



## Approved Minutes

### City of Flagstaff TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

4:00 PM, Monday, July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015

City Council Chambers  
211 W. Aspen Avenue

The following link will direct you to live streaming of this meeting.

<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/index.aspx?NID=1461>

---

#### CALL TO ORDER

COMMISSION MEMBERS, voting:

Andrew Benally

Bob Kuhn, Flagstaff Unified School District - **Present**

Erika Mazza, NAIPTA - **Present**

Bob Mullen - **Present**

Kevin Parkes, Chair

Gary Robbins, Vice-Chair - **Present**

Derik Spice

COMMISSION MEMBERS, non-voting:

Lt. Frank Higgins, Flagstaff Police Department

Jeff Bauman, Traffic Engineer

CITY STAFF:

Rita Severson, Recording Secretary

## **I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*At this time any member of the public may address the Commission on any subject within the Commission's jurisdiction that is not on this meeting's agenda. The Arizona Open Meeting Law prohibits the Commission from discussing or taking action on an item that is not listed on the prepared agenda. Commissioners may, however, respond to criticism made by those addressing the Commission, ask staff to review a matter, or ask that a matter be placed on a future agenda.*

*To address the Commission on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard.*

There were no public comments.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Regular Meeting of June 3, 2015

**Vice Chair Robbins** made a motion to approve the Minutes of June 03, 2015, motion seconded by **Commissioner Kuhn**, all in favor, motion carried.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. None**

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Major Plan Amendment – Regional Plan 2030 – Map 25**

The City of Flagstaff has prepared and submitted a Major Regional Plan Amendment Application (MPA) to the City of Flagstaff for consideration in 2015. Major Plan Amendments are considered once annually by the City Council. Deadlines for submission of an MPA have passed and this Map 25 amendment will be the only proposed MPA this year.

The purpose of this major amendment is to bring Map 25: Road Network Illustration (Map 25) in the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (FRP30) into compliance with Arizona Revised Statute (ARS) 9-461.05 and to resolve inconsistencies between the Land Use and Transportation Chapters and other part of the City Code related to Map 25. These changes are being processed as a major plan amendment because they are related to the major amendment category of "Addition of a Corridor or Great Street" on page III-9.

This amendment will result in:

A Road Network Illustration that conforms to the legal requirements of Arizona Revised Statutes;

Improved consistency on language related to Map 25 within FRP30 and with other City Code and policies;

Improved ability to provide consistent direction to City projects and development applications;

Expansion of the Corridor Place Type in two areas within the City;

Improved ability to communicate with the public about land use and transportation issues pertaining to corridors; and

Improved ability to determine the fair and roughly proportional share of infrastructure costs.

The following is a link to the webpage for the Map 25 MPA:  
<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/index.aspx?NID=3216>

**Staff Recommendation:** Informational Item – review the presentation and provide feedback

The City's Comprehensive Planning Manager Sara Dechter presented this item. Sara told them that staff had identified some edits needed since the plan's ratification in May 2014. The amendment to Map 25 is only one of the edits in the Regional Plan and this amendment is considered a major amendment because it will address more than a quarter mile of corridor to the map. These amendments will conform to the legal requirements of Arizona Revised Statutes to include all arterial and collector streets on the transportation map.

1. Map 25 Major Plan Amendment

- a. Road functional classifications and their relationship to Map 25 are better explained.
- b. Clearer references to City's *Engineering Standards*.
- c. The relationship between Regional Transportation Plan and the City's Plan is better explained.
- d. A description of what is a "conditional" road and that they require further study has been added.
- e. Residential Access is a new category and should be considered where appropriate for roads already on the map as Access.
- f. This new category is displayed as yellow on the amended map. The difference between "Residential Access" and "Access" is the type of usage the land could be used for on these roads.
- g. Regional and neighborhood corridors concept removed.
  - i. The old map displayed regional corridors or neighborhood corridors with no definitions of the difference. The change to the new map identifies both as corridors which could be considered neighborhood corridors if in proximity to an activity center.
- h. Enhanced description of transportation features in activity centers.
  - i. The transportation features around activity centers were written as urban, suburban or rural which wasn't defined and were similar, this will be better explained.
- i. "Corridor" as a Place Type is clearer
- j. Map 25 will be the main tool for identifying corridors for the Regional Plan. Map 12 will be used only for great streets and gateways.
- k. In the Transportation Chapter under Automobile and Mobility Section will also see some text changes.
  - i. There will be a better explanation of relationships between maps and language from the Regional Plan and the City's Engineering Standards.
  - ii. More defined reference of this map and how it works with the Regional Transportation Map and their relation to each other.
  - iii. There has been changes to Linda Vista and Ponderosa Parkway to be considered in the residential access category and adding Pine Cliff as a collector road which was missing from the map.
  - iv.
  - v.

Future amendments:

Clarify the use of terminology “Great Streets” and “corridors”.

Clarify terms and descriptive information in the Land Use Chapter.

Non-substantive editing errors.

Process for Adoption (tentative dates)

1. Planning and Zoning Work Session, September 9<sup>th</sup> 4pm to 8pm at City Hall
2. Planning and Zoning Public Hearing #1, September 23<sup>rd</sup> 4pm to 8pm at Aquaplex (*tentative*)
3. Planning and Zoning Public Hearing #2, October 7<sup>th</sup> 4pm to 8pm at City Hall
4. City Council Hearing – Date TBD

### **Commission discussion**

**Commissioner Kuhn** asked about the 180 bypass that would go around the City and connect to 180 out by Cheshire. Sara said this was a study done by ADOT and the road would be out of the jurisdiction for the City and doesn't show on Map 25. Jeff Bauman added that the study for the bypass was very expensive and it also raised concerns that development would start along the bypass. This roadway isn't in the Regional Transportation Plan mostly likely because of the study cost, limit benefits for the City and conflicts with the Coconino's Forest Plan.

**Commissioner Mazza** inquired about a better explanation or criteria used to determine transportation features around activity centers. Sara directed the Commission to a hand out that defined what would be considered to determine the difference between each of the transportation features around each type of activity center, urban, suburban and rural.

**Commissioner Mazza** then asked if there were any changes in this map that the Commission may have to weigh in on at a later time as these changes move forward. Sara indicated that there was an addition to the Map that showed the extension of Linda Vista and Lockett, the surrounding neighborhoods have expressed some concerns with these extensions.

**Commissioner Mullen** expressed the desire to know more about the 180 bypass and would like to keep this option on the radar. Which entity would be bearing the costs? Jeff told the Commission that the previous concept plans didn't get to that level of detail. **Commissioner Mullen** said he would like to hear public input on this potential bypass and feels this is something needed for the future of Flagstaff. Sara told the Commission that she feels the comments regarding the 180 bypass should be passed onto Council as a concern from the Transportation Commission to enable staff to get direction to pursue more information.

**Vice Chair Robbins** made a motion to encourage the adoption of Map 25, however the Commission also wanted to express the overcrowding of US180 and Fort Valley Road and what alternative would be best to address that, motion seconded by **Commissioner Mullen**.

### **Discussion on motion**

**Commissioner Mazza** suggested that the bypass discussion should be tabled and brought into the discussions with the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization (FMPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The FMPO is moving forward with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and that would be a better venue for a bypass discussion because of the jurisdiction boundaries. **Commissioner Mazza** added that NAIPTA is a member of the TAC and would be happy to bring the Commission's concerns to the group. Jeff added that currently the FMPO is building models of current year and future years for the RTP. After this discussion **Vice Chair Robbins** withdrew his motion and proposed another motion.

**Vice Chair Robbins** made a motion to approve Map 25 as presented, motion seconded by **Commissioner Mullen**, all in favor, motion carried.

**B. City of Flagstaff – Parking Management Program**

The City of Flagstaff has developed five possible parts to a parking management program – Residential Parking Permits, Additional Time Limited Parking, Employee Parking Permits, Meters/Kiosks and Private/Non-City Parking Management. Staff will present this information, which is scheduled to also be presented to the City Council on July 14<sup>th</sup>. Attached to the agenda are the powerpoint presentation, the City Council Staff Summary Report and a more detailed outline of each proposal.

**Staff Recommendation:** Informational Item – review the presentation, and provide feedback to Staff and the City Council

Jeff Bauman the City's Transportation Engineer presented this item, this project has been spear headed by Karl Eberhard the Community Design and Redevelopment Manager. Karl was unable to attend this evening's meeting. Tomorrow Karl will be presenting this item to the City Council. In the past the Transportation Commission did work on a permit parking process for downtown, which didn't develop into a procedure. The Student Housing Task Force has now brought this item back.

1. Stakeholder Input
  - a. Not a lot of public input as of today but the City Council meeting has been heavily advertised and Karl anticipates public participation.
2. Ready Implementation
  - a. Get the concept out to evaluate how it works before applying guidelines and rules, which could help with the goal of start small and grow from there.
3. Interconnectedness of Parking
  - a. The parking program could stand alone or group together.
4. Cost and Cost Recovery
  - a. Costs for enforcement, studies, permits, signs and markings.
  - b. Cost recovery would be in two forms, meters and paying for parking permits. The recovery wouldn't include parking citations. Citations are usually used to fund all the administrative costs to issue them.
5. Potential Components
  - a. Residential Permit Parking Program
    - i. Typically in residential areas.
    - ii. Requested by Property Owners.
    - iii. Block-by-block (On-street).
    - iv. 51% of residents on the street to request the program. If 51% of the residents are requesting then the Transportation Program would conduct an occupancy study of the street to determine if the parking program could benefit the neighborhood.
    - v. Change parking on the street to Time-limited Parking (2 hrs for Example).
    - vi. Permits Issued – One per water meter and each resident a guest permit. Regular / Guest Permit / Contractor; the street would become two hour parking restrictions except for these three exceptions. This exception wouldn't have any effect on the snow plow parking ordinance.
    - vii. Permits Exempt Vehicle from Time Limits
    - viii. Enforcement Performed
  - b. Additional Time-limited Parking
    - i. Limiting the time to be able to park in a space, such as two hours as an example. Candidate areas would be all of Beaver and San Francisco south side, currently there are bits and pieces of this parking on San Francisco.

Some of the side streets would become candidates for this program too. No permits needed for this type of regulations.

- c. Employee Permit Parking Program
    - i. Usually associated with a parking lot or garage, allowing downtown businesses to purchase an area for their employees to park.
      - 1. Currently the three Phoenix Avenue lots are all day parking, these would be candidates to splitting up as all day parking, two hour parking and selling permits for other type of parking needs.
    - ii. Quantity Limited for Desired Occupancy
    - iii. Permits to Exempt Some Vehicles from Time Limits
    - iv. Enforcement Performed
  - d. Meters / Kiosks
    - i. Kiosks can offer more than just parking permits, they are also used to communicate with the public on events in the area or even discount tickets to activities.
      - 1. Placement and costs associated with a Meter or Kiosks will need to be determined by City Council.
    - ii. Enforcement Cost Recovery – help recover cost for program.
      - 1. Surplus Could Purchase Parking Land and Facilities for Parking.
  - e. Private / Non-city Parking Management
    - i. In the future turning over the parking management to a private company.
6. Implementation
- a. Residential Permit Parking
  - b. Additional Time-limited Parking, and / or Employee Permit Parking.
    - i. Staff recommends the above three implemented together.
    - ii. Add (1) FTE Civilian Enforcement Staff to start the program. Currently the City has one employee to enforce parking within the whole City. Every 200 parking spaces warrant one enforcement employee.
  - c. Items to be implemented later
    - i. Meters / Kiosks and
    - ii. Non-city Parking Management
      - 1. Possibly wait until settling-in period is over.
7. Financial Implications
- a. Without Meters / Kiosks, Non-city Management, Randomized Enforcement
    - i. Cost: Approx. \$250 per space per year.
8. Program Costs
- a. The program cost to include enforcement would be about \$45,000.
  - b. To only issue permits the cost would \$225.00 per space.

### **Commission Discussion**

**Commissioner Mullen** suggested purchasing and installing the Kiosks first. This would enable the City to start collecting funds to help offset some of the costs before permitting and enforcement. Jeff told the Commission that this idea was discussed when building the permit parking management program, the fear that is associated with the implementation of Kiosks before the permitting is it could add to the off street parking in the surrounding neighborhoods. There is always an unwillingness to pay for parking when it's still available for free within close surrounding areas.

**Commissioner Mazza** would like to convey information to Karl Eberhard regarding the Phoenix Lot where the NAIPTA busses stop, the desire there would to have this lot as an employee parking lot instead of a two hour lot. Allowing all day parking would help avoid conflicts between the buses and automobiles throughout the day.

**Chair Parkes** asked what would be the hours for the restrictions for the Phoenix Lots, 24 hours or another block of time. Jeff answered that most of these restrictions would apply to an 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. time block.

**Commissioner Kuhn** stated he likes the Kiosks concept. He has been to towns where they also serve as an information center, which generates revenues from advertisement which helps provides the Kiosk to pay for itself.

**Vice Chair Robbins** expressed his thoughts regarding meters and Kiosks, he doesn't like meters and isn't too fond of the Kiosks.

**Commissioner Mazza and Chair Parkes** agreed to how critical signage will be with this program, helping citizens and visitors known, what, how and when.

Jeff asked the Commission how comfortable there were with the simplification of permits and issuing. When a permit is issued for a parking spot the owner of the permit will be responsible and if the permit is lost there will be no replacements. **Commissioner Mullen** suggested that tying the permit to a license plate number would help with the theft of these permits. Jeff said tying the two together is still in discussion but if in the event that would happen it would add costs for issuing and enforcement. **Chair Parkes** likes the simplicity and said when you start adding exceptions you start adding costs, the easy start up would be keep it simple and see how it goes from there.

Jeff told the Commission he will take their comments to Karl so he can include them in his presentation to the City Council tomorrow night.

#### IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

##### A. Reports

1. Report from the Bicycle Advisory Committee:  
<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/index.aspx?nid=1822>
2. Report from the Pedestrian Advisory Committee:  
<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/index.aspx?nid=1824>
3. Status of Transportation Engineering Program Projects
  - [General update presentation on several projects and work orders performed by Transportation Engineering Staff](#)

Nothing specific to report out on these reports.

##### B. Informational Items to/from Commissioners and Staff

1. Fourth Street Update

Preliminary plans have been received.

1. Concept Third Ave and Fourth St.
  - a. Scheduled to be accomplished this summer.
2. Dortha and Fourth St.
  - a. The entire completion here will be delayed because of an easement needed from one of the property owners.
  2. Bow & Arrow Neighborhood Traffic Calming

The foundation for the radar feedback sign is completed, the actual installation of the signs should be this week.

3. Commissioner Discussion

**Chair Parkes** asked about the traffic lane changes at Beulah and Lake Mary Road and the purpose for the right lane on 89a/Beulah becoming only right turn at that intersection. **Chair Parkes** observed that this change is now causing a possible traffic problem with vehicles heading North on Beulah after the intersection needing to merge right to proceed to I-17 or NAU. Jeff said the changes there is being done in several steps and the restriction of making the north bound 89a lane at the intersection was to help free up space for vehicles turning north

on Beulah from Lake Mary Road. Jeff said there are more changes coming with hopes that the function of this intersection will get better, and if needed the lane could be changed back to a north bound flow on 89a/Beulah. **Vice Chair Robbins** suggested that a left turn bay off of 89a/Beulah at University Heights South Drive may help with some of the backup. Jeff said he will look at the studies and counts at the street, ultimately the street will be widened with a median and left turn lane but as of today there isn't a designated left turn lane at that end of University Heights South Drive.

4. Membership Renewals  
<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/index.aspx?NID=1886>

**C. Next Meeting**

1. **Regular Meeting: October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

Tentative Agenda Items:

1. Isabel Street Diverters
2. Capital Improvements – Transportation Program project evaluation

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Mazza** made a motion to adjourn; motion seconded by **Commissioner Kuhn**, all in favor motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 5:37 P.M.