

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

May 21, 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 12:08 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. 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 requested that conversations be kept to a minimum during the meeting to ensure that the meeting could be heard. He acknowledged the attendance of Goodyear Vice Mayor and Mayor-elect James Cavanaugh, Avondale Vice Mayor Marie Lopez-Rogers and Councilmember Peggy Jones, and Phoenix Mayor Skip Rimsza.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the updated Transportation Policy Committee Progress timeline and a memorandum from Maricopa County received that morning was at each place.

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 DD Barker, who commented that the minutes of the April 16 meeting reflect her comments that the sales tax extension will help provide better roads and freeways. She stated that transit should be added to this comment. Ms. Barker stated that SB 1364 passed for airport planning and freeways in the amount of \$100 million. She questioned whether the total amount of money in transportation has been added up. She asked what happens if the sales tax extension is not passed? There needs to be an alternate plan in place that includes all funding sources. Ms. Barker questioned where will the money come from to get us out of air quality problems? We will need transit. As she has said in the past, if we don't watch out, we just might end up there. Ms. Barker thanked Mr. Driggs for the transit tickets. She performed a cartwheel. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, who displayed the MAG Urban Atlas. He stated that he liked the plan ten years ago on the three scenarios, but you are taking care of the here and now, not 20 years in the future where growth will happen. Coordinate right of way with plans. Mr. Crowley stated that he wanted a divided vote between transit options and roadways. He stated that we need maintenance and future contingencies in the plan. Mr. Crowley stated that you only trying to fix what is broken. In the TEA-21 reauthorization, he is happy with the bikeway part, but you are not doing it as a blending. Mr. Crowley stated that the Regional Visionaries were supposed to be those who have not had a part in the transportation process before, but Lisa Atkins, Diane McCarthy, and Rosendo Gutierrez have been in the process. He stated that he did not see the effort as getting new input, but making it the way you want it to be. Mr. Crowley stated that he appreciated the outreach of the TPC, but what are you doing on the state level as a blending? Mr. Crowley referred to a state planning meeting where two of the 40 attendees were from Phoenix. He stated that he did not need you convoluting the process. Mr. Crowley noted that the Phoenix representative walked out of an RPTA meeting just as he was going to offer public input. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda item #4A was 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.

Mr. Arnett moved to recommend approval of the consent agenda. Mayor Thomas seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of April 16, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the April 16, 2003 meeting minutes.

5. System Performance Measures and Plan Evaluation Criteria

Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC process was begun on September 21, 2002, when the TPC held their retreat and began the policy deliberations to develop the plan for the extension of the one-half cent sales tax. He expressed appreciation to MAG and member agency staffs and constituents for their efforts in the process. Chairman Giuliano reviewed accomplishments to date. So far, we have requested projects from all agencies and established a public involvement process. We hired a consultant for Phase II of the Plan and involved rural transportation elected officials in discussion of a statewide versus regional election. We initiated a poll to determine the interests of voters in Maricopa County, approved the goals and objectives, and recommended safeguards for authorizing legislation. Chairman Giuliano said that we also reviewed the scenarios for modeling and contributed to the development of HB 2292 that was signed by the Governor with our requested changes.

Chairman Giuliano reviewed the next steps. The performance measures and evaluation criteria have been previously reviewed and are before us today for approval. Key policy questions are before us today for preliminary approval. The results of the modeled scenarios are before us for our review. Today we will begin a preliminary discussion regarding the development of the plan that can be a combination of the information in the modeled scenarios.

Chairman Giuliano reviewed the timing to develop the plan. The schedule is to have a Draft Plan by July 16, 2003. That means we have three more meetings and one workshop remaining to develop the draft plan. In addition to today's meeting, the regular meeting on June 18, the workshop on July 2, the regular meeting on July 16, and a special meeting on July 22, if needed, have been scheduled.

Chairman Giuliano stated that at this meeting, the TPC must move forward on the performance measures, plan criteria and provide guidance on financial policies. Then we need to submit the Alternatives Stage of the plan for a 30-day review period. He added that although much work has been accomplished, there is still more to be done.

Chairman Giuliano stated that there was much previous discussion on geographic equity in regard to the performance measures. A meeting with the business coalition and member agencies provided input to help resolve this issue. Chairman Giuliano stated that direction appears to be that geographic equity would not be performance based on the front end of the evaluation process, but would be applied to the whole plan.

Mayor Thomas asked if objective 4C was for the current half cent tax and the extension. Eric Anderson replied that would be applied to the plan overall. He noted that this could be discussed by the TPC.

Discussion took place on Goal One, System Preservation and Safety, and Objective 1A: Provide for the continuing preservation and maintenance needs of transportation facilities and services in the region, eliminating maintenance backlogs. Performance Measures: Percent of maintenance and preservation needs funded.

Mayor Dunn commented that he was glad to see this as a performance measure. He stated that an entire project could be impacted if maintenance, such as for landscaping, is not included. Mayor Dunn mentioned that his city has a situation right now with ADOT where they cannot provide landscaping because they cannot maintain it. Landscaping is very important to citizens, and maintenance needs to be factored in.

Councilmember Dennis stated that the Maintenance Stakeholders Group is studying this issue. She stated that the question has been what has been the practice in the past and what will be funded in the future. Until the Stakeholders are done with their work, she did not know how this measure will work as written.

Mayor Hawker commented on including the maintenance and landscaping upkeep of existing facilities with the new tax. He stated that no landscaping is planned for the Santan or the Red Mountain freeways. Mayor Hawker stated that the citizens see landscaping on other freeways and this causes turmoil.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that since this was first discussed by the TPC, there has been additional discussion on what we are trying to preserve on the transportation system. She stated that ADOT will always take care of the safety and preservation of the system itself. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that landscaping is the issue in every community. We should care about it. Landscaping is not unnecessary, it is how we present ourselves to our visitors and is a part of our economic development. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the first thing that is eliminated during ADOT budget cuts is landscaping. She noted that ADOT will not stop fixing necessities, such as resurfacing, traffic boards, cable barriers, etc. Vice Chair Scruggs advised that her city's focus will be landscaping and litter. ADOT should control the necessary maintenance of the transportation corridors that belong to ADOT. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she was not as comfortable with this objective overall as before.

Mayor Manross stated that this objective may not stay as written. If we do not show voters that we can maintain what we currently have, we may not get their support. Voters may ask why give them more if we cannot take care of what we have. Mayor Manross stated that there must be a component for maintenance and operations, we cannot take care of just the capital costs.

Mr. Shultz commented on ensuring consistency with HB 2660 and Vision 21. He stated that preservation and maintenance was the focus of capacity. The objective was to take limited dollars and create capacity. Mr. Shultz stated that building new roads and freeways builds capacity. He commented that preservation and maintenance is a business-oriented decision. Mr. Shultz commented that he felt that this was intended to be a business-oriented preservation and maintenance objective. He indicated that landscaping and maintenance are important, but he thought of them differently. Preservation and maintenance, and attraction and aesthetics are two separate concepts in his opinion.

Mayor Thomas expressed concern for more items being funded by the sales tax. We are taking more from the tax and will still come up short. Mayor Thomas stated that having Plan A will build more freeways, then more gas tax will be collected from users. Mayor Thomas stated that the focus will be more on construction to generate more money for maintenance of the system. He stated that funds for maintenance costs must come from the users to make it functional.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that voters will look at the existing system. No funds are available for cleanup. If I go out and promote the tax, what answer will I give when voters say the freeways are a blight to the community? Councilmember Bilsten stated that she needs to be able to tell people with all honesty that new freeways will not be a blight.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that including maintenance is reflecting the constituents' thoughts. She noted that pavement, cable median barriers, and bridges need to be continually maintained. It is the owners' business to take care of the system. ADOT does not have sufficient funding for landscaping maintenance and litter control. In the past, we used the peanut butter approach—a little spread over each

need. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that ADOT's funding for some of the needs is at the will of the legislature. She indicated that she thought MAG would be better off relieving ADOT of those responsibilities that are important to the voters and ADOT will be able to devote their funds to their most important responsibilities that really are their business. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that this is extremely important, not just an add-on. It is a quality of life issue.

Dennis Smith stated that the Maintenance Stakeholders discussed the ADOT process. He noted that one idea that surfaced was to set aside a portion of HURF for maintenance which will go directly into the RARF fund. This way the funds cannot be taken away, and will not come out of the half cent sales tax.

Mr. Anderson clarified that this objective relates to the preservation of the system, not just that funded by the half cent sales tax. He added that the next agenda item would deal with whether a portion of the half cent sales tax would be dedicated to freeway maintenance.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked if the HURF allocation would require action by the legislature. Mr. Smith replied that it would. He added that when the plan is delivered in January, the law could be changed at that time. Vice Chair Scruggs asked if the legislature did not approve, we would be back where we are now, with no provision for landscaping. Mr. Smith replied that was correct. He explained the State budget process, and noted that the legislature does not see where the true needs are. Vice Chair Scruggs expressed concern with asking the legislature for another action. She noted that every community that has a freeway through it has identified maintenance as a problem.

Mayor Thomas asked the State Transportation Board member to describe the provisions for litter and landscaping. Mr. Gant explained that the process is convoluted at best. The actual amount of money needed is not communicated to the legislature. Mr. Gant stated that ADOT takes care of safety and long-term maintenance first, and what has to fall off are the less essential things. He advised that ADOT needs help. Mr. Gant stated that he was not sure that the way Mr. Smith described is the way to do it, but he had concern with suballocating maintenance money because that would take away flexibility from the department.

Mr. Shultz stated that there are three things going on here. All are embracing the preservation and maintenance objective, but there is also a strong commitment to landscaping. Mr. Shultz commented that the question is the TPC proceeding by leveraging all funds to design the entire program, which is in the next agenda item. He expressed that he thought of this as a \$29 billion exercise, not an \$8 billion exercise, for the purpose of leveraging all funds available.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the Maintenance Stakeholders are working on landscaping issue as part of system preservation and safety. He noted that consensus was not to overlook objective #1A. No comments were noted on objective #1B: Provide a safe and secure environment for the traveling public, addressing roadway hazards, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and transit security. Performance Measures include: Accident rate per million miles of passenger travel.

Discussion took place on Goal # 2: Access and Mobility, and its objectives: Objective 2A: Maintain an acceptable and reliable level of service on transportation and mobility systems serving the region, taking into account performance by mode and facility type. Performance Measures include: Travel time between selected origins and destinations. Peak period delay by facility type and geographic location. Peak hour speed by facility type and geographic location. Number of major intersections at level of service "E" or worse. Miles of freeways with level of service "E" or worse during peak period.

Objective 2B: Provide residents of the region with access to jobs, shopping, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities and provide employers with reasonable access to the workforce in the region. Performance Measures: Percentage of persons within 30 minutes travel time of employment by mode. Objective 2C: Maintain a reasonable and reliable travel time for moving freight into, through and within the region, as well as provide high-quality access between intercity freight transportation corridors and freight terminal locations, including intermodal facilities for air, rail and truck cargo. Performance Measures: Average daily truck delay. Objective 2D: Provide the people of the region with transportation modal options necessary to carry out their essential daily activities and support equitable access to the region's opportunities. Performance Measures include: Jobs and housing within one-quarter mile distance of transit service. Percentage of major arterial streets that have bike lanes. Percentage of regional connectors funded as part of the total Off-Street System Plan and the Regional Bicycle Plan. Objective 2E: Address the needs of the elderly and other population groups that may have special transportation needs, such as non-drivers or those with disabilities. Performance Measures include: Percentage of workforce that can reach their workplace by transit within one hour with no more than one transfer.

No comments were noted on objectives 2A through 2E.

Discussion took place on Goal # 3: Sustaining The Environment, and its objectives. Objective 3A: Identify and encourage implementation of mitigation measures that will reduce noise, visual and traffic impacts of transportation projects on existing neighborhoods. Performance Measures include: Per Capita VMT by facility type and mode. Total transit ridership. Objective 3B: Encourage programs and land use planning that advance efficient trip-making patterns in the region. Performance Measures: Households within one-quarter mile of transit. Transit share of travel (by transit sub-mode). Objective 3C: Make transportation decisions that are compatible with air quality conformity and water quality standards, the sustainable preservation of key regional ecosystems and desired lifestyles. Performance Measures include: Households within five miles of park-and-ride lots or major transit centers. Amount of pollutant emissions by type (NAQS).

Mayor Thomas commented that objective 3C is essential because of the air quality lawsuit. Mr. Anderson noted that this is an overall measure that will not replace the air quality conformity analysis.

Mayor Hawker stated that objective 3B could be unrealistic if you consider there are homes on one or five acre lots. He stated that this objective should be related to density of developments.

No further comments were noted on Goal #3 or its objectives.

Discussion took place on Goal #4: Accountability and Planning. Objective 4A: Make transportation investment decisions that use public resources effectively and efficiently, using performance-based planning. Evaluation Criteria include: Adopt performance measures that will result in a regional transportation system that is effective and efficient and meets the transportation goals and objectives of the region. Objective 4B: Establish revenue sources and mechanisms that provide consistent funding for regional transportation and mobility needs. Evaluation Criteria include: Percent of state and federal transportation taxes collected in Maricopa County that are returned to the region. Objective 4C: Develop a regionally balanced plan that provides geographic equity in the distribution of investments. Evaluation Criteria include: Geographic distribution of transportation investments. Objective 4D: Recognize previously authorized corridors that are currently in the adopted MAG long-range transportation plan; i.e., Loop 303 and the South Mountain Corridor. Evaluation Criteria include:

Inclusion of committed corridors. Objective 4E: Achieve broad public support for needed investments in transportation infrastructure and resources for continuing operations of transportation and mobility services. Evaluation Criteria include: Voter approval for a regional transportation revenue source.

Mayor Thomas commented on objective 4C. If you take into account commitments from the past, as in 4D, would that skew the geographic distribution of investments? Mayor Thomas commented on how transit versus highway is weighed in is a concern.

No further comments were noted on Goal #4 or its objectives.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the next steps. He explained that these performance measures will guide the development of the hybrid plan this summer.

Mr. Arnett moved to accept the proposed set of system performance measures and the plan evaluation criteria with the understanding that as the RTP proceeds, the system performance measures and plan evaluation criteria may need to be adjusted or refined based on their actual application in the planning process. Mayor McDermott seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

6. Regional Transportation Plan Policy Questions

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Donna Kruk, Arizona Bridge to Independent Living. She stated that she was representing the TRIP program and transit improvement projects for those who are dependent on transit. Ms. Kruk expressed her appreciation that the TPC was recommending a multimodal plan, instead of just a freeway plan. Ms. Kruk requested that the TPC consider regional taxi vouchers for those low income people who need regular transportation to a job. She explained that many workers have to cross boundaries to reach their jobs, and taxi vouchers are a less expensive alternative than dial-a-ride. She noted that many of these riders do not require assisted transportation. Ms. Kruk noted that the City of Phoenix has such a program, and Scottsdale and Mesa are experimenting with such a program, though limited at this time. She added that she works with a person for whom the voucher system worked. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Kruk for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who commented that he did not see how you are blending it and getting it done. He stated that he wanted paint used as a weapon for the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. Mr. Crowley stated that he saw system preservation in the MAG Urban Atlas. You say these are things that will be upgraded until 2017. He commented that all you have is a small part of the region when you need to do the whole. Mr. Crowley stated that if upgrades are done on arterials, the bike part will result in two to three years of pavement preservation. If sealed, and done right in the first place, you will get longer use. Mr. Crowley stated that he could not see where you are defining transit with light rail. He stated that the highest cost is operations. I don't need you to do that failure. Mr. Crowley stated that the City of Phoenix says it gets shorted, but Wickenburg paid taxes all these years and what did they get out of it? Look not just at the center, but the entire region. Mr. Crowley stated that Highway 85 is the biggest abhorrence. It is part of the Canamex Corridor. Mr. Crowley stated that he did not see where you are looking at non-urban roads. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano stated that four major policy questions were developed for discussion by the TPC: (1) What is eligible for sales tax extension? (2) If eligible, is it capital or operations? (3) Would local

match be required? (4) What types of contingency factors? Each of the four areas has been divided by mode of transportation, with a brief discussion and pros and cons.

Mr. Anderson reviewed question one: What transportation uses should be eligible for sales tax funding? Eligible uses for state and federal transportation funds are prescribed by law. Current half cent sales tax is limited to new freeway construction and a small portion (approximately \$7.5 million annually) funds regional transit services. The results of recent surveys show broad based public support for a multi-modal approach. Extensive discussion at the March 2003 TPC meeting indicated support for having all transportation modes eligible for sales tax funding. Possible Options include: Freeways only. Freeways and transit services. Freeways, transit and major streets. Freeways, transit, major streets, bicycle and pedestrian projects, demand reduction programs, and intelligent transportation systems. The recommendation for discussion by the TPC is freeways, transit, major streets, bicycle and pedestrian projects, demand reduction programs, and intelligent transportation systems. Pros: Using the half cent sales tax extension for all modes is supported by recent surveys. The metropolitan area needs a balanced transportation system to provide mobility options. Cons: Spreading resources among all modes may limit funding for some key projects in other modes. Mr. Anderson stated that these serve as a point of discussion, and all modes are eligible. This is not to imply all would be funded, but to use as the plan is put together look at all modes.

Chairman Giuliano asked if staff was recommending leaving in all options based on past TPC discussion. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Mayor Thomas asked for clarification if discussion has been about just the half cent sales tax and there are no federal requirements for bike. For the ISTEA portion, that could be part of the plan and not part of the half cent sales tax. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Mr. Shultz stated that he would like to have an indication of professional staff and elected officials sense of the best way to leverage existing funds. Some are doable technically, but not politically.

Mr. Anderson explained that staff went by major mode areas and looked at specific components that comprise each mode. He referred to the freeway portion of the chart included in the agenda packet. This is the time for the discussion of which pot of money will fund which freeway.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that vegetation maintenance would be a good term to use for landscaping. She noted that Mr. Gant had given a good description of ADOT's responsibilities. She stated that she is hearing from a majority of voters that it is important to have attractive vegetation on freeways that is maintained in a way that shows pride in their community. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that litter is not only unsightly, it is unsafe. She stated that she felt that ADOT could carry forward their responsibilities better if they did not have to take care of vegetation maintenance. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that there may be a better way to do this, but voters say this is important. We need to be assured there will be funding for vegetation maintenance. Let ADOT keep their responsibilities for paving, bridges, tunnels, structures, etc. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that she would not be happy with taking this to the legislature and ask them to vote another bill through. Mr. Anderson asked Mayor Scruggs for clarification that she meant that funding from the half cent sales tax would be limited to litter control and vegetative maintenance. Vice Chair Scruggs replied that was correct.

Mayor Thomas asked for clarification if discussion was about the \$17 billion or \$29 billion. Mr. Anderson replied that there are two primary components--HURF for local streets, and second, local

transit taxes and farebox revenues. He added that those funds were not considered in this analysis because they are dedicated funds. Mayor Thomas asked if there were some dedicated funds within the plan. Mr. Anderson gave as an example the plan will have a street component that will include the HURF dollars allocated to the cities and towns and to the County.

Mr. Shultz commented on getting the largest number of dollars available. Get more miles of arterials and freeways and investment in transit and light rail. He urged being as flexible as possible, because there may be multiple ways to get money into the pot.

Mr. Billings asked the percent anticipated for maintenance in the freeway scenario. Mr. Anderson replied that the cost is estimated at \$135,000 per mile per year for a typical six-lane facility. Mr. Billings asked about future costs. Mr. Anderson replied that work continues with ADOT on this. He gave as an example the cable median barriers. Mr. Billings asked the percent amount of capital versus operations. Mr. Anderson referred to the chart on the last page as an example. Using an average cost, a new freeway facility is \$39 million per mile and maintenance is \$135,000 per mile per year.

Mayor Hawker commented on the freeway component chart. He expressed that he was comfortable with new corridors, freeway widening and maintenance, but had an issue with new service interchanges. Mayor Hawker stated that current ADOT policy is 50 percent match. We get some contributions from developers, so he would rather not use regional money if there is a local match. Mayor Hawker suggested a 50/50 percent local match for new service interchanges. He added that he felt the same for service interchange improvements unless they tie into HOV.

A consensus was noted to leave all options in for now.

Working with Exhibit A, Mr. Anderson reviewed each mode. He clarified that local match could be from some other funding source.

Councilmember Dennis asked out of the \$135,000 maintenance number, the amount that landscaping and litter cost. Mr. Anderson replied that the amount was approximately \$57,000 per mile for litter and landscaping costs. Dan Lance, ADOT State Engineer, confirmed that was correct. Mr. Anderson commented that this number does not include the amount for all litter pickup. Mr. Lance stated that the litter number is difficult to assess, because ADOT picks up only 15 percent, and volunteers or corporate sponsors pick up the rest. Mr. Lance added that prison labor is also used to pick up litter. He stated that litter pickup costs approximately \$2,000 per mile, but the corporate adopt a highway litter pickup costs an average about \$6,000 per mile per year.

The Freeway Mode was discussed.

Vice Mayor Schweiker asked for clarification of the methodology used to come up with the percentage used in the contingency factor. Mr. Anderson replied that there had been national research done on cost estimation. In addition, some were based on logic. Mr. Anderson stated that some corridors and improvements had not yet been scoped. Consequently, costs could change. He explained that factors were established to ensure they are reasonable and to try and avoid what happened in 1985 when cost contingencies were not built in. Vice Mayor Schweiker asked how that worked over the past 20 years. Mr. Anderson replied that for the last ten years, costs have been looked at every six months. He noted that the major wildcard is right of way, and it is challenging to isolate where there will be a potential for higher cost.

Mr. Billings commented that the \$135,000 per mile is the 2002 number. Scenario C showed that cost over 20 years at \$135,000 without contingency. Mr. Anderson replied that staff would look further into this.

Mayor Manross stated her agreement with Mayor Hawker's comments on new service interchanges. She indicated that the local match requirement should not be zero. Mayor Manross requested a definition of service interchange improvements. Mr. Anderson explained that improvements to increase capacity and reduce congestion would be typical improvements, such as putting in dual left turn lanes or dual exit lanes. Mayor Manross asked if there were specific reasons for no match. Mr. Anderson replied that currently, there are a number of interchanges or planned interchanges that have been improved with no match.

Mr. Kane expressed his agreement with Mayor Hawker and Mayor Manross regarding service interchanges. If the need for a new interchange is generated by an adjacent development, it is fair for the developer to pay. He noted that the match could be higher than 50 percent. It is important to recognize new service interchanges are not always generated by a recognizable development and sometimes are generated by regional need. Mr. Kane suggested that the TPC apply performance standards in terms of match rather than a hard and fast percent.

Mr. Anderson confirmed discussion on new service interchanges that if the area meets performance criteria, there would not be a match required. If the interchange did not meet the criteria, what would be the match? Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC would need to work on that. He directed staff to bring back some options to the TPC.

Councilmember Dennis commented on interchanges created by economic development, which may not require a match by the local community. Criteria to address future growth areas are needed.

Chairman Giuliano stated that new service interchanges and service interchange improvements would have some aspect of performance measurements applied to the level of which there would be another source of revenue applied or not.

Mayor Thomas asked how much maintenance was included in the modeling. He expressed concern if the half cent tax is short, the situation is further exacerbated by spending too much on capital. Mr. Anderson replied \$400 to \$500 million was included for freeway maintenance in each of the three scenarios. He noted that spending funds on maintenance means not funding capital projects.

Mayor Thomas asked for clarification if the amount is \$17 billion or \$29 billion and have additional maintenance opportunities that are not part of this plan had been considered. Mr. Anderson replied that of the \$17 billion, \$5 billion of ADOT funds and the half cent sales tax funds are the only sources available for maintenance of the system.

Councilmember Dennis asked Mr. Anderson of the amount he just mentioned, how much funds what is already there? Mr. Anderson replied that distinction had not been made. We will establish set allocations to ensure we set aside a sufficient amount of funds. When the plan is developed, we will distinguish between existing facilities and factor in new facilities. Councilmember Dennis asked about reducing the amounts of funding to litter and landscaping maintenance and see how that worked. Mr. Anderson stated that could be examined, and limit sales tax to litter and landscaping maintenance and the remainder from ADOT funds.

Mayor Manross stated that in her city, if operations and maintenance are not built in, the project is not built. This must be a part of the complete package.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if motions for approval were needed.

Mayor Dunn commented that he was comfortable giving direction to staff.

A consensus was noted that no motions were needed.

Mr. Smith stated that this would be a starting point for staff. The expectation is to come back with refinements.

The TPC discussed the Streets portion of Exhibit A.

Mayor Dunn asked how the 20 percent determined? Mr. Anderson replied that staff relied on the aforementioned national study. He mentioned that because of the uncertainty of right of way and alignment costs, higher factors were built in. Mayor Dunn stated local match requirements may not be specifically from the city, but a property owner could be a source of contribution.

Mr. Shultz commented that the roads of regional significance through communities could be funded under different categories. He asked if the TPC would see the appropriate recommendation on the maps? Mr. Anderson affirmed that was correct.

Mr. Kane asked for clarification when referring to major streets, and whether today's discussion includes an actual classification that contains arterials and parkways as eligible for the half cent sales tax. Mr. Anderson replied that this would be consistent with the TPC's definition of major streets in HB 2292.

Mayor Dunn commented about limited access parkways, which may be alternative means to building freeways, and may serve flow-through traffic. In that case, who should pay the 20 percent match? Mr. Anderson replied that was a difficult question. It could be a consortium of cities. Mr. Anderson commented that how that 20 percent funding is composed will vary throughout the region.

Mr. Billings requested clarification of the 100 percent maintenance on the street program. Mr. Anderson explained this is part of the difference between the \$17 billion and the \$29 billion. He stated that projected over 20 years equals about \$6.9 billion for local street improvements, including maintenance. Mr. Anderson indicated that this may not be enough to cover 100 percent of the cost. Administratively, it may be easier that it be a local responsibility. Mr. Billings asked if the overall percentages were similar to those of freeways? Mr. Anderson replied that operations and maintenance probably would be a little higher as a percentage of capital costs.

Mayor Hawker expressed concern with a 20 percent local match on new major streets. He asked if the TPC is looking at areas where roads have not been plotted and we will build them with regional money at an 80 percent match? Mr. Anderson stated that some of these roads exist today, but would need to be reconstructed as higher level facilities.

Mayor Hawker asked when do new major streets become the responsibility of the municipality and when does it become the responsibility of the region? Mr. Anderson stated we have been going back to the definition of major streets in HB 2292 would tie in with freeways. Mr. Smith read the definition

from HB 2292: “Design, right-of-way purchase or construction of major arterial streets and highways that are included in the regional transportation plan of the county. For the purposes of this paragraph, ‘major arterial’ means an interconnected thoroughfare whose primary function is to link areas in the region and to distribute traffic to and from controlled access highways, generally of regionwide significance and of varying capacity depending on the travel demand for the specific direction and adjacent land uses.”

Mayor Hawker asked if a roadway is in the RTP and is in the County, it would qualify as a major street. Mr. Smith replied that was correct if they meet all criteria. He stated that the one question that arose was Southern and Baseline that are immediately adjacent to freeways without frontage roads.

Mayor Thomas expressed concern with maintenance. If we haven’t a plan on maintenance that crosses jurisdictional boundaries, would we have an inconsistency problem, and would it be the responsibility of the jurisdiction the facility goes through. Mayor Thomas suggested looking at match requirements on a case-by-case basis with the entity and developers. Leave open to the concerned entity to arrive at the match requirements. Mr. Smith commented that local match could be funds that a local jurisdiction receives, such as discretionary funds.

Chairman Giuliano stated that this could be retitled as “other source of funding at the local level.”

Mayor Dunn asked about including rubberized asphalt. Mr. Anderson replied that it could be a part, but has not yet been discussed. Mayor Dunn commented that some communities are using rubberized asphalt on arterials successfully.

Mr. Kane commented on the major street issue. Is the RTP going to identify parkways and major streets of regional significance on the map as a precursor to its eligibility, or would the classification be defined by a city in adopting their general plan? Mr. Anderson stated that there needs to be regional criteria to identify streets in the plan. The issue is, we have a 20 year plan and some will be added in over time. In addition, many corridors lend themselves to ITS technology.

No further comments were noted on the Streets mode.

The Transit mode that includes local bus service, Regional Connections bus service, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was discussed.

Mayor Dunn asked for clarification of the rationale for the 100 percent local match for local bus operations as well as for paratransit operations. Mr. Anderson replied that local bus provides local transit service and responds to local need in a community as opposed to those that provide regional mobility. He mentioned that some cities operating local bus systems are paying for local service already. Mayor Dunn stated that it may come down to defining local bus service tied into multiple jurisdictions. Some have this service and some do not. This could cause disruption in the system or may be a policy decision that each jurisdiction will need to proceed in a certain fashion. Mr. Anderson stated that the Transit Mode was divided into categories. Local bus service serves local needs; Regional Connections provides regional movement on arterial streets to many destinations. Mayor Dunn stated that it seemed regional routes are becoming smaller, and the more successful routes are the local routes. He added that some short routes are considered local, but cross jurisdictions. Chairman Giuliano commented that in Tempe, the local free shuttle does not qualify as a regional system. Mayor Dunn

commented that this might destroy those routes if there is funding on one side of the border and not the other.

Mr. Anderson stated that Valley Metro is working on defining these two categories, but they have not quite completed their work.

Mayor Dunn stated that there needs to be a balance and definition could help the voters.

Councilmember Dennis asked if the BRT category would be considered a regional route. Mr. Anderson replied that all BRT is regional and provides regional connections.

Chairman Giuliano noted that member agencies understand the concept that local service could be downtown, but regional bus goes from one part of the region to another.

Mayor Manross asked why transit along major streets may not be included. Mr. Anderson stated that major streets were crossed out because much of local service is on half mile streets.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the last definition opens up all bus service to funding by the half cent tax. A more broad definition of what is regional bus service on operations cost is needed.

Chairman Giuliano commented that regardless of boarding location, people are getting on buses to go throughout the region.

Vice Chair Scruggs noted that she envisioned longer routes through multiple jurisdictions, perhaps connectors to LRT, rather than the narrow focus of transit within a community.

Chairman Giuliano commented that the starting point would be the consideration, for example, if a route starts in the West Valley and went to Ahwatukee, that would be regional.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked if that would mean Phoenix would get money back. Some cities have used their own dedicated funds, and this creates a severe inequity. She stated that there needs to be a better definition of local and regional.

Mr. Kane stated his agreement. Local bus service defined as not a part of a regional connection would have access to funding of 80 percent of the cost from the half cent sales tax. Mr. Kane said that it seems counter-intuitive for the plan we have been asked to draft. Will we be funding all bus service to 80 percent with the half cent sales tax?

Mr. Smith noted that the business coalition was tepid in their response to funding regional bus service with the half cent sales tax. He suggested RPTA bringing back their proposed network to the TPC. If the region funds these routes, that would free up funds to the City of Phoenix. Mr. Smith stated that a map from Valley Metro would provide clarification to the TPC.

Mayor Hawker stated that he was comfortable with local bus service at 100 percent locally funded. Justification for capital at 20 percent from local and 80 percent from regional because operations costs are still paid locally. Mayor Hawker stated that there should be a differentiation between local and regional, and be very selective in what becomes regional. He stated that another aspect is the cost for

paratransit. If local routes are expanded to 100 percent for paratransit, within that 3/4 mile, you must take care of paratransit.

Mayor Manross supported Valley Metro working on this and bringing it back to the TPC.

Mayor Thomas stated that one component was left out—connectivity. After you take a long commuter ride in, an opportunity is needed to board a bus to take you to your final destination.

Vice Chair Scruggs expressed concern, not for funding 80 percent capital costs of local bus service, but the definition of regional connections that will have 100 percent of operations funded. She stated that some jurisdictions are on the RPTA Board, some are not. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the next board meeting is June 12, and a plan is needed by July 23, therefore, this needs to be addressed now. Mr. Smith stated that formal action by the RPTA Board was not anticipated, just looking for expertise and guidance to bring back to the TPC.

Mayor Dunn stated that citizens want a system that works. May not need to go from the West Valley to the East Valley to be regional. If the system is truly a regional system, it should be funded on a regional basis.

Chairman Giuliano noted that the maps on display showed the regional system. The hybrid scenario will say at what point the buses will have riders.

Mr. Billings stated that there is a need to spend more time on the operational side of transit, which amounts to 50 percent of available funds. If the model based on performance, is it what people want for \$4.2 billion? Mr. Anderson stated that in his opinion, scenario C is too heavy on transit. In developing the hybrid, we need to meet the performance test and see the highest performing routes. Mr. Anderson stated that what he was hearing from the TPC was that a definition of regional and local routes is needed and that local bus service should be funded locally, both capital and operations.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that a bus route that runs every 30 minutes costs \$60,000 per mile. If regional routes are higher performing, would cities currently paying for these routes be relieved of the cost under the half cent sales tax? Mr. Anderson stated that from the equity standpoint, the desire would be to provide regional funding on a regional basis.

No further comments were noted.

Discussion continued on the Rail Mode that included light rail and commuter rail.

Mayor Hawker stated that what he was hearing at the legislature was caution with light rail. The first 20 mile segment was brought forward with Phoenix, Tempe, and Mesa that earmarked funds to build the segment. To pass that along to the region would be a death blow to light rail. Mayor Hawker commented that if we go with BRT at 100 percent, we will never build any more light rail. If the existing funding is retained for the 20 mile starter segment, he would be agreeable. Mayor Hawker stated that this was the first time he heard about doubling the miles and the region would pick up half the system cost. He added that might be a good compromise.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the regional bus program will be tying into regional park and ride lots and passengers may board light rail or a bus. He added that there will be no particular mode a resident will use, a resident will use a variety.

Mayor Thomas commented on commuter rail and bus system that tie in. He brought up the 32 miles of commuter rail identified in the Transportation Plan, and noted that he had a difficult time identifying where commuter rail was.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the concept of some local funds for the light rail extension is appropriate. Those building the initial segments are taking on the lion's share of the spine of the system so it will be in place to serve the Valley. Both the region and the jurisdictions need to take on the burden in some split.

Councilmember Dennis asked about integrating light and commuter rail. Does it have to be one or the other? Coming in on Grand Avenue, commuter rail may be easier than taking the bus. Councilmember Dennis stated that she would like to examine options other than light rail. She asked she would like to know what is more cost effective to bring to the West Valley?

Councilmember Bilsten stated that if the region funded capital, the local match could fund operations. Chairman Giuliano indicated that was not an unreasonable request.

Mr. Kane commented that it was a great suggestion, because based on the business community's indications, there is a great fear that the tax will be pulled into the light rail operations and maintenance conundrum, while needed improvements do not get done. He stated that this fear is greater for light rail than bus service, where operations and maintenance are more greatly understood. Mr. Kane indicated that operations and maintenance may be difficult to sell as an appropriate extension into the sales tax.

Mayor Thomas expressed concern with light rail—it is a more localized system. Light rail includes local stops every half mile, whereas commuter rail can travel 30 miles with five or six stops. Mayor Thomas stated that light rail might be a feeder, like a bus. He indicated that he favored commuter rail. Mayor Thomas asked if coopting commuter rail by light rail that has already been planned, are we circumventing our own process? He stated that light rail will not connect to the current rail we could use for commuter rail. If we offer connectivity and make a more complete system, we will have a better sell.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that commuter rail did not poll high on surveys and light rail did. Hopefully, commuter rail will be a part of the system some day, but it does not sell right now. She commented that light rail is not just local service. It will get riders there faster and help with congestion.

Mayor Thomas brought up the presentation given on the survey of voters that said that the acceptability level for commuter rail was high on the list at 65 percent.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that if we do commuter rail, a written agreement is needed. She noted that previous attempts with railroad companies have been unsuccessful.

Chairman Giuliano directed that staff would come back with further information on operations and maintenance being taken care of by local jurisdictions and capital being taken care of as meeting regional need. Mr. Anderson asked for clarification that the 20 mile light rail starter segment would be

a part of the analysis. Chairman Giuliano replied that from an operations and maintenance standpoint, the segment would not part of it. For aspects that support the regional nature, there may be flexibility.

Supervisor Stapley asked if the intent was to take the 20 mile system funded by Phoenix, Mesa and Tempe and supplant what was committed by the half cent sales tax. He commented that he thought this would not fly. Chairman Giuliano stated that if a regional park and ride lot is servicing light rail and bus transfers for a regional bus system and is part of the regional program, then all or part of the costs would be regional. Supervisor Stapley stated that he would be interested in seeing the numbers on that. Mixing RARF money with projects already on the books would be a red flag.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that what Supervisor Stapley mentioned is what was said was going to be done with bus service. Are we going to ask some to bear the cost and some to get service free? Vice Chair Scruggs stated this creates inequity and the conundrum starts with buses.

Mr. Smith stated that Phoenix probably oversized their maintenance facility planning for the future. In fairness, if we build the system with sales tax money, they would get some contribution back.

Chairman Giuliano stated that if components are to service the system over the next 20 years, our job is to tell people that is the purpose. Supervisor Stapley asked if that could be done outside the \$8 billion in RARF, through other dedicated regional transit money?

Mayor Hawker stated that it was OK with park and ride. To supplant those funds and take \$500 million is a big chunk out of \$8 billion. Mayor Hawker stated that the dilemma is if you do it for bus, why not light rail?

Mayor Thomas brought up the public comment given by Marty Manasco, BNSF Railroad, at the April TPC meeting, where he expressed the cooperation of the railroads with the TPC. Mayor Thomas mentioned that he took a tour of the rail line. He suggested having a presentation at the next TPC meeting to see what BNSF has to offer. Mayor Thomas commented that if we cannot get a backbone for the commuter rail system, we will suffer the consequences. He stated that commuter rail is the key to get us out from under that burden.

Mr. Anderson summed up that the TPC would like more information on regional facilities and staff will assemble figures; will look at bus components and put numbers behind the concepts. Mr. Anderson stated that as the hybrid is developed, some assumptions need to be made, but there is the understanding that this mode is a major open issue. Chairman Giuliano noted that the same discussion applies to paratransit and vanpool rural transit. Mr. Anderson stated that the ADA-required component would be separated from the non-required components for paratransit. He noted that the ADA-required would be funded regionally, the others would be funded locally with the region picking up the capital costs. A consensus was noted.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that funding for some of these programs are available from other sources, such as CMAQ funds. She stated that she would prefer moving funding for operations from the half cent tax. Vice Chair Scruggs suggested not making those projects eligible. Chairman Giuliano commented that was good direction. Mr. Smith commented that travel reduction and rideshare programs were funded by CMAQ and could be left with that funding. He suggested that the TPC may want to consider funding the Freeway Service Patrol portion with the half cent because it is very popular with residents.

Mayor Hawker commented that having no local match and no contribution for capital for rural transit gives a blank check. Mr. Anderson noted that criteria is needed to show that the services would be supported. Mayor Hawker asked if the County had current rural programs. He noted that he had difficulty with none capital and none operations.

Mr. Anderson stated that the Bicycle and Pedestrian mode were omitted from the list, but perhaps should be considered for funding because those projects are typically very popular with citizens.

Chairman Giuliano noted that including elements of the Freeway Service Patrol and pedestrian and bicycle would need to be determined. A consensus was noted on direction to staff as a starting point to assist in the development of the RTP.

7. Alternatives Stage Results

Chairman Giuliano stated that staff was directed to develop three modeling scenarios (Scenario A: Higher Freeway Emphasis; Scenario B: Higher Arterial Street Emphasis; and Scenario C: Higher Transit Emphasis) to evaluate the performance of the packages of projects contained in the scenarios. After the scenarios are simulated using the transportation model, the output will be used to assess how projects perform in the various corridors in the Valley. Using the information from the modeling scenarios, a hybrid scenario will be developed and the performance analyzed using the transportation model. The hybrid scenario will be the basis for the Final Draft Stage of the Plan.

Mr. Smith noted that action by the TPC was very important in order to comply with HB 2292 requirements to submit the Alternatives Stages for entity response.

Mr. Anderson expressed his thanks to MAG modeling staff, who worked on coding the scenarios almost 24 hours a day, seven days a week to get the technical work completed. He noted that volumes of additional data are available, in addition to the document provided. Mr. Anderson provided a presentation on the Alternatives Stage.

Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation. He added that staff could provide presentations at local meetings, if requested.

Mayor Manross asked about the accuracy if the modeling for the transit scenario, whether it included BRT and how accurate was the modeling for BRT and LRT. Mr. Anderson replied the modeling included some BRT, especially in scenario C. Because of coding, for BRT/LRT, the ridership was probably understated. Mr. Anderson advised that with time constraints, staff was unable to re-run the model. Mayor Manross asked if the modeling would be accurate enough. Mr. Anderson replied that in his opinion, they were. He explained that the coding issue affected all modes consistently across the board. Mr. Anderson added that coding becomes more critical in the hybrid development stage.

Mayor Thomas noted that scenario C was the only scenario that had 50 miles of BRT. Mr. Anderson replied that BRT and LRT were only in scenario C, and Regional Connections and light rail were in scenarios A and B. Mayor Thomas asked if there was a sense where commuter rail fit in 20 years from now. He noted that rail can accommodate more capacity by adding cars, whereas freeways and BRT are limited capacity. Mr. Anderson replied that commuter rail will continue to be looked at as a long term part of the system. He added that the High Capacity Transit Study concluded that the cost effectiveness ratios show commuter rail is less cost effective than light rail and BRT. Mr. Anderson

explained that options will be exhausted over time. He gave as an example, freeways that move more people, but in the urban core, new freeways can no longer be built.

Mr. Kane asked for clarification that no reimbursement of light rail funded outside of the half cent sales tax, either capital or operations had taken place. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mr. Kane commented that if equity is addressed, how far the money would go would be different. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct.

Mr. Billings asked about an increase in transit fares to offset the operations cost. Mr. Anderson replied that the subsidy per passenger was considered, but the issue with transit is it is price sensitive. He explained that in the expert's opinions, the viability of raising fares to recoup 100 percent of operating costs is very limited or non-existent.

Chairman Giuliano commented as staff works on the hybrid, they will consult with stakeholders on this and have additional discussion.

Mayor Thomas asked about farebox revenue. Mr. Anderson replied that operating numbers are the farebox revenues.

Mayor Thomas asked if commuter rail had the highest opportunity for federal funding? Mr. Smith replied that commuter rail could have that availability, along with projects the Regional Council submitted that are not transit—i.e., Rio Salado. Mr. Smith noted that federal funding for I-17 redevelopment could be pursued.

Mr. Shultz commented on federal funds. There is a higher probability of federal funds going to arterial streets rather than transit. Mr. Shultz stated that he got the impression that much money would be allocated for transit.

Chairman Giuliano stated that as some point in the future, the TPC and the Regional Council need to have those discussions.

Mayor Hawker commented on the possibility for a freeway and transit component. He noted that he and Mayor Manross would be attending the National League of Cities conference and would provide a report. Mayor Hawker stated that scenario C does not perform as well in a return for money. He commented that Scenario B.5 might be a good model for effective use of funds. Mr. Anderson stated there were good projects in each scenario. The impacts from HOV, general purpose widening, new corridors and transit were evident. Our challenge is to draw out good features and build a hybrid. Mr. Anderson stated that there are some clear high priority needs out there that show in the volume numbers. He expressed that he was surprised by the power of the analysis. Mr. Anderson commented that he was glad the three scenarios were modeled because we might not have grasped the impacts and importance of the components.

Mayor Hawker stated that one of the charts showed that even with spending money on improvements, we will still have the level of congestion we have today. How do you sell that to the public? Mr. Anderson replied that the reality in urban areas is that congestion will be relieved in some part. Traffic is growing and we are adding traffic at twice the rate as we are adding capacity.

Mr. Almanza commented that he was surprised with the transit ridership shown in scenarios A and B. While there was more investment in scenario B, ridership was down. Mr. Almanza asked if work had been done on that or would it be up to each community to figure out the transit routes. By identifying routes might get benefits. Mr. Anderson replied that we will work on that for each community in the next couple of months to show high demand corridors. As the hybrid is developed, marginal transit routes would be cut back transit to show more ridership per dollar investment.

Mayor Thomas stated that impact fees are the wild card and are not included as a component. They could be a huge benefit to the region.

Ms. Scherer commented that many in the business community would have issue with impact fees.

Mr. Kane asked about the process for getting formal input from the stakeholders now rather than later. Mr. Smith stated that staff has been in contact with the legislative staff to get input. If the TPC takes action today, the Alternatives Stage would be hand carried to the County, ADOT, and RPTA the following day. He added that member agencies may also comment. Mr. Smith stated that the three agencies can approve, disapprove or modify. All recognize the scenarios are not perfect, but a recommendation is needed to transmit the scenarios.

Mr. Arnett stated that the CTOC Board was very impressed by the presentation on the plan given by Mr. Anderson at their meeting. Over the years, MAG and ADOT have been bashed and the legislature and the public need to sense that staff has done a marvelous job. Mr. Arnett stated that staff has a sense of the performance measures the TPC wants to take place and the political plan evaluation criteria as to regional equity.

Chairman Giuliano stated that from a timing standpoint, the TPC needs to submit the scenarios because the three entities need to have a full 30-day review. If we wait, we cannot meet the timeline. Chairman Giuliano stated that the scenarios would be submitted and we understand there will be modifications. Consulting with stakeholders will continue and the hybrid will be developed with that input.

Mr. Shultz commented on the intent and language in the legislation. He suggested recasting these alternatives because they are modal alternatives. Mr. Shultz commented that it seemed they could be retitled as mode related to transit, streets, or freeways. He added that these are not meant to be the plan, but a focus. Otherwise, some may get the idea staff set up three separate plans. Mr. Shultz noted that these are just illustrative on a mode basis. Chairman Giuliano stated these are the alternatives that the entities must comment on within 30 days. Mr. Shultz stated that it was unclear whether the legislation requires modal alternatives or three complete plans. Chairman Giuliano asked for assurance that the alternatives could move forward and meet legislative requirements. Mr. Smith replied that it is important to use the language from the law to meet the legislative intent. Get the 30-day clock started, and then meet with ADOT, Maricopa County and RPTA on the hybrid. Mr. Smith stated that the goal is to come back in June with a working draft of the plan.

Mr. Shultz moved to submit the Alternatives Stage of the plan for review for a 30-day period. Mr. Kane seconded. Chairman Giuliano asked if the motion included direction for staff to meet with stakeholders. Mr. Shultz, as maker of the motion, noted his agreement to amend the motion. Mr. Kane, as second, noted his agreement. The vote taken on the question passed unanimously.

8. Preliminary Discussion of Final Draft Stage of the Plan

At the June 18, 2003 TPC meeting, the Final Draft Stage of the Plan will be discussed. To assist staff in preparing for the June meeting, members of the TPC are requested to suggest possible strategies to address the transportation issues identified in the modeled scenarios. This input along with input from the 30-day review period and previously received input from the MAG member agencies will be used to prepare a Final Draft Stage of the Plan. Chairman Giuliano asked for thoughts on visual input.

Mayor Thomas asked if this plan is the plan voters will ultimately see on the ballot. A series of maps will be necessary. Mr. Smith replied that in addition to the plan for the half cent sales tax will be the ADOT funds to make it a complete plan, with the understanding that a subset of the sales tax will be what goes on the ballot.

Mr. Arnett moved to direct staff to develop a hybrid plan and two alternative hybrids. He stated his confidence that staff will meet the performance, legislative, and politically based plan. Mr. Arnett stated that staff has done a terrific job. Mayor Thomas seconded.

Mayor Hawker asked why two alternatives were needed. Mr. Arnett replied that they would provide emphasis one way or another. Mayor Hawker asked staff's preference. Mr. Anderson replied that staff would prefer doing one map. He added that the objective is to keep things moving. Mr. Smith stated that we not only need to get the map out, but look at priorities. He stated that some finality is needed by June if we are looking at a draft in July.

Ms. Scherer expressed her opposition to the motion on the table. She commented that just one map is needed, otherwise, we will not have a draft in July.

Mr. Arnett modified his motion to direct staff to develop a hybrid map. Mayor Thomas, as second, noted his agreement to the modification to the motion. The vote on the question passed unanimously.

9. Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Ms. Barker, who stated that at the May Management Committee meeting, Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix City Manager, said that cities already have the information and the study would probably be a waste of money. Ms. Barker suggested having MAG staff contact cities and see if the data is readily available. If compiling the information is beyond the duties of staff, hire a consultant for \$40,000 to compile the information and take the \$365,000 for road improvements. Ms. Barker stated that those improvements could be balanced by need. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Mr. Anderson stated that at the April 23, 2003 Regional Council meeting, a recommendation to conduct an Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis consultant study was discussed. He stated that Mayor Hawker had commented that it may be more appropriate for the TPC to weigh in on the decision whether to conduct the analysis. Mayor Hawker had suggested waiting to make a decision until after the sales tax election in May 2004. Mr. Anderson stated that the Regional Council recommended that this proposed study be reviewed by the TPC. Chairman Giuliano asked if members had comments.

Vice Chair Scruggs moved to recommend reconsidering the Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis (\$400,000) in the draft FY 2005 Unified Planning Work Program. Mayor Hawker seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

10. Legislative Update

Chairman Giuliano stated that HB 2292 passed and was signed by the Governor.

11. Future Agenda Items

Items anticipated on the June 18, 2003 TPC agenda include: Policy Assumptions; Preliminary Discussion of Final Draft Stage of the Plan.

Chairman Giuliano requested that veterans be remembered on Memorial Day.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary