

PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL
PUBLIC WORKSHOP
TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2009
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA

MINUTES of the PUBLIC WORKSHOP OF THE PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL held on May 26, 2009 in the Council Chambers, 201 South Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

◆ CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Wilson called the Public Workshop to order at 1:00 p.m.

◆ ROLL CALL

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL:

Present

Absent

Mayor Wilson
Councilman Bell
Councilman Lamerson
Councilwoman Lopas
Councilman Luzius
Councilman Roecker
Councilwoman Suttles

None

Mayor Wilson explained that a Public Workshop is for the Council to gather information to make decisions. Because of Open Meeting laws, they cannot get together in private and make discussions of three or more. They have a workshop where they can discuss issues, and public comment will be taken toward the end of the agenda.

I. Workshop Purpose and Focus Area

Mr. McConnell noted that they had distributed about 30 copies of the presentation notes, and they have 25 more coming in, and he then began a PowerPoint presentation that addressed:

▶ WORKSHOP OUTLINE

Mr. McConnell said that the purpose of the Workshop was to discuss the Peavine Trail and its significance as a recreational asset of the City and region. Secondly, to identify several trail crossings and third, to consider from a public policy standpoint, how the crossing should be treated, especially in locations where the terrain may not be favorable for grade separations. He noted that while there are several existing grade separations in the Prescott Area, such as Willow Creek

Road, the City has not been faced with new streets coming in through new development and crossing the trail. From a public policy standpoint, they are treading on new ground. The City has no definitive standards requiring grade separations or specifying how crossings are to be handled. The funding implications are substantial, but this is for the formulation of public policy trying to bring to bear objective information and determine what level of service will be provided for street trail crossings.

A particular level of crossing may work but the City may choose to use a higher level of service i.e. a grade separation, when an at-grade crossing would be acceptable considering National practice.

▶ FOCUS AREA

He said that the focus area that afternoon was the Peavine Trail and the vicinity of Granite Dells Ranch and Granite Dell Estates. The specific focus area is in proximity to SR 89A around Side Road.

II. Background – Prescott Peavine Trail

▶ CHRONOLOGY OF THE PEAVINE TRAIL

Eric Smith worked through a chronology of events that lead up to that day with respect to the Prescott Peavine National Recreation Trail. He said the Peavine Trail is the former Santa Fe Railroad that came into Prescott, established in 1893 and flood damage in 1983 caused the railroad operation to end. A&K Railroad Materials, out of California, purchase the railroad and used it for salvage. The Town of Chino Valley was the first Rails to Trails project in the area. They applied for a Heritage Fund Grant to do the first project. They opened their segment of the trail in 1994.

He said the name Peavine comes from a nickname given to the railroad because of the long, twisting wood trestles North of Paulden. The community coalition formed for the Rails to Trails to work closely with the City of Prescott in pursuing transportation enhancement grants which were set up to purchase something like that for transportation and recreational purposes. The first grant was received in 1994 to buy the section from Yavapai Block in the Sundog Industrial Area out to the old 89A.

Mr. Smith said that in 1996, the City adopted a Trails Master Plan emphasizing the importance and potential of the Rails to Trails Program to Prescott. In 1998, the City acquired 5.5 miles from A&K Railroad Materials up to \$325,000. The City also secured a second transportation enhancement grant for Phase II to connect the Peavine Trail to the Town of Chino Valley's Peavine Trail. At the same time the City received a third grant for improvements. Ten years ago Peavine was

opened for non motorized uses. It was the first official trail of the City's Mile High trail system.

In 2001 they received national recognition for trail status for the Peavine Trail and purchased property near the airport for Phase II to connect to the Town of Chino Valley. They then received a fourth Federal grant to do the improvements near the Granite Creek Area. That grant was stalled for many years because they did not own the land. In 2007, they made another purchase which allowed them to anchor the Peavine Trail to just South of SR 89A, which has 15 temporary parking spaces, through an informal agreement with Yavapai County. The trail extends to Watson Lake and then North of Watson Lake it takes in the Granite Dells area that the City has acquired as Open Space.

The Mile High Trail System is more than 40 miles in length, with the Prescott Peavine Trail receiving the highest level of use of any of the trails, with the most diverse use.

▶ PEAVINE TRAIL KEY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Peavine has been identified as a priority in various City plans. It met the criteria of the National Recreation Trail because of its scenic value. With that status, it would bring in more tourism into the area. The grant fit well with the project in purchasing a historic corridor. The trail does not require much maintenance. What little is done is paid for out of park impact fees, bed tax and the General Fund. The long term goals are to maintain it exactly how it is today. They are currently developing a lot of spur trails that take off from the Peavine and provide better access to Watson Lake.

III. Trail/Street Crossings – National Traffic Engineering Practice

Ian Mattingly noted that he would discuss the state of the practice on trail crossing. The purpose is to provide current national practice regarding trail crossing at street intersections which may assist Council in formulating City Policy. Several references were used in gathering his information, which include the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities and the Federal Highway Administrations Equestrian Design Guidebooks for Trails, Trailheads and Campground.

▶ COMMON ENGINEERING PRACTICE ON TRAIL CROSSINGS

Mr. Mattingly said that no national standards exist on grade separation; some agencies have created their own criteria for use. It is generally agreed that a grade separated crossing is preferred, operationally, over an at-grade crossing, whenever it is practical and affordable. This is because of the enhanced convenience of the trail users, and improved safety through the elimination of conflict with cross traffic. With these benefits, grade separated crossings are

typically reserved for roadways classified as arterial or higher, and roadways which demonstrate higher volumes and speed and only as a measure of last resort after other appropriate crossing measures have been tried. It is common practice to use drainage structures as a trail underpass.

He said that equestrian trails most often cross streets at grade, many times using signalized treatments. Agencies must weigh the benefits of grade separation. Each of the following factors should be weighed for its location: street classification, the posted speed, traffic volume, trail volume, and the trail use, proximity to traffic signals and the cost for construction and maintenance and environmental and visual impact.

Slides were shown from Seminole County, Florida of their National Scenic Trail System. They recommend grade separation with streets of 7500 vehicles per day and streets with traffic lights. Alternative crossing treatment is currently used. At-grade with signing and striping were only used on lower to mid volume roads. Optional median used on 2 and 4 lane roadways.

He then showed an enhanced, at-grade crossings using a median and flashing system. Councilwoman Suttles asked if this is what was installed on Gurley.

Mr. Mattingly said that the installation is similar, but this would have flashing beacons which they do not have at Gurley and Summit. They do have enhanced overhead signing.

He then showed a slide of vehicular traffic that is asked to stop for the pedestrian, grade-separated, with continuous flow of trail traffic, and the last example was of a metal truss bridge, used with flat topography.

He said that on grade separated crossings, they may experience reduced use if a shorter, more direct, at-grade route is available, or the ramps have a steep grade. If the structure is built to meet ADA requirements, the maximum grade is 8.33%; it requires resting pads every 30 inches of vertical rise. The ramp would be 200-300 feet to get to 18' clearance at the bottom of the bridge. The greatest portion of the cost for an elevated trail structure is the ramp, which normally represents 75% of the construction cost.

He then reviewed comparative costs of crossing treatments.

Councilwoman Suttles asked who begins to pay for this. She asked if it was the developer, trails group, a bequeath of dollars, or if it was a grant.

Mr. Norwood said that they will talk later to determine if it would be a policy of the City that they do it or it would be something to negotiate with the developer and maybe seek grant opportunities.

Councilman Luzius asked, regarding the conspan precast trail, who determines if it a perfect condition and how is it determined. Mr. Mattingly said that the conspan precast is a concrete, large culvert. It is typically used where there is light traffic above, minimal roadway width above, and not used for drainage. The more expensive one, the 10x10 box culvert is typically used for drainage and may require a pump station. The price of \$180,000, was based on phone bids given to them. It is strictly for materials. It does not include installation or site feasibility studies. He thinks it will be used in a hilly region, where they would cross under a very low volume, two lane roads, at a National Park or something. It is misleading. To date, it has not been applicable to any of the locations that they will talk about later.

▶ PRINCIPAL FINDINGS FROM RESEARCH OF NATIONAL PRACTICE

Councilwoman Lopas asked if the other trail systems that were researched were as rural as this one. She is concerned that children riding their bikes ahead of their parents will not have the same judgment as an adult and they may shoot through an intersection not realizing the danger. She asked if he found trails that were similar.

Mr. Mattingly said that many of the trails are 40, 60, 100 miles in length. They span urban and rural areas. Some are in the East where conditions are not as dry. They do see at-grade facilities being used. Consistency in the design of any at-grade crossings is crucial. If they all look the same to roadway and trail users, once they approach, they will recognize what they are approaching.

Councilwoman Lopas said that if it is someone new to the area, they would not know that they are consistent unless they are from the area. Mr. Mattingly said that the only way to show that to a first time user is to have advanced signing and warnings.

IV. Draft Policy Statement and Tentative Crossing Configurations in the Granite Dells Estates and Granite Dells Ranch Annexation Area

Mr. McConnell said that the objective was to balance the interests to trail users, access to private property, traffic circulation on the City street network and to prudently use public funds. The level of service is the essential consideration for the City. What level of service will be provided to the trail users, at what cost and how uniformly. He then showed a draft policy statement.

Mayor Wilson said that there were two other entities that got part of the trail, Chino Valley and Prescott Valley, and asked if they had a policy. Mr. McConnell said that they were not aware of any.

Mayor Wilson asked if they would be setting a precedent that would have regional implications. Mr. McConnell answered that they would be leading the way.

Mr. McConnell then showed the next slide showing Granite Dells Estates annexed in November of 2007, which he said is also called the Fann Property. The slide showed the anticipated street network for the focus area.

It has not been determined if Side Road will connect to Road 39 and Granite Dells Parkway. If they have the looping on Centerpoint East Drive, they probably would not need Side Road coming all the way down.

The land and the experience are going to change considerably from the old 89A railroad trestle, as they go north to the new freeway. The character is going to change, and Centerpoint East will be a developed area. There will be lots on both sides. One question is how much should be spent to provide an uninterrupted trail experience from old 89A to new 89A. Time is of the essence because Granite Dells Estates has been annexed. They will be coming in with their grading plan in a few weeks and they want to build Road 39. The City needs to figure out what the crossing will look like. Also, they have the interchange project with Centerpoint East Drive and they will need to know what they want the configuration of the intersection to be with the Peavine Trail passing through.

He said that with the first annexation of Granite Dells Ranch, they will be looking at that annexation in June, so the workshop is timely.

Mr. McConnell said that the Peavine Trail at Granite Dells Parkway is a side road connector. This is City property and Granite Dells Estates is not responsible for improvement of the crossing. The suggested treatment is that at Old 89A and the Peavine Trail, the grade-separated crossing be perpetuated. The crossing is narrow and there should continue to be a grade separation.

The second crossing is the Peavine Trail at Road 39 in Granite Dells Estates. Road 39 requires right of way from Cavan and the City and the City is to provide a mutually agreeable crossing location. The traffic projections indicate an at-grade, two lane street crossing. If Road 39 were moved southerly, it would enhance the prospects for a grade separation. But, the hill slopes on the property to the West would be substantial. When they have locations where terrain is not favorable for grade separations then they get into visual and property impacts. They would have to fill and provide long approaches, which could be 200' – 300' long.

He said that one suggestion that has not been discussed publicly is that if Road 39 was an at-grade crossing, and understanding there is equestrian use, it would

make sense to look at the possibility to put in a new trailhead and parking area. This would be accessible from New Granite Dells Parkway and then would ramp up to the Peavine Trail and equestrians could park their horse trailers there. In the long-term future as the trail opens and connects to Chino Valley that would still be an at-grade crossing. Factors, such as practicality and money, have to be brought to bear. The trail experience could be improved by new facilities on the trail, which provide some of the objectives of grade separation.

Indicated Treatment: Road 39 an at grade crossing would work. It would be a safe crossing. There are requirements for signing it. Traffic could be stopped with flashers. It is a two lane road, not a five, or six lane road.

He then reviewed the Granite Dells Ranch annexation area, noting there were three locations - Centerpointe East Drive and then two north of SR 89A.

At Centerpointe East Drive it is the City's responsibility to construct as part of the interchange project. With the interchange project, the temporary trailhead will be moved northerly to south side of 89A with a new parking area. Since it is up north, then if people park there and want to go south into the dells, the immediate conflict would be Centerpointe East Drive and the next conflict will be Road 39.

Mr. McConnell said that Phase I would be an at grade crossing of the East leg of the intersection of Centerpointe East Drive to be used by all trail users. Phase II – an overpass be added to the East side to enhance the level of service. It is fairly flat and they cannot work with the terrain. They will not have the opportunity to use a drainage box. It becomes problematic when they try to provide a grade separation.

He said there are three options which provide flexibility to the City North of 89A while annexation proceeds. It will be a number of years before the development happens on the North side of SR 89 and before the trail is connected up to Chino Valley. The easement has to be bridged with an overpass for trail users.

He then reviewed the three options: Option 1 – trail in existing right of way. The City of Prescott owns this segment of the trail. These locations will have the problem that there are not opportunities for grade separation. It would be cheaper to buy the 17 acres. Option 2 – relocate the trail westerly along the east bank. Option 3 – in the long-term, there could be trails in both alignments.

All of these options are addressed in the development agreement. The starting point is that according to National Traffic Engineering Criteria, they do not anticipate that the crossings with fairly low traffic volume could be at-grade crossings. If they are at-grade, it is difficult to go to the developers and say they have to be grade separated.

When they talk about the Development Agreement and negotiations, the City needs to be fair. It is not an opportunity to get everything they can. It is as a matter of standard practice, trying to be fair and equitable. That is why they talk about policies and standards and uniformity and consistency.

▶ KEY ACTIONS FORWARD

Mr. McConnell said that they are suggesting in every case, for each Peavine Trail crossing, that the configurations of these, whatever they are, would treat them as any capital improvement project which requires public information on a preliminary design, and have preliminary design meetings so public input could be received prior to design and construction.

V. Public Comment

Councilwoman Lopas asked about the Peavine Trail at Centerpointe East and what the trigger was for the overpass. She wondered if there was an urgency to put that in. Mr. McConnell said that it would be having the money to do it.

Councilwoman Lopas asked if it would make more sense to have a loop system in the area of the connector road. Mr. McConnell answered yes.

Mayor Wilson said that no matter what is decided, they need to look at it regionally, if that means getting Chino Valley, Prescott Valley and the County together. Whatever their final determination is, they need more people on board because they do not want to make a unilateral decision.

Councilwoman Suttles asked if they would start with some type of system and ask them to come on board. Mayor Wilson answered that they have to start since Road 39 is upon them. That does not dissuade him from bringing in partners to acquire a regional approach.

Councilwoman Suttles said that they have to start and then send out information to Chino Valley, Prescott Valley and the County. If they are in better shape than Prescott, they can get on board or say that they cannot do it right now.

Mayor Wilson said that he would hope to at least get a dialogue started. The money is a different matter in his mind.

Councilman Lamerson said that it sounds like they are telling their regional partners that they are going to make a policy and ask them if they want to get on board. He asked if it would make more sense to talk to them first.

Mayor Wilson commented that he can only start where he can start. It is a Prescott issue right now. Instead of deciding as a Prescott only issue, he would like to include their partners.

Councilman Lamerson said that he was not arguing that point. He was suggesting that before they start hammering out their policy they should sit with their counterparts to discuss what they are doing. Mayor Wilson said that that may be the next step.

Mr. McConnell inserted that the draft policy approach is to address each crossing on a case by case basis. While there may be an over arching regional policy that emphasizes grade separations, each crossing is different with respect to terrain and property ownership. If the policy embraces a case by case approach, they could deal with it while having the regional dialogue.

Councilwoman Suttles asked if they cannot get regional help, if the trail just end in the Prescott area

Mr. McConnell believed that the actions of the City Of Prescott regarding policy formulation and adoption need not be held up or subject to a regional dialogue. They see the Peavine Trail from Prescott Lakes Parkway up to Hansen as being a done deal. There is still some development and uncertainty north of the freeway. The trail ends at Hansen. At some point in the long term future, which is the focus, there will be a crossing at the Hansen easement.

► PUBLIC COMMENT

Debbie Cotton, 7916 Manley Dr. Prescott Valley, Vice President of Prescott Cycling Club and the clubs ride coordinator, said that for the past 30 years she and her husband have selected their summer vacations by the trail networks for mountain biking. They have been to Park City, Moab, Aspen, Durango, Telluride, Sedona, Scottsdale, Lake Tahoe, and Springfield, Oregon – to name a few.

All of the communities she has gone to offer safe routes to trail systems. They have implemented policies to keep existing trails intact when developers have put in commercial and residential development. They have kept the trails in tact to give people access to the trails with bridges over road crossings or tunnels under. The communities realize millions of dollars a year from bicyclists who seek out these communities. In Park City Utah, when someone rides on the free bus system, it has bike racks, and some of things that the bus drivers will tell them are that developers there are held responsible for offering alternate grade crossings as part of their City policy any time they put development through trail systems. She stayed at a Residence Inn and rode from the hotel to the Peavine. The Lakeview vistas are beautiful. She stopped at local bike shops over last week and pretended to not be local. She asked about trail networks that were available. Every shop told her to see Peavine. It is truly a treasure to the community; one that will be lost if there are at-grade crossings.

She asked the Council to please adopt a policy that will not allow at-grade crossings on the Peavine or any other trail system that is already in their community. She said the slides have shown all of the at-grade crossings in an urban surface street condition. It is sad to see that what they are proposing is to make the Peavine Trail look like that environment. It seems like they could have all of the access coming from new and old 89A and allow a separation of the trail system. She said to look at what Chino Valley and Prescott Valley have already done. When they put in Granville everyone was concerned about the Peavine. They rerouted the trail so the residential development did not interfere at all. They also put in box culvert underneath Glassford Hill Road. She asked Council to look at the good plan that Prescott Valley already has.

Joyce Mackin, 1235 West Merrell, with Yavapai Trails Association. She said that Nygel Reynolds asked her to speak for him first. He e-mailed a letter with specifics on why Peavine is such a special trail. She read his statement to Council and showed two maps.

It stated that Fann's Road 39 is unnecessary. It is only ½ mile south of Centerpointe East and less than 1/3 mile north of 89A Bridge, with a future road planned west to connect to Highway 89. Traffic from the western area has good access to 89A at the Side Road Interchange via Centerpointe East Drive. The map makes it clear that distance via either route is almost the same.

The letter said that If Mr. Fann thinks it is necessary they recommend that Council tells him to build above or below grade at his expense. There is an existing trestle just north of Road 39 which would reduce the cost of an underpass. There is an existing dirt road that goes west from the trestle along the North side of the property almost to the existing Centerpointe East Drive. If a loop is planned, there would be no need for Road 39.

Ms. Mackin pointed out the economic benefits of the Peavine Trail. Hiking and outdoor recreation is a booming business at \$311 billion annually. Walking is the most popular activity in the United States. Trails increase property values and attract corporations. The Peavine provides new commuting opportunities for new business and corporations. The Peavine preserves Prescott's history. She has lived here all her life and when the train was still running. The Peavine is a major tourist attraction as a National Rails to Trails Trail which generates expenditures from tourists of food and lodging.

A survey of 2000 recent homebuyers listed the importance of trails second only to highway access. The Peavine benefits both developers and the City of Prescott. All should be willing to spend what is required to maintain the safety, scenic and free flowing nature of Prescott's most important trail.

The Yavapai Trails Association urges the City Council to support a bridge over Centerpointe East and the elimination of Road 39. She asked that they please do

not allow any dangerous at-grade crossings. She said that the Yavapai Trails Association would be happy to provide many different bridge designs that are appropriate for riders, bikers and hikers.

Christina Gen, 17155 East Rover Way, also representing the Yavapai Trails Association said she would also like to represent trail users in this region from a different perspective; that of someone who has not lived here all their life, who moved to the area specifically for the recreational opportunities provided here. She has lived here for 3 years. She is an avid user of many Rails to Trails across the nation. She has been on Rails to Trails that only use bridges and underpasses with no at-grade crossings. She has used at-grade crossings. She has been involved with other trail users for both types and had a lot of discussions on problems they run into with at-grade crossings.

She said that to address the examples shown in the packet, she thinks that they are fabulous. But they should keep in mind that many of those trail systems were developed after urban interface already existed and they did not have ability to acquire additional right of way to either build ramps for a bridge or to make tunnels under the roads. They were forced to use an at-grade crossing. The City of Prescott has a good opportunity to make precedence regionally and nationally where streets have not already been built. It was pointed out that they cannot distinguish trails by users. There is a lot of movement in the National trails community, that they can separate trails based on who uses them and how they are used.

For example, the Peavine is not in the same classification as a sidewalk. Although in a residential or commercial setting they may be able to build a sidewalk at an intersection with at-grade crossings, the Peavine trail is not an example of that type of trail. The Peavine Trail is sought after by people because it does not have at grade crossings because the entire trail is not in urban interface. They are getting the safety factor and scenic factor and other factors that were all listed in the Grants that were acquired with Federal monies under the assumption that all of those things would continue with the trail, as it is. She agrees with the previous presenter about Road 39, one bullet point missing is that it is expected to have heavy industrial traffic. It may have less lanes than Centerpointe East, but it is expected to carry most of the heavy industrial traffic used by the developers of those parcels. With an at-grade crossing they would need to consider safety, even with flashing lights.

The last point she made was as a member of the working class, in her age generation that is coming in and moving into areas such as this, there has been a lot of talk about how to bring in younger, more green, corporations and if they look at most towns that have been successful, they should look at the employees they hire. She asked Council to please keep in mind that most of the younger generations that they are looking to bring into this area are looking for trails such as the Peavine Trail with no at grade crossing.

Tom Slaback of 715 E. Goodwin, gave a quick background. He was representing the Yavapai Group of the Sierra Club. Back in 1983, the Sierra Club partnered with the Chamber of Commerce, and he feels it is responsible for Rails to Trails through the Granite Dells. They worked to see that the Railroad would be preserved, and with a minimum of 100' right of way, they would also have a rail system on it. He thinks there is something that has been missed. They are only considering this as a recreational trail. As they get all of this built out with new annexations, present and future, they will have a high degree of people living in the North section of the City. The trail will be a high use commuter route, connecting Chino Valley, Prescott Valley and Prescott. He noted that on the presentation made by city staff several examples were made. He has ridden all of them. He has ridden in Washington, D.C. and Tucson and all of the at-grade crossings were dangerous. He also believes that they are in the catbird seat on annexations and they need to make decisions to enforce the trail to be remaining and safe for all users.

He wanted to warn against what has happened with the previous councils. They could have had the full 28 miles and section Sixth Street and the Sundog Ranch area, but they have lost all of those. They need to preserve the sections that they do have and preserve it safe.

Jason Gisi, 3200 Lakeside Village Drive, said that he always has a conflict of interest when he is talking to Council, but today he comes before them as an active trail user. They are a wonderful amenity for City Of Prescott and the region. Practical and affordable are the two buzz words moving forward. The National Traffic safety standards are a guideline to start the discussion. The City of Prescott will be the leader with further development of trails. One size does not fit all. No different than the smart building codes, it is not easy to say they do it one way all the time. He would encourage them all to consider flexibility for City Council's positions. Different topography, grade features, size of roads; it is a case by case basis, and decisions need to be made as such. As a result, along lines of smart building codes, there needs to be flexibility built into policy moving forward.

Councilman Roecker asked if he had any comment on requirement for Road 39. Mr. Gisi answered that regarding Road 39, there is a 15-16 acre parcel on west side of Peavine Trail. It was purchased by Mike Fann to meet state statutes as it related to annexations requirements. The property existed as a cul-de-sac on the Centerpointe East side of the road, with access from north to south. They wanted connectivity from that property into the Granite Dells Estates as it gets developed. It is a two lane road, which is the reason it is an at-grade crossing. In previous workshops, on site and field trips they have discussed that the old 89A crossing exists with the train trestle in place. A separated grade made sense. At grade at Road 39 does not make sense. There is a ripple effect as they play with

that dimension that radiates out to the property on either side of Peavine Trail. He could not tell them how much the cost is. At-grade is cheapest and simplest in that case. If the question is about connectivity, the loop road referenced first time he had seen it was an hour ago is a possible connector.

Councilman Roecker asked if it was possible to eliminate Road 39. Mr. Gisi said that it had not been studied to date. The Development Agreement speaks to mutually acceptable resolutions for the trail crossing. It is interesting that in his mind, as a citizen, that the financial onus is on the City of Prescott as it relates to that crossing. He vividly remembers it being on the board earlier.

Eric Nelson, 731 North Lakeview, Prescott, said that he represents seven members of the Nelson family, ages 1-8 and is a surgeon in Prescott for eight years. He closed his practice to come and comment. He is an avid cyclist and uses the Peavine Trail personally in different ways. He commutes to work at the Tri City surgery center 2-3 times a week. In addition to that, he uses it personally to get to the new technical single track. The third way he uses it is as a family recreation. The Peavine is a special trail because Prescott is not flat. He said that if they want to ride with kids, or walk with a stroller, that is the place to go. He has concerns with at-grade crossings with the kids; he feels uncomfortable with at-grade.

As with houses going up north, they will want to go south to go to the Dells. They will have lots of young families to use this as their place to go. He has also seen motorized wheelchairs on Peavine Trail. He takes photos and posts them on the internet on various mountain bike websites. He gets asked where he lives. People cannot believe that it is Arizona because it is so beautiful. It is grabbing people's attention. The uses are only going to increase. He wanted to encourage the Council to think 30-50 years into the future. When they lose these trails, they are gone. The development comes in and they never get access back. He asked that they make it as convenient as possible. He would prefer not to have at-grade crossings. He understands that they are purchasing things for the future. He intends to stay in Prescott as long as he can work as they love it here.

Rob Halen, 1380 East Valley View Road, said he came to talk in favor of the Peavine Trail. A lot of good things had been said before him. He would be for separated crossings. They have an opportunity here where nothing has been developed to keep the integrity of the trail as it is. It will be a transportation system for non-motorized users between all three cities. There are expenses involved, but there are ways to pay for them, through Transportation Enhancement funds. As he understands it, the match is only 5.5%. It seems like the developer or the City of Prescott should pay. He does not know why the expenses could not be split. If the developer wants a road across the trail, let him pay for the crossing. If the City of Prescott wants it, let them pay. It concerns him regarding the distance from 89A to Chino Valley. They are talking about five crossings in less than a mile. Three of them are at-grade crossings in $\frac{3}{4}$ mile.

With another 15 miles to develop there will be another 40-50 at-grade crossings. He wondered what kind of trail experience that would be. If that is what it is going to be, then all of the traffic needs to stop for the trail users. Let the trail users have the free right of way.

Lisa Barnes, representing Prescott Alternative Transportation, of 1513 Linwood Avenue. She has already heard a lot of good points and will not repeat many of them. She had a few things to add. The proximity to the trail for developers is of value. They have to acknowledge that. When it comes down to cost the developers, residents, will all gain a benefit. When looking at costs, she asked that they not forget that proximity to trail is a value. When thinking about costs, do not forget they are looking at defining their values of this community. She asked what is about this community that they want to value. Even if they look at them case by case, it is not unreasonable to state what their value is of the trail and how it is accessed by vehicular traffic. She does not know what the policy statement should be, but thinks it could be stronger in favor of the trail than what has been proposed.

She likes the matrix from Florida, identifying different roadway characteristics and how roadways should access that trail.

She has been there several times talking about bike lanes, and hearing the argument that bikers should be away from traffic. They would love that and here is a trail that is keeping them away from traffic and now they are trying to integrate traffic across the trail. It is confusing to her, to want to integrate vehicular traffic with nonmotorized traffic, without providing a way where there is no actual interaction.

If they are going to have all the roads crossing, not only maintaining trail integrity over/under roads, but as the area is growing and this becomes part of the network, she wondered how trail users are going to access those roads. That has to be added into the equation. It will be looked at as transportation with development coming.

Mike Fann, 450 Whetstine, said that he agrees with almost everything that had been said. The Peavine Trail is a fabulous asset of the community; it is an asset of development that will go around there. He was not there to advocate at grade or grade separation. He was there to advocate the trail. All of them were there when they were going through the annexation process. Granite Dells Estates is a series of trails to tie into the Peavine and into the Iron King Trail. It is important to him. The Development Agreement does not require him to pay for split-level crossings. He does not have a financial interest in that at all. His opinion is that at grade crossings should be used where they make sense. Split elevation crossings should be used where it makes sense. The City Council makes decisions. There are engineering concerns. His company just finished two

multimillion projects for the Federal Highway Administration. One of a series of projects at the Grand Canyon another one at Big Lake. They built trails and roads systems, many at grade and many split elevation crossings. There is not one size fits all. He supports the staff and Council in making decisions that are best for the community.

His opinion was that split elevation is not necessarily the prettiest for the trail user. If he is at an at grade crossing with 360 views, that is a good thing. If he is using a pedestrian overpass, a chain link fence will be required and he thinks that it takes away from trail user experience. He feels the same about an underpass. If traffic is heavy enough, use it. But if it is not heavy enough, as a trail user he wants views. Going through a tunnel or bridge takes away the visual experience. From a safety standpoint, he understands that. He asked that they please consider this is for equestrian use, mountain bike use and pedestrian traffic. When they put horses and pedestrians in a tunnel there are safety issues. Those are all of the considerations.

Councilman Roecker asked if Road 39 could be eliminated. Mr. Fann said that it could be eliminated if they had control of the other properties. The only thing that is in the City of Prescott is his property and Centerpointe East. Centerpointe East Drive is a long cul-de-sac which the Fire Department and Police Department says no. For safety considerations, Road 39 is a requirement and they do not want to restrict traffic flows any more than you have to.

Kathy Schultz said she was a member of Back Country Horseman of America and a member of Yavapai Trails Association. She wanted to comment on the equestrian use of culverts and overpasses. Her horses go through culverts that are underneath Pioneer Parkway. If they are looking at how the County might view trail use and interfacing with equestrians, bicyclists and pedestrians, she feels that those people have done a good job. Her horses are comfortable going through the culverts. Her horses are also comfortable going over bridges whether there are trees or chain link. Horses can be trained. Just like children, horses can be trained. If they provide alternate crossings, not at grade crossings, they will have a much safer environment. If they are looking at high use trails with all modes of traffic, safety is going to be the #1 concern for those issues.

Dorothy Williamson, 374 Summit Point Drive, said that her husband is president of Prescott Outings Club and they are both directors and she was speaking for senior citizens. At least half of their 180 members are seniors. They are concerned about having a flat place to walk also. Hope they will seriously think about building at grade crossings. It is not safe. Seniors get hard of hearing and they may not hear traffic coming. They would appreciate the Council finding alternate ways of getting across the trails rather than at grade crossings.

Mr. Peters, 640 West Lee Blvd, said he had been sitting there absorbing all of the comments. They are good and poignant ones, including comments made by Mr.

Fann. He has not heard anything about the preservation of historicity, the heritage of the Peavine Trail that has been given. If the City Council is going to be policy trend setters, then they should develop the policy maintaining that heritage. There are plenty of places to develop. They should short circuit the development when it comes to maintaining the heritage and safety of the Peavine Trail. They can do the elimination of Road 39. They can create the Councilwoman Lopas loop. There are plenty of things to be done to eliminate crossings at grade. They have heard it from a representative of the citizens. The citizens have a lot of important things to say. Federal funding has gone into it. Taxpayer dollars have been spent to acquire it. Give it the integrity that it deserves.

Councilman Rocker said that he was keeping score and asked if Mr. Peters was not in favor of any at-grade crossings. Mr. Peters said that if they can do it, bypass the at grade crossings. He has not heard the word speed bump. It is a low cost measure. As they approach a crossing they can put up reduction signs. The \$15,000 seems to be high. If the statistics are correct, they have got five crossings in a mile or so, which is way too many. If they need one, focus on one and put money into that one. For Dr. Nelson and Councilwoman Lopas, who have small children, they can put up preventers, gates to get off bikes, etc.

Jim Knapp, 200 Parker Rd., and member of Prescott Area Advisory Committee. He said that even though there may be other options available, they think that for the safety of pedestrians and bicycles, separated grade crossings will be the safest. As a businessman, he appreciated tight fistness, yet short sightedness would cost a lot in the long run and the cost would be lost opportunity.

VI. Council Discussion/Direction

Mr. McConnell acknowledged that time was short. He suggested that if the City Council had any concluding remarks for that day that would be appropriate. Following remarks, staff will review all of the input made and have additional dialogue as may be necessary. He knew that there would be discussion on Road 39. He will bring it back to the Council within an appropriate time frame.

Councilwoman Suttles noted that the City of Prescott is concentrated on their trail system and the Peavine Trail and the dollars. They are not going to be cavalier, throw this away, because of development. It will have to be a give and take, but to require the City to come in with "x" number of dollars to buy property or require the developer to donate "x" number of dollars, she does not think they can do that. They need to come up with something. They all want the same thing. They are going to take it under advisement to do the best for the most.

Councilman Lamerson noted that at Planning & Zoning, they discussed some of these things and they were negative with at-grade crossings, especially with traffic. They have heard things today that they need to look at. He likes the idea

of the Lopas Loop. He said that Ms. Barnes is right. They have struggled up here for the years that he has been on the Council. He asked how they take bikes and horses away from traffic, not how do they bring the traffic to them.

Councilman Luzius said that as far as the Peavine Trail goes, they must do everything they can to uphold the integrity of that trail. He is for no at-grade crossings. In a younger life he used to hike the Appalachian Trail. Mr. Fann mentioned that they do not want to see chain link fences. Need to do everything they can to uphold integrity of the Peavine Trail.

Councilman Bell said that he thinks that it is evident that they all would like to see the safest solutions to this, and that sounds like the separated crossings. However, he did not hear anyone give them a good suggestion on how to raise the money to build it. The Sierra Club talked about partnering. He asked Mr. McConnell if the developers were obligated to do this.

Mr. McConnell said that with respect to Granite Dells Estates, the developer is not responsible for off site improvements. With respect to Granite Dells Ranch, as they go forward, that is a draft Development Agreement. On the one hand, while there is not a provision in that document to obligate the property owner to provide grade separations, when they look at it, at Centerpointe East Drive, that is a City responsibility. North of 89A there are two crossings into the 17 acre parcel which are tentative. The costs of the crossing is worth more than the land.

Councilman Bell asked anyone with ideas to fund this project to please step forward. Councilman Roecker asked Mr. Podracky if the study shows that a separation of the crossing is not required and an at-grade crossing would be sufficient, if a municipality could force a developer to do something that is not required. Mr. Podracky said that they could negotiation that in future.

Mayor Wilson concluded the meeting because a decision was not going to be made at that point in time. He appreciated the information from Florida which said that it depends on the circumstance. To him it is not black and white. They are looking at it case by case and what is in the best interest for the citizens of Prescott.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business to be discussed, the Public Workshop of the Prescott City Council held on May 26, 2009, adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

JACK D. WILSON, Mayor

ATTEST:

ELIZABETH A. BURKE, City Clerk