*Final*

# FVI Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting #13
# Final Meeting Minutes

**October 5, 2006, 11 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.**
**Phoenix Public Works Department**

**PDT Members Present:** Jerry Marmon (Environmental PM), Brian Sheadel (Roadway), Christina Fera-Thomas (TPAU), Jim Wear (City of Phoenix), Dale Petrasek (Jackson County Roads), Murray LaHue (City of Phoenix), Dan Moore (RVCOG)

**ODOT Present:** Debbie Timms (Project Leader), Peter Schuytema (TPAU), David Pyles (Planner), Susan Landis (ROW), Dan Dorrell (ODOT)

**Non-ODOT Present:** Nick Fortey (FHWA), Vicki Guarino (RVCOG), Nancy Reynolds (URS), Tani Wouters (CAC), Lenny Neimark (CAC)

---

## 1, 2. REVIEW AGENDA, APPROVE MINUTES, PROJECT UPDATE

The goal of this PDT meeting is similar to the CAC/PDT meeting last night. The PDT members will review the alternatives, and cast ballots on which alternatives/options they would like to advance for further refinement. All of the PDT members were at last night's meeting, and so heard the CAC member discussion.

Last month's PDT meeting minutes were approved last night at the joint CAC/PDT meeting.

## 3. REVIEW OF JOINT CAC/PDT MEETING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Vicki Guarino presented the following results of the CAC balloting from last night's CAC/PDT meeting. (The numbers reflect total votes cast for the alternative—whether identified as first choice, second choice, etc. Breakdowns according to choice are included in the ballot summary handout.)

| Alt/Option # | Description | Number of Votes |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | PBA West, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 9 |
| 2 | PBA West, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 6 |
| 3 | PBA West, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 3 |
| 4 | PBA West, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 5 | PBA West, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 6 |
| 6 | TPAU West, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 1 |
| 7 | TPAU West, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 2 |
| 8 | TPAU West, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 9 | TPAU West, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 10 | TPAU West w/Luman Undercrossing, SPUI South, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 12 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 13 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 14 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 15 | E/B-W/B Couplet, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 0 |
| 16 | Original Table 1 W, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 5 |
| 17 | Original Lowry W, SPUI South, Lowry/TPAU East | 2 |

Debbie Timms indicated that a couple of the CAC members voted only for one alternative (one person voted for one alternative for first, second and third choice; one person voted for one alternative only as first choice). The top five alternatives were:

- #1
- #2
- #3
- #5
- #16

**4. OPTIONS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

Debbie said that after reviewing the alternatives, considering the CAC balloting, and completing the PDT ballots, the PDT will determine the next steps.

The following represents each PDT member's comments on each of the options: (Note: Nick Fortey was included in the discussion and vote to obtain FHWA perspective.)

<u>6-Lane w/ SE Loop</u>

- Peter: No comment.
- Murray: No comment.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: No comment.
- Brian: No comment.
- Jim: No comment.
- Jerry: No comment.
- Dale: This is a viable option.

<u>8-Lane Diamond</u>

- Peter: Don't think it's viable. It's way too out-of-scale for the area.
- Murray: Kind of like the TPAU East with this, but agree that this is not a viable option because it's too big.
- Nick: No comment.
- Brian: Lots of wasted space with this option.
- Jim: Is too big.
- Jerry: Is too big.
- Dale: Nothing to add.

SPUI North

- Peter: Nothing to add.
- Murray: No comment.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Still question whether this is a viable option.
- Brian: No comment
- Jim: Is a very viable option.
- Jerry: Is a viable option.
- Dale: Is a viable option.

SPUI South

- Peter: Don't like the SPUI South.
- Murray: No comment.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Not a viable option.
- Brian: No comment.
- Jim: If a SPUI is forwarded, we need to develop something between the north and south locations. North is not as viable as the south SPUI.
- Jerry: Is less viable than the other SPUI, primarily because it limits options on the west side.
- Dale: Nothing to add.

PBA West

- Peter: Nothing to add.
- Murray: Really like this option. It is far superior to others.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Is a viable option.
- Brian: Is a viable option.
- Jim: Is a viable option.
- Jerry: Is a viable option.
- Dale: Is a viable option. Look at narrowing the lanes and accommodating bicycles. See if there's room to squeeze down the cross-section.

TPAU West Side

- Peter: Operates better than others. Is a viable option. Two Bear Creek crossings is a negative.
- Murray: No comment.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Favor the PBA option over this. Two Bear Creek crossings is negative.
- Brian: No comment.
- Jim: Is a viable option. Has good and bad points. Two Bear Creek crossings and forcing traffic through Ray's are bad points. Improved traffic flow is a good point.
- Jerry: Increased costs are associated with this option. Is less viable than other options. There is poor public support for this option.
- Dale: Is a viable option, but the two Bear Creek crossings is a negative. Not having to make tight angled turns is a possible negative. This is second choice on the west side.

Eastbound/Westbound

- Peter: Don't like this option; it's a confusing mess.
- Murray: Agree with Peter.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Agree with Peter.
- Brian: Agree with Peter. Not in favor of this option.
- Jim: If grades don't match for other options, this could work as alternate.
- Jerry: Don't support this option, but may have to relook at access road under the I-5 structure for another option.
- Dale: No comment.

TPAU w/ Luman Undercrossing

- Peter: Option is confusing.
- Murray: Confusing.
- Nick: Confusing.
- Dan: Confusing.
- Brian: Confusing.
- Jim: Confusing.
- Jerry: Option maximizes impacts to the creek; not in favor of this option.
- Dale: Nothing to add.

Original Table 1 West

- Peter: Alignment is by far the best operationally. If we can narrow the cross-section to reduce impacts to Highway 99, this is definitely a viable option.
- Murray: No; don't like this option.
- Nick: No comment.
- Dan: Has two Bear Creek crossings and heavy impacts to businesses.
- Brian: Echo Peter's comments. This option (including signals) sets up the system for the long-term growth. Would like to see evaluation of reduced cross-section. Two Bear Creek crossings is a negative.
- Jim: Growth is going to happen. This is the option that will accommodate that growth. If a smaller cross-section is constructed, is concerned about where funding for future improvements would come from. At this time, local input to the RVACT focuses on starting small and getting bigger as needed.
- Jerry: Is a viable option with modifications. Need to look at refinements. There is a benefit to widen at some specific locations, but is not in favor of full build-out in some locations. Option received support from some CAC members.
- Dale: Nothing to add.

Original Lowry West

- Peter: Doesn't like this option. Alignment is not as good as others. Option prevents reasonable access to Ray's. Option has fatal flaws. Handles growth the worst of the options.
- Murray: No—don't support this option.

- Nick: This has improved intersection alignments, but the impacts to Ray's are problematic. Thinks a similar option should be forwarded that doesn't have these flaws.
- Dan: No comment.
- Brian: No comment.
- Jim: Like that this option lines up with Cheryl, but also don't like that it lines up with Cheryl.
- Jerry: We have other, more viable options.
- Dale: No additional comment.

N. Phoenix Thru

- Peter: Is a very viable option—the top one for the east side. This N. Phoenix Road alignment allows for future growth. Option has the best traffic operations by far on the east side. In actuality, even though the route is slightly longer for the neighborhood, the time would be less than the options along Fern Valley Road.
- Murray: Kind of like this option, but do not like the SPUI, which is the only intersection option this one hooks into. Would like to know if this can be done with a diamond interchange.
- Nick: Like this option, but it depends on what interchange it is combined with. This option has a regional tie-in to the network. It is a reasonable option.
- Dan: Echo Murray's comments.
- Brian: No comment.
- Jim: Option divides Phoenix. David Lewin said that though it looks like it would divide Phoenix, it is logical to consider for the future. Is a very viable option.
- Jerry: Absolutely a viable option. It is the best option to handle the traffic that wants to go north. The CAC indicated moderate support for this option.
- Dale: This is a viable option. Is concerned regarding connectivity to Fern Valley Road. However, all of the east side options have some issues. Hopefully, we can find the best combination of the options to develop a better solution. Even though it's a faster route, it seems that it's not a smooth connection to get to Fern Valley Road.

Lowry TPAU East

- Peter: Is a compromise solution; pulls traffic away from Phoenix Hills compared with the PBA East option. Option minimizes truck disruption. Is much better for pedestrian movement. Has concerns regarding forcing left turns. This intersection falls apart with long-term growth. 20% growth will result in substantial impacts—including 1,000-foot queues. Can support this option, but with lots of reservations.
- Murray: Support this option. It moves trucks away from housing. People would still have to go to Breckinridge for access, and that is somewhat problematic. Can support this option; it is a very viable option.
- Nick: Is a reasonable option. The question is how well it will accommodate future growth. Likes that it moves traffic away from the neighborhood and likes the routing of truck traffic.
- Dan: Is a viable option.
- Brian: Is a viable option.
- Jim: Because of the information that Peter gave regarding accommodating major growth, this is not a viable option.

- Jerry: Peter's sensitivity analysis was helpful. This is a compromise option. It may restrict future growth on the east side, but it is a viable option.
- Dale: Is probably better than the other direct Fern Valley Road connection to the interchange. Is concerned that a major amount of traffic has to make a left turn. But it is still a viable option.

PBA East Side

- Peter: Cannot live with this option. All of the traffic would have to go by the neighborhood. The problem remains the same as today, but amplified. Trucks will potentially turn wide close to the interchange; the turning bays close to the edge of the street will only hold a couple of trucks. This would interfere as trucks back up in a major way. Option is extremely unfriendly to pedestrians. There is no way to have a sidewalk on the south side due to truck impacts. However, because of the dual lefts and right, this option is dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists on the north side. There is a high chance of conflicts between bikes/pedestrians and traffic with this option.
- Murray: No comment.
- Nick: The central issue is the location of the truck service station. Options result in problematic truck operations. It's not clear how we'll separate out the truck traffic. We should look at acquiring the property. Need to determine how we'll address truck access and delay—that's the central issue with this option.
- Dan: Agree with Peter.
- Brian: Agree.
- Jim: Not a viable option because of wide driveway at truck station location.
- Jerry: Can't add much more. We've tried to compromise on many items. Struggles with this option because we're still mixing truck and through traffic. Don't feel it's a viable option.
- Dale: Option would result in same problems that we have out there already. Am not totally in favor of any east side option at this time.

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Lewin: Dave said that he is a member of the CAC, which goes back more than two years. There are three sets of concerns the CAC has consistently heard regarding the project:

- Noise and pollution in proximity to neighborhoods.
- Bear Lake Estates not wanting out-of-direction travel for access.
- Effect on businesses along Highway 99.

Glen Archambault: There is no way to get around the engineering requirements for trucks. One of the problems is the number of slow trucks and poor traffic operation. Glen said he doesn't see any options that will solve all of these problems. Any solution will not solve handling the increasing number of trucks.

## 6. BALLOTING

Debbie emphasized that the PDT is not voting to select alternatives to go into the Environmental Assessment, but is identifying which alternatives/options should be further reviewed before making a final selection.

The ballots were tallied, with the following results:

| Alt/Option # | Description | Number of Votes |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | PBA West, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 3 |
| 2 | PBA West, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 5 |
| 3 | PBA West, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 4 | PBA West, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 5 | PBA West, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 8 |
| 6 | TPAU West, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 2 |
| 7 | TPAU West, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 8 | TPAU West, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 9 | TPAU West, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 10 | TPAU West w/Luman Undercrossing, SPUI South, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 11 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 6 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 12 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 6 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 13 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 8 lane, Lowry/TPAU East | 0 |
| 14 | E/B-W/B Couplet, Diamond 8 lane, PBA East | 0 |
| 15 | E/B-W/B Couplet, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 0 |
| 16 | Original Table 1 W, SPUI North, N. Phoenix Thru | 5 |
| 17 | Original Lowry W, SPUI South, Lowry/TPAU East | 1 |

The four alternatives receiving the highest number of votes were:

- #1
- #2
- #5
- #16

Debbie said that, at this point, the PDT needs to determine what needs to be done next to move the process forward.

**Discussion:**
Jerry said that the PDT has voted on which alternatives should be discussed further. This information needs to be taken back to the next joint CAC/PDT meeting, and the CAC will formally vote to recommend alternatives/options for further evaluation. The PDT will then make a formal decision on which alternatives to forward for refinement.

Jerry said that there is close agreement on the CAC and PDT with three of the alternatives. Further discussion is needed on the PBA East Side options. He doesn't see any reason to continue evaluating any alternatives that received 0, 1 or 2 votes.

Dan said that it appears the PDT doesn't line up with the CAC on alternative #1. Regarding other alternatives, we shouldn't spend more time discussing them.

Peter said that the total PDT and CAC votes are above 10 on four alternatives. There's a clear break point. He feels that we should reduce the number of alternatives to four.

Murray said that cream rises to the top. He's comfortable with the vote, and feels we've come a long way.

Jim said he agrees this is what should be done, and that it will be interesting to compare the alternatives.

Brian said that we have quite a variety. Once we get the 3-D information on the alternatives, we'll be able to evaluate them side-by-side.

Dale asked how we reduce the four alternatives. Jerry said that we'll have further discussions. Ultimately, we'd like to get to the top two alternatives to advance to the EA. He's not comfortable forwarding 3 or 4 alternatives into the EA.

Nancy Reynolds asked when the 3-D information would be available for the alternatives. Jerry said that eventually Brian will have to look at the cut/fill lines to see how different the alternatives would be. Brian said that he we now need to add vertical alignments. Jerry indicated that we should just do 3-D on those alternatives where we have to. We can get some idea of potential impacts through topographic mapping.

Dan asked what additional information would be provided before the next meeting. Brian said that we'll show each whole alternative. It's important to get maps that show how each will function. Jerry said that the Access Management Team would meet to get some clarity on those alternatives that have not yet been evaluated for access management restrictions. Debbie said that we'd pull together a subteam on bike/pedestrian issues. Brian indicated the importance of needing to have this information available prior to decisions.

Nick said that it is important to incorporate the 3-D specifics on the alternatives so we can compare the impacts. He felt we needed more information to help sort through the alternatives. This includes: How does the truck circulation system work? Is this something we can solve? We need to know that it will work. There is an additional layer of information needed to help us make better decisions at the next meeting.

Jerry summarized the additional work that needs to be provided at the next meeting based on this discussion:

- Truck turning movements and circulation
- Access issues
- Bike/pedestrian accommodation
- 3-D at critical crossings

Brian said that when he gets the 3-D data determines whether he can produce the designs before next month's meeting. He felt he could start the 3-D for the crossing and on Highway 99. He

said access issues are probably doable this month, and the bike/pedestrian issues is more of a discussion.

Jerry asked if any more detail was needed. None was identified.

Jim asked if there was funding available if we build a scaled-down version, and then find we need to make more improvements to update the facility. Debbie said that since Highway 99 is a state highway, requests for additional funding would be through the STIP process. At this time, she could not say what funding may or may not be available.

The next PDT meeting will be a joint meeting with the CAC. There is support for moving the venue to the theater, if possible; it worked well last night.

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Lewin: David said he voted for #16, but wants to know more about the potential for reducing the cross-section. He wondered if we reduce the turn lanes, will it still function? He said we need to see if we can adapt this alternative and still keep it viable. He said that part of the choice would be driven by funding. He said that we need more detailed the cost information. If the SPUI is much more expensive than the 6-lane, it would change where he puts his emphasis. He wants to know the result of delaying the project until funding is available. He wants to see the 6-lane and SPUI go forward to see if cost is a deal breaker.

Pat Folger Angelo's Pizza: He supports the PBA West option, the Diamond and SPUI interchanges. He said that none of the options work on the east side.

Wanda Long, Norton Lumber: She said that Norton Lumber did a 3-D model of a SPUI. They would be happy to donate it for ODOT use. (Jerry and Brian indicated that this model is different from the technical topographic 3-D model they need to determine cut and fill lines.

Tani Wouter: She said that #5 and #16 alternatives are the same except for the design on the west side.

Lenny Neimark: Lenny said that Art (Area Manager) needed to hire an assistant for Brian (due to the amount of work that needs to be done). He said that PBA made a visual representation, and that, with the technical topographic information, both would be helpful. He encouraged use of both. He also said a critical point is that Highway 99 is the lowest common denominator. If we decide on the PBA west option for the first phase, he asked if we could present a list of ways traffic problems could be resolved later. He asked if we have to go with an alternative that provides for maximum growth now; he wondered if we could look at something else to address the problems later (e.g., widening Highway 99, alternate routes, etc.).

Debbie said that it helps to know what the City of Phoenix wants. Lenny said he doesn't know what the City wants at this time. Debbie indicated that an important point regarding the Highway 99 issue is whether it can be phased—and how the town could be planned to help phasing.

Dan said that the City of Phoenix can request assistance through the TGM (Transportation Growth Management) Quick Response program to bring in planners, engineers, and designers to come up with ideas on what Highway 99 could look like in the future. It's an option that could be considered. Jim said that this is probably a good idea. The City needs to look at the Transportation System Plan, modify the plan, and dovetail it to the City Center Plan—to see how it would look in the future. Debbie said that she's not sure this needs to be part of this (EA) process; she would discourage these planning efforts being combined because of the potential to delay the project. Jim indicated that the alternatives could be tweaked by the IAMP (Interchange Area Management Plan). Lenny said that he understands the importance of not slowing down—but that we need to look at the impacts on Highway 99 and make intelligent decisions. Jerry asked if Lenny's question is whether Highway 99 can be widened. Lenny indicated he was asking if there is a short list of how to address Highway 99 in the future if we use a smaller footprint now. Tani asked what if we don't have enough information now (to make the decision). Jerry indicated that we have baseline information. Nancy said that if an alternative is included in the EA, we'll thoroughly evaluate the alternatives and options regarding whether they are consistent with plans.

Lenny asked if there was a hybrid SPUI or some other alternative to resolve the issue on the east side. He asked whether we can get more fine-tuned cost estimates. At this point, the least expensive alternative is $55 million, which is more than the funding available. Glen Archambault added that there's a lot of land that is currently zoned for EFU, but that it is possible the land could be rezoned, and that the price for the EFU property could be higher. Susan Landis (ODOT) said that it depends on what has been planned. Bruce Marlow (ODOT) said that it is important to know whether the local jurisdiction plans to expand the urban growth boundary. The property appraisals are based on the highest and best use of the land as zoned. The key is whether it is legal to establish a particular land use on a piece of property (not just whether it is desired by the landowner). Glen indicated that these will be substantial issues. Bruce said that the timeframe of the zone changes is the key issue.

Jim asked whether there is a $40 million budget limit. Art Anderson said that we have $42 to 45 million at this time. If we get to an alternative that costs more, we can look at several methods to address the cost issue:

- Can we garner additional funding?
- Can we phase the alternative?
- Can the alternative be funded in a future STIP cycle.

## 8. COMFORT CHECK

Dale: He's happy with the process, and looking forward to evaluating the alternatives that are left.

Jerry: We've had good meetings (yesterday and today), and he's glad to see that the CAC and PDT are on the same page.

Jim: He's happy that folks are comfortable with where we are.

Brian: Is fine.

Dan: Is fine.

Nick: Is comfortable. The key will be getting additional information. Regarding the issue of cost, he wouldn't want that to be an impediment to advancing the best alternative. If the best alternative costs more, then politically, folks will need to ask what other projects could be deferred to help with this funding. He feels it's important not to put an artificial limit on which alternatives to advance at this point. What we're looking for is a long-term option. He said he feels it's important not to not advance an alternative just based on cost. Keep our options open.

Murray: Feels it was smart to put the CAC and PDT meetings together. It has helped. He's pleased with how things have gone.

Peter. Is satisfied.

Nancy: Would like to reiterate what Nick said. We really don't know the final costs at this stage. Costs can change dramatically based on right of way, hazardous materials, etc.

Art: We want to build the best alternative, even if we have to delay the start so it can be built.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next PDT meeting will be a joint meeting with the CAC on November 1 in Phoenix.

**PRE-MEETING INFORMATION PROVIDED**

1. PDT agenda
2. Matrix summary for west side, interchange and eastside options (included traffic operations, pros and cons)
3. Design options (on website)
4. TPAU Fern Valley Interchange Options, Sensitivity Analysis
5. Fern Valley Interchange alternatives cost and mix-and-match chart
6. FVI bike lane memo
7. Joint CAC/PDT agenda for October 4
8. Joint CAC/PDT September 6 meeting minutes
9. CAC/PDT cover memo (regarding alternative screening process)

(Note: CAC ballot summaries and ballots for PDT voting were provided at the meeting.)