

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

APPROVED

HELD ON July 21, 2026

The Transportation Advisory Board of the City of Mesa met at City Hall (20 East Main Street, 1st Floor) on July 21, 2026, at 5:30 p.m.

<u>TAB Members Present</u>	<u>TAB Members Absent</u>	<u>Others Present</u>
Mike James (Chairperson)	Dana Alvidrez	Anna Janusz
Michelle McCroskey (Vice Chairperson)	Lea Bertoni	Stephan Bach
Justin Bond	Tara Bingdazzo	Sabine King
Gennie Fasanella		Efren Carmona
Daniel Hartig		Erik Guderian
Melissa Leon		Stephanie Derivan
Samuel Taylor		Elizabeth Wiltrout
Nathan Woodworth		

Chairperson James called the July 21, 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 May 19, 2026.

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

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Hartig – James – Bond – Fasanella – Leon – McCroskey – Taylor - Woodworth

NAYS – None

Item 2. Acknowledge incoming Board Member Gennie Fasanella and Samuel Taylor.

Chairperson James welcomed incoming board members, Gennie Fasanella and Samuel Taylor. He invited both to provide a brief introduction to the Board. Board Member Fasanella introduced herself first, followed by Board Member Taylor.

Chairperson James also invited Board Member Woodworth, who had recently joined the Board, to provide a brief introduction. Board Member Woodworth did so.

Item 3. Items from citizens present.

None

Item 4. Hear and discuss a presentation on the City of Mesa Photo Safety Program.

Stephanie Derivan, Police Commander, introduced herself and indicated that she would be giving a presentation on the City of Mesa Photo Safety Program. She explained that Elizabeth Wilttrout, Police Division Manager, and Stephan Bach, City Traffic Engineer, would assist her with this presentation. Commander Derivan provided an overview of when the program began, and explained the types of cameras used, their locations and when cameras were most recently added. In total, there are 21 red-light and speed-on-green cameras, along with 9 cameras located within school zones.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked how schools are prioritized for school zone cameras, noting that Mountain View High school was not included on the list.

Commander Derivan explained that requests are received from schools and that speed studies are conducted in response. She noted that Westwood High school had submitted several requests, but the study results indicated that the primary issue at the school is traffic volume rather than speeding. Commander Derivan deferred the question to Mr. Bach for additional information.

Mr. Bach added that requests are also received from citizens. In addition to vehicle speeds, Transportation staff review crash data in the area. If speeding is identified as a concern, Transportation staff coordinate with the Mesa Police Department to determine next steps.

Commander Derivan continued the presentation and explained that the first school zone camera was installed at Rhodes Junior High school after a child was killed following an evening school event. She stated that the incident prompted the photo enforcement program in the City of Mesa.

Board Member Taylor noted that no portable units were shown and asked whether portable units had been considered.

Commander Derivan explained that the units at Eastmark High School and Highland Junior High are capable of being portable, but they are set not to be. The City of Mesa has chosen not to use portable units. When the program initially began, the City of Mesa used portable vans that were relocated based on requests and identified issues. After several years, City Council decided to discontinue this program. The City of Mesa now uses fixed locations, which are published on the City's website.

Board Member Fasanella asked for clarification regarding a speed on green camera.

Commander Derivan explained that any vehicle traveling 11 MPH or more over the posted speed limit while proceeding through a green light will trigger the camera. She stated that the purpose is to reduce vehicle speed.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey clarified that the City of Mesa has units capable of being moved but has elected not to move them.

Commander Derivan confirmed that this was correct. She explained that the issue is reviewed annually with legislature; therefore, the City of Mesa elected to use units capable of being portable while currently maintaining them at fixed locations.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked whether this approach provides flexibility.

Commander Derivan confirmed that it does, particularly because of uncertainty regarding the potential legislative changes and because portable units could be implemented in a timely manner, if necessary.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey stated that several members of the Transportation Advisory Board, including her, are particularly concerned about speeding and red light running. She requested that the Board be notified when related legislation is proposed so that Board members may have an opportunity to contact their legislators.

Commander Derivan agreed and then passed the presentation to Ms. Wilttrout.

Ms. Wilttrout discussed unit staffing and explained that the City of Mesa staff review every event in which the camera system is activated. Staff evaluate every event to determine whether sufficient information exists to issue a notice of violation or a citation.

Board Member Woodworth asked for confirmation that City of Mesa staff, rather than an outside agency or consultant, review the events.

Ms. Wilttrout confirmed that the reviews are conducted by City of Mesa employees.

Mr. Bach continued the presentation and discussed reduction in vehicle speeds within school zone during both school hours and non-school hours. Referring to the presentation, Mr. Bach noted that Red Mountain High School experienced approximately a 12 MPH reduction in speed during school hours and a 5 MPH reduction in speed during non-school hours. He then explained that the Transportation Department receives approximately one million dollars every year for safety related projects. Mr. Bach discussed how the funding is used and identified previous projects that had been funded. He also discussed improvements completed as part of the 1st Avenue project, including the separation of bike lanes.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked which picture Mr. Bach was referencing on the presentation screen.

Mr. Bach identified the photograph in the upper right corner of page 7.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked how the bike path was separated from traffic and whether a physical barrier was present.

Mr. Bach responded that the separation consists of a striped buffer with delineators.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey stated that the separation between the bike lane and vehicular traffic was a positive improvement.

Mr. Bach continued the presentation by explaining reinvestment projects involving sidewalk installation, traffic calming, raised crosswalks and bike lane improvements, all of which addressed identified safety concerns. He described several reinvestment projects funded through photo safety revenue, discussed future projects, and invited questions from the Board.

Board Member Hartig returned to the discussion regarding the speed reduction following enforcement and asked whether there was any correlation between the observed reductions and the number of citations issued.

Commander Derivan responded that she doesn't have an answer at this time, but it could be reviewed. She added that the program has helped reduce recidivism rates.

Board Member Taylor requested that the presentation return to the speed reduction slide. He stated that including the posted speed limit on the slide would be helpful. He also expressed interest in crash reduction data to determine whether crashes have been reduced in these areas. In addition, Board Member Taylor suggested including the year in which each project was installed to provide a better understanding of the amount of work completed annually using the available funding.

Erik Guderian, Transportation Department Director, introduced himself and responded. He explained that the use of photo safety program funding for safety projects began in 2020 and that all the projects presented by Mr. Bach had been installed since 2020. Mr. Guderian added that the funding provides an important opportunity to complete smaller safety projects that otherwise would not have a funding source. He stated that some projects extended over multiple years. Some projects are relatively simple and cost approximately \$ 15,000 to \$20,000, while others cost substantially more.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked about the last slide of the presentation and requested clarification regarding the white lines shown in one of the pictures.

Mr. Bach responded that the white lanes represent a crosswalk and curb extensions. He explained that these improvements encourage drivers to reduce speed, increase driver awareness of pedestrians, and reduce the walking distance in the road for pedestrians.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey inquired whether narrowing the roadway causes drivers to slow down.

Mr. Bach confirmed that it does.

Chairperson James commented that the intersection of Westwood & 10th Street is a good example of this treatment, with curb extensions and shorter pedestrian crossings.

Board Member Fasanella asked why the cameras appeared to be particularly successful at Fremont Junior High School and Red Mountain High School.

Mr. Bach explained the numbers for both schools and that they had the highest reductions.

Board Member Taylor stated that this further demonstrates the importance of including the posted speed limit when presenting the data. He then inquired whether the posted speed limit at Red Mountain High School was lower than the other locations.

Commander Derivan responded that the posted speed limit is 45 MPH and is reduced to 35 MPH during school hours.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey commented that the larger reduction near the high school may be related to students driving themselves to school, whereas the other locations parents are driving their children to school.

Board Member Woodworth inquired whether Red Mountain High School is located on Power Road near Brown Road.

Commander Derivan clarified that the school is located on Brown Road near Power Road.

Board Member Woodworth commented that the area experiences relatively high travel speeds heading towards the desert and that a great speed reduction would therefore be expected.

Board Member Leon asked how easy or difficult it is to enforce the citations issued through the camera system. She also inquired whether an increasing number of individuals were challenging photo enforcement citations in court and prevailing, and whether those challenges were resulting in additional time and expense for the City.

Commander Derivan responded that most individuals pay their citation, while in some cases judges rule in favor of the cited individual. She indicated that staff are currently reviewing the data to determine the percentage but stated that most individuals pay their fines or attend driving school.

Board Member Leon stated that the objective was to ensure that the cameras are not creating false positives.

Commander Derivan stated that false positive did not appear to be a concern and indicated that additional data could be provided once the analysis is finalized.

Board Member Leon commented that the cameras appear to be effective means of reducing speeds and generating revenue, provided that citations are not being continually and successfully challenged in court.

With no additional questions from the Board, Chairperson James thanked the presenters. He emphasized that it was encouraging to see the results associated with reduced speed in school zones and appreciated seeing how the City of Mesa uses the funds. Chairperson James also requested additional information regarding how safety investments are prioritized, including whether periodization occurs through the budget process or as opportunities arise.

Mr. Bach explained that school locations are evaluated based on multiple factors such as speeds, crashes, complaints and the demonstrated need. When several of these factors are present at a location, the project is a priority.

Sabine King, Assistant Transportation Director, introduced herself and provided additional information. She explained that the Transportation groups meet every other month and maintain a prioritized list of projects for which funding is not currently available. Staff determine which projects should move forward as funding becomes available. When new projects or needs are identified, the priority list is reevaluated.

Chairperson James thanked Ms. King and congratulated her on her new position.

Item 5. Hear and discuss an update on the Mesa Moves Bond Program.

Sabine King, Assistant Transportation Director, introduced herself and indicated that she would be giving a presentation on the Mesa Moves Bond Program.

Ms. King stated that this presentation was presented approximately one year earlier and therefore might be familiar to some Board members. She explained that the City of Mesa voters authorized a \$100 million bond on November 3, 2020. The City of Mesa Transportation Department was able to obtain an additional \$ 62 million from the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), providing a total of \$ 162 million for Transportation projects. Ms. King then explained that substantial price increases associated with the pandemic resulted in some projects being placed on hold. She also detailed the Regional Roadway Improvements with the status of each project.

Board Member Taylor noted that some areas in the southeast part of the City is currently underdeveloped and inquired whether it would be possible to receive funding through the development projects.

Ms. King explained that developers in the City of Mesa are required to construct the roadway along their frontage to the ultimate conditions identified in the Transportation Master Plan. For example, if development occurs along a roadway that currently has one lane in each direction, but it is identified in the Transportation Master Plan as ultimately having three lanes in each direction, the developer is required to construct the additional two lanes, as well as curb and gutter. She added that developers are also required to contribute toward the cost of a future traffic signal when developing property adjacent to an intersection where a traffic signal is planned. These contributions are referred to as in-lieu fees.

Ms. King continued the presentation by reviewing arterial roadway reconstruction projects and providing the status of project. One of them was the Country Club Drive and Southern Avenue Project which was originally included in the 2020 bond. Because of funding limitations, the City of Mesa was only able to fund the design through the bond. Ms. King advised that this project is now on their list of high crash locations, and they are focusing on the safety perspective at this location. The project will include raised medians because several incidents involved vehicles turning left in front of approaching traffic. She also stated that several pedestrians were crossing the roadway at a location without a designated pedestrian crossing. A pedestrian crossing will

therefore be added by the gas station located on the east side of the road. Construction is anticipated to begin in the spring.

Chairperson James asked for confirmation as to whether the Country Club Drive and Southern Avenue project would include the area near to Sunsplash.

Ms. King advised that the project would include the crossing between Hampton Avenue and Southern Avenue near the gas station.

Chairperson James stated that several Board members had expressed concerns regarding this area while reviewing the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan.

Ms. King indicated that the project design was funded through the 2020 bond and that project construction will be completed with MAG reimbursement and City of Mesa funding.

Ms. King continued by reviewing the status of other projects included in the Arterial Roadway Reconstruction presentation. She then provided details regarding the Active Transportation Projects with the status of each.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked about the next steps for the Lehi Loop Shared Use Path Project since the feasibility study had been completed.

Ms. King responded that the design and construction phases are included in the 2026 bond package.

Ms. King continues the presentation by outlining the projects proposed for funding through the 2026 Transportation Safety Bond. The estimated cost for the ten projects is slightly over \$ 186 million. The City of Mesa anticipated receiving over \$ 52 million in reimbursements from MAG and would ask voters to fund the remaining amount of \$ 134 million. She then provided a brief description of each project proposed for funding through the 2026 Transportation Safety Bond.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked if the nodes were part of the Lehi Phase II Feasibility Study.

Ms. King explained that the nodes were included in the Lehi Phase I project. Because the nodes were just as expensive as the path project itself, they were removed from that project because sufficient funding was not available. The nodes are now proposed to be added back in with Phase II.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey inquired whether trailheads are considered transportation nodes.

Ms. King confirmed that they are.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked whether the trailheads would be located at Val Vista Drive and at McDowell Road.

Ms. King confirmed those locations.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey sought confirmation that these trailheads would be included as part of Phase II.

Ms. King confirmed that the trailheads are part of Phase II. She then reiterated that, because funding was insufficient to construct both the path and the trailheads during Phase I, constructing the path was considered higher priority. The City of Mesa now intends to complete the trailheads.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey asked for the location of the Thomas Road Multimodal Project that was listed on the presentation.

Ms. King stated that the project is located on Thomas Road between Higley Road and Power Road and will connect to the recently completed Red Mountain Shared Use Path.

Ms. King then continued the presentation by explaining the remaining projects proposed as part of the 2026 bond package and presenting a map showing the locations of the projects.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey stated that residents in her neighborhood would be the primary users of the horse paths and expressed concerns about horse safety along these paths. She asked how the community could best voice their concerns before the project proceeds to construction.

Ms. King advised that the project must still go through the design process. Although the feasibility study provided an initial understanding of what could be constructed, detailed design is still required and will include public outreach.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey stated that the community wanted to ensure it did not miss the opportunity to provide input.

Ms. King said they are far from construction, and they still need a detailed design.

Vice Chairperson McCroskey inquired whether the community should prepare to provide input if the bond passes and, if the bond does not pass, whether the community would need to wait.

Ms. King stated that, when the bond passes and design begins, the project will include public outreach. She then added that staff will provide status updates on these projects.

Board Member Taylor thanked Ms. King for her presentation. He stated that the area in which he resides contains four-foot-wide sidewalks with power poles located in the middle of the sidewalks and three-foot-wide bike lanes. Board Member Taylor explained that upgrades to these facilities had been included in the 2020 bond but could not be completed because of insufficient funding. He asked why those improvements were not included in the 2026 bond.

Ms. King explained that staff had a list of approximately 30 projects. Staff worked with the City Council and City Management to determine the amount of funding the City of Mesa was prepared to request from voters and then identified the highest priority projects that could be completed within the available funding. She then asked whether Board Member Taylor was referring to Stapley Drive and University Drive project.

Board Member Taylor confirmed that this was the location he was referring to.

Ms. King stated that, unfortunately, the project did not make the final bond list.

Mr. Guderian added that, during the spring, the Transportation Department met with City Council and City Management to evaluate approximately 30 projects, including some projects from the 2020 bond that could not be funded. He then explained that participants had differing views regarding which projects were most important and collectively determined which projects would advance to the proposed bond list. Mr. Guderian stated that the Transportation Department would love to fund all of the projects, but the proposed list reflects the amount of bond funding the City of Mesa is comfortable moving forward with. He also noted that more existing bond debt is coming off the City's books than is being added.

Chairperson James said that another project favored by Board members was the Center Street project and inquired about the plans for moving that project forward.

Ms. King stated that the Center Street project is currently proceeding into design. The city of Mesa received a \$ 7 million public safety bond allocation that will fund the Center Street project from Main Street to University Drive.

Mr. Guderian added that the City is attempting to complete Phase I and will then evaluate opportunities to extend the project limits.

Chairperson James acknowledged that this was positive news and asked whether the project had been formally announced.

Mr. Guderian stated that he was unsure whether the project had been officially announced at a Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) meeting but noted it was part of the 2024 Safety Bond.

Chairperson James acknowledged that had not realized that the project was included.

Mr. Guderian advised that a designer has been selected, and the contract negotiations are believed to be underway. The goal is to begin public outreach this fall.

Board Member Taylor stated that his question is related to the Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP) which includes an aggressive crash reduction goal. He then asked whether other funding sources were available that were not included in this presentation to accomplish the goals from CSAP.

Ms. King confirmed that other funding is available. The City of Mesa is planning to use implementation grant funding through Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to install protected left turns at eight intersections. The Comprehensive Safety Action Plan identified 13 intersections for conversion to protected left turns, but the city staff were able to address 5 of those intersections in-house. The City plans to fund the remaining 8 intersections with federal funding. Ms. King also mentioned that the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) and photo safety funds could be leveraged to further implement safety projects.

Chairperson James said that the City would likely need to wait until the federal government's next fiscal year to determine whether the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) would be renewed.

Ms. King agreed.

Chairperson James thanked Ms. King for the presentation.

It was motioned by Board Member Hartig, seconded by Board Member McCroskey, to adjourn the meeting.


AYES – Hartig – James – Bond – Fasanella – Leon – McCroskey – Taylor - Woodworth

NAYS – None

Meeting adjourned at 6:39 pm.

X 
MIKE JAMES
CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

X 
STEPHAN PACH
CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER

City of Mesa Photo Safety Program



Current Program

February 2026

The goal of Mesa's Photo Safety Program is to modify driver behavior through voluntary compliance of traffic laws. A successful program will **reduce speeding**, **deter red light running violations** and **increase traffic situational awareness**, resulting in fewer serious or fatal injury crashes (Mesa CSAP, 2025).



Red-light Cameras

- 21 locations
 - Red Light and Speed On Green



9 Fixed School Zone cameras

- Porter Elementary School
- Fremont Jr High School
- Rhodes Jr High School
- Mesa High School
- Red Mountain High School
- Skyline High School
- Franklin @ Brimhall
- Eastmark High School
- Highland Junior High

Unit Staffing

- Civilian Staffing:
 - 1 Program Coordinator
 - 4 Police Investigators
- Unit review of events



Speed Reductions – School Zones

SCHOOL ZONE LOCATIONS

School Zone	<u>85th % speed</u> before cameras installed (ie. school flasher assemblies in place)		85th % speed after camera installed (most-recent year)		Reduction in 85th % speed	
	School Hours	Non-School Hours	School Hours	Non-School Hours	School Hours	Non-School Hours
Franklin @ Brimhall	39.1	49.7	38.0	48.8	-1.1	-0.9
Fremont JHS	44.6	50.0	34.9	42.9	-9.7	-7.1
Mesa HS	38.3	45.0	34.6	37.3	-3.8	-7.8
Rhodes JHS	40.8	47.5	37.5	40.4	-3.3	-7.1
Skyline HS	38.8	48.6	37.7	45.3	-1.1	-3.3
Porter Elem	39.1	47.8	35.3	45.3	-3.8	-2.6
Red Mountain HS	48.1	48.9	36.2	44.0	-11.9	-5.0
				Average @ 7 sites	-5.0	-4.8

School Zone	<u>Average speed</u> before cameras installed (ie. school flasher assemblies in place)		Average speed after camera installed (most-recent year)		Reduction in average speed	
	School Hours	Non-School Hours	School Hours	Non-School Hours	School Hours	Non-School Hours
Franklin @ Brimhall	33.3	42.9	33.1	42.6	-0.3	-0.4
Fremont JHS	38.6	43.3	31.3	37.0	-7.3	-6.3
Mesa HS	33.2	39.2	29.6	30.7	-3.6	-8.6
Rhodes JHS	36.0	40.8	32.4	34.0	-3.7	-6.8
Skyline HS	32.9	41.3	31.9	38.6	-1.0	-2.8
Porter Elem	32.4	40.4	31.1	38.4	-1.3	-2.0
Red Mountain HS	36.1	39.1	29.9	34.4	-6.3	-4.7
				Average @ 7 sites	-3.3	-4.5

Photo Safety Enforcement Funding

Transportation Department received approximately \$1 M each year for safety related projects.

- Pedestrian safety measures
- Upgraded bicycle facilities
- Mid-block crossing enhancements
- Traffic signal upgrades
- School zone upgrades
- Traffic Calming



Reinvestment Projects

Highland JH Traffic Signal*



Kleinman Park RRFB*



Rio Salado Pkwy PHB*



Guerrero Elementary School Zone Flashers



Equipment/
Programming
Software for School
Zone Flashers:

Allows for communication
and remote programming



Ellsworth & University FY Left Turn Arrows



Gilbert & Hampton Left Turn Arrows



Inspirian Pkwy & Kinetic Dr Crossing



*Project partially funded
with Photo Safety Funds

Reinvestment Projects

Westwood HS Bike Lanes



1st Ave
Separated
Bike Lanes



Installation of Missing Sidewalk & ADA Improvements:

- Higley north of McKellips
- McKellips between Higley and Recker
- Main St east of Power Rd



Driver Speed
Feedback Signs



Traffic Calming Study:

- Evaluated 10 locations with speeding concerns
- Collectors and local streets
- Identify traffic calming measures besides speed humps

Reinvestment Projects

Williams Field Rd
Sidewalk Installation



Brown Rd Bike Lane



Las Sendas Elementary Raised Crosswalks



Mesa High School Pedestrian Refuge



Farmdale Ave Traffic Calming



Reinvestment Projects



Hampton Ave Bike Lanes

- Enhanced Pedestrian Crosswalk
- Separated Bike Lanes



Eastmark Pkwy PHB*

- Part of Gateway Library Project



Straight Arrow Signal Heads

- Interchange locations to mitigate wrong-way

Westwood Traffic Calming Project

- University Dr to Rio Salado Pkwy
- Raised Crosswalks




Extension Rd Bike Lanes

- Buffered and separated bike lanes

*Project partially funded with Photo Safety Funds

Mesa Dr & Crosscut Canal Path Crossing Upgrades*


- Converted RRFB to full signal



Planned Reinvestment Projects

Stapley Dr Sidewalks

- South of Main St
- Project under construction



Horne & Consolidated Canal RRFB

- Project under construction

Beverly & 2nd St Curb Extensions

- Traffic calming & crosswalk enhancements
 - Project under design



Enhanced Crossing on Dobson Rd

- Pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB)
- Between Broadway Rd & 8th Ave
- Includes bus stop improvements
- Project under construction

Enhanced Crossing on Center Street near 8th Street

- Project in early design stage
- Pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB)



2020 Mesa Moves Bond Program Update

Transportation Advisory Board
July 21, 2026

Sabine King, P.E.
Assistant Transportation Director



On November 3, 2020, Mesa voters authorized the City of Mesa to issue \$100M of General Obligation Bonds to fund transportation projects throughout the City

2020 Mesa Moves Bond Program Summary

$$\text{\$100M} + \text{\$62M} = \text{\$162M}$$

*City of Mesa
General Obligation
Street Bond*

*Maricopa Association of
Governments (MAG)
Funding*

*Total Available Funds
For Transportation Projects*


2020 Mesa Moves Bond Program Project Costs

Price Increase since 2020

- Materials
- Labor
- Real Estate

Actions Taken

- Prioritize projects based on need and reimbursement
- Work with MAG to maximize reimbursements
- Used additional funding from Transportation Funds
- Place some projects on hold




Mesa Moves Project Status



Regional Roadway Improvements

<u>Project</u>	<u>Status</u>
1. Signal Butte Road – Williams Field Road to Germann Road	Completed
2. Sossaman Road and Baseline Road	Completed
3. Williams Field Road & Ellsworth Road	Completed
4. Sossaman Road – Ray Road to Warner Road	Completed
5. Broadway Road – Mesa Drive to Stapley Drive	Under Construction (ETA Spring 2028)
6. Ray Road Connection to Ellsworth Road	Under Construction (ETA Fall 2026)
7. Val Vista Drive – US 60 to Pueblo Avenue	Under Construction (ETA Spring 2027)
8. Ellsworth Road – Germann Road to Ray Road	Under Construction (ETA Spring 2027)
9. Elliot Road – Sossaman Road to Ellsworth Road	Final Design (Construction Fall 2026)
10. Stapley Drive & University Drive	60% Design – On Hold, No Funding

Regional Roadway Improvements



Arterial Roadway Reconstruction

Project

1. Southern Avenue – Gilbert Road to Val Vista Drive
2. Greenfield Road – Southern Avenue to Main Street
3. Greenfield Road – Main Street to Adobe Road
4. Country Club Drive & Southern Avenue
5. Broadway Road – Stapley Drive to Gilbert Road
6. Broadway Road – Country Club Drive to Mesa Drive
7. University Drive – Mesa Drive to Harris Drive
8. Stapley Drive – University Drive to McKellips

Status

Completed

Completed

Completed

Design 2020 Bond/Construction Other Funding


No Funding - 2026 Bond

No Funding

No Funding

No Funding

Arterial Roadway Reconstruction



Active Transportation

Project


1. Lehi Loop SUP Phase 2 Feasibility Study
2. Center Street - Brown Road to Broadway Road Feasibility Study
3. Eastern Canal – Brown Road to Broadway Road
4. Eastern Canal – Broadway Road to Baseline
5. US 60 Consolidated Canal to Eastern Canal
6. Mesa Gateway Phase 3

Status

- Completed - Final Report 12/2023
- Completed - Final Report 04/2024
- Construction in Spring 2027
- Construction in Winter 2026
- 75% Design 2020 Bond/Construction 2026 Bond
- No Funding - 2026 Bond



Active Transportation Projects



2026 Transportation Bond




Transportation Safety Project Summary

	2026 Transportation Safety Bonds	2026 Bond Amount	Other Funding	Total Project Cost	Status
1	Warner Road Bridge	\$ 16,847,534	\$ 21,377,042	\$ 38,224,576	
2	Mesa Dr: Phase 3 Main to Brown	\$ 19,811,485	\$ 30,982,355	\$ 50,793,840	
3	AR - Broadway: Spur to Gilbert Rd	\$ 8,151,104		\$ 8,151,104	
4	Broadway: Stapley Dr to Gilbert Rd (raised medians)	\$ 10,632,720		\$ 10,632,720	Comprehensive Safety Action Plan
5	Downtown Multimodal Pathway	\$ 12,050,816		\$ 12,050,816	Concepts
6	Lehi Phase II and Nodes	\$ 12,924,864		\$ 12,924,864	Design
7	Mesa Gateway Phase III SUP	\$ 11,755,640		\$ 11,755,640	
8	US60 SUP: Eastern to Consolidated	\$ 12,993,720		\$ 12,993,720	Under Design
9	Higley: McKellips Rd to Broadway Rd (raised medians)	\$ 10,386,624		\$ 10,386,624	Comprehensive Safety Action Plan
10	Thomas Rd Multimodal	\$ 16,957,200		\$ 16,957,200	Concept Study
	Bond Issuance	\$ 1,500,000		\$ 1,500,000	
		\$ 134,011,707	\$ 52,359,397	\$ 186,371,104	

Source: Council Presentation May 14, 2026

2026 Bond Election



Source: Council Presentation May 14, 2026

Questions?



MESA MOVES

CONNECTING PEOPLE TO PLACES