

May 5, 2010

TO: Members of the MAG Transit Committee

FROM: Debbie Cotton, City of Phoenix, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, May 13, 2010, 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transit Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as parking will be validated. Bicycles can be locked in the rack at the entrance to the parking garage. Committee members or their proxies may attend in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Marc Pearsall or Jason Stephens at the MAG Office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership or twelve people for the MAG Transit Committee. If the Transit Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. Please contact Kevin Wallace at (602) 254-6300 if you have any questions or need additional information.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. <u>Call to Order</u>	
2. <u>Approval of Draft April 8, 2010 Minutes</u>	2. Approve Draft minutes of the April 8, 2010 meeting.
3. <u>Call to the Audience</u> An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transit Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. 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 Transit Committee requests an exception to this limit.	3. For information and discussion.
4. <u>Transit Program Manager's Report</u> The MAG Transit Program Manager will review recent transit planning activities and upcoming agenda items for other MAG committees.	4. For information and discussion.
5. <u>Project Change Requests to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program</u> The FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan - 2007 Update were approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 25, 2007. Since that time, there have been requests from member agencies to modify projects in the programs. Two CMAQ projects that were deemed ineligible for funding have been reprogrammed to new projects. In addition, the City of Phoenix has requested 5307 funds be reprogrammed to new projects. Please refer to Attachment One for proposed amendments to the FY 2008-2012 TIP.	5. For information, discussion, and recommendation to approve amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 update.
6. <u>Transit Federal Funding Grant Opportunities</u> The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the U.S. Department of Transportation have	6. For information and discussion.

recently announced a total of four different federal competitive grant opportunities for transit projects: 1) Clean Fuels Grant & Bus and Bus Facilities through Clean Fuels, 2) Bus and Bus Facilities, 3) Transit Investments for Greenhouse Gas and Energy Reduction (TIGGER), and 4) Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) II. Attachment Two provides information about the grants, and MAG Staff will present additional information at the Committee meeting.

7. Quarterly Status Report on Federal Grant Activity

The City of Phoenix is the Designated Recipient (DR) for federal transit funds for the Phoenix-Mesa Urbanized Area (UZA). Among other responsibilities, the City of Phoenix manages federal transit grants for the region. In support of MAG's role of coordinating regional transit planning and programming activities, the City of Phoenix will provide quarterly updates to the Transit Committee on the status of existing federal grants. It is anticipated that the status report will be modified in the future, based on comments from the Transit Committee. Please see Attachment Three for additional information.

8. MAG Complete Streets Guide

Since February 2009, the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee has been working to develop a regional Complete Streets Guide. The guide will be implemented on a voluntary basis by local jurisdictions, and will help ensure that non-motorized and public transportation modes are fully considered in the development of a multi-modal transportation system. MAG staff will present the initial recommendations included in the Complete Streets Guide for discussion and comment by the Transit Committee. The draft report can be accessed at the following website location:

www.mag.maricopa.gov/detail.cms?item=11804.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Transit Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

10. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transit Committee meeting will be scheduled Thursday, June 10, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information.

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

April 8, 2010

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Lauri Wingenroth

#ADOT: Mike Normand

Avondale: Rogene Hill

#Buckeye: Andrea Marquez

Chandler: RJ Zeder

El Mirage: Pat Dennis

*Gilbert: Tami Ryall

Glendale: Cathy Colbath, Chair

Goodyear: Cato Esquivel

Maricopa County: Mitch Wagner

Mesa: Mike James

*Paradise Valley: William Mead

Peoria: Maher Hazine

*Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman

Scottsdale: Theresa Huish

Surprise: Michael Celaya

Tempe: Robert Yabes for Jyme Sue McLaren

*Tolleson: Chris Hagen

Valley Metro Rail: Wulf Grote

Regional Public Transportation Authority:

Carol Ketcherside

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Kevin Wallace, MAG

Alice Chen, MAG

Marc Pearsall, MAG

Kristen Sexton, Avondale

Jenna Goad, Glendale

Jeff Martin, Mesa

John Holman, Mesa

David Moody, Peoria

Jorie Bresnahan, Phoenix

Ken Kessler, Phoenix

Jim Swanson, Surprise

Lauren Neu, Strand Associates

Kammy Horne, URS

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:32p.m. by Chair Cathy Colbath of the City of Glendale. Chair Colbath welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She introduced two members of the Transit Committee, Committee member Andrea Marquez (Buckeye) and Mike Normand (ADOT) who were participating via teleconference. Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft March 11, 2010 Minutes

Chair Colbath asked if there were any comments or corrections to the March 11, 2010 meeting minutes. Mr. Mike James from the City of Mesa requested a small correction to page 4, paragraph 7, the agenda item on 'Park and Ride Mixed Use'. He requested to change the wording to 'contrary to FTA guidelines or direction' from 'counterproductive to FTA guidelines or direction'. Hearing no further comments or corrections to the meeting minutes, Chair Colbath called for a motion to approve the draft minutes as amended. Mr. RJ Zeder from the City of Chandler moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Robert Yabes (Tempe) seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Colbath stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Chair Colbath introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace, MAG Transit Program Manager, for the agenda item. Mr. Wallace explained that there were two items to report. The first was the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process, which was underway. One component required in the TIP Financial Plan was the reporting of 'Reasonably Expected Revenues' for operations and maintenance as there was added scrutiny at the federal level, particularly at the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for funding availability for any projects that are included in the TIP. He announced that MAG would send out letters next week to MAG Transit Committee Members with projects in the TIP. He added that MAG was requesting basic program level information regarding funding sources and amounts for individual city/agency transit programs, specifically in relation to operations and maintenance. Mr. Wallace explained the information would be incorporated into the TIP's Financial Plan.

Mr. Wallace also explained the second item was that the federal discretionary project requests had been submitted to the Federal Government. The FTA had recently requested from MAG to provide additional information on a number of these projects. MAG staff is coordinating with the City of Phoenix, which is working with various city contacts to obtain the follow-up information that the FTA has requested. Once this information is completed and compiled, it will be submitted to the FTA by MAG.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. Update on High-Speed Rail Planning Activities

Kevin Wallace introduced, via teleconference, guest presenter and Executive Director Tom Skancke of the Western High Speed Rail Alliance. MAG is a member of the Western High Speed Rail Alliance(WHSRA) and Mr. Skancke offered to give an update on the Alliance.

Mr. Skancke thanked Chair Colbath and the MAG Transit Committee for allowing him to give an update on the history and latest efforts of the WHSRA.

Mr. Skancke explained that in June 2009, MAG joined the Western High-Speed Rail Alliance. The WHSRA's purpose is determining the viability of developing and promoting a high-speed rail network to provide high-speed rail connections throughout the Rocky Mountain region with eventual possible connections to the Pacific Coast and other regions of the United States. He directed attendees to refer to attachment one at their place as well as visiting the Western High-Speed Rail Alliance website (www.whsra.com) for additional information.

Mr. Skancke added that the members of the Alliance have agreed to work jointly for the acquisition of funding to conduct studies of high-speed rail options, to develop plans for high-speed rail infrastructure, and to construct high-speed rail facilities throughout the region as is considered appropriate. He added that at the time of this application the alliance is investigating the procedure by which a multi-state compact would be formed for long term operation and maintenance of the High Speed Rail (HSR) system.

Mr. Skancke explained The WHSRA began formal activities in December of 2009. He announced that the WHSRA's initial membership included (Phoenix), RTC-Regional Transportation Commission (Las Vegas), RTC-Regional Transportation Commission (Reno), Utah Transit Authority (Salt Lake City) and DRCOG-Denver Regional Council of Governments (Denver). He explained that The Alliance came together after the USDOT announced the High Speed Rail Corridor Map with 11 corridors throughout America, yet no Intermountain West (Rocky Mountain and Southwestern states) corridors were represented in that system proposal. He added that the five MPOs COGs and transit authorities formed the WHSRA in order to work with the federal government so that a national high speed rail system would include the Intermountain West.

Mr. Skancke stated that one of the Alliance's goals is to acquire funding to study the Intermountain West corridors as High Speed Rail corridor options. The Alliance did not qualify for \$8 billion in federal funds released in late 2008/early 2009 due to the requirements that the applications be submitted by December 2009. He stated that The Alliance had then agreed to move forward with an FY11 appropriations funding request for \$5 million to study corridors from Reno to Salt Lake and Denver, and Salt Lake to Vegas and Phoenix, with corridors connecting Los Angeles to both Las Vegas and Phoenix. He announced a multi-year request for \$25-30 million over 6 years to further study corridors and would be submitted by the WHSRA in the future. Mr. Skancke added that The WHSRA was also working with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on a new multi-state planning proposal aimed at assisting states with their required 'State Rail Plans'.

Mr. Skancke added that there was significant private sector interest in the WHSRA. He announced a 2-day Conference was planned and would occur in Vegas in fall 2010, with 200-300 attendees expected. He mentioned the tentative title of the conference was "Western High Speed Rail Alliance: A National System and its Partners.". Invitations to FRA, FTA and Congress as well as worldwide operators, manufacturers, firms as well as national high speed rail partners.

Mr. Skancke explained that WHSRA plans to extend its membership to the states of New Mexico, Nebraska and Missouri in order to connect to Midwest High Speed Rail system planning efforts. He reported there has been much progress and national exposure in the last four months.

In closing, Mr. Skancke reported that the WHSRA was working with FRA/USDOT to have the rail corridors in the WHSRA Plan adopted and designated as official High Speed Rail corridors by late 2010.

Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Skancke on his presentation and the exciting opportunity for High Speed Rail. She added that MAG looks forward to hearing about the progress in the future.

Chair Colbath asked if there were any questions for Mr. Skancke.

Mr. Wulf Grote (METRO) asked what the dates were for the conference.

Mr. Skancke replied that the conference would occur from Wednesday, evening October 13 until Friday, Oct. 15, 2010.

Mr. Grote asked if the appropriation request was FRA railroad funds. Mr. Skancke responded that the appropriation request was a congressional request for highway funds, due to the fact that only state agencies could obtain rail money. He added that WHSRA was working with the Congressional Banking Committee to allow alliances, coalitions and organizations made up of MPOs, COGS and Transit Agencies to qualify for rail money through the Federal Railroad Administration.

Mr. Skancke reported that the primary goal of the study work was to focus on 'the first and last 25 miles' of the line, which were traditionally the most difficult to build. He said the 25 miles referred to how difficult it usually was to build new High Speed Rail (HSR) systems into the established urban cores of large cities and communities and that failed to plan for the connections. Mr. Skancke explained that many European HSR systems have noted that available right-of-way was very difficult to acquire, and the introduction of elevated or underground corridors could be cost prohibitive. He stated that rural trackage could be cheaper to build because of the available land. MPOs and the State DOTs were crucial to allow good planning to proceed, especially with the importance of connecting to other local and regional bus and rail transit systems. He explained that many of the Federal Programs in regards to High Speed Rail were created in the 1950s-1970s. He stated that programs had not been updated to reflect today's challenges and requirements, especially the 21st Century technology of 200 mph High Speed Rail.

Ms. Rogene Hill from Avondale asked with the first and last 25 miles reference, which corridor on the map would these first miles, Phoenix, Reno, Denver, Salt Lake, Los Angeles or Las Vegas?

Mr. Skancke replied that one of the recommendations out of the nation's High Speed Rail vision was that cities-pair distances of 500 miles or less were ideal candidates for rail service. This issues affecting the 'first 25 miles' was applicable to each city and corridor within the WHSRA map and could likely be applied to all of the proposed lines serving Phoenix, Reno, Denver, Salt Lake, Los Angeles and Las Vegas.

Ms. Hill noted that Tucson was not listed on the WHSRA map. Mr. Skancke responded that the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) had shown interest in joining the WHSRA, but that Tucson was not yet reflected on the map. He added that Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) had also shown interest in the WHSRA.

Mr. Wallace thanked Mr. Skancke for his initiative with the effort and stated that the WHSRA had benefitted greatly from his knowledge and experience on a national scale. Mr. Skancke thanked the Committee and offered his participation and service in the future.

Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Skancke and stated that the committee looked forward to learning more information as it became available.

Chair Colbath asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

6. Acceptance of Commuter Rail Planning Studies

Mr. Kevin Wallace, announced that three studies were brought before the Transit Committee for acceptance. He explained the studies were all conducted in concurrence over the previous year.

Mr. Wallace informed the committee that since November 2008, MAG had engaged in developing three commuter rail studies. He stated that the Grand Avenue Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan provided a detailed evaluation of the feasibility of implementing commuter rail service along the Burlington Northern/Santa Fe (BNSF) Phoenix Subdivision between Phoenix and Wickenburg, a distance of approximately 54 miles. He reported that the study identified elements necessary to successfully implement commuter rail transit service in the Grand Avenue corridor. Mr. Wallace explained that the Union Pacific (UP) Yuma West Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan provided a detailed evaluation of the feasibility of implementing commuter rail service along the Yuma West rail line between Buckeye and Union Station in downtown Phoenix, with a conceptual evaluation of the issues associated with extending the corridor to the Tempe Branch line in Tempe. He added that the study identified the elements necessary to successfully implement commuter rail transit service along this corridor.

Mr. Wallace explained that the Commuter Rail System Study provided an evaluation of commuter rail options for the MAG region and potential connecting routes immediately adjacent to the MAG region. He stated that the study established priorities for implementing commuter rail service through an evaluation of ridership potential, operating strategies, and associated capital and operating costs. He referred members to Attachment Two for additional information adding that the item was on the agenda for action with a request to accept three studies: Commuter Rail System Study Grand Avenue Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan Yuma West Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan

Mr. Wallace discussed various attributes of commuter rail technology in the PowerPoint presentation. He explained that commuter rail featured traditionally larger, heavier passenger cars with higher maximum speeds, slower acceleration and deceleration than light rail, but with competitive travel time and reliability. He explained that some systems are also using the latest in clean diesel technology. Commuter rail typically features longer station spacing (every 3-5 miles on average) than light rail (1-2 miles) with emphasis on park-and-rides and can share right of way and track with freight as it does not need exclusive right-of-way like light rail. He explained that for these reasons, averages a lower capital cost per mile (\$10-\$20M) than light rail (\$60-\$80M).

Mr. Wallace explained that funding for the commuter rail studies was initially included in the 2004 voter approved Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Commuter Rail Strategic Plan began in 2006 and was accepted by MAG Regional Council in April 2008. He stated that a recommendation from the study was for further conceptual analysis on steps needed to implement commuter rail on a regional level was granted by the Regional Council. Mr. Wallace reported that the Grand Avenue study was initiated in November 2008, with the Yuma West and System Study both initiated in April 2009. He added that studies featured extensive public involvement processes, four stakeholder events, study review teams and constant input from the MAG member agencies.

Mr. Wallace also discussed the MAG commuter rail map, which details existing railroad ownership by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and BNSF Railway, as well as potential future passenger/freight rail corridors linked to future freeway corridors and former railroad rights of way throughout the MAG region. Further discussion on lessons learned from other peer cities, stations, access to stations/transit Inter-connectivity and transit oriented development followed.

Mr. Wallace explained that a recommendation list of near term and long term steps for Commuter Rail Implementation is featured in the Commuter Rail System Study: (1.) Continued coordination with ADOT and railroads; (2.) Determine liability and indemnification statutes with ADOT in the lead; (3.) Regional Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study; (4.) Identify local funding; (5.) Develop and implement governance plan; (6.) Railroad agreements; (7.) Design and construction; and (8.) Operation.

Mr. Wallace mentioned that traditionally once a region had an identified and committed local funding source for operations and capital, the industry average was usually 3 to 5 years to begin operation of the commuter rail system. Mr. Wallace added that the ADOT Phoenix-Tucson Intercity Rail Alternatives Analysis (AA) was currently out for bid. He stated this study would assist the MAG region to determine options for East Valley rail service.

Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Wallace for his report. Then Mr. Wallace introduced Mr. Marc Pearsall, MAG Transit Planner. Mr. Pearsall presented an overview of the Commuter Rail System Study objectives, results and recommendations.

Mr. Pearsall announced that the Commuter Rail System Study objectives were to: (1.) Evaluate commuter rail options and potential connecting routes immediately adjacent to the MAG region; (2.) Establish priorities for implementing commuter rail service, through the evaluation of ridership potential, operating strategies, and associated capital and operating costs. (3.) Evaluate existing freight corridors and possible rail extension areas identified in the Commuter Rail Strategic Plan. The Grand Avenue and Yuma West Studies Objectives were to: (1.) review and document existing and forecast demographics, land use, and travel characteristics; (2.) Identify barriers and opportunities for implementation of commuter rail service; (3.) Assess alternative implementation or operating scenarios and associated costs and ridership and; (4.) Recommend a conceptual path forward for funding and implementation.

Mr. Pearsall clarified the phased implementation approach to commuter rail. Phase A was opening day service, peak hour, peak direction, Phase B. was hourly service and more reverse commutes and Phase C is considered 'Chicago/NYC style' service 15-30 minute frequency in both directions. Phase C was a service nearing light rail level of frequency.

Mr. Pearsall explained that the MAG model used for the Commuter Rail System Study was based upon the model approved by the MAG Regional Council in April 2007. He stated the model methodology assisted in analyzing daily boardings per revenue mile for stand alone corridors; stand alone corridors capital cost per mile; daily boardings per revenue mile for interlined corridors; 2030 daily boardings per revenue mile for interlined corridors; comparisons to other commuter rail systems in the USA; and the recommended overall most productive system, a four-line, X-shaped system. One of the study recommendations and Action Items was that MAG may periodically run new Socioeconomic model results in order to see if there are any changes in ridership and population in our Overall Most Productive System.

Mr. Pearsall also explained that Key Sensitivity Tests results included: (1.) if selected highway projects are not built; (2.) applying socio-economic data between through to 2035 and; (3.) looking for differences of 10% or greater and changes of less than 10% are considered nominal and generally within normal model variation. He reported that in these model variations, MAG staff removed projects from network and reran the model and compared results with and without projects. He stated the conclusions were that generally, planned highway projects do not substantially compete with commuter rail service and that the Southeast Valley might experience slightly higher ridership if the SR-802 project was not constructed.

Mr. Pearsall mentioned that MAG staff ran a base model of all five base corridors with 2030 socioeconomic data, then ran the same model with 2035 socioeconomic data and compared the results of 2035 with 2030. He stated the results indicated that Grand Avenue would experience an increase of 17%, Yuma West : would see an increase of 19%. The conclusion was that Grand and Yuma are likely to see a noticeable increase in ridership between 2030 and 2035 if development occurs as predicted. In regards to post-2035 potential corridor extensions, a combination of existing railroads, historic rail corridors and new rights of way would be used.

Mr. Pearsall added that potential extensions forecasting for a post-2035 scenario included another method for analyzing commuter rail corridor extension viability. Based on latest available MAG Future Land Use data (April 2007), each corridor's total projected households were measured within 8 miles and employment within 5 miles of target stations model areas. These were correlated with ridership potential with normalized values (control totals) for comparison across corridors by calculating households per mile and employment per station target area. He added that the results reported higher ridership potential for future extensions in eastern Maricopa County and northern Pinal County, with the Superstition Vistas extension as the most productive corridor. Ridership potential in the far West Valley was more viable in the longer-term, based on available projections and plans. He added that the lowest ridership potential was observed on the Hidden Waters extension to Gila Bend.

Mr. Pearsall detailed the evaluation criteria used for the commuter rail study analysis which included travel time savings, boardings per revenue mile, connections to activity centers, land use compatibility, impact on regional travel and air quality, capital cost per mile, annual operations and maintenance O&M cost per rider, the ease of implementation and compatibility with freight railroads. He also explained details on the evaluation results for stand alone corridors and interlined corridors.

Mr. Pearsall presented the corridor prioritization for the Commuter Rail System Study and the corridor recommendation for start-up commuter rail service. The first, Segment #1, was the Southeast Corridor. It featured the significantly highest ridership at 6450 daily riders, substantial travel time savings, and is most cost-effective. However, if use of railroad right-of-way is a fatal flaw, due to costs and agreements to get through rail yards in Central Phoenix, than other options included: building Grand Avenue corridor first; or building the Southeast segments between Tempe and Queen Creek and transferring to METRO light rail in downtown Tempe or at the airport. Another option would be to build the Tempe or Chandler segments in lieu of Southeast Corridor.

Mr. Pearsall discussed on Segment #2 of the corridor prioritization. The corridor recommended to interline with the Southeast Line, would be the Grand Avenue Corridor. While Yuma-Southeast may be more cost-effective (low capital cost for Yuma coupled with high ridership on Southeast), the Grand-Southeast is more effective because it carries more riders. The ridership is greatest when most productive East Valley and West Valley Corridors –Grand Avenue and SE –are combined. Therefore, Grand-SE was recommended as first system interline.

Mr. Pearsall explained that the three remaining corridors would be phased for implementation beyond segment 1 and 2. He added that there was no one outstanding performer in other three corridors: Tempe, Chandler, Yuma-West. Considerations for future phasing and system build-out of these lines would include development pattern, changes in travel demand, community support, potential integration with intercity rail, and railroad support.

Mr. Pearsall completed his presentation by showing the overall most productive system, a 4 line, X-shaped system map and a summary of the requested action. To accept the findings of the Grand Avenue Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan, Yuma West Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan, and Commuter Rail System Study and to revise the corridor

ranking included in the Commuter Rail System Study upon the completion of update regional socioeconomic forecasts.

Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Pearsall and asked the committee members if they had any questions or comments.

Ms. Hill of Avondale inquired how the Commuter Rail Studies would coordinate with the Western High Speed Rail Alliance efforts. Mr. Pearsall explained that HSR was another element that may effect commuter rail in the Region. He added that should funding become available to study high speed rail into the Region, then depending on which corridor is used for HSR, it may allow for additional commuter rail services in a shared corridor.

Mr. Wallace also reminded the committee that MAG was a member of the WHSRA and was on the project management team for the study. Mr. Pearsall stated that MAG would coordinate the commuter rail recommendations and information so that it is included and recognized within the WHRSA efforts.

Mr. Pearsall discussed that in Seattle, intercity long distance rail, regional rail and commuter rail all share the same corridor and operate upwards of 36 trains per day in a short, 40-mile segment between Tacoma and Seattle. He added that Amtrak service were to return to the Region (since ending service in June 1996), that the previous line might become a legacy line. He stated that the line would be a potential candidate for commuter rail service as industry experience dictated that it is usually easier to operate different levels of passenger rail service on a common, shared line.

Chair Colbath also asked if grade separations were included in the report due to their impact on safety, noise and congestion mitigation. Mr. Pearsall replied that the report provided detail on Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and MAG Region cities' recommended locations for grade separations, as well as possible candidate locations beyond what may already be planned..

Ms. Hill stated that while she appreciated the detailed work of MAG and its consultants on the Commuter Rail studies, she had mixed feelings on accepting the studies. She explained that the old data undervalued the West Valley in relation to rail ridership, growth and population. She stated that this continues a pattern were the West Valley is not on the map in regards to transportation options. She added that since the MAG recommendations for the Southeast Valley and Grand Avenue lines to begin service first and second, this leaves the West Valley's line to start service at a much later date. Ms. Hill said that this left the region with separate pieces and not a true system. It was because of these reasons that Ms. Hill stated that she would vote no on the acceptance of the three MAG Commuter Rail Studies.

Mr. Mike Normand from ADOT stated that the MAG commuter rail studies were an important step forward and that ADOT endorsed them. He added that the studies will compliment the ADOT Phoenix-Tucson Intercity Rail Study.

Mr. Mike James complimented MAG and URS on their work on the commuter rail studies and stated that he would vote yes to accept the studies.

Discussion followed regarding how often an update of regional socioeconomic forecasts, census and other transit reports results would be revised in the commuter rail model. Mr. Wallace clarified that while there was no fixed date on the updates, there would be a periodic review of new data when it became available.

Ms. Pat Dennis from El Mirage motioned to recommend to: 1) accept the findings of the Grand Avenue Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan, Yuma West Commuter Rail Corridor Development Plan, and Commuter Rail System Study; and 2) revise the corridor ranking included in the Commuter Rail System Study upon the completion of updated regional socioeconomic forecasts or relevant passenger rail studies. Mr. James seconded the motion.

Chair Colbath called for a vote. The motion passed by a majority voice vote of the committee members present, which included 15 in favor and 1 opposed. Ms. Hill from the City of Avondale dissented.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Colbath asked the members of the Transit Committee if there were any issues that they would like to add as a future agenda item. Mr. Grote offered to provide the Transit Committee Members an update on the Tempe South Study at the next meeting. Hearing no further comments, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Next Meeting Date

Chair Colbath thanked those in attendance for attending the MAG Transit Committee meeting. She announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, May 13, 2010 at 1:30 pm in the Saguaro Room. There being no further business, Chair Colbath adjourned the meeting at 2:54 p.m.

ATTACHMENT ONE

Request for Project Change - 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

TIP #	TIP Section	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fiscal Year	Fund Type	Local Cost	Federal Cost	Regional Cost	Total Cost	Requested Change
PHX07-310T	Transit	Phoenix	Various locations	Upgrade LNG fuel station - North Division	2009	5307	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,500,000	Delete
New	Transit	Phoenix	Various locations	Mid Life Bus Engine Rehabilitation	2009	5307	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,500,000	Add using funds from PHX07-310T.
PHX08-610T	Transit	Phoenix	Regionwide	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 5 expand (dial-a-ride)	2008	5307	\$ 79,000	\$ 316,000	\$ -	\$ 395,000	Delete
New	Transit	Phoenix	Various locations	Preventive maintenance	2008	5307	\$ 1,696,808	\$ 6,787,232		\$ 8,484,040	Increase funds by \$316k from bus purchase program (PHX08-610T).
VMR09-825T	Transit	VM Rail	Central Phoenix / East Valley (CP/EV) 20-mile light rail transit starter line	Expand METRO light rail hours of service from 11:00pm on Friday and Saturday evenings to 2:00am on Saturday and Sunday mornings.	2009	CMAQ		\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	Delete project
VMR09-826T	Transit	VM Rail	Central Phoenix / East Valley (CP/EV) 20-mile light rail transit starter line	Installation of additional METRO ticket vending machines and stand alone fare validation systems	2009	CMAQ		\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 600,000	Increase funds by \$300K to \$600K.

ATTACHMENT TWO

DOT Program	FTA- Clean Fuels Grant Program AND Bus and Bus Facilities through Clean Fuels	FTA- Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities/ "State of Good Repair" (SGR) Bus Initiative	FTA- Transit Investments for Greenhouse Gas and Energy Reduction (TIGGER)	Office of the Secretary- Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) II
Program Purpose	Among the goals of the Obama administration is to improve our Nation's environment and to secure our energy future. . . FTA advances these energy and environmental goals by funding projects that: assist nonattainment and maintenance areas in achieving or maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality standards for ozone and carbon monoxide. . .support emerging Clean Fuel and advanced propulsion technologies for transit buses and markets for those technologies.	The <i>"State of Good Repair" Bus Initiative</i> will make funds available to public transit providers to finance capital projects to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct/rehabilitate bus-related facilities, including programs of bus and bus-related projects which may include assistance to subrecipients that are public agencies, private companies engaged in public transportation , or private non-profit org.	Among the goals of the Obama administration is to improve our Nation's environment and to secure our energy future. . . FTA advances these energy and environmental goals by funding projects that: enhance the quality of public transp. services. . . reduce greenhouse gas emissions of public transp. systems.	Funding for supporting innovative transportation projects of National, regional and local significance including projects hard to fund via traditional transportation programs.
Amount Available	\$81.2 million for Clean Fuels, TBD for Bus & Bus Facilities	\$775 million	\$75 million	\$600 million
Eligible Applicants	Clean Fuels: Eligible 5307 Designated Recipients in maintenance or non-attainment for ozone or CO Bus and Bus Facilities: Tribes in rural areas, State DOTs, and direct recipients in attainment areas.	5307 Designated Recipients, States, and Indian Tribes. The City of Phoenix is the 5307 Designated Recipient for the MAG Region. Applications are required to go through them.	Public Transportation Agencies or State DOTs	State/Local Govts, Transit Agencies, Port Authorities, MPOs, Multi-state or multi-jurisdictional groups
Eligible Activities	1) Purchase/lease clean fuel buses, including buses that employ a lightweight composite primary structure and vans for use in revenue service; 2) Construction or leasing clean fuel bus facilities or electrical recharging facilities and related equipment 3) Projects relating to clean fuel, biodiesel, hybrid electric, or zero emissions buses that exhibit reductions to existing clean fuel or hybrid technology.	Capital projects such as: purchase, replacement, or rehabilitation of, buses and vans and related equipment (including ITS, fare equip., communication devices that are FCC mandatory narrow-banding compliant); replacement or modernization of bus maintenance and revenue service (passenger) facilities; and the development and implementation of transit asset management systems.	The project must assist in the reduction of the energy consumption of a public transportation system and/or the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions of a public transportation system	1) Highway or bridge projects under Title 23 2) Public Transportation Project under Title 53, 49 3) Passenger and freight rail projects 4) Port infrastructure investment

DOT Program	Clean Fuels	Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities	TIGGER	TIGER II
Minimum/Maximum Award	Not available	There is no floor or upper limit for any single grant under this program; however, FTA intends to fund as many meritorious projects as possible. In addition, FTA will take into consideration the geographic diversity of its award decisions.	\$1 million min. and \$25 million max. Proposals can only contain one project. FTA will not accept consolidated proposals. Agencies can submit multiple proposals.	\$10 million min. and \$200 max. per grant; - No more than 25% to one state - No less than \$140 million to rural areas - Up to \$150 million for TIFIA - Up to \$35 million for planning or design of eligible projects
Cost Sharing or Matching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vehicles- 90% for net incremental cost (83%) - Facilities- 90% on a case by case basis (83% N/A) - Biodiesel Bus- 90% - Hybrid Electric Propulsion- 90% net incremental cost (83%) No deferred local share allowed	Not to exceed 80% Federal Share. No deferred local share allowed. The federal share may exceed 80% for certain projects related to ADA and the Clean Air Act. Also, the FY10 Appropriations Act allows a 90% federal share for the total cost of a biodiesel bus.	90% Federal Share, may request up to 100% - Requests for less federal share may be given a higher score, all else being equal.	Not to exceed 80% Federal Share, exception in rural areas.
Project Evaluation Criteria:	1) Demonstrated need; 2) Planning and prioritization at the local/regional level; 3) Project is ready to implement; 4) Demonstrates benefits of proposed project in reducing transportation related pollutants; 5) Supports emerging clean fuels technologies or advances technologies for transit buses; 6) Demonstrates the technical, legal, and financial capacity to carry out project; 7) Geographic Diversity <i>Please see the Federal Register for specifics</i>	1) Planning and prioritization at the local/regional level; 2) The project is ready to implement <i>Please see the Federal Register for specifics</i>	1) FTA will evaluate proposals on total energy consumption savings projected; 2) Total amount of greenhouse gas reductions projected; 3) Project innovation; 4) National applicability; 5) Project readiness; 6) Project Management; 7) Return on Investment; 8) Geographic Diversity <i>Please see the Federal Register for specifics</i>	<i>Please see the Federal Register for specifics</i>

DOT Program	Clean Fuels	Discretionary Bus and Bus Facilities	TIGGER	TIGER II
FTA Application Deadline	June 14, 2010	June 18, 2010	August 11, 2010	Preapplication due by July 16, 2010. Final due date August 23, 2010.
Application Procedures	www.grants.gov Regional agencies must provide application(s) to the City of Phoenix by May 31, 2010. (tentative)	www.grants.gov Regional agencies must provide application(s) to the City of Phoenix by June 4, 2010. (tentative)	www.grants.gov/tigger Final procedures TBD Eligible agencies can apply directly to FTA	www.grants.gov *TIGER II Planning grants may be combined with HUD Community Planning Grant Eligible agencies can apply directly to DOT
Web links to Federal Register	http://www.fta.dot.gov/laws/leg_reg_86.html Date: 4-13-10	http://www.fta.dot.gov/laws/leg_reg_86.html Date: 5-4-10	http://www.fta.dot.gov/laws/leg_reg_86.html Date: 4-13-10	http://www.dot.gov/recovery/ost/tigerii/index.html
Notification of Award:	Not available	September 2010	Not available	

ATTACHMENT THREE

**CITY OF PHOENIX PUBLIC TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
FTA GRANT STATUS REPORT
AS OF MARCH 31, 2010**

PROGRAM/ GRANT NUMBER	FEDERAL FUNDING YEAR	GRANT AWARD DATE	FEDERAL FUNDS AWARDED	FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED	FEDERAL FUNDS REMAINING	STATUS
<u>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program</u>						
AZ-90-X063	2002	12/15/2003	31,640,155	31,640,155	0	All projects complete and all funds drawn down. Grant to be closed by 6/30/10.
AZ-90-X068	2003	7/16/2004	53,778,070	53,014,897	763,173	Fare Collection System project not yet closed out due to issues with reporting. Withholding final payment to vendor until all reports are working satisfactorily. Scottsdale park and ride project planning complete, Scottsdale is proceeding with procurement for project design and construction. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2011.
AZ-90-X070	2004	3/31/2005	55,536,053	54,022,343	1,513,710	Fare Collection System project not yet closed out due to issues with reporting. Withholding final payment to vendor until all reports are working satisfactorily. Remaining funds from various completed projects being reallocated by management to other FTA funded projects. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2010.
AZ-90-X074	2005	6/2/2006	43,319,916	36,762,763	6,557,153	Various project delays for RPTA, Scottsdale, Chandler and Phoenix. Agencies are working to move projects forward, as well as reallocate remaining funds from completed projects. Estimated grant closeout - 6/30/2011.
AZ-90-X080	2006	4/20/2007	45,336,056	40,933,586	4,402,470	Reimbursements for vehicle purchases pending, and some vehicles not yet received. Remaining funds from various completed projects being reallocated to other FTA funded projects. Estimated grant close-out - 6/30/2011.
AZ-90-X088	2007	8/18/2008	42,409,809	37,403,516	5,006,293	Peoria's two remaining vehicles to be delivered in June 2010. Scottsdale Mustang Transit Center/Park and Ride project has been delayed due to the adjacent development. Rezone and resulting necessary street improvements are planned; the city continues to explore additional options to construct park and ride on city owned property. Staff is researching the reallocation of unexpended funds awarded to Maricopa County STS. Estimated grant close out - 6/30/2012.
AZ-90-X096	2008	3/3/2010	39,606,732	27,015,761	12,590,971	RPTA buses and Phoenix Dial-a-Ride vans have been delivered and in revenue service. All other vehicles are having specification written to start bid process. Preventive Maintenance costs are being gathered for reimbursement. All other projects are having scope of work finalized. Estimated grant close-out - 6/30/2015.
5307 Program Total			311,626,791	280,793,021	30,833,770	

**CITY OF PHOENIX PUBLIC TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
FTA GRANT STATUS REPORT
AS OF MARCH 31, 2010**

PROGRAM/ GRANT NUMBER	FEDERAL FUNDING YEAR	GRANT AWARD DATE	FEDERAL FUNDS AWARDED	FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED	FEDERAL FUNDS REMAINING	STATUS
<u>CMAQ/STP Transfers from FHWA</u>						
AZ-90-X084	2006	6/21/2006	18,561,754	17,674,137	887,617	Scottsdale - Skysong transit center design work in process. Surrounding development issues may delay design completion. Mesa - design for Loop 202/Power Rd. park and ride is complete. Mesa currently bidding for construction. Estimated grant closeout - 06/30/2011.
AZ-95-X003	2007	1/7/2008	1,894,000	1,894,000	0	Funds fully expended and grant is complete. Grant to be closed by 6/30/2010.
AZ-95-X004	2007/2008	11/25/2008	16,538,743	14,502,340	2,036,403	Vehicles have been delivered and paid for except for expansion vanpool vans, which are currently on order. Design for Happy Valley/I-17 park-and-ride is awaiting final invoice with construction contract to be awarded in May 2010. Main/Sycamore intermodal transit center is complete and minor repairs to be completed. Estimated grant close-out: 12/31/2011.
CMAQ/STP Transfers Total			62,242,911	34,070,477	28,172,434	
<u>Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Program</u>						
AZ-03-0046	2004	8/2/2005	12,135,920	11,165,046	970,874	Recently received Congressional approval to move earmarked funds to another project. Planning process for new project to begin in the near future. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2011.
AZ-03-0050	2005	7/20/2006	12,730,295	12,390,172	340,123	Recently received Congressional approval to move earmarked funds to another project. Planning process for new project to begin in the near future. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2011.
AZ-04-0004	2006	8/31/2007	7,312,615	5,774,238	1,538,377	Evaluating reallocation of unexpended funds from completed projects to another FTA project. Scottsdale's project is 30% complete for design; right-of-way negotiations being conducted. Construction planned to start in September. Estimated grant close-out: 12/31/2011.
AZ-04-0005	2007	7/21/2008	3,210,240	2,307,360	902,880	Evaluating reallocation of funds to another FTA project. Scottsdale's Skysong project is 30% complete for design; right-of-way negotiations being conducted with adjacent property owners. Construction planned to start in September. Estimated grant close-out: 12/31/2011.
5309 Bus Program Total			35,389,070	31,636,816	3,752,254	

**CITY OF PHOENIX PUBLIC TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
FTA GRANT STATUS REPORT
AS OF MARCH 31, 2010**

PROGRAM/ GRANT NUMBER	FEDERAL FUNDING YEAR	GRANT AWARD DATE	FEDERAL FUNDS AWARDED	FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED	FEDERAL FUNDS REMAINING	STATUS
<u>Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization Program</u>						
AZ-05-0201	2007	7/10/2008	2,727,749	1,859,375	868,374	Vehicle purchase complete, remaining funds being evaluated for reallocation to another FTA project. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2010.
5309 FGM Program Total			2,727,749	1,859,375	868,374	
<u>Section 5309 New Starts Program</u>						
AZ-03-0031	2005	1/0/1900	489,950,097	489,950,097	0	Amount awarded for this grant is the total amount appropriated, allocated, and awarded through the grant process to date (through amendment 11). Balance of New Starts funding for the light rail transit project of \$61,249,903 is included in the FY 2010 appropriations, but not yet made available by FTA.
5309 New Starts Program Total			489,950,097	489,950,097	0	
<u>Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program</u>						
AZ-37-X006	2006	4/26/2007	1,437,345	1,414,832	22,513	Project nearly complete. MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan includes updates on the progress made from the previous plan, highlights useful coordination practices and provides new strategies to address the gaps in the region. The FY 2011 plan is going through the approval process. Estimated grant closeout - 09/3/2010.
AZ-37-X008	2007	8/15/2008	1,515,115	464,982	1,050,133	Evaluating the reallocation of funds resulting from the discontinuation of Maricopa County's Special Transportation Services. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2011.
5316 Program Total			2,952,460	1,879,813	1,072,647	
<u>Section 5317 New Freedom Program</u>						
AZ-57-X001	2006	6/13/2008	1,052,690	389,259	663,431	RPTA - programs continuing. Voluneeter program still operating well. Software update delayed. Travel training program - additional training conducted. Funds awarded to Maricopa County to be reallocated as a result of discontinuation of Maricopa County STS. Funds awarded to Four Sisters need to be reallocated due to matching funding issues. Estimated grant close-out - 06/30/2011.
AZ-57-X008	2008	8/19/2009	451,217	29,086	422,131	East Valley Paratransit service above and beyond required ADA Complementary Paratransit Service has been implemented and is operating with 5317 funds. East Valley Travel Training Program has begun preliminary travel training work. Operating assistance cost is coming in lower than anticipated. Estimated grant close-out - 9/30/2011.

**CITY OF PHOENIX PUBLIC TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
FTA GRANT STATUS REPORT
AS OF MARCH 31, 2010**

PROGRAM/ GRANT NUMBER	FEDERAL FUNDING YEAR	GRANT AWARD DATE	FEDERAL FUNDS AWARDED	FEDERAL FUNDS EXPENDED	FEDERAL FUNDS REMAINING	STATUS
5317 Program Total			1,503,907	418,345	1,085,562	
Section 5339 Alternatives Analysis Program						
AZ-39-0001	2007	5/15/2008	993,600	533,049	460,551	MAG - travel forecasting complete. Special events and model development in progress. RPTA - On-board survey final report is complete. Gathering supporting documentation for eligibility of staff costs to submit reimbursement request. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2010.
AZ-39-0002	2008	9/9/2008	1,568,000	1,289,148	278,852	Alternatives Analysis for high capacity/light rail extensions to Mesa, South Tempe and West Phoenix. Mesa and Tempe studies complete, West Phoenix study in progress. Estimated grant close-out - 12/31/2010
5339 Program Total			2,561,600	1,822,197	739,403	
ARRA						
AZ-96-0002 (5307 Urban Area)	2009	8/21/2009	66,074,735	7,978,174	58,096,561	RFP's have been issued. Contracts have been awarded on some of the projects. Projects at various stages - interviewing contractors, design completed, and construction started. Estimated grant close-out - 6/30/2011.
AZ-66-X001 (FHWA Transfers)	2009	8/20/2009	1,047,382	0	1,047,382	RFP was issued and construction contract is expected to be awarded by City Council in January. Anticipate construction to begin next quarter. Estimated grant close-out - 6/30/2011.
AZ-56-0001 (5309 Fixed Guideway)	2009	8/20/2009	640,070	816	639,254	A request for authorization to award the design contract is going to the Phoenix City Council on May 19th. Estimated grant close-out: 12/31/2011.
AZ-36-0001 (5309 New Starts)	2009	8/20/2009	36,000,000	36,000,000	0	The project has been substantially complete and service has been operating since December 27, 2008. The majority of the contracts are in close out phases with very few punch list items remaining. A few issues have occurred relating to various phases of the project and are in different stages of resolution. Funds in this grant are fully expended, and the grant was closed on 11/17/2009.
ARRA Program Total			103,762,187	43,978,990	59,783,197	
TOTAL			1,012,716,772	886,409,131	126,307,641	