MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

November 16, 2011
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Lyn Truitt, Surprise, Chair
* Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale, Vice Chair
# F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee
Ron Barnes, Total Transit
Mayor Bob Barrett, Peoria
* Dave Berry, Swift Transportation
* Jed Billings, FNF Construction
Councilmember Ben Cooper, Gilbert
Councilmember Shana Ellis, Tempe
Councilmember Dick Esser, Cave Creek
* Victor Flores, State Transportation Board
* Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny Mesa, Inc.
Phil Matthews, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
* Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye
Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
* Garrett Newland, Macerich
* Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale
* Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties
Councilmember Jack Sellers, Chandler
* Vice Mayor Thelda Williams, Phoenix
* Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County

* Not present
# Participated by telephone conference call
+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Lyn Truitt at 4:14 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mayor Bob Barrett and Mr. Roc Arnett participated in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Truitt requested that members of the public fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for consent or action items on the agenda, and then turn in the cards to staff, who will bring them to him. He stated that parking garage validation and transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting were available from staff.

Chair Truitt addressed those in attendance who were interested in the South Mountain Freeway. He stated that based upon the regional plan developed by MAG, ADOT is working with the Federal Highway Administration and other federal and state agencies to conduct the engineering and environmental study of the proposed freeway. This Environmental Impact Statement is still being developed and is expected to be out for public review and include a public hearing early next year. Chair Truitt stated that people are encouraged to provide comments through the project hotline at 602-712-7006. He advised that input provided through the hotline will become part of the public record.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Truitt stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. An opportunity is provided to comment on agenda items posted for action at the time the item is heard.

Chair Truitt recognized public comment from Richard Tracy, a resident of Mesa, who said that many mistakes in this region have been made by decision makers that caused people to not visit here. He said that with the sunshine as an asset, tourism should be the number one industry, instead of wanting to compete with South Carolina or Kansas City. Mr. Tracy stated that another mistake, the South Mountain Freeway, is going to be made. He said that the South Mountain Freeway is the road to nowhere. It does not have the traffic, but Baseline Road does and that is where the freeway belongs. Mr. Tracy stated that he had provided material on Fiesta Mall that was deliberately sabotaged by greedy people. He stated that light rail goes to the temple and to a retirement community. Mr. Tracy stated that this will have to be paid for at a later date, and he added that the bus there cost $800,000 over the last ten years. Mr. Tracy stated that light rail should be a priority to the airport. He stated that citizens are entitled to have places to live, work and drive. He stated that the Cardinals stadium should be in Tempe. Mr. Tracy stated that if light rail and the freeway are built where they belong, people would be able to travel to the racetrack without having to experience a three hour trip. Chair Truitt thanked Mr. Tracy for his comments.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Truitt stated that agenda items #4A and #4B were on the consent agenda. He stated that public comment is provided for consent items, and noted that no public comment cards had been received. Chair Smith asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted.

Councilman Esser moved to approve agenda items #4A and #4B on the consent agenda. Mayor Rogers seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the October 19, 2011, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the October 19, 2011, meeting minutes.

4B. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Status Report provides an update on ALCP projects scheduled for work and/or reimbursement in the current fiscal year, program deadlines, revenues, and finances for the period between April 2011 and September 2011. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

5. Update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study

Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer, provided an update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS). He said that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are in the process of completing the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the widening of I-10 between SR-51/SR-202L Red Mountain Mini-stack and SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain Pecos Stack interchanges. Mr. Hazlett reported that the EIS will allow reconstruction of I-10 to provide capacity improvements to the corridor, which could accommodate more than 400,000 vehicles per day. He stated that a Record of Decision is anticipated for 2012.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the improvements from 32nd Street to the Pecos stack are funded, but the improvements from 32nd Street to the Mini-stack are not funded. He noted that the entire project cost is estimated at $1.5 billion. Mr. Hazlett stated that some questions have been raised by some MAG member agencies about the need for alternative transportation options in this corridor, such as public transportation, as well as whether the 24 lanes proposed for the Broadway Curve on Interstate 10 is needed.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Southeast Corridor Major MIS was begun in Fall 2010. He noted that the final recommendations would be brought back to the TPC in the near future. Mr. Hazlett stated that there are numerous roadway, transit, and non-motorized related ideas for the corridor, and to make it easier the options were put into bundles instead of being looked at individually. He stated that they referred back to the Transit Framework Study for consistency.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the first bundle they looked at was the Basic Mobility Bundle, which looked at some improvements to I-10 and adding bus rapid transit to Central Avenue and Southern Avenue. He stated that they looked at whether the footprint of 24 lanes could be tightened up and still accommodate travel demand, and the recommendation of the project's planning partners to consider a managed lanes approach to Interstates 10 and 17.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Peer Competitive Bundle, which would include transit on par with cities such as Dallas, Denver, or San Diego. He said that options in this bundle include commuter rail

from Union Station in downtown Phoenix to the Kyrene branch, high capacity transit on Rural Road, bus rapid transit on Central Avenue and Southern Avenue, additions to the modern streetcar, and managed lanes along Interstates 10 and 17.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the Transit Focus Bundle requires significant funding. It adds on the Peer Competitive Bundle and includes high capacity transit on Central Avenue, Southern Avenue and Rural Road and adding to the SkyTrain operation through the Cotton Center to connect to Sky Harbor Airport. Managed lanes were also identified for Interstates 10 and 17.

Mr. Hazlett then reported on the differences between the I-10 Corridor Study EIS and the Southeast Corridor MIS managed lanes concept by looking at the Regional Transportation Plan planning segments of SR-51/Loop 202 to the Interstate 17 split, the Interstate 17 split to US-60, and US-60 to Loop 202 Pecos stack. He said they are essentially the same except for the addition of HOV lane improvements in the Southeast Corridor MIS. Mr. Hazlett stated that the I-10 Corridor Study EIS identifies 11 traffic lanes each direction in the area from the I-17 split to US-60 and the Southeast Corridor MIS identifies eight traffic lanes and premium Direct HOV (DHOV) ramps, alternative interchange geometrics, and managed lanes connecting to I-17.

Mr. Hazlett pointed out the existing and identified DHOV ramps on a map. He said that the Southeast Corridor MIS is looking at additional DHOV lanes that would get people into the right traffic lanes instead of them merging across traffic. Mr. Hazlett displayed a picture of a Direct HOV ramp configuration in Bellevue, Washington.

Mr. Hazlett addressed high capacity transit being studied in the Southeast Corridor MIS and explained the concept of Transit Oriented Parkways to provide exclusive right-of-way for high capacity transit. He said that improving transit travel time could increase ridership, but the concept is expensive. Mr. Hazlett stated that the three bundles were evaluated to determine performance. He noted that in the Transit Focus Bundle, about 20,000 of the 26,100 ridership projection was on high capacity rail, due to better station spacing and greater speeds gained through its own right of way.

Mr. Hazlett then explained that the model showed that fewer lanes using the managed lanes concept could improve a travel speed of approximately 28 miles per hour (mph) to more than 46 mph. He noted that managed lanes are included in all three bundles. Mr. Hazlett commented that he thought a lot of the improvement is attributed to the premium Direct HOV ramps and getting the right traffic in the right lanes.

Mr. Hazlett summarized system travel time savings. He said that travel time savings with building I-10 only is projected at 61,673 hours per day; building the South Mountain Freeway only is projected at 229,416; building the South Mountain and I-10 improvements is projected at 266,167, and building the South Mountain Freeway and I-10 improvements with managed lanes is projected at 372,964 hours per day. Mr. Hazlett remarked that it is counterintuitive that building a freeway with a smaller footprint would have greater travel time savings than a freeway with more lanes.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the time savings applied to the prevailing wage rate gave a net present value of investments over 20 years for each building scenario. He showed the system benefit cost ratio based on travel time savings for the South Mountain Freeway alone is a nine, and he added that in his experience, anything above a three is pretty good.

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, stated that this study is on the southeast valley, but the same principles could be applied to I-10 west to add transit and increase speeds in the general purpose lanes. Mr. Smith noted how Mr. Hazlett checked and rechecked the model because increasing vehicle speeds with fewer lanes is counterintuitive. Mr. Hazlett stated that besides checking the equations, he contacted his associates around the country who had worked on managed lanes concepts, and they indicated that travel times improved on facilities that had fewer lanes but utilized managed lanes. Mr. Hazlett noted that combining managed lanes with DHOV ramps is especially helpful between SR-143 and US-60, where there currently is a lot of weaving.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the preliminary benefit to cost ratios for transit projects in the Peer Competitive and Transit Focus bundles are pretty healthy. He mentioned the Transit Oriented Parkways concept he addressed earlier gives transit a competitive edge by getting transit in its own right of way so it is not subject to traffic signals, intersections, etc. Mr. Hazlett stated that one concept was to build the Southern Parkway on Southern Avenue. By itself, it is a .68 benefit to cost ratio, but when added to the transit focus, this project increases to a 3.14. Mr. Hazlett also noted that even simple restriping jobs are quite beneficial.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the study team has met with technical staff in Chandler, Phoenix, and Tempe and will be meeting with Guadalupe. He said in the next steps they will be examining the additional projects that came from this study as requested by member agencies, completing the analysis and identifying recommendations, and eventually incorporating the findings into the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Hazlett stated that the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study has a full public process and the team would like to vet the recommendations of the Southeast Corridor MIS through that process.

Chair Truitt thanked Mr. Hazlett for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Ms. Taylor stated that an analysis had been done on I-10 with 24 lanes and on I-10 with managed lanes and the South Mountain Freeway. She asked if an analysis had been conducted on just the managed lanes. Mr. Hazlett replied that this analysis had not yet been conducted, but is on their list of items to be done.

Councilmember Esser stated that ADOT is anticipating completion of the EIS in early 2012, and the agenda material mentions no public input has been received. He asked when and how the Southeast Corridor MIS would be presented to the general public. Mr. Hazlett replied that the EIS will clear the maximum footprint for I-10, which is more of a technical effort. He stated that they anticipate going to the public in three to four months with the information on the bundles. Councilmember Esser asked if they intended the timeframe would be March or April 2012. Mr. Hazlett replied that was the approximate timeframe.

Councilmember Sellers expressed he was glad to see that Arizona Avenue was included in the Transit Bundle, and he added that he had been concerned that the Southeast Corridor stopped at Loop 101 and he would be anxious to see the results. Mr. Hazlett clarified that the modeling for the Transit Bundle continues to downtown Chandler and does not end at Loop 101.

6. Sustainable Transportation - Land Use Integration Study

Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, stated that she was continuing the effort begun by Kevin Wallace, who began the study in January 2011, but has left MAG to assume the position as the Executive Director of the Spokane, Washington, MPO. She said that the origins of the study came out of MAG transit and commuter rail framework studies and input and requests from member agencies. Ms. Yazzie stated that the study is to help regional and local agencies know what they need to have in place to have high capacity transit, bus rapid transit, or light rail transit and the land uses that integrate with a sustainable transit network.

Ms. Yazzie stated that four meetings have taken place with stakeholders and transit partners. She said they are working on developing policies and tools and have been poring over detailed analyses. Ms. Yazzie stated there are five key components of the study: research & analysis, identifying potential mobility priorities, scenario modeling, policy development, and strategy.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the research & analysis element is complete. She said that this included research on best practices; integration of ULI panels made up of the development community, bankers, and economists; a regional market analysis of housing and employment demographics and land use; and a high capacity transit analysis.

Ms. Yazzie displayed a map of the land use around the Regional Transportation Plan transit corridors that show opportunities to enhance the transit corridors already identified and also to change the land use to encourage transit ridership. Ms. Yazzie spoke of factors for sustainable transportation performance.

Ms. Yazzie reviewed the findings of the ULI Focus Group panel. She that the panel identified obstacles to infill opportunities and that the government needs to change its way of thinking. Ms. Yazzie said that the panel expressed that infill is hard to do and it is easier to develop in the urban fringe and the market will dictate where development goes. She said that the panel consistently expressed interest in bus options and encouraged looking at rubber tire transit as a sustainable transit option. Ms. Yazzie stated that bus rapid transit has identified stations with dedicated right of way or signal priority access. She said that another message heard consistently is one size does not fit all as there are employment centers throughout the Valley.

Ms. Yazzie reported that staff will be working with transit leadership in the next couple of months on potential mobility priorities that will lead to sustainable transportation. She said this will provide the direction to move to the next phase, which is scenario modeling. Ms. Yazzie stated that three scenarios will be modeled: transit ready corridors, transit supply, and transit productivity.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the last component is strategy of recommended policies, programs, investments, and pathways. She noted that pathways will be a tool that helps agencies and the region come together and address three aspects of land use and two aspects of transportation integration. Ms. Yazzie stated that a goal is what type of land use will help riders get to transit and have a sustainable transit network.

Ms. Yazzie addressed next steps. She said they are working with mobility priorities and transit partners, reviewing the scenario modeling and reporting, holding one-on-one meetings with member agencies, conducting the second ULI Panel in February 2012, and holding the fifth stakeholders meeting in February 2012. Ms. Yazzie stated that they anticipate completion of the study in spring or early summer of 2012. She noted that relevant documents are posted on the bqaz.com website.

Chair Truitt thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report and asked members if they had questions.

Ms. Taylor referenced the ULI comment that incentives for development were around the fringes. She asked if there had been discussion at any of the stakeholder meetings on how to change that dynamic and encourage infill development. Ms. Yazzie replied that no solutions had been discussed at this point, and she anticipated at the end of the study with the final strategy with policies, programs and investments, would be the time when they will be able to integrate the comments and say these are areas of policies that could change.

Mayor Rogers stated that her city has a transit dependent population. She said that the city is currently in the process of adopting a general plan anticipated for late summer. Mayor Rogers asked if their plan will be incorporated into the MAG plan or does their general plan need to adapt to the MAG plan. Ms. Yazzie replied that this is where the pathways concept is complex. She said that this study might be the first time in this region to incorporate land use with transit investments. Ms. Yazzie stated that it is a building block which she thought would help communities decide which comes first. She stated that all adopted member agency general plans and amendments are being integrated into the scenarios.

Mayor Rogers stated that if we are looking to the future, she thought it made sense to look at future general plans. She said that she hoped those corridors in general plans that are changing would be looked at in a future context rather than the here and now. Mayor Rogers commended the effort, and she felt it was a long time coming, but she just wanted to ensure that we are looking ahead and not looking back.

Mr. Anderson stated that adopted general plans need to be the basis for planning because we cannot anticipate what all communities might do. He added that coming from the study will be guidelines on how to tune up general plans. Mr. Anderson stated that this is a sort of starting point, recognizing that general plans are dynamic and will change over time.

Mr. Anderson addressed the incentives issue. He said that developers will weigh the risk with the reward and have indicated that development on fringe has less risk and infill development is more

difficult. Mr. Anderson stated that the developers indicated it would be a positive change if a group of infill developers could have common areas for issues such as drainage or parking, instead of having their own individual areas. He noted that a developer with an infill project had to provide room for garbage trucks to turn around because the city did not allow the trucks to back up. Mr. Anderson commented that this requirement would make a constrained infill site almost undevelopable. He stated that these are the types of revisions being done at the staff level, not city manager level, that put an end to a project. Mr. Anderson noted that there are many unique issues with infill development.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Policy Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting were requested.

No requests were noted.

8. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity was provided for Transportation Policy Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Transportation Policy Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Mayor Rogers thanked Chair Truitt for his dedicated service to the MAG region. She read the Resolution of Appreciation that had been prepared.

Chair Truitt thanked the TPC and said that it had been a pleasure for him to serve his community. He said he was privileged and honored to have worked with the TPC. Chair Truitt thanked each member of the TPC for their friendship, participation, and leadership.

Adjournment

Mayor Rogers moved and Councilmember Esser seconded to adjourn the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

_____
Chair

_____
Secretary