

ELDERLY MOBILITY STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

Meeting Notes

November 29, 2000

Maricopa Association of Governments Offices  
302 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Phoenix, AZ

ATTENDING:

Maxine Anderson, City of Phoenix, HSD Senior Services

Melissa Bauer, Maricopa County Special Transportation Services

Terry Boyer, Foundation for Senior Living

Kristi Haas for Donna Brower, City of Scottsdale

Betsy Buxer, The Community Forum

Michael J. Cynecki, City of Phoenix, Street Transportation Department

Cydney Demodica, ADOT/MVD

Martha Dennler, DES/A&AA

Harvey Friedson, Computran/AARP

Peggy Jones, Councilmember of Avondale

Mary Lynn Kasunic, Area Agency on Aging

Gregg Kiely, Arizona Department of Transportation

Mary Kihl, ASU College of Architecture and Environmental Design

Maureen Mageau-Decindis, RPTA

Rev. Fran Park, Northwest Valley Regional Community Council

Chuck Post, American Red Cross

Nicolaas Swart, Maricopa County DOT

Arlando Teller, City of Phoenix Aviation

Claudia Walters, Councilmember of Mesa, Discussion Leader

ABSENT:

Margot Cordova, Valley of the Sun United Way  
Terri Collins, RPTA

Alberto Gutier, Governor's Office of Highway Safety

Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear

Norma Quevedo, City of Surprise

Phyllis Smith, Maricopa County DOT

Mary Lynn Tischer, Arizona Department of Transportation

Charles Ullman, PORA

MAG STAFF:

Eric Anderson

Sarath Joshua

Brande Mead

Suzanne Quigley

Christopher Shipley

Dennis Smith

Mary Thomson

RPTA

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m. by Councilmember Claudia Walters of the City of Mesa. She thanked everyone for attending the second meeting of the Working Group.

2. Review of October 25, 2000 Meeting Notes

Councilmember Walters asked members of the group if there were any questions or comments regarding the discussion from the first meeting held on October 25, 2000. There were none.

3. MAG Long Range Transportation Plan –Eric Anderson

Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the new Regional Transportation Plan that is currently being developed with the help of the URS consulting firm.

Mr. Anderson stated that the Regional Transportation Plan will replace the existing MAG Long Range Transportation Plan which was developed by a study in the late 1950's. The freeway system that the prior plan focused on is almost completed. Mr. Anderson noted that the metro area is growing very rapidly. Currently, the population in the region is approximately 3 million. By 2040, the population of Maricopa County will have more than doubled to over 6 million residents. By 2025, one in five people in the region will be over 65 years of age. A new Plan is needed to take into account these drastic changes in demographics and the maintenance of the new freeway system. Mr. Anderson showed a traffic map projected for year 2040. MAG transportation model projects that the majority of the region's freeways and major streets will be operating at level of service F or grid lock. This congestion problem will have serious implications for the Valley especially on the older population.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG just signed a consulting contract to begin Phase 1 of the plan development process. The purpose of the Plan is to provide a new policy framework to guide transportation investments over the next 20 years. There will be an emphasis on public involvement to ensure broad-based public support. The development of the Plan will also be integrated with local as well as statewide transportation planning efforts.

Phase I is a twelve month process which seeks to define the key issues, policies, goals, objectives, as well as establish performance measures and priority criteria. Mr. Anderson noted that the planning horizon is beyond 20 years. The key milestones in Phase II are to develop the Plan's priorities, identify major improvements and corridors, and evaluate improvements. Mr. Anderson discussed the following major tasks of Phase I of the planning process:

- Issue Papers and Expert Panel Forums
- State of the Region Report
- Regional Development and Transportation Values, Goals, and Objectives
- Alternative Growth Concepts and Transportation Options
- Analysis of Alternative Concepts
- Transportation Policies and Strategies
- Performance Measures

• Complete Final Report, December 2001

Mr. Anderson stated that the Expert Panel Forums are an important component of Phase I and hoped that members of the MAG Elderly Mobility Stakeholder Working Group would participate in the forums. The purposes of the Expert Panel Forums is to: (1) examine the external factors and future trends that will affect transportation needs and investment priorities; and (2) provide an opportunity for the community to better understand how the factors and trends will effect this region and impact transportation. He noted that the travel patterns of the elderly population will probably be drastically different in the future. The Baby Boomers will not have similar travel behavior than their parents - there is an expectation to work longer and to be extremely mobile.

There will four half day Forums held two weeks apart starting in February. The topics of the Forums are: (1) Demographics and Social Change; (2) Land Use & Urban Development; (3) New Economy and Technology; and (4) Environment & Resources. Each panel will consist of three to four members, including two nationally recognized experts to provide an overview of nationwide trends and an outsider's perspective on the issues. The intended audience for the forums are elected officials and member agency staff, business and community leaders, and transportation stakeholders. Mr. Anderson stated that issues related to elderly mobility will be addressed in many of the Forums.

A kick-off dinner with a nationally known keynote speaker will be held to initiate the Forums and energize the participants. Mr. Anderson noted that the dinner may be broadcast on city cable stations. The co-sponsors of the dinner and forums are Greater Phoenix??, Westmarc, Arizona Department of Transportation, and Pima Association of Governments. Mr. Anderson concluded his presentation by again encouraging members of the Working Group to participate in the Forums.

Councilmember Walters asked how the Working Group could assist in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan other than participating in the Forums. Mr. Anderson stated that it would be helpful for any data the Working Group collects from focus groups with special populations to be integrated into planning process.

Ms. Kihl asked about the method that will be used to allow for individuals to provide their input other than the kick-off dinner and the expert panels. Mr. Anderson stated that the consultant is currently researching each topical area and identifying national and local experts to determine who should be invited to be on the panels. If members of the Working Group have suggestions about the panel members or input for the overall planning process, they can forward that information to Ms. Quigley.

Rev. Fran Park asked how demographics have been taken into account up till now. Mr. Anderson stated that household survey data has always been used to help develop the prior Regional Transportation Plans. Mr. Anderson then discussed the current Grand Avenue Corridor Study and how the demographics in the Northwest Valley have been taken into

account in the development of the study.

Councilmember Walters thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation and for informing the members how the elderly mobility planing process fits into the overall Regional Transportation Plan development process.

5. Vision/Mission/Values Discussion

Councilmember Walters thanked all the members who provided their vision and mission statements to staff prior to today's meeting. She noted that staff took all the statements and developed a draft mission and vision statement for us to use as a starting point of discussion. She asked the members for their reactions to the statements. Ms. Mary Lynn Kasunic recommended that the phrase "well-understood" be added to the vision statement. She also suggested adding health services to the last line of the statement. With no other comments or modifications offered, there was consensus to approve the following **vision statement** which will guide the elderly mobility planning process:

*By 2025, the mobility options for seniors in Maricopa County will be safe, reliable, accessible, affordable, well-understood, and efficient, allowing for unlimited participation in life, work, social and health services, and recreational activities.*

Councilmember Walters then read the two options presented for the mission statement of the MAG Elderly Mobility Stakeholder Working Group. Discussion ensued about the difference between the two statements. Many of the members agreed that the second statement was too focused on activities or objectives rather than a broad focus for the Working Group. Councilmember Peggy Jones suggested only using the first half of the statement and then listing the action items or objectives under the statement. There was consensus on the following mission statement and objectives :

*The **mission** of the MAG Elderly Mobility Stakeholder Working Group is to provide regional leadership in developing and designing a transportation system that addresses the issues of elderly mobility in Maricopa County.*

*The Working Group will seek to accomplish this mission through the following **objectives**:*

- a. Develop a Regional Action Plan on Elderly Mobility ;*
- b. Utilize input from seniors and middle-aged residents on transportation needs and solutions in the creation of the Plan; and*
- c. Explore the potential to convene a national conference on aging and mobility in the Valley in 2002.*

6. Determination of Issue-Focused Ad Hoc Groups

Councilmember Walters referred to the Key Issue Summary provided in the agenda packet. She noted that the summary was compiled from input received at the August 25, 2000 Dialogue on Aging And Mobility, and the first meeting of the Working Group. The input was provided in response to the question: What are the key issues related to elderly mobility that should be

addressed in the Regional Action Plan? She then asked Ms. Suzanne Quigley to review the document.

Ms. Quigley stated that the input from both meeting show the breadth and complexity of the issue. She also noted that the topical areas listed may not cover all the issues. The common themes regarding the key issues to address that she was able to identify were: Alternative Transportation Modes; Infrastructure; Education & Training; Older Driver Competency; and Land Use. There were also prominent areas or sub-topics under each topical area which will need to be addressed. Again, Ms. Quigley stressed that this is not a comprehensive list of all the issues related to the key areas. The sub-topics noted by the participants were:

#### **Alternative Transportation Modes**

- Improved coordination of existing transit and para-transit services
- Expanding local programs that work
- Identifying new, innovative programs directed to seniors
- Rideshare
- Bus Buddy Programs
- Vehicle Sharing
- Mileage Reimbursement
- Community Bus
- Home Delivery

#### **Infrastructure**

- Signage
- Lighting
- Pedestrian and Bike Paths
- Length of Signals
- Roadway Markings
- Desert Shading
- Improved Access at Sky Harbor
- Intelligent Transportation Systems

#### **Older Driver Competency**

- Adaptive Behaviors
- Recognizing Loss of Capacity
- Medical Screening
- Self/Peer Screening
- Licensing Issues
- Health Care Involvement

#### **Land Use**

- Housing Development
- “Walkable” Communities
- Service Clustering
- Design Issues
- Involvement of Housing Industry

### **Education & Training**

- Improve Public Awareness
- Mobility Education Programs
- Travel Training
- Transit Driver Training
- Clearinghouse of Transportation Options
- Use of Internet
- Health Care Involvement
- Support for Care-givers and Concerned Family Members

Councilmember Walters asked for reactions to the key issues areas and the sub-topics identified. She asked if they covered the key areas related to elderly mobility – if something should be added or if some of the key areas could be combined. Ms. Maureen Mague-Decindis stated that there seemed to be overlap in the sub-topics related to Infrastructure and Land Use. She suggested combining these areas. Ms. Betsy Buxer disagreed stating that they are two very different topics. The items under Infrastructure are specific and the topic of Land Use is extremely broad. Mr. Brian Curtis of URS noted that in the development of the MAG Long Range Transportation Plan, land use and infrastructure issues are addressed separately but they go hand-in-hand. He stated that the sub-topics under infrastructure denoted very specific safety measures that could be put in place fairly quickly, whereas the land use issues are much more broad and complex. Mr. Harvey Friedson stated that if we really are going to approach this from a systems perspective, the two issues need to go together. Councilmember Jones also stated that they should be combined for our planning purposes.

Ms. Mary Kihl noted that there are many other land use issues that are not listed in the summary. Councilmember Walters stated that the role of the Ad Hoc Groups will be to identify the other issues that may have been left out of this summary. This summary should not be looked upon as an exhaustive list of the key issues related to elderly mobility, but as a starting point for the planning subcommittees as they begin to think about recommendations.

There was consensus from the Working Group members to combine the Land Use and Infrastructure categories and to form one ad hoc group which will address the following key issue areas:

- 1) Alternative Transportation Modes,
- 2) Infrastructure & Land Use,
- 3) Older Driver Competency, and
- 4) Education & Training.

Councilmember Walters asked for volunteers to lead the Ad Hoc Groups. She noted that the time commitment will be 4-5 meetings. She noted that the purpose of the Groups will be to develop a set of recommendations for action for each key issue area. She emphasized that the recommendations be action-oriented and implementable. The following members volunteered to lead the Ad Hoc Groups:

Alternative Transportation Modes:	Chuck Post
Infrastructure & Land Use:	Mary Kihl &
Older Driver Competency:	Cyndey Der
Education & Training:	Mary
Lynn Kasunic, Fran Park, Terry Boyer	

Ms. Kasunic requested that the Ad Hoc Groups be scheduled at different times to allow members to participate in more than one Group. Ms. Quigley stated that she will contact the leaders to set up 4-5 meetings on different days. A master schedule will be developed and mailed out to the members with a fax back form for the members to indicate what Group they will participate on. Ms. Quigley also asked members to include on the fax back form the names and contact information of people she should recruit to be on the Ad Hoc Groups. It will be important to broaden the membership of the committees to include experts in each area from around the Valley.

Councilmember Walters noted that as the Groups begin their work - they may come up with issues or recommendations related to the other three groups. She asked that these issues or recommendations be forwarded to Ms. Quigley who will then bring them to the attention of the leaders of the Group.

Councilmember Jones asked staff to provide the members with a list of the phone numbers and e-mails of all the participants on the Working Group.

1. Public Input Ad Hoc Group Report

Councilmember Walters noted that the Public Input Ad Hoc Group met twice this past month to develop ideas for public input activities which will be implemented during the planning process. She asked Ms. Quigley to provide a report on the progress the Group has made thus far. Ms. Quigley thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Group for their work developing the strategies, especially Ms. Mague-Decindis who facilitated the meetings.

Ms. Quigley noted that the members first discussed the type of information they wanted to receive from the target audience and what the Working Group would then do with the input gathered. She also noted that the Group consulted with Dr. Sandi Rosenbloom of the Drachman Institute about her Tucson data on travel behavior and her thoughts on appropriate public input methods for our planning purposes. The Group agreed that the objectives of the public input plan should be to:

- 1) Identify the transportation problems/needs of older adults in Maricopa County.
- 2) Identify the improvements or solutions which will enhance mobility and increase safety.
- 3) Solicit input on needs/solutions according to the four key issues addressed in the planning process (Alternative Transportation Modes, Infrastructure/Land Use, Driver Competency; and Education/Training.)
- 4) Target both older adults and Baby Boomer in the public input activities.

Ms. Quigley stated that the Ad Hoc members have recommended moving forward on two

public input methods:

- 1) Focus groups with seniors, care-givers, Boomers, and agency representatives; and
- 2) Short, user friendly Input Form utilizing a variety of sources, such as
  - ✓ MAG Website and others
  - ✓ Senior Magazines/Newspapers
  - ✓ Libraries
  - ✓ City District Meetings/City Public Information Officers
  - ✓ AARP mailing and/or newsletter
  - ✓ Homeowner/Neighborhood Associations
  - ✓ Area Agency Advisory Group
  - ✓ MAG Title VI Liaisons
  - ✓ Others as identified

The Ad Hoc Group also suggest that the input methods be structured according to the issue-areas the Regional Action Plan will address. This way there will be input for the Ad Hoc Groups to use as they are developing their recommendations for their particular topic area. After talking with Dr. Rosenbloom, the members agreed that data on travel behavior will be gleaned from national studies, the Dr. Rosenbloom's Tucson study, and results of the MAG Household Travel Survey which is due out in September of 2001.

In terms of next steps, the Ad Hoc Group suggests contracting with a research firm to conduct focus groups, design and tally the Input Form results, and to produce a final input report. Also, a part-time MAG Associate will be hired to work with the research firm in designing the input form, administer the form with different community groups, and assist in the preliminary planning for the national conference. Ms. Quigley noted that MAG has set-aside \$50,000 to support the public input activities and to begin the preliminary planning for the national conference. The particular costs associated with the research firm and MAG Associate tasks still need to be worked out.

Ms. Quigley referred to the tentative timeline provided in the Public Input Ad Hoc Group report handout. She stated that it will take most of December and January to identify and secure a research firm and hire the MAG Associate. In order to provide preliminary public input data to the issue-focused groups by April, the focus groups should be conducted and the input form administered during February and March.

Ms. Mague-Decindis mentioned that the Ad Hoc Group did a lot of research on effective public input activities and decided that for the budget that we have focus groups and a short, written survey would be the appropriate methods. She noted that the Group was also considering a telephone survey but chose not to pursue it because of cost. She then discussed what a full service focus group will provide the Working Group. The firms that conduct full service focus group handle the recruiting, screening, payment of the participants, transportation, video production, data analysis, and the development of a final report. The research firm will also design the focus group questions and design the Input Form.

Councilmember Jones suggested bi-lingual translation be used for any tool that is created in the

public input activities. There was consensus that the Public Input Ad Hoc Group should move forward with the strategies presented.

7. Regional Transportation Safety Forum

Mr. Sarath Joshua, MAG Intelligent Transportation Systems Manager, discussed the upcoming Regional Transportation Forum. He noted that MAG has begun to take proactive steps to improve the transportation safety in the Valley. Last year, a work item was identified to hold a forum on transportation safety issues. This will be a first for the region. The purpose of the forum is to bring together stakeholders to begin discussions on how ways to promote transportation safety. He suggested that the MAG Elderly Mobility Working Group be one of the stakeholder groups represented at the Forum. The event is scheduled for March 15, 2001 at the YWCA conference facility at 10:30 a.m. Lunch will be provided to the participants. MAG will be inviting a few of the members from the Elderly Mobility Working Group and pick up the registration fee. Mr. Joshua expects to have 30 people participate in the Forum.

After the morning session, five break-out groups will be asked to identify the five top concerns in their focus area:

- 1) Freeway/Arterial/Intersections
- 2) Pedestrian/Bicycle/Moped
- 3) Emergency Medical Services/911
- 4) Enforcement Issues/Education
- 5) Elderly and School Age Populations.

Ms. Kihl suggested that there would be overlap in both the elderly and pedestrian break-out groups. Mr. Joshua noted that there will probably be some areas of overlap that will have to be addressed.

8. Announcements

Ms. Marty Dimig discussed her Enabling Transportation (E.T.) program in Mesa. She noted that she often encourages seniors to advocate for themselves in working out their transportation problems. If E.T. will not work for them, she encourages seniors to contact their elected officials to talk about their issues. She suggested that advocacy be added as a sub-topic to the Education and Training Ad Hoc Group. There was agreement from the members that advocacy is critical and should be considered during the planning process.

Councilmember Walters again emphasized that the issues presented today under the key issue areas are not a comprehensive list. As the Ad Hoc Groups get started they will most likely identify many more critical issues.

9. Next Meeting

Councilmember Walters suggested rescheduling the next meeting date since it falls so close to the holidays. She noted that staff will work in December to recruit the Ad Hoc Groups and

develop a master schedule of meetings for the four groups. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 17, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in the MAG offices.

10. Adjourn

The meeting ended at approximately 2:30 p.m.