NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
PHOENIX CITY COUNCIL
TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE

Pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the PHOENIX CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE and to the general public, that the PHOENIX CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE will hold a meeting open to the public on Wednesday, October 22, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., located at Phoenix City Hall, 1st Floor Atrium, Assembly Rooms A, B, & C, 200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona.

One or more Subcommittee members may participate via teleconference. The agenda for the meeting is as follows (items may be discussed in a different sequence than posted):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Call to Order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Review and Approval of the September 9, 2014 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 3 is for Information Only. Although no presentation is planned, staff will be available to answer questions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Metro, Regional Public Transportation Authority, and Maricopa Association of Governments Meetings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Hyatt, Public Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items 4-6 are for information, discussion and possible action.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Light Rail Station Feasibility Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Hyatt, Public Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update on Private Street Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Dovalina, Street Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Phoenix Bicycle Master Plan**  
This report provides a summary of the 2014 Phoenix Bicycle Master Plan, which is a 20-year vision for improvements to the biking infrastructure of Phoenix. Staff requests the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee recommend City Council adoption of the plan as a guiding document for future improvements.  
*This item is for information, discussion and possible action.*

7. **Update on Infill Development/Utility Coordination**  
This report provides an update on infill development and Reinvent PHX planning efforts related to utility conflicts. This is the first of a two-phase study and discussion item. It provides an overview of current infill development modification efforts and will solicit feedback for the on-going study that will make recommendations regarding utility corridor conflicts that could potentially inhibit walkable infill development. The first phase provides an overview and evaluates the 2013 Infill Advisory Board technical recommendations. The second phase will provide the results. Staff anticipates presenting the second phase to the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee at the December meeting.  
*This item is for information and discussion.*

8. **Customer Care and Billing System Upgrade**  
This report provides information to the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee regarding the City of Phoenix Customer Information System hardware and software upgrade project.  
*This item is for information and discussion.*

9. **National Association of Clean Water Agencies – 23rd Avenue Wastewater Treatment Plant Platinum Award**  
This report provides the Transportation & Infrastructure Subcommittee with a summary of the 23rd Avenue Wastewater Treatment Plant’s award for outstanding performance by the National Association of Clean Water Agencies.  
*This item is for information and discussion.*
10. **Call to the Public:** Consideration, discussion, and concerns from the public. Those wishing to address the Subcommittee need not request permission in advance. Action taken as a result of the public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

Chair Williams

11. **Request for Future Agenda Items**

Chair Williams

12. **Adjournment**

Chair Williams

For further information, please call Rita Marko, Management Assistant, City Manager’s Office, at 602-262-7684 or Gabriel Morales at 602-534-9222.

**Persons paid to lobby on behalf of persons or organizations other than themselves shall register with the City Clerk prior to lobbying or within five business days thereafter, and must register annually to continue lobbying. If you have any questions about registration or whether or not you must register, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 602-262-6811.**

For reasonable accommodations, call Rita Marko at 602-262-7684 or Gabriel Morales at 602-534-9222 as early as possible to coordinate needed arrangements.

October 16, 2014
THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
1. **Call to Order**

Chairwoman Williams called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. with Councilman Gates, Councilwoman Gallego, and Councilwoman Pastor present.

2. **Review and Approval of the June 10, 2014 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

Councilman Gates moved to approve the minutes from the June 10, 2014 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee meeting. Councilwoman Pastor seconded the motion, which passed 4-0.
3. **Metro, Regional Public Transportation Authority, and Maricopa Association of Governments Meetings**

This item was for information only.

4. **Proposed Northern Area Infrastructure Phasing Plan – Infrastructure Limit Line Replacement**

This item was for information only.

Planning and Development Services Director Alan Stephenson explained the northern area infrastructure phasing plan is a new approach to update the existing infrastructure limit line. He summarized how this plan will help prepare for new growth in north Phoenix. Mr. Stephenson stated the plan was a collaborative effort between multiple City departments and the Arizona State Land Department.

Mr. Stephenson provided a map depicting the current limit line adopted by City Council 15 years ago to address growth in the Black Canyon corridor. He explained the current limit line does not address growth in the Desert Ridge and Anthem areas.

Mr. Stephenson stated a more comprehensive approach is needed to cover the entire area. He explained the need for a phased plan that works with the State Land Department to evaluate land sales for areas where infrastructure is closest. He stated this approach will reduce burden on the City as well as private developers who pay for infrastructure.

Mr. Stephenson explained Phase I is ready for development now; Phase I A needs a little infrastructure provided by the developer; Phase II will need additional studies and some substantial investment in infrastructure; and, Phase III are those areas west of I-17 and south of the Carefree Highway where there is no existing infrastructure.

Deputy City Manager Rick Naimark noted the biggest driver of the phases was substantial wastewater and water infrastructure needs for the northern areas of Phoenix.

Mr. Stephenson stated general plan amendments to remove existing infrastructure limit lines, along with policy for the infrastructure, will be brought to the subcommittee in four to six months.

Chairwoman Williams asked if this information will be included in the general plan. Mr. Stephenson stated the general plan will reference this information.

Chairwoman Williams asked if this information will go through the villages. Mr. Stephenson stated the information will be presented to the villages.
Councilwoman Gallego asked if wastewater and flood control was already included in the capital improvement program. Mr. Stephenson explained the plan does not include funding for water, wastewater and storm water. Mr. Naimark stated that any planned development in the plan area is well beyond the City’s 5 year CIP program.

Councilwoman Gallego asked if large, city-owned parcels, available for economic development, are driving factors for the phasing plan. Mr. Stephenson explained the plan information was provided to the Economic Development Department for their input and review.

5. Water and Wastewater Research Program


Councilwoman Pastor moved to approve consent items 5 and 6. Councilwoman Gallego seconded the motion, which passed 4-0.

7. Draft Infrastructure Financing Plan (Impact Fee Program) and Water Resources Acquisition Fee Update

Planning and Development Services Director Alan Stephenson introduced Chris Deperro, Principal Planner.

Mr. Stephenson gave a brief overview of the use of impact fees and the draft Infrastructure Financing Plan (IFP). He also reviewed key points associated with the IFP, such as updated land use assumptions and the Rio Vista Village expansion.

Mr. Deperro explained the details of the Rio Vista Expansion. He stated the best way to fund this expansion will be to use impact fees. He stated the fees will be used to fund items, such as water and wastewater extensions and major arterials.

Mr. Deperro described impact fees associated with parks. He explained parks impact fees were the most discussed items during the review of the IFP. Mr. Deperro stated the current park impact fees are not the full fee because the City Council did not adopt the full amount in 2006 or 2009. He also stated, in 2012, park impact fees were revised to remove items that could no longer be associated with the fees.

Mr. Deperro explained the draft IFP, published in May, included a complete reform of parks impact fees. He stated the draft IFP included typical parks planning standards, resulting in a significant increase in park fees. Mr. Deperro stated the Ad Hoc committee, formed to discuss impact fees, developed recommendations that differed from the draft IFP.
Mr. Deperro explained a new requirement went into effect in 2012 requiring refunds to property owners if infrastructure is not provided. He also stated, as part of the IFP, $300 million in additional capital funding will be required to provide the parks facilities in the plan, as well as additional costs for operation and maintenance.

Chairwoman Williams asked if the parks included in the IFP are regional, community, or all parks. Mr. Deperro explained the parks included in the IFP are community and neighborhood parks. He also explained state laws prevent impact fees from being used for parks larger than 30 acres.

Chairwoman Williams asked if north Phoenix will have any large parks. Mr. Deperro explained north Phoenix will not have large parks funded by impact fees; however, there are other methods of funding parks such as Phoenix Parks and Preserves Initiative (PPPI) money.

Councilwoman Pastor asked for clarification on the IFP and refund process. Mr. Deperro explained calculation of impact fees are based on equivalent dwelling units in a particular area.

Chairwoman Williams stated the impact fee is paid to the developer and included in the price of each home built. She then asked if a park was not built who receives the refund, the builder or homeowner. Mr. Deperro explained the homeowner receives the refund.

Chairwoman Williams asked if there was a specific timeframe for the refund to be provided. Mr. Deperro stated the refund window is 10 years.

Mr. Naimark provided details on the three elements used to fund parks: PPPI, bond money and impact fees. He explained PPPI money was used in the north area to purchase preserve land. He also explained PPPI has flattened and money from this program was used for critical issues not in the north area. He also stated money from the bond program was frozen, leaving impact fees as a main funding source.

Mr. Deperro briefly explained the proposed changes in Water Resources Acquisition (WRA) fees. He explained there was a decrease in WRA in off-project areas, which are areas not administered by Salt River Project (SRP). Mr. Deperro stated areas administered by SRP no longer needed WPA.

Mr. Deperro described the duties of the Ad Hoc Committee for impact fees and described the stakeholders involved in the committee. He also stated the committee was asked to develop a recommendation on impact fees. Mr. Deperro stated the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendation focused primarily on impact fees for parks. Mr. Deperro explained the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation included charging all uses to fund parks, fire and police land costs, and to maintain current service levels for libraries.
Chairwoman Williams asked if parcels for multi-use City facilities were included in developing the impact fees. Mr. Deperro explained multi-use land parcels were used to develop the impact fees. He also explained some of these parcels will not be developed, because growth in these areas does not warrant a facility.

Councilman Gates asked if parcels not being developed, because of lack of funds, will be evaluated for sale. Mr. Naimark explained some of the parcels cannot be developed with impact fees; however, there is still a desire to develop these sites in the future when funds are available.

Councilwoman Gallego asked what state law requires the City to provide geographically, when determining levels of service. Mr. Stephenson explained state law was changed so that impact fees can only be based on existing levels of service in any particular area.

Councilwoman Gallego asked how impact fees are determined for storm water infrastructure. Mr. Deperro explained the area drainage master plan is used to determine impact fees for storm water drainage.

Councilwoman Gallego asked for a description of impact fees structure in the southwest areas of Phoenix, such as Laveen east and west and Estrella north. Mr. Deperro explained impact fees for the southwest areas vary according to service. He stated wastewater fees are determined based on smaller areas because of the defined flow of wastewater, and other impact fees may be determined by using larger areas.

Jackson Moll, from the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona and an Ad Hoc Committee member, spoke in favor of the IFP and commended the City on developing the plan.

Councilwoman Gallego asked if information gathered during recent floods will be included in the IFP. Mr. Naimark stated the City’s infrastructure was built for a 100-year flood event. He also stated in light of the recent flood activities, the City, in partnership with the Maricopa County Flood Control District, will evaluate the current flood control plan projects for the Laveen area. He explained the results of the evaluation process will be presented in six months and any recommendations may be included the IFP.

Councilwoman Gallego stated areas in Laveen, where potential development may occur, may need additional infrastructure. Mr. Stephenson stated the IFP will mirror the area drainage master plan update once formal action is taken by the Flood Control District, which is evaluating the current plan.

Councilwoman Gallego expressed concerns raised by Laveen homeowners associations regarding calculation of impact fees for parks. Mr. Stephenson stated he will meet with the organizations to explain the process by which the impact fees are calculated.
Councilwoman Gallego asked if City staff met with parks or community stakeholders to gather input for the IFP. Mr. Stephenson explained a Parks Board member participated in the Ad Hoc Committee.

Councilman Gates asked if fees for the northwest area cover wastewater and water infrastructure development and asked if a private water provider in north area should provide infrastructure. Water Services Director Kathryn Sorenson explained the City of Phoenix provides water to the north areas of Phoenix and funds have been allocated to expand wastewater services farther north.

Councilman Gates moved to approve the item. Councilwoman Pastor seconded the motion, which passed 3-1. Councilwoman Gallego provided the dissenting vote.

8. **Phoenix Central Station Development Agreement with Smith Partners, LLC**

Deputy City Manager Paul Blue introduced Maria Hyatt, Public Transit Director, and Scott Sumners, Deputy Economic Development Director. He also introduced Bill Smith from Smith Partners.

Ms. Hyatt explained as bus routing has become more efficient, the use of Central Station has changed. She explained Central Station no longer needs to be the hub for bus connections; instead it can serve as a transit center, through which passengers are able to purchase fares, and where service providers can offer lost and found for bus and light rail. She explained interest from private development could help this vision become a reality.

Ms. Hyatt stated on August 25, 2014, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued new regulations on joint development, which provides the City opportunities for new revenue by redeveloping Central Station as a mixed-use site.

Mr. Sumners explained the City received two proposals for a development partner and Smith Partners was selected. Mr. Sumners stated Smith Partners has proposed a residential tower with 34 stories, a parking garage with 30,000-square-feet of commercial space, and a dog park. Mr. Sumners stated the tower will have 475 apartments, a 475-space parking garage, and will be transit oriented. He also stated a large shade structure will span Van Buren Street.

Mr. Sumners explained the City will retain ownership, and the developer will improve and maintain the site. He also explained a 25-year Government Property Lease Excise Tax (GPLET) will be used for the tower and a 99-year lease agreement for the garage. He also explained a phasing option for the tower that allows the developer to build two 20 story towers is possible.

Chairwoman Williams asked why the City decided on a 99-year lease. Mr. Sumners explained the 99-year lease was in the best interest of the City.
Chairwoman Williams asked if the structure will last 99 years. Mr. Sumners stated if the structure does not last that long, the City will have the ability to terminate the agreement.

Mr. Sumners explained the development of Central Station will save the City $32.7 million over 25 years. He also stated the development will bring $82 million in private capital investment to downtown and create 200 construction jobs.

Councilman Gates asked if the 30,000 square-feet of proposed commercial space could be used to relocate certain transit operations, which will provide leasable space in the current transit building. Ms. Hyatt stated she will look into this option.

Mr. Sumners explained the City will coordinate with all transit agencies for the new development. Mr. Sumners said he expected construction of the site to commence in 2017 and conclude in mid- to late 2018, possibly 2019.

Mr. Sumners explained the next step in the process is approval from City Council, and then to meet with the FTA to ensure the plan is in alignment with their regulations. He also stated the Community and Economic Development and Public Transit Departments have worked closely with stakeholders, including Phoenix Elementary School District, Roosevelt Action Association, Evans Churchill Community Association, Downtown Voices, and the Citizens Transit Commission.

Mr. Sumners stated the current plans for the site are conceptual and stakeholders will be able to provide input on the final plan. He explained the Planning and Development Department will be intimately involved in the development of the final plan.

Ms. Hyatt provided an overview of Public Transit and FTA requirements for the proposed development of the site. She explained the new site will enhance effectiveness for public transportation, and the City will maintain substantial control of the property – both FTA requirements. Ms. Hyatt stated plans to minimize impact to transit riders will be implemented during the construction.

Chairwoman Williams asked how employees will park in the new building when there are only enough parking spaces for tenets. Ms. Hyatt explained employees will be encouraged to take public transit, and parking spots are available in the parking garage in the current Public Transit building.

Marvin Rochelle expressed support for the redevelopment of Central Station. He said the development will help the growth of the city. He said he will ask the Citizen’s Transit Commission to take him around the site in his wheelchair, so he can provide input on making the area more accessible.

Jennifer Bocheck, member of Board of Directors of the Evans Churchill Community Association, expressed her appreciation for City staffs’ outreach regarding the project. Ms. Bocheck said high standards should be kept for the
proposed development, because it is a prime downtown location. She stated the project should conform to transit-oriented development. Ms. Bocheck expressed concerns related to public subsidies and the GPLET lease agreement offered to the developer.

Councilwoman Pastor stated she wants to be sure we follow all codes and processes and ensure people are engaged at all levels during the project.

Councilwoman Pastor asked to read an email from a constituent regarding the GPLET lease agreement. She stated the constituent asked for the public to see a detailed development plan for the ground floor elements of the proposed building and garage before the City enters into a contractual agreement with the developer. Councilwoman Pastor echoed the constituent's concerns and asked proper review is taken and stakeholders are engaged before proceeding.

Councilwoman Gallego asked if plans for the project could be reviewed by the Central City Village Planning Commission. Mr. Naimark stated Alan Stephenson suggested the project plan be reviewed by the Design Review Committee rather than the Central City Village Planning Commission. Mr. Stephenson explained the Design Review Committee was established to hear design appeals for the downtown code and ensure central city development is following the appropriate code.

Councilman Gates asked if the City could look into installing solar panels on the shade structure. He also asked how savings associated with the project will be allocated.

Ms. Hyatt explained funds directly related to the project will go back to transit. She also explained funds from the Community Reinvestment Fund will need to be paid back to the fund. Ms. Hyatt explained the remaining funds will need to be evaluated by the FTA to determine how they are allocated.

Mr. Blue shared staff's support of the recommendation to have the proposal reviewed by the Design Review Committee. He asked the Subcommittee to include in their motion that construction could not commence until the review process was completed.

Councilwoman Gallego moved to approve item contingent upon the ground floor design elements and the interaction with the transportation campus being reviewed by the Design Review Committee prior to construction beginning. Councilwoman Pastor seconded the motion, which passed 4-0.

The following residents submitted cards in favor of the item, but did not speak:

- David Krietor
- Sara Dial
- Leslie Lindo
- David Roderique
- Don Keuth
9. **Transportation Public Involvement Plan**

Rick Naimark, Deputy City Manager, introduced staff giving a presentation on the public involvement process for the streets and transit transportation initiative, and stated they would like a recommendation from the Council to proceed with the process.

Public Transit Director Maria Hyatt stated the kick-off meeting for the Citizens Commission on the Future of Phoenix Transportation (CCFPT) was held last week. Ms. Hyatt introduced Ray Dovalina, Interim Street Transportation Department Director. Mr. Dovalina introduced the new Public Information Officer for the Streets Department, Monica Hernandez.

Ms. Hyatt introduced Matt Heil, Public Information Officer for the Public Transit Department. Mr. Heil explained the goals of the public involvement process, which includes compiling accurate information from constituents. Mr. Heil stated staff will be visiting transit centers to gather transit rider feedback and reach out to constituents from various demographics, as well as speaking to business and organizations associated with transportation.

Mr. Heil discussed the use of talktransportation.org as a method of gathering community input. He explained the commission will be updated during every meeting with information compiled from the community.

Chairwoman Williams asked the Streets and Public Transit Departments to have representatives present when meeting with community groups. She also asked for a timetable on the public involvement plan. Mr. Heil explained the timetable will align with Council’s original request to have a formal recommendation completed by the end of the year.

Councilwoman Gallego asked if input from budget hearings and My Plan Phx could be included in the planning process for the transportation plan. Ms. Hyatt said this information will be included in the planning process and presented to the CCFPT.

Chairwoman Williams asked for staff to gather input from local colleges and school districts regarding the transportation plan.

Councilwoman Pastor moved to approve the public involvement plan. Councilman Gates seconded the motion, which passed 4-0.

10. **Concrete Reservoir and Steel Tank Rehabilitation Programs**

Rick Naimark, Deputy City Manager, introduced Troy Hayes, Assistant Water Services Director, and Aimee Conroy, Deputy Water Services Director.

Mr. Hayes explained 70% of the Water Department’s Capital Improvement Program is set aside for aging infrastructure. Ms. Conroy stated the City has 23
concrete and 35 steel reservoirs. She explained the largest concrete reservoir holds 40 million gallons of water.

Ms. Conroy explained the process used to monitor concrete and steel reservoirs. She stated larger concrete reservoirs are inspected for leaks and areas of concern using a small boat, whereas steel tanks have a hatch that is opened and a visual inspection is completed. She explained some of the issues discovered include leaks, coating failures, on the roof of the structures, and support beam deterioration.

Ms. Conroy explained rehabilitation of reservoirs is done on a priority bases.

Councilman Gates asked if infrastructure projects have been reviewed in light of decreased water usage by residents. Ms. Conroy explained there is a process when evaluating infrastructure that includes ensuring water pressure for fire flows and meeting daily demand.

Councilwoman Gallego asked what the system peak was last year. Ms. Conroy stated, it has been around 420 million gallons for the last 10 years.

11. **Call to the Public**

Marvin Rochelle spoke in favor of expanding the transit system. He also expressed his desire for the City of Phoenix to pursue a regional transit solution for disabled residents.

12. **Request for Future Agenda Items**

Councilwoman Gallego asked for a discussion of utility easements, sewer and water capacity in the infill area, and the interaction between utility system and shade trees.

Chairwoman Williams asked for a discussion on private streets.

Councilman Gates asked to review timing of yellow lights, rainwater capture, and for a recap on recent floods.

13. **Adjournment**

Chairwoman Williams adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Gabriel Morales
Management Intern
This report provides the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee with copies of past and/or upcoming meeting agendas/summaries for METRO light rail, Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA), and the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). This item is for information only.

THE ISSUE

Within Maricopa County, there are several agencies with different charges relating to public transit and transportation planning.

Valley Metro/RPTA: In 1993, the Regional Public Transportation Authority Board adopted the name Valley Metro as the identity for the regional transit system in metropolitan Phoenix. Under the “Valley Metro” brand, local governments fund the Valley-wide transit system which the public sees on the streets today. Valley Metro Board member agencies include Avondale, Buckeye, Chandler, El Mirage, Gilbert, Glendale, Goodyear, Maricopa County, Mesa, Peoria, Phoenix, Queen Creek, Scottsdale, Surprise, and Tempe. Councilwoman Thelda Williams serves as Phoenix’s representative on the RPTA Board of Directors.

METRO: METRO is the brand name for Valley Metro Rail Inc., a nonprofit, public corporation charged with the design, construction, and operation of the Valley’s light rail system. The cities that participate financially in the light rail system each have a representative on the METRO Board of Directors. Cities on the board include Chandler, Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, and Tempe. METRO is structured on a “pay-to-play basis” with voting power allocated based on investment in the system. Councilwoman Thelda Williams serves as Phoenix’s representative and is the current chair of the METRO Board of Directors.

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG): MAG is a Council of Governments that serves as the regional agency for the metropolitan Phoenix area. When MAG was formed in 1967, elected officials recognized the need for long-range planning and policy development on a regional scale. Issues such as transportation, air quality, and human services affect residents beyond the borders of individual jurisdictions. MAG is the designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for transportation planning in the Maricopa County region. Mayor Stanton serves as Phoenix’s representative.
OTHER INFORMATION

The goal of staff is to provide the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee with agendas for future meetings of these bodies. Meeting dates do not coincide and agendas are not available until close to the meeting date. However, prior to reaching each Board of Directors meeting, most agenda items are reviewed by staff committees which include City of Phoenix members. An attachment to the Subcommittee packet will provide meeting agendas and/or additional information for previous and upcoming METRO, RPTA and MAG meetings.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for discussion only. No Council action is required.

Attachments
TO:         Rick Naimark  
          Deputy City Manager

THRU:      Maria Hyatt  
          Public Transit Director

FROM:      Albert Santana  
          Special Projects Administrator

SUBJECT:  LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT STATION FEASIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

This report provides information and requests the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee recommend City Council approval of the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station Feasibility study recommendations.

THE ISSUE

In February 2013, at the request of the City of Phoenix, Valley Metro initiated a study to evaluate two potential additional stations along the Valley Metro light rail line. This study was completed in accordance with the Station Addition Policy prepared and approved by the Valley Metro Board of Directors in April 2011. The approximate locations of the stations are at 16th Street and Washington / Jefferson Streets and 48th Street and Washington Street. The potential station options in the vicinity of 16th Street and Washington / Jefferson Streets would serve Eastlake Park and key infill development sites, as well as several existing commercial and retail developments in the area. The potential station options in the vicinity of 48th Street and Washington Street would serve the Arizona Bridge to Independent Living and Disability Empowerment Center, Tovrea Castle, the U.S. Post Office and several new commercial and retail developments in the area.

OTHER INFORMATION

The study determined whether the addition of each potential station meets evaluation criteria in the Valley Metro Station Addition Policy. The study included two phases: Initial Evaluation and Detailed Assessment. The Initial Evaluation was more general and considered potential ridership, station spacing, service disruption, funding and public support. The Detailed Assessment was more specific and included engineering and design, operations and maintenance, accessibility, costs and funding. Three station options were analyzed for each of the two proposed station locations using the Initial Evaluation and Detailed Assessment criteria.

Community outreach for the station options was conducted through public meetings, surveys, project updates and stakeholder meetings. Valley Metro staff administered two surveys within the proposed station areas. Additionally, three rounds of public meetings
(May 2013, November 2013 and May 2014) were held for each of the two proposed station areas. A fourth public meeting was held for 48th Street station options in September 2014.

The following is a summary of the Initial Evaluation and Detailed Assessment results for the two station locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Location</th>
<th>Initial Evaluation</th>
<th>Detailed Assessment</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th Street and Washington/Jefferson Streets</td>
<td>Options A, B, C</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option A is technically feasible but does not meet all Valley Metro Station Addition Policy Criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Figure 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street and Washington Street</td>
<td>Options A, B, C</td>
<td>Options A, B, and C/C1</td>
<td>Options A and B are technically feasible but do not meet all Valley Metro Station Addition Policy Criteria. Options C/C1 are not feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Figure 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **16th Street**: It is recommended that Option A be deferred from consideration at this time because the station area is within a half-mile of the existing light rail station at 12th Street and Washington/Jefferson Streets and the addition of this station does not meet station addition criteria. Staff, however, has agreed to continue to work closely with the Planning and Development Department and with the community as part of the Reinvent Phoenix project. If future development/density occurs in this area staff can review the feasibility of this station at that time. See Figure 1.

- **48th Street**: While some of the station addition criteria are not met, it is recommended that Options A and B be considered for possible future implementation given the proximity to a significant facility serving people with disabilities along with several other recent transit-oriented developments with no light rail station in the area. It is approximately 1.8 miles between the 44th Street/Washington Street and Priest Drive/Washington Street light rail stations, which is the longest distance between stations on the light rail line. While both Options A and B are feasible, the community input has expressed unanimous support for Option B.

While a possible station in the vicinity of 48th Street will continue to be considered, the study recommendation does not ensure any new light rail stations will be added and funding for these stations has not been identified. The study purely provides a set of data to enhance decision-making by the City Council and Valley Metro Rail Board of Directors regarding possible additional light rail stations.

While the study’s primary focus was to assess the feasibility of additional light rail stations, the City of Phoenix and Valley Metro are evaluating other transit service modifications in the station areas to help address near term concerns for improved transit access.
RECOMMENDATION

This report requests the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee recommend City Council approval of the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station Feasibility study as follows:

16th Street area: Not advance at this time.

48th Street area: Advance options A & B.

While there is no current funding identified for this project, staff shall continue to pursue local, regional, federal and/or private-public funding.
Figure 1: 16th Street Station Options

*Station locations are general, not to scale

Figure 2: 48th Street Station Options

*Station locations are general, not to scale
This report provides information to the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee about the legal and practical issues surrounding private streets, including ongoing maintenance responsibilities and the existing dedication process for these streets.

**THE ISSUE**

The City of Phoenix allows the construction of private streets when developers wish to benefit from lower costs and/or design flexibility. During the initial development process, a developer who wishes to build private streets must design and construct them in accordance with the City standard for a private accessway. As a condition of the development of private streets, the developer and property owners assume full responsibility for all future maintenance costs. Ongoing private street maintenance responsibilities and costs can be significant, especially if regular preventative maintenance activities are delayed or deferred, and if the initial construction did not meet City design standards.

The City is regularly contacted by developers and property owners requesting to dedicate private streets and transfer maintenance responsibilities back to the City. The issue of dedicating private streets to the City has a long history dating back to 1973 (Attachment A). In 1986, the City Council approved modifications to the public streets standards, which permit the dedication of private streets if design standards are met. Based on this City Council action, the City developed and implemented a dedication process that is still in use for private streets that were constructed prior to March 19, 1986 (Attachment B).

There are currently 446 miles of private streets in the City.

**OTHER INFORMATION**

**City Concerns with Private Streets**

Developers are required to construct private streets to a private accessway standard, which helps to address issues involving public access, adequate pavement width, thickness, and geometric design. However, private streets may not meet current City public street design standards. They may not have complete sidewalks, street lighting, and ADA-compliant curb ramps and sidewalks. In addition, private streets may also contain private water and sewer infrastructure constructed with materials that do not meet public water and sewer standards. These are areas of potentially significant cost
and liability for the City if these private infrastructure elements were to become part of the public infrastructure.

A further concern is that the dedication discussion may be initiated when the developer and property owners are unable to fund necessary improvements to or perform the required maintenance of the private streets. On-going and regular street maintenance work is often deferred, increasing the future one-time costs to address any infrastructure maintenance needs. In the current City process, the developer and property owners are responsible for making all necessary improvements to bring the private street infrastructure to an acceptable condition prior to the dedication of any private streets.

Since 1985, the City Attorney has consistently opined that spending public funds on private streets is unconstitutional and violates the State of Arizona gift clause.

According to Planning and Development Department staff, there has been a strong development trend in the past few years towards more rather than less private street development, with nearly all small infill subdivisions and a majority of larger subdivisions using private accessways in their developments. Additionally, Neighborhood Services Department staff report that there has been an increasing number of homeowners' associations that have been dissolved or disbanded, which increases the likelihood of deferred maintenance on private street infrastructure. This environment indicates that private street dedication will continue to be an issue for the City.

The current City procedures, in place since 1986, are focused on the dedication of private streets within residential developments. It would be difficult to apply the existing City procedure to private streets built in conjunction with commercial developments, primarily due to the conditions that must be met. Additionally, the existing process is available only for dedications of streets built prior to March 19, 1986. There is no City procedure to permit the dedication of private streets built after March 19, 1986.

Options to Address Private Street Dedication Concerns

Improvement Districts – The City could market and publicize the option to establish an improvement district to raise funding to make necessary infrastructure improvements to private streets to bring them up to public street standards or address street maintenance issues. This option could be available for both commercial and residential developments.

Homeowners Association (HOA) Defaults - Planning and Development Department staff is currently working with the Law Department to identify options to address default situations with HOAs in Phoenix. Any City efforts would only address future developments of residential private streets, and would likely require changes to City Code and Subdivision and Zoning ordinances.

Amend Private Street Dedication Procedures – Currently the private street dedication process is focused on residential private streets, and is only available for private streets built prior to 1986. City procedures could be revisited to address commercial private streets and private streets built after 1986. Revised procedures could also clarify under
what conditions, if any, public tax dollars or resources could be used in the private street dedication process.

Increase Development Requirements – The City could require future private streets to be developed in compliance with current City and MAG public street standards. This would minimize both ongoing maintenance costs, and make it less costly for developers and property owners to bring the streets to a standard acceptable for dedication of those streets.

RECOMMENDATION

This report is provided for information and discussion.
June 30, 1986

The purpose of this letter is to advise Homeowners' Associations that it may be possible to dedicate your private streets as public streets and that effective January 1, 1987, the City of Phoenix will no longer provide maintenance to any streets not in the City's public street system.

Private streets are constructed in Planned Area Developments (PAD) to provide flexibility to developers for prospective buyers. The PAD zoning allows units to be clustered closer together, thereby providing an opportunity for more usable open space and other on-site amenities. Since street right-of-way is not dedicated to public use, a lower initial land cost may be passed on to the homeowners in the form of reduced purchase prices.

In 1973, the City Council agreed to accept responsibility for minor maintenance in private developments, provided pavements were of sound construction, in good condition, and appropriate assessments were provided. Major maintenance remained the responsibility of homeowners.

In 1982, the City Attorney discovered that doing minor maintenance work on private streets made Phoenix potentially liable for accidents/injuries, even though the streets remained private. Accordingly, the Council ceased accepting minor maintenance easements on private streets.

In 1985, the City Attorney further ruled that spending public tax dollars on private streets was unconstitutional, resulting in the need to cease minor maintenance.

Concerned about the potential impact on homeowners, in March, 1986, the City Council approved modifications to the public streets standards to allow Homeowners' Associations the option of dedicating their private streets, if constructed prior to March 19, 1986 and if they meet or are brought up to the modified standards. Once dedicated as public streets, the City would accept full maintenance responsibility.

The attached procedure outlines the steps necessary for dedication of private streets or if the streets do not qualify for dedication, the City will no longer provide maintenance services beginning January 1, 1987. If
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your Association has made application for dedication prior to January 1, 1987 and is pending review, minor maintenance services will continue until the dedication determination is final.

Questions regarding the application and dedication process should be directed to the Development Coordination Office at 422-7306.

Sincerely,

James H. Mattson, P.E.
Streets & Traffic Director

Thomas E. Callow, P.E.
Deputy Streets & Traffic Director

JHM/TEC/WSM/amb

Attachments
APPLICATION PROCEDURE.

On March 19, 1986 the City Council adopted a text amendment to Section 500-C-12 of the Zoning Ordinance that allows some private accessways to be dedicated to the City, when certain conditions are met. The following procedure outlines the conditions for acceptance of the streets and the various steps taken by City personnel before the Council will accept the streets as public right-of-way.

A. Homeowners' Association review the Pre-Application Checklist.

B. Homeowners' Association make application and pay filing fee to the Development Coordination Office (DCO).

C. The application will be routed to the following departments: Engineering, Streets and Traffic, Water and Wastewater, Fire Department, Planning Department, Public Works, and Utility Companies.

D. The departments will review the request, and respond within a 15 working day period.

E. Comments from the departments will be consolidated and a letter will be prepared outlining what improvements will be required, if any, prior to the City accepting the streets. The letter will be sent to the Homeowners' Association contact person.

F. If the pavement needs any type of surface treatment or any other improvements are required, the Homeowners' Association contractor must obtain a City permit before starting work. If extensive street modifications are required, a plan must be submitted to Engineering Plans Review Section prior to obtaining a permit. When the work is completed, the Streets and Traffic Department will make the final review.

G. Upon final review of work by the Streets and Traffic Department, the DCO will be notified.

H. If the streets are acceptable without upgrading or modifications or upon completion of Step E, the DCO will initiate an "Intent to Dedicate" request to the Real Estate Division to prepare the necessary documents for signatures.

I. When signatures have been obtained, the Real Estate Division will prepare the "Intent to Dedicate acceptance ordinance" for the City Council, and advise the Homeowners' Association when the streets have been accepted and recorded.
PRE-APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Prior to paying the fee and filing to request that a private street or accessway be dedicated as public, the applicant should be able to answer yes to the following questions:

1. Was the street constructed prior to March 19, 1966?
2. Is the pavement width including curbs at least 33.16' wide?
3. If there are street dead-ends, is there a 40' radius right-of-way available for cul-de-sac terminations?
4. If any restrictions to public access exist such as fire gates, guard houses, and private "keepout" type signs, will they be removed?
5. Was the street originally built to MAG pavement thickness and design standards? (See Engineering Department to verify if streets are built to standards).
6. Do the intersections have adequate visibility (3' x 15' if stop controlled and 2.5' x 33' if uncontrolled - see Streets and Traffic for further explanation)? This means the Homeowners' Association must be willing to remove walls, fences, and landscaping which obstruct these triangles. In some cases, building walls may be within the triangles which would make acceptance of the streets as public impossible.

In addition, the applicants must be willing to provide the following at their expense before acceptance:

1. All intersections must have street lights to public street standards. The cost of a pole and fixtures alone is $1,000 which does not include installation and underground trenching.
2. The pavement surface must be in a condition acceptable to Street Maintenance. This could require fixing potholes, chip sealing or resurfacing.
3. Traffic control signs which are deemed inappropriate and not in conformance with standards must be removed. The City will provide appropriate traffic control signs, if necessary.
4. "Private" indications on street name signs will be covered with tape by the Streets and Traffic Department. Signs will be replaced when maintenance is needed by the City unless the Homeowners' Association chooses to maintain special signs.
5. The water and sewer systems may need upgrading prior to acceptance by the City.
PRIVATE STREET DEDICATION

Pre-application Information

Before formally applying with the City of Phoenix for the dedication of your private streets please review this pre-application with the Street Transportation Representative. You may call (602) 262-4830 or (602) 262-6284 to set up an appointment.

Upon completion of review with Street Transportation's representative, return signed pre-application, along with written request to Street Transportation Department.

There are three steps to pass before approval by formal Council action.

- **STEP ONE.**
  Pre-application review by the City.

- **STEP TWO.**
  File application after passing step one.

- **STEP THREE.**
  Letter of stipulations to be satisfied by applicant.

**STEP ONE:** The City’s pre-application review involves a pass/fail test of the Zoning Ordinance, Section 608c, 11a. It also includes an on-site visual inspection to determine if the City requirements can be met for the requested dedications.

**EXPECT THREE TO FOUR WEEKS FOR REVIEW**

Ordinance requirements: For development utilizing an average lot or PRD (Private Residential Development) option or for development built under a planned area development district, a minimum of 16.5 feet half street right-of-way may be provided when all of the following conditions are met:

1) The street is not designated as a collector or major street.
2) There are no restrictions to public access to the street.
3) Pavement width shall be 33.16 feet from back of curb to back of curb.
4) Pavement thickness and design shall be in accordance with Maricopa Association of Government Standards (M.A.G. Standards).

5) All terminations shall contain 40 foot radius right-of-way (cul-de-sacs).

6) The street has been constructed prior to March 19, 1986.

On-site visual inspection: The on site visual inspection will include, but is not limited to, the following physical conditions:

a) Building setbacks must meet zoning requirements for dedicated streets and design requirements for vehicles.

b) All intersection and mid-block lighting must meet with City of Phoenix street lighting standards.

c) The pavement material and depth must meet with City of Phoenix and (M.A.G.) Standards. Pavement core testing may be required.

d) The pavement surface condition must meet City of Phoenix maintenance standards or be brought up to standards.

e) Traffic control signs inappropriate or not in conformance to City of Phoenix standards must be removed. City required signs will be installed by the City at the applicants expense.

f) Private water and sewer systems will meet with City standards or be upgraded for acceptance by the City.

g) Four (4) foot pedestrian access easements will be required on at least one side of all streets with an approved surface as required by the City.

h) Fire gates, guard houses, private signs, and other obstructions are required to be removed.

i) All intersections and driveways will be required to have unobstructed visibility triangles.

j) Trimming and removal of landscaping, walls or other obstructions may be required to meet City requirements.

k) Landscape islands and private parking areas are to be removed and be replaced with paving in accordance with plans approved by the City.

l) Curb ramp installations.
m) Drainage corrective measures.

n) Extreme horizontal alignments of vertical grade breaks will need to be corrected, according to plans approved by the City, where they deviate from City of Phoenix standards.

A pre-application report will be prepared. The report will indicate the items passed or failed in step one and the options available.

A meeting may be called to discuss your options, filing fees, and estimated costs to meet City requirements. Other fees or costs may be required in step two upon further review after an application for dedication is filed. Step one will disclose the major requirements and costs to your request.

Some fees can be anticipated:

1) Pavement Core Drilling: $600 minimum.

2) Zoning variance filing fee: $490* (when applicable)

3) Dedication application filing fee: $1,200*  
   (Dedications require a Phase I Environmental Report)

4) Map of Dedication filing fee: $1,350*

   *Please confirm latest fees in Phoenix City Code, Chapter 9, Appendix A.2.

STEP TWO: Upon formal application, various City departments and utility companies will review your request in detail. An application form in the Street Transportation Department is available for filing when Step One is passed. Additional information will be required to be filed with your application.

EXPECT SIX TO EIGHT WEEKS TO PROCESS

STEP THREE: A final letter of stipulations will be prepared and will be mailed to the applicant. All stipulations are to be met by the applicant within one year. A request for a one-time extension will require a fee of $100.

A meeting will be called to review the final stipulations.

COUNCIL ACTION: When all the stipulations are completed to the City's satisfaction and a Map of Dedication is reviewed and approved by the City of Phoenix, then the Phoenix City Council will be scheduled to approve dedications.

A letter of approval will be sent to the applicant giving the date of acceptance of the right-of-way.
AS THE SPOKESPERSON FOR THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION I HAVE REVIEWED THIS PRE-APPLICATION WITH THE STREET TRANSPORTATION REPRESENTATIVE AND ASK THE CITY TO PROCEED WITH STEP ONE.

Print Name: ____________________________
Signature: ______________________________
Association: _____________________________
Date: _________________________________
This report provides a summary of the 2014 Phoenix Bicycle Master Plan, which is a 20-year vision for improvements to the biking infrastructure of Phoenix. Staff requests the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee recommend City Council adoption of the plan as a guiding document for future improvements.

THE ISSUE

At 2013 City of Phoenix budget hearings, several residents expressed a need for the Street Transportation Department to provide additional or improved bike facilities throughout the city. As a result, the City Manager directed the department to allocate $1 million in funding for new bike infrastructure. Funded projects included the Greening of Lower Grand Avenue and major extensions of bike routes along Indian School Road and 15th Avenue corridors. In order to identify specific needs citywide, the department hired a consultant to develop a bicycle infrastructure needs assessment to guide future improvements.

The Bicycle Master Plan offers a blueprint for extending bicycle facilities throughout the City. A total of 385 potential projects were identified to complete gaps along 37 corridors throughout the City. The projects range in complexity from simple, inexpensive lane striping adjustments to bike bridge construction. Total estimated costs of the improvements recommended in the 20-year plan are approximately $52.6 million in today's dollars. Funding for all the improvements has not yet been identified, but the City will continue to build new bike infrastructure and make other enhancements as funding allows.

The proposed improvements with appropriate timeframes for implementation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Street from Indian School Road to Buckeye Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th Street from Van Buren Street to Baseline Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue from Mountain View Road to South Mtn Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th Street from Grand Canal Trail to Glendale Avenue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborn Road from I-17 to 40th Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Street from Mountain View Road to Washington Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Avenue from Dunlap Avenue to Jefferson Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington/Jefferson one-way pair from 27th Avenue to 56th Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReInventPHX Gateway Bicycle Improvement Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReInventPHX Eastlake Bicycle Improvement Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIER 2 (6 to 10 Years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Avenue from 43rd Avenue to 20th Street</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/5th Avenues - Washington/Jefferson Streets to the Arizona Canal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street - Central Avenue to East City Limits (56th Street)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue – Coral Gables to Deer Valley Drive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Road from Chandler Boulevard to I-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Avenue from 43rd Avenue to 24th Street</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street from Guadalupe Road to Pecos Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Bend Wash East of SR-51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th Street - Shea Boulevard to Union Hills Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Hills Drive – West City Limits (51st Avenue) to Tatum Blvd</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue - Thunderbird Road to Jomax Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater Avenue from 20th Street to Scottsdale Road</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIER 3 (11 to 20 Years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32nd Street– Dreamy Draw Park to Rose Garden Lane</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Creek Wash North of the Arizona Canal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roeser Road – 19th Avenue to East City Limits</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Road from 75th Avenue to 48th Street</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Canal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline Canal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Avenue to East City Limits</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Boulevard from 19th Avenue to I-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbins from 51st Avenue to 20th Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Creek Road – 7th Street to Carefree Highway</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Road from 107th Avenue to 48th Street</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Valley Road – 35th Avenue to 56th Street</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto Blvd - 31st Avenue to 87th Avenue</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th Street from Sky Harbor Airport to University Drive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Canal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A copy of the final draft has been posted for review since August 2014 at www.phoenix.gov/streetsite/Pages/Bicycle-Master-Plan.aspx.

OTHER INFORMATION

The first phase of this project gathered community input via public meetings, social media, and in-person interviews. During the second phase, the Mayor’s Pedestrian and Biking Ad Hoc Task Force and a Technical Advisory Committee were formed.

The Ad Hoc Task Force was made up of 12 members, including representatives from each council district and four at-large members. This group met twelve times over six months and advised City staff and the consultant on how to best identify and prioritize bike facility projects. Projects were prioritized based on a variety of factors, including connectivity, demand, constraints, and safety.

The Technical Advisory Committee was made up of City staff from departments including Parks and Recreation, Public Transit, and Planning and Development. In addition, other agencies were represented, including Valley Metro, Maricopa Association of Governments, and the Arizona Department of Transportation. This group provided technical input for the plan, as well as coordination with other projects in the region.

Bicycle Master Plan Summary

The Bicycle Master Plan Vision Statement adopted by the Ad Hoc Task Force is:

“In 20 years, Phoenix will be a Platinum-Level (as designated by the League of American Bicyclists) Bicycle Friendly Community. It will be safe and easy to bike anywhere in the City. A well-connected infrastructure network will link people and places, making bicycling a preferred option for daily transportation, recreation and healthy lifestyles.”

To help achieve this vision, the Ad Hoc Task Force completed the Bicycle Master Plan, which includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benefits of Bike Friendly Community</td>
<td>Benefits are outlined including reduced travel costs, a cleaner environment, improved community health, retail visibility etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How to Use the Master Bike Plan</td>
<td>Provides a framework for decision-making and actions to achieve the vision and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan Vision and Areas of Excellence</td>
<td>To achieve the vision, the city would adopt and achieve specific goals, strategies, actions, and objectives that address making Phoenix more bike friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Past and Present</td>
<td>Documents past accomplishments such as 1987 Council adoption of a bike plan and $2.9 million bond program in 1988 to implement the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policies and Perceptions</td>
<td>The goal is for public policy to be connected with the desire to have more people riding bikes more often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Opportunities and Investments</td>
<td>Investments made for bicycling will be smart, focused and equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Equity and Efficiency</td>
<td>Bicycling will be a safe, fun and convenient transportation option to access schools, parks, shopping, work and community centers in all parts of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>People on bikes will understand bicycling rules of the road through proper facility design and safety education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Design &amp; Connectivity</td>
<td>Missing gaps in the bicycle network will be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Connections and Collaboration</td>
<td>The City will be connected to bikeways in adjoining communities to provide recreation and commuting opportunities for all ages, abilities, and travel purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bikes and Transit</td>
<td>Commuting by public transit will be a seamless and efficient choice for bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff requests the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee recommend for City Council adoption the 2014 Bicycle Master Plan.
This report provides an update on infill development and Reinvent PHX planning efforts related to utility conflicts. This is the first of a two-phase study and discussion item. It provides an overview of current infill development modification efforts and will solicit feedback for the on-going study that will make recommendations regarding utility corridor conflicts that could potentially inhibit walkable infill development. The first phase provides an overview and evaluates the 2013 Infill Advisory Board technical recommendations. The second phase will provide the results. Staff anticipates presenting the second phase to the Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Subcommittee at the December meeting.

THE ISSUE

The establishment of the initial segment of the light-rail line combined with the City focus on infill development and adaptive reuse has created the need to evaluate development regulations that were created to facilitate new growth on the suburban fringe where regulations are not constrained by an established development pattern or established neighborhood concerns. Infill development that builds upon the existing character and development patterns is necessary to achieve City planning goals and utilization of the light-rail line as a public transportation amenity. These efforts have led staff to modify codes to allow for a more urban style of development.

In early 2013, the Planning and Development Department (PDD) began a two-year project, working with an Infill Advisory Group to address barriers to infill development and incorporate flexibility in standard development requirements. The group’s goal was to promote growth and development in areas served by light rail and existing public infrastructure. This process began with public meetings with more than 200 residents, design professionals, builders and business owners in attendance. Staff solicited input on attendees’ experience with infill development, how it has affected neighborhoods, and how the City’s process could be improved. Over 150 comments and suggestions were gathered and categorized into a work plan.

Comments from the public meetings led to the creation of two advisory groups. The first group was assigned the more technical issues related to the interpretation and application of City Code and Building Code requirements including utility conflicts. The group consisted of design professionals, builders, zoning professionals, and City staff.

The technical group met over a period of four months and formulated a number of technical recommendations ranging from reducing fire access and trash collection
requirements to eliminating plant salvage plans for downtown vacant lots (Attachment A). Included in those recommendations were two utility related items:

1. Allow the use of master meters for Single-Family Attached type subdivisions within the Infill Development District

2. New coordinated minimum standards for street and private driveway/accessway widths to cover requirements of both water/sewer demands, and traffic/pedestrian circulation demands

These were the primary utility issues identified by the technical group as negatively affecting infill development. The new standards were coordinated with the Water, Street Transportation, Fire, and Public Works Departments. These recommendations were approved by the Development Advisory Board and City Council and were implemented on January 1, 2014. Since then, PDD has applied these new standards to more than 40 projects currently in the development process within the Infill Development District (see Attachment B).

More recent public concerns have arisen about a challenge with implementing some provisions within the existing Downtown Code and the proposed Walkable Urban (WU) Code because of utility conflicts. Most significant are conflicts between utility easements and minimal building setbacks with mandatory shade requirements. Upon plat of a parcel, City Code requires an eight foot public utility easement (PUE) along all right-of-way adjacent to the property to accommodate both public and private utilities. Since no permanent structures can be built in a PUE, the additional eight feet of setback can be in conflict with the maximum setback requirements of the draft WU Code. The development applicant can petition the utilities for relief from the PUE, but many times the public and private utilities are unwilling to forego the easement due to existing or potential future needs to deliver services. Staff is currently working on options for developers to comply with both the PUE requirement and the WU Code in a manner that provides desired shade and urban amenities while also accommodating the utilities. These options will be further discussed in upcoming WU Code public hearings and presentations. Staff will also report other options at the T&I Subcommittee meeting in December.

There is potential for additional conflicts with the WU Code mandatory shade requirements and the City Code-required ten foot minimum distance for construction footings or tree roots adjacent to a water or sewer line. These distances were set for two purposes: (1) to prevent property damage of footings if the water or sewer line were to break; and (2) to prevent root invasion into water and sewer lines, which has the potential to result in serious disruptions to service, damage to streets, and increased costs to rate payers. It is important to note that the water and sewer lines located in PUEs downtown are likely to be lines that provide service to some of the City’s densest development, and disruption of service has the potential to impact a large number of businesses and families.

With regard to trees, the Water Services Department is currently reviewing whether root barriers or other measures could be used to allow trees within six to ten feet of a water or sewer line, and has engaged a landscape architect to design root barriers, if
appropriate. In addition, the landscape architect will identify appropriate trees that have less invasive roots. If revised guidelines are possible, these guidelines will be referenced in the WU Code to potentially enable planting of shade trees closer to water and sewer lines and sidewalks in the right-of-way.

With regard to construction footings, PDD is working on providing flexibility in the WU Code for alternative shade structures for which construction footings would not be allowed in the PUE. These alternatives could include cantilevered shade structures, removable shade canopies, false footings, and a reduction in mandatory shade depth when in conflict with a PUE. These options will also be further discussed in upcoming WU Code public hearings and presentations.

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information and discussion only. Staff will report and make recommendations on utility corridor issues regarding shade structures and trees at the T&I Subcommittee meeting in December. In addition, staff will also report on some of the preliminary information regarding infrastructure capacity issues within the eastern portion of the Reinvent PHX project boundaries.

Attachment A – Infill Advisory Group Technical Recommendations
Attachment B – Infill Development District Map
Infill Advisory Group Technical Recommendations

Streamline Technical Appeals

Remove need for the following commonly approved technical appeals

- Parcels included in the Infill Development District allowed pre versus post or first flush retention
- (Citywide) No automatic PUEs on Plat when applicant provides approval letters from utilities – will document utility approval in permitting system
- (Citywide) Low slope sewer taps allowed with appropriate engineering calculations
- (Citywide) Minimum fire line sizing allowed

Speed up technical appeal and Building Code Modification Processes

- (Citywide) Hold weekly Technical Appeal meeting, invite applicant to meeting, and render a decision at the meeting with written notification in 48 hours
- (Citywide) Hold bi-weekly Code Modification meetings, invite applicant to meeting, and render a decision at the meeting with written notification in 48 hours

Ongoing Improvement

- (Citywide) Track appeals for regular review of commonly approved items and determine if policies can be revised to eliminate the requirement for appeal

Reduced Inventory/Salvage/Landscape Requirements

- Eliminate inventory salvage requirement on properties in the Infill Development District (unless property has specific zoning stipulations regarding existing trees or plants and as long as there are no trees in the right-of-way that will be removed)
- (Citywide) Allow site plan to include landscaping information for lots less than two net acres
- (Citywide) Allow landscape/inventory/salvage combination plan review for sites less than five net acres in size

Reduced Fire Access requirements (new Fire Infill Development Policy)

- Allow 16-foot fire access road for all projects within the Infill Development District
- Allow alley access, if alley is paved per city standard, for all projects within the Infill Development District
**Water/Sewer/Utilities**

- Allow the use of master meters for Single-Family Attached type subdivisions within the Infill Development District

**Reduced Grading & Drainage and Retention Requirements**

- Allow pre versus post or first flush in the Infill Development District
- (Citywide) Grading and Drainage plan not required where sum of the additional impervious surfaces are no greater than 2,000 square feet
- Zero lot line buildings in the Downtown Code Area allowed first flush retention

**Reduced Site Requirements**

- (Citywide) Allow existing driveway widths to remain when traffic is not significantly increased due to a change of use
- (Citywide) Allow existing parking lots to remain as long as minimal parking lot changes are proposed
- (Citywide) New parking spaces can match existing spaces as long as less than 50 spaces are being added
- (Citywide) If less than 2,000 square feet of building is being added:
  - Waive requirement for driveway retrofits
  - Waive requirement for right of way and sidewalk dedications
  - Waive requirement for street improvements
- (Citywide) If a more intense use is not proposed, waive requirements to bring number of spaces up to code for sites short of parking

**Solid Waste Turn Around Relief**

- Allow for specialized collection in smaller truck reducing turnaround requirements within the Infill Development District (smaller 30-foot clearance)

**Encourage pedestrian and bike friendly development in the Infill Development District**

- Include pedestrian and bike connectivity in traffic studies for downtown/Infill Development District

**Dedicated, expert assistance for projects within the downtown/infill area map**

- Create an Infill Development Team to facilitate infill projects through the development process. Six new positions needed for this team are a Planning & Development Team Leader, Structural Plans Engineer, Electrical Plans Engineer, Mechanical Plans Engineer, Engineering Technician, and a Secretary II.
Facilitate Single Family Attached Subdivisions

In conjunction with a Text Amendment recommendation to facilitate new residential single-family attached subdivisions from the Phase II group:

Traffic

- New coordinated minimum standards for street and private driveway/accessway widths to cover requirements of both water/sewer demands, and traffic/pedestrian circulation demands

Solid Waste Collection

- Provide flexible options for centralized collection or street service depending on project configuration
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This report provides information to the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee regarding the City of Phoenix Customer Information System hardware and software upgrade project.

THE ISSUE

The Water Services, Public Works, Finance, and Information Technology Departments have initiated a project to upgrade the Customer Care & Billing (CC&B) Application, which is the software used for utility billing and tax collection on the City Services Bill. This upgrade will improve customer self-service options, streamline utility billing processes in a manner that improves customer service, and enhance system security and stability. The date for the system to start operating fully is December 2016.

Various contracts and purchases relating to this effort will be recommended for City Council approval over the next two years. Up to this point, $2.6 million has been spent to purchase some of the hardware and software. An additional $15.1 million is expected to be spent in the future. The source of funds for this project is Water, Wastewater, and Solid Waste utility revenue funds. No general funds will be expended.

OTHER INFORMATION

The Customer Information System software used for the City Services Bill is critical to the City, as it provides a direct billing interface for all water, wastewater, and solid waste customers (approximately 430,000 customers). Approximately $750 million in annual revenue for the utilities as well as for various City taxes is currently collected through the City Services Bill. This upgrade is recommended to enhance self-service options for customers and to upgrade software that will not be supported beyond May 2015. The new server and network infrastructure associated with the upgrade will also provide increased stability for revenue collection. Additionally, the project will entail a significant effort in mapping and streamlining existing billing processes to improve efficiencies and customer service.

The system upgrade will also offer significant benefits to customers including:

- The customer self-service module will offer customers the ability to start or stop service under some conditions, manage account information, establish
communication preferences, view bills including graphical usage and payment history, and make and manage payments. The self-service module can be accessed through mobile devices and tablets.

- The engineered hardware solution will significantly improve application response, system maintenance, and reporting performance. This will result in reduced hardware maintenance costs, improved customer service response times, and improved employee efficiency.

- A large-account management portal will improve customer service in the management of large customer accounts such as industrial users and hospitals.

- A more flexible system configuration will more easily accommodate regulatory and business changes to billing processes as they occur.

- Staff efficiencies will be gained through new features, including electronic bill presentment, enhancements to payment arrangements, the ability to execute a business process on a group of records, and the ability to add attachments to specific records.

- Bill presentment will be significantly enhanced allowing bill formatting to be tailored to customer needs. This will help customers better understand their bill through graphs showing consumption variances.

The project schedule is as follows:

**Fiscal Year 13/14 (Complete)**
- Installation of the new database platform for CC&B version 2.4 software application.

**Fiscal Year 14/15**
- Installation of new servers and increased database platform storage.
- Completion of a fit gap analysis, through which the features and functions of the new software are analyzed for potential gaps with the needs of the City’s billing requirements.
- Integration of Water, Public Works, and Finance applications into CC&B 2.4.

**Fiscal Year 15/16**
- Re-design of relevant business processes for Water and Public Works Customer Service Divisions to better fit the new software and avoid customizations.

**Fiscal Year 16/17**
- Implementation of business re-engineering recommendations.
- Training.
- Launch (planned for December 2016).
To ensure a successful implementation, a project management plan was developed to manage project risks, review and approve changes to the project, and oversee scope, schedule, and budget. The project team is comprised of staff from Finance, Information Technology Services (ITS), Public Works, and Water Services departments. The ITS Project Management Group will oversee the upgrade, providing direct management of vendors, the project implementation plan, and staff resources. Because of the complex nature of the project, staff recommends hiring firms with experience in upgrading Oracle Customer Information Systems to assist with the fit gap analysis, the integration of applications, testing, the re-design of business processes, and training. A request for proposals is under development and a recommendation to City Council is expected in December 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

This report was provided to the Finance, Efficiency, Economy and Sustainability Subcommittee on September 17, 2014.

This report is for information and discussion.
This report provides the Transportation & Infrastructure Subcommittee with a summary of the 23rd Avenue Wastewater Treatment Plant’s (WWTP) award for outstanding performance by the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA).

THE ISSUE

NACWA’s Peak Performance Awards recognize facilities for outstanding compliance with their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit limits. The Silver Awards are presented to agency facilities that have had five or fewer permit violations during a calendar year. Gold awards are presented to those agencies with no reporting or permit limit exceedances for the year. A platinum award is given to an agency with 5 consecutive gold awards. Permit violations can range from missed samples to sample results that exceed specified permit limits.

The 23rd Avenue WWTP achieved five consecutive years with no reporting or permit limit exceedances and received a platinum award for the 2013 calendar year. This is the first time a City of Phoenix facility has received this prestigious award. The 23rd Avenue WWTP treats an average of 36 million gallons of wastewater every day. This is approximately 13 billion gallons per year. Over the past 5 years, there have been more than 14,500 samples collected and analyzed and more than 65 billion gallons of wastewater treated at the 23rd Avenue WWTP equal to filling 55 Olympic-size pools every day over the past five years. Over 75 operations, laboratory, and maintenance staff have worked diligently at this facility to ensure regulations are met and water is treated properly.

The 91st Avenue WWTP plant received a gold award for 2013. The 91st Avenue WWTP treats an average of 135 million gallons per day. Plant staff at 91st Avenue WWTP collected more than 6,900 samples and treated more than 49,000 million gallons in 2013.

OTHER INFORMATION

The main role of wastewater treatment plants is the treatment of wastewater before it enters local rivers and water bodies to make the water safe for plants and animals. In Phoenix, wastewater treatment plants also reclaim wastewater so it can be reused. All of these efforts must be accomplished under very strict regulatory requirements to protect humans and the ecosystem. The treatment and reclamation of wastewater is
one of the most important ways the City of Phoenix protects the environment and ensures sustainable management of water supplies.

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only.