

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

April 16, 2003
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair	Rusty Gant, ADOT
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
* Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona	Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee	*Councilmember Seth Kanter, Goodyear
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction	Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors
Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix	Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria	*Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
* Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
* Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler	Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

#Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano at 2:38 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Giuliano thanked all for adjusting their schedules to accommodate the meeting time change for Passover. He announced that transit tickets were available from RPTA for those who used transit to come to the meeting. Validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

Chairman Giuliano stated that material was at each place for agenda items #4B, FY 2002-2003 Annual Transit Performance Report; #4C, Regional Transportation Plan - Phase II Contract Amendment, #4D, Proposal to Accelerate Certain Segments for Rubberized Asphalt; #4E, Requested Changes for the MAG Regional Freeway Program, and #8, Update on the MAG High Capacity Transit Study. Chairman Giuliano also noted that the Transportation Policy Committee progress timeline had been updated and was at each place.

Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda item #7, Performance Measures, was tabled until the May meeting. He noted that this will not impact the timeline.

Chairman Giuliano recognized Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County, who was present at the meeting.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Giuliano stated that an opportunity is available to members of the public to offer public comment. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Marty Manasco, General Director, Public/Private Partnerships for Burlington, Northern and Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad. Mr. Manasco stated that BNSF has been studying the possibilities of relocating their existing freight rail operations and the implementation of commuter rail service within the Grand Avenue corridor from Fourth Avenue and Jackson Street to a point north of Surprise, with future service anticipated to Wickenburg. Mr. Manasco stated that BNSF has determined that the Grand Avenue corridor can accommodate commuter rail service. He expressed the commitment of BNSF to cooperate with MAG to further study this transportation option. He advised that the relocation of existing BNSF infrastructure will assist in addressing traffic congestion, air quality, and safety. Mr. Manasco stated that the local BNSF contact is John Dugan. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Manasco for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from DD Barker, who stated that she came to the meeting on the bus and her bike. Ms. Barker demonstrated that her folding bike is useful when the two bike racks on the bus are already taken. She stated that all can share in multimodalism, even cars. Ms. Barker commented that it has been said that the sales tax extension will help provide better roads and freeways. She stated that many people think that transit does not pay its way and cars pay their way with gas taxes and license fees. However, she will be paying for cars because of the half cent sales tax. Ms. Barker commented on the health benefits received from bicycling and stated that a multimodal future is needed and is in the hands of the decision makers. She performed a cartwheel. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Bill Lazenby, Vice President of the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists, a statewide volunteer organization of more than 1,000 members. Mr. Lazenby stated that he is also a member of the MAG Bike/Pedestrian Committee. He mentioned that in February 2003, the Committee sent a letter to TPC members requesting a policy that bike/pedestrian elements not be forgotten in the RTP. Mr. Lazenby commented on recent lobbying efforts at the National Bike Summit in Washington, DC for a share of reauthorization money for these modes. He stated that there is a growing demand for safe bicycling and walking. The Surgeon General's report on health and physical activity has declared that 75 percent of Americans are at risk because of inactivity. Mr. Lazenby stated that the Centers for Disease Control has implemented conditions for bicycling and walking as national health priorities. He stated that the Coalition is willing to work with all committees toward multimodalism. Mr. Lazenby stated that all own vehicles and the Coalition is not anti-vehicle, they just want multimodal elements. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Lazenby for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Joseph Ryan, who stated that he would be addressing three federal documents. He pointed out that in the 5309 document, two stops are not in the middle of the road. Mr. Ryan stated that Exhibit A of the Transit 2000 election material is an example

of selling light rail as rapid transit. He pointed out that the material showed the stations on the sides of the roads, not in the middle. Mr. Ryan stated that the executives who contributed to the campaign should say the marketing was false. Mr. Ryan stated that in the record of decision document, the FTA says they approve of this project because light rail will save time for those going to the airport from downtown, which will be accomplished in nine minutes instead of 28 minutes. Mr. Ryan stated that the final EIS document does not have a light rail connection with the people mover. The EIS document estimates boardings on 22nd Avenue and Jefferson and 22nd Avenue and Washington at 300+ people per day. He commented that everyone wants a multimodal connection at the airport, but that is not in the documents. Mr. Ryan's public comment period expired. He stated that federal law says the public can comment on federal documents without a time restriction. Chairman Giuliano stated that the federal documents Mr. Ryan commented on were not agenda items. Mr. Ryan stated that federal law says he can speak on a Call to the Public for as long as he wishes. Chairman Giuliano requested that Mr. Ryan talk to staff about this. If there is a constitutional issue, it will be addressed. Mr. Ryan stated that MAG has no authority to override federal regulations or the first amendment and he insisted on continuing his comments. Chairman Giuliano referred to the speaking rules printed on the request to speak card. The public comment card contains the following rules: "Please speak from the podium. Please present your comments in three minutes or less. Your comments shall not include any personal attacks on other citizens or persons present at the meeting. The purpose of this opportunity for public comment is to allow citizens to provide additional information on items under discussion. The Transportation Policy Committee may ask questions for clarification, however this comment period is not designed for debate with the audience. The public is encouraged to provide comment to MAG during the committee process, prior to the Regional Council action. Written comments will always be accepted by the Chairman. Note: The Chairman or his/her designee has the power to accept additional comments and extend the time of the speaker, or limit public comment based on time availability." Chairman Giuliano continued that the public comment card reads that "by completing this form, I agree to observe the above rules and to abide by all directions of the Chairman or his/her designee." He noted that when Mr. Ryan filled out the card, he agreed to abide by the rules. Mr. Ryan stated that if an agreement is illegal, it is not an agreement. Chairman Giuliano stated that there were other citizens wishing to comment, and time needed to be allotted for them also.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, who asked what was happening with I-17 and the tunnel? Mr. Crowley commented that the I-10 express terminal is in the MAG document, but the City of Phoenix is doing nothing to complete it. He noted that the federal regulations state that you cannot start another project without finishing those uncompleted. Mr. Crowley asked why the terminal is the only project prior to Transit 2000 not to be completed. Mr. Crowley stated that at a recent public hearing, Mr. Ryan was granted ten minutes to speak and he was limited to five minutes. He stated that he was not allowed to address the RPTA. Mr. Crowley stated that the RPTA meeting was cancelled because there was nothing to discuss—not the \$12 billion that the feds did not assign, not the Bus Book that did not include the spring training schedules, as directed by the RPTA Board. Mr. Crowley stated that he appreciated rail along Grand Avenue, but what about bike and pedestrian sensitivities also? Mr. Crowley noted that FY 2003-2004 is starting soon, but the Annual Transit Performance Report covers FY 2001-2002. Mr. Crowley stated that in prior documents, the Papago station was on the plan to get funding, but now it is gone. He asked when it was removed. Mr. Crowley stated that all stops and stations are needed, not just light rail. The express terminal should be completed or Phoenix should abandon it to the State. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D and #4E were on the consent agenda.

Chairman Giuliano stated that any member of the committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. No questions nor requests were noted.

Councilmember Dennis moved to recommend approval of the consent agenda. Mayor Berman seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of March 19, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the March 19, 2003 meeting minutes.

4B. FY 2002-2003 Annual Transit Performance Report

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended acceptance of the RPTA Annual Transit Performance Report, contingent upon any air quality conformity analysis that may be required. The Annual Transit Performance Report, formerly known as the Short Range Transit Report, is prepared and updated annually by the Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority on behalf of MAG. In addition to providing recommendations for transit improvements over the next year, the report also includes a summary of the regional transit system's operating characteristics from Fiscal Year 2001-2002. The report was developed using input from MAG member agencies and citizen participation efforts that are normally conducted throughout the year.

4C. Regional Transportation Plan - Phase II Contract Amendment

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval to increase the contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for the Regional Transportation Plan - Phase II, from \$499,917 to an amount not to exceed \$559,917. The MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes a total of \$750,000 for consultant services for Phase II of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). On October 30, 2002, the Regional Council approved contracting with HDR Engineering, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$500,000, to assist in the development of the RTP. At that time, it was noted that a portion of the \$250,000 balance might be required later, depending on possible study scope revisions. Certain revisions are now being proposed for the scope that would result in an increase of \$60,000 in the total amount of the contract with HDR. The increased contract amount is needed to cover additional public attitude surveying (\$45,000), and a project video (\$15,000).

4D. Proposal to Accelerate Certain Segments for Rubberized Asphalt

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the proposed accelerations, including the amendments that the section of Loop 101 through Scottsdale from McDonald to 90th Street be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Spring 2004; that the segment from Frank Lloyd Wright to Tatum be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Fall 2004; and that the segment north of Raintree to Frank Lloyd Wright be accelerated from 2005 to 2003, depending on ADOT's ability to accommodate the acceleration, with the City of Scottsdale advancing the funding for these amended accelerations. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has been working with MAG member agencies to advance certain segments for the application of rubberized asphalt. These advancements

would be considered under the MAG Highway Acceleration Policy adopted by the MAG Regional Council in March 2000. This policy provides for the advancement of projects by members if such accelerations do not impact the scheduled delivery of other projects. ADOT has developed a map showing the proposed accelerations. Such proposed accelerations of highway segments include: 1) Loop 101 between McKellips Road and McDonald Drive (advanced from Fall to Spring of 2004); 2) State Route 51 from Shea Boulevard to Bell Road (advanced from Spring 2004 to Fall 2003); 3) I-17 from Greenway Road to Utopia Road, near Loop 101 (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004); 4) I-10 from Ray Road to Baseline Road (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004); 5) I-10 from Van Buren Street to 17th Avenue (advanced from Spring 2006 to Spring 2004); 6) I-10 from 27th Avenue to 67th Avenue (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004). At the April 9 Management Committee meeting, the City of Scottsdale requested amending the accelerations to include the section of Loop 101 through Scottsdale from McDonald to 90th Street be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Spring 2004; that the segment from Frank Lloyd Wright to Tatum be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Fall 2004; and that the segment north of Raintree to Frank Lloyd Wright be accelerated from 2005 to 2003, depending on ADOT's ability to accommodate the acceleration, with the City of Scottsdale advancing the funding for these amended accelerations. The Management Committee recommended approval of the proposed accelerations and amended accelerations.

4E. Requested Changes for the MAG Regional Freeway Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the requested change to add the new project to provide additional noise mitigation at the Price Freeway and Guadalupe Road interchange and on the Red Mountain Freeway between Center and Mesa Drive and to provide a portion of the funding for a screen wall on the Red Mountain between Mesa Drive and Gilbert Road, with the understanding that a precedent would not be set for screen walls on the Regional Freeway System. The Arizona Department of Transportation has requested that a \$1.4 million new project be added to the MAG Regional Freeway Program to provide for additional noise mitigation measures at two locations. The first location is the Price Freeway interchange at Guadalupe Road. The other location is along the Red Mountain Freeway between Center Street and Mesa Drive. The scope of work for these locations primarily includes construction of new noise walls at an estimated cost of \$1.0 million. The proposed project also includes \$400,000 of RARF funding for a screen wall between Mesa Drive and Gilbert Road. Through an Intergovernmental Agreement with Maricopa County, an additional \$1.7 million is being provided for the remaining costs of the screen wall. The noise walls are being proposed since noise readings taken after the freeway was open to traffic were found to exceed the acceptable noise mitigation standard. According to the ADOT Noise Attenuation Policy, reasonable noise mitigation measures must be pursued if noise levels exceed 65 Db levels along highways for which development occurred prior to the date of public knowledge for the new highway. Since the freeway segments have opened, ADOT has conducted noise studies to determine the actual noise levels in neighborhoods adjacent to the freeways. Based on these noise studies, and given development had occurred prior to the date of public knowledge, ADOT has determined additional noise mitigation is needed. A review of the net impact of these changes indicates that the cash balances for the MAG Regional Freeway Program are adequate to accommodate the requested changes. At the April 9, 2003 Management Committee, concerns were expressed that the installation of sound walls might set a precedent. It was noted that there are many unmet needs on the Regional Freeway System of a higher priority than screen walls. The Management Committee recommended approval of the change, with the understanding that a precedent would not be set for screen walls.

5. Update on MAG Town Hall on Transportation

Tom Remes, on behalf of Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Chair of the Town Hall Steering Committee, addressed the TPC on the MAG Regional Town Hall held on March 28, 2003. Mr. Remes stated that the report on outcomes from the Town Hall is being finalized and will be distributed to members shortly. He stated that attendees were those who typically have not had a voice in the transportation planning process. Mr. Remes stated that invitations were sent to approximately 500 residents, mainly from local leadership groups, and more than 100 participants attended. He stated that Mayor Feldman-Kerr served as the master of ceremonies. Mayor Elaine Scruggs provided a presentation on the Transportation Policy Committee, and Eric Anderson gave attendees an overview of transportation in the region. Mr. Remes stated that attendees participated in breakout sessions to determine what they liked and disliked about transportation, improvements needed, and possible solutions. He added that electronic voting was held at the end of the day to summarize the thoughts of the participants.

Mr. Remes stated that key issues were identified: the regional system must be multimodal with connectivity; additional funding is needed and participants are willing to pay; transportation planning should also include land use planning and focus on build out; transit should be high capacity and operate separately from the congested streets and freeways; additional communications, marketing and advocacy are needed. Mr. Remes stated that participants were asked a number of questions, and three specific questions showed that 96 percent of the participants agreed that additional funding is needed, and 92 percent agreed that the half cent sales tax should be extended. He added that 95 percent agreed that developers and new residents should share the costs. Mr. Remes displayed the list of priorities developed by the participants, with synchronization of traffic signals as the number one priority. Tied for second priority are intelligent transportation systems, completion of the arterial network and expanding regional roads of significance, and high capacity transit. Mr. Remes stated that other priorities included light rail, standardized traffic control, expanding existing freeways, bicycle and pedestrian, more HOV lanes and incentives, carpooling, more rapid transit buses and transportation for disabled, commuter rail, more park and ride lots, smaller more flexible transit, more buses, telecommuting, enhancing law enforcement on freeways, and creating a truck bypass.

Mr. Berry observed that new freeways were not a priority on the list. Mr. Remes replied that priority number five, expanding the existing freeways, was perhaps reflecting that it would be expanding the existing freeway system. Mr. Berry asked for clarification of who the participants were. Mr. Remes explained that the participants answered demographic questions that showed that 61 percent were more than 50, 54 percent have lived in the county for more than 20 years, 78 percent drive alone to work, and 95 percent voted in either of the last two elections. Mr. Berry asked if "build out" meant no growth? Mr. Remes replied that this was discussed as interconnectivity in nature, and as transportation issues are discussed, we need to look at the big picture.

Mr. Remes presented the list of sponsors, who donated approximately \$15,000 toward the cost of the event.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that she came to the Town Hall because she was speaking, but stayed for the entire event because it was very interesting. She stated that the Town Hall was highly organized. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the participants were energized, very well informed and knowledgeable, had a high level of civic involvement and were committed to the process. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that 95 percent of the participants voted in past elections, and were quite knowledgeable about those elections. She added that the results from the Town Hall were surprising, and we need to realize that

this is what the citizens are telling us. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the Town Hall was an excellent program.

6. Guidance on the Conceptual Framework for Development of the Alternatives Package

Chairman Giuliano asked members to keep in mind that none of the draft alternatives are what the final plan will be. He expressed that the desire is that there will be components in the plan for all, so all will support it.

Mr. Anderson stated that staff has been developing a conceptual framework for the development of the alternatives packages for consideration by the TPC. Three modeling scenarios were developed to check the performance of the projects in the transportation model. Mr. Anderson stated that the intention is not to select a scenario, but allow staff to test the projects in order to meet the aggressive deadline of September 30. Mr. Anderson stated that the output from this discussion will be very useful in developing the plan and providing technical back up. A hybrid will be developed this summer, followed by development of the phasing and funding plan. Mr. Anderson provided an overview of major regional revenue sources. He stated that the purpose of the scenarios is to determine how different configurations and components of the regional transportation system perform, identify deficient areas that need additional improvements, and use the output as part of the process to select an effective combination of projects for the plan. Mr. Anderson reviewed the major assumptions used in developing the scenarios. He noted that some have policy implications and direction on them is needed. Mr. Anderson stated that the major assumptions include: Local contributions for 20 percent of capital costs for arterial street projects; All maintenance costs for arterial streets paid from local funds; Fifty percent local contribution for new traffic interchanges; All other freeway improvements paid from regional funds; Current local contribution for bus services will continue, adjusted for population growth. Funding for the 20-mile light rail transit starter segment and for 10 miles of LRT extensions from local and FTA 5309 funds; Fifty percent of operating costs for expanded local bus service paid from local sources; Twenty percent local contribution for capital costs for additional express bus, bus rapid transit and rail; Regional funds for all operating costs for additional express bus, bus rapid transit, and rail.

Councilmember Dennis asked if operations costs for bus service that is of regional significance could be funded 100 percent, leaving those operations costs for service local in nature at 50 percent. Mr. Anderson replied that could be examined. Councilmember Dennis expressed that she wanted to ensure that when operating costs are examined that bus routes of regional significance should be covered.

Chairman Giuliano asked if bullet two referred to capital or operations? Mr. Anderson replied both capital and operations costs were assumed.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if city staff had been consulted on the assumptions. Mr. Anderson replied that a series of meetings had taken place with member agencies. Councilmember Bilsten stated that the assumptions were policy discussion and inappropriate for staff to determine. The policy discussion on assumptions could be discussed as an agenda item or at a workshop. Mr. Anderson agreed and restated that these have major policy implications and that staff is asking for direction.

Chairman Giuliano stated that staff prepared the scenarios as a framework for the TPC to take to the next level. Mr. Anderson stated that in development of the scenarios these are the types of policy issues that surfaced, and would be a useful exercise. The scenarios bring forward the policy issues that can be

addressed independently of the plan. Mr. Anderson stated that discussion has to occur next month or the following. Staff needs policy direction on these and others.

Ms. Scherer asked if municipalities with dedicated funding had been taken into account. Mr. Anderson stated that it was assumed that existing sources of funding are being used to pay for existing service. Ms. Scherer asked how was it known that all municipalities could pay 20 percent? Mr. Anderson stated that comments were made at last month's TPC meeting that some cities do not have transit, nor could they afford transit—that it was an equity issue that some cities provide transit service out of their general fund or local taxes. Mr. Anderson stated it is not just a regional, but a local decision, and where you draw the line is most difficult.

Mr. Berry referred to the line item for operating expenses shown in exhibit four that would be a major assumption. He asked for clarification of the amount from local sources that does not show up on exhibit four. Mr. Anderson replied that more detail was included in tables for each scenario, for example, on page 16, Scenario B, the local contribution column is shown. He noted that was put in to have an idea of local and regional funding proportion and the overall capital/operating cost mix.

Eneas Kane stated that criteria are the most important. Figure out a set of assumptions because if you do modeling, it skews the funding. Mr. Anderson stated that the assumptions were used uniformly for all three scenarios. If you take one assumption, for example, 50 percent of the operating cost for local bus service was paid from local funds and that went to 100 percent, then you would end up with more miles of service, but you are increasing the need of local communities to either pass a local tax or use their general fund to pay for that. The more contribution at the local level, the farther you can stretch regional dollars.

Mr. Kane stated that the question he had within certain scenarios relating to local contributions. Are there other obvious scenarios we should be testing as options? Mr. Anderson replied that we have not looked at the financial capability of each jurisdiction to provide service. We have come up with assumptions for the plan to result in a plan with a realistic expectation of revenue. Mr. Anderson noted that we are dealing in the 2006-2025 period, and some communities are projected to grow from 50,000 to 300,000 residents. He added that the only way we can do this with a high degree of accuracy is to build a fiscal model. Mr. Anderson advised that if the region is offering free service without requiring a local contribution, this changes the dynamic.

Councilmember Dennis stated that to her, local service is service within a city. She commented that to her, regional service is service on a transit route along a road such as Bell Road. Look at 100 percent for those types of major corridors of regional significance that bring people to medical or employment centers. Mr. Anderson commented that would be a topic for discussion over the next few weeks.

Chairman Giuliano asked members to provide policy issues that might need to be identified, or modeling scenarios to bring forward to the Committee.

Mr. Smith stated that this exercise will show the highest contenders in three modes. From that list, the TPC will pick the highest contenders for a package. He commented that when the three scenarios are run, we may find there are certain corridors that are not helped and we might need to go back to the drawing board. Mr. Smith expressed concern with having additional scenarios because of the modeling times in order to meet the September 30 timeframe. He stated that this will show the high contender projects, which form what the TPC will need to look at.

Chairman Giuliano stated that what he was hearing was these are projects on which there will be strong consensus. Mr. Smith stated that I-10 west may bring back results that indicate BRT, commuter and light rail, and a facility south of I-10 will work. The plan needs to include the best projects for the money we have, because we do not have the money to do all of the projects. Mr. Smith stated that we will have a few trade-offs in some corridors.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that Scenarios A, B and C have different components throughout. Some cities have mandated projects. She suggested a subcommittee be established or an additional meeting be scheduled for transit needs and exactly what has to be included in the plan. Mayor Thomas joined the meeting.

Chairman Giuliano stated that a workshop or series of meetings on various modes could be held. A recommendation is needed on how to manage the decision making process to ensure the Committee has all the information for all components.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that at the workshop staff could focus on projects we know we have to have.

Ms. Scherer commented that the scenarios were difficult to interpret and do a side by side comparison. It appeared that the only commonality in all three scenarios was those mandated projects. Ms. Scherer stated that the TPC needs to decide what goes into the scenarios, not staff.

Mr. Kane stated that there are two processes. One relates directly to need. The proposed scenarios in order to test projects is very valuable and important. The second issue is that the TPC is matching up top contenders with those mandated. Mr. Kane stated that a subcommittee process with city priorities organized to match up with the transportation modeling exercise would be important but parallel so staff can stay on the timeline. Eventually, we will have to test transportation efficacy in a scientific manner and be back more or less where staff is proposing today.

Mr. Anderson clarified that MAG staff had met with all cities' staffs and picked up the mandated projects in all three scenarios. He expressed his apologies that this seemed unclear in the document. Mr. Anderson stated that if projects are committed and funded at the local level, those would be in the base case in all scenarios. In addition, staff is proposing the South Mountain, the 303 and projects programmed in the TIP be included. Mr. Anderson commented that if smaller work groups were desired, staff would be glad to accommodate them.

Chairman Giuliano stated that it would be helpful to set up a series of work groups. Mr. Anderson stated that model runs could take a person weeks to code and 50 hours to run. He indicated that we want the scenarios as close to right as possible because we will not have time for a redo.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the most difficult decisions will be policy decisions. The Committee started in that direction last month, started toward establishing guidelines upon which the plan will be built. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that it seemed the Committee was stepping back from that. She stated that staff has deduced from discussion in an effort to keep moving forward, but the TPC cannot move forward until policy decisions are made. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that in addition, there are the opinions and mandates of legislators regarding various uses. She stated that the TPC is not scheduled today to make decisions, but until those tough decisions are made, this is just a comfort level. Mr. Anderson stated that no implication is intended that these scenarios will be the assumptions of the plan.

Starting next month we need to bring them back in policy discussion and gives us time to incorporate them into the plan in June.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that policy decisions need to come first. Otherwise, we are studying things that may not be policy nor the pleasure of this Committee. We need to decide policy first, then model.

Mr. Berry asked for examples of the policies. Councilmember Bilsten stated that Phoenix, Tempe, Mesa, and Glendale have individual transportation taxes and plans that voters have approved. That is what we have to have in the plan. Mr. Berry suggested having a meeting soon and decide these policy issues. Get them on the table and ensure the plan includes them.

Chairman Giuliano stated that cities have submitted projects. He asked how have those projects been incorporated into the scenarios? Mr. Anderson replied that an attempt was made to include all submitted projects, with the exception of bicycle and pedestrian projects because they will not be modeled. Mr. Anderson noted that the objective is to have all of these projects in one of these scenarios. He indicated that those mandated projects are part of our base network. That was the reason for the meetings with city staff to ensure projects and findings of the subarea studies were included in the regional network.

Mr. Kane stated that two essential points have been raised. The plan scenarios include everything cities need. Secondly, he agreed with Vice Chair Scruggs that we cannot model with assumptions. The TPC needs to decide those and vote on them. Mr. Kane stated that staff has many hours of work to do, and has to start that work now, a huge amount not sensitized by TPC discussion. He suggested allowing work to proceed within the schedule. Mr. Kane asked when the body needs to provide direction to keep the plan on schedule. Mr. Anderson replied that direction is needed next month, and some could take place into June. If the assumptions change for the purpose of the alternatives, it will only increase or decrease that scenario and will not tell how each project performs within each scenario. Mr. Anderson stated that a key part of policy discussion needs to occur before the plan develops. He added that once we complete modeling the alternatives, that will happen.

Councilmember Bilsten suggested drafting a Scenario D, which would be a map of needs that the cities submitted. Mr. Anderson mentioned that there are many maps included in his presentation that may provide some of this information.

Ms. Scherer asked if there was one map or list of what was submitted by the cities? We cannot afford all projects, and those that are mandated will be kept in. She suggested having those new projects on the map, not the ones that the half cent sales tax will not be funding.

Vice Mayor Schweiker commented that a more clearly written report might have avoided many questions. He mentioned that a motto at his former job was “measure twice, cut once.” He stated that it seemed like we are cutting before measuring. Vice Mayor Schweiker commented on ensuring sufficient time at the May meeting for decision making.

Councilmember Dennis asked if the current scenarios could be adjusted. Mr. Anderson stated that those were assumptions, not policy, and following discussion, the assumptions could change. He advised that the alternatives need to be resolved before deciding how to spend the \$17 billion in regional funds when we start putting the plan together in June.

Vice Chair Scruggs addressed Mr. Berry's question about which policy decisions were needed. She stated that at the last TPC meeting, there was discussion on policy/value statements such as what will be done with maintenance. Vice Chair Scruggs brought up previous policies adopted by MAG, such as the 1994 HOV Plan. Will those policies continue, or will new policies be needed? She expressed concern with committing a bloc of funding for streets, while the TPC has committed to identifying all projects on a map. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the most difficult questions will be if we are paying for capital and operations of transit? What percentage? Will there be a match? These will be difficult questions. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she was uncomfortable modeling when there is not yet agreement on underlying assumptions. She noted that staff has indicated this is the preferable way to do it, however.

Chairman Giuliano stated that all modeling will have value, because it relates to the components in the entire plan. You have to model everything before to see if it fits. If a piece is not modeled, and the decision is made to put it in the plan, you cannot because you do not know from the modeling if it fits or not. Mr. Anderson commented that having policy discussion over a period of three to four meetings would be optimal, then go into scenarios, then plan development; however, the TPC does not have the luxury of time. He advised that parallel paths must be run or the timeline will not be met.

Mr. Smith commented on the time demands for modeling and coding. If the TPC wants to decide policy issues first, and have extra meetings, accommodations will be made, but there is only so much time. He stated that HB 2292 has added intermediate steps so all can comment on the plan, and this also adds time to the process.

Chairman Giuliano stated that policy choices could be a significant agenda item on the May agenda, or at an extra meeting in between now and the May meeting.

Mayor McDermott stated that he would like to see the rest of the presentation, as it may answer policy questions. Look at assumptions and tell staff what we agree and disagree on.

Mayor Manross stated her agreement with Mayor McDermott to continue with the presentation.

Mr. Anderson continued his presentation by stating that Scenario A is freeway emphasized, Scenario B is arterial emphasized, and Scenario C is transit emphasized. He displayed maps of roadway system improvements of the three scenarios. Jim Dickey, Valley Metro/RPTA, continued the presentation on transit improvements.

Mayor Hawker stated that because some cities have their own transit taxes as the base case, and if the assumption is to continue to fund with their existing transit tax, how does that balance out? They will have all their own routes and people will say you already have your facilities. Mr. Dickey replied that is the question—how do you address those cities who make the investment and those who do not. He added that the assumption is that those cities will continue the level of investment. Mayor Hawker commented on the possibility for a citizen referendum that does away with the local tax, thus putting the burden on the region. Mayor Hawker stated that this needs to be addressed. He asked if the assumption was that express buses are a regional burden. Mr. Dickey replied that was correct. Mayor Hawker asked the expenditure of express bus vs. local. Mr. Dickey replied that RPTA picks up most of the cost, approximately \$2.5 million for most of the region, except for those routes within the City of Phoenix.

Mr. Billings asked about the operating costs of \$4 billion in Scenario C. Mr. Dickey replied that operating costs are a critical component of a transit system. Funding capital costs alone, a system cannot succeed. Mr. Dickey stated that the ratio is usually a 25/75 percent split between capital and operations costs. Mr. Billings noted that the 1985 tax was 98 percent capital and two percent operations. He noted that in Scenario C, the split is shown as a 50/50 capital and operations. Mr. Dickey replied that Scenario C was a different emphasis.

Mayor Thomas asked about whether the 25/75 split for operating costs was a permanent tax base or an expiring tax process. Mr. Dickey commented that this does bring up the issue of what happens 30 to 40 years down the road. Cities have dedicated funding, including capital and operations. Mr. Dickey stated that a system that is effective will probably anticipate renewal of commitment. He expressed that he could not think of a community with a dedicated tax for transit that does not use at least one half for operating costs.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented on the revisions made to the TPC timeline. She stated that the single most important decision making meeting was not scheduled for August until tonight. Many have made vacation plans since that is the only time of the year they can get away. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that staff could have done a better job in scheduling.

Discussion took place on meeting schedules. It was decided that staff would work on a revised schedule that would include additional meeting time and modifying the decision making meeting to a date other than August.

7. Performance Measures

This agenda item was tabled.

8. Update on the MAG High Capacity Transit Study

On October 30, 2001, the MAG Regional Council approved the IBI Group as the consultant to develop the High Capacity Transit Study. The study evaluated the possible use of existing railroad corridors for commuter rail and identified other high capacity transit technologies, such as bus rapid transit or light rail, in other high demand corridors in the region. The planning efforts for the High Capacity Transit Study will be integrated with the development of the Regional Transportation Plan. Several reports to various committees and groups have been made in developing the High Capacity Transit Study. On March 27, 2003, members of the Transportation Review Committee requested that final approval of the study be delayed to have questions addressed. Due to the complexity of the issues addressed in the study, the questions posed by the TRC are being presented at the April Management Committee meeting, with approval being delayed until these questions are addressed, with possible approval in May 2003. This will allow a greater understanding of the study and outstanding issues before it proceeds.

Steve Schibuola, consultant for IBI Group, gave a presentation on the MAG High Capacity Transit Study.

Mayor Thomas asked if the I-10 express terminal was a part of the study. Mr. Schibuola replied that this terminal was not an explicit consideration in the study, but could be a logical eastern terminal for some corridors along I-10.

Mayor Thomas stated that the cost to kick off the project is estimated at \$9 billion. He asked about the estimate for operations and maintenance. Dave McCrossan, consultant for IBI Group, stated that the Milestone Five paper provides detail by individual service and mode. Mr. Schibuola added that the rule of thumb for light rail operations is approximately \$20 million per year for each line.

Mayor Thomas commented that it is believed that light rail is the best opportunity to receive federal funding. Mr. Schibuola replied that was correct at this point, but BRT is becoming more seriously considered by federal agencies. In the near future, BRT may start to compete for new starts funds. Mayor Thomas asked about discussion on right of way usage with BNSF and Union Pacific. Mr. Schibuola replied that historically, leverage attempts have not been successful, and the real successes have come from partnerships.

Mr. Billings asked why operating costs were not mentioned in the presentation. Mr. Schibuola replied that traditionally, people want to see up-front capital costs, which are typically the most difficult to amass. It costs little to buy a bus, but you need to continue to pay bus operators. When you are talking high capacity, the capital costs are much higher and the ratio goes to 75 capital/25 operations. Mr. Schibuola commented that the federal agencies want to see the local financial capacity to run these systems.

Mr. Billings noted that one half of the \$8 billion is for operating costs and has not yet been discussed. Mr. Schibuola stated that this study was not financially constrained, but was based on how the region was growing and what would be supported by the population. He stated that those costs would be reported in the final report along with capital costs.

Gary Kaasa, Cantelme, Kaasa and Associates, provided a review of past polls conducted on light rail transit. He noted that many have indicated that light rail will take down the election, but the past polls do not back this up.

9. Formation of Maintenance Stakeholders Group

Chairman Giuliano stated that at the March TPC meeting, the topic of funding maintenance needs was initiated. Due to the policy/legislative and technical nature of this issue, a stakeholder group is being formed to develop a recommendation for consideration by the TPC. Chairman Giuliano stated that seven TPC members, one Governor's Office representative and one Legislative representative had submitted their names for the Group. He asked members wishing to add their name to the Group to contact him or staff.

10. Legislative Update

Mr. Smith stated that on April 15, HB 2292, including all the amendments that MAG wanted, passed the Senate by a vote of 27-2. He acknowledged the assistance of Representative Gary Pierce, the intergovernmental representatives and the business coalition. Mr. Smith noted that out of 114 total votes cast on the bill, only two were no votes. He stated that HB 2292 now goes back to the House for concurrence. Mr. Smith noted that an amendment on usage by hybrid vehicles on HOV lanes was added, and there is a potential issue with FHWA on this.

Chairman Giuliano asked if the November 2004 election language could come up again. Mr. Smith replied that the November 2004 election mandate was stripped from the bill and we now have the option for selecting a date in 2004.

11. Future Agenda Items

Chairman Giuliano stated that at the May 21, 2003 TPC meeting, the Committee anticipates discussing Revenue Projections, Preliminary Evaluation of Scenarios, Performance Measures. The timeline will be revised to accommodate significant action in August to another time.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary