

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

DRAFT

HELD ON January 20, 2026

The Transportation Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met at City Hall (20 East Main Street, 1st Floor) on January 20, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.

<u>TAB Members Present</u>	<u>TAB Members Absent</u>	<u>Others Present</u>
Daniel Hartig (Chairperson)	Mike James (Vice Chairperson)	Ryan Hudson
Lea Bertoni	Dana Alvidrez	Anna Janusz
Tara Bingdazzo	Daniel Laufer	Efren Carmona
Justin Bond	Michelle McCroskey	Erik Guderian
Rob Crist		
Melissa Leon		

Chairperson Hartig called the January 20, 2026, Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:35 pm.

Item 1. Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on September 16, 2025.

It was moved by Board Member Bertoni, seconded by Board Member Crist, that receipt of the above-listed minutes be approved.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Hartig – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Bond – Crist – Leon

NAYS – None

Item 2. Acknowledge outgoing Board Member Tim Meyer.

Chairperson Hartig acknowledged outgoing Board Member Meyer.

Item 3. Items from citizens present.

None

Item 4. Hear and discuss a presentation on the Mesa Temporary Traffic Control Manual

update.

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and Adam Barrier, Traffic Control Supervisor, indicating that they would be giving a presentation on the Mesa Temporary Traffic Control Manual Update.

Mr. Hudson provided an overview of the Temporary Traffic Control (TTC) Team's responsibility, explaining that the team designs, coordinates, plans, and advises on temporary traffic control measures and barricades on City of Mesa public streets. He stated that staff are currently updating the City of Mesa Temporary Traffic Control Manual, which outlines the rules, standards, and guidelines for TTC in the City of Mesa. He added that the first edition was published in 2017 and requires updates to reflect current federal and City of Mesa standards, integrate continued improvements/enhancements, and account for industry's best practices and advancements.

Adam Barrier reintroduced himself and reviewed proposed changes to Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 of the Mesa Temporary Traffic Control Manual. Mr. Barrier outlined each of these chapters in the manual and provided some insight into the proposed major chapter updates. He provided examples and figures to supplement the justification for the proposed modifications.

Mr. Hudson stated that the goal is to publish the second edition in spring of this year and that staff are requesting comments and feedback from the board by the end of the month regarding the proposed updates.

Board Member Leon asked about the automated flagger, discussed in Chapter 5, and how it operates.

Mr. Barrier explained that the automated flagger is a trailer equipped with a railroad-style arm, cameras facing all four directions, and a radar system. If a vehicle drives past the arm, the flagger operating the automated flagger can sound the horn to warn workers. He explained that the operator can manually control the automated flagger arm or set it to raise at timed intervals.

Mr. Hudson stated that automated flaggers are typically used on narrow roadways with low traffic volumes in rural areas and would not typically be used in areas like Downtown Mesa.

Mr. Barrier added that they have been successfully used in rural areas and are a great measure to maintain traffic flow and increase work zone safety.

Board Member Bertoni asked whether a police officer is required at every project and if it is a state requirement.

Mr. Barrier responded that it is not a state requirement and that requirements vary by city. He stated that the City of Mesa evaluates several factors to determine whether a police officer is needed and that this determination is project specific and not included in the manual as a standard. Instead, the manual outlines guidelines for when to consider off-duty officers and the process to implement their support for work zones.

Board Member Christ asked how the public would report issues with barricade setups.

Mr. Barrier stated that the public can contact the Temporary Traffic Control group or the Transportation Department using the contact information listed on the Transportation Department's website. He also explained that requests can be submitted through the CityLink app, which will direct the issue to the Mesa Temporary Traffic Control group.

Mr. Hudson added that if members of the public encounter confusing construction zones within the City of Mesa, they should contact the Transportation Department.

Board Member Bond asked whether landscape companies are required to obtain a TTC permit.

Mr. Barrier explained that it depends on the scope of work. He stated that the manual allows landscape companies to use a shadow truck with a light bar on top and place six cones behind the truck for up to 15 minutes, provided they are not near a signalized intersection. If the truck is equipped with an arrow board, they can stay there for up to an hour. Work along a raised median for approximately half a mile would require a TTC permit. He added that if landscape crews are observed working from a sidewalk, blocking sidewalk access, the TTC group would appreciate being notified as that is not a proper procedure.

Chairperson Hartig confirmed that there were no other comments or questions from the board and thanked staff for the presentation and opportunity to comment on the proposed manual updates.

Item 5. Discuss and take action, providing a recommendation to Council on a staff

proposal to modify the Transportation Department's schedule of fees and charges for traffic signal in-lieu fees (citywide).

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on providing a recommendation to Council on a staff proposal to modify the Transportation Department's schedule of fees and charges for traffic signal in-lieu fees.

Mr. Hudson explained that developers might be required to pay the in-lieu fees when developing land adjacent to an intersection where a traffic signal is anticipated in the future but is not currently warranted. He provided an example of development occurring at an intersection with an arterial and a collector street in an area with limited activity or development, with vacant land surrounding the intersection. He stated that as the area develops, staff anticipated that a traffic signal will eventually be warranted. Mr. Hudson also described a scenario in which a developer was building a school on vacant land, creating the need for the traffic signal as part

of the subject development. In that case, the developer was required to install the traffic signal as part of their off-site development improvements. He stated that in-lieu fees were not collected from other developers because the traffic signal was required with the school opening. He stated that traffic signal in-lieu fees are infrequently required but help offset future City of Mesa costs when the traffic signal is ultimately installed, as installation costs are expected to increase over time. He then reviewed the existing in-lieu fee structure, the current traffic signal installation costs, and the proposed schedule of fees and charges.

Chairperson Hartig asked whether there was a time limit for installing a traffic signal once in-lieu fees were collected and, if fees were collected for only two quadrants of an intersection, who would be responsible for the remaining costs when the signal became warranted.

Mr. Hudson responded that there is no established timeframe for installation once in-lieu fees are collected; however, the intent is that a traffic signal will eventually be installed. He added that development in an area typically occurs in succession with additional parcels developing soon after the first project. In response to the second question, he stated that if the City of Mesa collected fees for only two quadrants and a traffic signal was warranted, the City of Mesa would absorb the remaining costs.

Chairperson Hartig asked whether a future developer could reimburse the City of Mesa for those costs when developing adjacent property.

Mr. Hudson stated that the possibility could be investigated, but that he did not have an answer at that time. However, this is not a scenario that has occurred in the past and would likely involve development agreements.

Board Member Bertoni asked if a development was already established at a location and if a traffic signal becomes warranted in the future, whether that development would be asked to help pay for it.

Mr. Hudson responded that if the development was already established and in-lieu fees had not been collected, it would be more likely that a new developer triggering the need for the traffic signal would be required to install it. He added that if the established developer decides to redevelop the property and the redevelopment generates additional traffic, that developer could be required to install the traffic signal as a part of the redevelopment.

Board Member Leon asked whether these types of fees are compared with those of other cities. She expressed concern that the higher cost could deter development in the City of Mesa.

Mr. Hudson stated that staff could review comparable fees in other cities and appreciated the feedback. He added that based on the cost of adding infrastructure, staff does not believe the fee would deter developers in any way because it is a shared cost.

It was moved by Board Member Bertoni, seconded by Board Member Leon, to approve the recommendation to council in favor of staff's proposal to modify the Transportation Department's schedule of fees and charges for traffic signal in-lieu fees (citywide).

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Hartig – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Bond – Crist – Leon

NAYS – None

Item 6. Discuss and take action, providing a recommendation to Council on the staff

proposal to modify the speed limit on Ellsworth Road between Elliot Road and the south City limits (Council District 6).

Ryan Hudson, City Traffic Engineer, introduced himself and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on providing a recommendation to Council on the staff proposal to modify the speed limit on Ellsworth Road between Elliot Road and the south City limits (Council District 6).

Mr. Hudson discussed the proposed speed limit change on Ellsworth Road. He explained the recent widening of the roadway and presented information on the street's cross-section and corridor characteristics. He stated that staff's recommendation is to reduce the posted speed limit from 50 mph to 45 mph, based on the roadway characteristics, developing land-use context, active projects to build out the roadway cross-section, and consistency with typical arterial speed limits in the City of Mesa.

Chairperson Hartig asked about the posted speed limit south of Germann Road in Queen Creek.

Mr. Hudson responded that as the roadway enters Queen Creek, Ellsworth Road has a posted speed limit of 45 mph.

It was moved by Board Member Bingdazzo, seconded by Board Member Crist, to provide a recommendation to Council to approve staff's proposal to reduce the speed limit from 50 mph to 45 mph on Ellsworth Road between Elliot Road and the south City limits (Council District 6).

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Hartig – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Bond – Crist – Leon

NAYS – None

It was motioned by Board Member Bertoni, seconded by Board Member Christ, to adjourn the meeting.

AYES – Hartig – Bertoni – Bingdazzo – Bond – Crist – Leon

NAYS – None

Meeting adjourned at 6:29 pm.