceed.

Committeemember Pomeroy voiced opposition to the stark appearance of the landform graphics and stated that he would prefer the inclusion of landscaping enhancements as part of the freeway design scheme. He also expressed concerns regarding the snakes landform graphic, but added that if he had to select one of the options, he would choose the South Canal landform graphic. Committeemember Pomeroy also concurred with Committeemember Walters' comments relative to staff pursuing compromise design options with ADOT.

Discussion ensued relative to noise mitigation along freeway corridors.

Chairman Davidson stated the opinion that ADOT's proposal for artwork enhancements is not the best use of tax dollars, and commented that during his and Committeemember Walters' recent visit to Washington, D.C. to attend the National League of Cities conference, a major topic of discussion was the lack of funding for transportation and transit issues. He expressed concerns with regard to the Citrus Landform and stated that at night, its appearance may be distracting to motorists. Chairman Davidson voiced support for landscaping enhancements, but said that after hearing the presentation on agenda item 3, it does not seem logical that the City has funds available for landform graphic projects but not for landscaping.

It was moved by Committeemember Walters to recommend to the Council that staff's recommendation, Alternative B, be approved.

Committeemember Walters reiterated her comments relative to agenda item 3 and requested that staff investigate the financial impact on the City if it is compelled to contribute to the cost of freeway landscape maintenance, and also to consider various freeway design modifications relative to long-term maintenance costs.

In response to a question from Committeemember Pomeroy, Mr. Kramer clarified that it is staff's recommendation that ADOT be requested to return to the original design concept of adding more landscaping material to the Gilbert Road to Higley Road segment of the freeway and that the landform graphics be eliminated.

Committeemember Pomeroy seconded Committeemember Walters' motion.

Chairman Davidson expressed support for staff's recommendation, but informed Mr. Brady that the Committee is not taking lightly the letter from ADOT referenced in agenda item 3.

Carried unanimously.

Chairman Davidson thanked Mr. Kramer for his presentation.

5. Discuss and consider schedules for the current construction phase of Red Mountain Freeway interchanges and related City street projects.

Deputy City Engineer Jeff Kramer addressed the members of the Committee relative to this agenda item. He explained that the purpose of today's presentation is to provide the Committee with a status report on the roadway improvement projects in northeast Mesa relative to corresponding ADOT Red Mountain Freeway improvements, and to seek the Committee's direction on current plans for opening new traffic interchanges along the freeway, as well as staff's proposal for the adjoining arterial streets schedules.

Mr. Kramer reported that the Red Mountain Freeway segment between Gilbert Road and Higley Road is currently under construction on a somewhat accelerated schedule as compared to what staff originally anticipated. He advised that ADOT's current schedule calls for opening the freeway to Greenfield Road by October 2002 and to Higley Road by December 2002. Mr. Kramer commented that based on ADOT's proposed schedule, staff has examined the progress of the City's current arterial street projects and the impact on the City. He stated that with regard to Greenfield, Higley and Power Roads, staff anticipates that the construction of those arterial street projects will be completed prior to the opening of the Red Mountain Freeway to Higley Road in December 2002. Mr. Kramer added that the Power Road improvements are also scheduled to be completed in advance of the freeway extension from Higley Road to Power Road in June 2005.

Mr. Kramer reported that the status of the remaining arterial street projects including Val Vista Drive, Thomas Road, Recker Road and McDowell Road are somewhat more complex. He advised that the Val Vista Drive improvements project is designed in two phases, the first from McDowell Road to the South Canal, and that bids for the first phase will be opened tomorrow, March 14, with construction estimated to be completed by December 2002. Mr. Kramer stated that a potential conflict might arise if ADOT accelerates its time schedule for the opening of this freeway segment and the City is still in the process of completing its roadway improvement project on Val Vista Drive.

Mr. Kramer reported that the second phase of the Val Vista Drive project, which splits north and south of phase one, includes the County section from the South Canal to the Red Mountain Freeway, and also the portion from McDowell Road to McKellips Road. Mr. Kramer informed the Committee that staff has developed the following three options for the second phase:

- Option 1. The current proposal is to proceed with a project that includes two sections of full improvements from McKellips Road to McDowell Road and from the South Canal to the Red Mountain Freeway. It is anticipated that construction would be completed by September 2003, which would represent an additional nine months of arterial street construction after the freeway opened.
- Option 2. To proceed with the improvements in the County, but provide a spot improvement on Val Vista Drive near Hermosa Vista, including a limited amount of temporary pavement and re-stripe the roadway for two through lanes in each direction and a center turn lane. Right-of-way and Utility relocations could proceed as under Option 1, but permanent improvements would be delayed until after the freeway is extended to Power Road in June 2005 or later. The cost would be \$40,000.
- Option 3. To proceed with the same temporary improvement between McDowell Road and McKellips Road as defined in Option 2, not to proceed with the improvements in the County section, and to defer both of those portions until the Red Mountain Freeway is extended to Power Road in June 2005.

Development Services Manager Jack Friedline clarified that the proposal which Mr. Kramer outlined whereby the City would delay construction of the County section from the South Canal to the Red Mountain Freeway, is contained in Option 2.

Mr. Kramer apologized for the misstatement and noted that under Option 3, the County section would be improved from the South Canal to the Red Mountain Freeway. He advised that it is the recommendation of staff to proceed with Option 2.

Committeemember Walters voiced concerns relative to the fact that her packet did not contain backup material for this agenda item.

In response to a series of questions from Committeemember Walters, Mr. Kramer clarified that Option 2 includes a temporary 300-foot pavement widening project near Hermosa Vista, as well as roadway re-striping between McDowell Road and McKellips Road to a five-lane section. He commented that the purpose for the delay in the construction of the County section is to ensure that when the Red Mountain Freeway is open at Val Vista Drive, the City's arterial street project is not under construction. Mr. Kramer also said that construction would be deferred until the freeway is open to Power Road, which would allow the development of natural traffic patterns and a reduction in traffic volume on Val Vista Drive to occur.

Committeemember Walters reiterated her concerns that she is unable to visualize the graphics which were provided to the other Committeemembers, and said that she would depend on Chairman Davidson and Committeemember Pomeroy for their guidance relative to this issue.

In response to a question from Chairman Davidson regarding whether the matter could be deferred until a future Committee meeting, Deputy City Manager Paul Wenbert said that it is the intent of staff to proceed with this matter and to conduct a neighborhood meeting with the residents in the area of Val Vista Drive before the issue is presented to the Council.

Chairman Davidson commented that despite the fact that Committeemember Walters was not provided with the necessary backup material, she appears to have a good grasp of the issues for this item to proceed forward to the Council.

Committeemember Walters concurred with Chairman Davidson's statement and directed staff to conduct the neighborhood meeting.

In response to a question from Committeemember Pomeroy, Mr. Wenbert clarified that staff would be agreeable to holding the neighborhood meeting first and subsequently seeking further direction from the Committee relative to this matter.

Committeemember Pomeroy concurred with Mr. Wenbert's suggestion and also stated that the additional time would afford Committeemember Walters the opportunity to review the necessary material prior to a future Committee meeting.

It was moved by Committeemember Pomeroy, seconded by Committeemember Walters, that action on this agenda item be delayed until staff conducts a neighborhood meeting with residents in the area of Val Vista Drive, and once again presents this issue to the members of the Transportation Committee.

Chairman Davidson voiced concerns regarding City streets being affected by end-of-freeway conditions and noted that this issue has the potential to adversely affect motorists on Gilbert Road and Greenfield Road by restricting traffic at Val Vista Drive. He also thanked staff for their efforts and hard work with regard to this issue.

Carried unanimously.

6. Discuss economic development aspects of transportation decisions.

Chairman Davidson advised that this issue was placed on the agenda per his request. He stated that at future meetings when the Committee addresses transportation issues along the U.S. 60 or near Falcon Field Road or Williams Gateway Airport (WGA), it is important that a member of the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) or the Economic Development Office be in attendance to update the members of the Committee on economic development issues at these locations. Chairman Davidson added that the Committee primarily focuses on specific technical aspects of transportation issues and not the ancillary effects that various transportation issues may have on the City's economic development.

Committeemember Walters concurred with Chairman Davidson's remarks. She commented that in reading a recent report from EDAB with regard to the Committee's decision relative to an interchange at Sossaman Road and the Loop 202, the Committee never discussed the impact of the interchange on a nearby business park. Committeemember Walters added that the Committee endeavors to include all parties who may be affected by the decisions of the Committee, and in this particular instance, some entities were excluded from that process.

Chairman Davidson stated that as Chairman of the Committee, he takes responsibility for the Committee's recent oversight in not including all interested parties in the discussion process. He also encouraged Economic Development Director Dick Mulligan to attend the Committee meetings whenever possible.

7. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Transportation Committee meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Transportation Committee meeting of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 13th day of March 2002. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK