

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

January 29, 2014
MAG Office, Ironwood Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|--|--|
| Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye, Chair | Joseph La Rue, State Transportation Board |
| Councilmember Jack Sellers, Chandler,
Vice Chair | * Lt. Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River
Indian Community |
| F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee | # Mayor Georgia Lord, Goodyear |
| Ron Barnes, Total Transit | Mayor Mark Mitchell, Tempe |
| * Dave Berry, Swift Transportation | * Garrett Newland, Macerich |
| # Jed Billings, FNF Construction | * Mayor Tom Rankin, Florence |
| Councilmember Cathy Carlat, Peoria | Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale |
| Councilmember Ben Cooper, Gilbert | * Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa |
| * Supervisor Clint Hickman, Maricopa County | Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix |
| * Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny
Mesa, Inc. | * Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties |
| Mayor W. J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale | Mayor Jerry Weiers, Glendale |
| | Mayor Sharon Wolcott, Surprise |
- * 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 Mayor Jackie Meck at 10:03 a.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mayor Georgia Lord and Mr. Jed Billings participated in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Meck announced that at each place was a corrected project changes table for agenda item 4D.

Chair Meck 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. He stated that parking garage validation

and transit tickets for those who purchased transit tickets to attend the meeting were available from staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Meck 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 will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Transportation Policy Committee requests an exception to this limit. Those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

No requests for public comment were received.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Meck stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D 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 Meck asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted.

Mr. Ron Barnes moved to recommend approval of agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D on the consent agenda. Vice Chair Jack Sellers seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the October 16, 2013, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the October 16, 2013, meeting minutes.

4B. Recommendation of Projects for the MAG Transportation Alternatives Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the modified ranked list of projects for Transportation Alternatives funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2017; amendment of the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program; and addition of projects to the Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. On September 25, 2013, the MAG Regional Council approved the goals and objectives and evaluation team composition for the Transportation Alternatives (TA) program. That same day, applications for infrastructure projects opened with a due date of October 22, 2013. In total, 33 applications were received from 16 MAG member agencies (Apache Junction, Avondale, Buckeye, Chandler, Cave Creek, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Gilbert, Glendale, Litchfield Park, Maricopa County

Department of Transportation, Mesa, Peoria, Phoenix, Scottsdale, Surprise, and Tempe). Total funding available is approximately \$12 million for FY 2015-2017, while requests for funding totaled more than \$24.5 million. On December 5, 2013, application review and project ranking concluded with presentations to the TA Evaluation Team (two members each of the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian, Safety, and Street Committees, one member of the Transit Committee, and one representative each from Federal Highway Administration and the Arizona Department of Transportation). On December 12, 2013, the MAG Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the ranked list with the removal of the Phoenix project (Third Street Promenade: Roosevelt Street to Thomas Road, ranked 14) and the Mesa project (Consolidated Shared-Use Pathway – P2 Lighting, ranked 15), so that all other projects move up in ranking. If additional funds become available (e.g., a project does not obligate), projects will be funded in rank order. On January 8, 2014, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval.

4C. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report - May 2013 Through November 2013

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is the financial management tool for the arterial street component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Management of the program is guided by the ALCP Policies and Procedures, which were approved by the MAG Regional Council on December 9, 2009. The ALCP Policies and Procedures require that a status report is provided to MAG committee members to give an update on all project requirements and financial information. The ALCP Status Report has traditionally been published on a semiannual basis. The May 2013 through November 2013 Status Report is the first for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014. The report provides information on the 48 projects scheduled for work and/or reimbursement this fiscal year. Of these 48 projects, 11 are in the design phase, 13 are in the right-of-way-acquisition phase, and 24 are in the construction phase. It is anticipated that 10 of these projects are or will be completed and open to traffic by July 1, 2014. Scheduled ALCP project reimbursements in FY 2014 total \$78 million. Federal funds comprise \$29 million of the total programmed reimbursements while the remaining balance of \$49 million is programmed with the ½-cent sales tax allocated to arterial roads, known as the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF). Actual RARF revenue collections in FY2013 totaled \$35.9 million, which was slightly higher than what had been projected in the October 2012 Arizona Department of Transportation revenue forecast. Through October 2013, current fiscal year collections have totaled \$12.2 million. A list of ALCP Project Requirements received to date can be found on Pages 4 and 5 of the ALCP Status Report. The report also provides additional detail on the status of projects, revenues, and other relevant program information.

4D. Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update, and as Necessary, the Draft FY 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments and administrative modifications to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update and draft FY 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program. The FY 2011-2015

MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2010 Update were approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 28, 2010 and have been modified thirty-one times. The last modification was approved on December 4, 2013. Table A includes changes to the FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program. The amendments consist of a correction and schedule update to the Scottsdale Airpark Area project and an adjustment to the Black Mountain Boulevard project reimbursement schedule. The amendments will not adversely impact the balance of programmed reimbursements. Table B includes adjustments to project budgets in the Highway Program. Table C lists a correction to the FY 2013 transit program of projects. Table D contains amendments to the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). All of the projects to be amended may be categorized as exempt from conformity determinations and administrative modifications do not require a conformity determination. The project changes were recommended for approval by the MAG Transportation Review Committee on December 12, 2013, and by the MAG Management Committee on January 8, 2014.

5A. FY 2014 MAG Final Phase Public Input Opportunity

Jason Stephens, MAG staff, reported on the input received during the Final Phase Input Opportunity. This was input received during the final opportunity for comment on the FY 2014-2018 Draft Transportation Improvement Program, the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, and the 2014 Conformity Analysis. Mr. Stephens stated that the Final Phase is summarized in the Final Phase Report, which was included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Stephens stated that MAG has a four-phase public involvement process, which is part of the public participation plan adopted by the MAG Regional Council in 2006. He noted that the Final Phase provides residents with their final opportunity to provide input into draft plans and programs before MAG policy committees take action.

Mr. Stephens stated that the public is notified of the public meeting to solicit input on the updated TIP and Plan, through postcards and display advertisements in the Arizona Republic, Arizona Informant and Prensa Hispana newspapers.

Mr. Stephens displayed a summary of comments received and said that all comments received a formal written response. Chair Meck thanked Mr. Stephens for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

Chair Meck called for a motion. Vice Mayor Sellers moved to recommend acceptance of the FY 2014 MAG Final Phase Public Input Opportunity. Mr. Barnes seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

5B. Approval of the Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Teri Kennedy, MAG staff, reported that the Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan, all regionally significant projects funded with state, local, and private funds, competitively selected projects,

Regional Area Road Fund projects, federally funded transportation projects, projects in the expanded planning boundary (all of Maricopa County and portions of Pinal County).

Ms. Kennedy displayed a summary of the 782 projects contained in the FY 2014-2018 TIP, totaling approximately \$4.4 billion. She noted that the projects are categorized as highway and transit projects. Ms. Kennedy then provided a summary of projected revenues, which total approximately \$8.7 billion. She noted that \$280,000 in the TIP still needs to be programmed.

Ms. Kennedy displayed a graph comparing the project costs of the approved FY 2011-2015 TIP to the draft FY 2014-2018 TIP and noted that for the first time ever in MAG's history, the amount federal formula funds coming to MAG for federal projects has declined. She noted that the amount is 3.9 percent. Ms. Kennedy stated that the sales tax funds are very volatile and change with the economy. She stated that overall, there has been a 23 percent decline from the FY 2011-2015 TIP to the draft FY 2014-2018 TIP and a shift toward operations and maintenance projects and less toward new projects.

Ms. Kennedy followed up on a question at the last TPC meeting asking how many buses were operating in the region. She said that she researched the question and found there are 1,439 buses. Ms. Kennedy stated that Valley Metro conducts the procurement process in coordination with Phoenix Transit and ADOT to combine quantities and receive price discounts.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the TIP will be considered for approval by the MAG Regional Council on January 29, 2014. The approved TIP will then be submitted to Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and Environmental Protection Agency for review and approval of various areas of the TIP, RTP and Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Ms. Kennedy noted that they anticipate completion of this process in the beginning of March 2014.

Ms. Kennedy stated that current programming activities include FY 2014-17 Highway Safety Improvement Program projects, FY 2015-17, Transportation Alternatives infrastructure projects, FY 2014 PM-10 CMAQ street sweepers, and FY 2013-17 PM-2.5 CMAQ Paving Unpaved Road projects. Future programming includes ADOT Competitive Transit Section 5307 and 5339 projects, Transportation Alternatives Non-Infrastructure projects, Pinal County STP (currently is partially programmed), and MAG Unified Planning Work Program projects (Traffic Signal Optimization Program, Design Assistance Program, and street sweepers).

Chair Meck thanked Ms. Kennedy for her report and asked members if they had questions.

Vice Chair Sellers asked Ms. Kennedy to elaborate on the increase in the private funding shown in the revenue sources slide. Ms. Kennedy replied that a couple of private developers submitted additional projects.

Mayor Lane asked for clarification that the numbers at the bottom of the slide showed the percentages of declining federal, regional, local funding. Ms. Kennedy replied she had developed

the slide the night before and the percentages shown were the declines from the FY 2011-2015 TIP to the FY 2014-2018 TIP.

Mayor Lane asked the anticipated trend for federal funding. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, replied that the Highway Trust Fund is projected to be bankrupt in the August/September timeframe unless Congress decides to use general fund money or find additional revenue. He added that MAG assumes federal funding will be flat. Mr. Anderson mentioned that there were two factors in MAP-21 that impacted federal funding. He explained that when federal transportation law is reauthorized the most recent decennial census numbers are used, but with MAP-21, the 2000 census numbers were used to allocate federal transportation funds, not the 2010 census numbers. He remarked that this was probably done to simplify the allocation process, but is a disadvantage to fast growing states, such as Arizona. Mr. Anderson explained that another factor impacting federal funds to this region is that a percentage of CMAQ funds is required to come off the top for PM-2.5 areas, for example, Nogales and the City of Maricopa/Casa Grande area. Mr. Anderson stated that reauthorization is on Congress's calendar for this year, and this region should get more funding if the allocation is based on census 2010 numbers in the future.

Mayor Lane asked for clarification of the reauthorization of MAP-21. Mr. Anderson noted that MAP-21 is due to expire September 30, 2014. Mayor Lane asked for clarification that it seemed MAP-21 was a patchwork of funds from a variety of sources, such as pension funds.

Mr. Anderson replied that Mayor Lane was correct. He said that Congress supplemented the Highway Trust Fund with approximately 30 percent of general funds and some other savings they found. He indicated he did not know how reauthorization would work without a new source of funds. Mayor Lane asked for clarification that funding is projected to be flat. Mr. Anderson replied that the Transportation Improvement Program must be fiscally constrained on committed revenue and MAG has kept the assumptions flat to be conservative because there is so much uncertainty at the federal level.

Mayor Mitchell noted the figures on declining federal, regional, and local funding provided in the presentation and suggested that staff provide that information ahead of the meeting so that members have time for review. Mayor Mitchell asked how the declining revenues coupled with an expanded MAG boundary would be handled.

Mr. Anderson explained that the federal revenue coming to MAG includes a proportional increase because the MAG planning area includes a portion of Pinal County. He noted that the current 3.9 percent decline in MAG's federal funds would have been approximately 12 percent decline without the expanded boundary.

Mayor Wolcott stated that it would be helpful to see the breakout of the impacts of increased membership. She indicated she would like to see how the CMAQ number impacts the chart. Mayor Wolcott expressed concern for the numbers and said that it seemed like the trend was not favorable to Maricopa County.

Mr. Smith expressed that he thought the bigger issue was that Western states are high growth states and the 2000 census numbers are protective of the Eastern states. Mr. Smith stated that when reauthorization is being discussed at meetings such as NLC, the position that MAP-21 needs to be fair to the high growth Western states needs to be expressed.

Ms. Kennedy stated that prior to the MAG boundary being expanded, MAG had a 12 percent decrease in federal funds from SAFETEA-LU to MAP-21. She noted that since the boundary was expanded, MAG has received an additional \$1.3 million in Surface Transportation Program funding, \$600,000 in Safety funding, and a small amount of State Planning and Research funds. Ms. Kennedy added that Congress is looking at regional and local agencies building their own infrastructure. She remarked that a decline in federal funds is unprecedented since MAG's inception.

Chair Meck noted that no public comment cards had been received. With no further discussion, he called for a motion.

Mr. Barnes moved to recommend approval of the Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with the included errata sheet and table correction updates, contingent on a finding of conformity of the Draft TIP and 2035 Regional Transportation Plan with applicable air quality implementation plans. Mr. Arnett seconded, and the motion passed with Mayor Wolcott voting no.

5C. Approval of the Draft 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan

Roger Herzog, MAG staff, stated that a regional transportation plan is required to maintain eligibility for federal transportation funding and must be updated at least every four years. He noted that this draft Plan extends through Fiscal Year 2035 and continues the established plans, priorities and policies contained in the current adopted Plan.

Mr. Herzog stated that the Plan is a comprehensive document, reviewing the status and strategies for a range transportation activities in the MAG area. He stated that the Plan identifies the freeway/highway system, the arterial street network, the bus service network, the light rail transit/high capacity transit system, and a number of other transportation activities in the MAG region.

Mr. Herzog stated that activities for review of the draft Plan include opportunities for public input, such as early phase, mid phase, and final phase input opportunities, public meetings and hearings, and committee meetings. He reported that actions to conduct an air quality conformity analysis on the Draft 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan were taken by the Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council. Mr. Herzog stated that the air quality conformity analysis has been successfully completed and demonstrated conformity. He said that a public hearing was held on November 25, 2013, and the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval on December 3, 2013. Mr. Herzog advised that the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the Draft

2035 Plan on December 12, 2013, and the MAG Management Committee recommended approval on January 8, 2014.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Herzog for his report. No questions from the Committee were noted. No public comment cards were received.

Mayor Lane moved to recommend approval of the Draft 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), contingent upon a finding of conformity of the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the 2035 RTP with applicable air quality plans. Mr. Barnes seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

6. MAG Regional Transportation Survey Results

Eileen Yazzie, MAG staff, noted that a copy of the PowerPoint presentation was at each place. She noted that at the August 14, 2013, Transportation Policy Committee meeting, an update on transportation revenues was provided. It was noted at the meeting that the current sales tax projections reflected a 40 percent decrease compared to the 2003 projections.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the TPC discussed next steps, including conducting a public opinion survey to gauge public views and sentiment regarding needs and revenue sources. Ms. Yazzie stated that a telephone survey was conducted from December 4-31, 2013, similar to the statewide survey conducted in 2008 and the survey conducted in preparation for Proposition 400. Ms. Yazzie stated that the Regional Transportation Survey focused on high efficacy voters, not general voters, to discover their receptiveness on taxes or fees for transportation.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the Regional Transportation Survey contacted approximately 600 high efficacy in the MAG region (Maricopa County and the MAG portion of Pinal County), who tended to be older, White, and Republican.

Ms. Yazzie said that the survey began with a question on how respondents viewed their financial status in the next year. She noted that most responded that they saw their financial status as remaining the same.

Ms. Yazzie stated that respondents were asked their frequency of travel within the state of Arizona, but outside of their county of residence. She noted that responses mirrored the responses in the 2008 statewide survey. Ms. Yazzie stated that respondents were asked their political perspective, to which most answered very conservative or somewhat conservative. Ms. Yazzie stated that respondents were asked the method used to commute to work and the overwhelming majority answered driving alone. She added that many who drive alone do not have much experience with public transportation.

Ms. Yazzie then introduced Kathy DeBoer from WestGroup Research, Inc., who continued the presentation. Ms. DeBoer stated that the survey asked satisfaction questions. She said that respondents indicated satisfaction with freeways/highways and streets and roads, but indicated a

lot of “do not know” with light rail and buses, probably because they do not have or use these modes of travel. Ms. DeBoer said that respondents in Maricopa County were more satisfied with streets and roads than respondents in Pinal County.

Ms. DeBoer stated that the next question asked the one most important transportation-related issue or problem in the greater Phoenix area today. The top responses included traffic congestion on freeways, lack of bus service/public transit, lack of light rail/access to light rail, traffic congestion on major streets, road maintenance and repair, and not enough freeways/highways. Ms. DeBoer stated that the number one response in the 2008 statewide survey was lack of public transit and the Regional Transportation Survey shows it is still an important issue.

Ms. DeBoer stated that respondents were asked to name the number one most important thing they think could be done to improve the transportation system in their local area. She noted that the most common responses related to public transportation, followed by traffic control, freeways, and streets and roads. Ms. DeBoer noted that improvements rolled up into public transportation included light rail and expanded bus coverage. Improvements rolled up into traffic control issues included better traffic control, synchronized lights, and better law enforcement.

Ms. DeBoer stated that respondents were asked the number one priority and number two priority for the greater Phoenix area transportation system. She said that the components chosen most often by voters include completion of the regional freeway system and expanding the existing light rail system. The next two chosen most often include improving major streets and intersections and implementing a valleywide bus system. Ms. DeBoer remarked that this indicates respondents realize the need for a balance between streets and public transit.

Ms. DeBoer stated that greater than 60 percent of respondents, when asked whether there is enough funding available to cover needed transportation improvements in the greater Phoenix area for the next 20 years, indicated there is “probably not enough” or “definitely not enough” funding.

Ms. DeBoer reported that respondents were asked the importance of the regional transportation system for the region’s economy, with five as extremely important and one not at all important. She said that 78 percent rated it as a five or four, with 48 percent indicating it as a five.

Ms. DeBoer stated that the interviewers read a preamble to the respondents and then asked them questions: “Our transportation system primarily relies on gas taxes and dedicated sales taxes for funding. The Arizona gas tax has been 18 cents a gallon since 1991, which means that the purchasing power of the gas tax is almost 60 percent less due to inflation and increased fuel economy. The 20-year transportation sales tax for Maricopa County, which ends in 2025, is expected to generate 40 percent less than projected due to the recession. Because of lower revenue, maintenance and expansion of major parts of the regional transportation system have been delayed indefinitely.”

Ms. DeBoer said that respondents were asked, based on the previous statement, to rate their level of support for each proposed funding option to improve the transportation system in the greater

Phoenix area. She listed the options from highest level of support to lowest: Extending the current County half cent sales tax for transportation beyond its expiration; Increasing developers' fees; Increasing the gas tax; Taxing service-based businesses; Increasing vehicle registration/licensing fees; Increasing the sales tax; and Increasing the property tax. Ms. DeBoer stated that extending the half cent sales tax for transportation is perceived as something already being done and increasing developers' fees are not perceived as coming out of the respondents' pockets. Support drops when it seems the tax or fee will increase their own costs. She pointed out that those mid-range areas receiving a three rating are areas of opportunity where voters can be persuaded because the mid-range indicates respondents do not feel strongly one way or another.

Ms. DeBoer displayed a table that demonstrates that liberal voters (and in some cases, moderate voters), were generally more likely than conservative voters to support any of the taxes.

Dennis Smith noted that individual cities might trend to more liberal or moderate and could be more receptive to supporting their own tax.

Ms. DeBoer stated that the results from the Regional Transportation Survey regarding the level of support for potential new revenue streams were compared to the 2008 statewide survey. Support for increasing developers' fees decreased, while support for increasing vehicle registration/licensing fees, increasing the sales tax, and increasing the property tax remained about the same. Ms. DeBoer noted that respondents were not asked about extending the half cent sales tax for transportation in 2008.

Ms. DeBoer stated that respondents were asked to rate their level of support for an increase in the taxes dedicated for transportation improvements if it would result in paying approximately \$50 more in taxes spread across the course of a year. She said they were also asked to rate their level of support for increasing the gas tax each year in the future to match the general inflation rate in order to fund transportation system improvements. Ms. DeBoer stated that there was more support for paying \$50 per year. She added that because indexing the gas tax is more unknown element and people are less likely to support it.

Ms. DeBoer reported that the survey then asked respondents which tax they would prefer if they had a choice of paying \$50 more per year in the sales tax or gas tax or 10 cents more per gallon in gas tax. She said that half of the respondents chose the \$50 per year even though the two taxes would amount to the same thing. Ms. DeBoer stated that this is the result of the perception – people lock in on a phrase.

Ms. DeBoer stated that respondents were asked their level of support for additional taxes or fees for different transportation improvements. She said that repairing/maintaining existing roads, repairing/maintaining existing freeways, utilizing technology to make freeways more efficient/reliable, expanding light rail, and building new freeways/lanes received the most support. Ms. DeBoer noted that by their replies, respondents showed that even though they supported expanding light rail, they realized maintaining the freeway and street systems was important.

Mr. Smith noted that this is relevant to the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) sweeps issue. He said that the HURF is provided to cities and counties for street maintenance and this survey shows that the public supports street maintenance.

Mr. Arnett asked for clarification of a “three.” Ms. DeBoer replied that three indicates the unknown and does not indicate support or non support by the respondent.

Ms. DeBoer displayed a slide of support for proposed usage of additional fees broken out by political persuasion. She noted that the conservatives were less likely to indicate support than liberals.

Ms. DeBoer stated that respondents were asked how likely they were to support a tax increase if all of the money is used for regional transportation projects that may not be in their community. She said that 57 percent were somewhat likely or very likely to support this, which indicates they realize transportation is a regional issue.

Ms. DeBoer then summarized conclusions from the survey. Voters do not appear to support any new taxes/fees. Voters are not overwhelmingly ready to support the extension of the existing half cent sales tax. There is little interest/support for increasing the gas tax. Many “undecided” or “middle of the road” responses leaves room for education. The majority of the voters understand the link between transportation and the economy, which can be the foundation to build the case for the need for additional funds.

Chair Meck thanked Ms. Yazzie and Ms. DeBoer for their reports and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Arnett noted that the majority of those surveyed were over the age of 55. He asked if the results of the survey would be expected to be different if the age was lower. Ms. DeBoer replied yes, the average age of high efficacy voters is higher than the age of those who vote mainly in presidential elections. She said they were particularly interested in high efficacy voters, because they consistently vote in all elections, not just the presidential elections. Ms. DeBoer remarked that if this group can be won over, it helps in influencing an election.

Mayor Lane commented that this is the demographic who are the taxpayers and are those that need to be informed. Ms. DeBoer stated that they did a survey for a school bond election that showed 58 percent support by high efficacy voters and the actual voting result was 56 percent. She noted that they usually look for 60 percent support in a survey to have a successful election.

Mayor Mitchell asked the sample size to end up with 602 respondents. Ms. DeBoer replied that they probably dialed tens of thousands of numbers to end up with the 602 respondents. Mayor Mitchell asked the percentage of those reached. Ms. DeBoer replied that she did not have that number with her, but could get it to him after the meeting. Mayor Mitchell also requested a breakdown by Maricopa County and Pinal County, and by geographic areas of Maricopa County because not all areas have all elements, such as light rail. Ms. DeBoer noted that they do have the

information by zip code. Ms. Yazzie noted that results of a breakdown of high efficacy voters by community would be different than the regional results. Mayor Mitchell remarked that he thought this was important to see. Ms. Yazzie remarked on the differences between Maricopa and Pinal respondents regarding public transportation. She stated that a lot of those in the focus groups used public transit for special events, but there were a lot of “do not know” responses for transit.

Councilmember Carlat asked for clarification of the conclusion that there would not necessarily be support for an extension of the sales tax because the number indicating support was less than 60 percent. Ms. DeBoer replied that was correct – there is always slippage. She added that if an election were held today it would be risky.

Mr. Anderson noted that a couple of surveys were conducted in preparation for Proposition 400. An early survey showed support exceeding 70 percent and another survey in 2002-2003 showed 68 percent support, but in the end the vote in support of Proposition 400 was 57 percent. He noted that support usually declines during a campaign. Mr. Anderson noted that if surveys do not show more than 60 percent support, you might want to give pause. He also mentioned the 1994 preliminary surveys that showed 64 or 65 percent support for 1994's Proposition 400 and it ended up being defeated.

Councilmember Carlat asked about the timeframe being 11 years out and would there be more support the closer to the time the tax expires. Mr. Anderson noted that there are similarities between 1994 and now – 11 years was the same timeframe as the 1994 election and the region was coming out of the recession of the early 1990s. He remarked that this is probably not the right time to go forward with an election on a regional tax because there is not a high level of support.

Mr. Smith noted that the split of funding between transportation modes could be different for the extension of the tax than it was for Proposition 400. He noted that the freeway system in this region is close to completion.

Mayor Wolcott stated that she needed more information on reaching voters because the needs of the West Valley are different from the East Valley, especially if cities are being encouraged to go for a local option. She noted that the demographics of the high efficacy voters in the Regional Transportation Survey are similar to the voters in the City of Surprise. Mayor Wolcott spoke of how the quality of life diminishes by the hour as people sit for an hour each way in traffic congestion on the freeway while fumes spew into the air. She said that people want to hear that discussion.

Mr. Anderson stated that they are ready to run the cross-tabs for east, west and central and will discuss the results with member agencies. He said that the one point he did not want to get lost is that people do not have a good understanding of how transportation is funded. Mr. Anderson remarked that the message about the declining gas tax revenue needs to be communicated and a discussion is needed on whether there is a desire to fund transit operations.

Mr. Arnett asked about extending the half cent sales tax for ten years and leveraging against that amount to finish projects. Mr. Anderson replied that could be an option and was the thinking in 1994. He said that the decision would need to be made to expend the dollars and political capital to do that.

Mr. LaRue referenced the 78 percent of respondents who felt that transportation is tied to the economy, but then there is great opposition in the following question that asks if people favor expediting freight across the Mexican border. He remarked that the foundational basis for Interstate 11 is expediting freight.

Mr. Smith stated that the Regional Transportation Survey says that the public needs more information. He said that MAG committees understand how the port of Nogales helps all of us, but there has been no effort to explain the issue to the public so they understand. Mr. Smith stated that Arizona is ninth from the bottom in gas tax and people still do not want to increase it. He said that a mechanism to support the Department of Public Safety is needed, like the special tax on vehicle license fees in California, otherwise, the struggle with funding will continue. Mr. Smith stated that perhaps a federal fix is needed. He added that the gas tax equation is broken. He pointed out that many vehicles now get more than 40 miles per gallon, and HURF collections will only decrease. Mr. Smith stated that the decrease in federal funds shown in the TIP slide was included because this is a policy issue and elected officials need to know this when they go to Washington, DC.

7. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG staff, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. Mr. Pryor stated that for some time, MAG has been reporting on declining regional, state, federal transportation revenues. He indicated that the focus of his presentation today is the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF).

Mr. Pryor stated that over the past decade, the HURF has been subject to more than \$1 billion in sweeps by the state. He said that recently, a number of cities, towns, and other organizations have taken positions opposing HURF sweeps, and MAG staff is suggesting taking a position to stop the HURF sweeps and keeping the statutory limit for transfers to \$20 million annually. Mr. Pryor stated that \$126 million was swept in FY 2014 and \$234 million in FY 2013.

Mr. Pryor stated that leadership and members of the Legislature have indicated their willingness to fully fund the HURF. He noted that the state budget for 2015 is showing HURF sweeps of more than \$125 million. Mr. Pryor noted that keeping the HURF to its statutory limit of \$20 million per year is the simplest short term option.

Mr. Pryor stated that he would be presenting this item to the Regional Council at their meeting later that day. Mr. Pryor stated that one option might be a letter to the Governor signed by the Regional Council. He noted that a letter from Speaker Andy Tobin and Representative Chad Campbell in support of the HURF was provided to the TPC.

Mayor Mark Mitchell moved to recommend that the MAG Regional Council consider sending a letter to the Governor and Legislature regarding Highway User Revenue Fund sweeps. Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

8. 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.

Mr. Smith noted that a further analysis of the Regional Transportation Survey would be presented.

9. 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.

No comments were noted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Chair

Secretary