

December 7, 2009

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: David Moody, City of Peoria, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Monday, December 14, 2009, 10:00 a.m.  
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) 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.**

The next meeting of the MAG Transportation Review Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. 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 Christina Hopes 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 TRC. If the Transportation Review 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 Eric Anderson or Christina Hopes at (602) 254-6300 if you have any questions or need additional information.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Draft October 29, 2009 Minutes
3. Approval of Draft November 14, 2009 Minutes
4. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Review 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 Transportation Review Committee requests an exception to this limit.

5. Transportation Director's Report

Recent transportation planning activities and upcoming agenda items for the MAG Management Committee will be reviewed by the Transportation Director.

6. Consent Agenda

Consent items are marked with an asterisk (\*). Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda to be heard.

2. Approve Draft minutes of the October 29, 2009 meeting.
3. Approve Draft minutes of the November 14, 2009 meeting.
4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

6. Recommend approval of the Consent Agenda

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT

- 6a\*. Development of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 - 2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the FY 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program

The processes for developing the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement

- 6a\*. For information and discussion.

Program (TIP) and FY 2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) have been developed and released to MAG Member Agencies. Please refer to Attachment One for memorandum addressing the annual update processes for the Draft FY 2011-2015 TIP and Draft FY 2011 ALCP, deadlines, and ALCP certification requirements.

#### ITEMS TO BE HEARD

7. Project Changes – Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The Fiscal Year 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan 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. A handout of proposed amendments to the FY 2008-2012 TIP will be provided at the meeting.

8. Programming of Projects for MAG Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding in the Draft FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) allocates MAG Federal CMAQ funds to specific modes, and, in some cases, identifies specific projects for the funds. For Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Bicycle, Pedestrian and Air Quality projects, the RTP identified CMAQ allocations, but did not specify individual projects. The CMAQ funding available for PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road projects in FY 2013 is \$4.513 million (m); \$6.887m is available for ITS projects in FY 2014; and \$8.737m is available for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects in FY 2014. Applications were made available in August 2009 with a due date of September 18, 2009. The related technical advisory committees (TAC) went through a two-tiered committee

7. For information, discussion and recommendation to approve of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update.

8. For information, discussion, and possible action to recommend a list of projects to be added to the Draft FY2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

review process starting in October that resulted in project rankings by the ITS and Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee in November and the Air Quality TAC in December. Attachment Two includes memoranda from the Chairs of the respective committees that details the evaluation and ranking process used and the ranked lists of projects per modal category.

9. Re-allocation of Unused Local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds Policy Options – Technical Programming Issues

Through the MAG Committee process, discussions have been held regarding the anticipated unobligated Local/MPO ARRA funds due to low project cost bids and projects not obligating by the March 2, 2010 deadline. An approval of policy and programming recommendations through the last committee cycle addressed how unobligated American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Local funds (due to either projects not obligating or project cost savings)\* are to be programmed. The Committees recommended approval that any unobligated American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Local funds\* are to be programmed at the local discretion first, and may remain ARRA funds or may be exchanged with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for ADOT Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. ADOT would then use the ARRA funds on highway projects in the MAG region and ADOT will transfer an equivalent amount of ADOT STP funds that can be used by MAG members on local federally funded projects. If applicable, the local agency may use project cost savings from their original ARRA allocation to lower the 30 percent local cost share on projects programmed under the 70/30 cost share policy. There are three technical programming issues to be addressed for the policy recommendation to move forward: (1) establish a threshold (total cost percent, dollar amount, etc.) related to

9. Information, discussion, and possible recommendation of technical programming issues related to the previously approved policy for programming future Unused Local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds.

programming ARRA/STP funds on local projects, (2) determine local projects that can obligate by September 2010, and (3) prioritize a Regional Projects list. Please refer to Attachment Three.

10. Development of MAG Transportation Financial Plan

One of the recommendations made at the recent MAG Federal Certification meeting was for MAG to have better documentation on the financial assumptions underlying the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Federal Certification process is conducted every four years by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to ensure that the MPO planning process meets the federal requirements and to make recommendations that could improve the transportation planning in the region. Both the FHWA and FTA are concerned about the fiscal component of the TIP and RTP in light of the significant downturn in local and regional revenues. The first two years of the TIP must be constrained to committed, available revenues and the RTP must be constrained to revenues that are reasonably available. MAG Staff will provide an overview of the fiscal constraint requirements and what financial components may be included in the MAG Transportation Financial Plan.

11. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Monthly Status Report

A Status Report on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds dedicated to transportation projects in the MAG region details the status of project development as of November 24, 2009. The report covers highway, local, transit, and enhancement projects programmed with ARRA funds and the status of project

10. For information and discussion.

11. For information and discussion.

development milestones per project. Please refer to Attachment Four.

12. Report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update (PM/CMP) Study

The MAG Regional Performance Report completes Phase II of the PM/CMP Study. The report documents and analyzes primary transportation performance indicators at a system and corridor level based on multi-modal observed data sets. Measures such as throughput, speed, travel time, delay and variability are included, as well as safety and mobility indicators. Performance for transit, freight and alternative modes are also documented, establishing a reporting template for future years. A summary of analysis and findings will be presented as well as a overview of the Technical Advisory Group collaborative participation on this process. Please refer to Attachment Five for additional information.

13. Request for Future Agenda Items

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

14. Member Agency Update

This section of the Agenda will provide Committee members with an opportunity to share information regarding a variety of transportation-related issues within their respective communities.

15. Next Meeting Date

The next regular TRC meeting will be scheduled Thursday, January 28, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room.

12. For information and discussion.

13. For information and discussion.

14. For information.

15. For information.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

October 29, 2009

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
ADOT: Steve Hull for Floyd Roehrich	Mesa: Brent Stoddard for Scott Butler
#Avondale: David Fitzhugh	Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Phoenix: Ed Zuercher
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus	Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman
El Mirage: Pat Dennis for Lance Calvert	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart
*Gila Bend: Rick Buss	Surprise: Bob Maki
Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for Doug Torres	Tempe: Jyme Sue McLaren for Chris Salomone
Gilbert: Michelle Gramley for Tami Ryall	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Glendale: Bob Darr for Terry Johnson	Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson
Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres	
*Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten for Mike Cartsonis	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Peggy Rubach, RPTA
*ITS Committee: John Abraham, City of Surprise	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Kevin Wallace, MAG	Karen Peters, Phoenix
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Andy Granger, Peoria
Roger Herzog, MAG	John Dickson, ADOT	Thomas Relucio, Glendale
Christina Hopes, MAG	Clem Ligocki, MCDOT	Wulf Grote, METRO
Marc Pearsall, MAG	Bill Vachon, FHWA	Ray Dovalina, Phoenix
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Kwi-Sung Kang, MAG	Linda Branch-Dasch, MCDOT
Monique de los Rios -Urban, MAG	Connie Randall, Phoenix	
	Matt Busby, Apache Junction	

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Chairman Moody started the meeting with a few brief announcements. He reminded the Committee of the MAG Committee Operating Procedures and Policies approved by the MAG Regional Council, which required a quorum at all times during the meeting. Chairman Moody directed the Committee's attention to a memorandum at their places from the MAG Executive Director regarding the "Arizona We Want" Gallup poll.

2. Approval of the Draft October 1, 2009 Minutes

Chairman Moody asked if there were any changes or amendments to the October 1, 2009 meeting minutes, and there were none. Mr. Bryan Jungwirth from RPTA moved to approve the minutes. Mr. David Meinhart from City of Scottsdale seconded the motion, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Moody stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Eric Anderson from MAG to present the Transportation Director's Report. Mr. Anderson reported that the September Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues had decreased by 13.4 percent compared to September 2008. He also reported that year-to-date RARF revenues were down 13.6 percent.

Mr. Anderson announced that the MAG Regional Council had approved a modification the November 30, 2009 hard deadline to obligate projects funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). He stated the Regional Council voted to change the November deadline to a milestone for locally sponsored ARRA projects to obligate. He added that a hard deadline would be established for the month of January.

Mr. Anderson also announced that MAG Regional Council approved the tentative scenario for the Freeway Life Cycle Program (FLCP), which deferred over \$6 billion in project funding to an unfunded phase of the program. He reported that MAG Staff would begin the cash flow analysis and fiscally balance the FLCP based on the approved prioritization of projects.

Mr. Anderson reported that the MAG Federal Fund Working Group met on October 22, 2009. He explained the Working Group was reviewing the Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming

Principles. Mr. Anderson stated that at the meeting, MAG Staff presented a survey of the programming processes and deferral policies of six large Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). He added that a third meeting of the MAG Federal Fund Working Group meeting would be held in December 2009; however, the exact date had not been determined.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about this agenda item. There were none, and this concluded the Transportation Director's Report.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Addressing the next order of business, Chairman Moody directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda. He inquired if there were any questions or comments about consent agenda item 5a on the Transportation Review Committee tentative 2010 meeting schedule. There were none. Ms. Pat Dennis from the City of El Mirage motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Ed Zuercher from the City of Phoenix seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

6. Project Changes – Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager, to present proposed project changes to the MAG Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a revised project change sheet at their places that included an additional column regarding air quality conformity determination.

Ms. Yazzie explained that the project changes with a conformity notation would be heard by the Management Committee in November and by the Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council in December. She stated that the project changes would be presented for inclusion in the MAG TIP pending the conformity determination was approved by the MAG Regional Council.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda item, and there were none. Mr. Meinhart motioned to approve of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County seconded the motion, and the project changes were approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Federal Funded Projects Not Obligating in FFY 2009

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to present on federally funded projects that would not obligate in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009. Ms. Yazzie reported that after the completion of the Federal Fund Closeout Process MAG received notification that two additional projects would not obligate in FFY 2009.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the current Federal Fund Programming Principles did not address projects that failed to obligate outside the closeout process. She explained that the local agency sponsors (City of Scottsdale and Town of Fountain Hills) had requested to defer the projects from FFY 2009 to FFY 2010. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown motioned to defer the two projects from FFY 2009 to FFY 2010 as requested. Mr. Scott Lowe from the Town of Buckeye seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

8. Re-allocation of Unused Local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds Policy Options

Moving on, Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to present on the policy options for the reallocation of unused local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds. Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that a five page memorandum and other handouts for the agenda item had been transmitted electronically to the Committee earlier in the week. She apologized for delay in disseminating the information citing that MAG had not received the information until Friday the previous week.

Ms. Yazzie acknowledged that Mr. Bill Vachon from the local Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office and Mr. John Dickson from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Local Governments Section were at the table to assist in answering any questions or concerns of the Committee. She reiterated the main objective was to obligate all locally sponsored ARRA projects prior to the federally mandated March 2, 2010 deadline.

Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff continued to frequently coordinate with ADOT and FHWA to meet the objective. Ms. Yazzie added that FHWA wanted to obligate all local, regional and state ARRA funds by February 1, 2010. She explained that FHWA's deadline was to allow the local office sufficient time to balance the books and ensure that all ARRA funding was obligated by the federally mandated deadline.

Ms. Yazzie emphasized the time constraints each agency would experience between November and January in attempt to process all of the ARRA funded projects. She reported that 65 local ARRA projects in the MAG Region, excluding highway projects and statewide ARRA projects. Ms. Yazzie cautioned that ADOT and FHWA would experience congestion in processing the ARRA projects given the number of projects that must be reviewed and obligated by the established deadlines.

Ms. Yazzie also cautioned that typically it required two to four weeks for a project to obligate once environmental clearances had been approved. She stated that self-certified agencies would be at an advantage in regards to clearances because generally the agency could obligate a project within a week once environmental cleared. She encouraged the Committee to consider these factors in the discussion and development of possible policy options.

Ms. Yazzie addressed a handout that was electronically disseminated to the Committee, which listed projects as possibly candidates for unobligated ARRA funds. She explained that the

eligibility listed in the handout was derived from project status information available to MAG, FHWA, and ADOT. Ms. Yazzie emphasized that projects listed as “No” were not being excluded from potential funding. She clarified that the projects did not appear, based on current information, to be likely to obligate by the February 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

Ms. Yazzie added that project status in the handout could be discussed with each member agency and revised at a later time if additional information was available. She emphasized that a project listed as a “No” may be a potential candidate to receive ARRA project savings. She explained that MAG Staff would continue ARRA policy discussions through the January Committee cycle to identify candidate projects for ARRA project savings that could obligate after the initial March 2, 2010 deadline and prior to the September 10, 2010 deadline. Then, Ms. Yazzie summarized upcoming deadlines and meeting dates between November and the March obligation deadline. She also summarized the October ARRA Status Report noting the obligation of a City of Phoenix project.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that key factors used to develop policy options included eligibility per the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and ARRA guidance and project readiness to obligate by the established deadlines. Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff was coordinating with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to evaluate project readiness. She then presented policy options, or categories, which were presented in no particular order.

Ms. Yazzie stated that under Category 1, unused/unobligated ARRA funds would be applied to existing ARRA funded projects, however, any increase in project scope would be prohibited. She announced that two analyses were conducted on Category 1, which were provided in Exhibits One and Two.

Ms. Yazzie explained that Exhibit One provided calculations if the existing local, regional, and non-ARRA federal funds were replaced with additional ARRA funds. She explained that the approach would result in current ARRA projects being funded with 100 percent ARRA funds. Ms. Yazzie reported that funding all ARRA projects at 100 percent could result in the obligation of \$18.45 million in unobligated ARRA funds by the March 2, 2010 deadline.

Ms. Yazzie explained that Exhibit Two demonstrated the application of unobligated ARRA funds to current ARRA funded projects that required additional funding due to unexpected project costs. She stated that more information would be required on the potential projects. Ms. Yazzie reported that the approach listed in Exhibit Two could result in the obligation of \$3.68 million in unobligated ARRA funds.

Then, Ms. Yazzie summarized the policy considerations pertaining to Category 1. She explained the policy considerations and proposed prioritization included:

- If the Local Agency had cost savings or unobligated ARRA funds, then the unused funds could be moved to another ARRA funded project in that jurisdiction that needed additional funds; AND THEN,
- If the Local Agency had cost savings or unobligated ARRA funds, and the Local Agency did not have another ARRA funded project that needed additional funds, the cost savings would be returned to the region to be reprogrammed on currently ARRA funded projects

that had other types of funding (i.e., federal, regional, local) programmed or that needed additional funds; OR

- If there are cost savings/unobligated ARRA Local funds, the funds are automatically returned to the region to be reprogrammed on a currently programmed ARRA funded project with other types of funding (federal, regional, local) programmed or that needed additional funds. (Under this policy option, the local agency would not have discretion in the reallocation of cost savings.); AND THEN,
- If the cost savings or unobligated ARRA funds came back to the region, currently programmed ARRA local projects that could use the funds would be reprogrammed according to a prioritized list generated by MAG and approved through the MAG Committee process.

Next, Ms. Yazzie summarized Category 2. She explained that under Category 2, cost savings or unobligated ARRA funds would be applied to federally funded projects that would obligate prior to March 2010. She stated that MAG Staff had received suggestions to reduce the minimum local match established in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and other MAG policies to maximize the amount of ARRA funds that could be applied under Category 2.

Ms. Yazzie referred the Committee to Exhibit Three, which included two scenarios for replacing non-ARRA federal funds and other fund sources on currently programmed federally funded projects. Under Scenario 1, unobligated ARRA funds would be applied towards the local match on currently programmed federally funded projects resulting in several projects funded with 100 percent ARRA funds. Ms. Yazzie announced that under Category 2-Scenario 1, \$10.749 million in unobligated ARRA funds could obligate before the March deadline.

Ms. Yazzie explained the Category 2-Scenario 2 would work in a similar fashion, but maintain the local match requirement established in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as well as other current MAG Policies. Under Scenario 2, non-ARRA federal funds and other funds would be removed and replaced with unused unobligated ARRA funds up to the regionally established local match requirement. Ms. Yazzie stated that under Category 2-Scenario 2 \$7.33 million could be obligated before March 2, 2010.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that by replacing federal funds with ARRA funds, MAG Member Agencies would have the flexibility to obligate the freed up federal funds by September 2010. He added the federal funds then could be reprogrammed to other projects that would not obligate by the March deadline, but could obligate by the September deadline.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that certain projects listed as "No" in Exhibit Three would be unable to obligate by March 2010, but may be eligible for ARRA project savings. She explained certain projects currently listed as "No" may be candidates for the reallocation of ARRA bid savings because the projects would be able to obligate by the federally mandated project savings obligation deadline of September 10, 2010.

Then, Ms. Yazzie summarized the policy considerations pertaining to Category 2. She explained the policy considerations and proposed prioritization included:

- If project cost savings occur AND the Local Agency had another federally funded project ready to obligate as indicated on the approved "ARRA Project Ready list," AND the cost savings represent at least 25 percent of the federal funds programmed for the proposed project, THEN Local Agency could request to reprogram the funds to that project; OR.

- If the cost savings did not represent at least 25 percent of the federal funds programmed for a proposed project, THEN the cost savings would be returned to the region to be reprogrammed; OR;
- If a Local Agency had cost savings but did not have a federally funded project ready to obligate, THEN the cost savings are returned to the region to be reprogrammed.

Ms. Yazzie clarified that the 25 percent threshold listed in the policy considerations was a suggestion and not a recommendation. She explained that Committee should consider what threshold, if any, would be appropriate under the policy option.

Next, Ms. Yazzie discussed Category 3, which would apply funds towards other local projects eligible for ARRA funds that could obligate by March, but considered “new” or are not currently programmed federal funds. Ms. Yazzie referred the Committee to Exhibit Four that listed projects submitted by MAG Member Agencies for consideration and that the member agency thought could obligate by March 2, 2010.

Ms. Yazzie stated that based on discussions with ADOT and FHWA, all of the projects submitted for consideration would not obligate by the March 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline. She added that if member agencies had additional information that might change a project’s eligibility status that MAG would set up meetings to discuss documentation further. Ms. Yazzie emphasized that projects deemed “No” may be candidates for ARRA funds from bid savings after the March deadline.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie addressed Category 4. Under Category 4, the region would transfer any unobligated funds to the Arizona Department of Transportation for regional highway projects. Ms. Yazzie announced that the MAG Regional Council approved \$59 million in backup highway projects that could obligate by the March deadline. She stated that if the Committee decided to proceed with this option, then MAG would need to conduct additional talks with ADOT about the exchange of ARRA funds for STP funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Category 5 included the transfer of unobligated ARRA funds to transit for regional transit projects. She referred the Committee to Exhibit Six, which indicated that approximately \$62 million of capital projects are currently funded with ARRA Transit funds. Ms. Yazzie explained if highway/local/MPO ARRA funds were flexed over to transit, then a budget modification would be required that would reallocate the ARRA Transit funds to operations and maintenance and apply the highway/local/MPO ARRA funds to transit capital expenditures. She emphasized that under the STP guidance, ARRA and STP funds could not be used for transit operations and maintenance.

Ms. Yazzie explained that under the Category 5 option, the unobligated funds must be transferred by FHWA to FTA by February 1, 2010. She added that FHWA had encouraged MAG to apply the ARRA funds to non-transit projects before making the transfer if possible. She added that under the option, any funds flexed to transit must be obligated by September 2010, and any funds exchanged would not return to the MAG region.

Mr. Eric Anderson noted that the next regularly meeting of the TRC was schedule for Monday, December 14, 2009. He explained items discussed at that meeting would be presented to Management, TPC, and Regional Council in January. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG Staff

needed policy guidance from MAG Member Agencies otherwise staff would be forced to make the decision internally in order to ensure the obligation of the regional ARRA funds.

Mr. Anderson reported that MAG Staff would coordinate closely with FHWA and ADOT on project status over the next few weeks. He stated MAG intended to allow FHWA and ADOT to make the determination on if project could obligate by the established milestones and deadlines. Mr. Anderson added that if it appeared that a project might not obligate by the established deadlines, then MAG would coordinate with the Local Agency to determine if any remedial action was available to ensure timely obligation.

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Vachon to address the Committee before opening the floor to a general discussion. Mr. Vachon stated that FHWA was not interested in influencing the project selection and prioritization process. He stated that FHWA was subject to heightened scrutiny on ARRA funded projects from the US Congress and the General Accounting Office (GAO). Mr. Vachon stated that FHWA was available to assist agencies where applicable, but cautioned that FHWA would not give any leeway with the issues being discussed given the required level of transparency.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated that Arizona was subject to higher scrutiny on ARRA funding and implementation due to the FHWA Administrator's previous position as the Director of ADOT. He announced that the GAO had conducted an office visit two weeks early and would continue to monitor ARRA funded projects in the region.

Then, Chairman Moody invited Mr. John Dickson from the ADOT Local Governments Section to address the Committee. Mr. Dickson reiterated the sentiments of Mr. Vachon. He encouraged MAG Member Agencies to review project information in a timely manner in an effort to keep the obligation process fluid. Mr. Dickson stated that the ADOT's target was to finalized all environmental clearances by the end of November. He acknowledged that the effort was ambitious, but reachable if the local government coordinated with ADOT.

Chairman Moody solicited Committee input on the agenda item. Mr. Hauskins noted an error on Exhibit Three. He reiterated that Maricopa County was interested in being a team player in the ARRA programming process. Ms. Yazzie explained that readiness opinions were determined in collaboration with FHWA, FTA, MAG, and ADOT. She stated that MAG Staff would met with local agencies to address any concerns in greater details.

Mr. Hauskins and Mr. Ed Zuercher from the City of Phoenix expressed gratitude to MAG Staff, FHWA, and ADOT for their efforts on ARRA funded projects. Mr. Zuercher stated the a City of Phoenix recently obligated and that the City anticipated significant savings due to lower bid costs.

Mr. David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale voiced support for Category 1 given the various factors associated with ARRA funding. He stated it would be beneficial to fund all existing projects at 100 percent before funding additional projects. Mr. Fitzhugh also concurred with

FHWA and ADOT's stance the Local/MPO ARRA funds should be applied to streets and highways before being applied towards transit.

Ms. Dennis voiced support for allowing local agency's to reprogram bid savings to other projects in that jurisdiction before returning the funds to the region for reprogram. She stated the City of El Mirage needed to coordinate with MAG on updating the project listing as presented in the Exhibits and MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

Ms. Yazzie inquired if the Committee felt a minimum savings threshold should be established to determine if the savings are reprogrammed within the jurisdiction or returned to region for reprogramming. She questioned the feasibility of programming a minute amount of bid savings to another project, which would require the local agency to provide a substantial amount of local funds. Mr. Eric Anderson added to the discussion stating that the administrative costs associated were significant when reprogramming ARRA funds to another project. He encouraged to the Committee to consider establishing a minimum threshold for projects.

Chairman Moody inquired if amendments to the TIP, if needed, would be difficult. Mr. Anderson replied that TIP amendments that did not impact air quality conformity could be done on a monthly basis. He explained that TIP amendments that did not impact conformity were typically financial adjustments. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG Staff would coordinate with member agencies on making necessary modifications to the TIP. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Scott Lowe from the Town of Buckeye stated it might be in the region's best interest to maximize funding on existing projects, excluding expenditures related to scope creep. He stated that certain bid alternates might increase cost estimates without changing the scope of the project. Ms. Yazzie replied that in March/April 2009 that the City of Phoenix had contacted ADOT to request doing bid alternatives. She explained that FHWA sent the request the FHWA Headquarters for review and approval, and FHWA decided that bid alternatives would not be accepted for ARRA funded projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that once a project scope and clearances had been submitted and approved that changes to the scope and type of pavement were not typically permitted. She deferred the question to Mr. Dickson for clarification and additional input. Mr. Dickson responded that allowable changes were dependent on the defined environmental footprint and other factors. Mr. Lowe stated that FHWA did allow bid alternatives regarding pavement. Ms. Yazzie deferred the question to Mr. Vachon, who stated that although FHWA would permit bid alternatives it was not something that ADOT traditionally permitted. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown stated that the focus should be on clearances not design. He explained that small cities rely upon ADOT management consultants for clearances. He stated that obtaining clearances, not that design element, that was the critical path for small cities that wanted to apply bid savings from a project to another project. Mr. Grant Anderson stated it is the ADOT staff and the management consultants' capacity to obtain the clearances in a short time frame that was most important. He

emphasized the need to achieve the goals instead of saying things could not be done.

Mr. Dan Cook from the City of Chandler stated the process needed to be fluid and dynamic as it could be. He stated the application of unused ARRA may be based on projects, which are ready to go first. Ms. Yazzie stated that MAG Staff had conducted additional research, which noted potential projects to receive ARRA funding that could obligate between March and September 2010. She stated that MAG would send the information electronically to the Committee after the meeting.

Mr. Bob Maki from the City of Surprise expressed concerns about the delays in processing documentation at ADOT. He stated that delays were contributing local agency challenges in obligating projects within the established time frame.

Mr. Meinhart inquired if the suggested 25 percent threshold applied to the total project cost or the federal funds programmed on a project. Ms. Yazzie clarified the proposed threshold applied towards the total cost on federally funded projects. Mr. Meinhart inquired if MAG Staff had modified the stance on applying unobligated ARRA based on guidance received from FHWA and FTA. Ms. Yazzie explained that flexing the unobligated ARRA to transit was still a viable option, however, the funds could not be directly transferred to transit operations.

Mr. Brent Stoddard from the City of Mesa inquired if the "No" determination was based on the February or March 2010 deadlines discussed. Ms. Yazzie replied that both deadlines were taken into consideration when making the determinations. Mr. Stoddard stated member agencies probably needed additional time to process the information presented and to verify project information with internal staff, ADOT, FHWA and MAG before deciding on a specific policy option. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Ed Zuercher from the City of Phoenix exited the meeting and was replaced by a proxy, Mr. Ray Dovalina. Mr. Stoddard inquired what specific guidance MAG was requesting from the Committee. Mr. Eric Anderson stated that MAG Staff would like guidance on a policy option to proceed adding that any guidance on the subject at this point would be beneficial. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG Staff could call a special session of the Transportation Review Committee to discuss the matter further and allow member agencies to review the information presented.

Ms. Yazzie encouraged the Committee to consider the likelihood that transit would have project savings from Transit ARRA funded projects. She stated that bid savings were coming in at 10 to 50 percent below cost estimates. Ms. Yazzie stated that according to the RPTA Board, the majority of Transit ARRA project savings would be allocated towards operation and maintenance.

Mr. Cato Esquivel from the City of Goodyear inquired if the supplanted funds in Exhibits One and Two would be returned to the local agencies or a regional pot for reprogramming. Ms. Yazzie replied that various factors would need to be considered. She added that Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds allocated to the Arterial Life Cycle Program would need to remain with the program due to a current deficit of program funds.

Discussion followed. After the discussion, Chairman Moody inquired if the Committee would like to make a motion. Mr. John Hauskins motioned for MAG Staff to conduct a special session of the Committee to allow members to review the information presented and discuss the agenda item further. Mr. Stoddard seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program Policies and Procedures

Chairman Moody invited Ms. Christina Hopes from MAG to present proposed revisions to the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures (Policies). Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) was one of three life cycle programs funded through Proposition 400. She stated that the implementation of the ALCP was governed by the ALCP Policies and Procedures approved through the MAG Committee Process.

Ms. Hopes explained that November 9, 2009 MAG Member Agencies had expressed concerns about the Policies after an update was approved by the MAG Regional Council on April 22, 2009. She reported that MAG Staff conducted an ALCP Working Group meeting on September 3, 2009 to address the concerns and develop potential revisions to the approved Policies. Ms. Hopes stated she would provide the Committee with an overview of the ALCP Working Group discussion and present policy recommendations stemming from the meeting. She stated that specific concerns addressed at the meeting included programming the ALCP with a deficit of program funds, the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) Closeout Process, the timely and accurate collection of program data, and the reallocation of project savings.

First, Ms. Hopes discussed member agency concerns expressed about programming projects with a deficit of program funds. She reported that Section 270 of the Policies addressed the surplus or deficit of program funds in the ALCP. Ms. Hopes stated that the current policy was to defer programmed reimbursements in priority order in the event of a deficit. She explained that when a deficit of funds occurred that reimbursements would be shifted to maintain the fiscal balance of the program. Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that although the Working Group was concerned about the deficit of program funds, changes to existing policies were not recommended by the Working Group.

Next, Ms. Hopes addressed the RARF Closeout Process detailed in Section 260 of the Policies. She stated that Section 260 established the eligibility and prioritization of projects selected during RARF Closeout. Ms. Hopes explained that any project eligible for RARF Closeout must be completed and the facility must be open to traffic. She stated the issue addressed by the Working Group was if the definition of “completed” or “closed out” needed to be defined in the Policies. Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that a project previously recommended to receive RARF Closeout funds had requested to submit invoices after the project was reported as complete. She stated that although facilities may be open to traffic, invoices from consultants were submitted to the Lead Agency after the project segment was “closed out.”

Ms. Hopes announced the Working Group’s policy recommendation was to allow MAG Staff to make the determination on if a project is closed out, but to prohibit additional invoices from

being submitted for reimbursement. Ms. Hopes reported that the Working Group did not want to revise the current Policies and preferred that MAG Staff use their discretion in making decisions related to RARF Closeout eligibility and invoicing.

Moving on, Ms. Hopes discussed the timely and accurate submission of project data to MAG. Ms. Hopes stated that per the approved Policies, Lead Agencies were required to update project data on annual basis, commonly referred to as the annual update. She reported the MAG Staff has experienced issues with late submissions of data and gross inaccuracies in the data submitted. Ms. Hopes cited a length amendment in July 2009 to the MAG Transportation Improvement Program after the discovery of inaccurate project data being incorporated into the ALCP, which has been approved a month earlier. She provided examples that included data being submitted two to three months after the deadline as well as work being reported as done in previous years that had not been done and was now schedule to start in 2016.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that MAG Staff had no recourse when agencies did not submit accurate data in a timely manner. She stated that the ALCP Working Group agreed the issue was a concern, but did not propose revisions to the Policies or provide specific direction for MAG Staff. She requested the Transportation Review Committee's input on potential methods to improve the collection of data. A brief discussion followed. The Committee agreed that erroneous and late data was an issue and requested that MAG Staff conducted additional analysis and report to the Committee at a future meeting in an effort to resolve the issue.

Continuing on, Ms. Hopes discussed Section 350 of the Policies, which addressed the reallocation of project savings. Ms. Hopes directed the Committee's attention to the existing policy language that was provided in a memorandum in the agenda packet. She explained that the current policy required additional refinement because it was unclear if project savings must remain with a project until the entire corridor was completed. She added that the Policy also did not provide guidance on how the reallocation of project savings should be treated for multi-jurisdictional projects versus projects contained and administered wholly within one jurisdiction.

Chair Moody inquired about the current methods for notifying and requesting data regarding the ALCP. Ms. Hopes replied that at the start of each fiscal year MAG Staff published an ALCP Program Schedule that details processes and deadlines pertaining the program. She stated that two months prior to the annual update submission due date that MAG Staff disseminates materials, including clearly defined instructions and due dates. She added that MAG Staff continuously coordinates with member agencies during that period to facilitate the timely submission of accurate data.

Ms. Hopes expressed concerns about the assignment of TIP identification numbers for projects that would not be underway during the TIP window as well as the impact the inaccuracies have on the programming of reimbursement in the program, particularly when the ALCP is experiencing a deficit of program funds. Discussion followed.

Ms. Hopes informed the Committee that the ALCP Working Group's policy recommendation was to clarify the existing Policies to permit the reallocation of project savings once a project

segment is complete if the project segment is contained and administered wholly within one jurisdiction. She stated the Working Group also recommended adding a new policy requiring a Lead Agency to obtain consensus from any partnering agency(s) on the reallocation of project savings from a multi-jurisdictional project if the corridor was incomplete.

Ms. Hopes directed the Committee's attention to proposed revisions to the Policies included in the agenda packet. She stated the item was on the agenda for information, discussion, and recommendation to approve the proposed revisions to Policies as listed in the agenda attachment. The proposed revisions would modify Section 350 on the Reallocation of Project Savings to read as follows:

A. Project Savings from the ALCP will not be determined by MAG to be eligible for reallocation, unless and until:

1. Construction has been completed and the work satisfies the original intent and scope of the Project, as included in the Project Agreement and Project Overview, and there are remaining regional funds allocated to the Project; OR,
  - a. high degree of certainty is obtained that construction for the original ALCP Project will be completed consistent with the Project Agreement and Project Overview specified scope and schedule.
2. If applicable, right-of-way, or other capital assets acquired with ALCP funds not used in the ALCP Project is disposed of at market rates and the funds returned to the ALCP.
3. The project segment has been reimbursed or the Final PRR documenting all project costs has been accepted by MAG.

B. ALCP regional funds found by MAG to be surplus to an ALCP Project, and for which certain criteria as established below are met, may be noted as Project Savings and reallocated to another ALCP Project depending on the availability of Program funds. Project savings may be applied:

1. To another ALCP Project or Projects to address a budget shortfall, not to exceed 70 percent of the actual total Project costs.
2. To advance a portion or entire existing ALCP Project or Projects up to the amount of available Project Savings.

C. If there are ALCP Project Savings that are not reallocated to another project or project segment currently programmed in the ALCP and the ALCP is completed, then new Project(s) for that jurisdiction may be funded.

D. Project savings may be reallocated after the completion of an ALCP Project segment.

1. For project savings from completed ALCP project segments contained and administered wholly within one jurisdiction.
  - a. The Lead Agency responsible for the project segment may reallocate the project savings to another project currently programmed in the ALCP.
2. When project savings occurs on a completed ALCP project segment located in multiple jurisdictions:
  - a. The project savings must be reallocated to another project segment located on the same corridor unless:
    - i. All project segments located on the corridor are completed. If all project segments pertaining to a corridor currently programmed in the ALCP are complete, then the Lead Agency may reallocate the project savings to another project or project segment currently programmed in the ALCP under the Lead Agency's jurisdiction.
  - b. An exception to 350.C.2.a may be granted by MAG to a Lead Agency requesting the

reallocation of project savings to another corridor prior to the completion of the original corridor where the funds were programmed for reimbursement if the Lead Agency obtains consensus from the partnering agencies from each project segment on the corridor.

i. The Lead Agency must submit a formal request in writing requesting the exception and documenting the requested reallocation of project savings. The written request must include the signed endorsement of a designated signer from each partnering agency before the reallocation will be programmed in the ALCP.

Mr. Stoddard from the City of Mesa motioned to approve the proposed revisions to ALCP Policies and Procedures approved on April 22, 2009 as presented in the agenda attachment. Mr. Dovalina from the City of Phoenix seconded, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. Acceptance of the Regional Transit Framework

Chairman Moody announced that the agenda item to accept the Regional Transit Framework Study would not be heard at this time. He stated that the agenda item would be heard by the Committee at a future meeting, and continued on to the next agenda item.

11. MAG Commuter Rail Studies Update

Chairman Moody invited Mr. Marc Pearsall from MAG to present an update on the MAG Commuter Rail Studies. Mr. Pearsall stated he would provide the Committee with an update on the Commuter Rail Studies being conducted by MAG Staff. Mr. Pearsall explained that at the request of the Regional Council, MAG Staff began in-depth Commuter Rail Planning Studies earlier in the year.

Mr. Pearsall explained that the Commuter Rail Strategic Plan indicated the need for additional planning studies on the Grand Avenue Corridor, the Yuma West Corridor, and a systemwide study. Mr. Pearsall announced that based on those recommendations MAG initiated three planning studies accordingly. He stated the Grand Avenue Corridor Development Plan would focus on the northwest of the region, and the Yuma-West Corridor Development Plan would focus on southwest valley communities. Mr. Pearsall added that the System Plan encompassed the entire MAG region and Northwestern Pinal County. He stated that a final report on the studies would be available in early 2010.

Next, Mr. Pearsall presented a series of flow-charts and maps that visualized MAG Staff's efforts on the studies. First, he presented a flowchart demonstrating the interactivity between the data-collection, the MAG rail studies and the ADOT- Building a Quality Arizona (BQAZ) rail studies that would be used to reach conclusions and recommendations in the final report. Mr. Pearsall also presented maps on the existing freight railroad network featuring candidate corridors for commuter rail service and presented a sampling of boardings per revenue mile from the first round of modeling.

Mr. Pearsall announced that the third round of modeling would be complete in November 2009. He explained the models would analyze operating scenarios, including cross valley service on a single train on multiple corridors. He stated that future extensions and

right-of-way preservation also would be included in the final report. Mr. Pearsall summarized the next steps in the ridership forecasting, which included:

- Base model scenario refinements;
- Interlined model scenarios and sensitivity test model runs,;
- Potential future extensions; and,
- Systems analysis and corridor prioritization.

Then, Mr. Pearsall stated the purpose of the corridor development plans was to determine the necessary elements to successfully implement commuter rail service and the feasibility of implementing commuter rail service from :

- Wickenburg/Wittmann to downtown Phoenix (Grand Avenue);
- Arlington/Buckeye to Phoenix-Sky Harbor-Tempe (Yuma West); and,

In closing, Mr. Pearsall provided an overview of the Commuter Rail Studies schedule. He stated that the majority of the three studies would be completed by the end of 2009 and that the final stakeholder meeting would be conducted in late January or early February 2010. Mr. Pearsall reported that MAG Staff would continue coordination with ADOT on Rail Studies and would like present the studies for review and acceptance through the MAG Committee process in the Spring of 2010.

Chairman Moody asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda item. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved to the next item.

12. Report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update (PM/CMP) Study

Chairman Moody announced that the report on the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study would not be heard at this time. He stated that the agenda item would be heard by the Committee at a future meeting and proceeded to the next agenda item.

13. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Moody inquired if the members had any topics or issues of interest they would like to have considered for discussion at a future Committee meeting. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved onto the next agenda item.

14. Member Agency Update

Chairman Moody asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates, address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level, and asked if any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved to the next agenda item.

15. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on December 14, 2009. He added that MAG Staff would notify the Committee of the date, time, and location of the special session of the TRC to be held in the upcoming weeks. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 11:53 a.m.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

November 13, 2009

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: David Moody	Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten
ADOT: Steve Hull for Floyd Roehrich	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
*Avondale: David Fitzhugh	Mesa: Brent Stoddard for Scott Butler
Buckeye: Jose Herdia Scott Lowe	Paradise Valley: Bill Mead
Chandler: RJ Zeder for Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Ed Zuercher
El Mirage: Lance Calvert	Queen Creek: Wendy Kaserman
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth
Gila Bend: Rick Buss	Scottsdale: Dave Meinhart
Gila River: Sreedevi Samudrala for Doug Torres	Surprise: Bob Maki
*Gilbert: Tami Ryall	Tempe: Chris Salomone
Glendale: Terry Johnson	Valley Metro Rail: John Farry
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City of Litchfield Park	Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Peggy Rubach, RPTA
*ITS Committee: John Abraham, City of Surprise	*Transportation Safety Committee: Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	John Carlson, Sundt Const.
Christina Hopes, MAG	Frank Fletez, Guadalupe
Nathan Pryor, MAG	Paul Ward, Olsson
Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Jeanne Sapon, Sundt
John Dickson, ADOT	Wendy Sapon, Sundt
Clem Ligocki, MCDOT	Shane Silsby, Phoenix
Kwi-Sung Kang, MAG	John Merritt, ADOT
Linda Branch-Dasch, MCDOT	Bob Antilla, Valley Metro/RTPA
Ray Dovalina, Phoenix	Wendy Miller, Phoenix
Bill Vachon, FHWA	Joris Bresnanhan, Phoenix

1. Call to Order

Chairman David Moody from the City of Peoria called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

Chairman Moody stated that he had received a request to speak card from Mr. Mark Shreffler, a citizen from the City of Phoenix. Chairman Moody invited Mr. Shreffler to address the Committee. Mr. Shreffler thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak and expressed concerns about the lighting and spacing of light poles on the freeway system. In particular, Mr. Shreffler expressed concerns about the lighting on the Loop 202.

Mr. Shreffler referenced the current conference at the Phoenix Convention Center sponsored by the US Green Building Council. He stated that he, as well as the Council, were interested in promoting the use natural light to reduce lighting load. Mr. Shreffler inquired about planning efforts on freeway lighting and the costs of lighting the freeway system. He also expressed concerns about the procurement of lighting, engineering costs, the life cycle costs of energy and materials, and emissions.

Chairman Moody stated he was unsure what the accurate answers to his questions were. Chairman Moody encouraged Mr. Shreffler to provide MAG Staff with additional contact information and directed MAG Staff to determine the proper individuals to provide Mr. Shreffler with the information requested and any opportunities for public input.

Mr. Shreffler requested input from the Committee on the topic. Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, stated that under the open meeting law, the Committee could not discuss an item that was not formally on the agenda adding that the Committee could add the item to a future agenda. A brief discussion followed about the technical process for adding the item to the agenda. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG Staff would assist Mr. Shreffler with obtaining additional information about the subject.

3. Re-allocation of Unused Local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds Policy Options

Moving on, Chairman Moody invited Ms. Yazzie to present on the reallocation of unused Local/MPO American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a memorandum and attached table that had been disseminated to the Committee electronically. She stated that the handouts were also available at the meeting.

Ms. Yazzie quickly summarized the discussion on the agenda item at the October 29<sup>th</sup> meeting on the Committee. She stated that the focus of the current agenda item was the policies and programming of the unobligated Local ARRA funds that failed to obligate by the established

deadline or project savings from lower bids.

Ms. Yazzie reported that three factors were considered by MAG Staff, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) in the development of the policy option being presented. Ms. Yazzie emphasized the need to obligate all of the Local/MPO by ARRA funds by the federally mandated deadline. She expressed the importance of obligating any project bid savings after the initial deadline as well.

Ms. Yazzie reported that MAG was coordinating frequently with ADOT and FHWA on ARRA funded projects. She stated that MAG Staff had met weekly with ADOT and FHWA to identify and resolve issues in an efficient manner. Ms. Yazzie reported that FHWA and ADOT were focused on administrative and review work on clearances in an effort to obligate all local, regional and state ARRA funds by February 1, 2010. She explained that FHWA's deadline was to allow the local office sufficient time to balance the books and ensure that all ARRA funding was obligated by the federally mandated deadline of March 2, 2010.

Ms. Yazzie explained that MAG was looking at two deadlines, pre- and post- March 2010. She stated that 'pre' March, funds were likely to be available due to the inability for some projects to obligate by the March 2, 2010 deadline or due to project costs being less than programmed. She stated that the 'post' March 2, 2010, ARRA local funds were likely to be available due to project costs being less than programmed.

Next, Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the recommendation of MAG Staff with input from FHWA and ADOT was that any unobligated ARRA Local funds, due to either projects not obligating or project cost savings, be exchanged with ADOT for ADOT STP funds. She stated that by allocating the ARRA funds to the larger highway projects, the MAG Region could reduce the potential of not obligating all of the ARRA funding by the March 2, 2010 deadline. Ms. Yazzie announced that ADOT would then use the ARRA funds on highway projects in the MAG region. She stated that MAG would then have a like amount of STP funds transferred back to the region for use by MAG members on local federally funded projects.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the pros and cons of the policy option. She explained a 'pro' of the option included allowing a flexible, local solution that would simplify ARRA process. Ms. Yazzie stated that during previous policy discussions at TRC, MAG Member Agencies expressed interest in keeping the Local ARRA sub-allocation within each jurisdiction. She explained that by swapping the ARRA funds for STP funds, local agencies would be allowed that flexible solution. She added that the option also extend the obligation deadline to the deadline to obligate ADOT STP funds, which was September 2010.

Ms. Yazzie reported that one negative of the proposed policy option was that local agencies would need to meet the 5.7 percent minimum local match requirement. She stated that with ARRA funds, a local match was not required; however, using STP funds would require the minimum local match established under the Surface Transportation Program guidance.

Continuing on, Ms. Yazzie stated policy and programming considerations that would need to be addressed for the policy option presented to be implemented. She stated that for cost

savings that did not meet an established threshold funds should be returned to the region to be programmed. She explained the minimum threshold was needed for projects where the project savings did not cover a substantial amount of the total project cost. Ms. Yazzie then gave a few examples to demonstrate the point.

Ms. Yazzie stated another issue for further consideration was project readiness. She explained that new projects likely would not obligate by the September 2010 deadline for federal funds. She stated that projects selected to receive the reallocated ARRA/STP funds should be underway and in the process of obtaining clearances. Ms. Yazzie reported that a prioritized regional project listing would need to be developed under the option. She stated the prioritized project list could include current ARRA funded, current federal funded, or current local funded projects that could obligate by the established deadlines. She added that the list did not need to be developed and approved immediately.

Next, Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee the policy option could allow Local ARRA cost savings to be applied to the 30 percent local match established in the RTP. She explained that the application of ARRA savings towards the local match only would be applicable for projects within the jurisdiction with the cost savings. Ms. Yazzie stated the policy option presented was the option suggested by MAG Staff, FHWA, and ADOT; however, other policy options could still be considered at the discretion of the Committee.

Chairman Moody asked the Committee if there were any questions regarding the policy option presented by MAG Staff. Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County requested clarification about the threshold. Ms. Yazzie stated that if project savings exceeded the minimum threshold, then under the policy option, the cost savings would be returned to the local agency for reprogramming. She added that for project savings that did not meet the minimum threshold, the funds would be returned to the region for reprogramming. She emphasized that under the policy option presented, the priority was with local jurisdiction discretion. She explained the threshold was added to the policy option due to the administrative expense and time needed for a project to obligate. Discussion followed.

Mr. Cato Esquivel from the City of Goodyear inquired which of the policy options presented considered projects that could obligate by the February 1, 2010 deadline. Ms. Yazzie replied none. She explained that MAG's approach had shifted from 'pre' and 'post' March deadline to the policy option being presented before the Committee. Ms. Yazzie stated that many projects at the local level are not ready-to-go, and for that reason, the ARRA/STP swap would benefit most of the member agencies.

Mr. Esquivel inquired how projects that would be ready-to-go by the February deadline would be prioritized and/or considered. Ms. Yazzie stated that all projects that would ready-to-go by February deadline had been programmed with ARRA funds. She explained that the option presented would allow member agencies to develop additional projects that could obligate by the STP deadline of September 2010. Ms. Yazzie added that under the policy option presented, local discretion and flexibility would be increased due the extended time frame. Discussion followed about the feasibility of funding various types of projects under the proposed option.

Ms. Yazzie emphasized that local discretion was the first priority under the option presented.

She explained that the additional categories under the option were in the event that local agencies did not have additional projects that could use the ARRA/STP funds in the established time frames.

Mr. Terry Johnson from the City of Glendale stated the policy presented may not take advantage of ready-to-go projects in jurisdictions that had met the sub-allocation of Local ARRA funds and could use additional ARRA funds. He cited ARRA projects in Glendale that could use additional ARRA funds to due increased project costs. Mr. Johnson questioned if monies should be swapped with ADOT if existing local ARRA projects could use the additional funds.

Ms. Yazzie replied that under the policy presented, MAG was looking to hold the original sub-allocation of ARRA funds to each member agency. She inquired if Mr. Johnson would prefer to have project savings from other jurisdictions reallocated to member agencies, where applicable, before the swap. Mr. Johnson stated that was an option for the Committee to consider. Ms. Yazzie summarized Mr. Johnson's option for the Committee. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown asked why the STP obligation deadline was September 2010. Ms. Yazzie explained that the deadline was based on the availability of ADOT-STP funds for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010. Mr. Eric Anderson further explained that ADOT had received a notable rescission notice for FFY 2009 and carrying forward the ARRA/STP funds may be problematic. He added that it was the goal of the region to obligate all federal funds by the established deadlines. Ms. Yazzie added that the intent of the September deadline was to keep in line with the spirit of the ARRA legislation and stimulate jobs in the region.

Mr. Grant Anderson stated that under these deadlines that only projects "on the books" would be able to take advantage of the policy option. Ms. Yazzie agreed. Mr. Grant Anderson stated that the proposed approach would only reallocate additional funds to existing projects. He inquired if the Magnificent Seven policies regarding STP funds would need to be revisited under the circumstances. Ms. Yazzie replied that the Draft Federal Fund Programming Principles, which evolved from the Magnificent Seven's STP guidance, would not need to be revised. She explained revisions were not needed because the swapped funds would be ADOT-STP funds not MAG-STP funds.

Mr. RJ Zeder stated that the City of Chandler was in a similar position to other jurisdictions citing ARRA projects that could use additional funds. He recognized that the original Local ARRA sub-allocation was determined based on a minimum allocation plus a population allowance to ensure that smaller communities would receive a portion of the Local ARRA funds. Mr. Zeder stated that based on this, he felt local jurisdictions should be given priority to allocate any unused ARRA funds before redistributing those funds to other agencies. He continued, adding that if local agencies did not have ready-to-go projects, then the funds should be redistributed to the region. Mr. Zeder finished his comments by expressing support for the policy option presented by MAG Staff.

Mr. Dave Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale echoed Mr. Zeder's sentiments regarding the sub-allocation of Local ARRA funds to each MAG Member Agency. He stated the first step

in addressing the issue would be to keep the funds within the original jurisdiction. He expressed support for the policy option presented as a means to allow smaller jurisdiction additional time to obligate funds.

Mr. Johnson stated that both options were viable options. He expressed support for the approach to extend the obligation deadline to September with an STP wash. He explained the approach would help smaller jurisdictions to maximize the amount of sub-allocation of funds obligated. Mr. Johnson expressed concerns about the annual trend in the region not to obligate all of the STP funds in a timely manner.

Chairman Moody acknowledged Mr. Bill Vachon from the local Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office and Mr. John Dickson from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Local Governments Section and inquired if either would like to speak to the issue. Mr. Vachon stated that most of the Local ARRA funds should be obligated by the February deadline based on current data. He opined that the issue would not be failure to obligate the ARRA funds by the established deadline, but how to address bid savings. Mr. Vachon stated the ARRA/ADOT-STP swap would allow for additional time for the smaller member agencies to obligate projects in their jurisdictions.

Mr. Zeder motioned to approve the recommendation of MAG Staff as presented in the attachment, which stated that:

- 1) MAG would exchange any unobligated ARRA Local funds, due to either projects not obligating or project cost savings, with ADOT in exchange for ADOT STP funds;
- 2) ADOT would then use the ARRA funds on highway projects in the MAG region;
- 3) MAG would then have a like amount of STP funds that can be used by MAG members on local federally funded projects.

Mr. Lance Calvert from the City of El Mirage seconded the motion as presented. Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions about the motion as presented. Mr. Hauskins suggested that either the Committee or MAG Staff determine the threshold before voting on the motion. Mr. Hauskins also requested the issue of preserving the 70/30 split in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) be discussed.

Ms. Yazzie replied that three issues did not need to be addressed as part of the agenda item, including the threshold amount, the 70/30 RTP split, and the prioritization of projects for reallocated funding. She stated that the membership may want to consider these points further and make a decision at a later meeting. However, she welcomed the Committee to decide the points at the current meeting if that was the prerogative of the Committee membership.

Chairman Moody stated that from the standpoint of the City of Peoria, he would like the 70/30 split discussed at the current meeting because of the potential ramifications on one of the City's projects. Chairman Moody then inquired if anyone had additional questions or comments on the motion. Mr. Zuercher inquired if the motion before the Committee would allow member agencies to place project bid savings on another ARRA funded project to increase the amount of ARRA funds on a project. Mr. Eric Anderson stated yes with the caveat that projects receiving the additional funds needed to be ready to obligate.

Mr. Zeder clarified that the intent of his motion was that there was not a minimum threshold applied to the local jurisdictions project bid savings from the original sub-allocation of Local

ARRA funds. Mr. Zuercher stated that he understood the motion to be as presented by Mr. Zeder. Mr. Woody Scoutten from the Town of Litchfield Park requested clarification that ready-to-go projects meant projects that could obligate by February 1, 2010. Mr. Eric Anderson clarified that ready-to-go meant projects that could obligate by September 2010.

Mr. Vachon replied that FHWA did not believe there would be an issue with obligating projects by the February and March 2010 deadlines. He stated the issue would be project bid savings that would occur afterwards. Mr. Vachon added that the project bid savings could be applied to an existing ARRA project or to a new project that would be able to obligate by the September 1, 2010 deadline.

Mr. Meinhart expressed support for allowing local jurisdictions to apply project bid savings from their original sub-allocation of Local ARRA funds to reduce the 70/30 split established in the RTP. He stated, however, that he did not support using project savings from another jurisdiction to reduce the RTP local match requirement.

Mr. Zeder stated he would amend the motion to include a provision that local agencies could apply project bid savings in that jurisdiction to meet any of the local match requirements. Mr. Calvert seconded the amended motion.

Chairman Moody inquired if there were any questions or comments about the amended motion. Mr. Vachon cautioned that if a jurisdiction experienced minimal project bid savings, the jurisdiction should consider the administrative costs for ARRA funded projects when determining how to reallocate the ARRA funds within that jurisdiction. Mr. Vachon added that if ARRA savings were reallocated to another project that the federal reporting requirements would still apply.

Chairman Moody stated that the Committee should discuss the threshold further at some point given the administrative costs and reporting requirements associated with ARRA funds. Mr. Grant Anderson thanked Mr. Vachon for the clarification. Ms. Yazzie stated the ARRA reporting requirements was a consideration in recommending the swap of ARRA funds with ADOT-STP funds. She explained that by swapping the funds, ADOT would be responsible for the reporting requirements on the ARRA funded highway projects in the region, and the local jurisdictions would not be required to meet the ARRA reporting requirements for local projects using the ADOT-STP funds. Discussion followed.

Mr. Hauskins moved to call the vote to question. Chairman Moody requested the motion be repeated. Ms. Yazzie stated the amended motion as stated by Mr. Zeder was to recommend that any unobligated ARRA Local funds, due to either projects not obligating or project costs savings, would be programmed:

- 1) At the local discretion first, and may remain ARRA funds or may be exchanged with ADOT for ADOT-STP funds; then,
- 2) ADOT would use the ARRA funds on highway projects in the MAG Region, and ADOT would transfer an equivalent amount of ADOT-STP funds that could be used by MAG Members on local federally funded projects; and,
- 3) If applicable, local agencies may use project cost savings from their original ARRA allocation to lower the 30 percent local cost share on projects programmed under the 70/30 cost

share policy in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Zeder verified the motion as summarized by Ms. Yazzie. Chairman Moody called for a vote, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

4. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Moody inquired if the members had any topics or issues of interest they would like to have considered for discussion at a future Committee meeting. There were none, and Chairman Moody moved onto the next agenda item.

5. Member Agency Update

Chairman Moody asked members of the Committee if they would like to provide updates, address any issues or concerns regarding transportation at the regional level, and asked if any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their respective communities.

Ms. Peggy Rubach, the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee representative, announced that the Maricopa Department of Public Health would be applying for a \$20 million twenty four month ARRA grant to the Center for Disease Control on Monday, November 23, 2009. She encouraged member agencies to consider submitting potential projects as part of a consolidated project and funding proposal. Ms. Rubach also announced that Valley Metro would hold a combined Valley Metro Grants Technical Advisory Committee and 2010 Valley Bike Month Committee meeting on Tuesday November 17, 2009 to discuss the funding opportunity and encouraged the various member agencies to attend the meeting.

6. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Moody informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on December 14, 2009. There be no further business, Chairman Moody adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

# **ATTACHMENT ONE**

December 7, 2009

TO: Members of Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Eileen Yazzie, Transportation Programming Manager  
Christina Hopes, Transportation Planner II

SUBJECT: DEVELOPMENT OF THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2011-2015 TRANSPORTATION  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND THE FY 2011 ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is required to update data on regionally significant projects in accordance with state and federal laws. Periodically, MAG is responsible for producing a fiscally constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which includes a prioritized listing of transportation projects in the region that covers a 5-year period. In addition, MAG is tasked with updating project data and producing a fiscally balanced Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) on an annual basis. To meet the federal and state requirements, MAG Staff requests that MAG Member Agencies update project schedules and costs each year. **The deadline for MAG Member Agencies to submit project updates is Monday, January 11, 2010.**

#### **DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAFT FISCAL YEAR 2011-2015 TIP**

MAG Staff developed the Transportation Improvement Program Data Entry System to facilitate and standardize the annual update of the federally required MAG TIP. The TIP Data Entry System allows member agencies to update project data on project scheduled from fiscal years 2009 to 2015. The information submitted by each member agency will be used to develop the Draft FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

The TIP Data Entry System is a Microsoft Access 2007 application that requires Access be installed on the computer(s) or network running the application. Each member agency has its own database, which is annotated in the title and the download link. The databases and instructions are available for download from the MAG-TIP website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=413>.

#### **DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAFT FY 2011 ALCP**

The annual update process is a requirement of the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Policies and Procedures. Information submitted for ALCP projects is used to update the Arterial Life Cycle Program as well as project listings in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). For the FY 2011 Annual Update, each Lead Agency has a customized Microsoft Excel workbook to use for updating project schedules and cost estimates in the ALCP. The ALCP Annual Update workbooks, and other related materials are available for download from the MAG Website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/detail.cms?item=10905>.

Please email Eileen Yazzie at [eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov) or Stephen Tate at [state@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:state@mag.maricopa.gov) or call MAG at (602)254.6300 with any questions or problems regarding the annual update and/or the TIP Data Entry System.

Please email Christina Hopes by phone at 602.254.6300 or by email at [chopes@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:chopes@mag.maricopa.gov) with any questions, concerns, or technical issues. MAG Staff also is available for training on the annual update process upon request.

**The deadline for MAG Member Agencies to submit project updates for the FY 2011 - 2015 TIP and FY 2011 ALCP is Monday, January 11, 2010.**

### **ALCP CERTIFICATION PAGE**

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) is a reimbursement program. Lead Agencies are responsible for all aspects of project implementation, including project management, risk management, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction. Adequate and secure funding from the local, regional, and if applicable, the federal level, must be identified in the Lead Agency's CIP or other budget document before projects are programmed for work and/or reimbursement in the first two years of the ALCP, as required by the ALCP Policies and Procedures.

MAG Staff uses CIP/budget data to program the first two years of the ALCP, which pertains to 2011 and 2012 in the FY2011 ALCP. If projects are not shown as programmed with committed funds in a local CIP/TIP or budget document in 2011 and 2012, the project may not be programmed in the ALCP as requested.

In an effort to maintain the fiscal balance of the ALCP, MAG Staff is requesting that ALCP Lead Agency certify the local funds committed for a project, and submit ALCP Progress Reports and CIP/budget data for projects programmed in 2011 and/or 2012. MAG requests that the city/town administrator for the Lead Agency certify the local funds and project data submitted. The Certification of Local Funds and related materials should be submitted to MAG no later than February 1, 2009. A copy of the Certification of Local Funds form is attached and may be downloaded from the MAG website at <http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/project.cms?item=5034>.

# MAG ARTERIAL LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

## CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL FUNDS FOR ALCP PROJECTS IN 2011 AND 2012

The Arterial Life Cycle Program is reimbursement program funded by three revenues sources: the regional area road fund (RARF), otherwise known as the 1/2 cent sales tax, federal surface transportation program (STP) funds targeted for the MAG region, and federal congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) targeted for the MAG region. ALCP project budgets are limited to the regional contribution specified in the ALCP, or 70% of the total eligible project expenditures, whichever is less.

The Lead Agency is responsible for all aspects of Project implementation, including, but not limited to, Project management, risk management, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction. All ALCP projects must be programmed in the Lead Agency's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the approved MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) before they may be implemented or reimbursed.

**Adequate and secure funding from the local, regional, and if applicable, the federal level, must be identified in the Lead Agency's CIP before projects are programmed for work and/or reimbursement in the first two years of the Arterial Life Cycle Program, as required by the ALCP Policies and Procedures.** MAG is also required to demonstrate fiscal balance based on committed funds for the first two years of the adopted Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

MAG Staff uses this information to program the first two years of the ALCP, which pertains to 2011 and 2012 in the FY2011 ALCP. If projects are not shown as programmed with committed funds in a local CIP/TIP or budget document in 2011 and 2012, the project may not be programmed in the ALCP as requested. For projects to be considered for work and/or reimbursement within the first two years of the Arterial Life Cycle Program, the following materials must be completed:

1. Completed and signed certification letter as attached
2. ALCP Progress Report for each ALCP Project in 2011 and 2012
3. Page(s) from an approved (or current draft) of the jurisdiction's Capital Improvement Program or other approved budget document demonstrating adequate and secure funding has been identified for each ALCP Project in 2011 and 2012.

For additional information, or for questions, please contact:

Christina Hopes, Transportation Planner II  
Maricopa Association of Governments  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 300  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Phone: (602) 254-6300  
E-Mail: [chopes@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:chopes@mag.maricopa.gov)

**[TO BE COMPLETED ON AGENCY LETTERHEAD]**

[DATE]

Christina Hopes, Transportation Planner II  
Maricopa Association of Governments  
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300  
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

**RE: Certification of Local Funds for ALCP Projects in 2011 and/or 2012**

Ms. Hopes,

The [CITY/TOWN] of \_\_\_\_\_ is requesting that ALCP Projects listed in the table below be considered for programmed in FY 2011 and/or FY 2012 in the draft FY2011 Arterial Life Cycle Program. The required ALCP Project Progress Reports and appropriate pages from the [CITY/TOWN]'s Capital Improvement Program or other approved budget documents are attached as requested.

**TABLE – REQUEST TO PROGRAM PROJECTS**

ALCP Project Name	RTP ID	Work Phase(s) Underway in FY 2011 and/or FY 2012

As the jurisdiction's manager/administrator or designated representative, I certify that the projects noted in the table above are programmed at the local level and have committed local funding as noted in the \_\_\_\_\_ (jurisdiction) current CIP/TIP or budget.

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# **ATTACHMENT TWO**

December 7, 2009

**TO:** Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

**FROM:** Eileen O. Yazzie, Transportation Programming Manager

**SUBJECT:** RECOMMENDATION FOR ITS, BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND PM-10 PAVE UNPAVED ROAD PROJECTS TO BE PROGRAMMED WITH CMAQ FUNDS

Per the Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles (Principles), the MAG Transportation Review Committee's (TRC) role is to review the evaluation and analysis completed by the Technical Advisory Committees (TAC), and recommend projects to be selected and programmed with Federal funds based on guidelines established for project selection. The TRC can make recommendations to change the project scope, schedule, or budget during the project selection process.

## **BACKGROUND**

Applications were made available in August 2009 with a due date of September 18, 2009. All information explained below pertains to on-time, complete, and eligible applications.

- There were thirteen ITS project applications submitted requesting a total of \$7,464,642 of CMAQ funds. There is \$6,887,000 of CMAQ funds available for ITS projects in FY 2014.
- There were nineteen Bicycle and Pedestrian applications submitted requesting a total of \$17,299,787 of CMAQ funds. There is \$8,737,000 of CMAQ funds available for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects in FY 2014.
- There were thirteen PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road applications submitted requesting a total of \$10,461,448 of CMAQ funds. There is \$4,513,000 of CMAQ funds available for PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road Projects in 2013.

In addition to the application process, \$7,503,000 of CMAQ funds are identified via the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) CMAQ funding distribution for Air Quality Projects in FY2014. Historically, six programs have been funded: purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers, pave unpaved roads program, telework/ozon education program, regional rideshare program, trip reduction program, and travel reduction program. As the PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers and pave unpaved roads program moves forward, specific projects are identified as needed

## **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RANKINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Per the Draft MAG Federal Fund Programming Principles, applications are heard and ranked at the related technical advisory committees (TAC). The applications go through a two-tiered committee review process, which began in October 2009. The TACs are not allowed to change the project scope, schedule, budget, or requested federal funds during the evaluation process. The TACs purpose is to rank order projects as submitted in the application through a project evaluation process.

The ITS Committee met in October 2009 and agencies that submitted applications presented/briefed the committee of their project(s) and answered questions. At the November 2009 meeting, the ITS Committee moved forward with their ranking process. This is explained in the attached memorandum from John Abraham, Chair of the ITS Committee and the ranked ordered list of ITS projects. ***The ITS Committee recommended that all thirteen proposed projects for FY2014 be programmed with the necessary cost adjustments.***

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee met in October 2009 when agencies presented the applications that were submitted. At the November 2009 meeting, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee completed their scoring and ranking process. This is explained in the attached memorandum from Brandon Forrey, Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and the ranked ordered list of Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects. ***The Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee moved to forward the list of recommended projects to the TRC with the recommendation that the Phoenix Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School Road and 16<sup>th</sup> Street be funded with the balance of the \$531,472.***

The PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road applications that were submitted went through a slightly different review process. The MAG Street Committee reviews the applications and the Air Quality TAC ranks the projects. The MAG Street Committee met in October and November 2009 to present, review, and question the projects submitted. The AQ TAC is meeting on Thursday, December 10, 2009 to rank the PM-10 Pave Unpaved Road applications. The recommendation and material will be forwarded to you via e-mail by Friday, December 11, 2009 and be available at the TRC meeting on December 14, 2009.

The Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee met in October 2009 and made a recommendation to forward six Air Quality programs/projects for the \$7,503,000 in CMAQ funding for 2014. Since that recommendation, the MAG Executive Committee met and approved the elimination of the telework and ozone outreach program. At the time of the TRC agenda mailout, the information and funding amounts were being reviewed. Final material will be forwarded to you via e-mail by Friday, December 11, 2009 and be available at the TRC meeting on December 14, 2009.

An overview of all information will be presented at the TRC meeting. If you need additional information or have questions, please contact me at (602) 254.6300 or at [eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov](mailto:eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov).

November 17, 2009

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Review Committee

FROM: John Abraham, City of Surprise, Chair MAG ITS Committee

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION OF ITS PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE FY 2014 TIP

In response to the call for projects for inclusion in the FY 2014 TIP, a total of 13 ITS project applications were received by MAG. The ITS committee completed a two-staged review of these projects at our October 7<sup>th</sup> and November 10<sup>th</sup> committee meetings and have taken action to recommend the entire list of 13 projects. The attached table shows how the committee ranked these projects. The total amount of federal funds available to be programmed for ITS projects in FY 2014 is \$ 6,887,000. However, the total cost of the 13 recommended projects exceed this amount by \$577,642. In view of this shortfall, the ITS Committee requests that the TRC consider keeping all 13 projects in the list of recommended projects when determining the approved federal funding amounts for ITS projects.

Below is a brief summary of the ITS project review process used to generate the ITS Committee recommendation.

#### Project Applications

For a number of years the MAG TIP application process has incorporated a guideline developed by the ITS Committee that has set an upper limit for federal funds requested for ITS projects at \$1,000,000 per agency per program year. An exception is made for multi-jurisdictional ITS projects that involve more than three member agencies. This guideline has worked very well over the years and was incorporated in the FY 2014 application.

#### Project Review Process

A complete set of project applications were provided to the committee for review. The TIP project applications have been designed with input from the committee to capture key information that addresses the following questions:

- 1) How does the project comply with the current ITS Strategic Plan (2001) - a federal requirement
- 2) How does the project conform to the current Regional ITS Architecture (2009) - a federal requirement
- 3) Is the project supported by local agency with essential staffing and operating costs
- 4) Does the planned project schedule seem realistic?

#### Project Ranking Process & Recommendation

Stage 1: At the October 7, 2009, meeting member agencies that proposed projects were provided the opportunity to brief the committee on their projects and answer any questions from the committee members to

clarify information in the TIP application.

Stage 2: At the meeting held on November 10, 2009, members were provided a memorandum from the Air Quality Committee that recommended cost effectiveness scores for each ITS project. The committee was advised that this information was to be considered in generating a project rank, along with all other project information contained in the project application and at the project briefings.

Each ITS committee member then generated an entirely subjective project ranking, considering all of the information provided on the projects. Individual rankings were then combined into one composite ranking to represent the entire committee's ranking recommendation. The committee reviewed the result of the combined project ranking, further discussed and agreed upon the recommendation to be made to the TRC.

## ITS Projects Recommended for the FY 2014 MAG TIP

Agency	Project Name	Descriptions	Fed\$ Requested	Final Rank
Phoenix #1	ITS Strategic Plan	Develop the City of Phoenix's first ITS Strategic Plan. This Plan will include strategies for building out, operating and maintaining and enhancing the City's ITS Infrastructure and manpower needs.	<b>\$182,000</b>	<b>1</b>
MCDOT #1	RADS upgrade	Upgrade the Regional Archive Data Center Equipment and Systems to enhance archiving capacity and the utility (performance monitoring, research, sharing, planning capabilities) of real time traffic data.	<b>\$136,500</b>	<b>2</b>
Scottsdale	Adaptive traffic control at FLW Blvd & Loop 101	1. To identify traffic adaptive signal systems that have been deployed and returned successful outcomes in reducing traffic delay on stated corridors across the country. 2. Deploy the selected system on FLW and complete before and after delay studies. 3. Evaluate if the Adaptive System can minimize delay as well, or better than real-time control of the area signals through the Traffic Management Center and human intervention.	<b>\$39,375</b>	<b>3</b>
Peoria	ITS Corridor Upgrade	To upgrade the existing cabinets, traffic controllers and also upgrade the existing loop detection to video detection on selected corridors to improve the overall communication within the City's Network and also upgrade the hardware and software with the changing technologies in ITS. Upgrade the hardware and software technology within the City's Traffic Signal Control System in order to improve the overall reliability and system performance. This will enable the City to improve the overall performance of traffic operations within City's street network system.	<b>\$700,000</b>	<b>4</b>
Tempe	South Tempe Communications Project	Tempe currently uses leased phone lines to facilitate traffic signal operations. This project proposes to use an existing conduit along Elliot for fiber optic communication to the signals. Wireless radios will be used to provide communication to signals along Guadalupe & Warner. CCTVs will be placed at the major intersections for traffic monitoring.	<b>\$415,485</b>	<b>5</b>
Phoenix #2	Fiber Optic Backbone Expansion Phase B	To extend Phase B Fiber Optic Backbone, To provide Traffic Signal interconnect to the City of Phoenix TMC	<b>\$818,000</b>	<b>6</b>
El Mirage	Arterial ITS Enhancements	Phase I, various arterial traffic signal enhancements to upgrade the existing signalized intersections for computerized signal control, closed circuit video, improved pedestrian control, improved signage and better signal preemption. Future phases to provide planned interconnections of signals both locally and with adjoining agencies	<b>\$415,660</b>	<b>7</b>
Chandler	North Chandler Fiber Loop	Provide fiber optic communications from traffic signals in the project area back to the TMC. Improve the city's efficiency in responding to emergencies by providing communications from TMC to traffic signals.	<b>\$801,500</b>	<b>8</b>

## ITS Projects Recommended for the FY 2014 MAG TIP

Agency	Project Name	Descriptions	Fed\$ Requested	Final Rank
Glendale	Fiber conduit & CCTV at 67th Ave & node building	Connect seven intersections to the city's central signal system and install four CCTV cameras along 67th Avenue to allow for remote monitoring and management of traffic along the corridor. Additionally, connect the fiber communications infrastructure to existing fiber and add equipment to a public safety building so that redundant pathways between node buildings for city and RCN communications are created.	<b>\$980,000</b>	<b>9</b>
Gilbert	Traffic signal improvement and coordination	This project installs 3-mile fiber optic communication lines in existing conduits; The project will also add new CCTV cameras, traffic signal video detection, and controllers near Baseline Rd. & Val Vista Dr. The project enables Traffic Management Center to respond to traffic congestion at 7 remote intersections in real-time. It also includes jurisdiction-wide signal timing operations improvements.	<b>\$317,122</b>	<b>10</b>
MCDOT #2	MC85 ITS	Extend traffic management capabilities along MC 85, thus improving traffic flow and overall roadway capacity, and reducing reliance on private sector leased lines for required communication links. Implement ITS corridor improvements recommended in the MCDOT ITS Communications Plan; provide interconnection among area traffic signals; improve traffic monitoring and traffic signal control in the MCDOT and Avondale TMC's; expand AZTech regional traffic information database	<b>\$847,000</b>	<b>11</b>
Goodyear	Van Buren St Fiber and Conduit	The goal of this project is to improve the City's ability to manage traffic on Van Buren Street. This project will provide traffic signal connectivity to three existing and one future traffic signal. In addition, CCTV cameras will be provided at key intersections. In addition to being an important east-west corridor in the City of Goodyear, Van Buren Street has been identified as a key corridor in the I-10 Integrated Corridor Management System (ICMS). CCTV images and traffic signal timing plans from intersections along this corridor will be shared with ADOT to maximize east-west traffic mobility during incidents and freeway construction restrictions.	<b>\$812,000</b>	<b>12</b>
Fountain Hills	ITS Initial Deployment	Provide an initial deployment of ITS for traffic signals on Shea Blvd and in the downtown area. Provide monitoring/control sites at Town Hall and the Street Yard.	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>13</b>

**Fed\$ Requested= \$7,464,642**

**Fed\$ Available = \$6,887,000**

**The MAG ITS Committee has recommended that all 13 proposed projects for FY 2014 be programmed with the necessary cost adjustments.**



---

302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490  
E-mail: mag@mag.maricopa.gov ▲ Web site: www.mag.maricopa.gov

December 1, 2009

**TO** Members of the Transportation Review Committee

**FROM** Brandon Forrey, Chair, MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

**SUBJECT:** Recommend Approval of Bicycle and Pedestrian projects for 2014 TIP

The MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee spent six months revising the TIP application based upon the MAG Bikeway Master Plan and the MAG Pedestrian Plan. The committee then revised the Evaluation Criteria based on the application. There were nineteen bicycle and pedestrian projects submitted by MAG jurisdictions. Copies of each application were mailed out to each committee member with an Evaluation Criteria sheet for each project. At the first meeting in October, members presented their projects to the Committee. Committee members asked questions and submitted a score for each project. The bicycle and pedestrian scores along with the CMAQ scores were tallied by MAG staff and sent back to committee members for review and consideration. At the November meeting, committee members discussed the scores and project merits. The attached excel spreadsheet reflects the ranking list recommended for approval by the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee.

The MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee has recommended that the \$531,472 be applied to the City of Phoenix Grand Canal Multi-use Path at Indian School and 16<sup>th</sup> Street. The city of Phoenix will work with the TRC to fund the project. Attached please find a copy of the ranked projects and a copy of the Evaluation Criteria.

---

A Voluntary Association of Local Governments in Maricopa County

City of Apache Junction ▲ City of Avondale ▲ Town of Buckeye ▲ Town of Carefree ▲ Town of Cave Creek ▲ City of Chandler ▲ City of El Mirage ▲ Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ▲ Town of Fountain Hills ▲ Town of Gila Bend  
Gila River Indian Community ▲ Town of Gilbert ▲ City of Glendale ▲ City of Goodyear ▲ Town of Guadalupe ▲ City of Litchfield Park ▲ Maricopa County ▲ City of Mesa ▲ Town of Paradise Valley ▲ City of Peoria ▲ City of Phoenix  
Town of Queen Creek ▲ Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community ▲ City of Scottsdale ▲ City of Surprise ▲ City of Tempe ▲ City of Tolleson ▲ Town of Wickenburg ▲ Town of Youngtown ▲ Arizona Department of Transportation

## Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle/Shared Use Projects TIP 2014

Project Name (include city): \_\_\_\_\_

Member Name (include city): \_\_\_\_\_

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS EARNED
<b>Transportation Improvement 10%</b>	Project enhances the local and/or regional transportation system	10	
<b>Safety and Convenience Improvements 30%</b>	Project addresses: existing safety concern = 6-10 pts; potential safety concern 0-5 pts	10	
	Types of safety improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
	Types of convenience improvements included in project: three or more = 6-10 pts; two = 3-5 pts; one = 0-2 pts	10	
<b>Linkages 40%</b>	Projects links with: regional facility = 6-8 pts; multi-jurisdictional facility = 4-5 pts; local facility only = 1-3 pts	10	
	Links with one or more activity centers, parks or community, senior, recreation, or adult day care centers within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more commercial destinations ( <i>malls, retail centers, business parks, etc.</i> ) or transit (bus/rail route/stops/station) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
	Links with one or more schools (elementary, middle, or high schools, colleges, or universities) within: 1/4 mile = 6-10 pts; 1/2 mile = 3-5 pts; 1 mile = 0-2 pts	10	
<b>Demographics 10%</b>	Housing density (dwelling units per acre) is: 15+ = 5 pts; 5 - 15 = 2 pts; < 5 = 0 pts	5	
	Project is located within an area with an average income < \$26k/yr: yes = 3 pts; no = 0 pts	3	
	Project is located within an area with higher elderly (age > 60 years) population: 25%+ = 2 pts; < 25% = 0 pts	2	
<b>Policies and Plans 10%</b>	Project is: identified in the General Plan, Council adopted policy, or CIP = 3-5 pts; consistent with general policy/practices = 1-2 pts; not addressed by jurisdiction's plans, policies, or practices = 0 pts	5	
	Jurisdiction has policies for improved bicycle/shared use facilities that are: required = 3-5 pts; recommended = 1-2 pts; not emphasized or do not exist = 0 pts	5	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		

### FOR COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

<b>Highly Recommended</b>	Project consistently exceeds most measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. It is highly ranked for: safety & convenience; and linkages to identified facilities, destinations and schools are clear and identifiable. The project benefits underserved populations and more densely populated areas. Jurisdictional support is exhibited through existing plans and policies.
<b>Recommended</b>	Project meets most measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. It demonstrates a minimum commitment to safety and convenience; linkages to facilities, destinations and schools may be identified. The project may benefit underserved populations and somewhat dense populated areas. There may be support for the project in a jurisdiction's existing plans and policies.
<b>Not Recommended</b>	Project does not consistently meet the measured goals of a Bicycle/Shared Use project. Application exhibits deficiencies in most measured areas.

Project Title	General Project Description	Project Location	Length (Miles)	Local Funding Source	Local Cost	Federal Cost (\$8,737,000 available)	Bike Score	CMAQ Cost Effectiveness	Rank	Comment
<b>100% FUNDING AVAILABLE</b>										
<b>Phoenix: Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Thomas Road and 22nd Street</b>	This project will provide an accessible alternative for crossing Thomas Road along the Grand Canal by constructing a 10' wide multi-use pathway along the south side of Thomas Road between the traffic signal, located at the intersection of Thomas Road and 22nd Street, and the Grand Canal where it crosses Thomas Road. To the north of Thomas Road a 10' wide multi-use pathway will be constructed along the 22nd Street alignment.	Thomas Road: 22nd Street to Grand Canal	0.1	AHUR/CMAQ	\$146,550	\$341,950	1220	\$ 84,230	1	
<b>Chandler: Galveston Street Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Bridge</b>	The Galveston Street Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge over the Price/Loop101 freeway will link the existing north-south & east-west bicycle/pedestrian paths on both sides of the freeway to allow access to adjacent parks, schools, employment & shopping centers. This project will complete the non-motorized link from the regional core area to Downtown Chandler.	Galveston Street & Loop 101 at milepost 59.6. Bridge length over the freeway and frontage roads is approximately 540' with ramps of approximately 290' on each end of the structure	0.15	Street G.O. Bonds	\$2,545,742	\$2,056,758	1336	\$ 323,998	2	
<b>Gilbert: Bicycle Crossing Improvement &amp; Safety Project Phase III</b>	The project will improve five shared-use path crossings of arterial streets with appropriate bicycle facilities, such as bicycle signals, bicycle refuge islands, marked crossings, larger traffic signs, and ADA compliant ramps. The project will make these improvements in reference to the HAWK system.	Guadalupe Road & SRP Powerline Easement (between Val Vista Drive & Greenfield Road)	0.1	General Fund	\$213,000	\$497,000	1189	\$ 103,671	3	
<b>Avondale: Central Avenue Bicycle Facility Project</b>	Addition of bike lanes on Central Avenue with mill and overlay. Provide reduced roadway widths	Central Avenue in Avondale, Arizona - Van Buren Street south to Western Avenue	1	CIP	\$461,746	\$1,077,405	1330	\$ 361,137	4	
<b>Youngtown FFY2014 Bike Path Project</b>	Multi-use project, which will include a bike lane that meander through a large portion of town, connecting with (and in some cases adjacent to) walking trails, giving residents easy access to no less than three Town parks, as well as connections to light rail along Grand Avenue, and Valley Metro bus lines at various locations.	Rural Road to Kiwanis Park	5 miles	Local	\$300,700	\$292,800	1106	\$ 77,340	5	
<b>Scottsdale: AZ Canal Shared-Use Path: 64th St - Goldwater Blvd</b>	Construct 0.9 miles of 14-foot wide shared-use path along the south bank of the Arizona Canal from 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard. Construct accessible intersections at 64th St/Thomas, 64th/Osborn, 64th/Indian School, and 68th/Indian School. Construct pedestrian bridge and park connection at 68th St and AZ Canal.	Along the south bank of the Arizona Canal from 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard, and the 64th Street/Thomas intersection, 64th/Indian School intersection, northwest portion of 68th/Indian School intersection, and pedestrian bridge/Lafayette Park connection.	0.9	Sales tax and bonds	\$995,904	\$2,323,780	1196	\$ 232,595	6	
<b>El Mirage: Rancho El Mirage Multi-Use Path</b>	This project will provide a Multi-Use Path located within a drainage channel owned and maintained by the City to provide continuous non-motorized transportation to daily trip destinations throughout the community from schools, parks, shopping, and places of work. The path will provide a linear park with defined staging areas, points of access and other public amenities.	Thunderbird Road to Port Royale Lane	0.85	HURF	\$339,786	\$792,835	1201	\$ 320,654	7	
<b>Tempe: El Paso Gas Easement Multi-use Path: Rural Rd.-Kiwanis Park</b>	The project is a multi-use path extension of the existing El Paso Gas Easement path from Rural Road to Kiwanis Park. The project would extend the multi-use path system from Price Road to Kiwanis Park, a major regional destination. The project would allow and promote non-motorized access to Kiwanis Park.	Along the north bank of the Arizona Canal, north of Camelback Rd.	0.5	CMAQ	\$567,000	\$1,323,000	1298	\$ 461,014	8	
<b>TOTALS</b>					<b>\$5,570,428</b>	<b>\$8,705,528</b>				<b>\$531,472 available</b>
<b>PARTIAL FUNDING AVAILABLE</b>										
<b>Phoenix: Grand Canal Multi-Use Path Connection at Indian School Road and 16th Street</b>	This multi-use path/bridge project will construct a two-phase crosswalk across 16th Street at the Grand Canal alignment; a 10' wide multi-use pathway; and two pre-fabricated multi-use bridges over the Grand Canal to provide an accessible connection between the existing asphalt path along the Grand Canal and the proposed multi-use paths leading to the signalized intersection.	Indian School Road: Grand Canal to 16th Street	0.1	AHUR/CMAQ	\$598,500	\$1,396,500	1160	\$ 162,688	9	The Committee recommended that the \$531,472 be applied to fund the Phoenix Grand Canal Project. The city of Phoenix will work with the TRC.
<b>TOTALS (INCLUDING FULLY FUNDED PROJECTS)</b>					<b>\$6,168,928</b>	<b>\$10,102,028</b>				<b>\$865,028 Federally Unfunded</b>

**NO FEDERAL FUNDING AVAILABLE**

<b>Glendale: New River/Grand Canal Pathways - Hub Connector</b>	This will be a project to build pathway connections for three multi-use pathways that intersect at the point where the Grand Canal outfalls into New River. The pathways will ramp down below the future ball Park Blvd. bridge for a below grade connection. The project will also include amenities such as shade structures, benches, water fountains, and landscaping for pathway access.	Grand Canal outfall channel and New River	0.09	Transp. Sales Tax	\$284,280	\$663,320	1053	\$ 106,798	10
<b>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation: Fort McDowell Rd: SR-87 to Mohave Rd; Design and Construct Roadway Shoulder Bike Lane</b>	The Nation wishes to start their on-road (and future off-road) bicycle and pedestrian system with a centrally located backbone along Fort McDowell Road that will eventually link their RV resort (south of SR-87), casino and community buildings (south of Fort Loop Road). Further additions will be to link the tribal offices, elementary school, residences and connect to Fountain Hills along branches along Mohave and Yavapai Roads.	Fort McDowell Rd: SR-87 to Mohave Rd	1.3	Tribal funds	\$297,300	\$693,700	750	\$ 13,882	11
<b>Maricopa County: New River Road Shoulder Widening</b>	This project will provide bike lanes along New River Road from Desert Hills Drive north to Venado Road.	New River Road from Desert Hills Road to Venado Road	8.6	HURF	\$392,025	\$914,725	669	\$ 6,919	12
<b>Gilbert Heritage District Pedestrian Pathway Development</b>	This project will design and develop a quarter-mile pedestrian pathway connecting the Water Tower Plaza and Western Powerline Trail and Park. The pathway will increase safety of pedestrians, reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and provide universal access with ADA certified ramps.	A pathway located between Gilbert Road and Ash Street, from the Water Tower Plaza (south of Page Avenue to Western Powerline trail.	0.25	General Fund	\$95,400	\$222,600	1262	\$ 2,963,238	13
<b>Glendale: Maryland Avenue Bicycle Spot Improvement at the Russian Cemetery</b>	This is a multi-use path connecting two separated segments of the Maryland Avenue Bike Route.	Maryland Avenue and 75th Avenue to a point 257 feet east of 75th Avenue on the Maryland Avenue alignment.	0.05	Transp. Sales Tax	\$161,671	\$358,529	1023	\$ 173,213	14
<b>Avondale: Western Avenue Pedestrian Project - Avondale</b>	Avondale is seeking funding to support sidewalk improvements along Western Avenue between Goodyear and the intersection at Central Avenue. This project is located in the city's revitalization area and will benefit low to moderate income families. Improvements include .42 miles of sidewalk to include lighting, street trees, and parking medians.	Western Avenue from Central Avenue to City Limits	0.42	CIP	\$320,918	\$344,308	1191	\$ 1,846,408	15
<b>Glendale: New River Multi-use Pathway - Amenities Project</b>	This project will provide underpass lighting, landscaping, irrigation, ramada, tables, benches and bike racks for the planned New River Multi-use Pathway. These amenities will be added to the future 2.25-mile New River Pathway that includes underpasses at Glendale Avenue and Northern Avenue.	The project is located on the east bank of New River from Northern Avenue to the bethany Home Road alignment	2.25	Transp. Sales Tax	\$780,500	\$999,500	980	\$ 278,309	16
<b>Scottsdale: AZ Canal Shared-Use Path: 64th St - North of Camelback</b>	Construct 0.1 miles of 10-foot wide shared-use path along the north bank of the Arizona Canal from Camelback Road extending north.	Along the north bank of the Arizona Canal, north of Camelback Rd.	0.1	Sales tax and bonds	\$1,108,091	\$2,585,545	1122	\$ 797,171	17
<b>Litchfield Park: Pathway Along West Side of Old Litchfield Road</b>	Multi-use path.	West side of Old Litchfield Road from W Fairway Drive north to E Bird Lane	0.52	CIP	\$65,978	\$153,948	1008	\$ 426,216	18
<b>El Mirage: Varney Road Sidewalk Pedestrian Project</b>	This project will provide one mile of a new 8' sidewalk on the south side of Varney Road from Dysart Road to El Mirage Road, and will be completing the existing sidewalk on the north side of Varney Road from El Mirage Road to approximately 1350' to the west.	Varney Road from Dysart Road to El Mirage Road	1.25	HURF	\$112,108	\$261,584	848	\$ 11,357,278	19

# **ATTACHMENT THREE**

December 7, 2009

TO: Members of the Transportation Review Committee

FROM: Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Programming Manager

SUBJECT: POLICY AND PROGRAMMING OPTIONS FOR UNOBLIGATED ARRA LOCAL FUNDS

At the November 13, 2009 Transportation Review Committee (TRC), the committee recommended approval that any unobligated American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Local funds, due to either projects not obligating or project cost savings, are to be programmed at the at the discretion of the local jurisdiction as ARRA funds or may be exchanged with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for ADOT Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. ADOT would then use the ARRA funds on highway projects in the MAG region and ADOT will transfer an equivalent amount of ADOT STP funds that can be used by MAG members on local federally funded projects. If applicable, the local agency may use project cost savings from their own original ARRA allocation to lower the 30 percent local cost share on projects programmed under the 70/30 cost share policy.

Two technical programming issues need to be addressed together for the above policy recommendation to move forward: 1) Establish a threshold (total cost percent, dollar amount, etc.) related to programming ARRA/STP funds on local projects, and 2) local project readiness since the local projects will need to obligate by September 2010.

**Objective: Establish a threshold related to programming ARRA/STP funds on local projects**

Currently, all local ARRA projects in the MAG region are scheduled to obligate prior to February 2010 according to ADOT and local agencies. Additional ARRA funds available for programming are anticipated as a result of project savings. It is recommended that a threshold dollar amount and/or percent of proposed new project cost be established for programming ARRA/STP project savings on future local projects. The analysis outlined bellowed outline suggestions; other ideas and suggestions are welcome.

1. Member jurisdictions must have a **minimum dollar amount savings** in order to request ARRA/STP project savings to be programmed on another local project. If the cost savings do not do not meet a minimum dollar threshold, the cost savings are returned to the region to be reprogrammed.
  - A minimum dollar amount threshold would need to be established. Some analysis to take into consideration:

- About half of the member agencies were allocated at least \$1 million in ARRA. Based on a projected cost savings of 20%, this would result in project cost savings of \$200,000. Is \$200,000 enough federal funds to reprogram on another project considering the project development and STP guidelines? (20%/\$200K is an example)
  - All jurisdictions received at least \$500,000 ARRA to program. Based on a projected cost savings of 20%, this would result in project cost savings of \$100,000. Is \$100,000 enough federal funds to reprogram on another project considering the project development process and STP guidelines? (20%/\$100K is an example)
2. Member jurisdictions must have ARRA savings that amount to a **minimum percentage of total costs** of any new proposed local project to request ARRA/STP funds. If the cost savings do not represent a minimum of the total project costs programmed for the proposed project, the cost savings are returned to the region to be reprogrammed.
- A minimum percentage of total cost threshold would need to be established. Some analysis to take into consideration:
    - A 50% threshold would mean that a project that has a total cost: \$500,000 would need to have \$250,000 of ARRA cost savings.
    - A 70% threshold would mean that a project that has a total cost: \$500,000 would need to have \$350,000 of ARRA cost savings.
    - Looking at the total costs of currently funded ARRA Local projects: projects that cost less than \$250k, \$500k, and \$1M represent 10%, 16% and 45% of all projects respectively.

**Objective: Discuss local project readiness, local projects will need to obligate by September 2010**

For local projects to be funded with either ARRA/STP funds, due to project savings, the local projects will need to be obligated by September 2010. Project readiness will continue to be a leading factor in programming project savings.

During October and November, member agencies submitted project candidates for anticipated unobligated local ARRA funds. MAG staff worked with FHWA, ADOT and local agencies to review projects and readiness. Not all of the projects submitted will be able to meet the deadline. In addition, many local jurisdictions do not have any eligible projects.

It is highly unlikely if the local agency has not begun the project development process that a project could obligate by September 2010. Member agencies that have not initiated the project development process could possibly not have the opportunity to request additional ARRA/STP funds.

Project readiness factors will need to be decided on for projects to be funded with project savings.

If there are any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at: eyazzie@mag.maricopa.gov or (602) 452.5058.

# **ATTACHMENT FOUR**

**Project Status Report**  
**Transportation Projects – MAG Region      November 24 2009**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. The national Highway Infrastructure Investment component of the legislation is \$27.5 billion.

For the highway portion, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has 120 days to obligate 50 percent of the funding, and a year – by March 2, 2010, to obligate the remaining funds. Of the ADOT portion, \$129.4 million was directed for Highway projects in the MAG Region. The legislation also sub-allocates 30 percent of the funding (\$156.57 million) to local jurisdictions. The amount being sub-allocated to the MAG Region is \$104.6. Metropolitan planning organizations and Local Agencies have one year to obligate the funds, by March 2, 2010

The MAG regional portion for transit is \$66.4 million. The legislation requires that 50 percent of the transit funds be obligated within 180 days, and the remainder to be obligated within one year by March 2, 2010

**REPORT COMPONENTS – TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Project Status Report</b>	<b>p. 3 – 10</b>
<b>Local Sponsored Project Overview</b>	<b>p. 11</b>
<b>Local Sponsored Project Details</b>	<b>p. 12 – 15</b>
<b>Highway Projects – ADOT Allocation Update</b>	<b>p. 16 – 18</b>

## **Project Status Report**

The Project Status Report highlights three areas of project details as noted below:

**Project Information:** Lists information about the project as reported on in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) including the project location and description.

**Project Funding:** Explains the project funding sources and amounts as listed in the MAG TIP.

**Project Development Status:** This section reports on the status of project development steps. This section will most likely change in the future as projects are under construction. The project development steps are:

- Project Approved by MAG RC (Date): Project approved by the MAG Regional Council for inclusion in the current MAG TIP
- Design & Federal Clearances: The required design and federal clearances have been complete or have estimated completion dates. Or other notes may be provided regarding status with FHWA or FTA. Check mark indicates that work is completed.
- Obligate: The project has obligated, which means that the Federal Highway Administration agrees that the project has completed the necessary federal steps and the federal funds can be promised for the project.
- Bid Opened - The project has received bids and the bids have been opened.
- Award Date - The date the project is awarded to contractor.
- Estimated Completion - The contractor has estimated that construction will be completed by this date.

**This information can also be found at the MAG Website:  
<http://www.mag.maricopa.gov/detail.cms?item=9615>**

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†							Comments		
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fund Type	Federal - ARRA	Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environmental	Obligated	Bid Opened	Award Date		Estimated Complete	
<b>State Sponsored Projects - Roadways</b>																
DOT09-815	DOT	I-10: Verrado Way - Sarival Rd	Construct General Purpose Lane	ARRA	\$26,272.0	\$26,272.0	\$26,271.6	05/27/09	✓	✓	✓	✓	7/17/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$28.2M to \$26.3M.	
DOT09-818	DOT	I-17: SR74-Anthem Way	Construct General Purpose Lane	ARRA	\$13,314.1	\$13,314.1	\$13,314.1	05/27/09	✓	✓	✓	✓	6/19/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$13.4M to \$13.3M	
DOT09-6C00R	DOT	US 60: SR 303L - 99th Ave	Road Widening	ARRA	\$22,275.7	\$22,299.9	\$22,299.9	03/25/09	✓	✓	✓	10/23/09	11/20/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$45.0M to \$22.3M	
DOT07-323	DOT	99th Ave from I-10 to MC-85	Road Widening	STP-AZ & ARRA	\$3,152.9	\$3,753.9		04/22/09	✓	✓					\$2.5 million in ARRA-Highway, and \$652,890 in ARRA-MPO/Local.	
DOT09-801	DOT	US 60: 99th Ave to Thunderbird Rd (within the city limits of El Mirage)	Transportation Landscaping Enhancement	ARRA	\$207.3	\$207.3	\$207.3	04/22/09	✓	✓	✓	10/23/09	11/20/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$300k to \$207k	
DOT07-332	DOT	US 60: 99th Ave - 83rd Ave	Road Widening	ARRA	\$7,647.2	\$7,647.2	\$7,647.2	03/25/09	✓	✓	✓	✓	8/14/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$11.2 mill to \$7.6M.	
DOT06-613	DOT	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	Widen roadway, adding 2 through lanes	ARRA	\$11,042.3	\$11,042.3	\$11,042.3	05/27/09	✓	✓	✓	8/21/09	9/18/09		Admin Mod: Change project costs from \$18.6 mill to \$11.0M - pending contract award	
DOT12-840	DOT	101 (Agua Fria Fwy) at Union Hills Dr/Beardsley Rd	Construct traffic interchange, construct new frontage road and Texas U-Turn structure over L101	ARRA, STP MAG & Local	\$9,100.0	\$27,564.4	\$5,667.4	04/22/09	✓	✓	✓	9/25/09	10/16/09			
DOT08-673	DOT	74: US-60 (Grand Ave) to Loop 303 (Estrella Fwy); MP 20-22	Construct eastbound and westbound passing lanes	ARRA	\$3,900.0	\$3,900.0	\$2,324.6	05/27/09	✓	✓	✓	9/25/09	10/16/09			
					\$96,911.5	\$116,001.2	\$88,774.4									

†Date in Design and Environmental fields indicate estimated completion date.

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†							Comments	
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fund Type	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligate	Bid Open	Award Date		Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Roadway</b>															
APJ09-801	APJ	Ironwood Drive: Southern Avenue to 16th Avenue	Design and Reconstruction of Pavement	ARRA	\$1,348.3	\$1,348.3		4/22/09	12/30/09	12/15/09	1/8/10				
AVN09-801	AVN	Dysart Road-I-10 to Indian School Road	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	ARRA	\$2,035.2	\$2,035.2		4/22/09	11/20/09	✓	12/11/09				AVN09-801 & AVN09-802 could be bid together under one TRACS to save cost
AVN09-802	AVN	Dysart Road -Van Buren to the I-10	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	ARRA & Local	\$179.7	\$401.8		4/22/09	11/20/09	✓	12/11/09				AVN09-801 & AVN09-802 could be bid together under one TRACS to save cost
BKY09-801	BKY	Various Locations Townwide - Functionally Classified Roads	Pre-engineer/Design and Pavement Rehabilitation and Preservation	ARRA	\$1,621.9	\$1,621.9		4/22/09	12/1/09	11/30/09	12/22/09				Send to C&S without clearances for C&S to begin review.
CFR09-801	CFR	Intersection of Tom Darlington Drive and Ridgeview Place	Pre-engineer/Design and construct Pedestrian crossing	ARRA	\$35.0	\$35.0		4/22/09	N/A	11/26/09	N/A				Combined w/ LG CFR09-802
CFR09-802	CFR	Cave Creek Road: Scopa Trail to Carefree Eastern Border	Pre-engineer/Design and construct, repair and restoration of Cave Creek Road	ARRA	\$553.3	\$553.3		4/22/09	11/12/09	12/4/09	12/31/09				City not happy with type of flashers. Would like to use illuminated.
CVK09-807	CVK	Various Locations - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Pavement Rehab projects	ARRA	\$614.8	\$614.8		5/27/09	11/30/09	11/30/09	12/31/09				Over budget. Scope will be reduced - C&S
CHN120-07C	CHN	Chandler Blvd/Dobson Road Intersection, and Dobson Road from Chandler Blvd to Frye Road	Intersection and Capacity Improvement	ARRA, Local & RARF	\$2,288.7	\$7,629.0		4/22/09	✓	✓	11/23/09				Clearance for RW & URR may be under old TRACS S578201C.
CHN09-801	CHN	Price Road from Germann Road south to Queen Creek Road	Design and reconstruction of pavement	ARRA	\$3,678.9	\$3,678.9		4/22/09	✓	✓	12/17/09				Additional scope was done for this project.
ELM09-801	ELM	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and Mill and Replace Existing Road.	ARRA	\$952.8	\$952.8		4/22/09	11/16/09	11/16/09	12/7/09				Scope of work chng. Letter sent to EPG to confirm chng.
FTH07-301	FTH	Shea Blvd. (Palisades Blvd. to Fountain Hills Blvd.)	Widen for 3rd (westbound) lane, bike lane, sidewalk, and turn pockets.	ARRA, STP, & Local	\$1,081.6	\$3,376.6		6/24/09	✓	✓	11/4/09				Under review w/ C&S 6/19/09. C&S to drive location to verify project limits. Send copy of plans to District for review.
GBD09-801	GBD	Pima Street/SR-85 Various Locations	Design and Construct Signage Improvements	ARRA	\$33.0	\$33.0		4/22/09	12/1/09	11/30/09	12/22/09				Combined w/ GBD09-802
GBD09-802	GBD	Pima Street/SR-85 Various Locations	Design and Construct Pedestrian and Landscape Improvements	ARRA	\$339.5	\$339.5		4/22/09	12/1/09	11/30/09	12/22/09				Possible 4F. Actual cost estimate is pending. Gila Bend has requested MAG for additional funding. No survey work has been done.
GBD09-803	GBD	Gila Bend Airport on SR-85	Design and Construct Carpool and Transit Park & Ride Lot	ARRA	\$170.0	\$170.0		5/27/09	12/1/09	11/19/09	12/22/09				
GRC09-801	GRC	Various Locations - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Pavement Rehab projects	ARRA	\$561.3	\$561.3		4/22/09	12/1/09	11/30/09	12/22/09				EPG - Avoidance Letter from District. District waiting for change in scope.
GLB09-301	GLB	Various Locations - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Nova Chip Overlays- arterial roadways	ARRA	\$5,306.3	\$5,306.3		4/22/09	11/20/09	✓	12/11/09				

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†							Comments	
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fund Type	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligate	Bid Open	Award Date		Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Roadway</b>															
GLN09-801	GLN	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	New traffic signal cabinets and controllers	ARRA	\$1,100.0	\$1,100.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/10/09	12/21/09				City of Glendale to Procure equipment but will advertise through ADOT for installation.
GLN09-802	GLN	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Modernize traffic signals	ARRA	\$550.0	\$550.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/10/09	12/21/09				City of Glendale to Procure equipment but will advertise through ADOT for installation.
GLN09-803	GLN	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	CCTV Camera Installations	ARRA	\$90.0	\$90.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/10/09	12/21/09				City of Glendale to Procure equipment but will advertise through ADOT for installation.
GLN09-804	GLN	Camelback Rd. - 47th to 83rd Aves.	Install wireless communication with traffic signals	ARRA	\$230.0	\$230.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				City of Glendale to Procure equipment but will advertise through ADOT for installation.
GLN09-805	GLN	Bethany Home Rd. - 63rd to 83rd Aves.	Install wireless communication with traffic signals	ARRA	\$200.0	\$200.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				City of Glendale to Procure equipment but will advertise through ADOT for installation.
GLN09-806	GLN	Glendale Ave. - 51st to 66th Aves.	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement overlay	ARRA	\$1,170.0	\$1,170.0		4/22/09	11/25/09	11/27/09	12/16/09				Advance NTP given to Dibble
GLN09-807	GLN	Litchfield Rd. - Missouri to Northern Ave.	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement surface treatment	ARRA	\$510.0	\$510.0		4/22/09	11/25/09	11/25/09	12/16/09				Advance NTP given to Dibble
GLN09-808	GLN	25 Miles on Arterial Streets	Install thermoplastic pavement markings	ARRA	\$358.4	\$358.4		4/22/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				This project could be combined with other Pavement Pres projects to save cost.
GLN08-604	GLN	63rd Avenue at Loop 101 Expressway	Design and construct multi-use overpass over Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy) (Phase 2)	ARRA, CMAQ, & Local	\$1,850.0	\$5,407.4		4/22/09	✓	✓	✓				Project submitted to C&S
GDY09-801	GDY	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill, patch and replace	ARRA & Local	\$782.4	\$798.4		4/22/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				
GDL09-801	GDL	Various Locations Townwide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Design and Mill & Asphalt overlay roadways	ARRA	\$634.0	\$634.0		4/22/09	11/20/09	11/30/09	12/31/09				Combined w/ LG GUA0201. Previously 2 projects.
LPK09-801	LPK	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and mill and replace pavement resurfacing/reconstruction	ARRA	\$614.0	\$614.0		4/22/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				Cost estimate high. Scope will need to be reduced. Need funding prior to advertisement. JPA needs to be amended.
MMA09-801	MMA	Various Locations Countywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct AR Overlay	ARRA & Local	\$6,469.2	\$6,478.1		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/30/09	12/21/09				Project Design 100% Complete. MOU is place between both agencies.
MES09-801R	MES	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades	ARRA	\$1,610.9	\$1,610.9		5/27/09	✓	✓	12/21/09				
MES09-802R	MES	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill and replace pavement	ARRA	\$970.7	\$970.7		5/27/09	✓	✓	12/21/09				
MES09-803	MES	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades, Group 1	ARRA	\$2,559.3	\$2,559.3		5/27/09	✓	✓	12/21/09				

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status						Comments		
Tip #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fund Type	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligate	Bid Open		Award Date	Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Roadway</b>															
MES09-804	MES	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades, Group 2	ARRA	\$2,333.3	\$2,333.3		5/27/09	12/4/09	✓	12/21/09				
MES09-805	MES	Various Locations Citywide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades Group 3	ARRA	\$3,310.6	\$3,310.6		5/27/09	12/4/09	✓	12/21/09				
PVY09-801	PVY	Various Locations Townwide - Functionally Classified Roadways	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement resurface projects	ARRA & Local	\$823.2	\$823.8		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/30/09	1/7/10				District needs a copy of plans. Under C&S Review 6/19/09. Don is going to drive area to verify plans - old project.
PEO100-07AC1	PEO	Beardsley Rd Connection: Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy) to Beardsley Rd at 83rd Av/Lake Pleasant Pkwy	Construct Beardsley Road extension and bridge over New River	ARRA, STP-MAG & Local	\$2,850.4	\$11,489.7		4/22/09	✓	✓	✓	11/19/09	12/18/09		Pending Advertisement Date: October 23, 2009
PEO09-801	PEO	Various Locations	Pavement Preservation: Major Arterial mill, overlay and re-striping	ARRA & Local	\$1,130.1	\$1,396.3		6/24/09	11/30/09	✓	12/21/09				City hopes to have ARRA funds left over from Beardsley Rd to cover (\$1,389,351)
PHX07-316	PHX	7th St & McDowell Rd	Design & Construction of Intersection Improvements	ARRA & CMAQ	\$1,000.0	\$2,256.0		4/22/09	✓	✓	✓				Advertised - 3 low bids rejected. FHWA would like to review. Low bid \$750K
PHX09-801	PHX	Various Locations (North Area) - Functionally Classified Roadways	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	ARRA	\$7,136.2	\$7,136.2		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/4/09				
PHX09-802	PHX	Various Locations (Central Area) - Functionally Classified Roadways	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	ARRA	\$7,150.0	\$7,150.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/4/09				
PHX09-803	PHX	Various Locations (South Area) - Functionally Classified Roadways	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	ARRA	\$7,150.0	\$7,150.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/4/09				95% Plans turned into ADOT
PHX09-804	PHX	Various Locations - (North Area)	Design & Construction of Removal/Replacement of Existing ADA Ramps or Construction of New ADA Ramps	ARRA	\$1,750.0	\$1,750.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/14/09				95% Plans turned into ADOT
PHX09-805	PHX	Various Locations - (South Area)	Design & Construction of Removal/Replacement of Existing ADA Ramps or Construction of New ADA Ramps	ARRA	\$1,750.0	\$1,750.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/14/09				95% Plans turned into ADOT
PHX09-806	PHX	11 Locations Citywide	Design & Construct Bridge Deck Rehabilitations	ARRA	\$2,250.0	\$2,250.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/11/09				95% Plans turned into ADOT
PHX09-807	PHX	6 Locations Citywide	Design & Construct Bridge Joint Rehabilitations	ARRA	\$1,250.0	\$1,250.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/11/09				95% Plans turned into ADOT
PHX09-808	PHX	Citywide Corridors	Inventory / Programming & Procure / Install Traffic Control Signs	ARRA	\$3,000.0	\$3,000.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/18/09				PB need to verify if non-standard signs
PHX09-809	PHX	Citywide Corridors	Design & Procure/Install Fiber Optic Backbone System	ARRA	\$1,500.0	\$1,500.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/18/09				PS&E package at ADOT awaiting approval.

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†							Comments	
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Fund Type	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligate	Bid Open	Award Date		Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Roadway</b>															
PHX09-810	PHX	Citywide Corridors	Design & Procure/Install CCTV	ARRA	\$1,000.0	\$1,000.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/18/09				PS&E package at ADOT awaiting approval.
PHX09-811	PHX	Citywide Corridors	Design & Procure/Install Wireless Communications	ARRA	\$500.0	\$500.0		4/22/09	12/15/09	✓	12/18/09				PS&E package at ADOT awaiting approval.
QNC09-801	QNC	Combs Rd: UPRR/Rittenhouse Rd to approx. 1,000 ft west of Gantzel Rd	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct resurfacing roadway	ARRA	\$227.3	\$227.3		4/22/09	12/4/09	12/1/09	1/6/10				Drafted PA complete.
QNC09-802	QNC	Various Locations on Rittenhouse Rd	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct resurfacing roadway and shoulder paving	ARRA	\$805.8	\$805.8		4/22/09	12/4/09	12/1/09	1/6/10				Drafted PA complete.
SRP09-801	SRP	Various Locations - Functionally Classified Roadways	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation/Chip-Seal	ARRA	\$653.9	\$653.9		5/27/09	11/19/09	11/30/09	12/30/09				Constructibility. Still need to determine where they will store equipment.
SCT09-802	SCT	Various Locations	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	ARRA	\$4,600.0	\$4,600.0		7/22/09	12/17/09	11/30/09	1/7/10				PB will meet w/ City to determine what City plans to do with high cost estimate. <i>JPA will need to be amended.</i>
SCT12-813	SCT	Various Locations in Southern Scottsdale	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	ARRA, & Local	\$439.6	\$500.0		4/22/09	11/16/09	✓	12/7/09				Meet w/ Scottsdale to discuss installation requirements
SUR09-801	SUR	Bell Road-Parkview to West City Limit	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement Reconstruction and ITS Conduit Installation	ARRA	\$2,933.4	\$2,933.4		4/22/09	10/30/09	✓	11/21/09				PS&E being reviewed by C&S. Materials Clearance needs to be verified.
TMP09-801	TMP	Baseline Road between Kyrene Road and the Union Pacific Railroad, over the Western Canal	Construct replacement bridge over the Western Canal	ARRA, & Local	\$4,362.6	\$6,000.0		4/22/09	✓	11/30/09	12/21/09				Awaiting clearance.
WKN09-801	WKN	North Vulture Mine Rd: US 60 to Northern Town Limits	Design and Complete Pavement Mill and Replace	ARRA	\$644.1	\$644.1		4/22/09	11/30/09	11/30/09	12/21/09				Additional scope is being requested by City. Need to determine if there is enough time to do this.
YTN09-801	YTN	Peoria Ave: 111th Avenue west by 1950 feet/approx. 115th Avenue	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill and replace - pavement resurfacing	ARRA	\$645.9	\$645.9		4/22/09	12/1/09	12/4/09	12/21/09				Fee proposal at LG for approval
					\$101,695.7	\$124,995.3									

†Date in Design and Environmental fields indicate estimated completion date.

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†						Comments	
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligated	Bid Opened	Award Date		Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Transit Projects</b>														
AVN09-804T	AVN	Citywide	Purchase 2 replacement dial-a-ride vehicles	\$126.0	\$126.0		6/24/09							
GDY05-202T	GDY	I-10: Litchfield Rd to Dysart Rd (ADOT Basin between Litchfield and Dysart)	Park and Ride Land Acquisition	\$352.2	\$1,847.1		6/24/09	✓	✓	✓			Mar-10	Grants have been submitted to FTA
GDY06-204T	GDY	I-10: Litchfield Rd to Dysart Rd (ADOT Basin between Litchfield and Dysart)	Construct regional park-and-ride (1/10 - Litchfield)	\$2,036.2	\$4,193.8		6/24/09	✓	✓	✓			Mar-10	The design is completed. The EA is completed. The land was acquired. Contract for construction is expected to be signed in December 2009.
GDY08-800T	GDY	I-10: Litchfield Rd to Dysart Rd (ADOT Basin between Litchfield and Dysart)	Acquire land- regional park and ride	\$186.5	\$977.6		6/24/09	✓	✓	✓			Mar-10	Grants have been submitted to FTA
MES08-801T	MES	Loop 202/Power	Construct regional park-and-ride (Loop 202/Power)	\$517.8	\$1,800.0		9/30/09							Admin Mod: Modify project costs to lower amount and change funding type to ARRA-Transit and 5309.
MES10-801T	MES	US60/Country Club	Park-and-Ride design	\$367.5	\$367.5		9/30/09							Amend: Add new ARRA-Transit project to list.
MES10-802T	MES	US60/Country Club	Park-and-Ride land acquisition	\$3,238.3	\$3,238.3		9/30/09							Amend: Add new ARRA-Transit project to list.
MES10-803T	MES	Loop 202/Power	Design regional park-and-ride (Loop 202/Power)	\$765.0	\$765.0		9/30/09							Amend: Add new ARRA-Transit project to list.
MES10-804T	MES	Gilbert/McDowell	Design regional park-and-ride	\$765.0	\$765.0		9/30/09							Amend: Add new ARRA-Transit project to list.
MES10-805T	MES	Gilbert/McDowell	Construct regional park-and-ride	\$517.8	\$2,289.0		9/30/09							Amend: Add new ARRA-Transit project to list.
MES10-809T	MES	Country Club/US 60	Park-and-Ride construction	\$3,228.8	\$3,228.8		3/25/09	✓	✓					Admin Mod: Modify project costs to lower amount.
PHX08-704T	PHX	27th Ave/Baseline Rd	27th Ave/Baseline Park and Ride Construct	\$1,100.0	\$1,100.0		5/27/09		✓	✓			Jun-12	The RFP for design is currently on the street. A pre-submittal meeting was held with potential consultants on November 16, 2009.
PHX08-705T	PHX	I-17/Happy Valley	Happy Valley/I-17 Park and Ride - construct	\$5,500.0	\$5,500.0		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Dec-10	The project is currently out to bid for construction. Construction is scheduled to begin in February 2010.
PHX09-611T	PHX	Regionwide	Preventive Maintenance	\$5,400.0	\$11,964.0		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Jun-10	Ongoing
PHX09-837T	PHX	Bell Rd/SR-51	Bus access crossover	\$640.1	\$640.1		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Jul-10	The RFP for design is currently on the street. A pre-submittal meeting was held with potential consultants on November 30, 2009.
PHX09-838T	PHX	Pecos Road/40th Street	Pecos/40th St Park and Ride Expansion	\$3,000.0	\$3,000.0		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓	✓		Dec-10	The project is currently out to bid for construction. Construction is scheduled to begin in January 2010.

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†							Comments
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligated	Bid Opened	Award Date	Estimated Complete	
<b>Local Projects - Transit Projects</b>														
PHX09-839T	PHX	Regionwide	Intelligent Transportation System Enhancement: Regional Transit Stop Data Overhaul	\$300.0	\$300.0		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Sep-10	Consultant was meeting with staff to assess needs and specifications. An Operation review will be created from the information collected. The Operational Review and a project plan will be submitted for review by Nov 25, 2009. Staff is currently researching.
PHX09-840T	PHX	Citywide	Bus Stop Improvements	\$4,321.2	\$4,321.2		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Dec-11	The bid is currently being advertised.
PHX10-818T	PHX	Central Avenue/Van Buren	Central Station Transit Center Refurbishments	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0		3/25/09		✓	✓			Jan-11	Programming schematic design, and design development phases are complete. We are now working to complete final design plans and specs. The bidding process will begin in January 2010.
SCT09-803T	SCT	Loop 101/Scottsdale Rd	Park-and-Ride construction	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0		3/25/09	✓	✓					Programming schematic design, and design development phases are complete. We are now working to complete final design plans and specs. The bidding process will begin in January 2010.
TMP09-806T	TMP	East Valley Operations and Maintenance Facility	Expansion/ Updgrade	\$6,500.0	\$6,500.0		3/25/09	✓	✓	✓			Mar-11	Negotiating contract for final design and construction drawings.
VMR09-801T	VMR	Central Ave/Camelback Rd	Central/Camelback Park and Ride Expansion	\$1,400.0	\$1,400.0		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	✓		Jun-01	A design-build team has been selected and is working with VMR on finding a consultant.
VMR09-802T	VMR	Regionwide	LRT Park and Ride Shade Canopes	\$2,500.0	\$2,500.0		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓			Dec-09	A design-build team has been selected and is working with VMR on finding a consultant.
VMT10-807T	VMT	Arizona Avenue/Country Club (Service between Ocotillo Ave/Alma School and Sycamore and Main using Arizona Ave/CC)	Bus Rapid Transit - Arizona Avenue/Country Club (Phase I) - Acquire ROW	\$2,500.0	\$2,500.0	\$0.0	3/25/09	✓	✓	✓	✓		Dec-09	Land Acquisition - Less than 50% complete.
VMT10-807T	VMT	Arizona Avenue/Country Club (Service between Ocotillo Ave/Alma School and Sycamore and Main using Arizona Ave/CC)	Bus Rapid Transit Arizona Avenue/Country Club (Phase I) - Construct busway improvements and stations	\$12,500.0	\$12,500.0	\$4,154.3	3/25/09	✓	✓	✓	✓		Jul-10	Construction - Less than 50% complete.
				\$67,762.2	\$81,823.3									

†Date in Design and Environmental fields indicate estimated completion date.

**PROJECT STATUS REPORT    TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN MAG REGION**  
**American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding**  
**NOVEMBER 24 2009**

Project Information				Project Funding			Project Development Status†						Comments	
TIP #	Agency	Project Location	Project Description	Federal - ARRA	Estimated Total	Award Amount	Approval Date	Design	Environment	Obligated	Bid Opened	Award Date		Estimated Complete
<b>Local Projects - Transportation Enhancements</b>														
CHN09-805	CHN	Paseo Trail, Consolidated Canal: Galveston to Pecos Rd.	Construction of multi-use path	\$750,000	\$1,161,610		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓				Authorized 08/11/2009 but hold back NTP pending resolution of sole-source issue.
GLB04-303R	GLB	Canal Crossing Project	Design and construction pedestrian bridges over canal crossing	\$270,000	\$680,000		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	9/18/09			
GLB08-801	GLB	Heritage District Downtown Ped Project	Design and construct sidewalks, landscaping and other pedestrian improvements	\$578,670	\$578,670		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	10/6/09			
GLN08-611	GLN	Old Roma Alley	Design and construct pedestrian enhancements and landscape	\$732,562	\$732,562		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	12/3/09			
MMA09-725	MMA	Bush Hwy from Usery Pass Rd to Stewart Mtn Rd	Design and construct bicycle lane	\$750,000	\$1,117,817	\$561,095	5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Dec-09	Construction scheduled to begin Oct 5, 09.
MES09-806	MES	Consolidated Canal Pathway, 8th Street and Lindsay	Design and construct 12-foot wide multi-use pathway with lighting and signing	\$750,000	\$1,509,375		6/24/09	✓	✓	✓				PH IIA auth; Adding PHIIV after 12-3 MAG TIP action
SCT09-703	SCT	Crosscut Canal, Thomas Rd to Indian School Rd	Construct new pedestrian/bicycle bridge and multi-use path	\$1,632.3	\$3,117.3		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	12/15/09			Project is using \$750,000 TE ARRA funds plus \$882,333 MAG ARRA funds.
SCT09-801	SCT	Downtown Canal Bank Improvements	Design and construct transportation enhancements to connect Sun Circle Trail to Goldwater Underpass	\$600,000	\$625,402		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓	12/3/09			
TMP09-704	TMP	Crosscut Canal from Papago Park to Mouer Park - Tempe	Design and construct multi-use path (phase II)	\$750,000	\$1,400,000		5/27/09	✓	✓	✓				Pending Notice of Additional Funding
				\$5,181,232	\$7,805,436									

†Date in Design and Environmental fields indicate estimated completion date.

## LOCAL SPONSORED PROJECT OVERVIEW

MAG was notified by ADOT on March 16, 2009 that the MAG region will receive \$104,578,340 of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. These funds are known as the sub-allocated ARRA transportation funds. On March 23, 2009 Regional Council approved the policy direction for the sub-allocated ARRA funds of: a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population in accordance with the following:

1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects.
2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate.
3. Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary.
4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009 for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010 in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds.

Jurisdiction	Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500K Plus Population
Apache Junction (a)	\$ 1,348,343
Avondale	\$ 2,214,899
Buckeye	\$ 1,621,878
Carefree	\$ 588,340
Cave Creek	\$ 614,813
Chandler	\$ 5,967,599
El Mirage	\$ 1,252,805
Fort McDowell	\$ 518,436
Fountain Hills	\$ 1,081,614
Gila Bend	\$ 542,497
Gila River (b)	\$ 561,349
Gilbert	\$ 5,306,313
Glendale	\$ 6,058,413
Goodyear	\$ 1,829,797
Guadalupe	\$ 634,022
Litchfield Park	\$ 613,958
Mesa	\$ 10,784,779
Paradise Valley	\$ 823,174
Peoria (b)	\$ 3,980,451
Phoenix	\$ 35,436,181
Queen Creek (a)	\$ 1,033,098
Salt River	\$ 653,910
Scottsdale	\$ 5,921,966
Surprise	\$ 2,933,374
Tempe	\$ 4,362,619
Tolleson	652,890
Wickenburg	\$ 644,140
Youngtown	\$ 645,926
Maricopa County (c)	\$ 5,950,757
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 104,578,340</b>

**LOCAL SPONSORED PROJECT DETAILS  
NOVEMBER 24 2009**

<b>APACHE JUNCTION</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
APJ09-801	Design and Reconstruction of Pavement	\$ 1,348,343
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,348,343</b>

<b>AVONDALE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
AVN09-801	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	\$ 2,035,200
AVN09-802	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	\$ 179,699
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 2,214,899</b>

<b>BUCKEYE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
BKY09-801	Pre-engineer/Design and Pavement Rehabilitation and Preservation	\$ 1,621,878
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,621,878</b>

<b>CAREFREE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
CFR09-801	Pre-engineer/Design and construct Pedestrian crossing	\$ 35,000
CFR09-802	Pre-engineer/Design and construct, repair and restoration of Cave Creek Road	\$ 553,340
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 588,340</b>

<b>CAVE CREEK</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
CVK09-807	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Pavement Rehab projects	\$ 614,813
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 614,813</b>

<b>CHANDLER</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
CHN120-07C	Intersection and Capacity Improvement	\$ 2,288,700
CHN09-801	Design and reconstruction of pavement	\$ 3,678,899
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 5,967,599</b>

<b>EL MIRAGE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
ELM09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and Mill and Replace Existing Road.	\$ 952,805
DOT09-801	Transporatation Landscaping Enhancement	\$ 207,299
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,160,104</b>

<b>FOUNTAIN HILLS</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
FTH07-301	Widen for 3rd (westbound) lane, bike lane, sidewalk, and turn pockets.	\$ 1,081,614
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,081,614</b>

**LOCAL SPONSORED PROJECT DETAILS  
NOVEMBER 24 2009**

<b>FT. MCDOWELL YAVAPAI NATION</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation will be doing a joint project with Maricopa County. \$518,436 of Maricopa County's project is for paving and rehab of roads in the Ft. McDowell community.		

<b>GILA BEND</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GBD09-801	Design and Construct Signage Improvements	\$ 33,000
GBD09-802	Design and Construct Pedestrian and Landscape Improvements	\$ 339,497
GBD09-803	Design and Construct Carpool and Transit Park & Ride Lot	\$ 170,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 542,497</b>

<b>GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GRC09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Pavement Rehab projects	\$ 561,349
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 561,349</b>

<b>GILBERT</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GLB09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and Construct Nova Chip Overlays- arterial roadways	\$ 5,306,313
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 5,306,313</b>

<b>GLENDALE</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GLN09-801	New traffic signal cabinets and controllers	\$ 1,100,000
GLN09-802	Modernize traffic signals	\$ 550,000
GLN09-803	CCTV Camera Installations	\$ 90,000
GLN09-804	Install wireless communication with traffic signals	\$ 230,000
GLN09-805	Install wireless communication with traffic signals	\$ 200,000
GLN09-806	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement overlay	\$ 1,170,000
GLN09-807	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement surface treatment	\$ 510,000
GLN09-808	Install thermoplastic pavement markings	\$ 358,413
GLN08-604	Design and construct multi-use overpass over Loop 101 (Agua Fria Fwy) (Phase 2)	\$ 1,850,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 6,058,413</b>

<b>GOODYEAR</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GDY09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill, patch and replace	\$ 782,415
GDY06-204T	Construct regional park-and-ride (1/10 - Litchfield)	\$ 508,666
GDY08-800T	Acquire land- regional park and ride	\$ 186,500
GDY05-202T	Park and Ride Land Acquisition	\$ 352,216
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,829,797</b>

<b>GUADALUPE</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
GDL09-801	Design and Mill & Asphalt overlay roadways	\$ 634,022
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 634,022</b>

**LOCAL SPONSORED PROJECT DETAILS  
NOVEMBER 24 2009**

<b>LITCHFIELD PARK</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
LPK09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and mill and replace pavement resurfacing/reconstruction	\$ 613,958
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 613,958</b>

<b>MARICOPA COUNTY</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
MMA09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct AR Overlay	\$ 6,469,193
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 6,469,193</b>

<b>MESA</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
MES09-801R	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades	\$ 1,610,892
MES09-802R	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill and replace pavement	\$ 970,728
MES09-803	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades, Group 1	\$ 2,559,279
MES09-804	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades, Group 2	\$ 2,333,311
MES09-805	Pre-Engineer/Design and pavement reconstruct and ADA upgrades, Group 3	\$ 3,310,569
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 10,784,779</b>

<b>PARADISE VALLEY</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
PVY09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement resurface projects	\$ 823,174
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 823,174</b>

<b>PEORIA</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
PEO100-07AC1	Construct Beardsley Road extension and bridge over New River	\$ 2,850,401
PEO09-801	Pavement Preservation: Major Arterial mill, overlay and re-striping	\$ 1,130,050
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 3,980,451</b>

<b>PHOENIX</b>		
<b>TIP #</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Federal Cost - ARRA</b>
PHX07-316	Design & Construction of Intersection Improvements	\$ 1,000,000
PHX09-801	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	\$ 7,136,181
PHX09-802	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	\$ 7,150,000
PHX09-803	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation	\$ 7,150,000
PHX09-804	Design & Construction of Removal/Replacement of Existing ADA Ramps or Construction of New ADA Ramps	\$ 1,750,000
PHX09-805	Design & Construction of Removal/Replacement of Existing ADA Ramps or Construction of New ADA Ramps	\$ 1,750,000
PHX09-806	Design & Construct Bridge Deck Rehabilitations	\$ 2,250,000
PHX09-807	Design & Construct Bridge Joint Rehabilitations	\$ 1,250,000
PHX09-808	Inventory / Programming & Procure / Install Traffic Control Signs	\$ 3,000,000
PHX09-809	Design & Procure/Install Fiber Optic Backbone System	\$ 1,500,000
PHX09-810	Design & Procure/Install CCTV	\$ 1,000,000
PHX09-811	Design & Procure/Install Wireless Communications	\$ 500,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 35,436,181</b>

**LOCAL SPONSORED PROJECT DETAILS  
NOVEMBER 24 2009**

<b>QUEEN CREEK</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
QNC09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct resurfacing roadway	\$ 227,282
QNC09-802	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct resurfacing roadway and shoulder paving	\$ 805,816
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,033,098</b>

<b>SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
SRP09-801	Design & Construction of Pavement Preservation/Chip-Seal	\$ 653,910
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 653,910</b>

<b>SCOTTSDALE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
SCT09-802	Preliminary engineering, design and construction for Mill & Replace	\$ 4,600,000
SCT09-703	Construct new pedestrian/bicycle bridge and multi-use path	\$ 882,333
SCT12-813	Replace traffic signal controllers and cabinets	\$ 439,633
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 5,921,966</b>

<b>SUPRISE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
SUR09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct pavement Reconstruction and ITS Conduit Installation	\$ 2,933,374
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 2,933,374</b>

<b>TEMPE</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
TMP09-801	Construct replacement bridge over the Western Canal	\$ 4,362,619
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 4,362,619</b>

<b>TOLLESON</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
DOT07-323	Road Widening	\$ 652,890
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 652,890</b>

<b>WICKENBURG</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
WKN09-801	Design and Complete Pavement Mill and Replace	\$ 644,140
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 644,140</b>

<b>YOUNGTOWN</b>		
TIP #	Project Description	Federal Cost - ARRA
YTN09-801	Pre-Engineer/Design and construct mill and replace - pavement resurfacing	\$ 645,926
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 645,926</b>

## American Recovery Investment Act (ARRA) - ADOT Allocation Update

**KEY**

- # Not recommended for prioritization.
- \* Obligated, not awarded. Amount subject to change.
- \*\* Special recommendation.

Prioritized by Regional Council (R.C) - Currently Funded with ARRA											
R.C. Priority Order	Recommendation	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Status	Prog. Cost ('000s)	Actual Cost ('000s)	Diff. ('000s)	Avail. Funding ('000s)	Project Notes	
									\$129,393.0		
1	1	Yes	I-10: Verrado Way - Sarival Rd	Construct General Purpose Lane	AWARD 07/17/09	\$26,272.0	\$26,271.6	\$0.4	\$103,121.4	Contract was awarded on July 17, 2009.	
2	2	Yes	I-17: SR74-Anthem Way	Construct General Purpose Lane	CONST 8/7/09	\$13,314.1	\$13,314.1	(\$11)	\$89,807.3	Construction started on August 7, 2009	
3	#	Yes	SR802: L202 to Ellsworth	Design & ROW		\$20,400.0			\$89,807.3	This project was advanced from Phase III (2016-2020). The 2009 State Budget fix removed the State STAN funds; this project is currently unfunded. The design component is \$12 million. The completion of the Environmental Assessment is uncertain at this time.	
4	3	Yes	US 60: SR 303L - 99th Ave	10 Miles Widening	BID 10/23/09	\$22,299.9	\$22,299.9	\$0.0	\$67,507.4	The bid is expected to be opened on October 23, 2009.	
5	4	Yes	US 60: 99th Ave - 83rd Ave	2.5 Miles Widening	STB 8/14/09	\$7,647.2	\$7,647.2	(\$7)	\$59,860.2		
6	5	Yes	Loop 101: Beardsley Rd / Union Hills	TI Improvement - Widening Union Hills and Bridge with Beardsley connector	BID 9/25/09	\$9,100.0	\$5,667.4	\$3,432.6	\$54,192.8	The bid is expected to be opened on September 25, 2009.	
7	6	Yes	SR 85: Southern Ave - I 10	2 Miles New Roadway	BID 8/21/09	\$11,042.3	\$11,042.3*	\$0.0	\$43,150.6	The bid was opened on August 21, 2009. The lowest bid was \$11,042,300	
8	7	Yes	SR 74: MP 20 - MP 22	2 Miles Passing Lane	BID 9/25/09	\$3,900.0	\$2,324.6	\$1,575.4	\$40,826.0	The bid is expected to be opened on September 25, 2009.	
#	8	Yes	99th Ave: I-10 to MC85	99th Avenue/Van Buren Street intersection with the SRP well relocation, pavement rehabilitation for 99th Avenue from I-10 to Van Buren Street, and acquiring right-of-way.		\$3,152.9	\$2,500.0	\$652.9	\$38,326.0	This is a carry-over from Prop. 300. Project ready to Obligate.	
<b>ARRA Funds Available as of November 24, 2009 to be programmed:</b>									<b>\$38,326.0</b>		

## American Recovery Investment Act (ARRA) - ADOT Allocation Update

**KEY**

- # Not recommended for prioritization.
- \* Obligated, not awarded. Amount subject to change.
- \*\* Special recommendation.

Projects Recommended to be Funded with Available ARRA Funds Based on Project Readiness - Currently Unfunded with ARRA										
R.C. Priority Order	Recommendation	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Status	Prog. Cost ('000s)	Actual Cost ('000s)	Diff. ('000s)	Avail. Funding ('000s)	Project Notes
9	9**	Yes	Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB	Auxiliary lane - 3 miles		\$3,000.0			\$35,326.0	Project is ready to move forward. This project is requested to be combined with un-prioritized auxiliary lane project, Loop 101: 51st Ave to 27th Ave EB. Conformity would have to be assessed.
10	#	Yes	Loop 101: Olive Avenue	TI Improvements		\$3,000.0			\$32,326.0	This project is still in development and may not make the March 2, 2010 ARRA obligation deadline. Project readiness needs to be monitored. There is current funding committed for the project in 2010.
11	#	Yes	SR 74: MP 13 - MP 15	Construct Passing Lanes		\$3,200.0			\$29,126.0	This project is still in development and may not make the March 2, 2010 ARRA obligation deadline. Project readiness needs to be monitored. There is current funding committed for the project in 2010.
12	9**	Yes	I-17: I-10 to Indian School	Southbound Roadway Improvements		\$1,500.0			\$27,626.0	Final plans due by end of August 2009. Project requested to be funded based on project readiness.
13	#	Yes	Regionwide	Construct Noise Walls		\$15,600.0				This project is still in development and may not make the March 2, 2010 ARRA obligation deadline. Project readiness needs to be monitored. There is current funding committed for the project in 2010. Revised to \$15.6M at the January 2009 Regional Council.
#	9**	No	Loop 101: 51st Ave to 27th Ave EB	Auxiliary lane		\$3,000.0			\$24,626.0	Project is ready to move forward. This project is requested to be combined with auxiliary lane project, Loop 101: Northern to Grand SB. Conformity would have to be assessed.
#	10	Yes	SR 87: Four Peaks - Dos S Ranch Road	Construct Roadway Improvements		\$23,000.0			\$1,626.0	The project is projected to be ready to advertise by November 2009. Recommend as a "catch-all" for all remaining ARRA funds after previous bids are submitted.
#	11	Yes	<u>143 Hohokam: SR 143/Sky Harbor Blvd TI</u>	<u>TI Improvements, Adding Ramps</u>		\$35,100.0			(\$33,474.0)	<u>Scheduled to advertise April 8, 2010. May be ready to obligate by the end of February 2010.</u>

## American Recovery Investment Act (ARRA) - ADOT Allocation Update

**KEY**

- # Not recommended for prioritization.
- \* Obligated, not awarded. Amount subject to change.
- \*\* Special recommendation.

Backup List of Projects to be Funded with Available ARRA Funds Based on Project Readiness - Currently Unfunded with ARRA										
R.C. Priority Order	Recommendation	Prop. 400 Project	Project Location	Project Description	Status	Prog. Cost ('000s)	Actual Cost ('000s)	Diff. ('000s)	Avail. Funding ('000s)	Project Notes
#	#	No	SR 87: Gilbert - Shea	Pavement Preservation		\$3,000.0			\$35,326.0	Work currently underway. Can no longer use ARRA funds.
#	#	No	I-8: Gila Bend Rest Area	Pavement Preservation		\$10,000.0			\$25,326.0	
#	#	No	I-8: MP 121 - Rest Area	Pavement Preservation		\$21,000.0			\$4,326.0	
#	#	No	US 60: San Domingo - Whitmann	Pavement Preservation		\$11,000.0			(\$6,674.0)	
#	#	No	US 60: Wickenburg to San Domingo Wash	Pavement Preservation		\$3,777.0			(\$10,451.0)	
#	#	Yes	Loop 303: Greenway to Mountain View	Construction		\$135,000.0				Conformity would have to be redetermined. This project is being advanced from 2012 to 2010. Will not be ready to obligate.
#	#	No	Loop 202: MP 10 - MP 17	Sign Replacement		\$1,150.0				
#	#	No	SR 51: MP 7 - MP 14	Sign Replacement		\$1,500.0				
#	#	No	I-10: MP 112 - MP 129	Sign Replacement		\$1,500.0				
#	#	No	I-10: MP 129 - MP 146	Sign Replacement		\$1,500.0				
#	#	No	I-17: MP 194 - MP 201	Sign Replacement		\$1,500.0				
#	#	No	Various Routes	Guard Rails		\$1,800.0				
#	#	No	I-17: 19th Avenue - 16th Street	Pavement Replacement		\$1,500.0				

# **ATTACHMENT FIVE**

# PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK AND CONGESTION MANAGEMENT UPDATE STUDY

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2008-2009

### TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE MAG REGION

The MAG Performance Measures (PM) Report has been developed in conjunction with a Regional Performance Measurement Framework and a Data Gap Analysis Document as part of Phase II of the Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study. The purpose of the PM Report is to provide an overview of how the transportation system in the MAG region is currently performing, as well as highlight significant facts regarding performance across selected corridors and facilities.

Data analyzed as part of the Performance Measures Report are primarily from 2006 and 2007, prior to both the dramatic increase in gasoline prices during 2008 and the economic recession which began to gain traction in the middle of that year. As a result, significant changes in transportation system use and performance are likely to have occurred since the data presented in this report were produced. Even so, this report illustrates how tracking transportation system performance data facilitates more informed public decision making, thereby resulting in better public policy, planning, and project selection.

This Executive Summary highlights findings within the reported data that are of significant interest or that have potential future policy implications. Following is a summary and discussion for the principal sections of the Study:

#### **LIMITED ACCESS HIGHWAY AND HOV LANE PERFORMANCE**

The freeway system in Maricopa County encompasses fifty-three (53) miles of Interstate highway, and one hundred sixty-three (163) miles of other freeways and expressways. Interstate highways include I-10 (the Maricopa/Papago Freeway) and the I-17 (the Black Canyon Freeway). Other important freeways and expressways include: U.S. 60 (the Superstition Freeway), Loop 202 (the Red Mountain/Santan Freeway), Loop 101 (the Price/Pima/Agua Fria Freeway), SR 51 (the Piestewa Freeway), and SR 143 (the Hohokam Expressway). According to the Texas Transportation Institute's 2009 Annual Urban Mobility Report, congestion in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area cost (based on wasted time and fuel) \$1.89 billion in 2007. The average cost of congestion per traveler during 2007 was \$1,034.

The most heavily traveled freeway is I-10 west of downtown Phoenix, which serves almost 200,000 vehicles on an average weekday. The I-10 is a heavily congested roadway, moving at an average of just over 35 mph from SR 51 to 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue during parts of both the AM and PM peak periods. Other regional freeways carrying fewer total vehicles are, at times, equally congested. As an example, the Loop 101 (southbound) between the Loop 202 and Guadalupe

Road has an average speed of less than 30 mph during the peak of the evening rush hour. In addition, the westbound portion of the Loop 202 is somewhat unique in that it routinely experiences heavy congestion between SR 143 and I-10 during both the AM and PM peak periods.

An important contributor to the MAG area's traffic congestion pattern is the transportation-land use configuration and how it influences travel behavior, especially for commuter trips which tend to concentrate on morning and afternoon periods. One consequence of regional traffic congestion (primarily resulting from high levels of demand and consequent slower vehicular speeds) is that portions of all of the freeways in the MAG region typically and consistently operate at lower efficiencies only during certain hours of the AM and PM periods. That is, as a result of traffic congestion, each of these roads becomes incapable of serving the traffic volumes they were designed to support under more favorable conditions. For example, congestion is frequently so severe during the peak period, that several sections of I-10 actually serve less than 60 percent of the vehicles they were designed to serve, simply because traffic is moving so slowly. Likewise, PM peak period traffic demand along sections of I-17 is so high that these portions of the freeway are able to serve less than 40 percent of their design volumes.

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes have been designed and built to encourage carpooling and transit ridership, thus helping in relieving congestion. Nevertheless, congestion is also common on sections of several of the region's HOV lanes, reducing incentives associated with their use. This may be due, in part, to how motorists interact with the HOV lane usage time of day restrictions currently being applied in the region. For example, in the afternoon prior to 3 PM, the HOV lanes are open to general purpose (non-HOV) traffic. Consequently, a significant number of single occupancy vehicles (SOV) make use of the HOV lanes right up to the 3 PM change-over; in some sections of the corridors, congestion begins to form in some HOV lanes as the usage period transitions. While traffic volumes in the HOV lanes do begin to decline after the HOV restrictions are imposed at 3 PM, the volumes remain high enough and the congestion in some sections of the HOV lanes is bad enough, that considerable congestion frequently remains in place until near the end of the peak period. While HOV lane congestion is not nearly as severe as general purpose lane congestion, some sections still perform fairly poorly, limiting the benefits the current HOV lane policy is intended to provide.

With regard to freeway safety, the total crash rates and injury crash rates per million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) appear to be consistent on a year-to-year basis. Total crash and injury crash rates are greatest on I-17 and US 60, followed by I-10 and SR 51. Results indicate that the Loop 101 and Loop 202 consistently have the lowest crash and injury rates as compared to all other freeways analyzed. Although I-10 experiences higher traffic volumes than any other roadway in the MAG region, crash and injury crash rates are lower for the I-10 corridor than for either I-17 or US 60.

Changes in freeway performance from 2006 to 2007 were mixed. Slightly more than half of the corridors showed slight increases in vehicle volume, while slightly less than half showed marginal decreases. Similarly, slightly more than half of the roadway sections examined had minor declines in average vehicle speed during the peak period, but almost half showed minor improvements.

## **ARTERIAL PERFORMANCE**

Arterials are also responsible for a very high percentage of Maricopa County's regional mobility. The major arterials selected for inclusion in this report were chosen due to the fact that they carry large volumes of traffic across the Valley and represent major traffic movements throughout the region. These arterials in some instances parallel the freeway corridors defined in Section 2 of this report, and in other instances carry traffic to and from areas not well-served by freeways.

Study results indicate that average hourly vehicle throughput on arterials is consistently higher during the PM peak period than during either the AM peak period or Midday period. Shea Boulevard carries the highest traffic volumes of all the arterial study corridors, with volumes averaging more than 22,000 vehicles per day along each direction of travel. Bell Road/Sun Valley Parkway is the second highest, with more than 20,000 vehicles per day along each direction. The lowest traffic volumes observed in the arterials selected for inclusion in this study occur on Dysart Road, with daily volumes of approximately 7,900 vehicles per day along each direction of the corridor.

With regard to arterial congestion, during the PM peak period, the westbound direction of Glendale Avenue/Lincoln Drive experiences the most significant delay, with well over half of the corridor experiencing average travel speeds less than 75 percent of the posted speed limit. During the AM peak period, the southbound direction of Dysart Road experiences the greatest congestion-related delay, with more than 60 percent of the corridor experiencing average travel speeds less than 75 percent of the posted speed limit. Power Road is also highly congested during the AM peak period and Midday period, with almost half of the arterial (in both directions of travel) experiencing congestion-related delays in the morning, and more than half experiencing significant delays during the middle of the day.

## **TRANSIT PERFORMANCE**

The transit system in the MAG region consists of a combination of local bus service, express bus service, arterial bus rapid transit service, circulator/shuttle services, dial-a-ride services, and as of the end of 2008, light rail service. As per the MAG Regional Transportation Plan, service levels on particular routes are determined by balancing demand for transit along those routes against the availability of funding. The Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA), commonly known as Valley Metro, is a membership organization aimed at helping to streamline transit service across the region. RPTA board member agencies include: Avondale, Buckeye, Chandler, El Mirage, Gilbert, Glendale, Goodyear, Maricopa County, Mesa, Peoria, Phoenix, Queen Creek, Scottsdale, Surprise, and Tempe.

The transit-related performance measures contained in the Performance Measures report reflect data collected by RPTA concerning the operation of the City of Phoenix, RPTA, and City of Tempe's transit services. As the data sets being analyzed are for 2006 and 2007, only bus-related modes of travel (express, local, and paratransit/dial-a-ride) are included; light rail transit service was not in operation at that time and is consequently not included as part of this report.

Although fixed route transit ridership increased from 2006 to 2007, the efficiency of those transit services (i.e., transit boardings per revenue mile driven) declined slightly. The most significant impact of a drop in boardings per revenue mile is the potential for it to result in an increase in subsidy per boarding.

On-time performance for all transit services in the MAG region increased from 2006 to 2007, with the exception of City of Phoenix's fixed route service, which fell by 1%. Nevertheless, during 2007 all services, both fixed route and Dial-A-Ride, exceeded the 90% on-time performance goal laid out by RPTA and the City of Phoenix for their transit services.

### **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PERFORMANCE**

A number of planning-related efforts have taken place over the past few years with the purpose of improving opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian travel in the region. Tracking performance measures associated with non-motorized (i.e., bicycle and pedestrian-based) modes of travel will provide MAG and its partners with key data concerning the extent to which those efforts have succeeded, as well as increase overall awareness of how travel via these alternative modes is being accommodated.

Based on an analysis of data collected regarding the modes of transportation utilized by commuters, no significant change was apparent in bicycle and pedestrian based travel between 2007 and 2008. Results also indicate that bicycle and pedestrian trips have the shortest commuting trip lengths (6.12 miles and 2.04 miles, respectively).

With regard to the safety of bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel, the annual number of crashes and injury crashes appear to be fairly stable from year to year, increasing or decreasing annually by no more than 7-10%.

### **QUALITY OF LIFE PERFORMANCE**

Quality of life-related issues are of growing concern to communities around the nation. The focus being placed on greater environmental quality, sustainable development, and healthy communities are evidence of an emphasis on an improved quality of life. Tracking quality of life-related performance measures is an important first step in providing community leaders with the information needed to implement substantive quality of life enhancement initiatives.

As a first step in assessing quality of life as it relates to the MAG region, the Performance Measures Report contains an assessment of participation in Maricopa County's Trip Reduction Program (TRP), aimed at encouraging the use of alternative modes (non-SOV based) of travel. Results of the analysis indicate continuing high levels of participation in the program (over 650,000 participants) which, according to the Maricopa County Air Quality Department's Trip Reduction Report, resulted in the elimination of 12,934 tons of air pollution due to the use of alternative modes of travel by program participants during 2008.