

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

September 3, 2003
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

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

* Not present

#Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The workshop of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Elaine Scruggs at 10:05 a.m.

2. Presentation of Transportation Modeling Results and Draft Priorities

Eric Anderson began the workshop with a presentation on the draft plan evaluation and phasing priorities. He noted an additional amount of more than \$433 million to revenue streams and cost reductions of \$450 million, leaving a positive balance of \$94 million. Mr. Anderson stated that comments on the draft plan would be recorded and noted that efforts would be made to accommodate as many as possible.

Vice Chair Scruggs called for comments on the freeway projects in the draft plan.

Mayor Cavanaugh requested that he would like to see the I-10 widening between Loop 303 to Loop 101 moved from Phase 3 to Phase 2. He commented that this could be defended by the traffic volumes. Mayor Cavanaugh commented that Loop 303 from I-17 to I-10 is in Phase 1 and Phase 2, then four miles along I-10 to MC 85 is delayed to Phase 3. He noted there will be tremendous volume experienced in the area. Mayor Cavanaugh expressed that Phase 2 is essential for commercial development. Developers are advocating moving forward with that project so they can proceed with

huge commercial projects. He requested that this project be moved from Phase 3 to Phase 2. Mr. Anderson noted that for new facilities, right-of-way preservation money has been added up front in the plan.

Mayor Dunn commented that the I-10 project from Loop 202 south to Riggs Road should be moved to Phase 3 from Phase 4 because traffic volume will be increasing, and the capacity is insufficient now. He mentioned that this segment is impacted by growth in Pinal County. Mayor Dunn stated that the HOV lanes from Arizona Avenue on Loop 202 to Gilbert be moved from Phase 3 to Phase 2 due to the development occurring in the area. Mayor Dunn stated that the HOV ramps at I-10 and 202, as well as 101 and 202, be moved up from Phase 4 to Phase 3, and perhaps higher. He noted that these ramps are vital connections for both traffic flow and mass transit. Mayor Dunn commented that he was glad to see the South Mountain in the plan. He stated that it needs to stay in Phase 2 and will be a major reliever for I-10 and the Broadway Curve, and will allow access for both East and West Valleys. Mayor Dunn commented that he preferred Phase 1, but that Phase 2 was acceptable.

Mr. Shultz commented that the credibility of the plan has to do with performance criteria. Each project is modeled by mode, so we are aware of traffic demand congestion issues. We are able to evaluate its performance against a standard of reducing congestion. Mr. Shultz stated that system continuity is a subset of that because this is a regional system and the components need to work together. Revenue flow has to do with how the projects are phased. Mr. Shultz commented that project readiness and development are subsets of a performance standard fit into the computer model. Mr. Anderson commented these are processes that have to occur prior to construction. Mr. Shultz stated that presently, I-17 is a concept, and this concept needs development to a project specific before it can be realized because it is a regional system. Mr. Shultz asked if project analysis was based on performance? Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mr. Shultz commented that added to the criteria and performance evaluation are the observations of local elected officials in their communities. He asked if there were some modifications that are appropriate to accommodate without compromising the regionality of the plan? Mr. Anderson replied yes.

Mayor Manross addressed her comments at once because she had to leave the meeting for a commitment in her city. She noted that Mr. Shultz's comments were well taken that the TPC is trying to balance the plan based on criteria. Mayor Manross urged coordination of park and ride lots and HOV construction with transit, especially BRT. She stated that this must look credible to the public and show it can work. She stated that she hoped cities will be allowed to put their own funds upfront for plans or environmental studies if they want to move forward a project a little faster.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that one piece still missing, that the TPC will need to address after plan approval, is setting the criteria and process for the TPC to use when voting to approve projects for new money. This is the next piece to work on after the plan is approved, to be fair to all.

Mr. Berry stated that the improvements to I-10 are beneficial, but are we telling the taxpayers that I-10 will be under construction for the next 20 years? Mr. Anderson replied that portions will be. He stated that staff had given thought about this aspect. One idea on the loop system was adding both general purpose and HOV lanes at the same time to minimize disruption to the public. As the plan was put together, it became obvious that it was important to have HOV lanes early for transit purposes. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT informed staff that adding HOV lanes on the 101 and 202 would be easily accommodated because they would be constructed in the median. He noted that this would also enable elimination of the cable median barriers. Mr. Anderson stated that adding general purpose lanes is

usually more expensive and disruptive because the TI ramps have to be reconstructed. An option was to split the HOV and general purpose lanes. To the extent possible, staff packaged the improvements to avoid disruption. Mr. Anderson also noted limitations to doing too much at one time because of cash flow. Mr. Berry asked about phasing of SR 85 to divert interstate traffic. He noted that new roads are not as disruptive to travelers, but expanding existing roads can be extremely disruptive. Mr. Anderson explained the phasing to reduce disruption. Mr. Berry commented that from a traffic and goods movement standpoint, 15 out of 20 years under construction needs to be considered. Mr. Anderson replied that most of the construction projects will be in two-year blocks.

Councilmember Dennis commented on the Beardsley Road and 101 project listed in freeway projects for \$13.8 million. She noted that in the arterial projects, Beardsley Road improvements are shown at \$20 million. She asked if they were the same project. Councilmember Dennis noted that her staff agreed that Beardsley improvements should not be greater than \$13 million. Mr. Anderson replied that staff would re-examine this. Councilmember Dennis expressed concern that the Beardsley Road intersection needs to be done soon. She noted that the cities of Glendale and Peoria have made improvements already, but that interconnection is needed now. She commented that the project needs to be moved to Phase 1 from Phase 2. Councilmember Dennis commented on Happy Valley Road, which is contained in Phase 4 in the amount of \$12.1 million. She stated that there is currently no east/west connection in the northern area and requested that the project be moved to Phase 2 if money is available from the Beardsley Road project.

Mayor Hawker asked if it was possible to do the Hawes Road at Williams Gateway project in two phases. Accelerate the segment to Ellsworth, the location of the future terminal at Williams Gateway, and finish the remainder in a later phase. Mayor Hawker stated that the Mesa Drive intersection improvements in the amount of \$3 million could be moved back to Phase 3 from Phase 2 and the money applied to Meridian Road. Mayor Hawker added that the County wants to move this project from Phase 3 to Phase 2 and the amount is also \$3 million, so that is balanced out. He stated his agreement with Mayor Manross's comments about flexibility for cities using their own funding to accelerate projects and hoped the concept would be incorporated. Mayor Hawker stated his agreement with Vice Chair Scruggs's comments about a process for new money. He added that cost savings will be realized from developers and that money will be coming in. Therefore, a regionally adopted strategy is needed to account for that money. Mayor Hawker stated that the firewalls component is a great concept so money does not move from one mode to another. He commented that he assumed there would be a life cycle analysis on individual components. He commented that the regional equity issue is not going to be resolved. Mayor Hawker stated that the East Valley turned in some projects so that the mayors can politically campaign for the election with their citizens.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that Phoenix would like to move the north/south leg of the Southwest Loop from Phase 2 to Phase 1. In addition, move the Broadway Curve project from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked MAG staff to confirm for the record an understanding between Glendale and MAG staff that the segment on Loop 303 from Lake Pleasant to I-17 will be built as an interim facility in 2006-2010. In Phase 2, 2011-2015, the entire Loop 303 segment from I-10 to I-17 would be constructed as a full freeway. Mr. Anderson confirmed that was in the plan. Vice Chair Scruggs commented on Grand Avenue. She stated that the draft plan includes \$151 million in Phase 4 for improvements between 19th Avenue and Loop 101. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that after interchanges, Glendale's portion comes to \$50 million. She requested that \$30 million be placed in Phase 1 and \$20 million in Phase 2 to accommodate the city's plans already in place. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that

Glendale will be contributing a 20 percent match and this money will be available in the first ten-year period, whereas, the project is programmed in the back half.

Mayor Berman commented that it appears that Gilbert will be a donor community, which is acceptable because they were beneficiaries in the last tax. However, Gilbert cannot be the donor and be expected to wait until the end of the tax to get their roads in. Mayor Berman stated that two projects that are important are the Gilbert portion of the San Tan HOV lanes from Dobson to Higley, and the intersection at Guadalupe and Cooper. Mayor Berman stated that everyone will not get everything and cities will have to dig into their own pockets. He stated that he would like assurances that if a city builds a project sooner than programmed, they will be reimbursed.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she was around when policies, such as project acceleration and reimbursement, were set in place for the old plan. Her question is how soon after the RTP is adopted can the TPC set about developing those processes for the new plan? Mr. Smith replied that discussion could take place on September 17th, because people will be comfortable knowing the processes. He stated that a freeway policy could be modeled on the existing policy. With new or reduced money, people will be more comfortable if firewalls are there and percentages are in place. Mr. Smith stated that in general, the TPC needs to put the processes in motion at the September 17th meeting and they could be fine tuned later if needed. He noted that some of the best practices are already in place, they may just need to be refined.

Vice Chair Scruggs suggested mailing the existing policies and procedures soon if they will be used as the baseline. She added that the September 17th meeting will be a busy meeting and would not be the best time to start explaining new processes. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that having firewalls is important. The TPC needs to have processes in place for evaluating those new projects or projects that did not make it to the final plan. She commented that there is no plan for I-17, just unanimous agreement that I-17 needs to be fixed. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that there is \$1 billion for I-17, but we do not know if that will be enough. She asked when miscellaneous projects come in, where do the big regional items fit in? A process is needed that will stay in place for at least the first decade. Mr. Smith noted that one of the responsibilities of the TPC is to make recommendations to the Regional Council on material cost changes. He explained that Mr. Anderson would do a cash flow analysis to show that the change would not impact other projects.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that you cannot have a cost change on something for which there is no plan and provided I-17 as an example from the RTP. When someone comes in with a street project, the TPC needs a rational non-emotional process for weighing new money. Mr. Anderson stated that the issue is how you make plan changes going forward. Circumstances, such as economic changes, will occur that will impact the plan. Mr. Anderson suggested that maybe every few years there would be a re-examination of the plan. He mentioned that the changes in 1994 were done behind closed doors without significant input from local elected officials and the public. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the process was probably included in HB 2292 to avoid that situation.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if the contingency money was still in place or had been used to bring the plan into balance. Mr. Anderson replied that the contingency money was still in place, although the amount was adjusted a bit due to cost reductions in freeways and a miscalculation in arterials. He noted that none of the contingency money had been used to balance the plan.

Ms. Scherer stated that she was glad there were firewalls, but no matter what happens, the TPC needs to ensure firewalls stay in place. Mr. Anderson commented that firewalls is a fundamental concept of the plan. Ms. Scherer noted that the firewalls concept that will last 20 years is also fundamental to voters.

Mr. Berry asked about the performance measures for each project being included in a revision of the book. Mr. Anderson replied that volume numbers are included in the blue book. Mr. Berry asked about the cost per vehicle miles traveled or cost per passenger mile. Mr. Anderson replied that those calculations could be provided. He added that volume and cost information were included in the book's appendix.

Mr. Shultz stated that detail is helpful in the analysis of a specific project. However, it is not a science of how our travel behavior will be. Mr. Shultz stated that he would like a discussion of volume compared to need without too much detail. He expressed that he felt the data in the blue book was at the right level—one can see capacity requirements and volumes. Mr. Shultz stated that too much detail tends to weigh down debate on what the plan and corridors should be. Too much detail will not work with the general public. The public wants to know when they can use the corridor and will it be usable. Mr. Anderson commented that it becomes more difficult to do cross-mode comparisons on a regional basis.

Mr. Shultz stated that he had heard suggested changes to the phasing from several local elected officials based on their understanding of the area, These are helpful to the TPC and serve a purpose.

Mr. Gant stated that comments from the State Transportation Board would be submitted in writing. Significant items include general purpose lanes on I-10 from Loop 202 to Riggs Road and HOV lanes on I-10 from Loop 202 to Riggs Road. He stated that the Board recommends moving these projects from Phase 4 to Phase 1.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that at the public hearing at the Burton Barr Library she kept hearing sound walls, landscaping, and litter control for freeways. She stated that she wanted to know if sufficient funds had been set aside to cover these items for freeways. Councilmember Bilsten stated that these are projects important to the plan that neighborhoods can embrace. Many citizens bring up broken promises for landscaping that didn't happen. Mr. Anderson stated that \$354 million is included in the plan for freeway landscaping maintenance and litter control. Regarding walls, no money is included in the plan at this time. He added that may be coming forward over the next couple of weeks. Mr. Anderson expressed that from a voter perspective, mitigation efforts are important elements for the TPC to consider.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked for clarification how the issue of money for firewalls may be coming forward over the next couple of weeks. Mr. Anderson replied that staff has heard it would be through TPC members.

Vice Chair Scruggs referred to Councilmember Bilsten's comments. She stated that the old rules say if developments show on maps you get sound walls. The City of Glendale learned a lesson the hard way. It cost the city \$7 million for six miles of sound walls, even though Arrowhead Ranch was master planned and showed houses in only one place. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that rule needs to be gone. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the Loop 101/Bethany Home Road interchange is programmed in Phase 3. She recalled a past TPC meeting when she explained that the reason there is currently no interchange at Bethany Home was due to the Paradise Parkway being eliminated from the plan that was approved

by the voters in 1985. If the Paradise had been built, there would now be an interchange built at Bethany Home. Vice Chair Scruggs stated the City of Mesa got an interchange in 1998 under similar circumstances. She noted there will be tremendous activity at Bethany Home Road and the interchange is a regional need. She stated that ramp volume is estimated at 30.5 in Phase 3. Ramp volume at I-10 at Bullard is estimated at 30.9 in Phase 1; Dixileta volume at 31.1 in Phase 2; Beardsley volume at 24.3 in Phase 2, Mesa Drive volume at 27.4 in Phase 2; Superstition and Lindsey volume at 16.2 in Phase 2. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that less volume interchanges than Bethany Home Road are in the plan at lower phases. She added that this interchange needs to be in Phase 1. Mr. Anderson acknowledged that this was an oversight on staff's part. He noted that the north and south portions are now programmed in Phase 1.

Mayor Hawker asked for clarification of the phasing of the Bethany Home interchange. Mr. Anderson explained that one half of the interchange was 2005 program and funds for the north were in the ADOT 2008 program. He added that the interchange on the north side was more complicated because of the canal. Mayor Hawker commented that his point was that a portion of the interchange needs to be in Phase 1 and another portion in Phase 2.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that her point was that if the 101 had been built without the aspect of the Paradise, there would have been an interchange built at that time. She commented that the Paradise was another promise broken and that we must go back and fix that. There is no rationale for the interchange to not be done. That interchange should have opened in October 2000, when the Loop 101 Freeway opened.

With no further comments on the freeway program, Mr. Anderson continued with the arterials program.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the concept was correct on Northern Avenue, but the green segment needed to be switched with the blue segment. She noted that for the accuracy of historical files, a change needed to be made to the Northern Avenue modeling figure. She explained that it was shown as an at-grade facility with signals and needed to be shown as a grade separated facility. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that this error would attribute a lower volume.

Mr. Berry commented on the chart of costs and daily volumes included in the blue book. For US 60, Loop 303 to the 101, the cost is estimated at \$105 million. He noted that the average daily traffic volume is 42 until 2015, which then increases to 47 in 2025. Mr. Berry asked how that passes through performance measures? Mr. Anderson replied that the volumes would be re-examined. He noted that the figures are from the Northwest Grand Avenue Study, which could provide additional data. Mr. Anderson also explained that some of the improvements to Grand Avenue, such as limiting access, are difficult to model and that many improvements are to address non-capacity issues such as safety. Mr. Anderson stated that one of the projects in that section is at the hospital so that ambulances would not have to stop at the railroad crossing. This would not do anything for through capacity, but would provide safety and access to the hospital.

Mayor Hawker noted that the high capacity transit segment from terminus to downtown Mesa should be shown as 2.7 miles, not 2.5 miles. Mr. Anderson noted that would be corrected.

Councilmember Bilsten commented that the I-17 on Sonoran Parkway is in Phase 3 and Phoenix requests this be moved to Phase 2, if possible. Councilmember Bilsten commented that Phoenix sees

the need to do this project sooner than later with the understanding that Phoenix will provide additional dollars.

Mr. Anderson continued on with the presentation. Comments were heard on the transit program.

Councilmember Dennis noted existing transit service on Peoria Avenue. If there is not local money, will that service go out of service until 2011-2015? Mr. Anderson replied that existing service will be maintained, but increased service would be in Phase 2.

Vice Chair Scruggs expressed concern for the level of bus service on Grand Avenue. She commented that Grand Avenue is thought of as a productive corridor for transit after the improvements have been made. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that this is a huge connection to the entire Northwest Valley. Vice Chair Scruggs asked if she needed to do additional work on this. Mr. Anderson indicated that he has met with Valley Metro and Glendale staffs. Mr. Anderson advised continued communication with MAG and Valley Metro staffs, in addition to MAG staff continuing to track this.

Mr. Anderson explained the high capacity corridor and what was in each phase.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked for clarification of the high capacity alignment to Glendale. Mr. Anderson replied that the map showed an alignment along Bethany, but that alignment has not yet been decided. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that the alignment needs to be along Bethany Home Road or Northern Avenue in order to receive funding from the Glendale transportation tax.

Ms. Scherer asked for clarification of the line south in Tempe. Mr. Anderson explained the light rail line would drop down from Rural Road in Tempe to Southern—a two-mile segment. Ms. Scherer asked if this was warranted by traffic volume. Mr. Anderson replied that based on passenger volume, this is a very high demand corridor. Ms. Scherer asked if the line would lead somewhere in 20 years. Mr. Anderson replied that this was what was funded in the plan, unless cities want to add in money.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Mr. Anderson to sum up today's meeting. Mr. Anderson stated that he heard requests for many changes. Some may be able to be accommodated, some not. He added that staff intends to put together a list of those changes that can be made and show the changes. Mr. Anderson indicated that staff could take a look at financing techniques after phasing of projects is complete. We want to put together a fiscally responsible plan that matches the cash flow and makes logical sense to voters.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Mr. Anderson if the processes for accelerations, reimbursements, and new money could be brought forward after approval of the plan on September 17th. Mr. Anderson commented that a list could be assembled of tools available to manage implementation of the plan. Those tools could include plan modifications, firewalls, life cycle management. Mr. Anderson noted that policies are already in place on the freeway program that the TPC could draw from. Staff could define the concepts for discussion by the TPC. Vice Chair Scruggs stated she had suggested mailing out those existing policies now, but it might make more sense to send out all of the material in one packet. She added that it would be useful if the TPC has a minimum of one week time to review the material. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that these policies will be important to the decisions made by the TPC. Mr. Anderson stated that staff would be putting together the draft official document for the October meeting, and the document could incorporate these types of policies for information and discussion.

Mr. Shultz suggested developing a concept of a motion in advance of the September 17th meeting. He commented that he had heard excellent modifications today, and was getting the impression that this plan will be embraced by the entire TPC. Mr. Shultz stated that non-MAG TPC members need to see the draft policies. He asked if it would be helpful having a group to discuss and meet a consensus recommendation that would be presented to the TPC in advance so wording can be worked out to the satisfaction of all.

Mayor Hawker stated his agreement with the concept. He stated that he felt it was appropriate for staff to make a first draft and the entire TPC could go forward with modifications, instead of having a motion drafting committee.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that there could be concerns that a predetermined motion might be out of character with the open meeting law. She added that there might also be new information presented at the meeting that might make a draft motion irrelevant. She asked the TPC for thoughts on a committee or staff to draft motion language.

Vice Mayor Schweiker stated his support for Mayor Hawker's suggestion. He stated that his Town Council has suggested motions. This helps to avoid the problems of drafting a motion at the table and allows time to consider the ramifications. Vice Mayor Schweiker stated that a first draft would be merely a suggestion on wording, and he did not feel it would be a violation of open meeting law. He commented that it would provide the opportunity to see if the wording encompasses what the TPC desires.

Mr. Shultz commented that his interest was in the result, and had no preference if the group drafting the wording was staff or a committee. He added that the corporate world has draft motions presented to the Board and they work through them.

Vice Mayor Schweiker expressed that he felt that staff could make the first draft.

Ms. Scherer stated that she was comfortable with staff making the first draft. She urged getting the draft to the TPC in time to allow feedback. Perhaps a second draft could be sent to the TPC prior to the meeting, if time allowed. Ms. Scherer stated that she felt a draft would not be a violation of open meeting law, because the TPC could decide not make the motion or could make a substitute motion.

Mayor McDermott stated that he liked the concept, but was concerned with a draft motion. Having a motion ahead of time indicates that the TPC is saying they endorse the plan now. Mayor McDermott commented that there is still another step—this plan needs to go to the Legislature and he did not agree with some portions of the plan. Until that is done, it is inappropriate to draft a motion on the plan because it is not approved yet.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that her city uses staff recommendations. She commented that a motion trumps discussion somewhat. Vice Chair Scruggs expressed that she had concern with this concept.

Mr. Smith commented that a different plan will be brought back incorporating comments made at the workshop. That plan will be the new baseline. Then other concepts—firewalls, life cycles, accelerations, material cost changes—could be bulleted out for discussion by the TPC. Mr. Smith added that a member could frame these concepts in a motion if they chose.

Mayor Berman stated that there will not be a motion that satisfies everyone. He stated that he would not mind seeing a couple of examples of draft motions from staff. The TPC can then discuss those drafts. Mayor Berman stated that failure could take place at the end when someone says this is the break point for me. He suggested that staff could prepare a couple of drafts, similar as those jurisdictions use at council meetings. Mayor Berman expressed that everyone has to give on something.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that she was struggling with a prepared motion, that it infers the motion is expected to pass with those exact words. She stated that it may not be respectful of the public process. However, staff recommendations would be acceptable, and might settle some issues. Getting information in advance is key. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she did not anticipate a unanimous vote on the plan, which does not mean it is a bad process, just free will.

Councilmember Bilsten requested that staff meet with those having issues with the plan. Even if there is not a unanimous vote, it would be nice to get as close as possible. Councilmember Bilsten commented that the TPC has worked hard to get a plan all can wrap their arms around, and want all to feel they had a place at the table and were heard.

Vice Mayor Schweiker concurred with Councilmember Bilsten's comments. The TPC needs to get as close to unanimous, if not unanimous, as possible. He commented that in his business whatever the vote was, after the vote 100 percent of the people are behind the vote 100 percent. Any disagreements are taken care of at the vote and put behind them. Vice Mayor Schweiker stated that he trusted that the TPC will do that. Once the decision is made, he hoped all would be out there to support the plan as if it were their personal plan.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked for clarification of a public meeting on September 10th at which the County had requested doing a presentation. Mr. Smith replied there was a public hearing the evening of September 10th in Scottsdale. He suggested that the TPC could take a roll call vote and explain their issues on the record. Mr. Smith commented that he felt a unanimous vote is where the TPC needed to be, and he hoped that for regional unity, the TPC will vote for the plan unanimously. He commented that he realized two or three may have a hard time voting for it.

Mr. Shultz stated his agreement. The TPC has been a positive business/elected partnership. He stated that from an economic standpoint, the business community would be hopeful for unanimity with an expression of support for free will.

Vice Chair Scruggs confirmed that the TPC would be considering the adopted July 22nd draft plan at the September 17th meeting. At the workshop today, the TPC was working on fitting in priorities.

Mr. Smith stated that staff has heard that people want to have projects considered at the September 17th meeting.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the TPC started meeting in September 2002. Some requested bringing projects forward more quickly, but instead, the TPC wordsmithed for eight months. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that each entity brought projects forward, and each lost a lot of those projects. The draft plan came together July 22nd and the TPC voted on it. The TPC then asked staff to model the plan. Now, some communities have asked to model other projects. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that other communities were unaware there was an opportunity to model other projects. On the day of final approval of the tentative plan, which was presented to the public, new projects will be introduced that

were not a part of the July 22nd plan. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she thought the TPC talked today about the need to take newly found money and put it aside until the TPC could look at unmet need in the region and evaluate those projects that disappeared along the way by agreed upon criteria. Then a vote would be taken. She stated that now she was hearing that on September 17th, new projects that the TPC has not discussed, were not a part of the July 22nd plan, and were not a part of the September 3rd workshop, will be coming forward and be voted on.

Mr. Smith reported that he heard some cities intend to put these projects in a motion. Mr. Smith mentioned that most of the projects were modeled in the hybrid and are not new. He added that comments were heard from the public at the hearings that they want consideration of Jomax Road. Mr. Smith noted that the public is being told that the plan is not yet final, and their comments will be heard. In addition, cities are commenting on the plan.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Supervisor Max W. Wilson to brief the TPC on the County proposals for roads.

Supervisor Wilson stated that one of the proposals was for protection of SR 74 to have an outer loop and a road to CANAMEX, which was on the plan originally. He expressed concern for access on Northern Avenue, and mentioned that the County will review some issues on Northern. They will respond in writing. Supervisor Wilson stated that at this time, the County thinks that Jomax will probably be a County operation and paid for by developers.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked if motions on September 17th would include bringing back anything originally in the hybrid plan that dropped out. Mr. Smith replied that the plan is still a draft plan and the TPC needs to consider comments from members and the public.

Ms. Scherer stated that she voted against the plan on July 22nd because it was not close to being fiscally balanced. She commented that she hoped those who think about bringing projects back think hard before they do that. Ms. Scherer stated that it is important that the TPC be unanimous on September 17th. She commented that maybe the way to start that process is to go around the room and state break points. Ms. Scherer stated that her break point is a balanced budget and absolute firewalls. To start bringing back projects on September 17th would be ill advised. Ms. Scherer stated that everyone had projects that dropped off.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated her agreement with Ms. Scherer about bringing back projects. However, her position was that if other cities bring forward projects that were eliminated, she could not do a disservice to her city and not bring forward projects also.

Councilmember Bilsten proposed another workshop to work out issues. She stated that all have given and lost projects. Councilmember Bilsten commented that she thought the TPC was ready to move forward. She requested a workshop to get those with issues in a room so the TPC has something on September 17th they can move forward with.

Vice Mayor Schweiker stated his agreement with Councilmember Bilsten. He stated that September 17th will be a tough meeting, anyway, and bringing in projects will be a recipe for disaster. Vice Mayor Schweiker commented that he thought the TPC could have a unanimous plan. If everyone brings in projects on September 17th, that would not lead to a positive outcome. He urged members to think 10 times before bringing forward projects to that meeting.

Mayor Hawker commented that after the I-10 Reliever was added and the plan was \$800 million over budget, some of the East Valley mayors looked at the criteria. One of these criteria was “Can you convince your voters to support the plan in your community?” Mayor Hawker stated that the list of projects was put together to allow the East Valley mayors to campaign for the election, without going for an East Valley-only tax. He stated they tried to compromise and still be a contributor to the region, but at the same time be able to go to their voters and say this is a good deal for their communities. Mayor Hawker stated that these projects are the break point for the East Valley or they can end up with more revenue by having their own tax and not contribute to regional projects. Mayor Hawker stated they did not want to do that because the State and County are better served with regional projects. Mayor Hawker stated that this is the only way to convince his voters that they will get something back for their investment. He commented that without those projects, there will be split votes, not only on the TPC, but when the plan goes to the ballot.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that after a previous TPC meeting, Mr. Smith called the I-10 Reliever a “piggy project.” She noted that MAG has assumed the cost of the I-10 Reliever in the West Valley share of the program. Vice Chair Scruggs asked members to consider where the I-10 Reliever goes. She questioned whether cities think their citizens do not leave their city. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that this project is for the entire state and region. It moves goods and services and keeps the money flowing. To use that as the battering ram and say the West Valley is getting more than its share is extremely inappropriate.

Councilmember Dennis stated that at the beginning of this exercise, their staff looked at regional projects with regional dollars that were necessary for their citizens. She commented that the city will probably have to go back and ask their citizens for more money to address additional transit and street projects. Councilmember Dennis expressed concern with losing focus that this is a regional issue—not east/west, but how to make a plan that will last for 20 years and meet needs. She expressed that her concern with adding additional projects was where will they be phased in on September 17th.

Mr. Smith replied that if new projects were brought in, the TPC would need to know the phasing before they voted. Mr. Smith addressed Vice Chair Scruggs’s statement about comments on the I-10 Reliever attributed to him. He stated that he was unaware he said that about the I-10 Reliever. When staff saw revenue coming in from ADOT, the word “overprogrammed” was not used because it appeared that the plan could be funded and that this was supportive that the I-10 Reliever could be funded. Mr. Smith noted that the July 22nd book says the I-10 Reliever will be included.

Mr. Shultz stated that he respected that the elected officials’ need the plan represented in their areas. He noted that we have a \$16 billion program with very solid projects that stands up to performance measures. Mr. Shultz stated that if \$200 million is the numerator and \$16 billion is the denominator, the amount is fairly diminimus as a percentage of the total. He expressed his hope that the issues will be resolved before September 17th. The TPC needs to figure out the requests and challenges. Mr. Shultz noted that the TPC has programmed a good portion already. He stated that this RTP is too important to sacrifice for a diminimus amount of project allocation. Mr. Shultz stated that this is not an expression of who is right or wrong. Each elected official knows their area best. Mr. Shultz, speaking on behalf of the business community, stated that the TPC needs to resolve this discussion and strive for a unanimous vote because it is correct and politically right, so people have confidence in leadership.

Mayor Cavanaugh commented that striving for unanimous agreement, the TPC will meet obstacles and need to move past them. He stated that the I-10 Reliever was not a new project and was in the plan as late as June, then removed without direction from the TPC, then returned to the plan. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that the I-10 Reliever stands on its own merit. He stated that the TPC as a group trusted that those final requirements were included in the final draft stage of the plan. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that the TPC needs to hold fast to the July 22nd plan. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that other requirements may be valid for the future and could be handled separately. He expressed that the plan will be manageable only if there is a cutoff, and he believed that cutoff is the July 22nd plan.

Supervisor Wilson offered clarification on his previous comments on Jomax Road. He stated that Surprise just wanted right-of-way protection, which he thought would be done through the County, not necessarily as a part of this plan. Supervisor Wilson stated that he commented on other projects that were eliminated and will be a part of the future growth of the County, and not necessarily a part of this plan. Supervisor Wilson stated that the County will provide written comments that will be based on performance basis.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that once the final plan is adopted, it goes back to the County again. If the final plan includes projects not in the plan the County commented on, and some they do not agree with, how does the County deal with that? There would be no way for the TPC to change the plan to address those comments. Supervisor Wilson replied that the County does not have the right to change the plan, only comment on it.

A consensus was reached that an additional workshop was unneeded.

There being no further business, the workshop adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman